CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

5-6168

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

VOLUME XXVI.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1894.

VOLUME XXVI, PART I.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

SECOND SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1893.*

The first Monday of December being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the second session of the Fifty-third Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The VICE-PRESIDENT of the United States (Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, of the State of Illinois), called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

PRAYER.

Rev. W. H. MILBURN, Chaplain to the Senate, offered the following prayer:

We devoutly bless Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, that Thou has brought back in safety and in health to their seats upon this floor so many of the members of this time-honored and illustrious body. And we now beseech Thee to grant them Thy grace, with health of body and soundness of mind, for their arduous and responsible duties, enacting laws and making provision for the welfare of this great nation. Prosper them in all their ways. Let Thy heavenly benediction abide upon our land, upon all our people. May intelligence, virtue, patriotism, and piety increase among our families and throughout all the land, that God's smile may be upon our country and Thy grace be the portion of our descendants to the latest generation. We humbly pray, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

SENATORS PRESENT.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this being the opening of the regular session, I think the roll ought to be called to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators were present:

From the State of—

Alabama—James L. Pugh.
Arkansas—James H. Berry and James K. Jones.
Connecticut—Joseph R. Hawley and Orville H. Platt.
Delaware—George Gray and Anthony Higgins.
Florida—Wilkinson Call and Samuel Pasco.
Georgia—John B. Gordon.
Idaho—Fred. T. Dubois and George L. Shoup.
Illinois—Shelby M. Cullom and John M. Palmer.
Indiana—Daniel W. Voorhees.
Iowa—James F. Wilson.
Kansas—John Martin and William A. Peffer.
Kentucky—Joseph C. S. Blackburn.
Louisiana—Donelson Caffery and Edward D. White.
Maine—Eugene Hale.
Maryland—Charles H. Gibson and Arthur P. Gorman.
Massachusetts—George F. Hoar and Henry Cabot Lodge.
Michigan—James McMillan and Francis B. Stockbridge.
Minnesota—Cushman K. Davis.
Mississippi—Edward C. Walthall.
Missouri—Francis M. Cockrell and George G. Vest.
Montana—Thomas C. Power.
Nebraska—Charles F. Manderson.
Nevada—John P. Jones and William M. Stewart.
New Hampshire—William E. Chandler and Jacob H. Gallinger.
New Jersey—John R. McPherson and James Smith, jr.
New York—David B. Hill and Edward Murphy, jr.
North Dakota—Henry C. Hansbrough and William N. Roach.
Ohio—John Sherman.
Oregon—Joseph N. Dolph and John H. Mitchell.
Pennsylvania—James Donald Cameron.
Rhode Island—Nelson W. Aldrich and Nathan F. Dixon.
South Dakota—James H. Kyle.
Tennessee—Isham G. Harris.
Texas—Richard Coke and Roger Q. Mills.
Vermont—Justin S. Morrill and Redfield Proctor.
Virginia—John W. Daniel and Eppa Hunton.
West Virginia—Johnson N. Camden and Charles J. Faulkner.
Wisconsin—John L. Mitchell and William F. Vilas.
Wyoming—Joseph M. Carey.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MCPHERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two members be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the committee on the part of the Senate, and Mr. MCPHERSON and Mr. SHERMAN were appointed.

HOUR OF MEETING.

On motion of Mr. FAULKNER, it was

Ordered, That the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

RECESS.

Mr. HARRIS (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.). I move that the Senate take a recess for one hour.

The motion was agreed to; and at the expiration of the recess (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

At 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m., Mr. JAMES KERR, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared below the bar of the Senate and delivered the following message:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has appeared, and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

I am further directed to inform the Senate that a committee of three members has been appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed by the Senate to wait on the President and inform him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may have to make; and that the Speaker has appointed as the said committee on the part of the House, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, Mr. OUTHWAITE, and Mr. BURROWS.

RECESS.

Mr. HARRIS (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.). I move that the Senate take a recess for twenty minutes.

The motion was agreed to; and at the expiration of the recess (at 1 o clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MCPHERSON and Mr. SHERMAN, the committee appointed in conjunction with a similar committee of the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared below the bar, and

Mr. MCPHERSON said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, have performed that duty and have been requested by the President to say that he will immediately communicate to each House a message in writing.

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

At 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m. Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of the secretaries of the President of the United States, appeared below the bar, and said:

Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The message was received from the secretary, and handed to the Vice-President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the message of the President of the United States, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary (Mr. WILLIAM R. COX) read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The constitutional duty which requires the President from time to time to give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient, is fittingly entered upon by commending to the Congress a careful examination of the detailed statements and well-supported recommendations contained in the reports of the heads of Departments, who are chiefly charged with the executive work of the Government. In an effort to abridge this communication as much as is consistent with its purpose, I shall supplement a brief reference to the contents of these departmental reports by the mention of such executive business and incidents as are not embraced therein, and by such recommendations as appear to be at this particular time appropriate.

While our foreign relations have not at all times during the past year been entirely free from perplexity, no embarrassing situation remains that will not yield to the spirit of fairness and love of justice, which, joined with consistent firmness, characterize a truly American foreign policy.

My predecessor having accepted the office of arbitrator of the long-standing missions boundary dispute tendered to the President by the Argentine Republic and Brazil, it has been my agreeable duty to receive the special envoys commissioned by those states to lay before me evidence and arguments in behalf of their respective governments.

The outbreak of domestic hostilities in the Republic of Brazil found the United States alert to watch the interests of our citizens in that country, with which we carry on important commerce. Several vessels of our new Navy are now, and for some time have been, stationed at Rio de Janeiro. The struggle being between the established government, which controls the machinery of administration and with which we maintain friendly relations, and certain officers of the navy employing the vessels of their command in an attack upon the national capital and chief seaport, and lacking, as it does, the elements of divided administration, I have failed to see that the insurgents can reasonably claim recognition as belligerents.

Thus far the position of our Government has been that of an attentive but impartial observer of the unfortunate conflict. Emphasizing our fixed policy of impartial neutrality in such a condition of affairs as now exists, I deemed it necessary to disavow, in a manner not to be misunderstood, the unauthorized action of our late naval commander in those waters in saluting the revolted Brazilian admiral, being indisposed to countenance an act calculated to give gratuitous sanction to the local insurrection.

The convention between our Government and Chile, having for its object the settlement and adjustment of the demands of the two countries against each other, has been made effective by the organization of the claims commission provided for. The two Governments failing to agree upon the third member of the commission, the good offices of the president of the Swiss Republic were invoked, as provided in the treaty, and the selection of the Swiss representative in this country to complete the organization was gratifying alike to the United States and Chile.

The vexatious question of so-called legation asylum for offenders against the state and its laws was presented anew in Chile by the unauthorized action of the late United States minister in receiving into his official residence two persons who had just failed in an attempt at revolution and against whom criminal charges were pending growing out of a former abortive disturbance. The doctrine of asylum as applied to this case is not sanctioned by the best precedents and, when allowed, tends to encourage sedition and strife. Under no circumstances can the representatives of this Government be permitted, under the ill-defined fiction of extraterritoriality, to interrupt the administration of criminal justice in the countries to which they are accredited. A temperate demand having been made by the Chilean Government for the correction of this conduct in the instance mentioned, the minister was instructed no longer to harbor the offenders.

The legislation of last year, known as the Geary law, requiring the registration of all Chinese laborers entitled to residence in the United States, and the deportation of all not complying with the provisions of the act within the time prescribed, met with much opposition from Chinamen in this country. Acting upon the advice of eminent counsel that the law was unconstitutional, the great mass of Chinese laborers, pending judicial inquiry as to its validity, in good faith declined to apply for the certificates required by its provisions. A test case upon proceeding by habeas corpus was brought before the Supreme Court, and on May 15, 1893, a decision was made by that tribunal sustaining the law.

It is believed that under the recent amendment of the act extending the time for registration, the Chinese laborers thereto entitled, who desire to reside in this country, will now avail themselves of the renewed privilege thus afforded of establishing by lawful procedure their right to remain, and that thereby the necessity of enforced deportation may to a great degree be avoided.

It has devolved upon the United States minister at Peking, as dean of the diplomatic body, and in the absence of a representative of Sweden and Norway, to press upon the Chinese Government reparation for the recent murder of Swedish missionaries at Sung-pu. This question is of vital interest to all countries whose citizens engage in missionary work in the interior.

By Article XII of the General Act of Brussels, signed July 2, 1890, for the suppression of the slave trade and the restriction of certain injurious commerce in the Independent State of the Congo and in the adjacent zone of central Africa, the United States and the other signatory powers agreed to adopt appropriate means for the punishment of persons selling arms and ammunition to the natives and for the confiscation of the inhibited articles. It being the plain duty of this Government to aid in suppressing the nefarious traffic, impairing as it does the praiseworthy and civilizing efforts now in progress in that region, I recommend that an act be passed prohibiting the sale of arms and intoxicants to natives in the regulated zone by our citizens.

Costa Rica has lately testified its friendliness by surrendering to the United States, in the absence of a convention of extradition, but upon duly submitted evidence of criminality, a noted fugitive from justice. It is trusted that the negotiation of a treaty with that country to meet recurring cases of this kind will soon be accomplished. In my opinion treaties for reciprocal extradition should be concluded with all those countries with which the United States has not already conventional arrangements of that character.

I have deemed it fitting to express to the Governments of Costa Rica and Colombia the kindly desire of the United States to see their pending boundary dispute finally closed by arbitration in conformity with the spirit of the treaty concluded between them some years ago.

Our relations with the French Republic continue to be intimate and cordial. I sincerely hope that the extradition treaty with that country, as amended by the Senate, will soon be operative.

While occasional questions affecting our naturalized citizens returning to the land of their birth have arisen in our intercourse with Germany, our relations with that country continue satisfactory.

The questions affecting our relations with Great Britain have been treated in a spirit of friendliness.

Negotiations are in progress between the two Governments with a view to such concurrent action as will make the award and regulations agreed upon by the Bering Sea Tribunal of Arbitration practically effective; and it is not doubted that Great Britain will coöperate freely with this country for the accomplishment of that purpose.

The dispute growing out of the discriminating tolls imposed in the Welland Canal, upon cargoes of cereals bound to and from

the lake ports of the United States, was adjusted by the substitution of a more equitable schedule of charges, and my predecessor thereupon suspended his proclamation imposing discriminating tolls upon British transit through our canals.

A request for additions to the list of extraditable offenses covered by the existing treaty between the two countries is under consideration.

During the past year an American citizen, employed in a subordinate commercial position in Haiti, after suffering a protracted imprisonment on an unfounded charge of smuggling, was finally liberated on judicial examination. Upon urgent representation to the Haitian Government, a suitable indemnity was paid to the sufferer.

By a law of Haiti, a sailing vessel, having discharged her cargo, is refused clearance until the duties on such cargo have been paid. The hardship of this measure upon American shipowners who conduct the bulk of the carrying trade of that country has been insisted on with a view of securing the removal of this cause of complaint.

Upon receiving authentic information of the firing upon an American mail steamer touching at the port of Amapala, because her captain refused to deliver up a passenger in transit from Nicaragua to Guatemala upon demand of the military authorities of Honduras, our minister to that country under instructions protested against the wanton act and demanded satisfaction. The Government of Honduras, actuated by a sense of justice, and in a spirit of the utmost friendship, promptly disavowed the illegal conduct of its officers, and expressed sincere regret for the occurrence.

It is confidently anticipated that a satisfactory adjustment will soon be reached of the questions arising out of the seizure and use of American vessels by insurgents in Honduras and the subsequent denial by the successful government of commercial privileges to those vessels on that account.

A notable part of the southeasterly coast of Liberia between the Cavally and San Pedro Rivers, which for nearly half a century has been generally recognized as belonging to that Republic by cession and purchase, has been claimed to be under the protectorate of France in virtue of agreements entered into by the native tribes over whom Liberia's control has not been well maintained.

More recently, negotiations between the Liberian representative and the French Government resulted in the signature at Paris of a treaty whereby as an adjustment certain Liberian territory is ceded to France. This convention at last advices had not been ratified by the Liberian legislature and executive.

Feeling a sympathetic interest in the fortunes of the little commonwealth, the establishment and development of which were largely aided by the benevolence of our countrymen, and which constitutes the only independently sovereign state on the west coast of Africa, this Government has suggested to the French Government its earnest concern lest territorial impairment in Liberia should take place without her unconstrained consent.

Our relations with Mexico continue to be of that close and friendly nature which should always characterize the intercourse of two neighboring republics.

The work of relocating the monuments marking the boundary between the two countries from Paso del Norte to the Pacific is now nearly completed.

The commission recently organized under the conventions of 1884 and 1889 it is expected will speedily settle disputes growing out of the shifting currents of the Rio Grande River east of El Paso.

Nicaragua has recently passed through two revolutions, the party at first successful having in turn been displaced by another. Our newly appointed minister, by his timely good offices, aided in a peaceful adjustment of the controversy involved in the first conflict. The large American interests established in that country in connection with the Nicaragua Canal were not molested.

The canal company has, unfortunately, become financially seriously embarrassed, but a generous treatment has been extended to it by the Government of Nicaragua. The United States are especially interested in the successful achievement of the vast undertaking this company has in charge. That it should be accomplished under distinctively American auspices, and its enjoyment assured not only to the vessels of this country as a channel of communication between our Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, but to the ships of the world in the interests of civilization, is a proposition which, in my judgment, does not admit of question.

Guatemala has also been visited by the political vicissitudes which have afflicted her Central American neighbors; but the dissolution of its legislature and the proclamation of a dictatorship have been unattended with civil war.

An extradition treaty with Norway has recently been exchanged and proclaimed.

The extradition treaty with Russia, signed in March, 1887, and amended and confirmed by the Senate in February last, was duly proclaimed last June.

Led by a desire to compose differences and contribute to the restoration of order in Samoa, which for some years previous had been the scene of conflicting foreign pretensions and native strife, the United States, departing from its policy consecrated by a century of observance, entered four years ago into the treaty of Berlin, thereby becoming jointly bound with England and Germany to establish and maintain Malietoa Laupepa as King of Samoa. The treaty provided for a foreign court of justice; a municipal council for the district of Apia, with a foreign president thereof, authorized to advise the king; a tribunal for the settlement of native and foreign land titles, and a revenue system for the kingdom. It entailed upon the three powers that part of the cost of the new government not met by the revenue of the islands.

Early in the life of this triple protectorate the native dissensions it was designed to quell revived. Rivals defied the authority of the new king, refusing to pay taxes and demanding the election of a ruler by native suffrage. Mataafa, an aspirant to the throne, and a large number of his native adherents were in open rebellion on one of the islands. Quite lately, at the request of the other powers, and in fulfillment of its treaty obligation, this Government agreed to unite in a joint military movement of such dimensions as would probably secure the surrender of the insurgents without bloodshed.

The war ship Philadelphia was accordingly put under orders for Samoa, but before she arrived the threatened conflict was precipitated by King Malietoa's attack upon the insurgent camp. Mataafa was defeated and a number of his men killed. The British and German naval vessels present subsequently secured the surrender of Mataafa and his adherents. The defeated chief and ten of his principal supporters were deported to a German island of the Marshall group, where they are held as prisoners under the joint responsibility and cost of the three powers.

This incident and the events leading up to it signally illustrate the impolicy of entangling alliances with foreign powers.

More than fifteen years ago this Government preferred a claim against Spain, in behalf of one of our citizens, for property seized and confiscated in Cuba. In 1886 the claim was adjusted, Spain agreeing to pay, unconditionally, as a fair indemnity, $1,500,000. A respectful but earnest note was recently addressed to the Spanish Government insisting upon prompt fulfillment of its long-neglected obligation.

Other claims preferred by the United States against Spain in behalf of American citizens for property confiscated in Cuba have been pending for many years.

At the time Spain's title to the Caroline Islands was confirmed by arbitration, that government agreed that the rights which had been acquired there by American missionaries should be recognized and respected. It is sincerely hoped that this pledge will be observed by allowing our missionaries, who were removed from Ponape to a place of safety by a United States war ship during the late troubles between the Spanish garrison and the natives, to return to their field of usefulness.

The reproduced caravel, Santa Maria, built by Spain and sent to the Columbian Exposition, has been presented to the United States in token of amity and in commemoration of the event it was designed to celebrate. I recommend that, in accepting this gift, Congress make grateful recognition of the sincere friendship which prompted it.

Important matters have demanded attention in our relations with the Ottoman Porte.

The firing and partial destruction, by an unrestrained mob, of one of the school buildings of Anatolia College, established by citizens of the United States at Marsovan, and the apparent indifference of the Turkish Government to the outrage, notwithstanding the complicity of some of its officials, called for earnest remonstrance, which was followed by promises of reparation and punishment of the offenders.

Indemnity for the injury to the buildings has already been paid, permission to rebuild given, registration of the school property in the name of the American owners secured, and efficient protection guaranteed.

Information received of maltreatment suffered by an inoffensive American woman engaged in missionary work in Turkish Koordistan was followed by such representations to the Porte as resulted in the issuance of orders for the punishment of her assailants, the removal of a delinquent official, and the adoption of measures for the protection of our citizens engaged in mission and other lawful work in that quarter.

Turkey complains that her Armenian subjects obtain citizenship in this country, not to identify themselves in good faith with our people, but with the intention of returning to the land of their birth and there engaging in sedition. This complaint is not

wholly without foundation. A journal published in this country in the Armenian language openly counsels its readers to arm, organize, and participate in movements for the subversion of Turkish authority in the Asiatic provinces. The Ottoman Government has announced its intention to expel from its dominions Armenians who have obtained naturalization in the United States since 1868.

The right to exclude any or all classes of aliens is an attribute of sovereignty. It is a right asserted and, to a limited extent, enforced by the United States, with the sanction of our highest court. There being no naturalization treaty between the United States and Turkey, our minister at Constantinople has been instructed that, while recognizing the right of that Government to enforce its declared policy against naturalized Armenians, he is expected to protect them from unnecessary harshness of treatment.

In view of the impaired financial resources of Venezuela, consequent upon the recent revolution there, a modified arrangement for the satisfaction of the awards of the late revisory claims commission, in progressive installments, has been assented to, and payments are being regularly made thereunder.

The boundary dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana is yet unadjusted. A restoration of diplomatic intercourse between that Republic and Great Britain and reference of the question to impartial arbitration would be a most gratifying consummation.

The ratification by Venezuela of the convention for the arbitration of the long-deferred claim of the Venezuelan Transportation Company is awaited.

It is hardly necessary for me to state that the questions arising from our relations with Hawaii have caused serious embarrassment. Just prior to the installation of the present Administration the existing Government of Hawaii had been suddenly overthrown, and a treaty of annexation had been negotiated between the Provisional Government of the islands and the United States, and submitted to the Senate for ratification. This treaty I withdrew for examination, and dispatched Hon. James H. Blount, of Georgia, to Honolulu as a special commissioner to make an impartial investigation of the circumstances attending the change of government, and of all the conditions bearing upon the subject of the treaty.

After a thorough and exhaustive examination Mr. Blount submitted to me his report, showing beyond all question that the constitutional Government of Hawaii had been subverted with the active aid of our representative to that Government, and through the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States which was landed for that purpose at the instance of our minister. Upon the facts developed it seemed to me the only honorable course for our Government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us and to restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our forcible intervention. With a view of accomplishing this result within the constitutional limits of executive power, and recognizing all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference, our present minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end. Thus far no information of the accomplishment of any definite results has been received from him.

Additional advices are soon expected. When received they will be promptly sent to the Congress, together with all other information at hand, accompanied by a special Executive message fully detailing all the facts necessary to a complete understanding of the case, and presenting a history of all the material events leading up to the present situation.

By a concurrent resolution, passed by the Senate February 14, 1890, and by the House of Representatives on the 3d of April following, the President was requested "to invite, from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which can not be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peaceably adjusted by such means." April 18, 1890, the International American Conference of Washington, by resolution expressed the wish that all controversies between the republics of America and the nations of Europe might be settled by arbitration, and recommended that the government of each nation represented in that conference should communicate this wish to all friendly powers. A favorable response has been received from Great Britain in the shape of a resolution adopted by Parliament July 16 last, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, and expressing the hope that Her Majesty's Government will lend ready coöperation to the Government of the United States upon the basis of the concurrent resolution above quoted.

It affords me signal pleasure to lay this parliamentry resolution before the Congress and to express my sincere gratification that the sentiment of two great and kindred nations is thus authoritatively manifested in favor of the rational and peaceable settlement of international quarrels by honorable resort to arbitration.

Since the passage of the act of March 3, 1893, authorizing the President to raise the grade of our envoys to correspond with the rank in which foreign countries accredit their agents here, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germany have conferred upon their representatives at this capital the title of ambassador, and I have responded by accrediting the agents of the United States in those countries with the same title. A like elevation of mission is announced by Russia, and when made will be similarly met. This step fittingly comports with the position the United States hold in the family of nations.

During my former administration I took occasion to recommend a revision of the laws relating to the consular service, in order that it might become a more efficient agency in the promotion of the interests it was intended to subserve. The duties and powers of consuls have been expanded with the growing requirements of our foreign trade. Discharging important duties affecting our commerce and American citizens abroad, and in certain countries exercising judicial functions, these officers should be men of character, intelligence, and ability.

Upon proof that the legislation of Denmark secures copyright to American citizens on equal footing with its own, the privileges of our copyright laws have been extended by proclamation to subjects of that country.

The Secretary of the Treasury reports that the receipts of the Government from all sources during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893, amounted to $461,716,561.94, and its expenditures to $459,374,674.29. There was collected from customs $205,355,016.73, and from internal revenue $161,027,623.93. Our dutiable imports amounted to $421,856,711, an increase of $52,453,907 over the preceding year, and importations free of duty amounted to $444,544,211, a decrease from the preceding year of $13,455,447. Internal-revenue receipts exceeded those of the preceding year by $7,147,445.32.

The total tax collected on distilled spirits was $94,720,260.55, on manufactured tobacco, $31,889,711.74, and on fermented liquors, $32,548,983.07. We exported merchandise during the year amounting to $847,665,194, a decrease of $182,612,954 from the preceding year. The amount of gold exported was larger than any previous year in the history of the Government, amounting to $108,680,844, and exceeding the amount exported during the preceding year by $58,485,517.

The sum paid from the Treasury for sugar bounty was $9,375,130.88, an increase over the preceding year of $2,033,053.09.

It is estimated upon the basis of present revenue laws that the receipts of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1894, will be $430,121,365.38, and its expenditures $458,121,365.38, resulting in a deficiency of $28,000,000.

On the 1st day of November, 1893, the amount of money of all kinds in circulation, or not included in Treasury holdings, was $1,718,544,682, an increase for the year of $112,404,947. Estimating our population at 67,426,000 at the time mentioned the per capita circulation was $25.49. On the same date there was in the Treasury gold bullion amounting to $96,657,273 and silver bullion which was purchased at a cost of $126,261,553.

The purchases of silver under the law of July 14, 1890, during the last fiscal year aggregated 54,008,162.59 fine ounces, which cost $45,531,374.53. The total amount of silver purchased from the time that law became operative until the repeal of its purchasing clause, on the 1st day of November, 1893, was 168,674,590.46 fine ounces, which cost $155,930,940.84. Between the 1st day of March, 1873, and the 1st day of November, 1893, the Government purchased under all laws 503,003,717 fine ounces of silver at a cost of $516,622,948. The silver dollars that have been coined under the act of July 14, 1890, number 36,087,285. The seigniorage arising from such coinage was $6,977,098.39, leaving on hand in the mints 149,699,760 fine ounces of silver, which cost $126,758,218.

Our total coinage of all metals during the last fiscal year consisted of 97,280,875 pieces valued at $43,685,178.80, of which there was $30,038,140 in gold coin, $5,343,715 in silver dollars, $7,217,220.90 in subsidiary silver coin, and $1,086,102.90 in minor coins.

During the calendar year 1892 the production of precious metals in the United States was estimated to be 1,596,375 fine ounces of gold of the commercial and coinage value of $33,000,000, and 58,000,000 fine ounces of silver of the bullion or market value of $50,750,000, and of the coinage value of $74,939,900.

It is estimated that on the 1st day of July, 1893, the metallic stock of money in the United States, consisting of coin and bullion, amounted to $1,213,559,169, of which $597,697,685 was gold, and $615,861,484 was silver.

One hundred and nineteen national banks were organized during the year ending October 31, 1893, with a capital of $11,230,000. Forty-six went into voluntary liquidation and 158 suspended. Sixty-five of the suspended banks were insolvent,

86 resumed business, and 7 remain in the hands of bank examiners, with prospects of speedy resumption. Of the new banks organized 44 were located in the Eastern States, 41 west of the Mississippi River, and 34 in the Central and Southern States. The total number of national banks in existence on the 31st day of October, 1893, was 3,796, having an aggregate capital of $695,558,120. The net increase in the circulation of these banks during the year was $36,836,972.

The recent repeal of the provision of law requiring the purchase of silver bullion by the Government as a feature of our monetary scheme has made an entire change in the complexion of our currency affairs. I do not doubt that the ultimate result of this action will be most salutary and far-reaching. In the nature of things, however, it is impossible to know at this time precisely what conditions will be brought about by the change, or what, if any, supplementary legislation may, in the light of such conditions, appear to be essential or expedient. Of course, after the recent financial perturbation, time is necessary for the reëstablishment of business confidence. When, however, through this restored confidence the money which has been frightened into hoarding places is returned to trade and enterprise, a survey of the situation will probably disclose a safe path leading to a permanently sound currency abundantly sufficient to meet every requirement of our increasing population and business.

In the pursuit of this object we should resolutely turn away from alluring and temporary expedients, determined to be content with nothing less than a lasting and comprehensive financial plan. In these circumstances I am convinced that a reasonable delay in dealing with this subject, instead of being injurious, will increase the probability of wise action.

The Monetary Conference which assembled at Brussels upon our invitation was adjourned to the 30th day of November in the present year. The considerations just stated and the fact that a definite proposition from us seemed to be expected upon the reassembling of the conference, led me to express a willingness to have the meeting still further postponed.

It seems to me that it would be wise to give general authority to the President to invite other nations to such a conference at any time when there should be a fair prospect of accomplishing an international agreement on the subject of coinage.

I desire also to earnestly suggest the wisdom of amending the existing statutes in regard to the issuance of Government bonds. The authority now vested in the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds is not as clear as it should be, and the bonds authorized are disadvantageous to the Government both as to the time of their maturity and rate of interest.

The Superintendent of Immigration, through the Secretary of the Treasury, reports that during the last fiscal year there arrived at our ports 440,793 immigrants. Of these 1,063 were not permitted to land under the limitations of the law, and 577 were returned to the countries from whence they came by reason of their having become public charges. The total arrivals were 141,034 less than for the previous year.

The Secretary in his report gives an account of the operation of the Marine Hospital Service and of the good work done under its supervision in preventing the entrance and spread of contagious diseases.

The admonitions of the last two years touching our public health and the demonstrated danger of the introduction of contagious diseases from foreign ports have invested the subject of national quarantine with increased interest. A more general and harmonious system than now exists, acting promptly and directly everywhere, and constantly operating by preventive means to shield our country from the invasion of disease, and at the same time having due regard to the rights and duties of local agencies, would, I believe, add greatly to the safety of our people.

The Secretary of War reports that the strength of the Army on the 30th day of September last was 25,778 enlisted men and 2,144 officers.

The total expenditures of the Department for the year ending June 30, 1893, amounted to $51,966,074.89. Of this sum, $1,992,581.95 was for salaries and contingent expenses, $23,377,828.35 for the support of the military establishment, $6,077,033.18 for miscellaneous objects, and $20,518,631.41 for public works. This latter sum includes $15,296,876.46 for river and harbor improvements and $3,266,141.20 for fortifications and other works of defense.

The total enrollment of the militia of the several States was, on the 31st of October of the current year, 112,597 officers and enlisted men. The officers of the Army detailed for the inspection and instruction of this reserve of our military force report that increased interest and marked progress are apparent in the discipline and efficiency of the organization.

Neither Indian outbreaks nor domestic violence have called the Army into service during the year, and the only active military duty required of it has been in the Department of Texas, where violations of the neutrality laws of the United States and Mexico were promptly and efficiently dealt with by the troops, eliciting the warm approval of the civil and military authorities of both countries.

The operation of wise laws and the influences of civilization constantly tending to relieve the country from the dangers of Indian hostilities, together with the increasing ability of the States, through the efficiency of the National Guard organizations, to protect their citizens from domestic violence, lead to the suggestion that the time is fast approaching when there should be a reorganization of our Army on the lines of the present necessities of the country. This change contemplates neither increase in number nor added expense, but a redistribution of the force and an encouragement of measures tending to greater efficiency among the men and improvement of the service.

The adoption of battalion formations for infantry regiments, the strengthening of the artillery force, the abandonment of smaller and unnecessary posts, and the massing of the troops at important and accessible stations, all promise to promote the usefulness of the Army. In the judgment of army officers, with but few exceptions, the operation of the law forbidding the reenlistment of men after ten years' service has not proved its wisdom, and while the arguments that led to its adoption were not without merit, the experience of the year constrains me to join in the recommendation for its repeal.

It is gratifying to note that we have begun to attain completed results in the comprehensive scheme of seacoast defense and fortification entered upon eight years ago. A large sum has been already expended, but the cost of maintenance will be inconsiderable as compared with the expense of construction and ordnance. At the end of the current calendar year the War Department will have nine 12-inch, twenty 10-inch, and thirty-four 8-inch guns, ready to be mounted on gun lifts and carriages, and seventy-five 12-inch mortars. In addition to the product of the army gun factory, now completed at Watervliet, the Government has contracted with private parties for the purchase of one hundred guns of these calibers, the first of which should be delivered to the Department for test before July 1, 1894.

The manufacture of heavy ordnance keeps pace with current needs; but to render these guns available for the purposes they are designed to meet, emplacements must be prepared for them. Progress has been made in this direction, and it is desirable that Congress by adequate appropriations should provide for the uninterrupted prosecution of this necessary work.

After much preliminary work and exhaustive examination in accordance with the requirements of the law, the board appointed to select a magazine rifle of modern type with which to replace the obsolete Springfield rifle of the infantry service, completed its labors during the last year, and the work of manufacture is now in progress at the National Armory at Springfield. It is confidently expected that by the end of the current year our infantry will be supplied with a weapon equal to that of the most progressive armies of the world.

The work on the projected Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park has been prosecuted with zeal and judgment, and its opening will be celebrated during the coming year. Over 9 square miles of the Chickamauga battlefield have been acquired, 25 miles of roadway have been constructed, and permanent tablets have been placed at many historical points, while the invitation to the States to mark the positions of their troops participating in the battle has been very generally accepted.

The work of locating and preserving the lines of battle at the Gettysburg battlefield is making satisfactory progress on the plans directed by the last Congress.

The reports of the Military Academy at West Point and the several schools for special instruction of officers, show marked advance in the education of the Army and a commendable ambition among its officers to excel in the military profession and to fit themselves for the highest service to the country.

Under the supervision of Adjt. Gen. Robert Williams, lately retired, the Bureau of Military Information has become well established and is performing a service that will put in possession of the Government in time of war most valuable information, and at all times serve a purpose of great utility in keeping the Army advised of the world's progress in all matters pertaining to the art of war.

The report of the Attorney-General contains the usual summary of the affairs and proceedings of the Department of Justice for the past year, together with certain recommendations as to needed legislation on various subjects. I can not too heartily indorse the proposition that the fee system as applicable to the compensation of United States attorneys, marshals, clerks of Federal courts, and United States commissioners, should be

abolished with as little delay as possible. It is clearly in the interest of the community that the business of the courts, both civil and criminal, shall be as small and as inexpensively transacted as the ends of justice will allow.

The system is therefore thoroughly vicious which makes the compensation of court officials depend upon the volume of such business, and thus creates a conflict between a proper execution of the law and private gain, which can not fail to be dangerous to the rights and freedom of the citizen and an irresistible temptation to the unjustifiable expenditure of public funds. If in addition to this reform another was inaugurated which would give to United States commissioners the final disposition of petty offenses within the grade of misdemeanors, especially those coming under the internal-revenue laws, a great advance would be made toward a more decent administration of the criminal law.

In my first message to Congress, dated December 8, 1885, I strongly recommended these changes and referred somewhat at length to the evils of the present system. Since that time the criminal business of the Federal courts and the expense attending it have enormously increased. The number of criminal prosecutions pending in the circuit and district courts of the United States on the 1st day of July, 1885, was 3,808, of which 1,884 were for violations of the internal-revenue laws, while the number of such prosecutions pending on the 1st day of July, 1893, was 9,500, of which 4,200 were for violations of the internal-revenue laws. The expense of the United States courts, exclusive of judges' salaries, for the year ending July 1, 1885, was $2,874,733.11, and for the year ending July 1, 1893, $4,528,676.87.

It is therefore apparent that the reasons given in 1885 for a change in the manner of enforcing the Federal criminal law have gained cogency and strength by lapse of time.

I also heartily join the Attorney-General in recommending legislation fixing degrees of the crime of murder within Federal jurisdiction, as has been done in many of the States; authorizing writs of error on behalf of the Government in cases where final judgment is rendered against the sufficiency of an indictment or against the Government upon any other question arising before actual trial; limiting the right of review in cases of felony punishable only by fine and imprisonment to the circuit court of appeals, and making speedy provision for the construction of such prisons and reformatories as may be necessary for the confinement of United States convicts.

The report of the Postmaster-General contains a detailed statement of the operations of the Post-Office Department during the last fiscal year and much interesting information touching this important branch of the public service.

The business of the mails indicates with absolute certainty the condition of the business of the country, and depression in financial affairs inevitably and quickly reduces the postal revenues. Therefore a larger discrepancy than usual between the Post-Office receipts and expenditures is the expected and unavoidable result of the distressing stringency which has prevailed throughout the country during much of the time covered by the Postmaster-General's report.

At a date when better times were anticipated it was estimated by his predecessor that the deficiency on the 30th day of June, 1893, would be but a little over a million and a half dollars. It amounted, however, to more than five millions. At the same time, and under the influence of like anticipations, estimates were made for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, which exhibited a surplus of revenue over expenditures of $872,245.71; but now, in view of the actual receipts and expenditures during that part of the current fiscal year already expired, the present Postmaster-General estimates that at its close instead of a surplus there will be a deficiency of nearly $8,000,000.

The post-office receipts for the last fiscal year amounted to $75,896,933.16, and its expenditures to $81,074,104.90. This post-office deficiency would disappear or be immensely decreased if less matter was carried free through the mails, an item of which is upward of 300 tons of seeds and grain from the Agricultural Department.

The total number of post-offices in the United States on the 30th day of June, 1893, was 68,403, an increase of 1,284 over the preceding year. Of these 3,360 were Presidential, an increase in that class of 204 over the preceding year.

Forty-two free-delivery offices were added during the year to those already existing, making a total of six hundred and ten cities and towns provided with free delivery on June 30, 1893. Ninety-three other cities and towns are now entitled to this service under the law, but it has not been accorded them on account of insufficient funds to meet the expense of its establishment.

I am decidedly of the opinion that the provisions of the present law permit as general an introduction of this feature of mail service as is necessary or justifiable, and that it ought not to be extended to smaller communities than are now designated.

The expense of free delivery for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, will be more than $11,000,000, and under legislation now existing there must be a constant increase in this item of expenditure.

There were 6,401 additions to the domestic money-order offices during the last fiscal year, being the largest increase in any year since the inauguration of the system. The total number of these offices at the close of the year was 18,434. There were 13,309,735 money orders issued from these offices, being an increase over the preceding year of 1,240,293, and the value of these orders amounted to $127,576,433.65, an increase of $7,509,632.58. There were also issued during the year postal notes amounting to $12,903,076.73.

During the year 195 international money-order offices were added to those already provided, making a total of 2,407 in operation on June 30, 1893. The number of international money orders issued during the year was 1,055,999, an increase over the preceding year of 72,525, and their value was $16,341,837.86, an increase of $1,221,506.31. The number of orders paid was 300,917, an increase over the preceding year of 13,503, and their value was $5,283,375.70, an increase of $94,094.83.

From the foregoing statements it appears that the total issue of money orders and postal notes for the year amounted to $156,821,348.24.

The number of letters and packages mailed during the year for special delivery was 3,375,693, an increase over the preceding year of nearly 22 per cent. The special-delivery stamps used upon these letters and packages amounted to $337,569.30, and the messengers' fees paid for their delivery amounted to $256,592.71, leaving a profit to the Government of $80,976.59.

The Railway Mail Service not only adds to the promptness of mail delivery at all offices, but it is the especial instrumentality which puts the smaller and way places in the service on an equality in that regard with the larger and terminal offices. This branch of the postal service has therefore received much attention from the Postmaster-General, and though it is gratifying to know that it is in a condition of high efficiency and great usefulness, I am led to agree with the Postmaster-General that there is room for its further improvement.

There are now connected with the Post-Office establishment 28,324 employés who are in the classified service. The head of this great Department gives conclusive evidence of the value of civil-service reform when, after an experience that renders his judgment on the subject absolutely reliable, he expresses the opinion that without the benefit of this system it would be impossible to conduct the vast business intrusted to him.

I desire to commend as especially worthy of prompt attention the suggestions of the Postmaster-General relating to a more sensible and business-like organization and a better distribution of responsibility in his Department.

The report of the Secretary of the Navy contains a history of the operations of his Department during the past year, and exhibits a most gratifying condition of the personnel of our Navy. He presents a satisfactory account of the progress which has been made in the construction of vessels, and makes a number of recommendations to which attention is especially invited.

During the past six months the demands for cruising vessels have been many and urgent. There have been revolutions calling for vessels to protect American interests in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Honduras, Argentina, and Brazil, while the condition of affairs in Honolulu has required the constant presence of one or more ships. With all these calls upon our Navy, it became necessary, in order to make up a sufficient fleet to patrol the Bering Sea under the *modus vivendi* agreed upon with Great Britain, to detail to that service one vessel from the Fish Commission and three from the Revenue Marine.

Progress in the construction of new vessels has not been as rapid as was anticipated. There have been delays in the completion of unarmored vessels, but for the most part they have been such as are constantly occurring even in countries having the largest experience in naval shipbuilding. The most serious delays, however, have been in the work upon armored ships. The trouble has been the failure of contractors to deliver armor as agreed. The difficulties seem now, however, to have been all overcome, and armor is being delivered with satisfactory promptness. As a result of the experience acquired by shipbuilders and designers and material men, it is believed that the dates when vessels will be completed can now be estimated with reasonable accuracy. Great guns, rapid-fire guns, torpedoes, and powder are being promptly supplied.

The following vessels of the new Navy have been completed and are now ready for service:

The double-turreted coast-defense monitor Miantonomoh, the double-turreted coast-defense monitor Monterey, the armored cruiser New York, the protected cruisers Baltimore, Chicago, Philadelphia, Newark, San Francisco, Charleston, Atlanta, and Boston, the cruiser Detroit, the gunboats Yorktown, Concord,

Bennington, Machias, Castine, and Petrel, the dispatch vessel Dolphin, the practice vessel Bancroft, and the dynamite gunboat Vesuvius. Of these the Bancroft, Machias, Detroit, and Castine have been placed in commission during the current calendar year.

The following vessels are in process of construc tion: The second-class battle ships Maine and Texas, the cruisers Montgomery and Marblehead, and the coast-defense monitors Terror, Puritan, Amphitrite, and Monadnock, all of which will be completed within one year; the harbor-defense ram Katahdin and the protected cruisers Columbia, Minneapolis, Olympia, Cincinnati, and Raleigh, all of which will be completed prior to July 1, 1895; the first-class battle ships Iowa, Indiana, Massachusetts, and Oregon, which will be completed February 1, 1896, and the armored cruiser Brooklyn, which will be completed by August 1 of that year. It is also expected that the three gunboats authorized by the last Congress will be completed in less than two years.

Since 1886 Congress has at each session authorized the building of one or more vessels, and the Secretary of the Navy presents an earnest plea for the continuance of this plan. He recommends the authorization of at least one battle ship and six torpedo boats.

While I am distinctly in favor of consistently pursuing the policy we have inaugurated of building up a thorough and efficient Navy, I can not refrain from the suggestion that the Congress should carefully take into account the number of unfinished vessels on our hands and the depleted condition of our Treasury in considering the propriety of an appropriation at this time to begin new work.

The method of employing mechanical labor at navy-yards through boards of labor and making efficiency the sole test by which laborers are employed and continued is producing the best results and the Secretary is earnestly devoting himself to its development. Attention is invited to the statements of his report in regard to the workings of the system.

The Secretary of the Interior has the supervision of so many important subjects that his report is of especial value and interest.

On the 30th day of June, 1893, there were on the pension rolls 966,012 names, an increase of 89,944 over the number on the rolls June 30, 1892. Of these there were 17 widows and daughters of Revolutionary soldiers, 86 survivors of the war of 1812, 5,425 widows of soldiers of that war, 21,518 survivors and widows of the Mexican war, 3,882 survivors and widows of Indian wars, 234 army nurses, and 475,645 survivors and widows and children of deceased soldiers and sailors of the war of the rebellion. The latter number represents those pensioned on account of disabilities or death resulting from army and navy service. The number of persons remaining on the rolls June 30, 1893, who were pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, which allows pensions on account of death and disability not chargeable to army service, was 459,155.

The number added to the rolls during the year was 123,634, and the number dropped was 33,690. The first payments on pensions allowed during the year amounted to $33,756,549.98. This includes arrears, or the accumulation between the time from which the allowance of pension dates and the time of actually granting the certificate.

Although the law of 1890 permits pensions for disabilities not related to military service, yet as a requisite to its benefits a disability must exist incapacitating applicants "from the performance of manual labor to such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support." The execution of this law in its early stages does not seem to have been in accord with its true intention; but toward the close of the last Administration an authoritative construction was given to the statute, and since that time this construction has been followed. This has had the effect of limiting the operation of the law to its intended purpose. The discovery having been made that many names had been put upon the pension roll by means of wholesale and gigantic frauds, the Commissioner suspended payments upon a number of pensions which seemed to be fraudulent or unauthorized pending a complete examination, giving notice to the pensioners in order that they might have an opportunity to establish, if possible, the justice of their claims notwithstanding apparent invalidity.

This, I understand, is the practice which has for a long time prevailed in the Pension Bureau; but after entering upon these recent investigations the Commissioner modified this rule so as not to allow, until after a complete examination, interference with the payment of a pension apparently not altogether void, but which merely had been fixed at a rate higher than that authorized by law.

I am unable to understand why frauds in the pension rolls should not be exposed and corrected with thoroughness and vigor. Every name fraudulently put upon these rolls is a wicked imposition upon the kindly sentiment in which pensions have their origin; every fraudulent pensioner has become a bad citizen; every false oath in support of a pension has made perjury more common, and false and undeserving pensioners rob the people not only of their money, but of the patriotic sentiment which the survivors of a war, fought for the preservation of the Union, ought to inspire. Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds. By no means the least wrong done is to brave and deserving pensioners, who certainly ought not to be condemned to such association.

Those who attempt in the line of duty to rectify these wrongs should not be accused of enmity or indifference to the claims of honest veterans.

The sum expended on account of pensions for the year ending June 30, 1893, was $156,740,467.14.

The Commissioner estimates that $165,000,000 will be required to pay pensions during the year ending June 30, 1894.

The condition of the Indians and their ultimate fate are subjects which are related to a sacred duty of the Government, and which strongly appeal to the sense of justice and the sympathy of our people.

Our Indians number about 248,000. Most of them are located on 161 reservations, containing 86,116,531 acres of land. About 110,000 of these Indians have, to a large degree, adopted civilized customs. Lands in severalty have been allotted to many of them. Such allotments have been made to 10,000 individuals during the last fiscal year, embracing about 1,000,000 acres. The number of Indian Government schools open during the year was 195, an increase of 12 over the preceding year. Of this total 170 were on reservations, of which 73 were boarding schools and 97 were day schools. Twenty boarding schools and 5 day schools supported by the Government were not located on reservations. The total number of Indian children enrolled during the year as attendants of all schools was 21,138, an increase of 1,231 over the enrollment for the previous year.

I am sure that secular education and moral and religious teaching must be important factors in any effort to save the Indian and lead him to civilization. I believe, too, that the relinquishment of tribal relations and the holding of land in severalty may, in favorable conditions, aid this consummation. It seems to me, however, that allotments of land in severalty ought to be made with great care and circumspection. If hastily done, before the Indian knows its meaning, while yet he has little or no idea of tilling a farm and no conception of thrift, there is great danger that a reservation life in tribal relations may be exchanged for the pauperism of civilization, instead of its independence and elevation.

The solution of the Indian problem depends very largely upon good administration. The personal fitness of agents and their adaptability to the peculiar duty of caring for their wards, is of the utmost importance.

The law providing that, except in especial cases, army officers shall be detailed as Indian agents it is hoped will prove a successful experiment.

There is danger of great abuses creeping into the prosecution of claims for Indian depredations, and I recommend that every possible safeguard be provided against the enforcement of unjust and fictitious claims of this description.

The appropriations on account of the Indian Bureau for the year ending June 30, 1894, amount to $7,954,962.99, a decrease as compared with the year preceding it of $387,131.95.

The vast area of land which but a short time ago constituted the public domain is rapidly falling into private hands. It is certain that in the transfer the beneficent intention of the Government to supply from its domain homes to the industrious and worthy home-seekers is often frustrated. Though the speculator, who stands with extortionate purpose between the Land Office and those who, with their families, are invited by the Government to settle on the public lands, is a despicable character who ought not to be tolerated, yet it is difficult to thwart his schemes. The recent opening to settlement of the lands in the Cherokee Outlet, embracing an area of 6,500,000 acres, notwithstanding the utmost care in framing the regulations governing the selection of locations and notwithstanding the presence of United States troops, furnished an exhibition, though perhaps in a modified degree, of the mad scramble, the violence, and the fraudulent occupation which have accompanied previous openings of public land.

I concur with the Secretary in the belief that these outrageous incidents can not be entirely prevented without a change in the laws on the subject, and I hope his recommendations in that direction will be favorably considered.

I especially commend to the attention of the Congress the statements contained in the Secretary's report concerning forestry. The time has come when efficient measures should be taken for the preservation of our forests from indiscriminate and remediless destruction.

The report of the Secretary of Agriculture will be found exceedingly interesting, especially to that large part of our citizens intimately concerned in agricultural occupations.

On the 7th day of March, 1893, there were upon its pay rolls 2,430 employés. This number has been reduced to 1,850 persons. In view of a depleted public Treasury and the imperative demand of the people for economy in the administration of their Government, the Secretary has entered upon the task of rationally reducing expenditures by the elimination from the pay rolls of all persons not needed for an efficient conduct of the affairs of the Department.

During the first quarter of the present year the expenses of the Department aggregated $345,876.76, as against $402,012.42 for the corresponding period of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893. The Secretary makes apparent his intention to continue this rate of reduction by submitting estimates for the next fiscal year less by $994,2·0 than those for the present year.

Among the heads of divisions in this Department the changes have been exceedingly few. Three vacancies occurring from death and resignations have been filled by the promotion of assistants in the same divisions.

These promotions of experienced and faithful assistants have not only been in the interest of efficient work, but have suggested to those in the Department who look for retention and promotion that merit and devotion to duty are their best reliance.

The amount appropriated for the Bureau of Animal Industry for the current fiscal year is $850,000; the estimate for the ensuing year is $700,000.

The regulations of 1892 concerning Texas fever have been enforced during the last year, and the large stockyards of the country have been kept free from infection. Occasional local outbreaks have been largely such as could have been effectually guarded against by the owners of the affected cattle.

While contagious pleuro-pneumonia in cattle has been eradicated, animal tuberculosis, a disease widespread and more dangerous to human life than pleuro-pneumonia, is still prevalent. Investigations have been made during the past year as to the means of its communication and the method of its correct diagnosis. Much progress has been made in this direction by the studies of the division of animal pathology, but work ought to be extended, in coöperation with local authorities, until the danger to human life arising from this cause is reduced to a minimum.

The number of animals arriving from Canada during the year and inspected by Bureau officers was 462,092, and the number from transatlantic countries was 1,297. No contagious diseases were found among the imported animals.

The total number of inspections of cattle for export during the past fiscal year was 611,542. The exports show a falling off of about 25 per cent from the preceding year, the decrease occurring entirely in the last half of the year. This suggests that the falling off may have been largely due to an increase in the price of American export cattle.

During the year ending June 30, 1893, exports of inspected pork aggregated 20,677,410 pounds as against 38,152,874 pounds for the preceding year. The falling off in this export was not confined, however, to inspected pork, the total quantity exported for 1892 being 665,490,616 pounds, while in 1893 it was only 527,308,695 pounds.

I join the Secretary in recommending that hereafter each applicant for the position of inspector or assistant inspector in the Bureau of Animal Industry be required, as a condition precedent to his appointment, to exhibit to the United States Civil Service Commission his diploma from an established, regular, and reputable veterinary college, and that this be supplemented by such an examination in veterinary science as the Commission may prescribe.

The exports of agricultural products from the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, attained the enormous figure of $800,000,000, in round numbers, being 78.7 per cent of our total exports. In the last fiscal year this aggregate was greatly reduced, but, nevertheless, reached 615,000,000, being 75.1 per cent of all American commodities exported.

A review of our agricultural exports with special reference to their destination will show that in almost every line the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland absorbs by far the largest proportion. Of cattle the total exports aggregated in value for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, $26,000,000, of which Great Britain took considerably over $25,000,000. Of beef products of all kinds our total exports were $28,000,000, of which Great Britain took $24,000,000. Of pork products the total exports were $84,000,000, of which Great Britain took $53,000,000. In breadstuffs, cotton, and minor products like proportions sent to the same destination are shown.

The work of the statistical division of the Department of Agriculture deals with all that relates to the economics of farming. The main purpose of its monthly reports is to keep the farmers informed as fully as possible of all matters having any influence upon the world's markets, in which their products find sale. Its publications relate especially to the commercial side of farming.

It is therefore of profound importance and vital concern to the farmers of the United States, who represent nearly one-half of our population, and also of direct interest to the whole country, that the work of this division be efficiently performed and that the information it has gathered be promptly diffused.

It is a matter for congratulation to know that the Secretary will not spare any effort to make this part of his work thoroughly useful.

In the year 1839 the Congress appropriated $1,000, to be taken from the Patent Office funds, for the purpose of collecting and distributing rare and improved varieties of seeds, and for prosecuting agricultural investigations and procuring agricultural statistics. From this small beginning the seed division of the Department of Agriculture has grown to its present unwieldy and unjustifiably extravagant proportions.

During the last fiscal year the cost of seeds purchased was $66,548.61. The remainder of an appropriation of $135,000 was expended in putting them up and distributing them. It surely never could have entered the minds of those who first sanctioned appropriations of public money for the purchase of new and improved varieties of seeds for gratuitous distribution that from this would grow large appropriations for the purchase and distribution by members of Congress of ordinary seeds, bulbs, and cuttings which are common in all the States and Territories, and everywhere easily obtainable at low prices.

In each State and Territory an agricultural experiment station has been established. These stations, by their very character and name, are the proper agencies to experiment with and test new varieties of seeds; and yet this indiscriminate and wasteful distribution by legislation and legislators continues, answering no purpose unless it be to remind constituents that their representatives are willing to remember them with gratuities at public cost.

Under the sanction of existing legislation there was sent out from the Agricultural Department during the last fiscal year enough of cabbage seed to plant 19,200 acres of land, a sufficient quantity of beans to plant 4,000 acres, beet seed enough to plant 2,500 acres, sweet corn enough to plant 7,800 acres, sufficient cucumber seed to cover 2,025 acres with vines, and enough muskmelon and watermelon seeds to plant 2,675 acres. The total quantity of flower and vegetable seeds thus distributed was contained in more than nine million packages, and they were sufficient, if planted, to cover 89,596 acres of land.

In view of these facts this enormous expenditure without legitimate returns of benefit ought to be abolished. Anticipating a consummation so manifestly in the interest of good administration, more than $100,000 has been stricken from the estimate made to cover this object for the year ending June 30, 1895; and the Secretary recommends that the remaining $35,000 of the estimate be confined strictly to the purchase of new and improved varieties of seeds, and that these be distributed through experiment stations.

Thus the seed will be tested, and after the test has been completed by the experiment station the propagation of the useful varieties and the rejection of the valueless may safely be left to the common sense of the people.

The continued intelligent execution of the civil-service law and the increasing approval by the people of its operation are most gratifying. The recent extension of its limitations and regulations to the employés at free-delivery post-offices, which has been honestly and promptly accomplished by the Commission, with the hearty coöperation of the Postmaster-General, is an immensely important advance in the usefulness of the system.

I am, if possible, more than ever convinced of the incalculable benefits conferred by the civil-service law, not only in its effect upon the public service, but also, what is even more important, in its effect in elevating the tone of political life generally.

The course of civil-service reform in this country instructively and interestingly illustrates how strong a hold a movement gains upon our people which has underlying it a sentiment of justice and right, and which at the same time promises better administration of their Government.

The law embodying this reform found its way to our statute book more from fear of the popular sentiment existing in its favor than from any love for the reform itself on the part of legislators; and it has lived and grown and flourished in spite of the covert as well as open hostility of spoilsmen and notwithstanding the querulous impracticability of many self-constituted guardians. Beneath all the vagaries and sublimated theories which are attracted to it there underlies this reform a sturdy commonsense principle not only suited to this mundane sphere, but whose application our people are more and more recognizing to be absolutely essential to the most successful operation of their Government, if not to its perpetuity.

It seems to me to be entirely inconsistent with the character of this reform, as well as with its best enforcement, to oblige the Commission to rely for clerical assistance upon clerks detailed from other Departments. There ought not to be such a condition in any Department that clerks hired to do work there can be spared to habitually work at another place, and it does not accord with a sensible view of civil-service reform that persons should be employed on the theory that their labor is necessary in one Department when in point of fact their services are devoted to entirely different work in another Department.

I earnestly urge that the clerks necessary to carry on the work of the Commission be regularly put upon its roster, and that the system of obliging the Commissioners to rely upon the services of clerks belonging to other Departments be discontinued. This ought not to increase the expense to the Government, while it would certainly be more consistent and add greatly to the efficiency of the Commission.

Economy in public expenditure is a duty that can not innocently be neglected by those intrusted with the control of money drawn from the people for public uses. It must be confessed that our apparently endless resources, the familiarity of our people with immense accumulations of wealth, the growing sentiment among them that the expenditure of public money should in some manner be to their immediate and personal advantage, the indirect and almost stealthy manner in which a large part of our taxes are exacted, and a degenerated sense of official accountability have led to growing extravagance in governmental appropriations.

At this time, when a depleted public Treasury confronts us, when many of our people are engaged in a hard struggle for the necessaries of life, and when enforced economy is pressing upon the great mass of our countrymen, I desire to urge with all the earnestness at my command that Congressional legislation be so limited by strict economy as to exhibit an appreciation of the condition of the Treasury and a sympathy with the straitened circumstances of our fellow-citizens.

The duty of public economy is also of immense importance in its intimate and necessary relation to the task now in hand of providing revenue to meet Government expenditures, and yet reducing the people's burden of Federal taxation.

After a hard struggle tariff reform is directly before us. Nothing so important claims our attention and nothing so clearly presents itself as both an opportunity and a duty—an opportunity to deserve the gratitude of our fellow-citizens and a duty imposed upon us by our oft-repeated professions and by the emphatic mandate of the people. After a full discussion our countrymen have spoken in favor of this reform, and they have confided the work of its accomplishment to the hands of those who are solemnly pledged to it.

If there is anything in the theory of a representation in public places of the people and their desires, if public officers are really the servants of the people, and if political promises and professions have any binding force, our failure to give the relief so long awaited will be sheer recreancy. Nothing should intervene to distract our attention or disturb our effort until this reform is accomplished by wise and careful legislation.

While we should stanchly adhere to the principle that only the necessity of revenue justifies the imposition of tariff duties and other Federal taxation, and that they should be limited by strict economy, we can not close our eyes to the fact that conditions have grown up among us which in justice and fairness call for discriminating care in the distribution of such duties and taxation as the emergencies of our Government actually demand.

Manifestly, if we are to aid the people directly through tariff reform, one of its most obvious features should be a reduction in present tariff charges upon the necessaries of life. The benefits of such a reduction would be palpable and substantial, seen and felt by thousands who would be better fed and better clothed and better sheltered. These gifts should be the willing benefactions of a Government whose highest function is the promotion of the welfare of the people.

Not less closely related to our people's prosperity and well-being is the removal of restrictions upon the importation of the raw materials necessary to our manufactures. The world should be open to our national ingenuity and enterprise. This can not be while Federal legislation, through the imposition of high tariff, forbids to American manufacturers as cheap materials as those used by their competitors. It is quite obvious that the enhancement of the price of our manufactured products resulting from this policy not only confines the market for these products within our own borders, to the direct disadvantage of our manufacturers, but also increases their cost to our citizens.

The interests of labor are certainly, though indirectly, involved in this feature of our tariff system. The sharp competition and active struggle among our manufacturers to supply the limited demand for their goods soon fill the narrow market to which they are confined. Then follow a suspension of work in mills and factories, a discharge of employés, and distress in the homes of our workingmen.

Even if the often disproved assertion could be made good that a lower rate of wages would result from free raw materials and low tariff duties, the intelligence of our workingmen leads them quickly to discover that their steady employment, permitted by free raw materials, is the most important factor in their relation to tariff legislation.

A measure has been prepared by the appropriate Congressional committee embodying tariff reform on the lines herein suggested, which will be promptly submitted for legislative action. It is the result of much patriotic and unselfish work, and I believe it deals with its subject consistently and as thoroughly as existing conditions permit.

I am satisfied that the reduced tariff duties provided for in the proposed legislation, added to existing internal-revenue taxation, will, in the near future, though perhaps not immediately, produce sufficient revenue to meet the needs of the Government.

The committee, after full consideration, and to provide against a temporary deficiency which may exist before the business of the country adjusts itself to the new tariff schedules, have wisely embraced in their plan a few additional internal-revenue taxes, including a small tax upon incomes derived from certain corporate investments.

These new assessments are not only absolutely just and easily borne, but they have the further merit of being such as can be remitted without unfavorable business disturbance whenever the necessity of their imposition no longer exists.

In my great desire for the success of this measure I can not restrain the suggestion that its success can only be attained by means of unselfish counsel on the part of the friends of tariff reform and as a result of their willingness to subordinate personal desires and ambitions to the general good. The local interests affected by the proposed reform are so numerous and so varied that if all are insisted upon the legislation embodying the reform must inevitably fail.

In conclusion, my intense feeling of responsibility impels me to invoke for the manifold interests of a generous and confiding people the most scrupulous care and to pledge my willing support to every legislative effort for the advancement of the greatness and prosperity of our beloved country.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 4, 1893.

Mr. DOLPH. There have been distributed, while the message was being read, printed copies of what purports to be the message, and on page 9 I find a part of the page devoted to Hawaii. I did not hear it read from the desk. I myself would like to know, and I think the country would like to know, whether it was inadvertently or purposely omitted by the Secretary, or whether the copies which have been circulated are not true copies of the message.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that page 9 was inadvertently omitted by the Secretary. The Secretary will now read the page to which the Senator from Oregon refers.

The Secretary read page 9 of the message.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the message lie on the table, and that the usual number of copies be printed.

Mr. DOLPH. I desire, on the motion to print, to make some remarks upon that portion of the President's message relating to Hawaii.

Mr. CULLOM. Then let it lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH. If the motion may go over until to-morrow, I will submit my remarks immediately after the morning business, or I can submit them this afternoon, if in order, although I do not wish to detain the Senate to-day. If the position of the message will be such to-morrow that my remarks will be in order I shall not ask for a postponement of action on the motion to print.

Mr. GORMAN. My motion is that the message lie on the table, and that only the usual number of copies be printed. That will enable the Senator to call up the message in the morning.

Mr. DOLPH. Very well. Then I give notice that to-morrow, after the morning business, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate while I submit some remarks upon that portion of the President's message relating to Hawaii.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HOAR. Is it understood that the message is to come up to-morrow morning for consideration?

Mr. GORMAN. That is my understanding. I ask merely that it lie on the table and that the usual number of copies be printed.

Mr. HOAR. But while the Senator from Oregon is at liberty to call it up, if an objection is interposed, it will require a majority vote of the Senate to take the message from the table.

Mr. COCKRELL. We will vote to take it up.

Mr. GORMAN. There is no earthly objection to the Senator from Oregon addressing the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then we had better not make the order to print until to-morrow.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the message be printed, so that every Senator will have it on his desk, and may understand it.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is this trouble: If the motion to print is adopted then there will be no question before the Senate for debate.

Mr. COCKRELL. The motion to print will have been adopted and the message will be upon the table; and I shall move to proceed to its consideration in order that the Senator from Oregon may speak upon it.

Mr. SHERMAN. With that understanding I have no objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. Nobody wants to suppress free speech here.

Mr. GORMAN. More than that, my motion is to print only the usual number. To-morrow I shall make a motion to print an extra number, as is customary, and on that motion the Senator from Oregon can address the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. Any way will be satisfactory so that a debatable question will be before the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. There is no objection to that course. We all desire it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland, that the message lie on the table and that the usual number be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL DEPUTY COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the joint resolution just received from the House of Representatives be laid before the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 to pay the salaries and actual and necessary expenses of as many additional deputy collectors of internal revenue as it may be found necessary for the collectors in the several districts to appoint in order to the more thorough and effective execution of the act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893, relating to the registration of, and the issuance of certificates of residence to, Chinese laborers who are entitled to remain in the United States under the provisions of these laws, which additional deputy collectors shall be paid, out of the sum hereby appropriated, by such allowances as shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of internal revenue: *Provided*, That collectors of internal revenue shall not receive any fee or other compensation for the registration and issuance of certificates of residence to Chinese laborers who are entitled to remain in the United States under the provisions of the said laws.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOAR. Before it goes to the committee I should like to call attention to a very extraordinary omission in the joint resolution. As I heard it read it provides for the payment of such additional collectors of internal revenue as it may be found necessary for the various collectors to appoint. It nowhere gives authority to any particular officer, to the Secretary of the Treasury or the President of the United States, to appoint them, and it ought to contain such a provision.

Mr. COCKRELL. It says "deputy collectors."

Mr. HOAR. I understand; "additional deputy collectors."

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a general law authorizing the appointment of deputy collectors.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that; but the joint resolution does not put it under the general law. It merely provides for the payment of such deputy collectors as it may be found necessary to appoint. Now suppose the collector at San Francisco—I put an extreme case—thinks it necessary to appoint a thousand deputy collectors, is he entitled to do so? There ought to be some limitation

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator means a limitation upon the power of appointment?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh!

Mr. HOAR. It ought to be lodged in either the Secretary of the Treasury or the President.

Mr. CULLOM. That can be fixed in the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF SENATE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate submitting, in obedience to law, a full and complete account of all property belonging to the United States in his possession on the 4th day of December, 1893; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORTS OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, submitting a full and complete account of all property belonging to the United States in his possession December 4, 1893; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, transmitting a full and complete statement of all money received from sale of condemned property belonging to the United States from August 6, 1893, to date, and disposition made of same; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, showing the progress of construction upon the new Congressional Library building; which was referred to the Select Committee on Additional Accomodations for the Library of Congress, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by that court and the amounts thereof for the year ending December 2, 1893; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, transmitting, in compliance with law, a statement of the expenditures for propagation of food fish during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and also under certain other appropriations therein enumerated; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

PAYMENTS TO SPECIAL DEPUTY MARSHALS IN NEW YORK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of October 25, 1893, a statement from the First Comptroller, showing the amounts paid special deputy marshals by John W. Jacobus, United States marshal for the southern district of New York, previous to the election held at the city of New York, November 8, 1892; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of Charles A. Story, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a thorough and complete revision of the present system of spelling; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Peoria, Ill., remonstrating against an increase of the tax on malt liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States, through its president, Sarah E. V. Emery, praying that members of the Senate abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors during the present session of Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Central Labor Union, of Worcester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure governmental ownership and control of the telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Jeremiah Donovan and 198 others, and the petition of John Bush and 145 others, citizens of Springfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation look-

ing to the early release of American citizens confined in English penitentiaries for alleged political offenses; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1153) to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1154) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1155) granting a pension to John E. Burnes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1156) to increase the pension of John H. Bieling, of Detroit, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1157) to provide for the incorporation of street railway companies in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1158) for the relief of John Murphy and the Spalding Lumber Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1159) to relieve James Poundin of the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1160) for the relief of William Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1161) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes relating to life-saving appliances on shipboard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1162) to provide for the enlargement of the public building at Topeka, in the State of Kansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1163) to provide for the daily publication of a summary of the proceedings of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1164) to amend the immigration and naturalization laws; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1165) to prohibit unnaturalized persons of foreign birth from voting at any national or State election; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1166) to establish a customs commission; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1167) to protect interstate commerce; to prevent dealing in "options" and "futures;" to prohibit the formation of "trusts," "combines," "corners," and all other combinations which affect prices; and to punish conspiracies against freedom of trade among the people of the several States; which was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce in the absence of objection.

Mr. CULLOM. I think some other committee has had charge of a portion of the subject-matter involved in the bill. I presume it should properly be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PEFFER. I prefer that it should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be so referred.

Mr. PEFFER also introduced a bill (S. 1168) to establish a bureau of irrigation, and to prescribe the duties thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1169) to enable the people of the Territory of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1170) to establish an electrical experiment station for the purpose of investigating and determining whether electricity can be profitably applied as a motive power in the propulsion of farm machinery and implements; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1171) to prohibit the collection of special liquor taxes from persons other than those who are duly authorized by State laws to traffic in intoxicating liquors; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1172) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors at military posts and reservations and at national soldiers' homes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1173) to grant service pensions to soldiers and sailors of the War of the Rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1174) to reduce the number of pension ratings to ten, to abolish pension agencies, and to lessen the expense of examining boards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1175) to require payment of pension money to wives in cases where male pensioners desert or abandon their families, or are habitual drunkards, or for any reason fail and neglect to support their families; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1176) to increase pensions of the soldiers of the war of 1812 to $25 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1177) to increase the circulating medium by using Treasury notes based on gold and silver coin and bullion; and to amend the coinage laws accordingly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1178) to regulate the value of certain coins and pieces of money; to give to all sorts of current money equal qualities of legal tender, and to prohibit and prevent discriminations in favor of gold coin or bullion as money; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1179) to provide for lighting the public buildings in Washington, and to furnish means of lighting to the residents of said city; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1180) for the relief of Charles Williamson, late assistant surgeon Twelfth Kansas State Militia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1181) for the relief of Thomas Moonlight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEFFER. I introduce (by request) a bill to regulate the importation and sale of intoxicating liquors in the United States, to which I wish to call attention, as it is one of a somewhat peculiar character. It has been sent to me by a very intelligent citizen of the State of Kansas, a very earnest temperance worker. While the bill is not drawn in such form as a lawyer would prepare it, and while there may be some objections to its phraseology, yet my correspondent asks that it be submitted to the Senate without any change whatever. So I introduce the bill and ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill (S. 1182) to regulate the importation and sale of intoxicating liquors in the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the office of President to one term for each incumbent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 40) to amend the Constitution so as to elect the President and Vice-President by a direct vote of the people; which was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the absence of objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HOAR. I think the bill should be referred to that committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so referred in the absence of objection.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 41) relative to the erection of a penitentiary in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

COL. ANSON MILLS.

Mr. MILLS. I introduce a joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it may be now considered.

The joint resolution (S. R. 42) permitting Anson Mills, colonel of Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Anson Mills, colonel Third Regiment United States Cavalry, having been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as a commissioner of the United States under the convention between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, concluded and signed by the contracting parties at the city of Washington, March 1, 1889, is hereby permitted to accept and exercise the functions of said office of commissioner: *Provided*, Said officer shall continue to receive his emoluments in pay and allowances as colonel in the Army while holding said office of commissioner the same as he would receive were he performing such duty under military orders, and no other additional pay or emoluments for his services as such commissioner.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to inquire what is the necessity for the passage of the joint resolution?

Mr. MILLS. I will state. Col. Anson Mills is now colonel of the Third Regiment of Cavalry of the United States. He is a very skilled officer, familiar with the boundaries of the Rio Grande, where he served for a number of years. Under an agreement between the Republic of Mexico and that of the United States a joint commission has been raised to survey and fix the boundary between the two countries. Col. Mills has been selected by the President on account of his skill and his acquaintance with that country to represent the Government of the United States as the engineer on that commission; but there is a provision of law which prevents him from accepting a position of that sort without vacating his place in the Army. The joint resolution simply provides for giving the consent of Congress that he, an officer of the Army of the United States, drawing his pay as an officer of the Army, and with no other emoluments, may perform this duty for the Government of the United States. That is all.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether the resolution gives the officer the same compensation he now receives?

Mr. MILLS. The joint resolution does not change his pay, but leaves him an officer of the United States Army, detailed to do this business, which the law now in existence forbids him to do without the consent of Congress.

Mr. PALMER. Without additional pay?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Texas kindly state a little more distinctly the precise function this officer is to perform as a commissioner, notwithstanding he is an officer of the Army? I should like to hear, as I did not quite catch the Senator's statement.

Mr. MILLS. The officer is to act as engineer, as I understand, and under the treaty one is to be appointed by each government. He has been selected by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of the boundary commission?

Mr. MILLS. Of the boundary commission.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is the commission authorized to settle the boundary or only to report to the Executive?

Mr. MILLS. It is authorized to survey and fix the boundary line between the United States and Mexico on the Rio Grande River.

Mr. CHANDLER. How many commissioners are there?

Mr. MILLS. I have the convention and will read the provision relating to this matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is this officer the sole United States commissioner?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no; there are others. The convention provides that—

The International Boundary Commission shall be composed of a commissioner appointed by the President of the United States of America and another appointed by the President of the United States of Mexico, in accordance with the constitutional provisions of each country, of a consulting engineer, appointed in the same manner by each government, and of such secretaries and interpreters as either government may see fit to add to its commission. Each Government separately shall fix the salaries and emoluments of the members of its commission.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I understand, there are three commissioners on the part of the United States, and this military officer is only one of the three?

Mr. MILLS. He is one of those appointed by this Government.

Mr. CHANDLER. He is the engineer member of the commission.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir; so I understand.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Texas read from the document in his hand something which I understand is inconsistent with his verbal answer. Of course he did not wish to be misunderstood, but he probably was. I understand the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] inquired whether there were three commissioners on the part of the United States, and I understood the Senator from Texas to say there was one commissioner on the part of each Government.

Mr. MILLS. I have read the exact language of the convention to the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from New Hampshire asked if there were three commissioners.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator from New Hampshire said "three," but I did not make any answer in reply, if I recollect. I read the clause in the document.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LABORER IN LAW LIBRARY.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolved, That the assistant librarian in charge of the Law Library of Congress be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ a laborer at $30 a month to keep the rooms of the library in proper condition, and that this amount shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O'NEILL.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced the death of Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and communicated the resolutions of the House thereon:

Resolved, That the House has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the business of the House be suspended in order that the public services and private character of the deceased may be fully commemorated, and,

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate and to send a duly attested copy to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM LILLY.

The message also conveyed to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. William Lilly, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the action of the House of Representatives thereon.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I ask that the resolutions of the House of Representatives on the death of Hon. William Lilly be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions of the House of Representatives were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 4, 1893.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with sincere regret the announcement of the death of Hon. William Lilly, late a Representative of the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and send a duly attested copy to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That a committee of nine members of the House, with such members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral at Mauch Chunk, Pa.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker announced the appointment of Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. PAGE, Mr. MUTCHLER, Mr. NORTHWAY, Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, Mr. WHITING, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. TATE, as the committee provided for in the above resolutions.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I submit the resolutions which I send to the desk and move their adoption.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. William Lilly, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Senate concur in the resolution of the House of Representatives providing for the appointment of a joint committee to attend the funeral of the deceased at his late residence in the State of Pennsylvania, and that the committee on the part of the Senate, consisting of five Senators, be appointed by the Vice-President.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate, under the second resolution, Mr. QUAY, Mr. MANDERSON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. KYLE.

Mr. CAMERON. As an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 5, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1893.*

This being the day fixed by the Constitution for the annual meeting of Congress, the House of Representatives of the Fifty-third Congress assembled in their Hall for their second session at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER (Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP, a Representative from the State of Georgia) called the House to order.

The Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, our benefactor, our father, and our friend, we adore Thee for Thy loving-kindnesses and Thy tender mercies. We thank Thee, our Father, for Thy protection and Thy watch-care. We thank Thee that Thou hast preserved Thy servants in their separation and hast brought them again, in Congress assembled, to deliberate upon the affairs of this nation. We do not forget, our Father, that in this intermission our ranks have been broken and two members of this House have been called away. Especially are we reminded that one face accustomed to be seen here is absent, that one seat so long and ably filled is vacant.

Grant, our Father, that those who knew and loved him may cherish his memory and imitate his virtues, and may his gentleness, and his sympathy, and his life-long devotion to duty be an inspiration to us all. Now, our Father, we ask Thee to let Thy richest benediction rest upon this session of the House of Representatives. May the laws that shall be enacted here be wise and for the good of our people. Be with the President of the United States and his Cabinet; preserve the health of their bodies and the vigor of their minds. May Thy blessing so rest upon this Administration that the people of this vast nation, united and happy, may be able to adore Thee for Thy goodness and to declare that the Lord of Hosts is with us and the God of Jacob is our refuge. We ask this through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The roll was called; when the following-named members responded:

Adams,	Conn,	Henderson, N. C.	Mutchler,
Alderson,	Coombs,	Hepburn,	Newlands,
Aldrich,	Cooper, Fla.	Hermann,	Northway,
Alexander,	Cooper, Ind.	Hicks,	Oates,
Apsley,	Cooper, Tex.	Hilborn,	O'Neil,
Arnold,	Cooper, Wis.	Hines,	Outhwaite,
Avery,	Cornish,	Hitt,	Page,
Babcock,	Cousins,	Holman,	Paschal,
Bailey,	Covert,	Hooker, N. Y.	Patterson,
Baker, Kans.	Cox,	Hopkins, Ill.	Payne,
Baker, N. H.	Crain,	Houk, Ohio	Paynter,
Baldwin,	Cummings,	Hudson,	Pearson,
Bankhead,	Curtis, Kans.	Hulick,	Pence,
Barnes,	Curtis, N. Y.	Hunter,	Pendleton, Tex.
Bartholdt,	Dalzell,	Hutcheson,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Bell, Colo.	Davey,	Ikirt,	Perkins,
Bell, Tex.	Davis,	Johnson, Ind.	Phillips,
Beltzhoover,	De Armond,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Pickler,
Berry,	De Forest,	Johnson, Ohio	Pigott,
Bingham,	Denson,	Joy,	Randall,
Black, Ga.	Dingley,	Kiefer,	Rayner,
Black, Ill.	Dinsmore,	Kilgore,	Reed,
Blair,	Dockery,	Lane,	Reilly,
Bland,	Dolliver,	Lawson,	Richards,
Boatner,	Doolittle,	Layton,	Richardson, Tenn.
Boen,	Draper,	Lefever,	Robbins,
Boutelle,	Dunphy,	Lester,	Robertson, La.
Bower, N. C.	Durborow,	Linton,	Robinson, Pa.
Bowers, Cal.	Ellis, Oregon	Livingston,	Rusk,
Brawley,	English,	Loud,	Russell, Conn.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Enloe,	Lucas,	Russell, Ga.
Bretz,	Epes,	Lynch,	Ryan,
Brickner,	Erdman,	Maddox,	Sayers,
Broderick,	Everett,	Magner,	Shell,
Brookshire,	Fielder,	Maguire,	Sibley,
Brosius,	Fitch,	Mahon,	Simpson,
Brown,	Funk,	Mallory,	Sipe,
Bryan,	Fyan,	Marshall,	Smith,
Burrows,	Gardner,	Martin, Ind.	Snodgrass,
Bynum,	Gear,	McAleer,	Somers,
Cabaniss,	Geary,	McCall,	Sperry,
Cadmus,	Geissenhainer,	McCreary, Ky.	Springer,
Caldwell,	Goldzier,	McCulloch,	Stephenson,
Campbell,	Grady,	McDannold,	Stevens,
Cannon, Cal.	Grosvenor,	McDearmon,	Stockdale,
Cannon, Ill.	Grout,	McEttrick,	Stone, C. W.
Capehart,	Hainer,	McGann,	Stone, W. A.
Caruth,	Hall, Minn.	McKaig,	Storer,
Catchings,	Hall, Mo.	McLaurin,	Swanson,
Chickering,	Hammond,	McMillin,	Talbert, S. C.
Clancy,	Hare,	McRae,	Talbott, Md.
Clark, Mo.	Harmer,	Meiklejohn,	Tarsney,
Clarke, Ala.	Harter,	Mercer,	Tate,
Cobb, Ala.	Hartman,	Meredith,	Taylor, Ind.
Cobb, Mo.	Hatch,	Meyer,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cockran,	Haugen,	Montgomery,	Terry,
Cockrell,	Hayes,	Moon,	Thomas,
Coffeen,	Heiner,	Morgan,	Tracey,
Cogswell,	Henderson, Ill.	Moses,	Turner,
Tyler,	Warner,	Wever,	Wilson, W. Va.
Updegraff,	Washington,	Wheeler, Ala.	Wolverton,
Van Voorhis, Ohio	Waugh,	Whiting,	Wright, Mass.
Walker,	Weadock,	Williams, Ill.	Wright, Pa.
Wanger,	Wells,	Wilson, Ohio,	

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. Two hundred and fifty-five members have answered to their names.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Since I have been a member of this House it has been the invariable custom at the opening of a second session of Congress to call the roll by States, and by referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find that back to the early days of our Government the same practice has prevailed.

I move, therefore, that in order to conform to a precedent which has been so long established as to make it parliamentary law, the roll call just taken be recorded by States.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection the roll will be entered in that way, but the Chair does not see any necessity for it.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I do not think it is necessary, and I find there is no rule requiring the roll of the members to be called by States at the second session, but it has been the invariable custom.

I find that in the very early Congresses the record says: "The following members appeared," etc.; but for more than fifty years the roll has been called by States at each second session of Congress and the names have been so recorded.

At the opening of the second session of the Thirty-first Congress, December 2, 1850, Hon. Howell Cobb, Speaker, the record says:

> The roll of members was called over by States by the Clerk of the House.

At the opening of the third session of the Thirty-fourth Congress, December 1, 1856, the record says:

> The roll of members was called over by States.

At the opening of the second session of the Thirty-fifth, Thirty-sixth, Thirty-seventh, Thirty-eighth, Thirty-ninth, and Fortieth Congresses the roll was called and recorded by States.

At the opening of the second session of the Forty-first Congress, which succeeded an extra session like the present, the Speaker, Mr. Blaine, said:

> The Clerk will call the roll by States.

I also find that the roll was called and recorded by States at the second session of the Forty-second, Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, and Forty-sixth Congresses.

It will be remembered that the second session of the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses succeeded extra sessions, making the situation like the present in those cases. At the opening of the second session of the Forty-seventh Congress the Speaker said:

> In accordance with the usual course, the Clerk is directed to call the roll of members by States.

And so on from that time to the present, including the second session of the last Congress, the roll has been, under the direction of the Speaker, called by States and so recorded.

I do not regard the matter as material, but the custom is so ancient and has been so unbroken that it may be said to be unwritten parliamentary law.

The SPEAKER. No rule of the House requires the roll to be called or recorded in the manner which the gentleman suggests; on the contrary the rules require that the roll be called alphabetically, except that upon the organization of the House and when in the absence of the Speaker the Clerk discharges the duty of calling the House to order, the rules require him to have the roll called by States. In other cases the provision of the rule is that the roll be called alphabetically.

Mr. REED. Let us proceed according to the rules.

The SPEAKER. The roll will be so entered.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I have shown that under rules similar to those of the present Congress, the custom has been invariable to both call and record the roll of members by States. This, however, is not now a question of calling the roll, but of recording it.

The SPEAKER. But of course it must be recorded as called. The Clerk will so record it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

During the roll call, a message from the Senate by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that a quorum of the Senate had assembled and that the Senate was ready to proceed to business.

The message further announced that Mr. MCPHERSON and Mr. SHERMAN had been appointed a committee on the part of the Senate to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Hon. Hezekiah S. Bundy, elected as a Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of Ohio to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Hon. William H. Enochs, is present, and I ask that the oath of office be administered to him.

The SPEAKER. The credentials of the member-elect will be read.

The credentials having been read,

Mr. Bundy was duly qualified by taking the oath prescribed by law.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. SAYERS offered the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has appeared and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia offered the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That a committee of three members be appointed on the part of the House, to join the committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President and inform him that a quorum of the two Houses is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may have to make.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, Mr. OUTHWAITE, and Mr. BURROWS as the committee on the part of the House under the resolution just adopted.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. CATCHINGS submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House be 12 o'clock meridian.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. WEADOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that Maj. Griffin, elected to fill the vacancy from the first district of the State of Michigan, is present and desires to be sworn in. His credentials have not yet arrived, but I apprehend that no question will be made on that point.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Michigan, whose credentials have not yet arrived, will be sworn in.

There was no objection.

Mr. Griffin then appeared at the bar of the House and was duly qualified, taking the oath prescribed by law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CAMINETTI, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. FITHIAN, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. ABBOTT, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GRESHAM, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GRAHAM, on account of sickness.

LOSSES DURING THE RECENT CYCLONE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements of personal losses sustained during the cyclone of August 3, 1893, by keepers and assistant keepers of light stations, and recommending that they be reimbursed; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting for consideration, in connection with his letter of November 9, 1893, statements of personal losses sustained by keepers of light stations during the late cyclone.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, calling attention to his communication of November 9, 1893, and withdrawing the statement of the keeper of Bulls Bay (S. C.) light station; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

COMPENSATION OF LETTER-CARRIERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, pursuant to House resolution dated November 3, 1893, information relating to the claims of letter-carriers for compensation for services in excess of eight hours per day; which was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

EXPENDITURES SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a detailed statement of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Chief of Engineers, submitting a report on the construction of the Library Building of Congress during the year ending December 1, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FINDINGS COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House communications from the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings of the court in the cases of the following-named persons against the United States, namely:

C. W. Broadfoot, deceased; A. F. Comer, deceased; Patrick Dwyer, deceased; James H. Maury, administrator; Mordecai Tipton, deceased; John L. Murphy; Nicholas Rawlins; Andrew Allen; E. S. Gilbert, deceased; William Henderson, deceased; C. C. Baker; William Wallace, deceased; E. S. Grove, deceased; J. N. Hays; Morgan Coxen, deceased, J. B. Womack, deceased; Francis Kotz, deceased; A. H. Kennedy, deceased; Morgan M. Lee; and John Miller, deceased.

PROPERTY IN POSSESSION OF THE CLERK.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of the property of the United States in his possession on the 4th day of December, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

PROPERTY IN POSSESSION OF THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, transmitting an inventory of the property of the United States in his possession on the 4th day of December, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

DISBURSEMENTS BY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, transmitting a statement showing receipts and disbursements of his office for the year ended December 1, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese-exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893.

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 to pay the salaries and actual and necessary expenses of as many additional deputy collectors of internal revenue as it may be found necessary for the collectors in the several districts to appoint, in order to the more thorough and effective execution of the act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893, relating to the registration of and the issuance of certificates of residence to Chinese laborers who are entitled to remain in the United States under the provisions of these laws, which additional deputy collectors shall be paid out of the sum hereby appropriated, by such allowances as shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue: *Provided*, That collectors of internal revenue shall not receive any fee or other compensation for the registration and issuance of certificates of residence to Chinese laborers who are entitled to remain in the United States under the provisions of the said laws.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with that resolution I desire to have read a communication from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The communication will be read, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1893.

SIR: Referring to the conversation which I have had with you in relation to the Chinese exclusion act, I would say that under the construction which the First Comptroller has felt bound to give to section 9 of the act of May 5, 1892, provision can not be found, in the appropriation heretofore made by the sundry civil bill, for payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out that act. As in my opinion a thorough and effective execution of those provisions of the law which devolve upon collectors of internal revenue, the duty of registering and issuing certificates of residence to such Chinese laborers as may be found entitled to remain in the United States requires the appointment of a number of additional deputy collectors who may be assigned to this particular work, and whose salaries and necessary expenses shall be provided for by an ap-

propriation directly applicable to that purpose, I have prepared, and have the honor to transmit to you herewith, a draft of a joint resolution of Congress making such an appropriation. The sum of $50,000 which it provides for is, I believe upon careful consideration of the matter, the lowest amount that should be appropriated for this purpose, and I would therefore respectfully ask of you the presentation of this resolution to your committee with a view to its introduction and passage at an early date.

Respectfully, yours,

JOS. S. MILLER, *Commissioner.*

Hon. J. D. SAYERS,
Chairman of Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] for the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] a question.

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I understand that this appropriation of $50,000 is to carry into effect the act of 1892, and the amendment thereto.

Mr. SAYERS. Yes.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Is it believed that $50,000 is a sufficient sum?

Mr. SAYERS. It is estimated by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that it will be sufficient.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Very well, then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] for immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire objected, but subsequently withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there other objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. HINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HINES] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The resolution, providing for an investigation of the extent, causes, and effect upon interstate commerce of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company strike, was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HINES] for the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENGROSSMENT OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That after the passage of this resolution by the House, all bills and joint resolutions shall be engrossed only after they have passed the House.

Resolved, That the rule of the House numbered XXI be amended in line 5 of said rule by striking out in said line the words, "engrossed and," so that said rule will read, "shall the bill be read a third time," etc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I would like the gentleman from Tennessee to explain the necessity for the passage of that resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Rule XXI, which we propose to amend, provides for the engrossment of bills and joint resolutions before they are read the third time. As a fact this engrossment never takes place. I say never. I believe within my entire experience in the House I have never known such engrossment to actually take place, with only two or three exceptions.

The concurrent resolution, which has been adopted by the two Houses, provides for the printing of these engrossed measures, bills, and joint resolutions, does away with the manuscript copy which we have heretofore used, and provides for a printed copy. It is not more impracticable, possibly, to print than to write and to have an engrossed copy; but as a fact the printed copy will now take the place of the original manuscript engrossed copy; and this resolution simply changes the rules of the House so as to provide that the engrossment shall take place after the passage of the bill. It takes place that way now as a fact. A measure is not engrossed until after it is passed. This simply makes the rules conform to that which is now done. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I trust this will not be acted upon at once.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Permit me a moment——

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope this matter will go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let me make a statement. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was regularly introduced at the extraordinary session, and was considered by the Committee on Rules. They unanimously agreed that it should pass; but inasmuch as we were crowded the last day of the session, it was not possible to get the attention of the House; and for that reason it was not considered; but the Committee on Rules, both sides, unanimously agreed that this resolution ought to pass. I should have stated that much.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to take a little time to consider this matter now for the first time brought to the attention of the House. I think it ought to go over for the present.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

RECESS.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move that the House take a recess for fifteen minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes) the House was declared in recess for fifteen minutes.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON PRESIDENT.

At 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m. the committee appointed to wait upon the President appeared at the bar of the House.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to wait upon the President and to inform him that the two Houses are in session and ready to receive any communication from him, respectfully report that they have discharged their duty and are requested by the President to say that he will communicate with the two Houses at once in writing.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

At 1 o'clock and 35 minutes a message in writing from the President was communicated to the House by Mr. Pruden, one of his secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the message of the President of the United States.

The message was read by the Clerk of the House. (For text of message see Senate proceedings.)

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection this message will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the usual number of copies will be ordered printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolution (H. Res. 77) conferring diplomas upon designers, inventors, and expert artisans.

DEATH OF HON. CHARLES O'NEILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the sad and painful duty devolves upon me, at the request of the delegation from the State of Pennsylvania, to announce to the House of Representatives, in the accepted formal way, the death of our loved and honored colleague, Hon. Charles O'Neill, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, who died at his home in the city of Philadelphia on the 25th day of November last.

His death was not unexpected. Those of us who saw and heard him administer the oath of office—almost his last official act—to the distinguished Speaker of this Congress, felt that the shadows of death were already encompassing him thick and fast, and that "the father of the House" would soon be called to join his loved associates, Kelley and Randall, with whom he had earnestly labored, with equal fidelity, for more than a quarter of a century.

But one Representative remains in this House who was associated with him in the consummation of the patriotic, loyal, magnificent, and masterful legislation during the terrible and anxious years of the war of the rebellion. Happy, indeed, was my colleague that it was given to him to see his country reunited and to know that his labors had contributed to the peace, prosperity, and happiness of his fellow-countrymen. As we saw him

here in this Hall, day by day, for many many years, faithful, earnest, watchful, and true, so he was always and everywhere.

Surrounded by a loving, but broken-hearted family, attended by devoted friends and accompanied by many of his associates of this House, we saw him but a few days since carried to his last earthly resting place. The benediction has followed the prayer, and the requiem has been sung; "ashes to ashes, dust to dust;" Christ accept him, God receive him. He died as he had lived—loved and loving, at peace with all men.

At some future time I shall ask the House to devote a day when the members may express their feelings in memory of our deceased associate. For the present I offer the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; and

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and to send a duly attested copy to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were adopted.

DEATH OF HON. WILLIAM LILLY.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania and this House are confronted to-day with a twofold grief and loss. Hon. William Lilly, a Representative-at-large from the State of Pennsylvania, died at his home at Mauch Chunk on the 1st day of the present month. Elected to this Congress—his first term as a representative of five millions of people—his career of usefulness in this House had just opened. Honored with public trust and distinguished station, which measured years of marked probity and uprightness; familiar with legislative procedure, and understanding the wants of his great people, Pennsylvania looked confidently to his labors and their beneficent results, knowing he would be influenced only by the highest standards and for the good of all. His health was not robust or reliable when he entered upon his duties at the extraordinary session just closed. Gradually he grew weaker and weaker, until the final summons called him to his future home.

Sitting together in the house of representatives of the State of Pennsylvania during the years 1850 and 1851, we find Charles O'Neill and William Lilly earnestly laboring in their young manhood for the best interests of their State. Born in the same year, 1821, we mourn their loss to-day. I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with sincere regret the announcement of the death of Hon. William Lilly, late a representative of the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and send a duly attested copy to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That a committee of nine members of the House, with such members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral at Mauch Chunk, Pa.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The resolutions were adopted.

The SPEAKER appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. PAGE, Mr. MUTCHLER, Mr. NORTHWAY, Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, Mr. WHITING, Mr. HICKS, Mr. TATE.

The House then, pursuant to the last resolution (at 3 o'clock p. m.), adjourned.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the following bills, and the same were referred to the Committee on Pensions, to wit:

A bill (H. R. 2610) granting a pension to Elvin Brown.

A bill (H. R. 2100) for the relief of Phebe Norwood.

A bill (H. R. 1294) for increase of pension of Eviliana P. Low.

A bill (H. R. 1292) for increase of pension of Francis P. Gardener.

A bill (H. R. 701) to pension Mary Hartnett, widow.

A bill (H. R. 496) granting a pension to Ann L. Alexander.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4406) declaring a pension a vested right, regulating suspensions of pensions, granting appeals to supreme court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) defining sundry crimes against the United States in the administration of the pension laws thereof—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4408) to amend section 1674 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to consular officers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4409) providing that payment of pensions shall not be supended except upon presentation of charges and notice to pensioner, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 4410) to authorize the Washington and Marlboro Electric Railway Company to extend its line within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4411) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862; also to amend an act approved July 2, 1864, and also an act approved May 7, 1878, both in amendment of said first-mentioned act; and to provide for a settlement of claims growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of certain of the railroads, and to secure to the United States payment of all indebtedness of certain of the companies therein mentioned—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4412) to provide for the issuing of gold and silver certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUTCHLER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4413) to enable storage warehousemen in the District of Columbia to collect their charges upon goods deposited with them by the sale thereof—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bouef River, in Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4415) providing for an additional circuit judge in the eighth judicial district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4421) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements at the entrance to Coos Bay, Oregon, and for the inner harbor at the town of Mansfield and on Coos River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) to provide for the examination and survey of Nestuca River from the town of Woods to the Pacific Ocean, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) providing for the survey, with a view to the improvement of the navigation, of the Alsea River in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4424) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements on the Willamette River above Portland, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements on the Williamette and Columbia Rivers below Portland, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4426) to provide for the examination and survey of the Umpqua River from the town of Scottsburg to the Elkton Rapids, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) providing for an examination and survey of the Yamhill River, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the improvement of navigation to the town of McEllinville, by lock and dam construction—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4428) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements in the navigation of Tillamook Bay, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements at the mouth and on the upper waters of Coquille River, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4430) providing for the examination and survey with a view to the improvement of the harbor in Port Orford, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4431) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements at the entrance to the Columbia River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4432) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Siuslaw River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) providing an appropriation for the

speedy completion of the improvements at the entrance to Yaquina Bay, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Nehalem River, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McRAE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 89) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A joint resolution (H. Res. 90) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of the several States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 91) to permit Anson Mills, colonel of the Third Regiment of Cavalry, United States Army, to accept the office of commissioner under the convention between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico of the date of March 1, 1889—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A resolution to print 20,000 copies of the President's annual message—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HINES: A resolution asking for the appointment of a committee of five to investigate certain charges against the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4416) for the relief of Bvt. Gen. George S. Greene—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4417) for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Chouteau, Harrison & Valle—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 4418) for relief of Samuel H. Pook, constructor, United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 4419) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to issue a patent to Mace Clements's survey, No. 386, in the Virginia military district of Ohio—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to place the name of John P. Biehn on the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 4435) for the relief of David Young, Wilson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4436) for the relief of Smith R. Mershon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4437) for the relief of Charles M. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McALEER: A bill (H. R. 4438) to correct the naval history of John C. Dull—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4439) for the relief of John Compher, Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAGNER: A bill (H. R. 4440) for the relief of John L. Broome—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STORER: A bill (H. R. 4441) for the relief of Robert Macready, trustee, and another—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4442) for the relief of Arthur B. Lupfer—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) granting an honorable discharge to John W. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 4444) for the relief of the estate of John J. Hamel, Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4445) for the relief of Daniel Collins, Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of New London, Conn., for penny postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of J. Nelson James, asking Congress to compensate him for his discovery, which secures a more complete combustion of mineral coal—to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

WILLIAM D. WASHBURN, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, and MATT W. RANSOM, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress to regulate commerce, the seventh annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXPENDITURES AT SPRINGFIELD ARMORY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, together with a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, transmitting a statement of the amounts expended at the United States Armory at Springfield, Mass., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN HOME ASSOCIATION OF UTAH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the board of management and control of the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter from the governor of Illinois; which was read:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Springfield, December 2, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor as well as the pleasure of advising you that in pursuance of an invitation extended to the States by authority of Congress, the Legislature of the State of Illinois at its last session caused Mr. Leonard Volk, a distinguished American sculptor, to make a heroic statue in bronze of Gen. James Shields, one of Illinois's most distinguished warriors and statesmen. The same has been placed in position in Statuary Hall at Washington, and will be unveiled on December 6 of this year at the hour of 2 p. m. I respectfully invite your friendly coöperation. I have advised the President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

JOHN P. ALTGELD, *Governor.*

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
Vice-President and President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. CULLOM. I give notice that at some convenient hour to-morrow I shall introduce a resolution in reference to the statue, which is now in Statuary Hall, referred to in the communication just read, and ask for its consideration by the Senate. I move that the communication from the governor of Illinois lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Rock River Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Dixon, Ill., praying for the repeal of the so-called Geary Chinese law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a great number of petitions from citizens of Ohio, soldiers in the late war, without regard to party, who were honorably discharged, praying that the Senate "thoroughly investigate the present administration of the Pension Bureau, orders of suspension and subsequent orders, which claim to modify, but do not, and which leave us in doubt as to the exact relation we sustain to our Government as survivors of the late war." I ask that the petitions be separately noted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Pensions, as follows:

A petition of soldiers of Montville, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Chandlersville, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Lawrence County, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Martinsville, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Bloomingburg, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Castalia, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Wayne County, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Fultonham, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Manchester, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of South Bloomingville, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Loudonville, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Monroe County, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of East Liverpool, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Waterville, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Pyrmont, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Osborn, Ohio;

A petition of soldiers of Rebellion, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Reform, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Findlay, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Sandfork, Ohio;
A petition of soldiers of Waynesburg, Ohio; and
A petition of soldiers of Windham, Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Exchange, praying for the passage of the national antitrain-wrecking and antitrain-robbing bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The 1st of November last my colleague [Mr. DOLPH] reported from the Committee on Public Lands a bill (S. 945) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," which is now on the Calendar. I present a petition very numerously signed by citizens of Oregon, farmers, who are especially interested in the passage of the bill, in which they strongly urge its passage at an early date. The necessity for early action arises from the fact that under existing law the time within which the parties have the right to make payments on their lands expires on the 1st of January next. I wish to call the especial attention of the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and also of my colleague, to this matter. I hope the bill will be called up at an early date. I move that the petition lie on the table for the present.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I also present a preamble and resolutions recently passed by the State Horticultural Society of Oregon. As the resolutions refer to a subject of very great importance to the people of the Pacific coast generally, and especially to the people of California, Oregon, and Idaho, I beg the Senate to permit me to cite the petition a little more at length than usual. It is in regard to the prune industry on the Pacific coast.

The resolutions aver that this industry has already become one of very great importance on the Pacific coast and can attain immense proportions as soon as the trees now planted shall fully bear fruit, the product being equal to 150,000,000 pounds per annum in California and about half as much more in Oregon and Washington. They recite that "the national result of such production will be to cause prices to rule low from home competition, so that the grower can not expect more than fair wages for labor and rent for the capital invested, and that the prune-grower suffers from distrust that the duty now collected by the Government will be removed and thus subject him to ruinous foreign competition." The petitioners present these facts to the consideration of the Congress of the United States and memorialize Congress and the President of the United States that the present duty on prune importations shall be sustained for the following reasons, briefly stated:

First. That such protection will encourage an industry of great importance to both producer and consumer.

Second. That our cured prunes, under such protection, are acquiring an excellence of a high order that will increase if the industry is fostered.

Third. That our dried product is far more cleanly and healthful than the common foreign prune.

Fourth. That the law of supply and demand must regulate prices on the fair basis of the needs of both producer and consumer in the home market of the future.

The petitioners further state that they fully believe the result of encouragement of the prune industry will be much greater skill in producing and curing prunes and in developing new varieties, and that the Pacific coast will soon be able to export very largely of a superior quality of such product for the best trade of England as well as to the Americas and Asia.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oregon, praying that an appropriation be made for the publication of a pilot chart of the North Pacific Ocean; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the St. Louis (Mo.) Spanish Club, and a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., praying for a modification of the tariff duties on Mexican imports, and for enlarging commercial intercourse with Mexico; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOLPH. I present duplicate resolutions of the Oregon State Horticultural Society, favoring the maintenance of the present duty on prunes, being a copy of the petition just presented by my colleague.

I ask that the resolutions lie on the table and in the course of the next ten days, when I can do so without interfering with more important business, I shall call them up and on a motion for their reference, if there is not something better before the Senate to which I can address myself, I shall make some remarks upon the subject and the question of the tariff generally.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will lie on the table.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I present a memorial of sundry citizens of Bessemer, Mich., remonstrating against the placing of iron ore on the free list. As the memorial contains data relative to the cost of producing iron ore, I move that it be referred to the Committee on Finance, and that it be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a petition of the Detroit (Mich.) Typographical Union, praying for the establishment of a Government telegraph and for the construction of the proposed new Government Printing Office by day labor; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HILL presented a petition of the New York Jewelers' Board of Trade, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAVIS presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of the principals and superintendents of the American schools for the deaf and dumb held at Chicago, July 24, 1893, praying for the establishment of a department for the technical education of the deaf and dumb at the National Deaf-Mute College; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the petition of John Paul Egbert and other citizens of the United States, praying for the repeal of the so-called Geary Chinese law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL DEPUTY COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese-exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893, to report it with amendments, and I ask for its present consideration. I will state to the Senate that it will only take a few moments to pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VILAS in the chair). The Senator from Missouri asks for the present consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendments reported by the committee be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 5, after the word "dollars," the Committee on Appropriations report to insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary;" so as to read:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the salaries and actual and necessary expenses of as many additional deputy collectors of internal revenue, etc.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Missouri if the joint resolution does not give a great deal of power, discretion, and latitude to the collectors of internal revenue? I see that it gives power to the collectors to appoint as many deputies as they please. Is it the intention to restrict that in any way? I do not see any restriction in the joint resolution. It seems to me as though the power to appoint deputy collectors should be with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does the Senator from New Jersey know how deputy collectors are appointed?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I suppose deputy collectors are appointed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then necessarily the number of deputy collectors would depend upon the action of the Treasury Department.

Mr. MCPHERSON. But the collectors themselves have the right to recommend or appoint as many deputies as they please, as I understand it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will state to the Senator that the committee have reported an amendment, which has not yet been read, that the collectors shall appoint as many deputies as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem necessary. That really does not change the resolution as it came from the House of Representatives, because under the general law collectors of internal revenue can only appoint the number of deputies the Secretary will approve, and the deputies can not be increased in any way except with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If such appointments are already sufficiently guarded by law, I have no objection to the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. The ordinary appointments of deputy collectors of internal revenue are guarded by the general law. This is a special provision which is to operate for six months, and the law under which the appointments are to be made must be complied with in five months from now, from the 3d of November to the 3d of May. This is a specific appropriation for a specific object, and an amendment reported by the committee gives the control of the number of deputies to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. McPHERSON. Very well.

Mr. CALL. I understand that this joint resolution gives the appointment of the deputies absolutely to the collectors. It seems to me the objection suggested is well founded, and that the Secretary ought to be responsible for the persons appointed as well as for their number.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the classes of officers who are mere deputies, like deputy marshals and deputy collectors of internal revenue—I believe it does not apply to deputy collectors of customs—are appointed by the official who is personally responsible for their acts. They are not considered as coming within the constitutional provision as to the appointment of public officers. In the appropriation bills from year to year there is a limitation of the appointment of such deputies, as I understand, to the number existing at a particular time, that there shall not be any increase in that number.

This joint resolution as it came to us from the House of Representatives simply said that the sum of $50,000, without saying "or so much thereof as shall be necessary," is appropriated for the payment of salaries and expenses of as many deputy collectors as may be found necessary. It did not vest distinctly in anybody the discretion, but simply said $50,000 should be appropriated to pay so many deputy collectors as should be found necessary, leaving it in that vague and indeterminate condition.

The only limit, therefore, the only thing which will prevent the appointment of a thousand such collectors is the provision in the latter part of the joint resolution that the allowances shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. So, of course, no collector will be likely to appoint a number which the Secretary will not approve, because if he does they would not get any pay. The amendment now reported, as I understand, makes the thing clear; that is, it puts distinctly within the power of the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion and confers upon him the duty of judging of the necessity.

As I raised the point yesterday, I wish to say that I am satisfied with the joint resolution as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations; which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in line 7, after the words "revenue as," to strike out "it may be found" and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be;" so as to read:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the salaries and actual and necessary expenses of as many additional deputy collectors of internal revenue as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be necessary for the collectors in the several districts to appoint in order to the more thorough and effective execution of the act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893, relating to the registration of, and the issuance of certificates of residence to, Chinese laborers who are entitled to remain in the United States, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1183) to amend section 3 of an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1184) to amend sections 7 and 10 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1185) to authorize the Secretary of War to purchase for governmental and industrial use at Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill., a testing machine for tension and compression; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1186) for the relief of Samuel H. Pook, constructor United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HIGGINS introduced a bill (S. 1187) for the relief of Prof. Peter Collier; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1188) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1189) for the relief of Capt. Henry C. Seaman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1190) granting an increase of pension to David S. Corser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1191) making an appropriation for the completion of the light-house at Cape Arago, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1192) making an appropriation for the establishment of range lights at the mouth of the Willamette River, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1193) for the relief of Lieut. Col. John L. Broome; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1194) for the relief of Hudson C. Tanner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HOAR. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, so far as in his opinion it shall not be inconsistent with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate copies of all instructions which may have been given to any representative of the United States, or any naval officer thereof, since the 4th day of March, 1881, in regard to the preservation of public order in Hawaii, or the protection of the lives and property of American citizens, or the recognition or support of any government there.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am personally in favor of the resolution, but I think it ought to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the absence of the chairman of that committee I do not like to see anything done with it except to refer it there. I have no doubt it would be reported back promptly.

Mr. HOAR. It is merely a request for copies of such instructions as the President may think not inconsistent with the public interest, so that we may have the information in convenient form. I suppose probably nearly all the information will be found in the reports already submitted.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no doubt it will come in the reports, but in view of the President's message, in which he says, I think rather curtly, that he expects to send in further information on the subject, and in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think it is but courtesy to a member of this body to await his return before final action. I am told he is to be here soon. Perhaps Senators on the other side can state when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] will be here.

Mr. GORMAN. I do not know myself; but let the resolution go over.

Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution lie over.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no objection to that course.

Mr. HOAR. I shall call it up to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

RAILROAD LANDS IN FLORIDA.

Mr. CALL. I submit a resolution which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The resolution was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and they are, instructed to inquire and report to the Senate whether the approval of public lands by the Secretary of the Interior to the State of Florida for the benefit of the Florida Central and Peninsula Railroad Company alleged to be under the provisions of the act of Congress approved the 17th of May, A. D. 1856, and entitled "An act granting land to the States of Alabama and Florida, etc.," is not in violation of the said act of Congress, without authority of law, and void and of no effect; also whether such lands are not subject to homestead entry under the laws of the United States.

2. To report by bill or otherwise such legislation as may be necessary to protect the rights of homestead settlers on such land and for the issue of patents to innocent purchasers of land in limited quantities who have bought and paid for such land in good faith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 51) to change the boundaries of the judicial districts of the State of Florida; and

A bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within the Shawnee country, in the State of Kansas.

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business has closed, and the Calendar is in order.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that 10,000 extra copies of the President's message be printed for the use of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I was surprised yesterday by the statements of the President in his message read to the Senate concerning our relations with Hawaii. Notwithstanding the report of the Secretary of State to the President upon that subject, and the statements contained in the press of the country as to the purposes of the Administration, I could not conceive that it was possible that the Administration had determined upon the forcible overthrow of the existing government in Hawaii and the establishment of the native monarchy. I believed that if such had ever been the purpose of the Administration the expression through the press of the country of the almost unanimous public opinion against such a course would have changed such purpose and have caused the President to modify his supposed instructions to our present minister to Hawaii. But the President in his message yesterday said:

> Just prior to the installation of the present Administration the existing Government of Hawaii had been suddenly overthrown, and a treaty of annexation had been negotiated between the Provisional Government of the islands and the United States, and submitted to the Senate for ratification. This treaty I withdrew for examination, and dispatched Hon. James H. Blount, of Georgia, to Honolulu as a special commissioner to make an impartial investigation of the circumstances attending the change of government, and of all the conditions bearing upon the subject of the treaty.
>
> After a thorough and exhaustive examination Mr. Blount submitted to me his report, showing beyond all question that the constitutional Government of Hawaii had been subverted with the active aid of our representative to that Government, and through the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States which was landed for that purpose at the instance of our minister. Upon the facts developed it seemed to me the only honorable course for our Government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us and to restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our forcible intervention. With a view of accomplishing this result within the constitutional limits of executive power, and recognizing all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference, our present minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end. Thus far no information of the accomplishment of any definite results has been received from him.

So far as this statement asserts that the report of Mr. Blount shows beyond all question that the constitutional Government of Hawaii was subverted by the active interference of our minister, and by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States landed for that purpose, it assumes that the report of the personal representative of the President acting under secret instructions and conducting an *ex parte* examination is entitled to more credence than the official reports of our former minister to Hawaii and of our naval officers, the representations of the representatives of the Hawaiian Government to this country, and the information we have received through unofficial sources from the Christian and intelligent people of Hawaii since the revolution.

It would have been more satisfactory to me and I think to the country if the President had been a little more explicit as to how it is proposed to undo the wrong that it is alleged had been done to Hawaii by those representing us and as to how the Administration proposes to proceed to restore the status existing at the time of our alleged forcible intervention. It would have been more satisfactory if the President had given to the Senate the instructions to our present minister to Hawaii, so that the Senate and the country might have known what was proposed to be done by the Administration in its intervention to restore the monarchy in Hawaii. I think perhaps the President and myself, and possibly the Senate and the country, would have disagreed as to what could be constitutionally done by the Executive of the United States intervening to set up and pull down foreign governments.

But taking this communication in connection with the report of the Secretary of State to the President, I think I am warranted in asserting that it appears to confirm the newspaper reports concerning the policy of the present Administration that force is to be used for the overthrow of the provisional government and for setting up a half-civilized monarchy in Hawaii. Force is the only method by which foreign governments can interfere to create or to destroy a government.

Mr. CULLOM. Has the President the right to exercise it?

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from Illinois asks, has the President the right to exercise it? I say that undoubtedly if the President had stated what he believed was within his constitutional power in regard to Hawaii there would have been a wide difference of opinion as to the proper construction of the Constitution between the President and myself and the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we are warranted from the message of the President in assuming that something more than moral suasion is to be used to change the government of Hawaii. I consider the utterances of the President as most remarkable, considering the circumstances. What are the circumstances? Just before the close of the last Administration a revolution took place in Hawaii by which the effete, corrupt native monarchy, the existence of which had been possible to that time only by the policy of the United States, which prevented foreign interference and restrained the American influence from accelerating a change in the government, was overthrown. A dissipated, corrupt native queen was deposed and a provisional government representing the intelligence, the wealth, the business interests, the educational, moral and Christian elements in the islands was established.

On account of the preponderance of American interests in the islands and the well known policy of this Government towards them the Provisional Government applied to the United States for political connection. A continuance under a native government so corrupt that legislation was purchased, that justice was corrupted, that personal and property rights were insecure, and so revolutionary that constitutional limitations were disregarded, was longer unendurable; and to secure the reign of law and order, the protection of personal and property rights, and not for personal aggrandizement, the native government was overthrown. As the policy of the United States was well understood to be that no foreign government should acquire the sovereignty of the islands, and if there was to be political connection with any foreign power it should be with the United States, the Provisional Government, to prevent an unnecessary collict between civilization and barbarism, hastened to place itself under the protection of the American flag and to offer the sovereignty of the islands to the United States. Commissioners were appointed to negotiate for the annexation of the islands to the United States.

A treaty was negotiated by President Harrison and transmitted to the Senate for ratification, but the time remaining of the session was too short for its proper consideration. Upon the inauguration of President Cleveland the treaty was withdrawn from the consideration of the Senate, and instead of proceeding to investigate the matter upon the facts already in possession of the Government; instead of calling upon our minister at Hawaii for further information; instead, if the facts were supposed to justify such a course, of recalling our minister and appointing one satisfactory to the Administration, the President resorted to the unusual course of appointing a personal representative to go to Hawaii and investigate affairs with alleged powers paramount to those of a regularly appointed and regularly accredited minister of the United States. The instructions to this personal representative, the scope and extent of his investigation, the character of it, the sources of his information, his report, and his recommendations were kept a profound secret, although the matter was already before the people of the United States, was of great public importance, and was not of such a diplomatic character as to require secrecy.

After eight months of suspense on the part of the people and concealment on the part of the Administration, without any additional light upon the subject, the people were informed that the policy of the Harrison Administration and of every Administration in this country for the last forty years was to be reversed; that the annexation treaty was not again to be submitted to the Senate; that the provisional government of Hawaii was not to be further recognized as the lawful government; and we are at least led to the inference that the Navy of the United States is to be employed to roll back civilization in Hawaii; and that a corrupt, licentious queen, deposed by the Christian and civilized residents of the islands, is to be restored to a throne by American bayonets.

The people of this country were profoundly astonished and disappointed. The nations of Europe who have partitioned out among themselves the islands of the Pacific, and whose grasp has been kept from the Hawaiian group only by the policy of this Government, were perplexed. American and other foreign interests of the islands were alarmed and jeopardized; the friends of good government there were discouraged; and if the policy of the Administration results in restoring the monarchy a great crime against civilization will have been committed.

The people in this country are inquiring as to the cause of this course of the Administration, and there is room for a wide difference of opinion as to how far it has been caused by a desire of the present Administration to discredit the action and policy of its predecessor. The prompt withdrawal of the treaty, the sending of a personal representative to Hawaii under secret instructions, the secrecy by which the whole proceeding has been conducted, the colored, one-sided report at last promulgated by the Administration, all give color to the idea that the purpose of the Administration was early formed, and that all which has since been done has been done simply for the purpose of preparing for the announcement of the policy of the Administration.

It appears as if the Administration had early determined against the annexation of the islands and a provisional govern-

ment for them, in accordance with that construction of the Constitution which denies to the Federal Government those powers which are necessary for the development of our resources, for the extension and protection of our commerce, for the prosperity of our people, and for assuming among the great powers of the earth that place which our geographical position, our wealth, and our power entitle us to hold.

Mr. President, there was little room for controversy as to the facts between the officials of the present Administration and of the late Administration. All that was done in this matter prior to the inauguration of President Cleveland was done in open day, and is a matter of history. The revolution was public. The Provisional Government was recognized by the representatives of the great powers of earth at Hawaii either the day or the day after it was recognized by Mr. Stevens, our minister, and it is immaterial which. Commissioners were publicly appointed to come to the United States to negotiate for annexation. They came. They mingled with our people. They were interviewed by the reporters of our newspapers. They were received by the Administration. They negotiated a treaty.

Neither Mr. Harrison nor his Secretary of State, a man with large diplomatic experience and learned in international law, nor any member of his Cabinet supposed that the monarchy in Hawaii had been overthrown by our naval forces, that a great wrong had been done to that Government, or that in negotiating for the annexation of the islands we were seeking to take advantage of our own wrong. The people of the United States, who are a just people and would not consent that a wrong should be done to a weak nation, with all the facts before them failed to see that the revolution in Hawaii had not come from natural causes and was not in the interest of civilization and good government. All the investigation that can be had will not greatly change the case as made by the reports of our minister and our naval officers, by the protest of the Queen, and by the representation of the commissioners of Hawaii appointed to treat with this Government.

Mr. Cleveland and his Secretary of State had the means before them at the time the treaty was withdrawn from the Senate to have determined in twenty-four hours the facts in the case and to have determined upon a policy; and, I repeat, it is evident that the course of the Administration in this matter has been for the purpose of preparing the country for a movement by which the action and policy of its predecessor were to be reversed.

Our national interests, the protection of our coasts, the interests of our commerce, the requirements of our Navy, all demand that the United States should not permit the sovereignty of the Hawaiian Islands to pass to any foreign country. Our position in this regard was admirably stated by Secretary Marcy on the 4th of April, 1854, in a dispatch to Mr. Gregg, our commissioner at Hawaii. He said:

> It was foreseen that at some period, not far distant, such a change would take place—

That is, a change in the sovereignty of the Hawaiian Islands—

> and that the Hawaiian Islands would come under the protectorate of or be transferred to some foreign power. You were informed that it was not the policy of the United States to accelerate such a change; but if, in the course of events, it became unavoidable, this Governmennt would much prefer to acquire the sovereignty of these islands for the United States, rather than to see it transferred to any other power. If any foreign connection is to be formed, the geographical position of these islands indicates that it should be with us. Our commerce with them far exceeds that of all other countries; our citizens are embarked in the most important business concerns of that country, and some of them hold important public positions. In view of the large American interests there established and the intimate commercial relations existing at this time, it might well be regarded as the duty of this Government to prevent these islands from becoming the appendage of any other foreign power.
>
> It appears by your dispatches lately received at this Department that the ruling authorities of the Hawaiian Government have become convinced of their inability to sustain themselves any longer as an independent state, and are prepared to throw themselves upon our protection or to seek incorporation into our political system. Fears are entertained by those who favor such a measure that if the United States should manifest a disinclination to receive the proffered sovereignty of this country, the people would seek elsewhere a less desirable connection, or be given over to anarchy.
>
> The information contained in your last dispatch, No. 10, dated the 7th of February, renders it highly probable that the ruling powers of that Government will have presented to you, as our diplomatic agent, an offer of the sovereignty of their country to the United States. The President has deemed it proper that you should be furnished with instructions for the guidance of your conduct in such an emergency. With this dispatch you will be furnished with a full power to treat with the present authorities of the Hawaiian Government for the transfer of the Sandwich Islands to the United States. This can only be done by a convention or treaty, which will not be valid until it is ratified by the Senate of the United States.
>
> No intimation has ever been given to this Government as to the terms or conditions which will be likely to be annexed to the tender of the sovereignty. It is presumed, however, that something more than a mere protectorate is contemplated. A protectorate tendered to and accepted by the United States would not change the sovereignty of the country. In that case this Government would take upon itself heavy and responsible duties, for which it could hardly expect compensating advantages.
>
> I understand that the measure proposed by the people, and that in which the present rulers are disposed to concur, is "annexation" as distinguished from protection; and that it is their intention that these islands shall become a part of our territories and be under the control of this Government as fully as any other of its territorial possessions. In any convention you may make it is expected that the rights to be acquired by the United States should be clearly defined.
>
> Should the sovereignty of these islands be transferred to the United States, the present Government would, as a matter of course, be superseded, or at least be subjected to the Federal authority of this country.
>
> It is reasonable to anticipate that the present rulers and chiefs would expect that some provision would be made as compensation to them for the surrender of their political position. This provision could not be, as I conceive, any other than a pecuniary allowance. In this respect the United States would manifest toward them a liberal spirit. Annuities to the amount of $100,000 to be distributed in such manner as they would prefer might be secured to them in the treaty.

This policy, it is believed, has been approved by the people of the United States, it has been acquiesced in by foreign governments, and it has been followed, so far as I know, by every Administration from that time to the present.

It is known that Mr. Gregg negotiated a treaty with the Hawaiian Government for the annexation of the islands to the United States, a draft of which was sent to our Government; and although it contained two provisions—one for the admission of the islands as a State of the Union, and another increasing the amount of the annuities to be paid to $300,000—that were not approved by the Administration, it was agreed to by the native king and by his advisers, and would have received the royal signature except for the fact that the king suddenly died and Prince Alexander succeeded to the throne.

If you will take a map of the Pacific Ocean and examine it, you will see that, as was stated by Mr. Marcy, the geographical position of these islands is such that if they are to have political connection with any foreign power it should be with us. They lie in the route of commerce from Australia, from China and Japan to the western coast of this continent; they are so geographically situated as to give them a commanding naval and commercial importance. Their possession by the United States would make them a means of defense to our coast, and would give us a convenient naval and commercial station. Their possession by any foreign country would make them a constant menace to our commerce and our coast, another place where, as at Bermuda and Halifax and Esquimault, a hostile fleet could lie in safety and menace our coast and our commerce.

Great Britain already has control of Australia, New Zealand, part of New Guinea, and of the Fiji Islands in the South Pacific, Hongkong and Singapore on the Asiatic coast, and British Columbia on the western coast of North America. France has the Society Islands, the Marquesas groups lying north of Tahita, a portion of the Leeward Islands, New Caledonia, near Australia, one or two of the New Hebrides Islands, and Hué, on the coast of Cochin China. Germany lays a protectorate claim over the Marshall Islands, part of New Guinea, and two or three islands near the Equator. Russia has the undisputed possession of the Asiatic coast from Bering Sea and Kamchatka to Corea and China. Spain owns the Philippine Islands and about one hundred islands of the Caroline Group. The Dutch Netherlands have naval and waiting stations at Java, Sumatra, and Borneo. Portugal owns the Ladrone Islands.

It will be seen that the European nations have partitioned out among themselves all the islands of the Pacific but the Samoan Islands and the Sandwich group.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOLPH. I will.

Mr. VEST. Do I understand the Senator to be arguing in favor of the policy on the part of this Government of making the Hawaiian Islands a colony under what is known in Europe as the continental system?

Mr. DOLPH. I will come to that directly, and will explain precisely what I think should be done. I am in favor of the annexation of the islands. I am in favor of giving them a stable, good government, and exercising control over them.

As I said, it will be seen that the leading European nations have partitioned out among themselves the islands of the Pacific, except the Samoan Islands and the Sandwich Islands. By the vigorous foreign policy of the Harrison Administration the appropriation of the Samoan Islands by Germany was prevented, and a protectorate was created over them by Germany, Great Britain, and the United States.

The Hawaiian group alone of all the islands in the Pacific Ocean which are worth contending for remains. It affords the only opportunity for the United States to secure a suitable naval and commercial station in the Pacific Ocean, and an outpost for our defense. When the prize that our eminent statesmen had looked forward to for half a century is honorably laid at our feet upon our own terms and in a manner conducive of the best interests of all the residents of Hawaii, native and foreign, it is spurned with contempt.

Mr. President, if all that is claimed by the Administration concerning the manner in which the Provisional Government was established in Hawaii be true, still all that the United States

could properly do would be to withdraw its moral and physical support of the Provisional Government, and allow it to stand or fall by itself or to apply to other foreign governments for aid and protection. Forcible interference for the purpose of overthrowing the established Government would be so flagrant a violation of the principles of international law and of justice that foreign governments would be justified in interfering for the preservation of the existing Government and for the protection of personal and property rights in the islands.

Our policy in regard to these islands, maintained for half a century, is perfectly defensible, and has been and will be acquiesced in by foreign nations; but the United States should not be permitted to act the dog in the manger. If we will not, when there is ample justification and opportunity, interfere to give the islands good government and for the protection of American interests, we should get out of the way, and leave the intelligent population of the islands to apply elsewhere for protection. The moral sentiment of the world will justify the United States in asserting a better right to the annexation of the islands, or to a protectorate over them, than that of any other foreign country, and even to our interference on a proper occasion to give the islands good government; but it will most emphatically condemn actual forcible interference to fasten upon the intelligent, enterprising property-holding class of the islands a corrupt and plundering native monarchy.

If we may judge from the report of the Secretary of State to the President, from the President's message, and from all the information which the Administration has deigned to give us upon the subject, to the present time, the President has set himself up as an umpire to overthrow and set up foreign governments, and has assumed the power to revolutionize by force the Government of Hawaii, to overthrow a republic and set up a monarchy, to make war upon a friendly government recognized by all the great powers of the world, and that without consulting Congress and without previous notice.

Mr. GRAY. Am I to infer from what the Senator says that the present Government in Hawaii is a republic?

Mr. DOLPH. Well, it comes as near to that as anything.

Mr. GRAY. How near does it come to that?

Mr. DOLPH. I am not going to stop to discuss that question now. I will call it a republic, and when the Senator speaks, if he wants to criticise me, he can do so. It is at least a Government established by the people; it is no monarchy, that is certain; and that is sufficient for my present purpose.

Mr. GRAY. It is certain that it is not a republic.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. How many people established that Government?

Mr. DOLPH. As many as ever established any Government on the islands. Fifteen hundred people met in public meeting, men who pay the taxes and represent the moral and Christian elements of the islands.

I do not wish to be diverted into a discussion of these things. The Senators on the other side of the Chamber will have ample opportunity, I apprehend, before this session of Congress is over to discuss the subject to their satisfaction.

Mr. GRAY. I am sorry I asked the Senator the question.

Mr. DOLPH. Very well.

Mr. GRAY. It seems to be rather a disturbing question.

Mr. DOLPH. No, but it interrupts the line of thought which I was pursuing.

Mr. GRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. DOLPH. If we may judge from the information we have, it appears that the President has assumed that the Executive of this Government has a right to use the naval forces for the purpose of carrying out his unconstitutional and illegal designs. After eight months of deliberation, when Congress had been in session nearly three months of the time, and might have been consulted, the policy of the Administration is announced at a time so chosen that there can be no Congressional interference, and apparently nothing in the way of carrying out the long-concealed scheme of the Administration.

Claus Spreckels, a man who has grown rich off of the ignorant, improvident natives of the islands, from his connection with the deposed native Government, and on account of our improvident treaty with the islands, appears to have had more influence with the Administration than the thousand other Americans, residents of Hawaii, not basking in the smiles of the native queen, whose property interests are jeopardized by the native Government.

The whole course of the Administration on this subject has been most extraordinary. The purpose of the Administration is still obscure. The instructions to the present minister to Hawaii have not been made public, and every intimation of the purpose of the Administration was withheld until the late minister had sailed from San Francisco, and there was no longer any means by which the representatives of the Hawaiian Government to this country could communicate to their Government. There has been no administrative act in the history of this country so extraordinary, so censurable, so palpably unconstitutional, and so flagrantly in violation of the principles of international law as the supposed policy of the Administration towards the present Government of the Hawaiian Islands. If it is true that force is to be used to suppress the present Government, it is worse than war; it is worse than piracy, as it was designated by Hon. John A. Kasson in an interview published in the press, because pirates hoist the black flag and give notice of their intention to strike. It would more resemble assassination.

The report of the present Secretary of State to the President and the message of the President substantially charges, and that on the report of a personal agent of the President, acting under secret instructions and conducting an *ex parte* investigation, that our late minister to Hawaii and an able and patriotic officer of our Navy, since dead, conspired to overthrow the constitutional Government of Hawaii, and President Harrison, his distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Foster, the other members of his Cabinet, and a majority of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations with having been willing to approve a great wrong and to take advantage of it by annexing the islands; but, sir, reflections upon the late Administration are uncalled for and unpatriotic.

I have been surprised to see the action of the British Government when Lord George Paulet, commander of Her Majesty's ship Carysfort, compelled by force the Hawaiian King to cede the islands to England, cited by the newspapers as a precedent for the action of the Administration. In that case a British naval officer stationed at Hawaii, by the most arbitrary course and by force, compelled the native king to do many illegal and unjust things in regard to certain pretended rights of British subjects, and at last compelled him to cede the sovereignty of the islands to Great Britain. The king complied under force, under protest, and under duress, and immediately applied to the United States and Great Britain for redress of his wrongs.

Under the forcible protest of our Government the British Government disavowed the act of its naval officer, it having just treated with the principal powers of Europe, and I think with the United States, for the independence of the islands, and the king was left in possession of his dominions. There had been no change of Government; there was no Government to be overthrown. There had been an illegal seizure of the islands by a naval officer, and his act was disavowed by his Government.

Mr. President, previous Administrations have not been as adverse to territorial acquisition or as careful about the manner in which they are made as the present Administration. When the opportunity to purchase Louisiana occurred, President Jefferson, who declared that there was no power in the Federal Government to purchase territory, did not fail to act; and although Spain, which appeared to have a secret treaty with Napoleon at the time of the transfer of Louisiana from France to the United States that the territory should not be transferred, protested. Although the purchase of the territory was savagely attacked by the enemies of the Administration on the grounds of objection stated by Jefferson himself, the President called an extraordinary session of Congress for the 17th of October. Two days later the treaty was ratified, and ten days after a joint resolution was passed by Congress to carry the treaty into effect.

We put our own construction on the cession of Louisiana from Spain to France as regards the eastern boundary, Spain contending that the eastern boundary was the Mississippi River, and we enforced our construction by military occupation of the disputed territory. We demonstrated to Spain that she held Florida at our pleasure, and made the acquisition of Florida by the United States possible by military expeditions into Florida territory for one purpose or another.

Our people went to Texas and helped to organize there the revolution by which Texas was withdrawn from Mexico, and notwithstanding that our people were divided in sentiment about the admission of Texas into the Union, we admitted Texas in spite of the protest of Mexico.

The Mexican war was largely a party measure, and the people were divided in sentiment as to whether it was justified. It was not made for conquest, but it resulted in a large acquisition of territory.

As long as slavery existed the public men of the South were determined that the United States should annex Cuba. If I had time, I could cite history to show that they were not so very particular about the occasion which was to enable us to do so.

In acquiring Alaska we set the precedent for acquiring territory not contiguous to our own. We acquired from Russia a territory containing nearly 500,000 square miles, with about 35,000 native population and a very few white inhabitants, a territory which will probably never be ready for admission as a State into

the Union, and whose military and commercial importance is not far greater than that of the Sandwich Islands.

Our citizens went to Oregon Territory, which we laid claim to on account of the discovery of Capt. Gray, and settled there. We treated with Great Britain for the joint occupation of it. American citizens raised the American flag, constituted a state, and formed a provisional government, and we gave the Territory a Territorial government long before any effort had been made to treat with the Indians for the cession of the soil or for the extinguishment of their rights.

The treaty negotiated by President Harrison for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands was a treaty of annexation only, providing for the political control of them until Congress could act, and leaving the future government of the islands entirely to Congress. Statehood was not demanded or expected. If annexation were desirable, there could not have been framed a better or a more favorable treaty to the United States. Even a full territorial government would not have been required.

The government of Alaska is a very limited government, and in my judgment, in some respects, a very defective one. We shall have to provide for Alaska and all territory so situated, that it is not likely within any reasonable time to become a State of the Union, a form of government more simple and less cumbersome, reserving to the Federal Government more legislative and executive power than under the ordinary territorial government.

The control and government of Hawaii would have given us no trouble. Our flag would have protected their people from foreign interference; a single company of militia or a naval vessel, which could have been profitably stationed there for other purposes, would have preserved domestic order, and the resources and the revenues of the islands would have been sufficient to maintain the local government, to provide for general education, and to have contributed a fair share to the National Treasury.

Seventy-one years ago President Monroe, after long and careful deliberation and consultation with his Cabinet, stated in his annual message the doctrine which has since been known by his name concerning the interference of European powers with political affairs on this continent. I shall not encumber the RECORD by reading all that he said on that subject. A few brief quotations will be sufficient to show the character and extent of the doctrine.

I should say the occasion for the announcement of the Monroe doctrine was the proposed intervention by the allied powers of Europe, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, for the purpose of restoring the revolted colonies of Spain on this continent to the control of the mother country.

President Monroe said:

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

The reasons for this declaration and the construction which has since been put upon it by our Government extends it to the islands of both oceans, which are situated so near to the continent as to be of especial naval and commercial importance. In October, 1824, it was applied to Cuba and Porto Rico. Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, in a dispatch to Mr. Brown, our minister to France, stated the position of the United States concerning these two islands as follows:

In the same spirit, and with the hope of guarding beforehand against any possible difficulties on that subject that may arise, you will now add that we could not consent to the occupation of those islands—

That is Cuba and Porto Rico—

by any other European power than Spain under any contingency whatever. Cherishing no designs on them ourselves, we have a fair claim to an unreserved knowledge of the views of other great maritime powers in respect to them.

This doctrine has been frequently applied to the Sandwich Islands.

President Tyler, in his annual message of December, 1842, Mr. Webster being Secretary of State, said concerning the Sandwich Islands:

Just emerging from a state of barbarism, the government of the islands is as yet feeble, but its dispositions appear to be just and pacific, and it seems anxious to improve the condition of its people by the introduction of religious and moral institutions, means of education, and the arts of civilized life. It can not but be in conformity with the wishes of the Government and the people of the United States, that the community thus existing, in the midst of a vast expanse of ocean, should be respected, and all its rights strictly and conscientiously regarded. And this must also be the true interest of all other commercial states.

Far remote from the dominions of European powers, its growth and prosperity, as an independent state, may yet be in a high degree useful to all whose trade is extended to those regions; while its nearer approach to this continent and the intercourse which American vessels have with it—such vessels constituting five-sixths of all which annually visit it—could not but create dissatisfaction on the part of the United States at any attempt by another power, should such an attempt be threatened or feared, to take possession of the islands, colonize them, and subvert the native government. Considering, therefore, that the United States possess so very large a share of the intercourse with those islands, it is deemed not unfit to make the declaration that their Government seeks, nevertheless, no exclusive control over the Hawaiian Government, but is content with its independent existence, and anxiously wishes for its security and prosperity. Its forbearance in this respect, under the circumstances of the very large intercourse of their citizens with the islands, would justify this Government, should events hereafter arise to require it, in making a decided remonstrance against the adoption of an opposite policy by any other power.

President Taylor, in his message of December 4, 1849, said:

The position of the Sandwich Islands with reference to the territory of the United States on the Pacific, the success of our perserving and benevolent citizens who have repaired to that remote quarter in Christianizing the natives and inducing them to adopt a system of government and laws suited to their capacity and wants, and the use made by our numerous whale ships of the harbors of the islands as places of resort for obtaining refreshment and repairs, all combine to render their destiny peculiarly interesting to us.

It is our duty to encourage the authorities of these islands in their efforts to improve and elevate the moral and political condition of the inhabitants; and we should make reasonable allowances for the difficulties inseparable from this task. We desire that the islands may maintain their independence, and that other nations should concur with us in this sentiment.

We could in no event be indifferent to their passing under the dominion of any other power.

The principal commercial states have in this a common interest, and it is to be hoped that no one of them will attempt to interpose obstacles to the entire independence of the islands. * * *

President Johnson, in his message of December 9, 1868, said:

It is known and felt by the Hawaiian Government and people that their government and institutions are feeble and precarious; that the United States being so near a neighbor, would be unwilling to see the islands pass under foreign control.

I will also insert, without reading, an extract from a dispatch from Secretary Blaine, dated November 19, 1881, to our American minister at Hawaii:

But if negotiations such as you describe are really in progress—

Negotiations to induce the Hawaiian Government to withdraw from the reciprocity treaty with us—

you will ask for an interview with the secretary for foreign affairs and make the following representation of the views of the United States:

The Government of the United States has with unvarying consistency manifested respect for the Hawaiian Kingdom and an earnest desire for the welfare of its people. * * *

The Government of the United States has always avowed, and now repeats, that under no circumstances will it permit the transfer of the territory or sovereignty of these islands to any of the great European powers. It is needless to restate the reasons upon which that determination rests. It is too obvious for argument that the possession of these islands by a great maritime power would not only be a dangerous diminution of the just and necessary influence of the United States in the waters of the Pacific, but in case of international difficulty it would be a positive threat to interests too large and important to be lightly risked. * * *

I also submit an extract from another dispatch from Secretary Blaine, dated December 1, 1882:

The United States was one of the first among the great nations of the world to take active interest in upbuilding Hawaiian independence and the creation of political life for its people. It has consistently endeavored, and with success, to enlarge the material prosperity of Hawaii. On such an independent basis it proposes to be equally unremitting in its efforts hereafter to maintain and develop the advantages which accrued to Hawaii, and draw closer the ties which imperatively unite her to the great body of the American commonwealth. In this line of action the United States does its simple duty both to Hawaii and itself, and it can not permit such obvious neglect of national interest as would be involved by silent acquiescence in any movement looking to a lessening of those amenities and the substitution of alien and hostile interests. It firmly believes the position of the Hawaiian Islands, as a key to the dominion of the American Pacific, demands neutrality, to which end it will earnestly cooperate with the native Government, and if through any cause the maintenance of such position, neutrality, should be found by Hawaii impracticable, this Government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking avowedly an American solution of the grave issues presented.

I also submit an extract from a report of Mr. Secretary Fish, accompanying President Grant's message to the Senate of July 14, 1870:

It was at the period of the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle and of Laybach, when the "holy alliance" was combined to arrest all political changes in Europe in the sense of liberty, when they were intervening in Southern Europe for the reestablishment of absolutism, and when they were meditating interference to check the progress of free government in America, that Mr. Monroe, in his annual message of December, 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt to extend the European system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power," he said, "we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling, in any other manner, their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly feeling toward the United States."

This declaration resolved the solution of the immediate question of the independence of the Spanish-American colonies, and is supposed to have exercised some influence upon the course of the British cabinet in regard to the absolutist schemes in Europe as well as in America.

It has also exercised a permanent influence on this continent. It was at once invoked in consequence of the supposed peril of Cuba on the side of Europe; it was applied to a similar danger threatening Yucatan; it was embodied in the treaty of the United States and Great Britain as to Central America; it produced the successful opposition of the United States to the

attempt of Great Brirain to exercise dominion in Nicaragua under the cover of the Mosquito Indians; and it operated in like manner to prevent the establishment of a European dynasty in Mexico.

The United States stands solemnly committed by repeated declarations and repeated acts to this doctrine, and its application to the affairs of this continent. In his message to the two Houses of Congress at the commencement of the present session, the President, following the teachings of all our history, said that the existing "dependencies are no longer regarded as subject to transfer from one European power to another. When the present relation of colonies ceases, they are to become independent powers, exercising the right of choice and of self-control in the determination of their future condition and relations with other powers."

The policy is not a policy of aggression; but it opposes the creation of European dominion on American soil, or its transfer to other European powers, and it looks hopefully to the time when, by the voluntary departure of European governments from this continent and the adjacent islands, America shall be wholly American.

It does not contemplate forcible intervention in any legitimate contest; but it protests against permitting such a contest to result in the increase of European power or influence; and it ever impels this Government, as in the late contest between the South American Republics and Spain, to interpose its good offices to secure an honorable peace.

I also submit an extract from a dispatch of Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, dated July 12, 1887, on the subject of the Hawaiian Islands. It is a dispatch to our minister at Hawaii.

Whilst we abstain from interference with the domestic affairs of Hawaii, in accordance with the policy and practice of this Government, yet obstruction to the channels of legitimate commerce under existing treaty must not be allowed, and American citizens in Hawaii must be protected in their persons and property by the representatives of their country's law and power, and no internal discord must be suffered to impair them. Your own aid and counsel, as well as the assistance of the officers of our Government vessels, if found necessary, will therefore be promptly afforded to promote the reign of law and respect for orderly government in Hawaii.

As is well known, no intent is cherished or policy entertained by the United States which is otherwise than friendly to the autonomical control and independence of Hawaii, and no other member of the family of nations has so great and immediate an interest in the welfare and prosperity of Hawaii on such a basis as this Republic.

In regard to the Hawaiian Islands the policy of the United States has not only been that the sovereignty of the islands should not pass to any foreign country, but if the islands were to form a political connection with any foreign country it should be with us. While we have not been willing to force annexation or hasten the evident coming of the time when Hawaii would apply to the United States for political connection, as evidenced by the dispatch which I read from Secretary Marcy to Mr. Gregg, of April 4, 1854, the eventual annexation of the islands has been looked forward to. It has become more and more evident that with the decreasing native population of the islands and the increase of the naturalized citizens and white residents of the islands, the increase of wealth, the multiplication of industries, in a word, with the growth of civilization in the islands, the time would come when the progressive, civilized, property-holding inhabitants of the islands would be no longer content to be governed by a native monarchy, and every one has had a right to believe that while our Government would not hasten revolution in the islands, it would not be the last to recognize revolution accomplished, and would not, when it could honorably do so, refuse to accept the sovereignty of the islands.

The revolution in Hawaii, in my judgment, was brought about by causes which had been in operation for many years. It was the natural result of that law by which, whenever civilization and barbarism come in conflict, civilization prevails. Every step toward civilization in the islands has been brought about by Christian missionaries and by the influence of foreign residents of the islands; and the civilization of the islands to-day is mainly represented by the population of foreign birth. Ever since the islands were discovered by Capt. Cook, in 1798, the native population, owing to their dissipated habits, have been constantly decreasing, and to-day it is less than the foreign population of the islands. It is unfit for self-government, and the forcible subjection of the personal and property rights of the intelligent and progressive people of Hawaii to a native Government would be a great outrage.

The course of civilization in Hawaii has been but a repetition of the course of civilization in this country. Civilization, impelled by a natural law ever since the first settlement on the Atlantic coast, has gradually spread westward, and savage life has disappeared before it until a continent once occupied only by wandering tribes of Indians, engaged in perpetual warfare, has become the home of 67,000,000 industrious, civilized people. While we may not approve of some of the methods by which this transformation has been wrought, we must accept it as inevitable and as having taken place in accordance with an imperative law of the world's progress.

Mr. President, this is not the first time the people have been disappointed by the foreign policy of Mr. Cleveland—a snail-like policy, a policy that confines a nation within its own boundaries. When Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1885, there was pending a treaty between the United States and Nicaragua by which the United States was granted the right to construct, operate, and control a ship canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific across the territory of Nicaragua. Upon the inauguration of Mr. Cleveland he withdrew the treaty from the Senate and never submitted it again to that body, and our opportunity to secure the construction of that canal, the control of it to the United States, and its capitalization at cost was lost. I will not dwell upon the causes of the defeat of that treaty or the great national loss caused thereby.

The project had received the favorable consideration of nearly every Administration for three-quarters of a century. It was a project which if carried out would have been immensely beneficial to our commerce. It would have accelerated the development of our resources. It would have added to the value of every product of the Pacific coast, and by enabling us to utilize Lake Nicaragua for a naval station would have doubled the effectiveness of our Navy and would have saved its cost to the United States in a comparatively brief period by lessening the necessary annual expenditures for the Navy. If Mr. Cleveland had favored that treaty it would have been ratified, and to-day the canal might have been in successful operation, dispensing its blessings to the people of this country and to the world.

If that canal should be built by private parties it would be at a ruinous cost. It would necessarily be capitalized for several times its cost, and the tolls and charges would be so great as to largely offset the advantage of the shorter route for commerce. Work has been suspended on the canal, and it is more than probable that the present company may be compelled to surrender its concessions to Nicaragua, and a way may be opened for the United States to secure the right to construct and control the canal, but under the do-nothing policy of this Administration the opportunity would no doubt be lost.

We need an aggressive foreign policy. We need a reaffirmation of the Monroe doctrine as it is popularly understood applied not only to the continent of America but to those islands which are situated so near our coast as to be of great commercial and naval importance. We need an aggressive policy for the purpose of extending and protecting our commerce, and securing closer relations with South American republics—a policy which, if necessity requires, extends and is enforced beyond our own boundaries, a policy, in fact, which goes with our citizens and with our flag wherever they may lawfully go, and a policy which would give us a commanding position among the great powers of the world commensurate with our geographical situation and our wealth and power.

The question of the future control of the Sandwich Islands is a question of national importance, affecting our national safety, the interest of our commerce, the requirements of our Navy, the protection of American citizens; but the Pacific coast, on account of its geographical position, has an especial interest in it. With a seacoast line of over 1,600 miles, not including Alaska, with one of the greatest inland seas upon the face of the globe, with a fruitful soil and varied climate, with vast and valuable forests, with mines of precious and useful metals, with great resources as yet almost altogether undeveloped, situated nearer the markets of the Orient and of the islands of the Pacific by 3,000 miles than the Atlantic and the Gulf coast, our foreign and coastwise commerce, when our great resources shall be developed, will be scarcely less important than that of the Atlantic.

In contending for the trade of the trans-Pacific countries we must contend with those European countries which have partitioned out among themselves the islands of the Pacific, which will control their harbors and their commerce, and especially with Great Britain, which has for the purpose of controlling the commerce of the Pacific constructed at an estimated cost of $142,000,000 the intercolonial railroad connecting the maritime provinces of the Canadian Dominion with Halifax and Quebec, and has constructed the Canadian Pacific to connect Quebec and Halifax with Puget Sound, and is, in connection with the Dominion Government, by subsidies maintaining a British steamship line between the terminus of the Canadian Pacific on Puget Sound and Australia and the coasts of China and Japan.

In contending for our fair share of this commerce we shall have for all time to contend with that system of subsidies, of aid to their foreign commerce, maintained by Great Britain and other foreign nations. A wise statesmanship will endeavor to forecast the situation, to make provision by law to so far as possible place American commerce on an equality with the commerce of foreign countries.

The tide of immigration and civilization is still westward, impelled by a law as imperative as the laws of nature. It has swept across the continent, leaving along its course on mountain and in valley, on hillside and upon plain, great cities and towns and a civilized population, and will find its culminating point upon the shores of the Pacific.

The people of the Pacific coast in all that makes a people great and prosperous are the equals of their kindred of the East. In the disposition of all great questions affecting our future prosperity, and especially the extension and protection of our

commerce, the Pacific coast, on account of its geographical position, its present condition and necessities, and its future development, should receive fair consideration.

Mr. President, I take issue with the President that the report of his personal representative, Mr. Blount, shows beyond question, or at all, that the revolution in Hawaii was brought about by the interference of the American minister or by the interference of our naval forces. I have read Mr. Blount's report and the evidence accompanying it, and I have read Minister Stevens's report and his statement and the other information which could be derived from the press. The report of Mr. Blount reads more like the plea of a zealous lawyer for his side of a controversy than like the unprejudiced and impartial decision of a judge.

As for myself, I would sooner take the statement of Mr. Stevens, a man who has reached his seventy-third year and has served twelve years in honorable foreign positions under this Government, a man of standing and intelligence; I would sooner take the statement of Mr. Thurston, the representative of the Hawaiian Government here; I would sooner take the statement of the honorable men who were engaged in the revolution and know not only what was done, but what the intention of the parties was; I would sooner take the testimony that comes to us from the enlightened and Christian portion of the community in Hawaii, than to take the one-sided, colored report of Mr. Blount and the statement of the President in regard to affairs in Hawaii. I would prefer the statement of our minister and of these respectable men to that of all the admirers of the dissolute queen and of all the parasites who lived and thrived upon the native government.

I will state what I consider to be the true case in regard to Hawaii by submitting first to be incorporated in my remarks the dispatch of Minister Stevens of January 18, 1893, to the Secretary of State, being his official report:

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, H. I., January 18, 1893.
(Via San Francisco, January 28. Received January 28.)

Events in Hawaii in the past few days have moved rapidly. An entire overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and the establishment of a provisional government in the interest of the whole people of the islands without the sacrifice of a single life. The new government is in full possession of the islands and was promptly recognized by all the diplomatic representatives. The four men of whom it is composed are of high character, one of whom resigned his position as one of the supreme judges to assume the place. Full dispatches by the mail leaving Honolulu to-day by special steamer.

STEVENS, *United States Minister.*

UNITED STATES LEGATION.
Honolulu, January 18, 1893. (Received February 3.)

SIR: In my 73 of November 8 I gave full information of the surrender of the Queen to the wishes of the Legislature by the formation of a ministry composed of men of intelligence and wealth, possessing the entire confidence of the business men and the more responsible citizens of the country. But this surrender of the Queen and of those surrounding her was only seeming. As soon as the principal appropriations had been voted and the legislative work nearly concluded, several of the best members having already left for their homes, a remarkable conspiracy was revealed.

The undersigned, for the first time since he has been at the head of this legation, January 4 took passage for Hilo and the volcano on the United States Steamer Boston for the benefit of the health of himself and of his daughter, it being also desirable that the town of the second importance in the islands should have this attention at the time the Boston was making a visit to Hawaii, the chief island in the group. Beyond all doubt, immediately after the Boston and myself had left Honolulu the unscrupulous adventurers around the Queen improved the opportunity to push through the Legislature an astounding lottery franchise with the obvious intent to sell it out to the Louisiana lottery men. This was worked by some of the same parties supposed to be of the powerful opium ring whose four points of operation are Vancouver, San Francisco, Honolulu, and Hongkong. They distributed the lottery stock among the native members of the Legislature in large figures.

Notwithstanding the strong opposition of all the best people of the islands, including whites and natives, and the emphatic opposition of the chamber of commerce, the Queen and her palace favorite gave their warmest support to the lottery bill and signed it at once. She was to be immediately compensated by being allowed to proclaim a new constitution, restoring to the Crown the old despotic prerogatives in direct violation of the existing constitution, which provides for the only mode of change, which is by the action of successive legislatures.

Returning on the Boston from our Hilo trip on the 14th instant, we found the Legislature was to be prorogued at 12 a. m., one-half hour after my arrival at the legation. The prorogation completed, members of the Legislature, diplomatic corps, judges of the supreme court and other officials went to the palace by invitation. In the mean time it began to be known in public circles, that it was the Queen's intention to proclaim the revolutionary constitution. This resulted in raising an excitement which alarmed her confidants and caused some of them to draw back. This consumed time, so that she could not secure the signatures of her new cabinet as she had expected. In the mean time the diplomatic corps grew weary and left the palace, realizing that the invitation to be present was a trick.

THE QUEEN'S DETERMINATION.

As I had just returned, weary from my voyage, I had not received the invitation, the chamberlain knowing I was absent when he invited the English, Portuguese, French, and Japanese diplomatic representatives the day before. In the short meanwhile I had suspicioned the trick. Finally, the Queen appeared in the throne room, before the supreme judges and other officials, in an extreme passion of anger, and avowed her purpose to postpone her revolutionary constitution for a brief period, and then went upon the balcony and spoke with great passion in the same strain to those around the palace, principally her retainers and the royal guard, her determination to proclaim her constitution at another time. What I have described as to the lottery legislation, the forcing out of the responsible cabinet of November 3, and appointing the lottery cabinet, two of whom had been voted out of the ministry during the legislative session by a two-thirds vote for the best of reasons. It was the lottery bribe and the autocratic design of the Queen that quickly precipitated events.

A mass meeting of the citizens was called to meet on Monday, the 16th, at 2 p. m., which assembled in the largest hall in the city. Short as was the notice, over 1,300 of the principal citizens of Honolulu and from other islands, who happened to be in the city, were in attendance. This meeting included merchants, bankers, professional men, the principal business men, and the mechanics, the chief German and some of the leading English merchants and other nationalities, as well as American residents. It is said such an assemblage was never before equaled in Honolulu. Intelligent American visitors here say that such a public meeting would do credit to a meeting of a similar class of citizens in our best American cities.

The assemblage was a unit in feeling and purpose. The speeches and resolutions are on the printed slips I herewith inclose. This remarkable uprising of the best citizens, including nearly all of the chief property holders, the Tahitian marshal and palace favorite did not dare attempt to suppress. A committee of public safety was at once created to meet the emergency and to prevent anarchy and riot. It was fortunate that the Boston was in the harbor. The committee on public safety called on me for aid. I promptly addressed to the commander of the Boston, Capt. G. S. Wiltse, the following note:

UNITED STATES LEGATION,
Honolulu, January 16, 1893.

SIR: In view of the existing critical circumstances in Honolulu, including an inadequate legal force, I request you to land marines and sailors from the ship under your command for the protection of the United States legation and United States consulate and to secure the safety of American life and property.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. STEVENS,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States.

A copy of the call of the committee of public safety for aid is inclosed.

Promptly the men from the Boston were landed. Detachments were placed around the legation and the consulate, the principal members having marched to a central hall for shelter and headquarters; the night being at hand, the public anxiety being especially strong as to what might be done by irresponsible persons in the night, the landing of the men of the Boston so promptly gave immediate relief to the public anxiety.

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT.

As soon as practicable a provisional government was constituted, composed of four highly respectable men, with Judge Dole at the head, he having resigned his place on the supreme bench to assume this responsibility. He was born in Honolulu of American parentage, educated here and in the United States, and is of the highest reputation among all citizens, both natives and whites. P. C. Jones is a native of Boston, Mass., wealthy, possessing property interests in the islands, and a resident here for many years. The other two members are of the highest respectability. The committee of public safety forthwith took possession of the government buildings, archives, and treasury, and installed the provisional government at the heads of the respective departments. This being an accomplished fact, I promptly recognized the provisional government as the de facto government of the Hawaiian Islands. The English minister, the Portuguese chargé d'affaires, the French and the Japanese commissioners promptly did the same; these, with myself, being the only members of the diplomatic corps residing there.

All is quiet here now. Without the sacrifice of a single life this change of government has been accomplished. Language can hardly express the enthusiasm and the profound feeling of relief at this peaceful and salutary change of government. The underlying cause of this profound feeling among the citizens is the hope that the United States Government will allow these islands to pass to American control and become American soil. A commission of citizens, duly accredited, will go by the steamer that takes this dispatch to Washington to state the wishes of the provisional government and of the responsible people of the islands and to give a complete account of the existing state of things here.

It is proper that I should add that the presence of the Boston here has been of the highest importance and the behavior of officers and men has been admirable. Capt. Wiltse has exercised prudence and great firmness, while he and the undersigned have recognized only accomplished facts and have not allowed the use of the United States force for any but the most conservative reasons.

I am, sir,

JOHN L. STEVENS.

I submit also a subsequent statement made by Mr. Stevens and recently published in the press:

[Washington Post, November 30.]

BLOUNT GIVEN THE LIE—EX-MINISTER STEVENS SHARPLY CRITICISES HIS REPORT—HIS STATEMENTS FLATLY DENIED—THE COMMISSIONER CHARACTERIZED AS A DIPLOMATIC NEOPHYTE CAUGHT IN THE SNARES LAID FOR HIM BY LILIUOKALANI'S ADVISERS—HE AND SECRETARY GRESHAM ACCUSED OF PLAYING INTO BRITISH HANDS—SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE MEN AT HONOLULU.

AUGUSTA, ME., *November 29.*

Ex-Minister Stevens has given out the following as his reply to the position of Commissioner Blount on Hawaiian affairs:

"A deep sense of obligation to my country and an American's duty to defend an insulted, threatened, and struggling American colony, planted as righteously and firmly on the North Pacific isles as our Pilgrim Fathers established themselves on Plymouth Rock, demand that I shall make an answer to the astounding misrepresentations and untruths of Commissioner Blount's report on Hawaiian affairs, a copy of which I first obtained, with difficulty, Saturday evening, November 25.

"It is proper for me to preface my answer by briefly alluding to the fact that those familiar with international rules and proceedings and who have had diplomatic experience must be astonished that Secretary Gresham and his commissioner should make before the world such a persistent effort to discredit the recent agents of the department they now represent, and which was once represented by Thomas Jefferson, William L. Marcy, William H. Seward, and James G. Blaine. The general adoption of such a policy by our department of foreign affairs could not fail to weaken greatly our influence with foreign countries in any future effort and serve to make the American diplomatic service contemptible in the eyes of the world.

PLAYING INTO BRITISH HANDS.

"Not only is the course of Gresham and Blount extremely un-American in its spirit, but it is also in direct opposition to the civilizing and Christianizing influence on the Hawaiian islands, while it is playing into British hands, in direct opposition of the efforts of the American Board of Missions, and to the American Government for more than sixty years, in all of which period there has been a uniform, continuous, and patriotic American policy. I may also make a preliminary remark regarding the repeatedly asserted

opinion of those who have assailed my official action that I was prepared for and stimulated to it by the accomplished and thoroughly American statesman who occupied the Department of State most of the period of President Harrison's Administration. It is sufficient to say that this expressed surmise is utterly without foundation. What I know and state on this point accords with what ex-Secretary Tracy has evidently asserted in that regard. Still more, I may properly add that the lines of official duty, as followed by myself and Capt. Wiltse and the course of the Administration and of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the critical Hawaiian days of January and February last were exactly on the lines marked out by Secretary Marcy in 1854, and by Secretary Bayard in his dispatch to Minister Merrill July 12, 1887. Marcy's instructions and draft of treaty provided for annexation; Bayard's instructions of 1887 held the United States minister and naval commander at Honolulu responsible for the protection of American life and property and the 'preservation of public order.'

A DIPLOMATIC NEOPHYTE.

"So much as a necessary introduction to my consideration of the Blount report. Not wishing to be severe on a neophyte in diplomacy, with but little knowledge of the world's affairs outside of his own country, sent on a very peculiar errand amid currents and quicksands entirely unknown to him, he has been partly the victim of circumstances, having been caught in the meshes and snares adroitly prepared for him by the cunning advisers of the fallen Liliuokalani, and by the shrewd, sharp, long-experienced British diplomatic agent, whose aims and hopes Blount has served so well, and without the least suspicion that he was aiding ultra-British interests, even more than he was helping the Hawaiian monarchists and the justly dethroned Queen. It is clear enough from Blount's manner on the day of his arrival at Honolulu, as well as by his letter to the Department of State, written shortly after, that he designed, at whatever cost, to repudiate the views and action of the recently terminated Administration, and that in order to do so he must impugn the action of Minister Stevens and of the commander of the United States ship Boston.

UNDER ROYAL ESPIONAGE.

"A total stranger, it was impossible for Mr. Blount to know how unfitting it was for him to take up his quarters where he was certain to be surrounded by royalists, and where the supporters of the Provisional Government would be reluctant to go. The hotel was kept by one who had served as Kalakaua's chamberlain, who was one of the principal persons in a syndicate that had cheated the Hawaiian Government out of nearly $100,000, a transaction which Minister Merrill had officially reported to Secretary Bayard, and this man was the leading member of a firm that sought to do its chief business with England, a thoroughly unprincipled opponent of the Provisional Government and of American predominance in the islands. He employed as his active assistant in managing the hotel a highly educated Englishman, of disreputable character, who had written in the Hawaiian British newspaper, under anonymous signature, articles abusive of the United States and grossly falsifying our Government's treatment of the Indians.

"Residing at that hotel, Mr. Blount was under the constant espionage of the palace adventurers. As a precautionary safeguard against thus shutting out the Americans from ready access to Commissioner Blount a wealthy and highly respectable widow lady of the American colony was ready to grant the use of her house to Mr. and Mrs. Blount, the commissioner to pay the same amount it would cost him to live at the royalist hotel. This private house was situated near the United States legation, in the quarter of the city where annexationists and royalists could have unobstructed access to the commissioner and he could conveniently avail himself of the legation records. This polite offer of an American resident to an American commissioner did not originate with the Provisional Government, nor did the Provisional Government have anything whatever to do with the proposed arrangement.

"The effort in his report to cast imputation on the Provisional Government and myself as to the offer of the American house to an American commissioner will be estimated at its true value by the American public. Commissioner Blount's manner toward me in the following weeks I would not allude to here, were it not absolutely necessary to do so. It is well known to all who have knowledge of diplomatic rules and customs that when a new diplomatic agent arrives at the capital to whose Government he is accredited his predecessor and the occupant of the legation should receive him courteously, proffer his services to his successor, inform him of the existing state of affairs, and as soon as convenient give him access to the legation archives. This I did promptly, and had he availed himself of the kind offer of his countrymen as to residence he could have occupied the room at the legation containing the official records, which I was ready to offer him. He coldly repelled my kindly intended offers, did not allow me to show to him the customary forms of introducing him to the foreign diplomatic officials and to the chief public men of Honolulu. How much of his singular course in these regards was due to want of knowledge, and how much to his already matured purpose to make out a case against the United States minister, the naval commander, and the Provisional Government the American public must judge.

SPECIFIC STATEMENTS DENIED.

"All insinuations and implications in Blount's report that I was averse to his access to the legation records is a shameless perversion of facts." Mr. Stevens says he carried necessary documents to Mr. Blount, and adds:

"His manner while allowing me to leave these important documents in his room showed that he cared not to receive them, for the general drift of his report indicates that he did not even read them.

"Ignoring his inferiority of official rank, which, according to established rules the world over, was below that of minister resident, between a consul-general and chargé d'affaires, with the utmost effort of will controlling my outraged sensibilities, while suffering a terrible affliction at the recent sad drowning of a gifted and beloved daughter, I endured this insolent treatment after thirteen years of service as United States minister, without a stain ever before attempted to be made on my official honor or my fidelity to American prestige and to American interests, never during my seventy-three years of life having lifted my voice, my hand, or my rifle against the flag of this American Republic. The charges, implications, and insinuations of Commissioner Blount against President Dole, Minister Thurston, and the other chief men of the Provisional Government are as baseless and unjust as those against myself and Capt. Wiltse, now sleeping in his honored grave.

"Under the date of April 21, he says he disapproved of a request of the Provisional Government that the American forces be landed for drill. I here affirm that the Provisional Government never made such a request.

THE JAPANESE SUFFRAGE.

"What Blount says about the Japanese man-of-war is officially *ex parte*, absurd, and egotistic. For weeks after his arrival in Honolulu he had not even met or spoken with the Japanese minister." Mr. Stevens then reviews his relations to the Japanese minister regarding the right of suffrage for Japanese residents, and says:

"These friendly interviews, in which the long-existing friendship and mutual interests of our respective countries were fully gone over, gave pacifying results to the well-informed, though they did not at once put an end to public anxiety as to the suffrage agitation and as to what use the fallen Queen's supporters might make of it. Every step of my action was duly reported to the Department of State prior to Blount's having any knowledge on the subject. His claim to have put an end to Hawaiian anxiety about rumored Japanese encroachment is as purely assumptive as his expression to me at my house that to him the Harrison Administration was indebted for the strong Democratic support which was given it in the threatened war with Chile, and that Senator Morgan, now chairman of the Senate Committee of Foreign Affairs, could not aid much in the same direction and is not a level-headed man.

COMMITTEE OF SAFETY.

"In Mr. Blount's report, as given to the press, I find the following language: 'The two leading members of the committee, Messrs. Thurston and Smith, growing uneasy as to the safety of their persons, went to Minister Stevens to know if he would protect them in the event of their arrest by the authorities, to which he gave his assent.' It is enough to say that there is not a semblance of truth in this assertion of Blount, made by him without his ever having hinted it to me or made any inquiry of me on the subject. He thus gives the signature of his indorsement to a charge which I never even heard of until I found it in Blount's printed report.

LANDING THE FORCES.

"He says the response to the call of the committee of safety to land the men of the Boston 'does not appear in the files of the legation.' The meaning of this insinuation is obvious. Enough to say there never was any such document. I received the invitation of the committee of safety for what it was worth, as I received other information on the same subject. I should have requested Capt. Wiltse to have landed his force had not the committee of safety requested it.

"It is well to state here that this landing of American forces in Honolulu had repeatedly taken place in a period running over many years. The elements and forces of Hawaii in play in 1887, 1889, and in 1893, were and are essentially the same, the breadth and strength of the prevailing elements and forces in 1893 being more decisive than in the former periods. Those who assert to the contrary are not honest, else they do not understand what they have written about.

"Blount squarely asserts that I promised to aid the committee of safety by force. This is emphatically and categorically untrue.

"The best answer to the baseless charge that I promised to use force against the Queen is the order of Capt. Wiltse to his officers and men, 'to remain passive,' and that no force was used, though the Queen, through her ministers, strongly requested it hours before the Provisional Government was recognized by me and all the other diplomatic representatives in Honolulu."

Mr. Stevens says that he knew nothing of the import of the meeting of the committee of safety on January 16 at Henry Waterhouse's home, adjoining his own, until he read of it in Blount's report.

KEPT HIMSELF INFORMED.

"It is proper for me to say here," adds Mr. Stevens, "that for three years prior to the Queen's *coup d'etat* and fall, I had kept myself as thoroughly informed as possible as to the views, plans, and purposes of the several factions and parties that contended for control in Hawaiian political affairs. This necessarily compelled me to hold conversations with the best informed persons of the reform party, the Queen's party, and with the Wilcox and native Hawaiian party, whose organized efforts for months was to induce or compel the Queen to break with her paramour, Marshal Wilson. I was certainly as well informed of the views and plans of the royalists as I was of those of her opponents generally, carefully keeping my private opinion to myself.

LETTER FROM THE QUEEN.

"Regarding the expectations and hopes of the Queen and her representatives in the exciting days from January 14 to January 17, and the views and hopes of her opponents, the following official documents speak for themselves:

"'The assurance conveyed by a royal proclamation by myself and ministers yesterday having been received by my native subjects and ratified at a mass meeting, was received in a different spirit by the meeting representing the foreign population and interests in my Kingdom. It is now my desire to give to your excellency, as the diplomatic representative of the United States of America at my court, the solemn assurance that the present constitution will be upheld and maintained by me and ministers, and no changes will be made except by the method therein provided. I desire to express to your excellency this assurance in the spirit of that friendship which has ever existed between my Kingdom and that of the Government of the United States of America, and which I trust will long continue.

"'Liliuokalani, R.; Samuel Parker, minister of foreign affairs; William H. Cornwell, minister of finance; John F. Colburn, minister of interior; A. P. Peterson, attorney-general. Iolana Palace, Honolulu, January 17, 1893.'

"This earnestly pleading document from the fallen monarch and the terror-stricken lottery gang came to me more than twenty hours after the men of the Boston had landed. This plainly amplified that the fallen Queen and her confidants then knew, as they could not have failed to know, that we had not taken part in her overthrow which had already been accomplished.

"In a report to the Navy Department dated January 16, Capt. Wiltse, after announcing the fact that the forces had been landed, says: 'While there has been no demonstration so far, there can be no doubt that the prompt landing of the battalion has saved life and property.' Mr. Blount's shamefully unfair attempt to cast suspicion on myself in the matter of the hall for the men of the Boston on the first evening of their landing I have answered in my letter to Secretary Gresham."

A CHANGE OF BASE.

Regarding Mr. Blount's change of opinion about Neumann, Mr. Stevens says:

"Why this remarkable change of opinion? So long as he supposed Neumann wished to make a trade with the United States or with the provisional government for a cash consideration of all Liliuokalani claims, Blount regarded Neumann a knave. As soon as this astute commissioner ascertained that Neumann was in full accord with Spreckels and Blount for Liliuokalani's restoration to the throne, Blount immediately learned that Neumann is 'a right-down good fellow.'

"So much for conclusive evidence that Spreckles, Neumann, and Blount were then, as now, rowing the same boat and closely linked in the conspiracy to damage the action of Harrison's Administration and of the Senate Committee of Foreign Affairs on the question of annexation. This tilt of Blount, Spreckels, and Neumann against Marcy, Grant, Seward, Fish, Blaine, Harrison, and other leading American statesmen must amuse the American public as much as other recent transactions hostile to the American colony in Hawaii are exciting just public indignation.

MAKERS OF AFFIDAVITS.

"So far as the affidavits of John F. Colburn, A. P. Peterson, and Charles L. Hopkins, and the letter of Cornwell conflict with any writing or act of mine, I will not multiply words. The first named is a notorious corruption-

ist, with some amiable qualities, who aided in bribing the legislative members to vote out the Jones-Wilcox ministry and to pass the lottery bill. Peterson is the man who aided in the distribution of the lottery stock for the purchase of legislative vote, and held the Queen's authority to constitute a lottery cabinet, and to aid the Queen to proclaim a reactionary constitution.

"As to Samuel Parker, whose testimony is used to discredit my action, I would gladly say little. Mostly of native Hawaiian stock, he has a small fraction of Anglo-Saxon blood. His word and his note are of little value among the bankers and business men of Honolulu. For years trying to play politics and to be the Queen's minister, for which service he is without capacity, he has competed with Wilson for the control and the favors of the recent immoral occupant of the palace."

Dr. Tronse, J. A. Cummins Hopkins, and W. T. Seward are also sharply criticised, and Mr. Stevens continues thus:

"Regarding the Gov. Cleghorn, whose protest Blount speaks of relative to landing the men of the Boston, little need be said. Under the monarchy, prior to the adoption of the constitution of 1887, the Hawaiian governor had some importance. The office was abolished by that constitution. The legislature of 1890 restored the office as an honorary title, giving little power of duty. Cleghorn is a brother-in-law to the fallen Liliuokalani; is the reputed father of the so-called princess now residing in England, whose half sister is married to the English minister's son. Cleghorn is completely under the influence and follows the advice of English Minister Wodehouse. His protest came to me after the landing of the Boston's marines. Prior to Cornwell's two expulsions, Neumann had been voted out August 20, 1892, by a vote of 31 to 10. Reappointed by the Queen, September 12, he was voted out October 17, by 31 to 15. He was a close confederate with Peterson and Cornwell. He was known to be of the contract-labor ring which was bleeding the planters. With good reasons he was believed to be the author of the Queen's revolutionary and despotic new constitution. He is the man whom the Queen sent to Washington to get her restored to the throne or to sell her claim to the crown in cash. What a remarkable trio, Spreckels, Neumann, and Blount, two honest German Jews, and the astute, impartial, unprejudiced new-born diplomatist who had represented that he was the Democratic leader who had led his party to support Harrison in the threatened Chilean war, while he severely denounced Admiral Brown and Minister Egan. Spreckels, Neumann, and Blount, who will decipher the enigma, explain the philosophy, and state the substantial considerations which bind this trio together?

"The testimony of hundreds of such would not counterbalance the words of Minister Thurston, President Dole, and Henry Waterhouse among honest men who knew the respective parties. As to Wilson, the Queen's immoral favorite for many years, whom Blount attempts to whitewash, I will not soil these pages by giving even the notorious facts in his regard. As to my recognition of the Provisional Government, I reaffirm what I said in my recent letter to Secretary Gresham.

"Queen Liliuokalani inaugurated the revolution by attempting to destroy the constitution by revolutionary means. From Saturday afternoon, January 14, to January 16, there was no government in Honolulu except in the united and self-possessed attitude of the citizens, who assembled in a great mass-meeting on January 16 and consummated their efforts for law and order by the establishment of the Provisional Government on the 17th, which was promptly acknowledged by all the foreign representatives who were familiar with the circumstances of its creation. It was nearly fifty hours after Liliuokalani and her favorites had destroyed her throne by a revolutionary outbreak when the men of the Boston landed. In the exciting hours preceding and following her fall her representatives, as well as those who formed the Provisional Government, had equal access to the legation. To all proper inquiries my answer was that the United States marines could not take sides, but whatever *de facto* government might exist would have to be recognized. When I did recognize it, late in the afternoon of the 17th, the Provisional Government was complete master of the situation, had full control of the city and of the Government archives, the police station being surrounded and at the mercy of the Provisional Government.

"Against all just expectations I have been forced to expose the anomalous, the un-American, and most unfair course of Blount and associates against my official conduct, my honor, and all that a public man holds dear. This extraordinary assault on the American colony in Hawaii, antagonizing the American Christian civilization there established at the cost of the lives and labors of noble American men and women; this strange turning back on an American policy of more than half a century; this wanton disregard of the opportunity to assume jurisdiction and ownership of a territorial and maritime prize with a clean title and without the cost of a single life is justly causing profound indignation among the American people. These strange and unpatriotic proceedings in the presence of our national rivals is making a most shameful page of American history, which our future, if not our present, statesmen and generation will repudiate and blot out by wise and effective measures."

I submit a statement made by Mr. Thurston concerning Mr. Blount's report:

MR. BLOUNT ANSWERED—MINISTER THURSTON DISSECTS THE COMMISSIONER'S REPORT—MANY VERY GROSS INACURACIES—IT IS SHOWN THAT THE UNITED STATES FORCES DID NOT LAND UNTIL NEARLY FORTY-EIGHT HOURS AFTER THE REVOLUTION HAD COMMENCED, AND THEIR INSTRUCTIONS WERE TO REMAIN PASSIVE—NO SECRECY ABOUT THE MOVEMENT TO OVERTHROW THE QUEEN.

Mr. Thurston, the Hawaiian minister, is no longer silent. He gave to the press last night a statement which dissects Commissioner Blount's report and shows upon how flimsy a foundation that famous document rests. Mr. Thurston hesitated some time before preparing his statement, but finally concluded that the statements of Mr. Blount ought not to remain unanswered. In his statement Mr. Thurston says:

MINISTER THURSTON'S STATEMENT.

As I have received no official information that Mr. Blount has made a report; have not seen a copy of it and do not know what it contains, except from reading newspaper abstracts therefrom, and am unaware of the present contentions of the United States Government concerning Hawaii, I am unable at present, in the absence of such knowledge, to intelligently state what the position and claims of the Hawaiian Government are. It would, moreover, be contrary to diplomatic courtesy for me to publish a statement on such subject prior to informing the United States Government of the same.

A large portion of the published extracts from Mr. Blount's report consist, however, of personal attacks upon me and those associated with me in the Provisional Government, impugning our veracity, good faith, and courage, and charging us with fraud and duplicity. I deem it proper, therefore, to make a personal reply to such charges, confining myself to statements of fact, which, as a principal actor, I am prepared to testify to before any impartial tribunal.

First. Before stating such facts, I desire to call attention to Mr. Blount's method of constructing his report. Although he in several places states that I was the leader of the revolutionary movement, he has never asked me a question concerning the same, nor given me opportunity to make any statement, although I have at all times been ready and willing to do so. The same is true of a large number of other men who took a leading part in the movement of January last.

In the second place, his evidence consists exclusively of prepared affidavits or answers to leading questions put by himself, at private interviews, no one else being present but the stenographer. In no instance has there been any cross-examination of witnesses, opportunity given to contradict or explain evidence given, or present other evidence.

NUMEROUS INCORRECT STATEMENTS.

A brief examination of the published portions of the report shows numerous incorrect statements. I shall endeavor for the present, however, to answer the more salient points only.

First. Mr. Blount charges that the American troops were landed under a prearranged agreement with the committee of safety that they should so land and assist in the overthrow of the Queen. In reply thereto, I hereby state that at no time did Mr. Stevens or Capt. Wiltse assure me or the committee of safety, or any subcommittee thereof, that the United States troops would assist in overthrowing the Queen or establishing the provisional government, and as a matter of fact they did not so assist.

I can produce witnesses in support of this statement, of the highest responsibility, in overwhelming numbers; but Mr. Blount has rendered it unnecessary to do so. The statements of Mr. Wurdenberg and Mr. Damon have been put forward as the strongest evidence in support of Mr. Blount's contention. In Mr. Wurdenberg's statement he says that when the committee of safety told Mr. Stevens they were not ready to act, he replied: "Gentlemen, the troops of the Boston will land ot 5 o'clock, whether you are ready or not." The reason for this reply and the subsequent landing of the troops is manifest. The troops were landed to protect American citizens and property in the event of the impending and inevitable conflict between the Queen and the citizens, and not to coöperate with the committee in carrying out its plans. In fact, the troops did not coöperate with the committee, and the committee had no more knowledge than the Queen's Government where the troops were going, nor what they were going to do. The whole gist of Mr. Damon's long examination is likewise contained in his statement that when, after the organization and proclamation of the new Government, a request was made for the support of the United States troops, it was refused, Lieut. Commander Swinburne, the commanding officer, sending back word, "Capt. Wiltse's orders are, 'Remain passive.'"

THE TROOPS DID NOT ASSIST.

Second. Mr. Blount charges that the Queen had ample military force with which to have met the committee, and that but for the support of the United States representatives and troops the establishment of the provisional government would have been impossible.

In reply thereto I hereby state that although the presence of the American troops had a quieting effect on the rough characters in the city, and may have prevented some bloodshed, they were not essential to and did not assist in the overthrow of the Queen. The result of the movement would have been eventually the same if there had not been a marine within a thousand miles of Honolulu.

In support of this statement I cite the following facts;

1. The troops did not land till Monday night, the 16th of January, after the revolution had been in full progress since the afternoon of Saturday, the 14th, during which time the committee of safety was openly organizing for the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Queen.

2. There was absolutely no attempt at concealment from the Government of the objects and intentions of the committee.

3. The Queen, her cabinet, and their supporters were utterly demoralized, suspicious of one another, and devoid of leadership.

4. The committee of safety and their supporters were united; had ample force to execute their purpose; knew precisely what they wanted, and proceeded with intelligent deliberation, thoroughness and confidence to do it.

There is no conflict concerning the facts of the first proposition. It is admitted by all that the Queen began the revolution at noon on Saturday, the 14th, by attempting to promulgate a constitution; that such attempt was immediately followed by preparation on the part of the citizens for armed resistance, and that the United States troops landed at 5 o'clock Monday, the 16th.

THE REVOLUTION NOT SECRET.

In support of the second proposition, that there was no concealment from the Government of the intentions of the committee, I submit the following:

1. On the afternoon of Saturday, the 14th, in reply to the request of the Queen's cabinet for advice as to what they had better do, the Queen then still insisting upon the promulgation of the constitution and supporting it by force, I advised them to declare the Queen in revolution and the throne vacant, and at their request and with the express approval of two of them and the tacit assent of the other two, then and there drew up a form of proclamation to that effect.

2. At half past 4 on the afternoon of Saturday, the 14th, at a meeting of about two hundred citizens at the office of W. O. Smith, the Queen was denounced in the strongest terms; armed resistance and a counter revolution was openly advocated, and the Queen's minister of the interior, John Colburn, addressed the meeting, asking their armed support against the Queen. The Queen's attorney-general, Mr. Peterson, and her attorney, Paul Neuman, were both present, taking part in the meeting. The committee of safety was publicly then and there named and proceeded forthwith to organize.

At 6 o'clock on Sunday morning, the 15th, I told Mr. Peterson and Mr. Colburn, two members of the Queen's cabinet, that the committee intended to depose the Queen and establish a provisional government; that if they would take charge of the movement, well and good, otherwise the committee intended to take action on its own account. They asked for twenty-four hours in which to consider the matter. I declined to wait, stating to them that the committee intended to proceed forthwith.

4. The committee met openly that morning at 10 o'clock, with the full knowlege of the Government of the place of its meeting. It remained in session during the greater part of the day, while several police kept watch of the building from the street.

THE PUBLIC MEETING.

On Monday morning at 9 o'clock the committee, without attempt at concealment, met in my office, within 200 feet of the police station, Marshal Wilson's headquarters, where the entire police force was stationed. While the meeting was in progress Wilson came to the office and asked to speak to me privately, and we went into an adjoining room. Our conversation was in substance as follows:

Wilson said, "I want this meeting stopped," referring to the mass-meeting for that afternoon.

I replied, "It can not be stopped. It is too late."

He said, "Can not this thing be fixed up in some way?"

I replied, "No it can not. It has gone too far."

He said, "The Queen has abandoned her new constitution idea."

I replied, "How do we know that she will not take it up again as she said she would?"

He said, "I will guarantee that she will not, even if I have to lock her up in a room to keep her from doing it, and I'll do it, too, if necessary."

I replied, "We are not willing to accept that guarantee as sufficient. This thing has gone on from bad to worse until we are not going to stand it any longer. We are going to take no chances in the matter, but settle it now, once and for all."

Wilson then left the office. He has since stated that he immediately reported to the cabinet and advised arresting the committee, but the cabinet were afraid and refused to allow it.

At 2 o'clock on the afternoon of Monday, the 16th, a meeting of 3,000 unarmed men was held within a block of the palace. The meeting was addressed by a number of speakers, all denouncing the Queen. The meeting with tremendous cheering and enthusiasm, unanimously adopted resolutions declaring the Queen to be in revolution and authorizing the committee to proceed to do whatever was necessary. The police was present, but no attempt was made to interfere with the meeting or make any arrests. The meeting adjourned amid the most intense excitement, and the citizens dispersed throughout the town, awaiting the further call of the committee.

While the meeting was in progress another meeting was being held by the royalists in the street, within a block of the armory, which adopted resolutions in support of the Queen.

MR. BLOUNT GROSSLY INACCURATE.

Never in the history of Hawaii has there been such a tense condition of mind, or a more imminent expectation of bloodshed and conflict than there was immediately after the adjournment of those two radically opposed meetings. Mr. Blount's statement that the community was at peace and quiet was grossly inaccurate.

It was at this juncture, two hours after the adjournment of the above meeting, that Capt. Wiltse and Mr. Stevens, acting upon their own responsibilities and discretion and irrespective of the request or actions of the committee, landed the troops, which were distributed in three parts of the city, instead of being massed at one point as stated by Mr. Blount. The reason that the Queen's Government took no action against the committee or its supporters was that they were overwhelmed by the unanimous display of indignation and determination shown by the citizens, and were cowed into submission in the same manner that the King and his supporters were cowed under precisely similar circumstances by the same citizens in June, 1887.

THE QUEEN'S SUPPORTERS DEMORALIZED.

In support of the third proposition, that the Queen and her supporters were demoralized and devoid of leadership, I submit the following:

1. During the few weeks prior to the revolution, Mr. Colburn, minister of the interior at the time of the revolution, had been one of the leaders of the political party opposed to myself, and openly and bitterly hostile to me personally. My first intimation of the revolutionary intention of the Queen was at 10 o'clock on the morning of Saturday, the 14th, when Mr. Colburn came to me greatly excited. He told me of the Queen's intentions to promulgate a new constitution, and asked my advice. I said to him, "Why do you not go to the members of your own party?" He replied, "I have no party. Those who have been our supporters are supporting the Queen. The downtown people (referring to the merchants) have got no use for me, and unless the members of your party and other citizens will support us we are going to resign right away."

2. At 1 o'clock on the same day I met all the members of the cabinet at the attorney-general's office. They had just come from an interview with the Queen, at which she had announced her intention of promulgating a constitution, and demanded their support. They stated that she had threatened them with mob violence, whereupon they had immediately left the palace, each one going out by a separate entrance. While we were talking a messenger came from the Queen requesting them to immediately return to the palace. Peterson and Colburn positively refused to do so, stating that they did not consider their lives would be safe there. I shortly after left them and started down town. After I had gone about two blocks I was overtaken by a messenger from the cabinet asking me to return, which I did. They asked me to ascertain what support they could expect from citizens, and formally authorized me to formally state the condition of affairs to leading citizens, and in their behalf to call for armed volunteers to resist the Queen. I immediately proceeded to comply with their request, and with the assistance of others within an hour or two thereafter about eighty leading citizens had signed a written statement agreeing to support the cabinet against the Queen by force.

STORMY INTERVIEW WITH THE QUEEN.

3. Later the same afternoon Mr. Colburn informed me that he had finally gone to the palace and held a stormy interview with the Queen, lasting for over two hours. He told me that he had no confidence in his colleague, Mr. Peterson whom he believed was playing double with him, and told me to beware of telling Peterson anything further. As a reason for his distrust he said that he knew nothing of the intention to promulgate a constitution, but that while they were discussing the matter with the Queen she said, in reply to an objection made by Peterson, "Why did you not make this objection before; you have had this constitution in your possession for a month and raised no objection to it."

Colburn said also that in reply to an objection made by Mr. Parker, minister of foreign affairs, she said, "Why did you not tell me this last night when we were talking over the subject?"

Colburn further stated to me that at a caucus of their party on the previous Friday night, one of the members of the Legislature, Kaluna by name, had said that if he colud establish the new constitution he would die happy, if he could kill some other men before dying.

4. The Queen was furiously angry at the refusal of the cabinet to join her in promulgating the constitution, and publicly denounced them therefor.

ROYALISTS WANTED TO SHED BLOOD.

5. When the Queen made announcement of her failure to promulgate the constitution, two of the leading Royalists, members of the Legislature, one in the throne room of the palace, and one upon the steps of the building, addressed the assembled crowd, denounced the cabinet as traitors, and said that they wanted to shed blood. One of them included the Queen in his denunciations.

6. During the entire time between noon of Saturday, the 14th, and the afternoon of Tuesday, the 17th, when the provisional government was proclaimed, the Queen's cabinet was without plan of action, and did practically nothing, but rush about the city consulting with various foreign representatives, and citizens of all parties, as to what they had better do, begging the American minister for the support of the American troops against the committee of safety, and securing from the Queen a declaration that she would not again attempt to abrogate the constitution, which they hurried into print and distributed broadcast to try and appease the indignation of citizens and break up the proposed mass-meeting.

THE COMMITTEE OF SAFETY WERE UNITED.

In support of the fourth proposition, that the committee and their supporters were united, had ample force to execute their purpose, and proceed with deliberation and confidence to do so, I submit the following: An essential factor in judging whether the force of the committee was sufficient, and their confidence in themselves well founded, is to know what the same men under similar conditions have done upon previous occasions. Fortunately there is no dispute as to the facts concerning two recent incidents in Hawaiian history, in which the same parties who were brought into conflict in January, 1893, were arrayed against each other under similar circumstances.

1. In 1887 the King, by a manipulation of the electorate and the legislature, had encroached upon popular rights and obtained autocratic power over the people. In this course he was supported by practically the same persons who in January last, and now, constitute the Royalist party in Hawaii. The open bribery, corruption, and debauchery of the King and his supporters crystallized the opposition thereto into an organization of practically the same men who organized and now constitute the provisional government. Such organization was formed with the openly avowed intention of wresting from the King his powers or dethroning him. In preparation of the expected movement, the King fortified the palace; loopholed its basement for sharpshooters; erected sand-bag breastworks at the entrance of the building; mounted cannon and Gatling guns at all the approaches thereto; largely increased his regular military force, and defied the organization and public opinion.

The leaders of the revolutionary movement proceeded deliberately to collect such arms as were available and organized their plans. An executive committee of thirteen was appointed, who took entire control of the movement and called a mass meeting in the same building used for that purpose in January last.

The King attempted to head off the meeting by sending a letter to it promising certain reforms. The letter had no effect. Resolutions were adopted denouncing the King and demanding the granting of a new constitution depriving the King of all personal power. The resolutions were forthwith presented to the King by the committee, who unarmed and alone proceeded direct from the meeting to the fortified palace, with the ultimatum that he comply with the demands within twenty-four hours or take the consequences.

HOW THE KING SURRENDERED.

The King was then in absolute control of the regular troops, the special troops enlisted for the occasion, four companies of native militia, the police, all the artillery and Gatling guns, the government buildings, the palace, the barracks, and the station house, with full knowledge of and weeks of preparation for the action taken by the citizens. His military strength was greater and his control of the public buildings more complete than was that of the Queen in January last.

He did not fire a shot, submitted to all demands, disbanded his troops, and turned the whole control of the government over to the revolutionary party, who, in consideration of his abject submission, allowed him to continue on the throne in a figurehead capacity.

2. In 1889, while the same men who now constitute the provisional government were in control of the King's government, a conspiracy was organized among the royalist supporters by the King and Liliuokalani, for the overthrow of the cabinet and the restoration of the old royal power and constitution.

The conspirators took the cabinet by surprise, and on the night of July 29 took possession of the Government buildings and palace, and, securing possession of all the artillery, fortified the latter.

VICTORY OVER ROYAL POWER.

The regular troops, by order of the King, refused to assist the cabinet, who called upon the white militia and white citizens for assistance. The call was promptly responded to. The revolutionists were protected by an 8-foot stone wall around the palace, and used artillery as well as rifles, while the cabinet supporters were armed with rifles alone. The fighting opened at 9 o'clock in the morning with less than thirty cabinet supporters in position in front of the palace, which number was later increased to about five hundred. The royalist revolutionists opened with a furious fire of both artillery and small arms. Within half an hour they were driven from their guns, seven were killed, and twelve wounded, and before dark all of them were dispersed or captured, while not one of the cabinet supporters was injured.

Such is the undisputed record of events upon two occasions when the royalists and the organizers of the Provisional Government have come into armed conflict, when there has been no suggestion of support to either side by any outside power.

PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT NOT COWARDLY.

Under these circumstances I submit that the burden of proof is upon those who claim that the leaders of the Provisional Government are cowards, or that they are incompetent to organize or successfully carry out a revolution against the royalists in Hawaii.

It is unnecessary for me to here restate the details of the bitter constitutional conflict which had been carried on between the Queen and the Legislature during the seven months prior to January last, nor to speak of the intense indignation existing among all classes of citizens by reason of the open and successful alliance of the Queen with the opium and lottery rings. The political liberties of the people had been trampled upon and their moral sense shocked. It simply needed the added provocation of the arbitrary attempt to abrogate the constitution and disfranchise every white man in the country to spontaneously crystallize opposition into a force that was irresistible.

THEY WERE NOT ALIENS.

In reply to the sneer that the persons taking part in the movement were "aliens," I would say that every man of them was by the laws of the country a legal voter, whose right to the franchise was by the proposed constitution to be abrogated. A large proportion of them were born in the country, and almost without exception those who were not born there had lived there for years, owned property there, and had made it their home. They were the men who had built up the country commercially, agriculturally, financially, and politically, and created and made possible a civilized government therein. They were and are such men as to-day are the leading citizens of the most progressive communities of the United States, with interests as thoroughly identified with the interests of Hawaii as are the interests of native and foreign-born citizens in similar communities in this country identified with it.

Upon these statements, coming from reliable sources, I submit that the statement of the President as to the manner in which the monarchy was overthrown and the Provisional Government was established is shown to be incorrect.

I also submit as part of my remarks a quotation from an interview which I suppose to be correct, at least I have never seen

it denied, of one among the ablest and best-informed men in this country upon international law, Hon. John A. Kasson. His personal relations to Secretary Gresham are friendly, and there appears to be no reason why he should not take an unprejudiced and impartial view of Hawaiian affairs. In the Washington Post of November 14 appears a report of the interview, which is as follows:

I can not accept the hypothesis of the press as correct that the President has ordered armed intervention to restore the deposed monarchy to the Hawaiian throne. I can not believe it to be true. Such an act would be worse than a declaration of war. It would be an act of piracy.

In the first place, Secretary Gresham's letter to the President contains charges of hypocrisy, deceit, and wrongdoing against not merely the preceding Administration, but against the American Government as represented by that Administration. In international matters it is an unwritten law, and is in line with the usage of nations, that there are no parties. No foreign government ever condemns in such manner the international acts and policy of its preceding administration, for in so doing it is attacking its own government. The Secretary's letter at least should have been kept from publication.

But to refer to the hypothesis that the President has ordered armed intervention; there are several plain reasons why I am compelled to regard it as untenable. First, it would be doing exactly what Secretary Gresham's letter accuses the previous Administration of doing, namely, interfering by force to overthrow a friendly government. It is den ed by President Harrison, Minister Stevens, and others in position to know that the Queen was deposed by American intervention; but admitting for the contention that force was used to overawe her supporters by the presence of the American marines, it is clear beyond question that the President would be doing the very thing his Secretary condemns so strongly in the preceding Administration.

Secondly, the hypothesis supposes that the President without the authority of Congress would declare war against a friendly power and in a manner which would violate every principle of international usage. It is a declaration of international law, only violated by savages or in dealing with barbarians, that a declaration of war must precede the overt act of hostility, that it must be made to the representative of the power to be attacked at the capital of the attacking nation, and that he be given time to settle his affairs and turn over the interests of his legation and the citizens of his country to the representative of some friendly government, as was done by the German minister at Paris on the declaration of war, when German interests were confided to the American minister. No such declaration has been made. The accredited and accepted representative of the Hawaiian Government has received no notice of this rumored act of hostility in time to inform his government. In fact, the whole theory presupposes a most violent and unprecedented act of aggression.

It should be borne in mind that whatever may have been the means adopted to remove the Queen from the throne, the international status of the provisional government is established beyond question. It has received the recognition not only of the foreign governments, but its representatives have been received by us and ours by it. It has all the rights of the most powerful government on the face of the earth. If there should be an attempt to land the armed forces of the United States at Honolulu it would not only be the right but the duty of the provisional government to draw up its forces at the landing place and attempt to arrest, seize, and hold them. It would be the unquestioned right of the provisional government to seize the person of the Queen as an ally of the United States, hold her as a hostage against aggression, and, if they deemed it necessary, to put her to death.

I am not prepared to believe that the President would either declare war without the consent of Congress in violation of the Constitution, or commit such an act of piracy as attacking and endeavoring to overturn a friendly power without due and formal notice to its representatives.

I also submit as part of my remarks an article published in the New York Independent. The New York Independent is a fair representative of the Christian press of this country:

A VERY PECULIAR EXHIBITION.

Let us see what the condition of things is. A queen was reigning who had attempted by absolute fiat to disfranchise the white citizens of the islands; the government was totally corrupt, hand in glove with the lottery. The white people of the islands, with the more intelligent part of the natives, including all the leading native ministers but one, were totally dissatisfied, and felt that her reign was a constant menace to their safety and prosperity. Her deposition was a righteous act, just as righteous as that which deposed Charles I; and there was far more occasion for it than for the rebellion of our ancestors against George III. By an uprising of the people who had been threatened and injured, and who felt that their property and lives were in danger, she was removed from the throne, and it was right that the representatives of the American Government should be ready to recognize the change.

A republican form of government was declared, and men were sent to this country to offer the islands to be annexed to the United States. There can be no sort of question on anybody's part that annexation would be better for the United States and better for the islands. They properly belong to us and have got to be, anyhow, under our protection. The only question is, if they are not annexed, whether they shall be protected as a republic or protected as a monarchy. Our Administration declares for the monarchy, and proposes to put back upon the throne a discredited queen, although her restoration can be effected only by a succession of bloody disturbances which will endanger the life and property of American citizens as well as of the people of Hawaii. It is a very peculiar exhibition, that of the United States restoring a monarchy against the will of the people.

In Hawaii the native race has less enterprise than the negroes, and the people care very little who rules them. Their interests are slight in either case. There is in Hawaii no system of suppressing the native vote, and yet we presume that on a fair vote at the present time the Provisional Government would be supported; at any rate, it is the only Government in existence, and President Cleveland takes a very serious responsibility if he undertakes to overthrow it. To give by force the American interests and citizens of American birth in Hawaii to Claus Spreckels and the lottery and opium gangs would be infamous.

One word as to Secretary Gresham's sneer at the revolutionists as aliens. He says that "a majority of the thirteen members of the provisional committee, including five Americans, were aliens," and that "a citizen of the United States" read the proclamation deposing the Queen. Every one of these men was a voting citizen of Hawaii. We quote from the Hawiian constitution:

"Every male resident of the Hawaiian Islands of Hawaiian, American, or European birth or descent, who shall have attained the age of 20 years, shall be entitled to vote at any election, provided that he shall have resided in the country not less than one year preceding such election; that he shall be able to read and comprehend an ordinary newspaper printed in either the Hawaiian or some European language, and that he shall have taken the oath to support the constitution of 1887."

The foreign element thus enfranchised conducts all the business and industrial enterprises, pays four-fifths of the taxes, and is most deeply concerned in good government.

If a Senatorial commission is sent to Hawaii, it will learn much more than Mr. Blount has told Secretary Gresham.

In this connection I submit what purports to be an interview with Bishop Newman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, an eminent divine, who visited the Sandwich Islands and undoubtedly speaks advisedly, as he always does upon any subject which he investigates:

BISHOP NEWMAN'S PLAIN WORDS CRITICISING THE COURSE OF THE ADMINISTRATION IN THE HAWAIIAN AFFAIR.

A special dispatch from Omaha to the New York Tribune quotes Bishop John P. Newman as follows in an interview upon the Hawaiian question:

"There is one point I wish to state first and emphasize. The revolutionists were natives, were subjects of the Government they overthrew. I am familiar with the islands and their people, and I have other information on this subject. They were not foreigners, and had as much right to revolutionize the Government as had our forefathers. The men who formed the Provisional Government were for the most part the native-born sons of missionaries and merchants who went to the islands long ago. The United States had nothing to do with deposing Queen Liliuokalani. The marines landed from the Boston, according to Minister Stevens and all the evidence, did not take any part in the revolution; they simply protected American property. The point is, what right has this Government to interfere now, and say that the Government which the people of the country overthrew shall be restored? When I was there during the old King's time the people were already talking of revolution—and it was their, not our, revolution."

"What will be the effect of the position taken by this Government?"

"President Cleveland is my President, that is, he is the President of my country, and I would not like to say anything harsh or unguarded, but for the honor of the country I hope that one Administration will not, out of pique, go back on another Administration. I think that the publication of Secretary Gresham's letter was premature, and I will also say that I think there is some personal feeling on his part in the matter toward the last Administration. The giving out of his letter and the position taken in it is certainly a remarkable proceeding. The letter should have been transmitted through the President to the next Congress. An important point is that the Government has recognized the Provisional Government, and Minister Willis has been accredited to it. How then can the President, acting alone, without Congress, withdraw our representative to the Provisional Government and send one to the Queen? The Government would have to reverse itself to do so, and the question comes up as to the right of the President to act without the consent of the Senate.

"But the present Administration's recognizing the Queen and restoring her to the throne are two very different things. The adherents of the Queen will not be able to restore her to the throne without aid, and whether President Cleveland will send warships and enough soldiers to restore the old government, which would be a most remarkable proceeding on the part of this Republic, I can not say. From my knowledge of the people there, whom I well know, the Provisional Government can not be permanently overthrown."

Bishop Newman believes that Hawaii should belong to the United States, and that the islands will in a short time be peopled and controlled entirely by the Saxon race. The native race is dying off, and the country must, in the course of time, be under the protection of and belong either to the United States or some European government. He is therefore heartily in favor of annexation, and believes that the sooner it is accomplished the better it will be for both countries.

I also submit in the same connection a cablegram from London:

ASTONISHED AT OUR HAWAIIAN POLICY.

LONDON, *November 13.*

The Daily News says editorially of Secretary Gresham's report on Hawaii: "It is astonishing what self-control the American Government shows in refusing to annex Hawaii, which could be had for the asking and would supply a want of America's growing commerce. Mr. Harrison did his best to pledge his successor to annexation, but vainly. It is an example to all of us, and especially to the warriors in Matabelaland, who announce light-heartedly that they have gone there to slay."

I submit another extract, "Spreckels feels very good." I think that should go in connection with the other quotations, as Mr. Spreckels appears to be unusually pleased with the policy of the Administration:

SPRECKELS FEELS VERY GOOD—CONFIDENT THE QUEEN WILL BE RETURNED TO POWER WITHOUT BLOODSHED.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November 12.*

In an interview to-day Claus Spreckels, in regard to Secretary Gresham's letter to the President, expressed his satisfaction over the news.

"Do you anticipate any serious trouble when an attempt to return the Queen to power is made?" he was asked.

"No. There have been threats made that the Queen would never live to rule Hawaii again, but I have regarded them as foolish utterances. If ever the Queen should be harmed there would be terrible times in Hawaii. The natives are a peaceable lot of people as a rule and love the Queen. I think that the restoration of the Queen to power will be accomplished without any opposition demonstration."

I also submit in this connection an article published in the Manufacturer, entitled "The Hawaiian business:"

THE HAWAIIAN BUSINESS.

The ground of Mr. Cleveland's extraordinary action with respect to Hawaii is the assertion made by Secretary Gresham, upon Commissioner Blount's authority, that the Government of the Queen was overthrown by the act of the American minister, backed by United States troops. This theory having been adopted, Mr. Cleveland has assumed it to be his duty to restore the Government thus wrongfully deposed by an act of unwarrantable interference upon our part. Ex-Minister Stevens, however, has publicly declared that the Gresham-Blount theory is without foundation in fact. He has asserted that the Queen was dethroned by the revolutionists without help from him, and that the new Government had been set up and put into successful operation before the American troops were landed. Here is a question of veracity between Blount, who obtained his alleged informa-

tion at second hand, and Stevens, who was upon the spot when the revolution was effected. It should be fully understood, in estimating the value of the evidence offered, that Mr. Stevens is a man of the highest character, against whom no word of reproach has been uttered, and whose declarations upon any subject would be received without question by anyone who knows him.

It is plainly apparent that the American people believe him as he was believed by President Harrison and Secretary Foster. The judgment of the nation upon the case is that the revolutionists did a most praiseworthy act in dethroning a worthless woman and in organizing a republic upon a basis of the intelligence and wealth of the islands. Public opinion here commends the wisdom with which the men in charge of the new Government have conducted its affairs under trying circumstances, and the success achieved by them in maintaining the public credit. The American people strongly incline to believe that Cleveland and Gresham were animated, from the very first, by a purpose to discredit President Harrison and his Administration, and that they have been busy during all these months of delay trying to manufacture evidence which would appear to justify their predetermined purpose to undo the good work that had been done.

Mr. Cleveland's method of procedure in this matter indicates that he feared the indignation of the American people. He has suppressed Blount's report; he did not venture to address Congress upon the subject of his purpose to restore the monarchy; he held back Gresham's letter until after the elections, knowing well what answer the country would give to that mendacious utterance; and he forbade the recently naturalized Englishman whom he has sent to Hawaii to disclose his mission until the sailing of the first steamer after his arrival. If the business were honest and defensible there would be no need to resort to these sneaking and shady practices. Mr. Cleveland knows that it is neither honest nor defensible. Even the Philadelphia Ledger, which has jeoparded its own popularity by eulogizing actions which the public attributed either to a want of patriotism or a want of sense, can not commend this grave misconduct.

The President is well aware that he has no more authority to overturn the Government of Hawaii and to put a dusky wanton on the throne than he has to declare war against England. He ought to be impeached and expelled in disgrace from the White House if he shall make such an attempt. He has been encouraged by the approval given by foolish journals to his unlawful efforts to bully and control Congress to imagine that he can do as he pleases; but he has gone too far. The American people have endured much insolence from him, but the spectacle of one of their Presidents defying the laws of his own country for the purpose of destroying the Government of another country will not be patiently observed.

There is a certain grim humor in the suggestion made by the Administration that the revolution in Hawaii deserves no respect, because the Provisional Government did not submit the matter to a vote of the natives. This was particularly complained of by Mr. Commissioner Blount, who found his way into Congress by suppression of the colored vote in his district in Georgia. It filled with grief and indignation the mind of Mr. Cleveland, who holds his office because the colored people of the solid South were forcibly disfranchised. This yearning desire for the free expression of opinion from the heathen of Hawaii by men who have connived at and profited by the refusal to permit great bodies of American citizens to give expression to their opinions is almost too ridiculous for serious consideration.

No Southern man can devise an argument for justification of the treatment accorded to the black people, which will not have far more force for the justification of the action of the native and other white men who have rescued the Government of Hawaii from the opera bouffe queen who controlled it. The hope of patriotic Americans is that the members of the Provisional Government, if overthrown by Mr. Cleveland's orders, will again seize the power when the American troops shall be withdrawn. It is also hoped they will fully understand that the sentiment of this nation was represented by President Harrison, not by the incubus now occupying the White House, and that if Hawaii will simply wait the people here will see to it that the next administration will be of a kind that will treat Mr. Cleveland's policy with the contempt it deserves.

I also submit articles, published in the New York Press of November 11, the Evening Star of the same date, and the Washington Post of the same date, and with these I will conclude.

[New York Press, November 11.]

COWARDICE AND TREASON.

It is with a deep sense of shame that the Press presents this morning the proposition of an American Secretary of State, holding the office once honored by Seward, Fish, and Blaine, to restore the monarchical government in Hawaii. For the first time in American history it is proposed to use the power of the United States to reëstablish a throne, and to impose upon a free people the degradation of monarchical rule, from which, by an uprising wisely planned and bloodlessly accomplished, they had been self-liberated. The pretense for this crowning infamy of the Cleveland Administration is that the United States gave sympathy and influence, through the American minister in Hawaii and the naval forces stationed there, to the cause of the revolution.

We are proud to be able to say that up to the time that Grover Cleveland, with Walter Q. Gresham as his chief adviser, took control of the National Administration, the sympathy and influence of the American Republic has always been given to the cause of free government in other nationalities. Americans aided the colonists of South America in their struggle for liberation from the Spanish yoke, but no American Secretary of State therefore proposed that American power should be used to restore the dominion of Spain over revolted Venezuela and Peru. Americans aided Texas in the heroic and successful effort of that people to cast off the dominion of Mexico. Indeed, the case of Texas is, in some respects, similar to that of Hawaii, for it was aliens, chiefly of American birth, as Gresham would have called them, who fell at the Alamo and who won the memorable battle of San Jacinto. But for "American aliens" the Texas war for independence would not have resulted in a glorious triumph, and the great State of the Southwest would never have added its Lone Star to the American galaxy.

Yet who, even among the most earnest opponents of Texas annexation, ever dreamed of suggesting that Texas should be given back to her tyrants because she owed her liberation from those tyrants to aliens of American birth? Had such an infamous suggestion been made to Andrew Jackson, how he would have crushed the craven proposal with patriotic fury!

But for Americans and American influence Mexico itself would have remained under the heel of the tyrant Maximilian, who was driven, chiefly through the patriotic policy of a Secretary of State far different from Gresham from the throne which he had usurped, and who met at the hands of Mexicans the fate which he richly merited. But why pile Pelion upon Ossa in reciting the well-known proofs that Americans and American influence, direct and indirect, have from the foundation of our Government aided in the overthrow of thrones and the establishment of republics? But for the dread of American power half the American continent would be under the rule of kings to-day, upheld on their thrones by the influence of monarchical Europe.

The Administration's outrageous course will be overwhelmingly condemned by the American people. Grover Cleveland and his policy, already emphatically repudiated by the voting millions last Tuesday, will be doubly repudiated when this infamy becomes known. The nation whose loyal sons bled on battlefields from Gettysburg to the Rio Grande that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from the earth will never sanction the restoration of a justly deposed and degraded monarchy over the sons of Americans in Hawaii.

Secretary Gresham's report making this disgraceful proposal is dated October 18, and was obviously withheld by the Administration until after the election. If it had not been, the Republican majority at the polls would have been vastly greater than it was—nearer 75,000 than 35,000 in Massachusetts, nearer 200,000 than 100,000 in Ohio, and nearer 300,000 than 135,000 in Pennsylvania.

[The Evening Star, November 11, 1893.]

After months of opportunity for considerations the Administration that now controls the official acts of the United States has decided to suppress the Government which the best residential elements in Hawaii had set up on the ruins of one of the rottenest thrones ever sat on by debauched and debauching monarchy and to give such moral support as this country has intrusted to its care to the woman who claims by descent and by "divine right" authority to sell the interests of her "subjects" to the highest-bidding lottery sharks and the opium smugglers who will divide most liberally with her majesty the proceeds of their illegal acts. The uprising of the better elements of Hawaiian population, sympathized with by a vast majority of the American people, is therefore to be nullified by influences that while officially American are more nearly British in the manner of their working. With American residents owning more than one-half of Hawaiian property and conducting the greater proportion of Hawaii's trade and with practical acquiescence by most of the natives in the situation as it was before Minister Paramount Blount was injected therein, this Government concludes to upset conditions that are at least semisatisfactory, elects to encourage conspiracy and provoke bloodshed, joins hands with the outlaws who have manufactured the uproar against the republican idea, and all to the end that a far from admirable specimen of womanhood be reclad with power to work great evil. To say that such a position is an astounding one is to speak mildly.

That the course of the Administration is indefensible must be evident to all reasoning people. It matters not now how the revolution was brought about; that it occurred is history, but with those causes the President can have nothing to do. Both President Harrison and President Cleveland have recognized the Provisional Government as a power, the latter having sent to that Government two representatives. President Cleveland might withdraw the American minister if he simply desired to let the two factions fight it out among themselves; that would be an unfriendly act. But to drag the throne from out the royal woodshed and, after dusting it off with the frazzled hopes of honest Americans, replace the low-comedy queen on its cushions is an act of hostility toward a friendly power which neither the Americans of Hawaii nor those of the United States are likely to forget. Responsibility for the destruction of American interests and influence in Hawaii and for bloodshed and loss of life which may result from this effort of the great Republic to bolster up a rotten pro-English monarchy will be upon the Administration of President Cleveland. And the burden will be heavy.

[The Washington Post.]

THE PROPOSED HAWAIIAN POLICY.

Mr. Gresham startled the country yesterday morning by proposing the forcible suppression of the existing *de facto* government of Hawaii and the equally forcible restoration of the burlesque monarchy deposed nearly a year ago. His theory is that the power of the United States was employed to consummate a wrong in the first instance and that the same power should now be invoked to vindicate justice by committing another. If Mr. Gresham had spent the whole period of his incumbency as Secretary of State in planning a theatrical effect he could not have been more bewilderingly successful.

With the issue of veracity raised by Mr. Gresham as against Minister Stevens and his own predecessor, Secretary Foster, we have nothing to do. We prefer to keep to the undisputed facts of the case and to seek in them such justification of Mr. Gresham's proposed policy as they can be made to furnish. Whatever may have been the circumstances under which the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown last winter, it is nevertheless true that the Cleveland Administration, upon coming into power two or three months later, found the present government installed at Honolulu. No matter what Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Gresham may as private citizens have thought of the methods by which that government was set up, it remains the fact that as President and Secretary of State, they found that government an accomplished and perfected entity, and it is equally true that they have recognized and dealt with it as such ever since. Of course nobody knows the exact nature of the instructions under which Mr. Blount acted while he was exerting his paramount authority by special and mysterious commission, but there can be no question that upon succeeding Mr. Stevens as minister plenipotentiary he gave official recognition to the then existing arrangement at Honolulu.

Nor can it be asserted that Mr. Blount was merely tolerating a government on paper or conniving at a temporary expedient, for one of the earliest manifestations of his paramount authority had been the hauling down of the United States flag and the transfer of the United States marines from their barracks there to their quarters aboard the Boston. The vessel's presence in the harbor after that act of official repudiation was no more of a support of the Provisional Government than of the deposed monarchy, perhaps not as much, and the former, from that day to the present has stood upon its own feet and by virtue of its own strength.

We do not find in Mr. Gresham's statement of the case, and we imagine that it is about as unfavorable a statement as could be made, the very smallest warrant for the hypothesis that the present government of Hawaii is destitute of inherent strength and incapable of maintaining itself. On the contrary, it seems to us that it has sufficiently contradicted such a proposition by exerting its authority and commanding the respect and obedience of the Hawaiian ever since the day on which Mr. Blount called off the United States forces and somewhat ostentatiously left it to stand alone.

There may be a question as to the means by which the revolution was accomplished originally, but there can be none as to the present reality and substance of the *de facto* government, or, in our opinion, as to the impropriety of foreign interference in a situation which the parties chiefly concerned appear to have accepted with entire satisfaction. If, as Mr. Gresham insists, the deposed monarchy is backed by an overwhelming public sentiment, it will reëstablish itself without aid from us. If not, and if the existing government be rooted in the people's sympathy, and inherently capable of self-support, the employment of the United States forces to overthrow it would be an act of the grossest and most wicked tyranny.

We do not see that the present Administration need hold itself responsible for the misdeeds, real or imagined, of its predecessor; but, even if it were responsible, we find it equally difficult to imagine why an outrage connived

at by Mr. Harrison should be followed by an outrage planned and executed by Mr. Cleveland. The proposition that two wrongs make a right has never yet been accepted by the enlightened moral sense of the civilized world.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O'NEILL.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I ask that the resolutions of the House of Representatives relative to the death of Hon. Charles O'Neill be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VILAS in the chair). The resolutions of the House of Representatives will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 4, 1893.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and to send a duly attested copy to the family of the deceased.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I submit for adoption the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret the announcement of the death of the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection the resolutions will be immediately considered. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 6, 1893, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REVENUE STEAMERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the construction of revenue steamers heretofore authorized by law; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LAND-OFFICE MAPS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Secretary of the Interior for engraving Land Office maps; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting additional estimates of appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, submitted by the Secretary of War; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

D. S. LOY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to pay D. S. Loy for shot manufactured by him for the Navy in 1862; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES INTERCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication of the Secretary of State, with inclosures, relating to compensation for representatives of the United States in the Intercontinental Railway Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the contingent expenses of that Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, WAR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the receipts and expenditures of appropriations for the contingent expenses of the War Department for the year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting a report of the California Débris Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and ordered to be printed.

SPRINGFIELD ARMORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Ordnance submitting a statement of expenditures at the Springfield Armory, Massachusetts, for the year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of expenditures of all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which, with accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

EXPENDITURES UNDER DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Commissioner of Labor, submitting a statement of all moneys expended under his direction for the year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting his annual report for the year ending October 31, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting its seventh annual report to Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PROPAGATION OF FOOD FISHES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a statement of expenditures from July 1, 1892, to June 30, 1893, of appropriations designated as "Propagation of food fishes, 1893;" which was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF UTAH COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the chairman of the Utah Commission, transmitting the annual report to Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, in pursuance of section 1057 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, transmitting a statement to Congress of all judgments rendered by said court for the year ending December 2, 1893, the amounts thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims on which said judgments were rendered; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SALES OF WASTE PAPER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, transmitting a statement, with Treasury receipts, showing the sales of waste paper since the commencement of the first session of the Fifty-third Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

PROPERTY IN CHARGE OF DOORKEEPER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of property under his charge on December 4, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

BOOKS, ETC., IN HOUSE FOLDING ROOM.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Doorkeeper of the House, transmitting an inventory of books, maps, and pamphlets in the folding room of the House December 4, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 460) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HARRIS, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for two weeks, on account of sickness.

STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following letter of the governor of the State of Illinois; which was read and laid on the table:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Springfield, December 2, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor, as well as the pleasure, of advising you that in pursuance of an invitation extended to the States by authority of Congress, the Legislature of the State of Illinois at its last session caused Mr. Leonard Volk, a distinguished American sculptor, to make a heroic statue in bronze of Gen. James Shields, one of Illinois's most distinguished warriors and statesmen. The same has been placed in position in Statuary Hall at Washington and will be unveiled on December 6 of this year at the hour of 2 p. m.

I respectfully invite your friendly coöperation. I have advised the President and the President of the Senate.

Very respectfully,

JOHN P. ALTGELD, *Governor.*

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The committees were called for reports; and no reports were presented

PRINTING OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, from the Committee on Printing, reported back with a favorable recommendation, the following resolution:

Resolved, That there be printed 20,000 copies of the President's message for the use of the House.

The report of the committee stating that the estimated cost of the proposed printing was $353, and recommending the adoption of the resolution, was read.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LIGHT-HOUSE AND FOG SIGNAL, BUTLER FLATS, NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at 15 minutes past 12 o'clock, and the call rests with the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The call was proceeded with until—

Mr. RANDALL (when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was called) said: I call up the bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. SAYERS. I shall insist on the bill being considered in committee.

Mr. RANDALL. I move then that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be established, on or near Butler Flats, entrance to the lower harbor of New Bedford, Mass., a light and fog-signal station, at a cost not to exceed $45,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask that the report be read.

The report (by Mr. HOUK of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass., respectfully report it back with the recommendation that it do pass.

The light and fog-signal station herein provided for was recommended to be established in the annual report of the Light-House Board for 1892; and that recommendation, as we are assured in a letter from Hon. C. S. Hamlin, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, will be renewed in the forthcoming annual report and annual estimates of the Light-House Board. The letter containing that assurance and an extract from the annual report of the Light-House Board of June 30, 1892, are filed herewith and made a part of this report.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *September 16, 1893.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from your committee dated September 13, 1893, inclosing House bill No. 156, for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

This bill with your letter was referred to the Light-House Board, which returned them with the statement that in its annual report for 1892 recommendation was made that an appropriation of $45,000 be made for the establishment of a light and fog signal at Butler Flats. This recommendation is renewed in the forthcoming annual report and annual estimates of the Light-House Board.

A copy of the recommendation made by the Light-House Board in its report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, is inclosed, together with a copy of H. R. bill No. 156.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. HAMLIN, *Acting Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

[Extract from the annual report of the Light-House Board, June 30, 1892.]

* * * * * * *

Butler Flats, New Bedford Harbor, Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts.—The following recommendation, which was made in the board's last three annual reports, is renewed:

"The entrance near buoy No. 9, on the point of Butler Flats, is narrow, obscure, and difficult to find in snowstorms, fogs, and dark nights. If a light with a fog signal was placed on that point it would mark both the entrance and turning point; would guide vessels to an anchorage in the lower harbor, and, with the light on Palmer Island, would guide them clear of North Ledge, Henrietta, and Hurricane Rocks, in Buzzards Bay, and be of great service to the navigation of this important port. It is stated by the custom-house authorities that 1,814 vessels entered the port of New Bedford during 1887, not including yachts, fishing craft, or boats. It is also stated that the Vineyard Sound and Nantucket steamers took 75,000 passengers to and from this port, and received $22,500 for freight carried. It is further stated that the New York propellers made 104 trips between New York and New Bedford, and received over $100,000 for freight carried. New Bedford is now said to be the third manufacturing city in Massachusetts, and the collector of the port states that about 500,000 tons of shipping came into the port during last year.

"The board, as stated in its last annual report, is of the opinion that the needs of commerce and navigation require the establishment of a light and fog signal at this point. It is estimated that they can be erected for $45,000, and it is recommended that an appropriation of this amount be made therefor."

Mr. RANDALL. This bill calls for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal on Butlers Flats at New Bedford. The city of New Bedford is an important seaport in the southeastern part of Massachusetts, and Butlers Flats is a ledge of rock covered by shoal water at the entrance of the harbor of that city, and directly in the track of vessels arriving at or leaving that port.

At present the only guide or warning of danger to sailors on this flat is a gas buoy, which is a structure made of boiler iron, weighing from 2 to 5 tons, charged with compressed gas, and costing from $2,000 to $5,000; the gas burns with a steady flame from three to four months. It is anchored to a sinker, weighing from 3 to 5 tons, by a chain cable. It can not constantly be kept in its prescribed position, as it may be driven from its moorings by storms, and is so liable to be displaced by moving ice during the winter season that it is the practice of the Light-House Board to replace the gas buoy with a spar buoy when such movements are feared, as in cases when the ice in the harbor breaks up and goes to sea, taking every buoy with it which it does not sink. It also sometimes happens that the light goes out, and as it is remote from the shore it is not easily accessible from the shore in storms, and has to remain unlighted. In foggy weather, when it can not be seen, it is useless to the mariner as locating a point of danger.

The Light-House Board has repeatedly recommended the establishment of a light-house and fog signal on this reef, and a statement of facts and figures will, I think, show that this work should be done immediately.

The population of the city of New Bedford, Mass., has increased within the last fifteen years from 33,000 to 50,000.

During the same period the number of spindles in its cotton mills has increased from 75,000 to 1,000,000; making it now the second place in this country in its number of spindles.

The number of steamers and sailing vessels arriving at that port in 1891 was 2,117, with a tonnage of 1,097,193.

The number of tons of coal landed at this port in 1891 were 490,690; the largest number in one day, 8,660. Number of bales of cotton used annually, 125,000; sacks of wool, 2,493; bushels of grain, 615,250; barrels of flour, 128,181; lumber, 12,500,000 feet; sugar, 15,000 barrels; grain, 650,000 bushels; iron and steel, 11,000 tons; besides articles of merchandise of great value, too numerous to mention.

A daily line of freight propellers leaves New Bedford for New York; also a line of passenger and freight steamers for Nantucket and the adjacent islands, carrying in the summer from 150,000 to 200,000 passengers.

Beyond question the establishment of a light-house and fog signal called for by this bill will in the course of a very few years result in the saving of property and perhaps many lives,

and considering the importance of the work, the amount asked for to complete it is comparatively insignificant.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the method in which appropriations have been made for the construction of light-houses. The Light-House Board has always divided these works into three classes: first, the indispensable; second, the necessary; third, the desirable. Now, it nowhere appears from this report or from any information as yet received from the Light-House Board whether this light-house is indispensable or necessary or desirable.

I would therefore ask the gentleman in charge of the bill to withdraw it and to permit it to remain on the Calendar for the present, so that we may ascertain from the Light-House Board, in an official manner, whether this structure is indispensable or necessary or desirable. And I will say to him that if the Light-House Board report officially that the construction of the light-house in question is indispensable, then I will have no further objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the bill from further consideration, with the request that it remain on the Calendar, and move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 156) had come to no resolution thereon, the bill having been withdrawn from consideration.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this bill remain on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. It will so remain.

CASH ENTRIES OF OFFERED LANDS.

When the Committee on the Public Lands was called—

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4244) to confirm cash entries of offered lands.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all private cash entries of public land subject to sale in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas as offered lands, made between the dates of the approval of the joint resolution of May 14, 1888, and its promulgation, May 29, 1888, in cases in which all requirements of law have been complied with, be, and the same are hereby, confirmed.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McRAE. This bill, Mr. Speaker, was reported just before the adjournment of the last session, with the reservation of all of the rights or privileges that it may have had, and I submit that it does not belong on the Union Calendar, having been considered in the Committee of the Whole House and reported favorably to this House.

The status of the bill is this: When under consideration October 26, 1893, it was reported to the House with an amendment, was engrossed and read a third time in the House. At this stage the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Public Lands with instructions to ascertain the amount of land covered by the bill and the purchasers thereof, which has been furnished the House in Report No. 169, made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SOMERS].

No action on the part of the Committee on Public Lands whatever, except to obtain the information desired, has been taken. The bill remains just as it was when recommitted. So the committee insist, Mr. Speaker, that the bill comes back to the House with the information desired by the House, and occupies the same parliamentary status as when it was recommitted. The question is, Shall the bill be passed as amended? That was the pending question when the bill was recommitted, and I submit is the question now.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman any authority on the questions which he has suggested?

Mr. McRAE. I have no special authority, for I never knew before a bill to be recommitted for information; but it seems to me that there can be no question about it, for there is no other sensible and logical step to be taken. The bill has had its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole, reported to the House, the amendment adopted, and the bill engrossed and passed its third reading. Shall all this be done again? Nothing remains to be done now except to determine whether the House will pass the bill or not after hearing the report which contains the information which has been called for by the House.

The SPEAKER. There seems to have been a ruling on the question, which is found on page 494 of the Digest:

When, in pursuance of Rule XVII, a bill, pending the question on its passage—

That the Chair understands to be the case presented here—

has been recommitted with instructions to the committee to amend it, the bill as thus amended is again reported to the House and occupies the same parliamentary status as when first reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole. It is in effect a different bill, and the vote must be again taken on the question "Shall the bill be read a third time," and when the question is again on its passage it is again subject to one motion to commit as provided in Rule XVII.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, that decision is not applicable to the status of this bill. There was no instruction to the committee to amend this bill. It has not been amended. It was recommitted solely for the purpose of obtaining certain information which has been reported to the House. There could be no amendment reported by the committee under the instructions. The bill itself has been amended, as shown by the italicized words in the bill, but this was done in the Committee of the Whole, reported to the House, adopted by the House, and the whole matter was taken out of the hands of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to ask a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Was this bill considered in Committee of the Whole to its conclusion?

Mr. McRAE. To its conclusion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then it has already had its consideration in Committee of the Whole. If it had not been considered to its conclusion, but pending the conclusion had been recommitted, it would have to go back to complete the action upon it to a conclusion in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the question of the gentleman from Arkansas to be whether the motion was on the third reading or the final passage of the bill. It is very clear that if it had its first consideration in Committee of the Whole it need not go there again.

Mr. McRAE. Certainly it has had its first consideration, and was reported to the House before recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then it must now be ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair the question should be, "Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?"

Mr. SPRINGER. It is presumed that it has not been engrossed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] will give his attention. Has the committee reported back the information which was asked for?

Mr. McRAE. Yes sir. That report was sent up by me with the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill was recommitted with instructions to the committee to ascertain certain facts. The committee report the bill back with a statement of the facts which they were directed by the House to inquire into.

Mr. McRAE. It is Report 169.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. McRAE. I suggest that the table containing the names and the descriptions of the lands contained in that report might be omitted in the reading. The printed matter which follows will give the information.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the information, the Clerk will omit the names contained in the report and read what follows.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the report as directed.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom the bill (H. R. 4244) to confirm cash entries of offered lands was recommitted on the 26th of October last, with instructions to ascertain the amount of land covered by the bill, and the purchasers, and the amount purchased by each person, respectfully report the same back to the House, with the following letter from the honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office, which contains all the information obtainable by the committee:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 31, 1893.

SIR: In reply to your verbal request for a report supplemental to that rendered by this office October 9, 1893, on H. R. bill No. 1829, "For the relief of Charles A. Hall," which shall show the amount of land covered by the bill, the names of purchasers, and the amount purchased by each person, I have the honor to submit the following statement, showing the dates, names, area, and amounts paid by the purchasers on private cash entries made in the States of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Alabama, between May 14 and 29, 1888, as well as the disposition thereof:

In Mississippi there were 21 cash entries made, aggregating 3,053.83 acres, for which $3,817.32 were paid. All of these entries have been patented.

In Arkansas there were 35 cash entries made, aggregating 3,908.20 acres, for which $4,885.48 were paid. Of this number 32 have been canceled, because they were made without authority of law, these canceled entries aggregating 3,623.74 acres, and 3 were patented, aggregating 284.46 acres. The purchase money on 9 of these canceled entries has been refunded, amounting to $789.63. Applications have been made for the repayment of the purchase money paid on 2 of said entries, amounting to $150. Granting that these two applications will be allowed, it is seen that the sum of $3,945.85 is covered into the Treasury, while the entries for which said sum was paid have been canceled, and the purchasers have received no benefit therefrom.

In Alabama there were 21 cash entries made, aggregating 3,602.50 acres, for which $4,503.15 were paid. All of these entries are suspended, four of them being before the Secretary of the Interior on appeal from the decision of this office holding them for cancellation because they were made in violation of law.

Thus in the three States of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Alabama offered Government lands were purchased at private sale, between the dates named, to the amount of 10,564.53 acres, for which there was paid the sum of $13,205.95.

Of this total area, entries covering 3,602.50 acres are suspended in this Department; patents have been issued for 3,338.29 acres; entries covering 3,623.74 acres have been canceled, of which amount 701.33 acres have been absolutely returned to the public domain, since after the cancellation of the entries the purchase money was refunded to the purchasers, leaving 2,922.41 acres, the entries for which might be reinstated, if no adverse claims have attached, should Congress pass the necessary legislation therefor, or the purchase money for which might be refunded upon the proper application of the purchasers.

Should the bill under consideration become a law in its present form, the suspended entries, representing 3,602.50 acres, would be passed to patent, and the patents already issued would be confirmed should their legality be ever questioned.

Should a clause be inserted in the bill allowing the reinstatement of the canceled entries upon application therefor, and where no adverse claims have attached, entries to the amount of 2,922.41 acres might thus be reinstated.

These lands were purchased under the provisions of the act of June 22, 1876 (19 Stats., 73), no act of settlement, cultivation, and improvements being required of the purchasers.

The operations of said act were suspended by the joint resolution of May 14, 1888 (25 Stats., 632), as amended by the joint resolution of July 16, 1888 (*ibid.*, 636), and the private sale of lands in the United States, except the State of Missouri, was prohibited by the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stats., 854).

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX,
Commissioner.

Hon. THOMAS C. MCRAE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I think this report sets out very clearly the necessity for the passage of this bill. I demand the previous question upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Before that is done I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MCRAE. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. How does the gentleman account for these single parties getting so much of this land? As I hastily footed it up here, one man has 2,500 acres.

Mr. MCRAE. In the States named in the bill, prior to the passage of the law of 1889, all these offered lands were subject to sale to anybody who would pay a dollar and a quarter an acre for them, without requiring residence, cultivation, or any other conditions except the payment of the money.

Congress repealed that law. Now, between the date of that law and the date of the fact of its promulgation these entries were made. In many of these cases, as you will see, the entries have been canceled and in some the money refunded. A number of them have passed to patent, and the bill deals with these and the pending entries, and confirms the title in all such cases. The Government has received the money for the lands.

Mr. PICKLER. That is, between the time of the passage of the law and the time when the land officers received notice of the passage of the law, some of these gentlemen rushed to the land office and got this amount of land.

Mr. MCRAE. I do not know whether they rushed or not. They made the entries anyway, entered the land, and paid the money. The Government has had the money for several years, and ought to make good the title.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do I understand that three men obtained 3,000 acres of this land?

Mr. MCRAE. I have not made any calculation to see how much each man got.

Mr. PICKLER. One man, Jared C. Martin, got 2,500 acres, as I foot it up.

Mr. MCRAE. In what State is that?

Mr. PICKLER. It is one of the first names on page 2 of this report. I do not know from what State the man comes.

Mr. MCRAE. The Jared C. Martin sales have all been canceled, although his money has not been returned to him. He does not come in under this bill, as the gentleman will notice if he examines the report.

Mr. PICKLER. Then whose lands remain intact?

Mr. MCRAE. Such of them as have been patented, and such of them as have not been canceled are confirmed. We do not by this bill reinstate canceled entries.

Mr. PICKLER. Has the Secretary of the Interior recommended the passage of this bill?

Mr. MCRAE. He has.

Mr. PICKLER. Not in this report.

Mr. MCRAE. The bill for which this is a substitute was sent to the Secretary originally; and the Secretary and the Commissioner of the General Land Office both recommended the passage of a general bill. This report simply contains the additional information as to the area covered by it that the House desired before it would vote upon the bill. In the State of Arkansas, to which the gentleman has called attention, there are only two entries that are affected by it, and they have passed to patent. They are very small, one being 80 and the other 45 acres. All the others have been canceled. So far as I am concerned, I do not care whether you pass the bill or not; but I do say that it is but little short of an outrage for the Government to have kept the money of these people from 1889 and now hesitate about giving back the money and refuse to confirm their title to the land.

Mr. PICKLER. I was only seeking to understand the bill. I do not know whether I am for it or not. It appears, however, that some of these parties have entered a very large amount of land, did it very quickly, and only paid $1.25 an acre for it.

Mr. MCRAE. If the case of Martin is a scarecrow to the gentleman, I repeat that his entries have been canceled, and there is no proposition here to reinstate them. I demand the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill and on the final passage.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MCRAE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO PURCHASERS OF FORFEITED LANDS.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3544) and will yield the floor to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLIS].

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3544) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," be, and the same is, amended so as to extend the time within which persons in possession of lands forfeited by said act shall be permitted to purchase the same, in the quantities and upon the terms provided in said section, at any time prior to January 1, 1897.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCRAE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of a bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The title was again reported.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

After the word "purposes," in line 5, insert the words "approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof."

In line 7 strike out the words "in possession of," and insert in lieu thereof the words "entitled to purchase."

After the word "ninety-seven," in line 10, add the following:

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to interfere with any adverse claim that may have attached to the lands or any part thereof."

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, how much of the hour remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that twenty-five minutes of the hour remains.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is one that does not involve any appropriation. It is simply an amendment of an act that has been heretofore passed by this House, giving to certain persons who are entitled to purchase under the act of September 29, 1890, certain forfeited railroad lands in the West and giving them an extension of time. The time in which they were to make the payment expires on the 1st of the coming January, and by reason of the hard times and failures of crops they will not be able to meet their payments upon their lands; and if they do not make the payment the lands will simply revert to the United States, and then can only be acquired under the homestead laws; and only such persons will come into possession of these lands as are entitled to do so by operation of the homestead laws. Thereby the Government will lose the price of the lands, whereas if the settlers are permitted to purchase and are given this extension of time, within that time they will be enabled to complete the purchase and the Government will realize $1.25 per acre for such lands.

Much of this land has been settled upon by persons who have exhausted their homestead rights and have no homes except the land they occupy, which they took under license from the railroad company prior to the forfeiture of the land. Since the act making the forfeiture passed and the lands reverted to the Government, they were permitted to purchase under certain restrictions contained in the act of September 29, 1890; but by reason of the reversal of fortunes which they have had they are not able to meet their payments in the time prescribed, and they are simply asking an extension. They ask until January 1, 1897.

This matter has been submitted to the Department and to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, who recommends the passage of the bill with an amendment, which has been incorporated:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to interfere with any adverse claim that may have attached to the lands or any part thereof.

That amendment is perfectly satisfactory to those people, and all they ask at the hands of Congress is that the time may be extended that they may be permitted to pay for these lands, not upon the 1st of the coming January, but on or before the 1st of January, 1897. By that time they will be able to pay for their homes, and the Government will be $1.25 better off for each and every acre of land, and these men will be permitted to hold their homes.

Mr. COOMBS. Are they simply homestead lands?

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. No, sir; they are not homestead lands, but they are part of the lands granted to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company which were forfeited in 1890 and have reverted to the Government.

Many of these men had already exhausted their homestead rights, and in some instances had homes upon inferior pieces of land valuable only for water privileges, and in order to have lands valuable for agricultural purposes occupied the lands they now seek to hold by virtue of a contract made with the railroad company; in many cases taking lands which were a mile or two from where they resided and used them for farming purposes, their homesteads being unfit and inadequate to their wants unless they are permitted to hold the forfeited lands to which the right of purchase had attached September 29, 1890, which right will not be enlarged but only extended if the pending measure should become a law.

By the provisions of this act with its amendments they are permitted to buy at any time prior to the 1st of January at $1.25 an acre.

Mr. COOMBS. How much land?

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. In no case to exceed 320 acres.

Mr. PICKLER. Lands upon which they have made improvements?

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. Yes; lands upon which they have made improvements and which they had signified their intention or were entitled to purchase from the railroad company prior to the passage of this act. Many of these people were bona fide settlers upon the lands by virtue of a contract of purchase with the railroad company, and when the land was taken out of the hands of the railroad company and reverted to the Government, Congress provided that it might be purchased in quantities not to exceed 320 acres by anyone who had complied with the provisions of the act of forfeiture. There was also an order from the Interior Department that within so many days after the passage of that act persons claiming under it should file notice in the Land Office specifying the particular lands that they intended to purchase, and where any man had more than 320 acres he had to specify the particular 320 acres he would take, and the surplus was made subject to entry by any other qualified person. Hence only 320 acres can be obtained under this character of claim by any one person.

These settlers want to have the privilege of purchasing the lands upon which they had settled and improved, and not to lose them, as many of them will in case this act of extension is not passed. This does not involve the appropriation of a dollar of public money. On the contrary, it brings money to the Government, because these people will pay for their lands at $1.25 an acre, while if this extension is not allowed many of them will lose the lands upon which they have made improvements and be left homeless, and others will be allowed to come in and take the lands under the homestead law and get the benefit of the labor and the improvements made by these settlers. This extension asked for is no more than a simple act of justice to deserving settlers.

Mr. PICKLER. Is the report unanimous?

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. The report of the committee is unanimous. The extension is also recommended by the Interior Department, and I earnestly ask that the bill may pass.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the amendments recommended by the committee.

The amendments were read, as follows:

After the word "purposes," in line 5, insert the words "approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof."

In line 7 strike out the words "in possession of," and insert in lieu thereof the words "entitled to purchase."

And, in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, after the word "ninety-seven," in line 10, add the following:

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to interfere with any adverse claim that may have attached to the lands or any part thereof."

The amendments were severally agreed to.

Mr. McRAE. I move that the committee rise and report the bill as amended to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY, from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3544) in relation to the forfeiture of certain lands, had amended the same, and had directed him to report the bill to the House with the recommendation that, as amended, it do pass.

The amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole were adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended, as recommended by the committee, by adding after the word "purposes," the words "approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof."

Mr. McRAE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table. The latter motion was agreed to.

LAND ENTRIES IN MILLE LAC INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for land within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all bona fide preëmption or homestead filings or entries allowed for land within the Mille Lac Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota between the 9th day of January, 1892, the date of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior holding that the lands within said reservation were subject to disposal as other public lands under the general land laws, and the date of the receipt at the district land office at Taylors Falls, in that State, of the letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, communicating to them the decision of the Secretary of the Interior of April 22, 1892, in which it was definitely determined that said lands were not so subject to disposal, but could only be disposed of according to the provisions of the special act of January 14, 1889 (25 Statutes, 642), be, and the same are hereby, confirmed where regular in other respects, and patents shall issue to the claimants for the lands embraced therein, as in other cases, on a satisfactory showing of a bona fide compliance on their part with the requirements of the laws under which said filings and entries were respectively allowed.

Mr. McRAE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the joint resolution which has just been read.

Mr. HALL of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the report be read. It states all the facts in the case.

The report (by Mr. HALL of Minnesota) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota, have had the same under consideration and report it back with the recommendation that it pass.

The Mille Lac Indian Reservation (owned by the Chippewas) was ceded to the United States in 1863 and had been declared open to entry by successive decisions of the Department of the Interior.

The most of the lands were entered prior to January 14, 1889. An act approved January 14, 1889 (25 Stat., 642), provided for the purchase from the Chippewas of all their reservations in Minnesota (except the Red Lake Reservation), and also for the sale of the lands, and the setting apart of the proceeds of such sales as a trust fund for the Indians. This act further provided for an examination of the lands, and their separation into "pine lands" and "agricultural lands." The "pine lands" were to be sold at auction at their appraised value, and not less than $3 per acre, and the "agricultural lands" were subject to entry under the homestead law.

On January 9, 1891, the then Secretary of the Interior held that the Mille Lac Reservation, having been ceded in 1863, was not embraced in the reservations covered by the act of January 14, 1889, and therefore that the Mille Lac lands were subject to disposal as other public lands under the general law.

Under this ruling, and prior to May 3, 1892, there were made upon these lands 109 homestead entries, aggregating 13,628 acres, and 131 preëmptions, aggregating 17,991 acres, and 1 soldier's declaratory statement, covering 40 acres; in all, 31,659 acres.

Afterwards, on April 22, 1892, the Secretary of the Interior reversed his former ruling and held that the lands were not subject to disposition under the general land laws, but under the special provisions of the act of January 14, 1889. This decision was communicated to the local land offices on May 3, 1892.

The object of the pending bill is to confirm the entries of said lands, made in good faith under the ruling of January 9, 1891, and between that date and the time when said ruling was reversed and the local land officers notified thereof. The occupants of these lands made their entries and paid their money under the general land laws and in accordance with the ruling of the Secretary of the Interior. The subsequent reversal of that ruling by the

same Secretary ought not to deprive them of their equitable right to these lands.

The present bill was approved by the late Secretary of the Interior, passed the Senate, and was favorably reported to the House in the last Congress. It also meets the approval of the present Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. HALL of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think the report states the facts quite fully, and unless some gentleman desires to be heard upon the subject I move that the committee rise and report the joint resolution to the House, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration joint resolution (H. R. 31) in relation to entries of lands in the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The joint resolution was passed.

Mr. MCRAE moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table. The latter motion was agreed to.

BIRMINGHAM, SHEFFIELD AND TENNESSEE RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 198) to grant to the Birmingham, Sheffield and Tennessee River Railway Company a right of way over the public lands traversed by it.

The b ll was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right of way through the public lands of the United States, 100 feet wide on each side of the center of the track now laid by the Birmingham, Sheffield and Tennessee River Railway Company, in the State of Alabama, is hereby granted to said railway company upon condition that said railway company shall, within six months after the passage of this act, file with the register of the land office at Huntsville, Ala., a map showing the Government lands traversed by it; and upon approval thereof by the Secretary of the Interior the said lands shall be noted on the plats in said office, and all such lands over which said right of way passes shall hereafter be disposed of subject to such right of way.

There is also granted to said railway company the right to take from the public lands adjacent to the line of said road material, earth, stone, and timber necessary to complete the construction of said railroad; also ground adjacent to such right of way for station buildings, depots, machine shops, side tracks, turn-outs, and water stations, not to exceed in amount twenty acres for each station, to the extent of one station for each 10 miles of its road.

An amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the words "right of way," at the end of line 14, to the end of the bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, is not this a bill that ought to be considered in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. It is on the House Calendar.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It grants but very few acres of the public lands, worth but a few dollars.

Mr. DINGLEY. That does not affect the principle. The simple statement of the gentleman from Alabama shows that this is a bill that should be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. This bill should be on the Union Calendar. It grants a right of way.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time. I will simply state that the railroad was entitled under the law to the land over which it goes, but there was a requirement in the law that the company should file with the Secretary of the Interior a statement or plat of the land over which the road was proposed to be built, but they failed to do this. Afterwards they made application to the Department; but the Secretary held that inasmuch as the law was so explicit some additional legislation was necessary.

Mr. PICKLER. Have any intervening rights accrued?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. None whatever. This is simply to perfect the title of the railroad company to the land over which the road runs.

Mr. DINGLEY. Land which is covered by their track?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. And which had been granted previously?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It had been granted because the company built the road before making the application. The road was built rapidly, and the Secretary of the Interior contended that as the statute had not been strictly complied with in making the application before the road was built, there must be Congressional action. This matter amounts to very little; yet it is better that the title should be absolutely perfect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

There was no objection.

The amendments reported by the Committee on the Public Lands were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MCRAE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] any further business to submit?

Mr. MCRAE. I have no other business this morning.

The SPEAKER. Then as the morning hour would expire in a minute and a half the Chair, without objection, will declare the hour at an end.

There was no objection.

ROLL CALL AT OPENING OF CONGRESS.

Mr. OATES. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to resume the consideration of the bankruptcy bill——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. If the gentleman will allow me a moment, I wish to make a point of order in reference to the correction of the Journal and the RECORD.

Mr. OATES. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since yesterday I have made an examination as to the practice of the House of Representatives from the beginning of the Government to the present time, and I have before me a statement of the method pursued in the calling of the roll at the convening of every Congress from 1789 to the present time.

I find that invariably members of the House have been recorded by States, and in many cases the record shows that the Speaker directed the roll to be called by States at the commencement of second sessions and also at the convening of third sessions. I think I am justified in saying that the record shows that the Speaker directed the Clerk to call the roll by States at the convening of second and third sessions quite as frequently, and probably more frequently than at first sessions. The idea in the early Congresses was that there should be a quorum of States as well as a quorum of members. It is true, the Constitution does not in words provide that the presence of Representatives from a majority of the States to make this a legal body for business, but I insist that the spirit of the Constitution and the spirit of our institutions is as I contend. I insist that before a Congress proceeds to business, whether it be a first, second, or third session, we should ascertain and place on record the fact of the presence of a quorum of members, and also that this quorum of members should be composed of Representatives from a majority of the States; and even if it is not essential, it is a good practice, and it is one that has been adhered to from the beginning of our Government to this time.

At the first meeting of the First Congress there was neither a majority of States nor a quorum of members present. At the meeting of subsequent Congresses there sometimes failed to appear a majority of States, which fact would not have been developed had not the roll been called by States. I regard this, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of great importance. During fifty-two Congresses, including one hundred and fourteen sessions, the practice has been invariably as I have stated. Yesterday when the question was raised the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] very soon saw the point, and saw that this innovation was the beginning of an encroachment upon the revered Democratic principle of the sovereign character of the States and a great stride in the direction of centralized government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the point of order that the Journal should show that the roll was called by States, and that the permanent record should be corrected to show the same thing. Should the Speaker decide that this can not be done, I make the point of order that the roll of the House should now be called by States, so that there may be an unbroken precedent from the beginning of the Government to the present time, namely, that at the convening of every Congress the roll has been called by States. I repeat that at the convening of every Congress, whether first session, second session, or third session, the roll has been called by States, and this is the first time that this rule has been deviated from. The innovation upon this principle which I seek to correct is not justified by the rules of the House. The rules, so far as they affect the subject, have been for many years precisely as they are to-day, and there is no rule which prohibits the roll being called by States.

FIRST CONGRESS.

The first session of the First Congress convened March 4, 1789. The record of both the Senate and House show that both Senators and Members were recorded by States. There was less than a quorum of members present in each branch of Congress, and a majority of the States were not represented either in the Senate or House.

The second session of the First Congress convened January 4, 1790. There was not a quorum present, nor were a majority of the States represented, but the Senators and Representatives present were recorded by States.

The third session convened December 6, 1790. The Senators and Members present were recorded by States.

SECOND CONGRESS.

The first session of the Second Congress convened October 24, 1791, and the record shows that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

The second session convened November 5, 1792, and here again in the Senate the Senators are recorded by States, and in the House the Representatives are also recorded by States.

THIRD CONGRESS.

The first session of the Third Congress convened at Philadelphia, December 2, 1793. The Senators and Representatives are all recorded by States.

The second session of the Third Congress convened November 3, 1794. The Senators and Representatives are all recorded by States.

FOURTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Fourth Congress convened December 7, 1795. The Senators and Representatives are all recorded by States.

The second session convened December 5, 1796. The Senators and Members are all recorded by States.

FIFTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Fifth Congress convened May 15, 1797. The Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

The second session convened November 13, 1797, and the third session convened December 3, 1798. The record of the third session says—

The names of all the members were called over by the Clerk—

and in all the sessions the Senators are recorded by States.

SIXTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Sixth Congress convened December 2, 1799, and the second session November 17, 1800, and in both sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

SEVENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Seventh Congress convened in the Capitol at Washington, December 7, 1801, and the second session convened December 6, 1802, and in both sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

EIGHTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Eighth Congress convened October 17, 1803, and the second session November 5, 1804, and in both sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

NINTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Ninth Congress convened December 2, 1805, and the second session December 1, 1806; in both sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

TENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Tenth Congress convened October 26, 1807. The record says:

The assistant clerk of the House announced 117 members and 1 delegate to be present.

The second session convened November 7, 1808. The record shows that in both sessions the Senators and Members were recorded by States.

ELEVENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Eleventh Congress convened May 22, 1809; the second session convened November 27, 1809, and the third session December 3, 1810. The record shows that in each session the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

TWELFTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Twelfth Congress convened November 4, 1811, and the second session November 2, 1812. In both these sessions the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

THIRTEENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Thirteenth Congress convened May 24, 1813. The record says:

The roll of the members was called over by States.

The second session convened December 6, 1813, and the third session September 19, 1814. In all the sessions the record shows that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

FOURTEENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Fourteenth Congress convened December 4, 1815, and the second session December 2, 1816; and the Senators and Representatives in both sessions are recorded by States.

FIFTEENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Fifteenth Congress convened December 1, 1817, the second session November 16, 1818. The Senators and Representatives in both sessions are recorded by States.

SIXTEENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Sixteenth Congress convened December 6, 1819, and the second session November 13, 1820. The Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Seventeenth Congress convened December 3, 1821, the second session December 2, 1822. The Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS.

First session of Eighteenth Congress convened on December 1, 1823. The record says:

The Clerk called the House to order; the roll being called the following Members appeared and took their seats, to wit.

The names are then recorded by States, and the record says:

After the Clerk has finished calling the members of States.

The second session of the Eighteenth Congress convened December 6, 1824. The record shows that in both sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

NINETEENTH CONGRESS.

First session of the Nineteenth Congress convened December 5, 1825.

There is nothing but a statement showing that a quorum of the Senate were present and 204 members of the House were present.

The Journal, however, records the members of the House by States.

Second session of the Nineteenth Congress convened December 4, 1826.

The record says:

The roll being called over by the Clerk of the House.

The record shows that both the Senators and Representatives are recorded in both sessions by States.

TWENTIETH CONGRESS.

First session of the Twentieth Congress convened December 3, 1827. The record says:

The House was called to order by Mathews St. Clair Clark, Clerk of the House, precisely at 12 o'clock, and the roll of the House being called over by States.

Second session of Twentieth Congress convened December 1, 1828. The record shows that the Senators and Representatives in both sessions are recorded by States.

TWENTY FIRST CONGRESS.

First session of the Twenty-first Congress convened December 7, 1829. The record says:

The roll of members having been called over by States.

The second session, Twenty-first Congress, convened December 6, 1830.

The record says:

The roll of members was called over by the Clerk of the House.

The Journal says:

The roll was called over by the Clerk.

The Journal shows both the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States in both sessions.

TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

The first session of the Twenty-second Congress convened December 5, 1831. The record says:

The Clerk called the House to order and having called the roll of members by States.

Second session of the Twenty-second Congress convened December 3, 1832. The record says:

The Clerk having called over the roll.

The record shows in both sessions that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

First session of the Twenty-third Congress convened December 2, 1833. The record says:

The Clerk proceeded to call the names of the several members by States.

Second session of the Twenty-third Congress convened December 1, 1834. The record says:

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The members of the House are recorded by States.

The Journal shows that the Senators and Representatives were all recorded by States.

TWENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

The first session of the Twenty-fourth Congress convened December 7, 1835. The record says:

The roll was then called by States.

The second session of the Twenty-fourth Congress convened December 5, 1836. The record says:

The roll was then called over by States.

The record shows that in both sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS.

First session of Twenty-fifth Congress convened September 4, 1837. The record says:

Walter S. Franklin, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the last Congress, who, having read the proclamation, proceeded to call over the roll by States.

The Members are recorded by States. The Senators are recorded by States in the Journal.

The second session of the Twenty-fifth Congress convened December 4, 1837. The record says:

The roll of the members of the House was then called over by States.

The members are recorded by States.

Third session of Twenty-fifth Congress convened December 3, 1838. The record says:

The roll was then called over by States.

The Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

TWENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

First session of Twenty-sixth Congress convened December 2, 1839. The record says:

The Clerk proceeded to call the names of members of Congress.

Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

It will be observed that although the record says that the roll was called over by States at the beginning of the second and third sessions of the Twenty-fifth Congress, and yet the record does not say that the roll was called by States at the beginning of the first session of the Twenty-sixth Congress.

The second session of Twenty-sixth Congress convened December 7, 1840. The record says:

The Clerk then called the roll by States.

It will be here observed that the record says that the roll was called by States at the beginning of the second session of the Twenty-sixth Congress, but not at the first session.

TWENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

First session Twenty-seventh, convened May 31, 1841. The record says:

The Clerk proceeded to call over the roll by States.

Second session of Twenty-seventh, convened December 6, 1841. The record says:

The roll was called.

Third session of Twenty-seventh, convened December 5, 1842. The record says:

The Clerk having called the roll.

At all three sessions the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

TWENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

First session of Twenty-eighth, convened December 7, 1843. The record says:

The House of Representatives was called to order precisely at 12 o'clock by Mathew St. Clair Clark, their Clerk, who stated to the House that he would proceed to the call of the roll of the members for the purpose of ascertaining whether a quorum was present.

The members are recorded by States.

Second session of Twenty-eighth Congress, convened December 2, 1844. The record says:

The roll being called.

In both sessions the Journal shows that the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

TWENTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

First session of Twenty-ninth, convened December I, 1845. The record says the Clerk announced that:

He would, in pursuance of usage, if not objected to, call over the list of members by States.

Second session of Twenty-ninth, convened December 7, 1846. The record says:

The roll of members was called.

The Senators and Representatives are recorded by States in both sessions.

THIRTIETH CONGRESS.

First session of Thirtieth, convened December 6, 1847. The record says:

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll by States.

Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

Second session of Thirtieth, convened December 4, 1848. The record says:

The roll as published above having been called by the Clerk.

The published roll referred to was by States.

THIRTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

First session of Thirty-first Congress, convened December 3, 1849. The record says:

And agreeably to usage the Clerk proceeded to call the roll of members in the order of the States and Territories.

Second session Thirty-first, convened December 2, 1850. The record says:

The roll of members was called over by States by the Clerk of the House.

Senators and Representatives are recorded by States in both sessions.

THIRTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

First session of Thirty-second, convened December 1, 1851.

The second session of Thirty-second, convened December 6, 1852. The record says:

The roll of members was called over by States by the Clerk of the House.

Senators and Representatives are recorded by States in both sessions.

I call special attention that in this case the record states that at the second session the roll was called by States, but it fails to state that this was done at the first session.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-third Congress, convened December 5, 1853. The record says that—

John W. Forney, the Clerk, said: I will now proceed, with the consent of the House, to call the roll of members.

The roll of members was then called.

The record and Journal show that the Senators and Representatives are recorded by States.

The second session Thirty-third Congress, convened December 4, 1854. The record says:

The Clerk then proceeded to call the roll.

The record shows the Senators and Members were recorded by States.

THIRTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-fourth Congress, convened December 3, 1855. The record says that—

The Clerk of the House, John W. Forney, called the House to order and proceeded to call the roll.

The second session of the Thirty-fourth Congress convened August 21, 1856.

The Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

The third session Thirty-fourth Congress, convened December 1, 1856. The record says:

The roll of members was called over by States.

The record shows that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

THIRTY-FIFTH CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-fifth Congress, convened December 7, 1857. The record says:

The roll was called.

The record shows that Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

The second session Thirty-fifth Congress, convened December 6, 1858. The record says:

The Speaker stated that the members would be called by States. They were so called.

The record shows the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

I call special attention to the fact that the Speaker directed that the names of the members be called by States at the convening of the second session, but did not direct it the first session.

THIRTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-sixth Congress, convened December 5, 1859. The record shows that—

The Clerk, James C. Allen, called the House to order for the purpose of ascertaining if a quorum was present, and proceeded to call the roll of the members by States.

Second session Thirty-sixth Congress, convened December 3, 1860. The record shows that—

The roll was called by States.

The record shows that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States in both sessions.

THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-seventh Congress, convened July 4, 1861. The House being in extra session, the record shows that the roll was called by States.

Second session Thirty-seventh Congress, convened December 2, 1861. The record shows that the roll was called by States.

The third session convened December 1, 1862.
The record shows that Senators and Representatives were recorded by States in all these sessions.

THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-eighth Congress, convened December 7, 1863. The record shows that the roll was called by States.
Second session Thirty-eighth Congress, convened December 5, 1864. The record shows:

The Clerk called the roll by States.

THIRTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

First session Thirty-ninth Congress, convened December 4, 1865. The record says:

The Clerk called the roll of members by States.

The record shows that Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.
Second session Thirty-ninth Congress, convened December 3, 1866. The record says:

The Clerk called the roll by States.

FORTIETH COEGRESS.

First session Fortieth Congress, convened March 4, 1867. The record shows—

The roll was called by State.

The record shows that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.
Second session Fortieth Congress, convened December 2, 1867. The record shows that—

The Speaker said: The Clerk will call the roll by States.

The third session convened December 7, 1868.

FORTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

First session of Forty-first Congress, convened March 4, 1869. The record says:

The roll was called by States.

Second session Forty-first Congress, convened December 6, 1869. The record shows that—

The Speaker said: The Clerk will call the roll.

The third session convened December 5, 1870.
The record shows the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States in all these sessions.

FORTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

First session Forty-second Congress, convened March 4, 1871. The record shows—

The roll of the House was called by States.

Second session Forty-second Congress, convened December 4, 1871. The record shows that—

The Speaker said: The Clerk will call the roll of the House by States.

The third session convened December 2, 1872.
The record shows that the Senators and Representatives were recorded by States.

FORTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

First session Forty-third Congress, convened December 1, 1873. The RECORD shows the roll call was made by States.
Second session Forty-third Congress, convened December 7, 1874. The RECORD says the—

Roll call was made by States.

FORTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

First session Forty-fourth Congress, convened December 6, 1875. The Journal shows that—

Edward McPherson, the Clerk of House of Representatives, proceeded to call the roll of members by States.

Second session Forty-fourth Congress, convened December 4, 1876. The RECORD shows—

The roll was called by States.

FORTY-FIFTH CONGRESS.

First session Forty-fifth Congress convened October 15, 1877. The RECORD says:

George M. Adams, Clerk of the House, called the roll of members by States.

Second session Forty-fifth Congress convened December 3, 1877. The RECORD shows that the roll was called by States.
Third session of Forty-fifth Congress convened December 2, 1878. The RECORD shows that the roll was called by States.

FORTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

First session Forty-sixth Congress convened March 18, 1879. The RECORD shows that the roll was called by States.
Second session Forty-sixth Congress convened December 1, 1879. The RECORD shows the roll was called by States.
The third session of the Forty-sixth Congress convened December 6, 1880. The RECORD shows that the roll was called by States.

FORTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

First session Forty-seventh Congress convened December 5, 1881. The RECORD shows that the roll was called by States.

It will be remembered that the second session of the Forty-fifty and Forty-sixth Congresses succeeded extra sessions, making the situation like the present in those cases. At the opening of the second session of the Forty-seventh Congress, December 4, 1882, the Speaker said:

In accordance with the usual course, the Clerk is directed to call the roll of members by States.

FORTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

First session Forty-eighth Congress convened December 3, 1883. The RECORD shows the roll of members was called by States.
Second session Forty-eighth Congress convened December 1, 1884. The RECORD shows the roll was called by States.

FORTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

First session Forty-ninth Congress convened December 7, 1885. The Journal shows that—

The Clerk was ordered to proceed to call the roll of members by States.

The second session Forty-ninth Congress convened December 6, 1886. The RECORD shows the roll was called by States.

FIFTIETH CONGRESS.

First session Fiftieth Congress convened December 5, 1887. The RECORD shows the House was called by States.
Second session Fiftieth Congress convened December 3, 1888. The RECORD simply shows the roll was called by States.

FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

First session Fifty-first Congress convened December 2, 1889. The Journal says:

The Clerk will call the roll by States.

Second session Fifty-first Congress convened December 1, 1890. The RECORD shows that—

The Speaker directed the roll be called.
It was called accordingly by States.

FIFTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

First session Fifty-second Congress convened December 7, 1891. The RECORD shows the roll was called by States.
Second session Fifty-second Congress convened December 5, 1892. The RECORD shows that the names of members were called by States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair of course must enforce the rules as the House has made them. The rules provide in clause 1 of Rule III:

The Clerk shall at the commencement of the first session of each Congress call the members to order, proceed to call the roll of members by States in alphabetical order, etc.

The only provision in the rules for calls of the roll after the House has been organized is to be found in clause 1 of Rule XV:

Upon every roll call the names of the members shall be called alphabetically.

When this House met yesterday it was thoroughly organized, and business was resumed under the rules of the House precisely as though there had been no adjournment. Rule XXVII provides that—

All business before committees of the House at the end of one session shall be resumed at the commencement of the next session of the same Congress in the same manner as if no adjournment had taken place.

The Chair can not see how, under the rules, he could direct the roll to be called in any other way than alphabetically. The gentleman from Alabama calls attention to the fact (and of course the Chair accepts his statement) that heretofore on the convening of Congress, even at a second session, the practice has been to call the roll by States. The Chair does not know, of course, why that was done; there was no rule requiring or authorizing it. The present rules provide, as the Chair has stated, that all roll calls, except at the organization of a Congress, shall be alphabetical. The Chair can not see that any right of anyone can possibly be affected injuriously.

The gentleman has spoken of a quorum of States; but there might be a quorum of the House organized to do business, and though half a dozen States might not have a single Representative present, that quorum of members could go on and transact business. There is not required a majority of the States to constitute a querum for the transaction of business, but a majority of the members.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. In the Senate prior to the war it was the universal custom to require the presence of a quorum of States.

The SPEAKER. The Constitution of the United States provides that a majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business; and no rule or practice can alter that provision.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I simply made the point that the practice has been invariable on this point during fifty-two Congresses.

I think it is just as important to call the roll by States ading pro-

beginning of a second and third session as it is at the beginning of a first session.

I do not think that Rule XV has any application to this question. The language of the rule is:

Upon every roll call.

If this was strictly construed it would apply to and control and contradict Rule III.

I think the construction that has been placed upon this question at the convening of one hundred and fourteen sessions of Congress, from 1789 to the present day, ought to be adhered to. I am thoroughly in favor of recognizing States in their individuality in every possible phase and form of legislation.

The autonomy of States is the sheet anchor of American liberty. It should be recognized, revered, and respected by Congress, and the people should be impressed with its importance for the same reason that soldiers and patriots are taught to revere and respect the flag of our country.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold that the roll has been properly called.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether this revived apprehension of the encroachments of "centralized power" has been suggested by the extraordinary character of the Executive message read at the desk here yesterday. [Laughter.]

BANKRUPTCY.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bankruptcy bill.

Mr. OATES. Pending that motion I desire to ask the consent of the House to an agreement which has been made among members of the Committee on the Judiciary as to limiting the time for general debate on this bill. Seven days have already been consumed in this debate; and we have agreed among ourselves that the additional time be limited to six and a half hours, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] shall control four hours and I the remainder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama to limit debate in the manner he has indicated?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. OATES. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that he has already had his time, and his colleague has agreed to this arrangement. The gentleman himself had an extension of his time.

Mr. BAILEY. It can be done by a motion.

Mr. OATES. Then I move that all general debate be limited to six hours and a half.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, four hours will be assigned to the gentlemen in opposition to the bill and two and a half to those in favor of it.

The motion of Mr. OATES, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, was then agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 139) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on this bill has been limited to six hours and a half; and under the agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] controls four hours of the time in opposition, and the gentleman from Alabama the remaining two hours and a half in favor of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill is not one of the things that the people of this country are clamoring for at this particular time. It occurs to me that it is not designed to fill the aching void of any long felt want. The advocates of this bill have mainly contended for its passage on the idea that some such measure was necessary to "restore confidence" and create a "basis for credit." I have failed to learn, if it be a truth in political economy, that men are made honest by legislation. The percentage of men who meet their obligations on account of a fear of the law is a very small one. The man who is determined to be a rascal and to beat his creditors is not going to be deterred, in any very large measure, by any statute that you may enact. The history of all bankrupt laws proves this, if it proves anything.

The Clerk

Sena'am one of those, Mr. Chairman, who believe, that one of the best things that Government can do, is to let the people alone. In the recent repeal of the Federal election laws, and all their concomitants of fraud and force, we have repudiated that monstrous heresy in a free government of trying to put a "bayonet behind every ballot," and have emphasized the grand declaration which Bulwer places in the mouth of Cardinal Richelieu, "Take away the sword; states can be saved without it."

The deliberate proposition to pass through the American Congress, a measure like that now before the House, is but another evidence of that vicious tendency of the times towards paternalism and centralization of power, and the constant effort to thrust the officious hand of law into all the affairs of human life, and supervise and regulate the business and conduct of men, as if they were mere machines, incapable of honest and intelligent action of their own. I undertake, sir, deliberately to assert, that *too much law and too little justice*, is the crying evil of the age; and to enact a law like this, is simply to pile another stone upon that "Cæsar's column" whose towering height already shadows more than half the world.

The most beneficent purpose for which State and national legislatures can now assemble, is not for the enactment of new laws, but for the repeal or modification of laws already enacted.

As I understand it, sir, the fundamental axiom—the great cardinal principle of democracy is, that the individual is king in his natural rights, and that society and government is based upon the surrender of only so much of these rights as is necessary to protect public morality, provide for the general welfare and promote the common good; that beyond the scope of that surrender, the functions of government legitimately do not extend, but that within that scope its powers are supreme and that every individual owes allegiance to the State: That as with the individual to the State, so with the State to the nation, the sovereignty of the State being based upon the surrender of certain rights of the individual, and the supremacy of the National Government being based upon the surrender of certain rights of the States.

This then, Mr. Chairman, I take to be democracy pure and undefiled: that the individual, the State, and the nation have each its own peculiar rights and its own peculiar province, beyond which neither of the others may justly go, and that no outside power should ever be permitted to interfere with or shape the conduct or policy of either—administrative, legislative, political, governmental, *financial*, or otherwise. That, sir, is democracy! That, sir, is true Americanism upon the best, the broadest and the highest plane!

As to the particular bill now under consideration, with a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee, I trust I can be permitted to say with no impropriety that I can not believe that a majority of the members of that committee are in favor of its passage. I was not able, sir, to be present when it was up before the Judiciary Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member.

Mr. OATES. Just there, will my colleague on the committee allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. TERRY. Certainly, sir.

Mr. OATES. The votes of the members of the committee who were present at the time the bill was ordered to be reported were all in its favor, save two. There was not a full attendance, but there was a quorum present.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman, perhaps, did not comprehend exactly the statement that I made.

Mr. OATES. I admit this, and I wish to state it just here: My friend was not present. There was an understanding among the members of the committee present, as this bill substantially in its present form had been considered in the last Congress by the full committee for three months, that it was unnecessary to consume so much time as it would require to read the bill and consider every section and paragraph; and wherever an amendment has been put and voted down, if the member offering it indicated a disposition to have it passed in the House, the committee reached an agreement that if the bill were reported here, while no considerable number of members desired the passage of it precisely in the form in which it was, or if they wanted to amend it, I, acting as chairman of the committee at the time and being in charge of the bill, and it being understood that I would have charge of it on the floor of the House—I stated to the committee that if they thus reported it and we came to consider it under the five-minute rule, I would see to it that they all had ample opportunity to offer amendments and be heard upon them in the House, and in that way we could determine whether the House wanted to pass the bill or not.

Mr. TERRY. I do not, for an instant, doubt the correctness of the statement made by my honorable colleague of the committee on that point; but this bill comes here, apparently, as the bill favored by a majority of the Judiciary Committee; and my statement was simply this, Mr. Chairman, that I can not be-

lieve that a majority of the members of that Judiciary Committee favor the passage of this bill. I do not believe they do.

I will further state, Mr. Chairman, and I think it proper that I should, that during the last Congress certain organizations in my district transmitted to me resolutions in favor of the Torrey bankrupt bill. And I will take occasion now to say that for the gentlemen, composing those organizations, I entertain feelings of the most profound regard; but I am satisfied that they would not have adopted those resolutions after a careful consideration of the many objectionable features of this bill.

I can not hope, sir, in the time that I shall occupy, to elaborate many of the objectionable features that it presents, but I shall endeavor, if I can get the attention of the House, to call attention to a few of them at least, and first to the "acts of bankruptcy" or acts for which a person may be "adjudged a bankrupt."

Now, with regard to these, Mr. Chairman, it is first to be observed that the test provided in the bill is not as to what may be the debtor's condition or conduct immediately prior to the time proceedings are commenced against him. He may be solvent then and his conduct honest in every particular; but if he had formerly concealed himself, departed or remained away from his place of business, residence or domicile, etc., although he may have returned, in perfect good faith; or if he had failed for thirty days, while insolvent, to secure the release of property levied upon under process of law, for $500, though he may afterwards have procured such release; or if he may at one time have made a transfer of any of his property with intent to defeat his creditors, though he may have repented of such purpose and obtained a reconveyance; or, if at one time he had "made, while insolvent, a transfer of any of his property, etc., for the purpose of giving a preference," though he may have rehabilitated himself. Nevertheless, notwithstanding all this, if, *six months before any petition is filed against him*, he has done any of these things, his right to have dominion of and manage and control his own property and business could, under the express provisions of this bill, be swept away, and the bar sinister of "bankrupt" be burned upon the shield of his reputation forever!

Is that just? Is that humane? Is it right between man and man, and can the legislative policy of this great Government, of the greatest civilized nation upon the earth, tolerate the enactment of such a law for the oppression of its citizens?

And yet, Mr. Chairman, just such proceedings are authorized under this bill—the great "olive branch" and "offering of peace" that a very large and eminently respectable portion of the creditor classes of this country are holding out to their unfortunate debtors.

In view of just such monstrous propositions, that are so often paraded as the very "essence of true benevolence," is it any wonder, sir, that it is rapidly becoming a saying in this country "God help the rich; the poor can beg."

Let us examine this feature of the bill a little further, and we find that it absolutely makes no difference what may be a man's financial condition or standing *at the time he is proceeded against*, if six months before that, his property could not be sold for enough *to pay all his debts*, his property can all be swept away from him and into a court of bankruptcy, all the same as if he was then insolvent or then engaged in acts of dishonesty or fraud. But that is not all. Ah, sir, it is but the beginning. If at any time within six months before, and whilst he could not help himself, he "failed for thirty days to secure a release of any property levied upon under process of law," even though that process may have been an attachment wrongfully sued out; or if twelve months before, he had made, however honestly, "an assignment for the benefit of his creditors," or if within six months prior, and whilst he could not help himself, a number of executions, aggregating $500, had been sued out against him from a lot of little J. P. courts, and finding no personal property, *at that time*, outside of exemptions, had been returned *nulla bona*, under the operations of this bill, a debtor could be deprived of the control and management of his property and business and adjudged a bankrupt, *although perfectly solvent* at the time the adjudication is made.

But outrageous, sir, as are these features of the bill, they are merciful indeed when compared to that other under which a debtor may be declared a bankrupt if at any time within six months before the petition is filed against him he made any kind of a gift or pledge or transfer, or turned over even a dollar's worth of his property by way of preference, however honest or however meritorious may have been its moving cause.

Let us look at that for a moment. It may have been some small requital due some poor neighbor who stood by him in the darkest hours of his life—who had put up his own last dollar to enable him to procure medicine or medical attention for a dying child, or to help him to put away, with decent burial in the bosom of mother earth, the lifeless form of the wife that God had given him; and yet for such an act as that, praiseworthy as it may have been in the eyes of all honest and Christian men, and sanctioned as it was and is by the great common law of the land and by the uses and traditions of the English-speaking race for more than five hundred years of its glorious history—for such an act as that, Mr. Chairman—done *six months before a petition in bankruptcy was even thought of*, that debtor, no matter what may have been his circumstances at the time of the petition, is, by the express provisions of this bill, made liable to be declared a bankrupt, and not only by a district judge, but even by the contemptible edict of a *petty referee*, and to have all his property swept away, consumed in litigation, attorneys' fees and costs, and his standing and reputation as a business man blackened and destroyed forever!

Such, Mr. Chairman, are some of the potentialities of the provisions of this most remarkable measure. Its benign features are nowhere visible to the naked eye; and yet, sir, in some mysterious way they have so manifested themselves to the members who reported it, that they have not been content to laud its virtues in simple prose, but have invoked the language of the immortal Shakespeare to proclaim in behalf of its inscrutable beneficence that

> The quality of mercy is not strain'd;
> It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for what this bill denominates the "Acts of Bankruptcy," for which an American citizen is to be put upon trial, and if found guilty of *any one of them*, to have his property taken away from him at one fell swoop and turned over to a horde of petty Federal officials, trustees, referees, clerks, pettifoggers, deputy marshals, *et id omne genus*, composing too often that delectable pack that "bark in the kennels of justice."

We now come to the tribunal before which he is to be tried, and here we find that an unfortunate debtor who has been pounced upon by a proceeding in bankruptcy, may be dragged a hundred miles from his home—called up before a Federal judge in some distant city—possibly to be turned over for trial before some petty referee—not even tried before the majesty which enrobes itself in the ermine of the Federal judiciary—turned over to the mercies of a *petty referee*—to try the dearest rights of an American citizen—and that petty referee, some miserable creature owned, perhaps body and soul, by the creditors or their attorneys—there, before *such a tribunal*, to be pulled and hauled around, vexed, harassed, browbeaten, perchance *kept a prisoner* for days, weeks, and months, "in the custody of a deputy marshal!" (So reads the law.)—His ready money all spent, his property all consumed or wasted, his business all broken up, and, if acquitted of the charge brought against him, *no bond*, absolutely, sir, NO BOND, upon which to claim indemnity for the outrages and injuries inflicted upon him!

If he demands a jury trial, even that may be denied him. Even a *jury trial may be denied* him, unless he happens to be lucky enough to have filed a written application for it within ten days—the brief time allowed him to plead—less time, sir, or not any more time, than is allowed a man to plead in a justice's court in Arkansas when sued for the ownership of a flea-bitten mule. [Laughter.] What show, think you, Mr. Chairman, would the average debtor have when once within the clutch of such proceedings as these? Stripped of the dearest right of an American citizen—a right guaranteed him not only by the Constitution and laws of the United States but by the constitution and the laws of every civilized nation on earth—tricked out of such a right as that, unless he has been lucky enough, *within ten days* of the time that the summons is made returnable, to file his written application for a jury trial.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman how far a man might be taken under this proposed law in the State of Texas to answer for his debts? Might he not be taken 500 miles?

Mr. TERRY. Yes, sir. "But," say the advocates of this measure, "a debtor can only be adjudged a bankrupt upon an *impartial trial*." But what does the bare phraseology of that sentence amount to when you come to examine the machinery provided in the bill itself? What boots an empty phrase from which all the balance of the bill is a complete departure? And what would an "impartial trial" itself amount to when, by the very terms of the bill itself, the bare proof of the facts to which I have before referred, is made *sufficient in law to have him declared a bankrupt?* A conscientious jury of his own neighbors, sworn to enforce the law, would be compelled to find against him, and a jerked-up jury specially summoned for the trial, as the bill provides, could readily be formed to decide against him, no matter what the proof.

But even the proof itself, upon which some vital point may turn, may consist of "certified copies of proceedings before a referee," or "papers issued by a referee"—which the bill provides shall be "admitted as evidence," with the same "binding

force and effect as records of district courts of the United States." Not only is such machinery as that provided to try the property rights of an American citizen, but, when it comes to any controversy arising in the settlement of the estate, a party can absolutely be *arbitrated out of his rights* by three arbitrators, one appointed by the trustee and another by the referee! What show would a fellow have before a board with *two-thirds of it organized against him?* The bill does not even require that the arbitrators shall be sworn!

Why, sir, in my State a board like that *would not be allowed to sit as appraisers on a heifer calf!* [Laughter.] I do not wonder, sir, at the just indignation of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY], who in discussing this bill declared that in his State, when a gang of men set out to accomplish jobs like that which this bill provides for, they "took a crowbar and a jimmy."

Advocates of this measure, industriously seeking to point out some redeeming feature, have constantly reiterated that it can not affect the farmer; that it expressly provides that he can not be adjudged a bankrupt against his will. But let no man deceive himself, or be deceived by any such talk as that. If the farmer owes the town or country merchant, or has given him a mortgage, this bill provides the machinery for the enforcement of that debt, and the foreclosure of that mortgage, and if this bill is enacted into law the farmers all over this land may soon find themselves face to face with this situation: that whilst their local merchant, or their home creditor, with whom they have dealt and whose custom it has been to carry them over and grant them indulgences and extension of time, and may still be willing to do so, he will be himself in a bankrupt court, stripped of all power to grant a minute more of time, and an officer of the bankrupt court will be pouncing down upon the farmers themselves for the immediate payment of all such debts and the sale of their property under mortgage. I take it, sir, to be no exaggeration to say that that, perhaps, is one of the very purposes of this bill. They want to get hold of those mortgages.

In view, then, Mr. Chairman, of all these matters of weighty moment, I ask, sir, can this House afford to pass this bill? Tell me, in all the history of this country, in all the course of its legislation for more than one hundred years, when was it that a Democratic Congress ever enacted a bankrupt law?

Mr. BLAND. Does not this bill propose to exempt farmers from the operation of its provisions?

Mr. TERRY. It provides that they can not be adjudged bankrupt against their will; that is the substance of the provision.

Mr. BLAND. Is not that a confession that it would be an injustice to impose the provisions of this bill upon farmers?

Mr. TERRY. Certainly.

Mr. BLAND. Why, then, can it be just to anybody else?

Mr. TERRY. I will leave that question to be answered by those gentlemen who in some mysterious way, as I have already stated, have been able to see the beneficent features of this bill which are not visible to the naked eye.

Certainly if there ever was a time for the passage of a bankrupt law the present is not such a time. Going back a moment in regard to bankrupt laws formerly passed by the Congress of the United States, gentlemen on the other side have quoted the Constitution as if its provisions were mandatory, requiring us to pass a bankrupt law. There was a law of this kind passed in 1800. It was not a Democratic measure; neither was the bankrupt act of 1841 or the bankrupt act of 1867. None of these were passed by a Democratic Congress. The act of 1800 was a mere temporary act, limited in its duration to five years; and its workings were such that there arose from the entire country a clamor against it; and it was repealed within a short time after its passage.

The next act of this kind was the act of 1841. It was intended to be a permanent law, but it was absolutely repealed by the very same Congress that enacted it. When members went home and touched their bases, and heard how the people were "walking and talking," they came back and repealed that act.

In regard to the act of 1867—if there ever was a time when a bankrupt law might seem justifiable, it was at the time of the passage of that act. But what lawyer does not remember the crimes, the perjuries, the vices, the outrages, the oppressions that sprang up under the act of 1867? I can not do better in pursuing this line of discussion than to quote from the message of President Grant, in reference to the act of 1867. He said:

> Careful and prudent men very often become involved in debt in the transaction of their business, and though they may possess ample property, if it could be made available for the purpose to meet all their liabilities, yet on account of the extraordinary scarcity of money they may be unable to meet their pecuniary obligations as they become due, in consequence of which they are liable to be frustrated in their business by proceedings in bankruptcy at the instance of unrelenting creditors.
>
> People now are so easily alarmed as to monetary matters that the mere filing of a petition in bankruptcy by an unfriendly creditor will necessarily embarrass and oftentimes accomplish the financial ruin of a responsible business man. Those who otherwise might make lawful and just arrangements to relieve themselves from difficulties produced by the present stringency in money, are prevented by their constant exposures to attack and disappointment by proceedings against them in bankruptcy, and beside the law is made use of in many cases by obdurate creditors to frighten or force debtors into a compliance with their wishes and into acts of injustice to other creditors and to themselves.

Why, sir, in those words of that great soldier, he seemed, as it were, with a vision as clear and sweeping as that with which he ever looked forward to formulate his plans of battle, to pierce through the gathering mists of intervening years, down to the very time in which we to-day move and act, and to be speaking of just such a condition of things as to-day confronts the American people. Under such conditions that soldier President believed that a bankrupt law, less objectionable than the measure now before us, was a thing to be reprobated by the American people.

Yes, sir, at a time like this, when so lately there has been heard from ocean to ocean the crash of falling values, to say nothing of what may be yet to come as the SHADOW OF THE YELLOW STANDARD shall continue to advance—to say nothing of what may be yet to come—I hope it may not come—is this a time for us to think of passing a bankrupt bill?

A long course of vicious legislation running through more than a quarter of a century of this nation's history has bred and battened a horde of giant monopolies, trusts, and combinations that are now battening upon the lifeblood of the American people. And to pass a law like this at the present time would be like rendering the people paupers by legislation and then by one general act passing a law to put them into the hands of a receiver.

Ah, sir! mark well my words; it is no time to be flying kites when there is lightning in the air! This is no time for a Democratic Congress to be passing a bankrupt law. It is a time when debtors all over this land are struggling to maintain their footing, and are compelled to rely upon the kindly aid of their neighbors and their friends. At such a period, when they are compelled to rely upon such neighborly offices, is no time to be depriving their neighbors of the right to extend them a reasonable indulgence; and that, sir, would be one of the direct effects of this bill. This is no time, sir, for a Democratic Congress to be passing a bankruptcy bill that imposes pains and penalties and forfeitures upon the requital of such indulgences.

The people, sir, have demanded no such legislation at our hands. There are other things they have demanded at our hands. They have demanded that we wipe out all legislation in the interest of particular classes and inaugurate legislation in the interest of the masses. They have restored the Democratic party to power in every branch of this Government. They have commissioned it to go forward in the pathway of reform of the existing abuses. I repeat then, sir, that there are other things which have been demanded at the hands of Congress. For the first time in more than a quarter of a century the Democratic party has been placed in power in every branch of the Government—commissioned by th epeople with a high and a holy duty. They have commanded it to go forward, with a purpose as national as the flag and a policy as broad as the bounds of the great Republic, and restore this Government to the pure principles upon which the fathers founded it.

What grander commission could be confided to any party, or to any band of freemen than to restore this Government to the principles upon which our forefathers founded it. Why, sir, when administered according to those principles, it is the grandest Government that God's sun in all its course ever yet shone upon. No grander, purer principles were ever formulated into a plan of human government, and when administered, Mr. Chairman, according to these principles, it stands forth the one unrivaled conception that American genius has added to the master works of man. Lofty in its conception, pure in its design, majestic in its proportions, massive in its strength, it stands upon the very summit of human achievement, the Parthenon of unequaled glory.

Fraternity is its broad foundation and justice its cornerstone—each pillar a sovereign State, its arch the Federal compact and its keystone the Constitution. And, Mr. Chairman, upon the very front of the keystone of the arch, in order that all the generations that might come after may read and understand the purpose of its existence and the object of its creation—upon the very front of the keystone of the arch, in the preamble of the Constitution itself, is written the object and purpose of its creation. And, sir, one of the first of all the objects there enumerated is to "establish justice."

Read you and consider this bill and answer for yourselves whether it is calculated to establish amongst the American people that justice for which our fathers did lay so broad, so deep, so strong thefoundations of the great Republic. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield twenty minutes additional time to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY then resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

Mr. OATES. I move that the committee rise, Mr. Chairman, temporarily.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and Mr. MCMILLIN took the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a letter from the governor of the State of Illinois was presented to the House this morning by the Speaker, and laid on the table. I ask unanimous consent to take the letter from the table and have it read for the purpose of offering a resolution in reference to the matter to which the letter refers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the letter, after which the resolution will be read, and the Chair will then ask if there be objection to its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Springfield, December 2, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor, as well as the pleasure, of advising you that in pursuance of an invitation extended to the States by authority of Congress, the Legislature of the State of Illinois at its last session caused Mr. Leonard Volk, a distinguished American sculptor, to make a heroic statue in bronze of Gen. James Shields, one of Illinois' most distinguished warriors and statesmen. The same has been placed in position in Statuary Hall at Washington, and will be unveiled on December 6, of this year, at the hour of 2 p. m.

I respectfully invite your friendly coöperation. I have advised the President and the President of the Senate.

Very respectfully,

JOHN P. ALTGELD, *Governor.*

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the resolution which the gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to consider at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Wednesday, the 6th day of December, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon be designated and set apart for the consideration of the following concurrent resolutions:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to the governor, and through him to the people of the State of Illinois, for the statue of Gen. James Shields, whose name is so honorably identified with the history of the State and of the United States;

Resolved, That this statue is accepted in the name of the United States, and is assigned a place in the old hall of the House of Representatives, already set apart by act of Congress for the statues of eminent citizens; and that a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of Illinois.

There being no objection, the resolutions were considered and agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SPRINGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

Mr. OATES. I move that the committee resume its sitting.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OATES. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LAYTON].

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, there can be no question as to the power of Congress to pass the bill now under consideration, for section 8 of the Constitution provides (among other things):

The Congress shall have power * * * to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

But it does not follow as a matter of course, Mr. Chairman, nor would I so maintain for a moment, that simply because our fathers saw proper to give Congress this power that therefore it must necessarily be exercised. In fact, although this provision of the Constitution has been in full force and effect for a hundred and six years, we have had bankruptcy laws on our statute books but about eighteen years in the aggregate—less than one-sixth of the period of time covered by the Constitution.

As I construe it many of the provisions of this great instrument are and were so intended to be, merely directory in their character, to be adopted, exercised, and enforced, permanently in most cases, but temporarily in others, as the exigencies and circumstances of the times might warrant and demand.

Mr. Chairman, while the fact just stated, that Congress has heretofore exercised its authority to enact and enforce bankruptcy legislation but a small portion of the time since the formation of the Government is a somewhat significant fact, and a strong argument perhaps that such legislation has not been deemed necessary for the welfare of the people, yet it is not in my judgment by any means conclusive, for it is conceded on all hands, as I understand, that the various laws heretofore enacted on this subject (three in number) were very crude, imperfect, and oppressive in their provisions and operations, so that instead of affording the relief intended, by the spirit of the Constitution at least, they became burdensome, onerous, and offensive.

Instead of affording the honest insolvent debtor a prompt, speedy, and fair distribution of his assets among his creditors as far as they would reach, and an honorable discharge from the unpaid balance of his indebtedness, so that he might thereafter start anew in life, these various laws seemed to provide a machine, a method by which the unfortunate bankrupt's property was eaten up in costs and expenses pertaining to the administration of his estate, and hence their speedy repeal after but brief trials.

Nor does it follow, in my humble judgment, that because Congress has failed thus often heretofore to adopt good, practical, satisfactory laws on this subject that none can be or should be enacted now.

By reason of the fact that by this same Constitution the States are prohibited from adopting laws impairing the obligation of contracts it is absolutely necessary that Congress should act in order to accomplish one of the great objects and purposes of that section of the Constitution first quoted by me, viz: The discharge of all honest insolvent debtors from all fair obligations.

Mr. Chairman, this should be the first and primary purpose of all national bankruptcy legislation. It may be argued—in fact, it has been said upon this floor by some of the able gentlemen who have preceded me in opposition to this bill—that the several States have power to grant this discharge as to all domestic or local indebtedness. So they have; but even if they exercise the power, which has been done but infrequently, if I mistake not, this would afford but a partial and poor relief in this regard at best; for in the first place, as a general rule, perhaps, a portion of the indebtedness, and frequently the greater part of it, is to parties residing outside of the particular State in which the debtor resides. And in the second place, it is the debtor's especial desire in nearly every instance, and very naturally, too, to be relieved, forever released, from this distant foreign indebtedness, if you please, rather than of that in his own neighborhood, perhaps to his immediate friends and neighbors.

The second object and purpose of a wise bankrupt bill, and of no less importance than the first, should be the fair, economical, prompt, and equitable distribution of the bankrupt's estate among all his creditors. And in my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman, this also can be accomplished much better by uniform national legislation rather than by the various and oft conflicting, inconsistent, and ever-changing laws of forty-four States. In truth and in fact every business man—substantially every business man who will be affected by this bill should it become a law—is both a debtor and a creditor every day of his active business life. They are inseparable. We should never forget while considering this question that in an active business life, pertaining especially to merchants and traders, every debtor is more or less a creditor, and every creditor is more or less a debtor. And hence whatever law will justly and fairly and without discrimination benefit the creditor will *per se* as a rule benefit the debtor, and *vice versa*.

And firmly believing that this bill, if amended in certain particulars, a part of which I will indicate before I take my seat, will be in the nature of a benefactor to both of these classes, I shall vote for it.

I say if amended in certain particulars, because, Mr. Chairman, I betray no secret of our committee or violate no rule of the House when I say that it was expressly understood and agreed at the time this bill was reported to the House that in its present form it did not meet with the approval of a large portion of the committee. In fact, it was conceded, as I understood it, by a large number of the committee that the bill was faulty in several minor respects at least, and hence that ample time should be secured and had for its careful consideration in the House, and that each member of the committee especially should be permitted to offer such amendments as he might desire and deem necessary to perfect the bill before being put on its final passage.

Some of the committee, it is true, as has already been stated on the floor here during this debate, were opposed to all that portion of the bill relating to involuntary bankruptcy, and but one or two of the committee, as I understood, being opposed to a bankrupt law *in toto*. Hence, while not desiring or intending to censure or criticise any of my learned colleagues on the committee, I can not refrain from expressing my surprise at their general opposition to the bill, seemingly in whole and in part. In accordance with that understanding the friends of this measure, or rather, perhaps, the friends of good bankruptcy legislation, a majority of the committee, invite a free, full, and fair

discussion and the adoption of any and all amendments necessary to make it more fair, just, and perfect to secure the great end of this character of legislation, but protest against its defeat simply because it may be imperfect in its present form.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with close attention and much interest, as I always do in fact, to the able speech of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee in opposition to and in condemnation of this bill; and while I would not presume for a single moment to enter the arena of discussion with him upon any question, and while I have the greatest respect and esteem for him personally and recognize and admire his rugged honesty, integrity, and great ability, yet I am constrained to say, after carefully considering and weighing his argument, that in my humble judgment the greater portion of it must fall to the ground simply because it is based on false premises. To illustrate what I mean by this statement: In the first place he assumes that all United States district courts, district judges, or nearly all, are putrid (using his own strong language) with fraud, oppression, wrong, injustice, perjury, and tyranny. Now on behalf of these courts and judges in my own State (Ohio) I must most respectfully and yet emphatically enter my protest against any such assumption. On the contrary, from what little experience I have had before these courts and judges there, and speaking more especially from general information as to their character and their manner of doing business, I do not hesitate to say that I believe justice (which is the object of all law) and the administration thereof can be had, obtained, and maintained there just as readily and as completely as in our State courts.

It is true that I regret very much that we are compelled to resort to these courts in order to preserve the desired uniformity of the law—not because I have no confidence in the Federal judiciary in Ohio, but because, as well suggested by the distinguished gentleman himself, they are more inconvenient and expensive to all parties interested in the bankruptcy proceedings as a rule, by reason of the fact that the courts are held so far away from their respective places of abode; hence on the grounds of convenience and economy, if it were possible and consistent with the great objects and purposes of this bill, I would gladly have our State courts substituted for the Federal, and would gladly vote for some amendment to that effect.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman assumes as the basis of his strong argument that a bankruptcy bill should be enacted solely for the benefit of unfortunate debtors; and in the third place that all debtors are honest and all creditors are oppressors and tyrants. I undertake to modestly controvert both of these assumptions also, because, repeating what I have already said, a good bankrupt law enacted and enforced under and in the spirit of our Constitution authorizing it, should operate and is intended to operate in the interest of the creditor in the same degree as that of the debtor. And my somewhat active experience as a practitioner of the law for more than a score of years, especially as pertaining to our insolvent laws, warrants me in saying that it is certainly a violent presumption to say that all insolvent debtors are honest, and that hence they alone are entitled to our sympathy and favorable consideration and legislation. On the contrary, experience tells me that but few honest debtors need any legislation for their protection other than that afforded by the existing homestead exemption laws of the several States, because if honest they can in nearly all cases secure reasonable terms of adjustment, settlement, and release from their creditors. Hence it is as a rule, Mr. Chairman, the dishonest, the fraudulent debtor with whom we have to deal, to litigate in the technical sense of the word; and in order to do it successfully it becomes necessary to have more or less stringent laws pertaining especially to the preservation and fair and equitable distribution of his property.

To illustrate further what I mean in this connection, I here again repeat that "the object of all law," as I understand it, "is justice." "Justice," says Fortescue, "is the virtue, jurisprudence the science; justice the end, jurisprudence the means." In order to do justice the jurisprudence, the means, the law should compel an insolvent debtor, if he will not do it willingly, to distribute all his property—less his legal exemptions—among all his creditors pro rata, except such as are preferred by statute law. Unless he does this he perpetrates a moral if not a legal fraud upon his creditors. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the law should prohibit any debtor in contemplation of insolvency from preferring one creditor to another. Many of the States, perhaps all of them, permit certain preference by providing that certain debts or a certain class of debts, such as taxes, claims for manual labor, etc., shall have priority.

Many of them, in fact all of them, I believe, provide that an insolvent debtor may prefer himself by way of very liberal homestead-exemption laws. I would not disturb any of these. So far as I now know to the contrary, they are just, wise, and humane laws. Neither does their existence on the various statute books disturb or weaken the force of my argument against preferences. For both debtor and creditor are presumed to know the law, especially the statute law; and when they deal with each other on credit they are supposed to do it in the light and with the knowledge that by existing law certain debts enumerated in the statutes are preferred, and the insolvent debtor is entitled to certain exemptions, running from hundreds of dollars in value in some States to thousands of dollars in others.

But as to all other property of the debtor, Mr. Chairman, the creditor believes and has a right to believe that if his debtor shall meet with misfortune and become insolvent, he shall share pro rata in his assets; and he makes his purchases, sales, and contracts based on that just belief, and hence if, in the face of this, the debtor is permitted to prefer still other creditors or classes of creditors it works a great injustice upon this particular creditor and virtually robs him of his just dues to that extent.

By way of further illustration and to show the necessity of some national legislation, I will state that it has become the rule rather than the exception in my State, and doubtless in other States, for insolvent debtors who make assignments for the benefit of their creditors (under the various State insolvent laws) to prefer one or more creditors, not in the deed of assignment itself, for that is prohibited by law in Ohio, but by other written instruments and transfers immediately preceding the execution or filing of the deed of assignment. And in a great majority of cases these preferences are given to the immediate relatives of the assignor, his wife, father, son, brother, mother-in-law, or nephew, or all of them—the very persons on the strength of whose financial standing or credit, perhaps indirectly, if not directly the debtor obtained the goods or money from his creditor or increased the obligation. And yet, although all this may have been done but five minutes before the filing of the deed of assignment and to the extent of fully exhausting the insolvent's estate, our supreme court has recently held (see Cross vs. Carstens, 49 O. S. R., 548) that this may lawfully be done providing, of course, the debts thus preferred and secured were bona fide. It did, however, in its opinion, by inference if not directly, condemn the practice, and suggest that the remedy should be sought if it was desired, in the legislative branch—just what I am now advocating.

Without intending to reflect upon that able court I am constrained to exclaim (again borrowing from the distinguished gentleman from Texas) What a travesty upon justice and the spirit and intent of all insolvency laws is this! The debtor is virtually prohibited from preferring any creditor in his deed of assignment, and yet, strange to say, he may do so by executing and delivering to as many different preferred creditors one, two, three, four, five, six chattel or real estate mortgages all within one, two, three, four, five, or six minutes respectively, just prior to filing his deed of assignment, in many cases covering his entire stock of merchandise or assets. Under this bill, Mr. Chairman, no such abuse or evasion of the law can be accomplished. Hence for this reason especially I favor the bill, for it will not only prevent this daily wrong and injustice but will ultimately prove beneficial to the deserving debtor inasmuch as it will strengthen his credit by thus depriving him of the power to prefer one general creditor to the injury of another. It will prove not only beneficial to the debtor class but to all the consumers of the land, because they will then be enabled to make their various purchases at a certain per cent less, which additional amount the wise creditor now imposes, in fact is compelled to impose, in order to cover possible and probable losses that may be incurred by reason of these very common and unjust preferences.

Mr. Chairman, in a very recent assignment in my own village, made by gentlemen, partners engaged in the milling and grain business, the assignors, not content with preferring a certain large creditor, a national bank—an institution not especially beloved by the gentlemen from Texas, I believe—by giving it an additional mortgage on their real estate immediately before the assignment, proceeded also to give the bank at the same time a chattel mortgage upon all or substantially all of their personal property, the result of which was that some thirty, forty, or fifty farmers of the immediate vicinity, old customers and most of them poor men who had deposited their wheat with them for their winter's bread—as is customary in our country—in quantities ranging from perhaps 50 to 500 bushels each, were compelled to accept about 10 cents on the dollar for their wheat, while the rich bank was paid in full.

Which illustration, Mr. Chairman, and numerous others of an analogous character which have come under my own personal observation, goes to show that the great wholesale houses of this country are not the only creditors by any manner of means who are materially interested in the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in order to protect debtors from oppression, and afford him redress for any injury or damage he may wrong-

fully sustain in case a wrongful attempt is made to force him into bankruptcy, the creditor or creditors who institute the proceedings should be required to give a good and sufficient bond of indemnity. This is required in my State, and perhaps in all the States, in cases of attachment, and for like reasons it should be required here, and an amendment to the bill to this effect should be first adopted.

Section 8 should also be amended so as to provide that in case of the decease of the bankrupt after proceedings have been commenced his widow and children shall be entitled to the benefit of the set-offs and exemptions allowed them by the laws of the respective States in cases of administration of decedents' estates, as provided in the amendment, as I understand it, proposed by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

Mr. Chairman, after the adoption of these and some other minor amendments which my time will not permit me to now indicate, I shall vote for the bill, firmly believing that such legislation is necessary and that it will prove a blessing to all deserving debtors as well as the deserving creditors of this land. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. LAYTON having expired—

Mr. CAMPBELL said: Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. OATES yielded five minutes, and subsequently five minutes additional.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRETZ] ten minutes.

Mr. BRETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to every section of it. I am opposed to any substitute for it. I think it a pernicious bill in the interest of the great creditor class and against the best interest of the debtor class. I think it an oppressive measure which if enacted into law will do more real injury to the small creditors of the country merchant than any act Congress could pass. Three times in the last ninety-three years the same principles embodied in this bill have been enacted into law by Congress, and each time in an incredibly short period repudiated by the people; and yet in the face of that history we find the wholesale merchants and boards of trade attempting it again.

In 1800 a bankrupt law was passed by Congress embodying substantially the same principles as the bill now under consideration. Its provisions were tried by the country, and found so obnoxious that in less than three years it was repudiated by the country and repealed by Congress by an overwhelming majority. So injurious and oppressive was this law that it did not survive a single Administration.

Again, in 1841, the same law in principle was tried, and the same Congress which passed it was compelled to repeal it. Not content with two trials with adverse verdicts, its advocates again, in 1867, made a motion for a new trial and Congress granted it. But like its former twin brothers it was also rejected by the popular will of the people and in less than four years after its passage the House voted twice to repeal it but it was sustained by the Senate until 1878, when opposition to it became so fierce even the Senate was compelled to yield to the popular demand for its repeal, and accordingly in 1878 the bankrupt law of 1867 was wiped from the statute books, and again the seal of condemnation placed not only upon the law, but upon the principle of that kind of a law. So that in a period of ninety-three years, in three distinct generations, each with new and improved ideas, this same law was repudiated and rejected by the people. The bill in principle has had three distinct, fair trials by separate and impartial juries of three intelligent generations, and each time the same kind of a verdict was returned and our statutes purged of the law.

And here, again, Mr. Chairman, in the year 1893, well-nigh on to a fourth generation of people, the same old putrid carcass of a thrice-repudiated law is thrust before Congress. A fourth motion for a new trial is made by its friends, alleging the same causes upon which new trials were granted its friends three times heretofore. Although not one of the judges that granted the new trial in 1867, I was one of the jury that signed the verdict against it. And now, being one of the judges in this instance, I am to pass on a motion for a new trial on the same law in principle that I signed the verdict that repealed it. With no better light or sufficient reasons for the law now than then, it can easily be judged what my decision on the motion will be. Although almost a quarter of a century has passed since the repeal of the last bankrupt law, yet the country has by no means forgotten the oppressive and loathsome effects of that law. Lest some of the particulars of that ruthless bankrupt law of 1867 be forgotten, the friends of the proposed measure are reviving the memories of the past.

I am opposed to the bill because like all other bankrupt laws it is an attempt on the part of the wholesale dealers of the country to invoke the aid of a powerful government to collect their private debts off the small merchants and retail dealers of the country. It is an effort to secure a law whose effects will be to drag the small retail merchant of the country away from his home, often many hundred miles, and force him into a United States bankrupt court, if misfortune should overtake him and he could not meet a debt aggregating $500. I oppose a bankrupt law for the reason it furnishes the means for the hungry, idle hanger-on around courts to devour and consume the assets of the unfortunate country merchant or trader who has fallen into the clutches of a merciless wholesale dealer.

I oppose it because it drags the small creditors, often the farmers and laborers, of the small retail merchant, long distances from home into strange courts and indirectly compels them to employ lawyers and pay large fees to establish their little claim, and in the end get little or nothing on their claim. It often occurs that the greater number of creditors of a failing retail merchant are the farmers of the neighborhood who have sold him the little surplus of wheat, or corn, or pork, the only reward for a hard year's work, or it may be the wages of labor, or it may be that the merchant has sought and obtained the loan of small sums of money from his neighbors, as is often the case.

This bill if passed would force these men I have mentioned in a distant United States court, to establish their claim and wait the will and pleasure of some rapacious officer or officers after their greed for fees have been satisfied for his pro rata share of what is left. Mr. Chairman, there are some debts more binding in conscience than others, and I believe a failing merchant or trader ought to be permitted to prefer such creditors as in good conscience he feels most bound to pay. This bill denies him that right. This bill puts the poor man on an equal footing with the rich in the distribution of what is left of a bankrupt estate after all expenses of administration are paid, which means about all of the estate; but it also puts the small creditor at a disadvantage with the opulent creditor in this, that often after traveling expenses to and from court and lawyer fees and witness fees are paid, whatever amount is received in the final distribution has been consumed in expenses.

The farmer who has taken the risks of a blighted and failing crop by drought, winds, and floods, and managed to have a meager surplus at the end of the year, sells that surplus to the country merchant on credit, is now subjected to a double risk of getting little or nothing out of his claim by being forced into a bankrupt court to establish his claim and await what always is unfavorable and unsatisfactory results. The creditor of the failing debtor may be some poor widow woman, who despite all the hardships incident to her struggle for an existence has by close economy managed to have a small surplus product which if sold for cash would perhaps pay her tax. She must be subjected to a long wait through the slow process of a bankrupt court and in the meantime suffer perhaps because she can not collect her debt, and perhaps herself be sold out by the taxgatherer of the county.

This bill denies the debtor in such cases the right to prefer his debt to the widow. But, Mr. Chairman, aside from all the justly harsh criticisms that might be made of this bill or any other embodying its principles, I am opposed to the passage of any bankrupt law, at least at this time, because no considerable portion of this country is demanding or even asking Congress to pass such a law. Who is demanding the passage of this law? A few of the wholesale merchants of the country, boards of trade, and opulent corporations alone are asking for it. No laborer has asked for it. No labor union has knocked at the door of Congress for its passage. No farmer has been heard to cry out for the passage of such a law. No small country retail merchant is asking for it to enable him to compromise with his creditors and be discharged from the payment of an honest and just debt.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I have never heard of a single man in my district even suggest the idea of Congress passing a bankrupt law, much less demanding it. I have been in close touch with all my constituents ever since I have been in Congress and know something about what they want, I think, and I have the first word to hear from any constituent and the first letter to receive from anybody asking me to vote for such a law, or even counseling the propriety of passing such a law. No newspaper has ever published a single editorial or even thought it necessary to mention such a law, there being absolutely no demand for it anywhere in my district.

The people have not considered this matter. They have not discussed it. They have not had an opportunity to express an opinion on it at the polls and are unprepared to have thrust upon them at this time a law of such vital and far-reaching effects. Its provisions are not understood by any considerable portion of the people for whom we are to legislate. Those most affected by it understand least about it, and I am opposed to its

passage until there is some kind of a general request for it, and its principles and provisions are understood by the country. I seriously question the policy of Congress passing any law until it has been asked for more generally by the country and its principles thoroughly discussed by the press and people. I believe it bad policy to lay aside great measures demanded by the people or even delay them to consider this or any other bill not asked for by any great number of people and certainly not understood by them. The people generally know what they want and have the ability to make their wants known to their representatives. I shall vote against this bill in any form.

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. BRETZ having expired—

Mr. BAILEY yielded five minutes more.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] one hour.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Chairman, I shall oppose this bill. In doing so I shall make no captious objection, and shall impugn the motives of no man who favors the bill.

I have an abiding fear that members of this House who intend always to vote fairly will vote for this bill—those who do vote for it—without fully understanding it. No man can understand its many ingenious provisions at one or two readings, nor without careful study, and that will develop it into what may be denominated "a scheme."

The principle of bankruptcy is admitted to be a humane one. The bankrupt bill of 1867 was passed with the humane purpose, partly at least, of relieving the people of the South, who had been overwhelmed by misfortune. The voluntary provision is a humane one. It is the involuntary provisions of this bill to which I object.

Upon an examination of this document it will be found that there is little else in it than the involuntary clauses. It shows forth on every page that the author of the bill, Judge Torrey, had nothing else in his mind but the involuntary clauses.

On the second page of this bill the animus of it appears. One would naturally suppose, if the professions of its friends were candid, and in the interest of the debtors who have honestly failed, that the bill would commence by providing voluntary bankruptcy for them and add to that clauses authorizing involuntary bankruptcy. But the reverse is true. The main if not sole object seems to be to collect debts in an arbitrary manner. I quote from the bill:

A person against whom a petition has been filed shall include a person who has filed a voluntary petition.

It never occurred to the author to provide for a voluntary bankrupt; that was not in his mind nor was it his intention, but in the provision for involuntary bankruptcy he incidentally provides for the man who wants to go into bankruptcy. Here is his definition of the word bankrupt:

"Bankrupt" shall include a person against whom an involuntary petition or an application to set a composition aside or to revoke a discharge has been filed, or who has filed a voluntary petition.

The provisions are first these weapons for creditors, then a voluntary bankrupt is incidentally permitted to come in. To make this machine more effective, more powerful, and more easily wielded, nearly everything is to be done in a summary manner. First, they enlarge the powers of a court for this purpose. Now, I want to know from these learned lawyers, old and young, in what case except bankruptcy the powers of a court are enlarged to administer a particular law in favor of the plaintiff and to the detriment of the defendant—depriving him of rights guaranteed to him in other cases under general law?

This bill, full of cruel and oppressive provisions, enlarges the powers of the court to suit them. We have also a new dictionary here that supersedes Webster and Worcester, a sort of legal grammar, and it is proposed to enact what the English language shall mean. It provides that when a word is used in one tense, it may be used in any other tense, and mean the same thing.

"Court" shall mean the court of bankruptcy in which the proceedings are pending and may include the referee.

Further on in this bill it will become patent how much the referee is a part of the court.

The meaning of the word "insolvent" as defined by this bill has been very ably discussed. I intended to comment upon it at some length, but for the reason that it has been so ably dealt with by other gentlemen I pass over that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come within the hour which has been allowed me, and shall occupy less time if possible. I ask now that I may be permitted to insert in my remarks what I desire in the way of statistics, without reading them here, and to extend my remarks in the RECORD. It will save time.

Mr. BAILEY. There will be no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. There is already leave to everybody to print.

Mr. OATES. I did not understand the gentleman's request.

Mr. BAILEY. It is to print statistics in connection with his remarks.

Mr. OATES. Of course there is no objection to that.

Mr. STOCKDALE. As I believe this bill to be unphilantropic and unpatriotic, and a machine to oppress the people, I propose to examine its provisions critically.

Among the causes of bankruptcy are these: If he shall "fail for thirty days while insolvent to secure the release of any property levied upon under process of law for $500 or over, or if such property is to be sold under such process then until three days before the time fixed for such sale and until a petition is filed." I regard that as one of the most oppressive provisions, and one of the most urgent inducements to perjury that I have seen proposed for enactment into law and should never be granted a place on the national statute books. It was said by a lawyer of some ability in my State, at one time, that "an attaching creditor sometimes swears with great facility." About then there was an epidemic of attachments in the Federal courts, to the scandal and injury of good citizens.

The Federal judges, in many instances, disregarding the decisions of the State courts, construing State statutes, it seemed almost as if judges regarded it as a duty to restrain debtors while creditors would flay them, and agents of wholesale houses would come there and sign in a perfunctory way whatever would procure an attachment writ.

Now, suppose two creditors conspire, or one alone sues out an attachment in either Federal or State court, and levies on the debtor's property. That is almost sure to invite other attachments and his property is all levied on. How is he to procure its release until the trial comes on? His creditors have deprived him of the power to give a bond by taking away his property; his credit is ruined whether he is insolvent or solvent. The court in which his cases are to be tried may not sit for three or five months, and it is impossible for him to show that he is not insolvent, and equally impossible to show that he was not guilty of any fraud for want of trial. Then one or more of these creditors, who have sworn falsely, files his petition to declare the debtor a bankrupt, no matter that he may have been perfectly solvent, but he did not release that property in thirty days and consequently he is a bankrupt, however solvent he might have been when the attack was made upon him. Stripped of his property, he is not able to try the attachment suits, and he will never see that property more; for it has been seized, and property when seized by a bankruptcy court, so far as my observation and experience go, is in the same condition that my friend from Missouri said the gold eagle was when it got into the hands of a capitalist: "Farewell, vain world; I am going home." [Laughter.]

By this provision it is in the power of one corrupt man to put a debtor into bankruptcy whether he is a bankrupt or not. It is a most alluring invitation to false swearing, to fraud, to oppression, and if enacted into law would or ought to shame the jurisprudence of America. Or suppose a man gets out an execution and levies on all or most of the property of the debtor; suppose the levy is excessive or the property undervalued; the party must go into court in order to discharge that levy, or another party to the judgment may be primarily liable to pay it all; but this debtor can not avail himself of his remedy in thirty days. But in the meantime a petition may be filed, and he may be put into bankruptcy, although he might have discharged that execution probably upon a proper valuation of the property if he had a little more time. But this bill does not intend to give proper time. It was never intended to give the debtor any right or justice before the law. He is a criminal and a disgraced man from beginning to end.

"Made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors" is another act made a cause of bankruptcy by this bill. Half, if not all the States of this Union have a law that a man may assign for the benefit of his creditors. He may do that in perfect good faith, in more than half of the States of this Union, without any intention to defraud anybody, and yet here comes in this law and puts him into bankruptcy, although his property, as I have known it to be done, is enough to pay every dollar he owes. Some misfortune has overtaken a man in his business or in his family, or he may want to remove to another State to better his condition and not wait to convert his property; or he may want to accept a position with a good salary. He has not time to wind up his business, but he says "Here is my property, sufficient to pay all my debts." He makes an assignment to an assignee and gives him the power to sell and convert and pay those debts.

Mr. BOATNER. Will it interrupt the gentleman for me to ask him a question there?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Certainly not.

Mr. BOATNER. If a man finds himself in such a condition that it is necessary that he should make a transfer of his prop-

erty to an assignee for the benefit of his creditors, is it not right that the creditors should have some say as to who that assignee should be?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I know that is the opinion of most gentlemen supporting this bill.

Mr. BOATNER. I ask for your opinion.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I have been astonished to hear gentlemen, in whose judgment and patriotism I have the utmost confidence, argue on this bill as if the security of the creditor was the only matter to be considered in legislation of this sort and the debtor is a poor devil to be hunted down like a criminal. Now, I say, in answer to the gentleman's question, that when a debtor gives over property enough to pay his creditors; when he wants to wind up his business and go somewhere else, where he has an inducement in the shape of a large salary, and he says to the trustee, "Here is my property, take it, convert it, and pay my debts," what right is it of the creditors to say that they should have an opportunity to go in and gobble him up in a United States court, disgrace him, and hound him because he happens to be a debtor? It is his property, and he has the right to convert it in his own way into money to pay his debts and to have it done by his friend so that it will be honestly done and not wasted or sacrificed.

The oppression, not to speak of the tendency to corruption, of the power of the Federal courts, where men owing $500 were taken 200 to 500 miles from home to try their cases for that small amount, induced the Congress of the United States, to remedy the abuse and hardship it involved, to raise the jurisdiction to $2,000 as the minimum for which debtors could be taken into the Federal courts. This is a scheme to subvert and evade that law. It is a scheme to put all debtors into the Federal courts, where they can not afford to go, where they can not stand the expense of a trial, and make the United States courts again collecting agencies. A great lawyer once said, "The judge seemed to be a *guardian ad litem* for foreign creditors."

Who does not know that it is the disposition of the Federal judiciary to extend its power and to exert that power with an iron hand to override State courts; and I believe that the liberties of the people of America are more in danger from the Federal judiciary than from any other power. I have observed with anxiety that whenever legislation has been attempted or accomplished by Congress to curtail State rights and destroy State sovereignty, the Federal courts have been or were to be the machinery to circumscribe and restrain the rights and liberties of citizens and even exercise espionage over the ballot, the only weapon a freeman has for self-defense. If any party favoring a stronger form of government should remain in power long enough to enable the Chief Executive to appoint the judges from men who think as he desires them, and then put the power of the ballot in their hands, he will be so nearly a dictator that the temptation should not be placed in view of a strong, ambitious man.

It is not wonderful that people are a little chary of coming in contact with these bankruptcy courts. The administration of the bankruptcy law of 1867 will remain a disgrace until the records decay or are destroyed. I have here the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House in reference to certain transactions which took place in the State from which my colleague on the committee [Mr. BOATNER] comes. In the bankruptcy court of that State, held in the great city of New Orleans, the law of 1867, intended by Congress no doubt partly to relieve the Southern people after the war, was put into operation by the machinery set forth in this report. The campaign was inaugurated by this order, to wit:

Ordered, That E. E. Norton be, and he is hereby, appointed official assignee in bankruptcy of this court, to whom, upon an adjudication in bankruptcy, a surrender of all assets and estate shall be made in all cases; and he is hereby designated as the person to be appointed assignee in all cases where appointments of assignees are to be made, under section 13 of the act. And he shall be appointed "additional assignee" in all cases where the assignee elected by the creditors shall be approved by the judge, unless otherwise specially ordered.

Of this order the committee said:

It was manifestly the purpose of this order to force all bankrupt estates into the hands of Norton. Under its provisions, he took possession, immediately upon adjudication, of all assets and estate of bankrupts—real estate that was mortgaged for all or more than it was worth, as well as personal assets. By it he was appointed assignee in all cases under section 13 of the bankrupt act, in advance of any proceedings being filed without regard to circumstances or locality of the estate. And under its provisions, no matter whom the creditors might select as assignee, Norton was thrust upon them, willing or unwilling, and having, by virtue of his appointment as official assignee, already procured possession of the "assets and estate," he was able to control the entire management of such estates.

This extraordinary order is, in itself, entirely inconsistent with that care for the rights of debtor and creditor which must be expected from and required of the judicial officer having those rights in charge.

Pursuant to this order Norton became custodian in about 1,300 cases in bankruptcy. His charges were outrageously extortionate, and seem to have been generally framed to absorb the estate. In cases where a bond in pursuance of the law was required for him by the creditors, he charged 2½ per cent commission to the estate for filing his bond to secure his own official fidelity, in one case receiving $1,250 on this account alone.

In cases where real estate was mortgaged for its full value, he required from the parties interested the payment of large sums of money, varying from $500 to over $5,000, to secure the release of the property from the bankruptcy proceedings, all of which he kept by way of compensation for his services, in no case putting any part of it into the assets of the respective estates.

My friend [Mr. BOATNER] knows what became of the estates which went into the hands of Norton and Durell.

Mr. BOATNER. Is not the gentleman very well aware that this bill provides against the very kind of evil to which he is now referring, by directing that in all cases the creditors shall elect the assignee, and that no official assignee shall be appointed by the Federal court?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not desire too much of my time taken up by that sort of a speech. [Laughter.] I am talking history now.

Mr. BOATNER. Then the gentleman ought not to make reflections upon this bill which are not justified by its provisions, and if he undertakes to read history to us, he ought to read history that is appropriate.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not desire to do that, but I am reading history; does the gentleman deny it? I do not read these facts to make reflections on this bill in that particular, nor to read history that is inappropriate; I read it to show what has been the practice of bankrupt courts, and while this bill does avoid that particular opportunity of abuse, it has others that are worse, as I will presently point out and people should be wary of it. The fact that this bill withholds from the courts the powers they abused in 1867 is recognition by its supporters that there is danger to the people in these courts, and therefore these grants of powers should not be made. Now let us see what the Judiciary Committee further says. I quote as follows:

With reference to oppositions to the charges made in bankruptcy cases, Judge Durell made the following order:

"*Ordered*, That in all cases where an opposition to the fees of the clerk, marshal, register, and assignee is made, the matter be referred to one of the commissioners of the court for examination and report; that the party opposing shall first deposit with the clerk or the commissioner the sum of $50 to secure the costs that may be incurred by such reference, and in case the opposition be sustained the deposit shall be returned.

"It is further ordered that this order shall apply to the two cases, Nos. 1144 and 1172, referred on yesterday."

This order had the effect to prevent scrutiny into the charges referred to. It was an obstruction to justice in the matter of these charges.

The property involved in the proceedings in bankruptcy during the period since 1867 extended over the States of Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Tennessee, and amounted to over $3,000,000.

Again the committee said:

Norton made an arrangement with the auctioneers who made sales of bankrupt property, by virtue of which a division of the fees and charges of the auctioneers was made between them and Norton. Out of this Norton received, as is shown, more than $20,000.

These facts, while they indicate a state of most extraordinary administration in the office of assignee in bankruptcy, your committee could not trace directly to the knowledge of Judge Durell, although some testimony was given tending to show such knowledge.

All through this report of the committee are statements far more damaging than the one that I have just read. I will not stop to read them now, but will insert some of them in my remarks. Here are some extracts from the report.

Mr. Sanger was attorney of the creditors of Davis & Jackson, adjudged to be bankrupts. He proposed to have trustees elected under the law. In this connection he testified as follows, after stating that he had a power of attorney from Davis & Jackson:

Under that power of attorney I went to New Orleans, taking with me a power of attorney from Mr. Smith to act for him. Mr. Ellis also went to New Orleans. I had a power of attorney from all the creditors to vote, and also powers of attorney from Mr. Catlin and Mr. Levenson, two of the trustees, to represent them in any matters where it might be necessary. When I got to New Orleans and attended court on the day appointed for the meeting of creditors, presuming that everything was all right, I proceeded to vote for trustees, when I was stopped by Mr. Hughes.

I asked him what the matter was now. Said he, "You gentlemen have seen fit to take some action in this matter, but as I represent Mr Norton, I do not intend to have this meeting go on without his consent. You can not take these proceedings out of our hands in that way?" I said I thought the whole matter was arranged, that Mr. Ellis had told us that it was all right and that Mr. Ellis was there; but in fact Ellis had not come to that meeting; he had kept away, and the only one that appeared was Hughes. Hughes said no, that the meeting could not go on, because, in the first place, the commission had not been returned from New York. I said that thing was abandoned. "In the second place," said he, "Mr. Norton has not given his consent, and he is the custodian of the property here, and he will not give his consent," and the meeting was adjourned with no day fixed for it. Mr. Ellis had met me at Cincinnati, and had traveled from there to New Orleans with me, and had given me the assurance that everything was all right. I hunted him up, and asked him what this meant. He said he did not know exactly, but he supposed it was all right. I then went to Hughes and asked him what it meant. He said that meeting could not go on in that way. I said, "Did you see that we have agreed to pay certain expenses; if we can not agree to that we will leave it to the judge." "No," said he, "our fees must be settled first; settle our fees and you can go and elect your trustees."

I asked him what guaranty I would have that if we settled the fees, trustees could be elected. Says he, "You arrange the fees, and I will see that your trustees are elected, and that they are ratified;" and then he told me

to go and see Norton. I went to see Norton, and from there to Cotton & Levy, and back again, and all around trying to make some compromise, and eventually I went to see Norton at the request of Cotton & Levy. Norton said this thing could be arranged; all I had to do, he said, was to pay his counsel and they would arrange what his compensation was to be. We came together, Cotton & Levy, and Billings & Hughes, and myself. I was sitting here, as it were, and Norton sat a little way behind me. I said, "Gentlemen, now what do you want; what am I to pay in order to have this meeting go on and my trustees elected?" Then they commenced to figure, Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hughes. They conferred together a little while, and then said to me, "I will tell you what we will do; you pay all the expenses that have been incurred by both Mr. Norton and Mr. Ellis, and pay them a reasonable compensation for their trouble, and pay us, and you shall have your trustees elected."

I asked them to state the amounts. Then they stated the amounts as follows: E. E. Norton, custodian in New Orleans, was to get some $6,500, and, in addition, disbursements, which they represented amounted to $4,201.69. Mr. Ellis, custodian, was to get a like sum of $6,500, and, in addition, disbursements in bankruptcy proceedings, amounting to $850. Cotton & Levy, Ellis's lawyers, and Billings & Hughes, Norton's lawyers, were to get each the sum of $5,500. That made nearly $30,000; and all the money they had there was $42,000. It was arranged that this money should be kept by them out of the fund that was in bank, and that they were to give me a check for the balance. I thought this was pretty steep. I telegraphed to New York that the best I could do was to pay about $30,000, and then I could get the estate out of their hands. They telegraphed me from New York that I should not do it; that it was too large; that I should try $20,000. Well, I could not move them, and that is what it remained at, $25,000 in fees and about $5,000 in expenses, making altogether $30,000, and I was coerced into that settlement, and subsequently agreed to it, and agreed to the entry of an order, and Mr. Hughes and Mr. Norton said to me afterward, when I again stated my doubts about having my voting ratified, should I vote for these gentlemen as trustees, "Don't you bother yourself about that; just consent to the fees being paid, and we will have the order."

It was about 4 o'clock in the afternoon when I drew up my consent to that effect, and Mr. Hughes drew this order which set forth the fact that the proper parties, who were authorized to make this compromise, had agreed upon certain specific amounts to be paid each person consenting to the issuing of this order. At 4 o'clock Mr. Hughes took this order away with him, and he brought it back signed by Judge Durell, as well as all the papers that I had signed electing these gentlemen as trustees. I carried out the resolution electing Catlin, and Ellis, and Levenson trustees, and Charles H. Smith and A. L. Sanger, and Carhart the committee, under whose direction the trustees should act. I drew up all the papers providing for the election of trustees and gave them to Mr. Hughes, and he took them and the order to Judge Durell, and they were all signed. The next morning, instead of giving the check (which was for about $13,000, the balance left) to me, they made it payable to the order of the trustees. They gave Ellis a check for his fees, which had been fixed by this order at $6,500, with some $850 disbursements; and then gave him a check for the balance, some $13,000, which stood to the credit of the creditors. The check was payable to the order of the three trustees, and Ellis took it and brought it to New York, or got a draft on New York for it. The other check was made payable to his own order.

By Mr. ELDREDGE:

Q. Were there any items presented in any of those accounts to be paid to those individuals, or was it a gross sum?

A. The amount for services was a gross sum stated in the lump, just as I have stated it, without any items. There was an item of disbursements of some $4,000, which was made up of separate items. Mr. Norton handed me the ledger, and the disbursements were apparently very little, except what were represented to be for engrossing orders. Part of these were for auctioneers' fees. I did not inquire into the legitimacy of the fees, nor whether they were a proper compensation.

Q. What had been done by the "custodian" in New Orleans, except to sell these $42,000 worth of goods?

A. Nothing at all.

Q. Was this $42,000 the net sum that the goods brought?

A. That was net.

Q. Do you know what the goods sold for in gross?

Q. They sold for more than that, and my impression now is that the auctioneers deducted their commissions first, and Norton deposited the balance in the Bank of Louisiana.

Had these facts been communicated by a less authoritative source than committees of the House of Representatives the world would not believe them, they are so infamous. In Mississipppi there was a court presided over by a judge who was regarded as proverbially honest. He never got any benefit from these bankruptcy proceedings and he never got drunk. But the bankrupt estates were managed with extravagance, such as 10 per cent for attorneys' fees and the like—amounting in one estate to $7,000. I have not been able to find anyone conversant with the facts who will say that in any bankruptcy court litigation was conducted fairly as in other cases. Loose practices seem to be indigenous to bankruptcy courts.

Another cause for putting a debtor in bankruptcy is:

Suffered, while insolvent, an execution for $500 or over, or a number of executions aggregating such amount, against himself to be returned no property found, unless the amount shown to be due by such execution shall be paid before a petition is filed.

This clause of the bill puts in the power of a sheriff or marshal, as the case may be, to put a solvent man in bankruptcy or provide the cause, without his knowledge or his fault. If a sheriff wanted to revenge himself, or was too indolent or careless to look for property, he would return the execution *nulla bona*. This bill does not even require him to call on the debtor to show property.

As I said of another case, he may have been sued jointly with another man for whom he was security, although joint maker, and depended on the other man to pay it, and gone from the State or from the county on business for thirty days and knows nothing of the execution, never expecting to pay the debt. Very many such hardships might be enumerated. No matter that he might return the next day after petition filed, with plenty of money to pay the debt, by this bill he is a bankrupt, and if he owes $5,000 debts and has $40,000 worth of property he can be forced to make out his schedule of all his debts and all his property and bring it into court.

This is no accident. The bill was drawn by a shrewd lawyer, and it is full of such traps and pitfalls.

Here is still another act of bankruptcy:

Suspended and not resumed for thirty days and until a petition is filed while insolvent the payment of his commercial paper for or aggregating $500 or over.

Now, I wish with all the earnestness of which I am capable to appeal to this House, and especially to the gentleman from Louisiana, who is my neighbor, not to perpetrate this act upon my people.

Mr. BOATNER. I will say to the gentleman that so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing, and in fact I advocate, that that provision be stricken from the bill. I never defended it.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I have heard expressions of that kind from friends of this bill again and again. Whenever objection is made to obnoxious provisions they are willing to strike it out. I do not know what our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], the gentleman in charge of this defense [Mr. BAILEY], or the handsome gentleman sitting in front of me [Mr. KILGORE] may ultimately do in this matter; but so far as I am concerned, if these gentlemen who so ably conduct the contention for this bill, will consent to an amendment, which ought in conscience and good faith to be made, striking out the provisions for involuntary bankruptcy, then I am ready to take my seat now and say no more. I am not opposed to a voluntary bankrupt law. My objections are to the unjust and cruel drastic provisions of the involuntary features of this measure.

Those provisions ought to be stricken out. Every once and a while when various provisions of this bill are shown up in their native deformity and crookedness and oppression, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] will say, "You can strike that out." God knows these provisions ought to be stricken out; they never ought to have put their ugly visage in this measure.

But suppose these provisions are stricken out in the House, what have we been taught by the history of other measures in this House? When I first came to Congress, I thought I had become associated with the cleverest set of gentlemen I had ever seen. When I offered an amendment they would say, "All right; we will accept that amendment, and allow it to pass." But afterward the bill would go into conference, would come back into the House without the amendment.

Mr. STOCKDALE. And so I would have to bid good bye to my amendment. Now, when we come to have a conference with the Senate on this bill the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] will be on the committee, probably the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], and one Republican member who may be in favor of the bill as it is. The Senate committee will stand in about the same way. The committee of conference will come in here and will present their report, move to concur in the conference report, and move the previous question; the Speaker will put the question. Gentlemen may say they are willing to consent to this or the other amendment, but Mr. Torrey will not consent to them, and he is the "boss" of this concern. [Laughter.]

Under this bill you can not put a farmer into bankruptcy nor a national bank. Is not this the strangest pair of twins that ever was seen. The lion and the lambare about to lie down together—the United States banks and the farmers! I doubt whether the farmers will like the company. The legislation of this country has already well-nigh bankrupted the farmers, and if we do not do something for their relief soon it will be little use to exempt them, for they will have nothing.

But what is the effect of this bill on the farmer? In the South money is realized almost entirely from the cotton and sugar crops. They mature about the same time. Money comes in to the merchant once a year. During the summer merchants advance supplies to the planters, as well as men who float logs to market. To secure these merchants who give them credit, the farmers are obliged to give a mortgage on their homesteads. In an ordinary proceeding for debt the creditor can not take the homestead or such property as is exempted by law.

But these farmers have been compelled under the oppressive legislation of this Government to mortgage their homesteads, to mortgage their exempt property. The merchant is trying to carry the farmer through. But he has given his note for supplies in New Orleans or St. Louis. Here comes the creditor who desires to be preferred and says, "You pay me or secure me in full or I will put you into bankruptcy within thirty days, for I have your commercial paper." What is a merchant going to do under such circumstances? The debtor may be perfectly solvent if you will let him go until the cotton crop comes in; he will then be able to pay every dollar he owes; but he can not do it in

midsummer, and he is thrust into bankruptcy. What then? Why, the mortgage which the farmer has given on his homestead and on his exempt property goes into the hands of a trustee. It is converted; and he is turned out of his home and loses his crop which he has toiled early and late to make thus far, and creditors, by putting one merchant in bankruptcy, may get fifty farms for a song and make the owners tenants, because this trouble comes at a time when he or they can raise no money.

Thus to people of the poorer classes a measure of this kind would operate as absolute confiscation. I appeal to gentlemen from the wealthier parts of this country who do not need the passage of a bill of this kind—gentlemen whose constituents have plenty of money. I say to them it is not necessary to ruin our people in this summary, oppressive, and unjust way.

Now, I want to call attention to another unique feature of this measure. Let us see for what offenses a debtor may be imprisoned for two years by the action of the United States court; and imprisonment by such tribunals means either imprisonment in the penitentiary or in the county jail, as the court may determine. Here is a definition of one of the offenses:

Made a substantially false valuation, as a bankrupt, of any of the property of his estate in his schedule of property, or omitted therefrom any of the property of his estate, or from the list of his creditors any person to whom he is indebted in a substantial amount, or included therein any person to whom he is not indebted or included therein a creditor for an amount substantially more than the true indebtedness.

If the debtor happens to include in the list as a creditor a man to whom he is not indebted, he is imprisoned two years. He may think he owes him. They may have had mutual running accounts and he thinks he is indebted a considerable sum, but if it turns out that he is mistaken he goes to prison for two years. There is no provision that "if he willfully does it," but simply if he does it.

On the other hand, if he omits a creditor by accident or mistake, or refuses to acknowledge a debt that he does not owe or believes he does not owe, if the court should hold that he did, he may be imprisoned for two years. The man who is charged with a debt that he disputes, will be in a dilemma. However unjust or corrupt the decision of the court may be, he goes to prison if it is adverse to his report. This was no oversight. The bill shows careful and cunning study from its initial to its final letter. These gentlemen may be willing to insert the word "willfully" here, but the author of the bill has not put it in, and he never intended to. He intended to hold this *in terrorem* over the creditors. The bankrupt may say that he does not owe the debt justly; that it is an unfounded claim. There is no provision for that. There may be an honest difference as to the amount of the claim, or he may believe that he has paid the debt; but no matter what the circumstances, if a mistake is made he goes to prison. It is not provided, as in all other penal statutes, that if these things "be willfully" or "corruptly" done.

I say that that is the intention of the bill. It was framed by a learned lawyer, and he is a fine lawyer. He is not only a good lawyer, but is a man of shrewd intellect and extensive information, and he has prepared barbs and put them all over this bill to catch and tear the unfortunate debtors of the country.

The eleventh act for which imprisonment will be inflicted—

(11) Transferred, otherwise than in the ordinary course of his business, and in contemplation of bankruptcy, any property which he has obtained on credit.

Suppose a merchant had purchased goods on credit and such a panic as is now upon us overtakes him and he has not sold them and can not sell them. Any honest man would give them back to the seller on demand, and especially if he contemplated bankruptcy; but that would not be "in the ordinary course of his business" for a retail merchant to sell to a wholesale merchant, and he would go to prison for two years under this bill for that honest act, which if he did not do he would be denounced as dishonest.

Suppose a merchant both solvent and honest shapes his business prudently with the lights before him in the spring, and agrees to furnish a certain number of customers, but to his surprise about July when the crop is nearly made and promises well, a panic overtakes him. Perhaps his money is in a national bank and he can not get it. He sees he can not get through and that his failure will greatly distress his customers. He applies to a friend, who has never made a dollar out of him, for a loan of money, and gets it without interest, both thinking that an extra session of Congress will relieve the hard times. He buys supplies with that money and sells to his customers to carry them through and enable them to finish their crops, and takes their notes secured for these same supplies that he bought with that borrowed money—and cotton or sugar is low, or cut short by drought or flood—and he fears he can not pay all his debts that fall, and transfers these same notes to repay that money, it would be an act of bankruptcy under this bill—sixth clause—and if his business failed to such an extent that he contemplated being put in bankruptcy he would be imprisoned for that act under this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we say that is pretty hard. It is entirely contrary to all the criminal jurisprudence of the country. There is nothing like it in the common law that has been handed down to us as the perfection of wisdom and justice. Whether any civilized country has ever adopted such a statute or not I do not know. It is too harsh, too unjustifiable for this country and people.

Now, we will go over to the next page and see how leniently this bill treats the other people who are to be chosen to enforce this iniquity and who may be as corrupt as Hades—I believe that is the parliamentary term now.

A MEMBER. Sheol.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Well, Hades or sheol, either of them will do; in fact the old Anglo-Saxon word would satisfy me when I am talking about this bill. [Laughter.] Let us see what it says:

First. A person shall be punished by fine, not to exceed $100, upon conviction of the offense of having willfully acted as a referee in a case in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

Mr. BOATNER. That is, the lawyers.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Oh, no; the lawyers do not act as referees. They can do better, especially those of them who live about the bankruptcy courts.

I do not know how I would do myself if I was down there, but I am now representing the people. [Laughter.] It would be better for the country's credit and for the interest of creditors if lawyers would act as referees and trustees. They have a professional pride that prevents the ridiculous practices that seem to be inevitable to bankrupt courts.

2. Neglected while an officer to furnish in writing and transmit by mail information such as is within his knowledge, or as may be shown by the records and papers in his possession, to the Attorney-General for statistical purposes within thirty days after being requested by him to do so.

Now, here is a very important feature of this bill, upon which depends the integrity of its execution. The Attorney-General may overlook this officer of the United States Government; but if he fails to make an accurate report of the records and papers in his possession, what is the consequence? He is not sent to jail or to the penitentiary for two years. Oh, no! The poor debtor may go to the jail for two years if John Smith claims $100 and the debtor claims that he owes him only $50 or nothing at all. If it should turn out that he did owe it, or if the bankrupt court should so decide, whether correctly or not, he goes to the jail or to the penitentiary for two years for insisting upon his rights.

But if a man takes a thousand dollars while an officer and fails to report it to the Attorney-General—and he may go through his court here as infamously as Norton did and get away with $10,000, or any amount of dollars of the estate—his punishment is a fine of $100. They might be amenable to the criminal law; but who ever heard of such a prosecution? What is the difference between Norton and those people who will execute this law in some places throughout the country? And Norton and his accomplices were not prosecuted, notwithstanding their extortions, such as taking $30,000 fees out of a $42,000 fund. Besides, it is the animus of this bill I am discussing, aiming to wreak vengeance of two years' imprisonment on a debtor for a mistake, and only $100 fine on officers of the court for a willful and corrupt violation of duty.

Again:

If he neglect for thirty days, while a referee or trustee, to furnish such reasonable information concerning an estate in process of administration before him, or of which he is trustee, as may be requested by parties in interest.

The trustee, a sworn officer of the court, into whose hands the assets are placed and who has to administer them and sell the estate and account for the funds, if he fails in his duty—and he is supposed to be an intelligent man—if he fails and acts corruptly, why he pays this fine of $100.

But the man who happens to make a mistake between John Smith for $50 goes to jail for two years. I suppose these gentlemen would not mean any such injustice. I would not make any such intimation; but it shows that this bill has not been closely scanned, has not been critically examined, for I know these gentlemen do not tolerate any such injustice as that.

Again:

Or practiced while a referee as an attorney, a counselor at law, solicitor in equity, or proctor in admiralty, in any bankruptcy proceeding.

The debtor would not know any better possibly, than to violate the law, and yet he is imprisoned for two years; but the lawyer who is presumed to know the law and willfully violates it pays $100. He could well afford to do it if he could make a few thousand dollars by the operation.

Who can read these two parts of this bill and not see that the former is intended by its author to handle debtors with severity, even with cruelty, while the latter invites the people who may be chosen for their qualifications to perpetrate the outrages

upon the rights of citizens to rigorous persecution of debtors by receiving in advance virtual immunity from liability for crime.

I will insert here paragraph *b* of section 8 and all of section 9 of this bill, and submit them without comment to civilized people:

b. The judge may, at any time after the filing of a petition by or against a person and before the expiration of six months after he has been adjudged a bankrupt, upon affidavit of any party in interest that such bankrupt is about to leave the district and that his departure will defeat the proceedings therein, issue a warrant to the marshal directing him to bring such bankrupt forthwith before the court; if upon hearing the evidence it shall appear to the judge that the allegations of such affidavit are true and that it is necessary, he shall order such marshal to keep such bankrupt in custody, but not imprison him, until he shall be released or give bail conditioned for his appearance from time to time, as required by the court, and for his obedience to all lawful orders.

SEC. 9. *a* Extradition of bankrupts.—Whenever a warrant for the apprehension of a bankrupt shall have been issued, and he shall have been found within the jurisdiction of a court other than the one issuing the warrant, he may be extradited in the same manner in which persons under indictment are now extradited from one district, within which a district court has jurisdiction, to another.

Another offense—

Purchased while a referee directly or indirectly any property of an estate in bankruptcy.

That would be a very corrupt act. He having judicial powers, and if permitted to do it, a corrupt man would enter corrupt orders and profit by them; and yet the only barrier interposed by this bill to such acts is a fine of $100. How lenient it is to corrupt officials and how cruel to unfortunate debtors. Oh, this is a terrible bill.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twenty-one minutes.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Now, here is the way in which this bill makes a referee a part of the court:

The referee shall certify the facts.

That is, if anybody "cuts up" before the referee, sitting on a log somewhere or at a country schoolhouse, if any man does anything unbecoming to the dignity of that referee, then—

The referee shall certify the facts to the judge, if any person shall do any of the things forbidden in this section. The judge shall thereupon, in a summary manner, hear the evidence as to the acts complained of and, if it is such as to warrant him in so doing, punish such person in the same manner and to the same extent as for a contempt committed before the court of bankruptcy or commit such person upon the same conditions as if the doing of the forbidden act had occurred with reference to the process of or in the presence of the court.

Who ever heard of such a provision as that? A referee, picked up in every county, selected for political services, perhaps; some fellow who does not know what a lawyer or a party to a suit can do or can not do before a court; may be taken hundreds of miles to Jackson, in my State, or to New Orleans, or Alexandria, or Baton Rouge, in Louisiana. In Texas he might have to go as far as across New England to answer for contempt of a referee, and the petitioner would be put upon his proof to show that the creditors were fewer than twelve. They might put him upon the stand and examine him, but under this bill, if that is alleged, the debtor must come in and file his schedule, and show to the court just whom he owes, where the creditors live and what amount, and even then, if he happens to say he owes a man $175 when he owes him $150, he goes to jail, and if he owes $150 and says that he owes $125, then he goes to jail.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. How does that provision hurt him if he is solvent?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am surprised that a man of the intelligence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS] should ask that question, unless he is like some of the balance of these people, and have an absolute contempt for a poor man or debtor.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Oh, no; I am a poor man myself.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Well, you have no business in New York, then. Your constituents never knew that fact or they would not have sent you to Congress. [Laughter.] Just wait until the tariff bill comes in, if it contains a schedule to tax incomes, and my friend from New York will make eloquent appeals to the House not to form an inquisition into a man's business.

How does it hurt him if he is solvent? Take a solvent man up when he is going on with his business, moving quietly and well, some creditor comes upon him with a conscience seared over with long practice in such methods and alleges that a debtor's creditors are fewer than twelve; instead of you giving him such an opportunity as any other man would have to try his cause, he is forced into court and must show up his whole business, in midsummer in my country, when there is no money in the country (and there is none anywhere else now, so far as that is concerned), and he must show his whole business; he must stop his business and go on and make a contest with this creditor and pay lawyers and incur expenses to disprove a mere allegation.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. All he has got to do is to deny it, and then the lawyer must prove his case.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is just where you show you do not know anything about the bill. [Laughter.] I said that at the beginning; that if gentlemen would read this bill they would not support it. If you will read this bill you will find you are mistaken.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I am not supporting this bill.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am glad to hear you say that.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. It is a general rule that if a man makes a complaint the other party may deny, and then issue is joined.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is justice; that is right; but that is not this bill.

Mr. WEVER. That is right.

Mr. STOCKDALE. He must go into court and show a schedule of his debts and creditors before he can deny it successfully.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I am not quite sure you are right about that.

Mr. STOCKDALE. And that would ruin his credit, if he had any. It would strike anybody that way who knows anything of just legal proceedings. I do not wonder that you doubt the accuracy of my statement. I do not wonder that you or any honest lawyer are startled at the statement, for such a thing is unknown in the jurisprudence of the Anglo-Saxons. If he were to be put upon his proof it would be all right; but this bill evades intentionally that principle, because it was drawn by one of the most astute lawyers in this country.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I agree with you about that.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I will settle the question as to whether I am right by reading from the bill.

If it be averred in the petition that the creditors of the bankrupt are less than twelve in number, and less than three creditors have joined as petitioners therein—

Now listen here—

and the answer avers the existence of a larger number of creditors, there shall be filed with the answer a list under oath of all the creditors, with their addresses and several amounts due to them, and thereupon the court shall cause all such creditors to be notified of the pendency of such petition and shall delay the hearing upon such petition for a reasonable time—

For what?

to the end that parties in interest shall have an opportunity to be heard.

No respect is paid to the man whose business has been thus rudely broken upon. But the court will delay until creditors can leasurely examine him.

You may delay it as long as you please; you have the debtor in your clutches. Here is a man perfectly solvent, brought in by a false oath, or no oath, and compelled to show up his whole business. If he is not insolvent make him so by this means, destroy his credit and turn him loose, and the man who works all this ruin without even the consent of a single other creditor incurs no liability, is not even required to give a bond to answer in damages to the injured man.

What superior claims have the creditor class upon the Government that Congress shall disgrace itself by reversing the rules of evidence of an hundred years' standing in order to give them an unfair advantage in the courts?

The proposition that this Government shall require its courts to force its citizens to parade a full schedule of their business before the court under oath at the behest of one creditor and notify all the others to come and behold it, and thus ruin his business and credit, then turn him loose with a sneer—only a poor devil of a debtor, anyhow—evinces to my mind a degree of insolence in the wealthy classes that I never expected to see in America. I know of no epithet sufficiently vigorous to name it, and much less did I ever expect to see an American Congress willing to aid them in such a scheme. I do not believe it will; patriotic men will not vote for it.

I venture the prediction that when the vote on this measure shall have been taken and recorded, it will present a rare anomaly. Framed and urged professedly in the interests and for the relief of debtors, it is opposed by representatives of the debtor classes and championed by the creditor classes. This is evidence that it is a scheme, a fraud, a snare, and upon its own face are branded evidences of tyranny and oppression and a jeering contempt for the rights as well as the liberties of American citizens and for the pride of the race.

Mr. Chairman, a tariff bill will be in here presently. Possibly it may contain among its provisions one imposing a tax on incomes in some form. If so, judging from the past, many gentlemen on this floor who represent constituencies among whom banks, insurance companies, trust companies, and great aggregations of wealth flourish, will swell to the danger line with indignation at the idea of a Government officer being authorized to look into their business. "It is inquisitorial" they will say. I suggest to those who expect to say that then, to withhold a vote for this measure, which not only allows a revengeful cred-

itor to examine a man's business, but to require the man himself to spread a full sworn schedule before the world on the records of the bankrupt court in order to prove himself not insolvent. He may be so held for months and then a creditor who did not gain in the prosecution may put him in bankruptcy for nonpayment of his commercial paper in thirty days while he was in that fix. In the South three-fourths of the merchants could be forced into bankruptcy under this bill if it becomes a law and widespread disaster be visited on the farmers and timber men, while if let alone until the cotton and sugar crops are marketed and the rains fall to float logs they would be perfectly solvent. I say to these gentlemen "If you persist in voting for this bill you ought to preserve a decorous and decent silence when the income tax presents itself."

This bill would allure and deceive the farmers of the country in excepting them from the operation of the involuntary clause. Knowing, as the advocates of this bill must know, that the farming population who are in debt—that is, the majority of them—are many of them indebted, as I have said, to people whom this bill would ruin, and then their claims against the farmers would go into the bankrupt court as assets and they, too, be ruined, however solvent they may be, because they can not pay in spring or midsummer.

Just at this time there are but few institutions of industry that could stand the operation of that part of the bill. The national banks themselves could not stand it to-day, and therefore they are exempted.

The United States national banks are the most dangerous institutions of the country, and are doing much to destroy the confidence of the people in the integrity of the Government. Their mismanagement well-nigh ruined the prosperity of the country in 1890, and would have precipitated a panic but for the timely rescue by the Secretary of the Treasury with $70,000,000 of Government money.

Mr. OATES. Does my friend want to put the national banks into the bill by an amendment? [Laughter.]

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am pointing out objections.

Mr. OATES. I wish my friend would answer the question.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do, if this unholy thing is to pass at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. OATES. Have you ever offered any amendment to include them in the bill?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Thank God, I am not the father of this bill, and I do not believe it can be perfected. [Laughter.] You may give it some hypodermic injections, but you can not cure it. You can not restore to soundness decayed fruit. You can not restore to health and vigor a body already permeated with blood-poison, and I look upon this bill as that sort of a thing. It is hereditarily unsound. It fits in well as a part of the great movement now sweeping over this country to subjugate the debtor and poorer classes to the domination and service of the rich classes. It is intended to take away from our people their property in these hard times and leave them without power to resist usurpation.

The past legislation of this country has made it so that every man will tell you that there is no money to be had either among the farming population or the business men. Who will stand up here and say that there is plenty of money in his town or in his district? If anyone does say that, I will show him the men that are holding the money which belongs to other people, and who can not pay it or will not pay it, and those men, it appears from this bill, must not be put into bankruptcy! Those banks now have got $1,600,000,000 of the people's money that they will not pay, and yet a poor devil of a debtor must be collared and made to pay at once.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman please tell us right there how the banks have got sixteen hundred millions? That is the whole of the circulation in this country. Have those banks got it all?

Mr. STOCKDALE. The last report of the Secretary of the Treasury showed that they had two billion and twenty millions of deposits. It was stated on the floor by some of the best informed men in this House, late in the debate, that they had still seventeen hundred millions of deposits, and they have paid out very little since that time, I think.

Mr. OATES. Do you not know that they have not got that amount in money in the banks?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes, I do know it; and I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Where is the money? Why, they have loaned it out on speculation. They receive the money from the people on deposit, knowing that the owners of it desire to put it away as a provision against a rainy day, against hard times, against such times as we have now, and, with full knowledge of that fact, they have loaned it out for sixty days, or ninety days, or for six months, or for twelve months, so that the depositors are unable to get their money when they want it, and the cash assets of the banks will not sell for 50 cents on the dollar. So that the poor people are swindled, and all the satisfaction they can get is to be told, "Just wait until confidence is restored."

Confidence in whom and by whom? The bankers have confidence now in the depositors. They ought to have, as they have got the depositors' money. [Laughter.] But when the depositor comes and asks for his money, the banker says, "You must have confidence in me; leave your money here with me; it will be all right." I tell you that when a man deposits his money with you as a provision against sickness, or want of work, or distress, and when sickness or want of work or distress comes and he asks for his money and you fail to give it to him, you will get his confidence again only when you pay him that money, and no sooner, and not for some time after that, either. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOATNER. But when the banker can not pay, then he becomes one of these "poor debtors" that the gentleman talks so much about.

Mr. STOCKDALE. No, you can not put him into bankruptcy. He gets your money and keeps it and does not become poor, and this law exempts him. Under this bill men may be driven into bankruptcy because they can not get their money out of the banks, yet the banks are excepted and the debtor ruined for want of the money.

Mr. BOATNER. Does not the gentleman know that under the law as it exists the doors of any national bank can be shut any day when the Comptroller directs?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes, the gentleman knows that, and the gentleman from Louisiana is not giving him any information, but it is not done.

Mr. BAILEY. But he knows, also, that that law has not been enforced.

Mr. BOATNER. Has any man ever asked in the regular manner to have a bank closed that was not closed? Does the gentleman know of a case?

Mr. STOCKDALE. The gentleman from Louisiana knows, and I know, that in the Senate an attempt was made to adopt resolutions to inquire whether the United States banks were not violating the law, and that no such resolution could pass immediately, although the Senators, men of integrity and ability, too much so to prevaricate, too much so to dodge, said that everybody knew the banks were violating the law, or words to that effect.

Mr. OATES. I do not wish at this time to go into the question of the conduct of the banks. I am not their friend. I do not propose to go into a discussion with the gentleman upon that subject, or to controvert what he may say about them. I am waiting for him to tell me how the banks have $1,700,000,000 on deposit, when the whole circulation is only $1,600,000,000.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I have told you that by the last report they had two billion and twenty millions.

Mr. SIBLEY. Why, Mr. Chairman, the same money can be deposited over and over again, so that one million may count as five millions, or as ten millions.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I hope that is not the question of the gentleman from Alabama. He knows how it is done.

Mr. OATES. That is the very question.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Suppose that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] is a banker and I go to him and deposit a hundred dollars; he gives me a certificate of deposit; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] borrows that hundred dollars. He does not borrow it to lay away, but to spend it to pay a debt with. He pays a debt, we will suppose to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], who goes to the bank and deposits that same $100 with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] and gets a certificate of deposit. There are two certificates of deposit for $100 each; yet there is only $100 in the bank to pay them with; but he holds your note, and your note in these times may not be worth 50 cents on the dollar; scarcely anybody's note is. [Laughter.] In addition to that there is almost as much deposited in the savings banks and State banks as in the national banks.

Now, let me say one word more. If this statement is not true I am not making it without high authority; it is the Secretary of the Treasury who has made it. I quote from him.

Mr. OATES. I am aware of that; and I am aware how the accounts are made; but my friend made a broad assertion that there was a certain amount on deposit in the national banks. The fact is the accounts show that amount, but it is not in actual money.

Mr. STOCKDALE. But there was that amount deposited in the national banks; and as I was about to say when I was interrupted, they had loaned out that amount or invested it in speculation in a manner which I say was wrongful and criminal. When the Senate of the United States was asked to investigate whether wrongful proceedings in violation of the law had been carried on by the banks, Senators said, "Of course everybody

knows they have been violating the law; but we can not afford to hold them to account now; they are United States banks." That, I say, shows the unfairness of this bill. I have not time now, but will verify what I say by adding the proof to my remarks in the RECORD.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SIBLEY. I ask that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended.

A MEMBER. Indefinitely.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Oh, no; I do not ask that; I know the time is limited.

Mr. BAILEY. I make this suggestion to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES]: It will not be possible for him or for me to proceed with our remarks this evening; and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be permitted to proceed further.

Mr. OATES objected.

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that if this arrangement is not consented to, the committee will simply rise and the House adjourn, and we thus lose the time. I would be willing to give the gentleman from Mississippi a portion of my time, but I have already promised it.

Mr. OATES. I yielded to the gentleman from Texas four hours out of the six hours and a half, and I can not yield further.

Mr. BOATNER. Let the time be extended twenty minutes by unanimous consent.

Mr. OATES. The House can do as it pleases in regard to that matter.

Mr. BOATNER. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended twenty minutes by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. OUTHWAITE). The time for this debate has been limited by the House, and the motion of the gentleman can not be entertained.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that by unanimous consent it can be done. I believe that, as a matter of fact, under our present rules, the Committee of the Whole itself can limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. But the time for this debate has already been limited by action of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. But the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] is for unanimous consent. Does the Chair decline to entertain the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to entertain it. The Chair thinks the proposition is not in order, the House having limited the debate.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] twenty minutes, and I will confine my remarks to forty minutes.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not want the gentleman to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the gentleman from Mississippi resumes, the Chair will have read a paragraph from the Digest.

The Clerk read as follows:

Debate having been closed at a particular hour by order of the House, it is not competent for the committee even by unanimous consent to extend the time.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that to have been the rule when the Committee of the Whole had no power over the course of the debate; but under our present rules—I have not examined them since the present session began, but I have understood that the former rule has been amended and that now the Committee of the Whole can itself limit the debate. I make no point on this matter, however.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, as the Chair understands, yields twenty minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE].

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I am surprised at the gentleman from Alabama. When they were speaking on that side, his colleague on the committee, Gen. WOLVERTON, I think spoke for about four hours. But we see the position that we are placed in.

Mr. OATES. I desire to correct my friend from Mississippi. I spoke but one hour.

Mr. BAILEY. He said Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. STOCKDALE. The gentleman from Alabama, at all events, was careful to have plenty of time for himself.

Mr. OATES. That is always a very good arrangement.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Well, yes; it is just about in keeping with this bill. It will not bear discussion. I do not wonder he does not want to see this bill held up in all of its nakedness. I do not wonder that he refused an extension to expose an utterly defenseless measure.

Mr. OATES. Why, I offered the gentleman ten minutes of my own time and Mr. BAILEY would not accept it.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Then I take back what I said. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. I did not decline it; I had no right to do so. I simply said that I would yield twenty minutes of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi. The gentleman ought to make his statement as straight as we want to make his bill.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Now, Mr. Chairman, a word further, for I do not wish to consume the time which has been so graciously accorded to me. This bill is not intended to discharge anybody. I have not time to read that feature of the bill; but you will find when you examine it that it does not intend to discharge a man from his debt when he is put into bankruptcy, voluntarily or involuntarily either, because it makes fraudulent an act which is perfectly legal under the State laws.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. What is that?

Mr. STOCKDALE (continuing). And if he acts fraudulently, according to the terms of the bill he can not be discharged. It is a scheme to trap the unwary. Just read the various causes here which will prevent him from securing a discharge and you will find that though honest and solvent at the same time a man may be put into bankruptcy and never be discharged if his creditors do not want it; and even under the bankruptcy proceedings within two years, whatever earnings he may have made in that time the proceedings can be opened up again by his creditor if he so desires and come in and take all of his property, and even then not discharge him. In answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS], it is the fourth cause—in other words, "made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors"—which is legal in all the States.

This measure is purely a creditors' bill. Debtors are not demanding it.

I will venture the assertion that not all the members in this House can show forty letters from debtors that want to be discharged. It is by the creditors that this bill is supported; and you wait until you hear the vote upon it and you will find the representatives of the creditor classes largely in the majority. I never saw such a set of benign creditors before in all my existence. They want to discharge the poor man from his debt when he does not ask it! Our people do not want to get rid of their debts in that way. They do not want the cloud of being a bankrupt hanging over them and the story told to their children. Give them a half chance and they will pay every cent they owe. But here is the creditor class with the stringent machinery of this bill taking the people by the throat and forcing them into an attitude that they do not wish to occupy, and I have heard nothing but expressions of contempt for the debtors since the debate began.

Now, in conclusion, a single word. What is the present condition? The legislation of the Congress has failed—utterly failed to relieve the stringent money market of the country. The people are laboring under the same problems that have so long beset them. The President's message of August 8 informed us that every man has done his duty, that agriculture has been prosperous throughout the country, that no calamity of any kind exists, that no sickness, no epidemic has prevailed, that no state of war threatens us, but the money, the stringency of the money, was producing all the harm. The business men cried out, the bankers cried out for relief. We were summoned to the capital to give that relief.

We have been here for three months and have made it worse, and now without waiting to postpone this proposition to see how we can aid by letting the people have a chance to relieve the stringency itself by their own exertions, here we have a proposition pressed upon us to let the creditors take the people by the throat and say: "Now we have got you where we want you. We will take your property, destroy your business, and put it into the hands of our own agents, and reap the profits ourselves." This panic has been brewing like the brewing of a storm ever since 1890, when the Secretary of the Treasury tided it over that paroxysm. But the cause was deep in our system, and the elements kept on concentrating, and in this fateful year 1893 burst upon the country with destructive force. Financiers could see it and prepare themselves; did see it and did prepare for it. They unleashed a storm, but it soon accumulated into a cyclone and swept the country.

I will append some statistics to my remarks on this branch of the subject.

Mr. Chairman, no law should protect a debtor in dishonesty and no law should encourage a creditor in dishonesty, nor aid him by oppression and wrong to ruin an honest debtor simply because he is a debtor.

Men incurred debts while prosperity reigned throughout all the borders of this great country, buoyant with hopes of a great future and confidence in the patriotism of their chosen servants. Commissioned for a time to rule, they shaped their business prudently in the lights surrounding them. Now, without any fault of theirs, they have been plunged into misfortune, the greatest panic of the age is inflicted upon them, brought on by bad legislation and bad management of the banks fostered by the Government combining to reduce property and enhance

obligations in value. And when distress is at its worst, when Congress by its own hand has produced largely this distress and utterly failed to furnish any relief. Having, I say, increased the value of debts in the hands of the creditor and reduced the value of the debtor's property and destroyed his ability to pay, and then hand him over, as this bill does, bound to be despoiled and have the name bankrupt branded on his frontlet, is a crown of thorns that no honest debtor should be made to wear by an honest government. Can the Congress afford to stand up before the country confessing its inability or unwillingness to remove this national financial distress that is pressing the spirit out of our people, many of whom are desolate amid plenty, hungry among abundance; and yet by such a law as this demand that debtors shall pay their debts at this moment or be branded as bankrupts?

Is there no softer voice in the American Government than the chink of gold? Is there no easier goad for our people than the lash of starvation? Have the American people and the American Congress no heart, no soul, no conscience higher and holier than the love of a dollar? Will they, after putting our people in this attitude, not waiting until even the latter part of the session to see if we can relieve the stringency of the times and restore the long lost confidence, and let money come out so that people can get it to pay their debts, will they vote for the passage of such a bill as this? The language of this bill is, "We will take you now, and take your property. That is what we want. We do not want business men. We want to drive out the little fellows and let the great firms do all the business of the country. We want your property. We want to make you tenants and slaves, and we will master the country."

Will Congress say it? The gentleman from Alabama has long been a member of this body, and is known over the nation. He is regarded in my State as a tribune of the people. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] is willing to eliminate from this bill its harsh and cruel features, and I hope my friend from Alabama [Mr. OATES] will withdraw from its support the influence of his great name, and not exert his powers to the injury of our people, as I believe this measure to be. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Under the leave granted I append the following:

In reference to the deposits and the action of the banks I submit the following extracts from a minority report, No. 163, from the Committee of the House on the Judiciary of the Fifty-second Congress:

The money status of the banks in December, 1890, was:

Specie	$190,063,006
Legal tender	82,117,126
United States certificates	5,760,000
Total	278,000,126

They had outstanding notes $123,038,785. Had these bills been secured only by the solvency of the banks, as in the old State bank issue, a run would have ensued on these notes as in 1837, 1857, 1861. Taking out that sum and leaving in banks $144,961,331, a run of depositors would have followed as before, closing the banks in a few days and wrecking again the industries of 62,000,000 people with an aggregate wealth of $70,000,000,000.

The banks owed depositors on the above date $1,485,095,885, and other items to the amount of nearly $500,000,000 more.

The United States Treasury came to the relief of the banks and put out over $70,000,000 in a few weeks. Secretary Windom said, in his last speech, had it not been for this help "the stringency would have resulted in widespread financial ruin."

The last report of the Comptroller of the Currency of December, 1891, vol. 1, pp. 154, 155, shows the total volume of money in all the national banks in the United States is—

Specie	$183,515,075
Legal tender	97,615,608
United States certificates	15,720,000
Total held	296,850,683
Reserve required by law	216,899,737
Available working cash	79,950,946

Suppose the United States Treasury, in 1890, had been in the condition that it is now, unable to furnish the relief of $70,000,000, a panic such as would have dwarfed all preceding panics would have blighted this country, and the depositors, who are generally people of moderate means, would have lost their money; for it is the history of the country that securities taken for loans of deposit money or other money, by banks, will not sell in times of panic, except at a great discount. The Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1892, page 214, shows that the assets of 181 insolvent national banks amounted to $108,633,185; of that sum were estimated as good, $45,046,031, as doubtful, $33,862,327, and as worthless, $29,724,823. These banks were liquidated in ordinary times; and then the same report shows that the loss on claims, compounded or sold by order of court, was $26,372,544. Had these banks been liquidated in times of panic the assets would have been practically worthless to creditors after the expenses were deducted.

The bank reserve of the United States banks, as shown by the Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1892, pages 160, 161, are—

Specie	$209,116,379
Legal tenders	104,267,945
United States certificates	13,995,000
Total	327,379,324

Of that sum the reserve required by law to be always in the banks at that date is $252,177,675, leaving in the banks to meet emergencies $75,201,649.

The same report (page 160) shows that there is on deposit in the United States banks $2,022,479,824. In this condition of the banks suppose a scare should come (and it would come now if the depositors knew the condition of the banks) and a run by depositors should be made. The banks have $75,000,000 available cash to pay depositors, and doubtless have securities to the amount of deposits loaned out and denominated "cash assets" by banks and may make them available if no crisis comes; but such a scare as came in 1890, without assistance from the Treasury, would precipitate a run by depositors and a panic would follow such as this country has never seen.

The failure of a few great firms would precipitate it at any moment.

Amidst such a panic the cash assets of banks would not sell for 50 cents on the dollar—for a time would not sell at all. Men who owe them could not pay them for lack of money, and depositors would lose their deposits and suffering and distress follow, and general depression follow that. It has been said that the depreciation of stocks and property in New York alone amounted to $100,000,000, owing to the scare of 1890, and to fabulous sums throughout the United States. Such a panic as is now threatened on account of the faulty system of the currency would cause a depreciation of property in America that can not be estimated, but would surely reach to thousands of millions.

Here is the evidence of the Treasury Department of the Government in 1890 and 1892, and the prediction of that report as to what might be expected from such a condition, which is now more than verified. I call attention to the facts shown above, to wit: In December, 1890, the national banks had received deposits and owed depositors to the amount of $1,485,095,885. The banks knew then that they could not pay their deposits. They knew that a disastrous panic was averted then only by the Secretary of the Treasury with his $70,000,000. They knew that a crisis was approaching, but instead of preparing to pay depositors they still took people's money until, in 1892, they owed depositors $2,022,479,824, an increase of over five hundred millions, knowing they could not pay it.

I stated that the law was not enforced against them and Senators acknowledge it. I here append extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 24, 1893, page 458, *et seq.*:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate—

"First. Whether, and in what respect, the national banks, or any of them, in the cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia are being now conducted in violation of law.

"Second. Whether said banks are paying depositors' checks promptly in lawful money.

"Third. Whether said banks, or any of them, are demanding rates of interest higher than those provided by law for the loan of money or in discounting notes and bills."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER. Is the motion to refer debatable?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. PEFFER. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not insist upon a reference of the resolution. It is a very important matter, and we ought to have the information immediately.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the resolution of the Senator from Kansas be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I once heard President Grant say that the worst subordinate a military officer could have is one who always obeys orders. In a time of popular distress and panic it is utterly impossible to get along without the greatest trouble and suffering if every man and organization charged with a public function is compelled to drive everybody it has to deal with up to the strict letter of the law.

I understand that the President of the United States appointed a Comptroller of the Currency who had not been a banker, who had not been a speculator, who had not been a dealer in credits or exchanges of any kind. He took a man whom he believed, and believed on good evidence, was a clear-headed, capable man, able to deal, with energy, force, impartiality, and honesty, with any public subject upon which his faculties should be turned, and to discharge any responsibility that should be committed to him. As to whether the President was right in his estimate of that gentleman I have, of course, no personal means of pronouncing an opinion, but I suppose the Senate thought he was right because they confirmed him.

I understand he has not thought it best to bring everybody right up to the rack whenever any national bank in this country has failed to comply with the strict and extreme letter of the law in dealing with its customers, and has tried to get along and have the communities and business men supplied with credit as well as currency; and I think it would be well to wait a week or ten days and see what we are going to do about things in general before we go to poking into that question too much.

The Comptroller of the Currency is acting under the direction and the constant supervision of an eminent gentleman familiar with these subjects, lately a member of this body, who is acting under the direction and constant control of the legally constituted President of the United States. I do not believe it is well to pass this resolution just now. If the Committee on Finance look at it and by to-morrow morning or the next day say that it is not going to do any harm, or that there is not any more information they want to ask at the same time, they will report it back.

Mr. VOORHEES. I think it would be much safer to have the resolution printed and referred to the Committee on Finance, so as to let us see exactly what we are doing in these critical times.

* * * * * * *

Mr. PEFFER. I am surprised, Mr. President, to witness the sensitiveness of Senators upon this point at a time of peril such as we are now passing through, when the people of this country are looking to the men who are congregated in the national Capitol as their lawmakers for counsel and advice. When it comes to our ears that one of the institutions which the Government has established for the purpose of supplying currency to the people is not obeying the law, and that instead of supplying currency they are refusing it, they are hoarding it, it is time that the people should know the truth about it. Hence I have asked for an official answer from the Secretary of the Treasury.

My information is, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] kindly suggested a moment ago, that the banks are being run to-day in open violation of law, that the lawful reserve in New York City alone has been diminished some $19,000,000 below the lawful amount. I am informed reliably by what has been said on this floor, by private correspondence, and by word of

mouth, that not only in Boston, in New York, and in Philadelphia, but in other portions of the country, the national bankers are refusing to pay even depositors their own money, and yet we are asked now, in this condition of things, to refer the resolution to the Finance Committee, for no other reason in the world, I am satisfied, with due respect to the integrity of the Senators, but to delay this proceeding and to shield the banks from the consequences of an exposure before the American public.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, a few days ago, in a debate upon the bill to increase the issue of currency by the national banks to the extent of 10 per cent of their bonds and up to the par thereof, the question arose as to what was the course which had been pursued during this time of great financial distress by the banks of the city of New York, and there seemed to be a difference of opinion and a lack of full knowledge in the Senate upon that proposition. I think that since that debate the press of the country has somewhat relieved the Senate's ignorance. There seems now to be no question but that the banks of the city of New York, when checks of their depositors are presented to them, decline to pay the currency upon such checks and demand of the depositor that for the check thus presented he shall receive a clearing-house certificate. That has been frequently stated of late in the press of New York.

I am not ready to say but that that course, which is a technical violation of the law and for which there is perhaps no warrant in the statutes, is probably justifiable under the present deplorable conditions; but I do not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is well we should cover up from the knowledge of the people exactly what is the course that is being pursued by the national banks of New York and elsewhere. If the existing facts justify such action outside of the pale of the law, the people of the United States are intelligent and patriotic enough to appreciate that that strain of the law is needed at this trying time.

I have in my hand the Sun, which, it is said, "shines for all," and rises daily in the city of New York, of date Monday, August 21, issued since the debate to which I refer, and I find therein an article signed Matthew Marshall. I have no personal acquaintance with him, but I understand that he is one of the trusted financial editors of the New York Sun, who every Monday morning gives to the public an article on the monetary situation. I read from this article the following statement of the facts as they now exist in the city of New York:

"Notwithstanding the large arrivals of gold from Europe and the increase of their reserves, the banks of this city still refuse to pay their depositors in currency, and will do no more than certify checks as good through the clearing-house. Consequently currency can be had in considerable amounts only by paying, as it is said, a premium upon it, which is now about 3 per cent, but the transactions are really sales of claims against the banks at 3 per cent discount. That is to say, the money which a depositor had to his credit on a bank's books a month, and which was then worth par, will now bring only 97 cents of the dollar, with the prospect of a still further depreciation. Many depositors, therefore, instead of buying currency with their checks, pay out the checks themselves to their creditors, who pass them on in turn to other creditors, and thus a new kind of currency has been added to the miscellaneous varieties of it already in circulation. We had: 1, gold coin; 2, silver dollars; 3, silver fractional coin; 4, gold certificates; 5, silver certificates; 6, old legal-tenders; 7, Sherman-act Treasury notes; 8, national-bank notes; and now we have a ninth kind in certified bank checks, the issue of which on an extensive scale by the banks of the South and the West is proposed as a means, in the absence of other money, for moving the crops to market. How grievously our whole currency system needs reorganization and reform this bare statement of its chaotic condition sufficiently testifies, but we seem to have no financiers competent for the task."

I quote further from this interesting article:

"The question is, how much longer our banks can, without bringing on a catastrophe, continue in their course of increasing the volume of clearing-house certificates and of denying to their depositors payment in lawful money of their checks. Thus far depositors have been very patient, and have good-naturedly submitted to the enforced scaling down of their dues; but they can not be expected to submit to it forever. A bank that can not or will not pay claims against it in the regular course of business is, by the decisions of our State courts, insolvent, and, if the bankrupt act of 1867 were now in force, a refusal by a bank for forty days to pay checks on demand would be a commission of bankruptcy."

This extract from the article shows the situation in the city of New York. There can be but little doubt about the truth being as stated by this writer.

* * * * * * *

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I am aware that it is the custom of this body to pass any resolution asking for information from a Department of the Government that any Senator may think he requires in the discharge of his public duty, but I submit that there are exceptions to all rules. There comes a time, as it has come before, when patriotic duty would require nonaction if action would bring further distress upon the people of this country. There are some things, Mr. President, that we are bound to take note of. They are as public as if they were in the written law. For the third or fourth time during our present monetary system we have reached a period when the national banks of the country are powerless to furnish sufficient currency to provide for the current business.

Mr. President, it is not a new case. The same thing occurred in 1873, 1877, and 1890, and now, in 1893, when it was impossible for the banks to literally comply with the law. They violated it by refusing to pay checks when presented, though the amount was on deposit. They issued clearing-house certificates by the millions, as they are doing to-day. They did it openly. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, whose sworn duty it is to enforce the law, may not have had official information of it; but they must know that the strict enforcement of the law would close the doors of many of the best banks in the country. Such action would not only impair the usefulness of the banks, but would affect injuriously every commercial interest. Mr. President, never during the existence of the national banks has a period arrived half as threatening as the one which confronts us now.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Maryland allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. Suppose the Comptroller of the Currency shuts up the banks, will not the result be that everyone of them will have to be put into the hands of a receiver and nobody will get any money until the receiver pays it out?

Mr. GORMAN. Why, Mr. President, the Senator states the law. He knows that is the law; and the mover of this resolution, and every gentleman of intelligence in the United States, understands that that is the fact. There is not a man I know of outside of this Chamber, no matter what his views may be as to the remedy, who does not know that there is a technical violation of the law, and that it is the patriotic duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to forbear and not add to the distress, but wait until we shall act and give relief.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] yield?

Mr. OATES. There is no one on my side ready to speak now.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I desire the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], who has something like two hours remaining, to consume all except such as he himself desires to retain.

Mr. OATES. I will yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER].

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to speak upon this bill this evening, and therefore am at some disadvantage; but I feel that it is due from me, as a member of the committee, to defend it as far as I can from the assaults which have been made upon it.

One would suppose, from the remarks of some gentlemen who have discussed this measure, that the bill is devised entirely in the interests of the creditor class. One would suppose that those of us who support the bill are animated entirely by a desire to oppress and to harass those who are so unfortunate as to be debtors, and one would infer from their remarks that they represent exclusively the class of people who are indebted, and that they have no respect whatever for the rights of those who are so unfortunate as to be creditors.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States invests in Congress the power to enact a general system of bankruptcy. I do not consider that it carries with it a mandate to enact a general system of bankruptcy, but certainly there is a permission and authority invested in the Congress to enact such a general system whenever in their judgment the condition of the country requires and justifies it.

The framers of the Constitution seemed to look forward to the time when the provincial system existing at the time of its adoption would give way to the closer intercommunication brought about by modern commercial methods.

The time has been when no one was interested in the laws of a locality or a State, except the citizens of that locality or State. The time was when no one could be injuriously affected by the operation of the laws of a State or a municipality, except those who lived within the State or municipality; but, Mr. Chairman, that time has passed away, and the time has come when the commercial interests of the United States demand and require that there shall be a uniform method of liquidation of insolvent estates. The time has come when the merchants of New York, the merchants of Philadelphia, the merchants of Chicago, the merchants of any great city in this Union, the merchants in any county or State, are interested in a uniform interpretation of what is recognized as the general commercial law of the country, and the uniform liquidation of estates of those who have failed in business, and this as much in the interest of those who fail as of their creditors.

Now, sir, it is not proposed to interfere with any local statutes or any State statutes which are for the protection of the debtor. The law does not propose to interfere with any of them. It merely proposes that when any debtor finds himself unable to pay his debts, or when he has committed any one of the acts which, under the law, gives ground for putting him into bankruptcy, that his property and assets shall be liquidated by an uniform rule, which shall guarantee to every creditor in any part of the United States a fair share in that distribution.

Mr. Chairman, I confess I stand absolutely amazed by the strictures and denunciations which are put upon this measure by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE]. Why, sir, he almost goes into spasms because national banks are not included in its provisions. It has been said here repeatedly, and so often that I repeat it with a certain degree of hesitation, that the reason why national banks are not included within the provisions of this law is because we have a rigorous and summary method of liquidating the affairs of any national bank which may appear to be insolvent or which fails to meet its obligations, whether solvent or insolvent. No national bank can refuse to honor a check drawn against a deposit, no national bank can afford not to redeem a certificate of deposit, no national bank can fail to comply with any of its obligations or contracts without incurring the penalty of immediate suspension and liquidation under the authority of the officers of the Government.

National banks are not subjected to the provisions of this bill, simply because the laws already upon the statute book are fully sufficient to protect the rights of depositors, and the rights of every one who may be interested in them, and it would be idle to supply other means of liquidation when those now provided by law have been found to be ample and effective. We have for them a general and uniform system of bankruptcy far more rigorous than that now proposed. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] refers to persons who have deposited their money in national banks, the poor depositors who have saved up their money against a rainy day, who, when they go to the na-

tional banks, are told, "We must have your confidence, but we can not give you your money." Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] know of any instance where a national bank has failed to pay a depositor, where the depositor could not, if he saw fit, take proceedings to put that bank into immediate suspension?

Why, sir, the law has not been suspended by the condition of the country for the last six or eight months; and the fact that no one proceeded against the banks and put them into suspension because of inability to meet their obligations only shows that the depositors and creditors of those institutions had confidence in them, and felt that it would be better for the general interests of the country that they should extend them consideration rather than involve them in the ruin that would be brought about by enforced liquidation at that time.

The gentleman forgets that according to his argument the moment a national bank or anyone else can not or does not pay his debts, that moment he becomes an innocent and persecuted debtor. That instant any proceedings invoked to enforce rights become oppressive. The creditor, however poor or however wronged by the failure of his debtor, becomes a remorseless, unpatriotic tyrant, who should be reprobated by the law the moment he attempts to assert his rights, and however wealthy the debtor may be, however great his resources may be, however great the assets in his hands may be, however great his obligation to respond to the demands of his creditors, and, finally, however fraudulent his conduct may have been, ought to be the special care of the law, and protected against the oppressive demands of creditors that property paid for with their money shall be subjected to sale in satisfaction of the just debts of the insolvent. He forgets that a bank would, the moment it closed its doors, unable to meet its obligations, become one of the unfortunate victims for whom his sympathy is so great, and he forgets also that the wealthy wholesale and great traders not infrequently fail, bringing ruin to many persons so unfortunate as to be their creditors. Has he no sympathy for the creditor whose all is involved in a failure, and who is in danger of failure himself because of inability to get what is due him? Is he entitled to no consideration? Has he no rights which the gentleman respects, and is he to be treated as criminal because he is a creditor? Now, sir, gentlemen say that this bill is not demanded by the country. They ignore the fact that the demand for it comes up from the commercial interests who alone are affected by the involuntary features of the law from practically all over the country.

It is not only asked for by the wholesalers, but by the retailers, because they all recognize that the scope, object, and effect of the law will be to cheapen credit by giving certainty to business transactions and protecting them against the frauds that are constantly being perpetrated. The wholesaler specially realizes that he will have less to charge up for bad debts, and will incur less loss from failures than under present conditions. He will know that in case of insolvency the assets of the debtor can be brought into court for distribution; that the debtor will no longer be permitted to select the assignee, in whose integrity and capacity his creditors are alone interested; that collusive attachments and sham sales, the convenient and accessible shelter of the fraudulent debtor, will be practically things of the past, and that goods sold by one dealer in due course of business, and to be disposed of in that way, may not be immediately transferred to a "preferred" creditor, or given in payment of a doubtful debt to a member of the debtor's family.

It is to the permanent interest of no one that frauds in business shall be encouraged and facilitated by refusing legislation that will make them difficult of accomplishment and easy of detection. The "trade," as it is called, is fully impressed that legislation of this character will be a protection to the fair dealer and a constant menace to those who would if they could, and as they frequently do, enrich themselves by buying goods which they never pay for and never expected to pay for when they bought them.

Now, sir, the gentleman from Mississippi makes scarecrows himself and gets frightened at them.

The bill will not affect the farmers of his district unless they voluntarily invoke its protection. The merchants of his district, I will guarantee, are making no protest against it. He imagines a case where people are owing money in the summer, at a time when money can not be raised to pay debts, when he says they ought be let alone until they can make their crops, so that they will be able to meet their obligations.

In reply to that, Mr. Chairman, I would state that people do not usually make debts payable in summer, when they can not get the money to pay them; but if they do, they ordinarily get extensions when they are entitled to them, because the average creditor never resorts to legal proceedings except as a last resort. Why, what lawyer upon this floor has known, and how many instances have they in their experience known, of a creditor who would go to law, who would take all the expense of precipitating litigation, that would run the risk not only of losing the debt, but of incurring heavy damages and expense, except as a last resort and when he saw no other means available to protect his rights.

If a debtor says, "I can not pay now, but I will be able to pay you at such and such a time," and is able to make a reasonable showing of his ability to do it, is it not the experience of every man upon this floor, of every man who has had anything to do with business of this character, that the creditor is always glad to accept it? I have had for my age a long experience as a practitioner, and I have not in my practice ever known of a single case of the institution of a malicious suit. I have never known a creditor to take out an attachment for the purpose of breaking up his debtor. I have never known a man to institute a malicious suit for the recovery of what he did not believe to be due him. I have known many men mulcted in damages for taking out attachments where the result was the debtor had shown that he had no intention to defraud his creditors, or made it to appear that way; and the party who brought the attachment suit was not only mulcted in damages, but the debtor succeeded in placing all his property beyond the reach of his creditors.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when we come to legislate in this House we should not look at any question which is presented to us from the standpoint of classes. We should not legislate in the interest of debtors; we should not legislate in the interest of creditors. I do not understand that there are any gentlemen here who represent exclusively either debtors or creditors. I am here in the advocacy of this bill, not as it stands, but with amendments; preserving, however, the general aspect and scope of the bill, merely for the purpose of giving to the country a conservative measure which will restore confidence to business, which will cheapen credits, which will insure a just, honest, economical administration of insolvent estates wherever debtors admit or wherever the courts decide that they are insolvent, are unable to pay their debts, and apply for relief, or have committed acts inconsistent with honest intention, and which renders a continuance of business impossible.

Simply that, Mr. Chairman, and nothing more. I would not stand here to advocate or support a measure which can be justly characterized as unpatriotic or as oppressive, and when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] and other gentlemen rise here and denounce this measure in that way, I think they are going beyond the bounds of reason. I think they are going beyond what the character of the gentlemen who advocate the bill justifies. I think they are taking rather too much upon themselves when they assume the position of champions and defenders of the oppressed classes against the attacks of other gentlemen here who represent people as virtuous as their own, who have as much interest, as much conscience, and as much sense of duty to stand by their constituents as have those who constitute themselves the champions of the people whom they profess to regard as likely to be oppressed by this bill.

Now, sir, before taking my seat I want to call attention briefly to certain amendments which I propose to suggest at the proper time. I shall move that the causes of bankruptcy be limited to cases of actual fraud, that no man be made subject to be adjudged an involuntary bankrupt unless he has absconded and remains absconded; unless he has sold his property with intent to defraud his creditors, or has converted it into negotiable assets, with the same intent; unless he has confessed a collusive judgment or taken some other collusive proceeding for the purpose of fraudulently preferring certain creditors. To these grounds the provisions of the bill in relation to involuntary bankruptcy in my judgment ought to be limited. I think also that the extreme penalties contained in the bill ought to be taken out.

I think there ought to be nothing in the bill imposing a penalty upon a man for anything that he does unless it is done after he has filed a petition to be adjudged a bankrupt, or in contemplation thereof, or after a petition has been filed against him to adjudge him a bankrupt or in contemplation thereof; and that he ought to have his honorable discharge if he has faithfully surrendered all his property and complied with the requirements of the law and the judgment of the court. To such provisions I think the bill ought to be limited. It ought to respect the laws of the States which authorize preferences. It ought to provide for setting aside only those preferences which are fraudulent and which would be held to be so by the courts of the States where they reside. It ought to respect the homestead and exemption laws of the States.

In other words, it ought to respect all the rights given to the citizen by the laws of the State wherein he resides, and that is the real scope of the bill as it is urged upon the House. Gentlemen who are opposing it here have been repeatedly informed that the friends of the bill were ready to support amendments

which would limit its scope in the way I have suggested. Yet in the face of that information we have seen them going on here fighting windmills, torturing the provisions of the bill, making mountains out of molehills, and trying to show that provisions which are entirely innocent are extremely oppressive. For instance, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] calls the attention of the House to a provision which imposes a penalty for a referee who fails to make a report to the Attorney-General of the business conducted before him.

The provision of the bill requiring the referee in each case to make a report to the Attorney-General is merely for statistical purposes, and a failure to comply with it is merely a failure to comply with a formal regulation, and is punishable by a fine of $100; but the gentleman from Mississippi would have the House believe that that penalty would apply to a case of misappropriation of $1,000 or $10,000! He described an imaginary case where on the one side the insolvent debtor was liable to imprisonment for two years for failing to make a correct and full surrender of his property, while, as he said, the referee, on the other hand, might embezzle $10,000 and only be sent to the parish jail and fined $100. The referee handles no money; the trustee handles it all, and the gentleman ought to have known that if the trustee fails to account for the funds in his hands he will be liable to prosecution under the general law for embezzlement, and, upon conviction, will be subject to the punishment which the law provides for that offense.

Yet the gentleman from Mississippi would have the House believe that, under the provision which he read, the referee could embezzle the funds and escape with a light fine.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You mean the trustee.

Mr. BOATNER. No, I mean the referee; I am quoting what the gentleman from Mississippi said.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi referred the House to another section of this bill, a section which provides that an insolvent may be prosecuted and convicted for doing certain things, among which is his failing to disclose the names of all his creditors. Now, what is the reason of that provision? Suppose an insolvent discloses the names of only a portion of his creditors and they by collusion and combination with him carry through bankruptcy proceedings, enormous injury might in this way be done to other creditors whose names are not disclosed. I say that an insolvent debtor by furnishing a false schedule of his debts, thus notifying only those parties whom he desires to notify, might perpetrate fraud upon others who were not notified. Therefore there should be, of course, some penalty to compel a full and substantially correct statement of his indebtedness.

More than that, he should be liable to punishment if he puts down as a creditor one who is not a creditor. It seems to me almost self-evident that an act of this kind should be provided against by proper penalties. If not, what would be the difficulty in the insolvent putting upon his schedule the names of friends of his to whom he had given simulated or sham evidences of indebtedness, and who, acting as creditors, might come in and vote as his interests might dictate? I might go on, Mr. Speaker, and successfully refute every criticism made, but the good sense of this House renders it unnecessary. The attacks on the administration of the bankrupt act of 1867 by Judge E. H. Durell have no application to this bill. That unfortunate official was driven from the bench in disgrace and has answered in the highest court of last resort. I do not feel called upon either to attack or defend him; but if he were upon the Federal bench now the frauds perpetrated under the act of 1867 would be impossible. The points of weakness in that bill are guarded and protected in this, but the honorable gentleman should borrow no trouble about that. He seems to be only concerned about the debtors, and they did not complain even of the act of 1867.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OATES. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OUTHWAITE reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 139) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 42) permitting Anson Mills, colonel of Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. William Lilly, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Resolved, That the Senate concur in the resolution of the House of Representatives providing for the appointment of a joint committee to attend the funeral of the deceased at his late residence in the State of Pennsylvania, and that the committee on the part of the Senate, consisting of five Senators, be appointed by the Vice-President.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

In compliance with the foregoing the Vice-President appointed Mr. QUAY, Mr. MANDERSON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. KYLE as said committee.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret the announcement of the death of the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

UNVEILING OF STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

Mr. SPRINGER, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol be authorized and directed to erect a temporary platform in the old Hall of Representatives to be used in connection with the ceremonies of unveiling the statue of Gen. James Shields, at 2 o'clock on to-morrow, the 6th instant.

And then (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), on motion of Mr. OATES, the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 4446) for the free coinage of the standard silver dollar—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CATCHINGS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4447) to provide money for the use of the people of the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RAWLINS: A bill (H. R. 4448) for the relief of persons who have filed declarations of intention to enter desert lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4449) for an act fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4450) providing for the erection of a public building at Salt Lake City, Utah—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) providing for the erection of a public building at Ogden City, Utah—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 4452) adding the towns of Manchester and Vernon, in the State of Connecticut, to the customs district of Hartford, Conn., and making the city of Rockville, Conn., a port of delivery—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4453) providing for the dedication of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STORER: A bill (H. R. 4454) to amend sections 3329 and 3330 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: A bill (H. R. 4455) providing for the transfer of the Pension Bureau to the War Department—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKRELL: A bill (H. R. 4456) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4457) to provide for a new grade of letter-carriers in cities whose postal revenues shall exceed the sum of $500,000—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLMAN: A bill (H. R. 4458) to amend section 7 of "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A joint resolution (H. Res. 92) to print extra copies of the decisions of the Interior Department relating to public lands and pensions—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANCHARD: A bill (H. R. 4459) for the relief of Paul Chappin, Rapides Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 4460) for the relief of James G. Reed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) granting a pension to Adaline Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4462) for the relief of Augustus C. Paul—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOMBS: A bill (H. R. 4463) for the relief of Lieut. Herbert Cushman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4464) for the relief of Adolph von Haake—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT: A bill (H. R. 4465) for the relief of John C. Howe—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: A bill (H. R. 4466) granting an increase of pension to John Stillwell, late a private in Company D, Fourth New Jersey Battery, Light Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 4467) to amend the military record of Capt. Thomas M. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4468) for the relief of Henry P. Bottom—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) for the relief of W. G. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'NEIL: A bill (H. R. 4470) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States revenue cutter Gallatin off the coast of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIPE: A bill (H. R. 4471) granting a pension to Mary A. Freeman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STORER: A bill (H. R. 4472) granting a pension to John C. Riker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEVER: A bill (H. R. 4473) for the relief of Lucy A Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petitions of 264 citizens of Heppner, 15 of Hardman, 32 of Lexington, 50 of Douglas, and 10 of Wasco County, all of Oregon, asking for the extension of time to pay for railroad lands forfeited under act September 29, 1890—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRADY: Papers in claim of Henry Covert, of Newberne, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Petition in relation to House bill 3291 amending the interstate commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Wear Craford, private Company G, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, to have the charge of desertion removed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John Weeks for removal of charge of desertion and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Indianapolis Subordinate Association of the National Lithographic Artists and Engravers' Protective Association of America for tariff protection—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Memorial of William A. Taylor, a citizen of Ohio, respecting the suspension of pensions under recent ruling of the Secretary of the Interior—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of J. A. Cooper to the Congress of the United States, requesting that his claim for stores and supplies taken by the Federal forces for their use during the late war be referred to the Court of Claims for findings of fact—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

DAVID TURPIE, a Senator from the State of Indiana; WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine, and WILLIAM B. BATE, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATIONS REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications for the year ending October 31, 1893; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

TREASURY ACCOUNTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Treasurer of the United States, transmitting fair and accurate copies of the accounts rendered to and settled with the First Comptroller of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893; which, with the accompanying papers, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney-General; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

INDIAN RIVER CHANNEL IN FLORIDA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of October 17, 1893, an estimate of cost for dredging a channel from the Indian River of Florida through Negro Cut to the bar at Indian River Inlet; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 51) to change the boundaries of the judicial districts of the State of Florida was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within Shawnee County, in the State of Kansas, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives relative to the statue of Gen. James Shields, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions.

Mr. CULLOM. I would ask the consideration of the resolutions at this time but for the fact that my colleague [Mr. PALMER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] are expected to say something on the subject and they are not now present. As soon as those gentlemen come in I shall call up the resolutions for consideration. In the meantime let the resolutions lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petitions of William Sanders Post, No. 661, of Shawnee; of soldiers of the late war of Madisonville, Sugar Tree Ridge, Williamsburg, Trimble, and Moscow; of L. D. Kee Post, No. 378, Grand Army of the Republic of Colebrook, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 121) for the relief of William A. Harkweather, of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 1195) to provide for the erection of an additional fireproof building for the National Museum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1196) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accomodation of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1197) declaring a pension a vested right, regulating suspensions of pensions, granting appeals to supreme court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1198) defining sundry crimes against the United States in the administration of the pension laws thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1199) to provide for furnishing the decisions of the courts in patent cases to the circuit courts of the United States and to the Patent Office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1200) granting a pension to Nancy Walker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1201) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamer Tallapoosa; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1202) to make Rockville, in the State of Connecticut, a subport of entry; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that it should go to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know why. It is purely a matter relating to the collection of revenue.

Mr. FRYE. But all such bills go to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. All similar bills have heretofore gone to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE. The Committee on Commerce has entire jurisdiction of the subject-matter.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course I submit to custom, but I supposed the Committee on Finance to be the appropriate committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 1203) to amend sections numbered 3433, 3433*a*, 3433*b*, and 3434, internal revenue laws; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1204) for the relief of Albert J. Pratt, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1205) granting a pension to Edmund C. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. HOAR, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, so far as in his opinion it shall not be inconsistent with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate copies of all instructions which may have been given to any representative of the United States, or any naval officer thereof, since the 4th day of March, 1881, in regard to the preservation of public order in Hawaii, or the protection of the lives and property of American citizens, or the recognition or support of any government there.

Mr. FAULKNER. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday to suggest that the resolution should lie over until the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is present.

Mr. HOAR. No, sir; I made no such suggestion.

Mr. FAULKNER. The Senator did not?

Mr. CULLOM. May I interfere for a moment? I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he will let the resolution be laid aside informally that I may call up another.

Mr. HOAR. Very well, if the Senator's resolution leads to no debate.

Mr. CULLOM. It is in relation to the statue that will be unveiled to-day in Statuary Hall; and whatever is done about it ought to be done at this hour.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interfere with such an act of graceful public recognition of Gen. Shields, and therefore I will consent that the resolution shall stand over until to-morrow. How long will the resolution of the Senator from Illinois take?

Mr. CULLOM. Three-quarters of an hour, perhaps.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the pending resolution may go over until the end of the consideration of the Senator's resolution and then be continued, notwithstanding the expiration of the morning hour.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not seek to displace it in any way except for the present consideration of the resolution from the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; let the resolution lie on the table informally.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts will lie on the table for the present.

STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the resolutions of the House of Representatives be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be again read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 5, 1893.

Resolved, That Wednesday, the 6th day of December, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, be designated and set apart for the consideration of the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to the governor, and through him to the people of the State of Illinois, for the statue of Gen. James Shields, whose name is so honorably identified with the history of the State and of the United States.

Resolved, That this statue is accepted in the name of the United States, and is assigned a place in the old hall of the House of Representatives, already set aside by act of Congress for the statues of eminent citizens; and that a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of Illinois.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire of my friend from Illinois how the resolutions come here.

Mr. CULLOM. They have come from the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions were received from the House of Representatives, the Chair will state.

Mr. HOAR. As the resolutions were read it is the action of the House of Representatives setting apart in that body a time for the consideration of a certain subject.

Mr. CULLOM. It is a concurrent resolution adopted by the other House and sent here.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have it read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolutions of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR. The resolutions seem to me very extraordinary in form. As the Secretary read them it is simply the action of the House of Representatives that a certain time in the future, to wit, 1 o'clock to-day, forty minutes hence, be there set apart for the consideration of the subject. Nothing else has passed the House. The concurrent resolution is something which the House is to take up forty minutes hence, and I submit respectfully that there is nothing before the Senate now.

Mr. CULLOM. For the purpose of settling the matter I will introduce a concurrent resolution in the Senate and ask for its consideration.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; let that be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the thanks of Congress be tendered to the governor, to the Legislature, and to the people of the State of Illinois, for the statue of Gen. James Shields, whose name is so closely identified with the history of Illinois and of the United States, by his eminent services as a soldier, jurist, and statesman.

Resolved, That the statue be accepted and assigned to a place in Statuary Hall (the old Hall of Representatives), and that a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of Illinois.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolutions.

Mr. VOORHEES. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether there is a precedent for tendering the thanks of Congress to the authorities of a State on an occasion of this kind?

Mr. CULLOM. It was done in the case of the Cass statue; and I think in almost every other case where action was taken by Congress in reference to a statue.

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not myself remember such a case.

Mr. CULLOM. I will state to the Senator from Indiana that I looked the matter up, and I found this to be the practice.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, it seems to me that he should proceed upon his resolutions.

Mr. CULLOM. That I propose to do.

Mr. HOAR. That is strictly in order; but the House resolutions are not before the Senate, except as a mere matter of information.

Mr. CULLOM. I offered my own resolutions with that view; and now, if the Senate will allow me, I will make a few remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Illinois are before the Senate, and the Senator from Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, the State of Illinois, responding to the act of Congress which extended to the several States an invitation to provide and furnish statues, not exceeding two from each State, of deceased citizens illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished military or civic services, has presented a statue, which now stands in the famous hall designated for its reception, of one whose name and services have long been familiar to the people of this country—Gen. James Shields. This statue is the first presented by Illinois to the National Government. The nation has done itself and the State of Illinois, which claims the martyred President as her son, great honor by placing the statue of Lincoln by the side of those of Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton.

Mr. President, the soldier and statesman whose statue is received to-day was a native of Ireland, born in the city of Dungannon, county Tyrone, in 1810. At the age of 16, filled with

enthusiasm for America and liberty, he found his way to the United States, and soon after his arrival began the study of the law. He located in Kaskaskia, the then capital of Illinois, and commenced the practice of his chosen profession.

In a few years he was elected to the State Legislature from his county, though not at the time a naturalized citizen. Subsequently he was chosen auditor of the State. In 1843 he became one of the judges of the supreme court of the State, and afterward was appointed by President Polk Commissioner of the General Land Office. While in this office the United States became involved in a war with Mexico; and the State of Illinois, ever ready to defend the flag and maintain the honor of the nation, furnished six regiments of volunteers—its quota of troops—which were placed in camp. Gen. Shields resigned his office as Commissioner of the General Land Office, was commissioned brigadier-general, and ordered to take command of the camp of Illinois troops. He did not have command of all these troops in Mexico, but he commanded there a brigade, and made a name for courage and patriotism not surpassed by any other soldier on any bloody field. In the battle of Cerro Gordo he was severely wounded and borne from the field, Col. E. D. Baker succeeding him in command.

Mr. President, you are familiar with the names of the brave men of our State who took part in the Mexican war: John J. Hardin, who dashed down to death, but who made sure of victory for American arms at Buena Vista; the gallant and honored Bissell; the generous and patriotic Irish soldier, Shields; the brave and accomplished orator, Baker; with Richardson, Logan, Oglesby, Morrison, Forman, Harris, Ross, and many other brave men who did gallant service in that war.

It is a remarkable fact that not less than five of the men who went from Illinois to the Mexican war afterwards became distinguished members of this Senate: Gen. Shields, Gen. Baker, Gen. Richardson, Gen. Logan, and Gen. Oglesby. In addition to these, Bissell became a distinguished member of the House of Representatives and afterward governor of the State, and Col. Thomas L. Harris and Hon. Lewis W. Ross became active and influential members of the House of Representatives.

Gen. Shields recovered from what at the time was believed to be a fatal wound, returned to duty and in the battle of Chapultepec was again severely wounded. In these great battles, the first under Gen. Taylor and the second under Gen. Scott, he fought gallantly, knowing no fear, was wounded severly in each, but doing much to bring victory to American arms. And I have been told that he received in the different wars in which he took part, in defense of his country, not less than eleven wounds.

Gen. Shields was mustered out of the military service in July, 1848, and was immediately tendered the office of governor of Oregon Territory, which, so far as I can learn, he declined. In 1849, a little more than a year after he returned from the Mexican war, and after a spirited contest, he was elected as a Democrat to the United States Senate. Not having been a citizen of the country for the constitutional period of nine years, the Senate declared his election void, after he had duly qualified. To fill the vacancy thus caused, the Illinois Legislature was convened in extraordinary session in October following, and Gen. Shields being now eligible (it was after he had become eligible under the United States Constitution), was again elected. He thus enjoyed the unusual honor of having been twice elected and qualified as a United States Senator in the same year.

In this high office he served the State faithfully and ably, as he had in every other position of trust and honor. After the expiration of his Senatorial term, Gen. Shields removed from Illinois to Minnesota Territory, and on the admission of that State into the Union he was elected United States Senator, and served until March 3, 1859. Following the promptings of his restless spirit, this energetic man, after retiring from the Senate, removed to California, and still later was engaged in mining and kindred pursuits in Mexico, until the breaking out of our great civil war.

With the true spirit of American chivalry, he at once tendered his services to the United States Government, and in 1861 he was again appointed brigadier-general of volunteers. He accordingly entered the service and in less than a year was so severely wounded at the battle of Kernstown (here in Virginia, near Winchester), in March, 1862, that he was compelled to resign on account of the permanent injuries received. He thereafter removed to Wisconsin, where he took part in the politics of that State, as a Democrat, and at one time acted as chairman of the Democratic State convention. Subsequently he moved to Missouri, and held important offices, both by election and appointment, having been successively railroad commissioner and member of the State Legislature. I have been reminded that he was in that State also elected a member of Congress from the district in which he lived, but failed to secure his seat.

Finally, after the death of Senator Louis V. Bogy, he was elected by the Legislature to succeed Senator Armstrong, who had been appointed to fill the vacancy until the convening of the Legislature. Gen. Shields again took his seat in the United States Senate in January, 1879, and retired in March following, upon the expiration of the term. He was succeeded in the Senate by the distinguished Senator [Mr. VEST] who now represents that State with such marked ability.

Mr. President, the simple recital of the wonderful career of Gen. Shields, giving but a brief outline, seems almost like a dream of fancy, a romance of imagination. No other American citizen, native or naturalized, has ever been certified or commissioned as a member of this Senate by three different great States. The announcement of the fact that Gen. Shields was so commissioned carries with it the irresistible conclusion that he was no ordinary man. It is proof in itself that he possessed qualities of head and heart that drew around him his fellow-men wherever he went or in whatever he was engaged, whether in field or forum.

Mr. President, while he was foreign-born, yet no American citizen has ever shown a greater devotion to American institutions; no American citizen has ever shown greater affection for the Union and the flag; neither did any patriot show more willingness to spill his blood for human liberty. He was the close friend of Douglas, serving with him upon the supreme bench of Illinois, and was also his colleague in this Senate. He was an admirer of Gen. Taylor, and spoke of him as "Old Rough and Ready." He was the friend of the Union soldier, and his last period of service in the Senate was marked by his fervent appeal in behalf of the veterans of the Mexican war.

The civil war was then over: a grateful people were showing a spirit of liberality toward those who had served in it and to their widows and orphans in granting liberal pensions and bounties. He was in full sympathy with the spirit which prevailed in the North, but he felt that the veterans of the Mexican war were being lost sight of, and in behalf of his comrades of that war he called the attention of the Senate to the services of the army in securing to the nation the command of the Pacific Slope by the acquisition of territory on our Western border, stretching 700 miles north and south and 900 miles east and west. In the simplest language he said:

> Give us a little of that we helped to secure for our country; give us a small pittance to help us while on the downward path of life in our old days; give us something so assist us in our last days when we are marching to that field from which no warrior has ever returned victorious.

This was an eloquent appeal, and in itself is proof that the real beauty of eloquence is in simplicity of utterance. He was not pleading for himself—Congress had dealt kindly by him; he was receiving a pension of $100 per month, which after his death was continued to his widow and children. Gen. Shields died in June, 1879, in Ottumwa, Iowa.

When the Mexican war ended, having commanded troops from the States of Illinois and South Carolina, he was honored by both States, the Legislature of each of which presented him with a richly mounted sword in consideration of the gallant and meritorious services rendered by him in the war. He was in command of troops of both States when he received his last wound. After his death these swords were purchased by the National Government from his widow and placed in the military archives of the nation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this brief story shows Gen. Shields to have been one of the most illustrious men of our country. He was a hero, patriot, soldier, and statesman. He believed in his adopted country, and was ever ready to fight for its flag in war, as he always served it faithfully in peace. He could not perhaps be said to have been an orator equal to Daniel O'Connell, who was called Ireland's liberator, or of Grattan, who, in condemning a measure in the Irish Parliament, uttered these memorable words:

> I will remain anchored here with fidelity to the fortunes of my country, faithful to her freedom, faithful to her fall;

or of Curran, the great advocate in the trial of causes. Shields had not the power of eloquence of either, but he was the equal of either in steadfastness to duty and in courage to perform it.

Mr. President, I should be unjust to the feelings of my own heart if I failed to refer on this occasion to the circumstances of my last meeting with Gen. Shields. Some who hear me will remember the day, some fifteen years ago, when the people of my own and several adjacent States met at Mount Vernon, Ill., to participate in perhaps the grandest meeting ever held in the Mississippi Valley, a reunion of the soldiers of five wars. Among the many thousands who gathered there were two or three solitary, wrinkled, and decrepit men, aged fathers, still surviving from the war of 1812; a number of the remnants of the Black Hawk and Winnebago Indian wars; others who had marched to Nauvoo in the Mormon war; there were veterans who had sur-

vived the deadly Mexican campaign, and there were very many who had left their records upon a hundred fields in the last great struggle which ended in 1865.

I can now without impropriety refer by name to some of great renown, now passed from earth, who that day cried "Hail" and "Welcome" to that vast multitude. The Army of the nation was represented by its great general, Sherman, then in his brightest mood, whose hearty handshake sent a thrill through the very soul of every greeting comrade: there was Logan, the volunteer soldier and the idol of his State, now gone forever from these Halls; and there was Shields, the adopted citizen, a soldier brave as the bravest, a statesman honored repeatedly by my State, wearing a wreath of honor conferred by three great commonwealths, a tribute of higher value than ever crowned a Roman senator.

I do not detract from the living in giving praise to such noble dead. It is a blessed memory to me, and it will remain with me always—the memory of that day when I stood face to face with men whose names now shed a glory upon the pages of American history. And of those aged and wearied forms who were met there, how many are now with the dust? How few now live?

Men who remembered the massacre at Chicago and the surrender at Detroit; those who had fought Tecumseh and battled at Peoria; men who had shaken hands with Lafayette at Kaskaskia; men who had marched to fight Black Hawk in 1832; those who had been mustered at Nauvoo in 1845; men who returned victorious from Mexico in 1847—all these, with unnumbered citizen soldiers of our own time, were there. And Shields, the brave and fearless Shields, was there, first to welcome and then to bid us all farewell.

What monarchy could present such a scene? What emperor could command such an audience? Where but in America could every man feel that this was his reunion; that this was his country, and these his comrades and his brothers?

I have gazed with pleasure upon the memorial statues which a grateful and reverent people have erected in the thronged and crowded street of the Irish capital city of Dublin, to O'Connell and Grattan, the patriot statesman and the great orator. May I hope, Mr. President, that this statue which the State of Illinois, on invitation of the General Government, this day unveils and presents in this Pantheon of America, will ever remain as a suitable memorial of the illustrious soldier and statesman, Shields?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the State of Missouri thanks Illinois for placing in this Capitol the statue of Gen. James Shields with that of Abraham Lincoln, her most distinguished citizen.

It is eminently suggestive and proper that the great Commonwealth which honored them both should have here the statues of Lincoln and Shields, always politically adversaries and at one time personal enemies, but never divided in their love of country. It augurs well for the future that the petty divisions of political opinion are thus obliterated, and the people of our whole country, so long as the Government exists, can look upon the marble images of those who differed in methods but not in motives, and of whom the impartial judgment of their countrymen has declared that they "deserve well of the Republic."

Of all the eminent men whose names will appear in our country's history, James Shields alone has represented three sovereign States in the Senate of the United States. It is equally significant that when he came to the Senate on each occasion he represented the same opinions and policies upon public questions.

At the close of the last war he became a citizen of Missouri, and in 1868 was elected to the National House of Representatives from the Kansas City district, but a portion of the returns were destroyed in the office of the Secretary of State, and the old hero was thus defrauded of his rightful title. He was afterward elected to the popular branch of the State General Assembly, and in 1879 was sent to this body, serving out the unexpired term of Lewis V. Bogy.

Cast in heroic mold, steadfast in conviction, a stranger to fear and duplicity, this soldier-statesman is the most illustrious representative of those Irish-Americans who baptized in blood their allegiance to our free institutions.

Illinois, Minnesota, and Missouri especially honored him when living, and the whole Union now claims his glorious career as a common legacy: but in Missouri, among the people who loved him above all others, rest his ashes. We will guard them well, for in all our broad domain never has there been a life which better illustrated American manhood or shed greater luster upon the American name.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the political career of Gen. Shields, varied and successful as it was, began in the State of Minnesota, it is manifestly proper that a representative of that State should say some words upon the present occasion.

The career of Gen. Shields illustrates and exemplifies beyond any precedent that occurs to me, the capacity of our institutions for the successful political and military advancement of those who love those institutions, wherever they may have been born, or whatever their political antecedents may have been.

Gen. Shields was a Senator from three States. He was a veteran of two wars. His personal valor largely contributed to the acquisition of an empire to the United States, and the same valor vastly contributed to the establishment of our institutions upon foundations of permanency.

After the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] and those of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] nothing is left for me to say by way of history or eulogium.

Gen. Shields belonged to a generation in Minnesota which laid the foundation of that Commonwealth. The most of them have passed away. I never knew him; I never saw him. His name is almost a tradition in our State; but, Mr. President, being, as he was, among those early pioneers who established that great and growing Commonwealth by his record of gallantry, his charms of personal manner, of which the tradition yet remains, he became one of the first Senators from that State, and these ceremonies, instituted by the State of Illinois, commemorative of the distinguished services, military and political, of this alien-born and yet patriotic citizen, will be intensely gratifying to those who remember Gen. Shields and to the people of his nationality in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, who has been its governor and who has so long represented it in this body, has very fittingly and properly performed the duty of speaking for the State and in paying its tribute to the great fame of Gen. James Shields. There remains for me but little more than to ask the adoption of the resolutions now before the Senate.

Mr. President, word painters, like other painters, sometimes fail to observe the fitting accessories and surroundings of their portrait. In order to understand the character of Gen. Shields, it must be known who were his rivals, who it was that engaged with him in the generous contests for both professional and political honors in Illinois. Without thus observing those who were his rivals and opponents, we should not properly appreciate and but little would we understand the true life and manhood and greatness of Lincoln. To delineate a giant and surround him with pigmies would convey no impression of his real power. So it is almost always the case that the biographer, in his admiration for his hero, forgets the essential conditions which surround him and which go to make up his greatness.

I met James Shields in October, 1840, at one of the circuits in Illinois. I had just come into possession of that which I regarded as almost a patent of nobility—a license to practice the profession of the law. At that court Sidney Breese, the great jurist and subsequently a distinguished Senator from Illinois, presided. Alexander P. Field, whose eloquence is still a tradition in central and southern Illinois, was there; and Gustavus Koerner, still living, wise and profound. He had been a citizen but a few years, and was then distinguished for the great characteristics which have made him so well known since.

These were the leaders of that bar. I admired them. They became to me objects of emulation. I met the general, then Mr. Shields, a month later at Vandalia. There the same lawyers were present, with the addition of Joseph Gillespie, that solid jurist, devotee of ancient black-letter law, a master of the science of special pleading, which he understood so well and which science he survived, it having perished by the blows mainly of men who never understood it or appreciated it. There we were joined by Usher F. Linder, the orator and wit of the bar of the State. Those were the men with whom Gen. Shields was called upon to contend for professional honors.

Later I knew him when he was the associate of Lincoln and Douglas and many other great men whose names now escape my memory. He was not like them. He was not like Douglas nor like Lincoln nor like Baker, but he was a foeman worthy of the steel of any of them at any time, either at the bar or in the Legislature.

I knew him subsequently when as a judge he presided in the circuit where I had a few clients. He was generous and just, not profoundly learned; but his acumen and his discrimination, his power of perceiving and weighing arguments addressed to him was something remarkable. His intuitive perception of justice and right was such as made him the very refuge of the oppressed and the wronged.

I knew him subsequently, when he had an office under the State government. I knew him when he was appointed to the Army. I was present when he returned and was welcomed at Springfield.

We were political associates and personal friends. I regarded him as being somewhat unique, somewhat unlike other men, but still a remarkable man, and I cluster around him from memory

names of these great men that he may be properly appreciated and understood, because greatness can never be manifested except on great occasions or in contests between great men. Wars of giants attract the attention of mankind, but wars between the pigmy and the giant have no attractions for any considerate mind.

I observed Gen. Shields's political course. It was my misfortune to differ with him on a great public question. I was a member of the State Legislature at the expiration of his term of service in this body. I was compelled by my convictions of political and public duty to vote for another for a seat in this honorable body. I did so, and my nomination and vote gave to this body another one of the great men of whom Illinois is so proud. It gave to the Senate Lyman Trumbull, whose great services as a jurist as well as a statesman are written upon the statute books of the Republic. This, I am proud to say, had no influence upon the personal relations between Gen. Shields and myself. We continued to be friends. He left Illinois soon after and became a citizen of Minnesota, and reappeared in this body as the Representative of that young Commonwealth.

His military history is a part of the inheritance of the country. That he distinguished himself in Mexico we know, and especially in Illinois it is remembered and known to all that he distinguished himself in the late civil war also. We have been proud of his fame. An alien by birth, Illinois took him to her bosom and cherished him as if he had been her own son.

My relations to him, I repeat, were of the kindest character. I esteemed him and respected him. His conduct toward me was always that of generous friendship, and to-day I take pleasure in asking the Senate to pass these resolutions in order that Illinois may place in the Capitol its selected memorial of her great adopted son.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 42) permitting Anson Mills, colonel of Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 198) to grant to the Birmingham, Sheffield and Tennessee River Railway Company a right of way over the public lands traversed by it; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for land within the Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 77) conferring diplomas upon designers, inventors, and expert artisans; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bill and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 198) to grant to the Birmingham, Sheffield and Tennessee River Railway Company a right of way over the public lands traversed by it; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for land within the Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HOAR. I now call up the resolution which I submitted yesterday, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, so far as in his opinion it shall not be inconsistent with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate copies of all instructions which may have been given to any representative of the United States, or any naval officer thereof, since the 4th day of March, 1861, in regard to the preservation of public order in Hawaii, or the protection of the lives and property of American citizens, or the recognition or support of any government there.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, this resolution is an ordinary resolution of inquiry such as the Senate rarely hesitates to pass on the request of any member of the body. It simply asks for information in regard to facts of public interest necessary for the information of all Senators in the discharge of their public duties, and, in accordance with the custom in such matters, it expressly defers to the President's judgment in the matter as to whether any particular paper or other fact asked for should or should not be made public with due regard to the interests of the public service.

It has not seemed to me that there was any occasion for delay in the passage of this resolution because of the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. MORGAN]. He may have from private sources or from private consultations with the Administration all the information which is needed by other Senators who do not sustain that confidential relation.

The resolution asks for the instructions which indicate the attitude of this Government toward Hawaii in three Administrations; first, that of the first Administration of the present President of the United States, then for the instructions given by the two able and eminent gentlemen who filled the office of Secretary of State during the last Administration, and for the instructions which have gone out during the present Administration.

I hope and believe that those instructions will show a settled and consistent policy, certainly down to a very recent time, in regard to which there has been no party or political difference of opinion.

If the President's message means anything, so far as I can understand it, it means that the Executive of the United States is meditating and considering the question whether he shall, by his own executive authority, commit an act of war against a friendly power. There can be no question that the Government which was in power in Hawaii at the last advices is a friendly Government. It established itself without violence, after an attempt on the part of the Queen to commit an act of revolution and usurpation, which is admitted and conceded by all parties. The Queen undertook of her own authority and in violation of a written existing constitution to exclude from the right of suffrage in that nation a large and important portion of its citizens, important in regard to numbers, in regard to character, in regard to intelligence, and in regard to property. I suppose nobody will be so hardy as to deny that that was a gross attempt at usurpation and revolution.

Now, the people, or some of them, resisted that act and set up a new government, and that government has been recognized by all the civilized powers of the world, so far as we are aware, who have international relations with Hawaii. It has been recognized by the Government of the United States. It is represented at the capital of the United States by a duly accredited representative, and is recognized by the present Executive, with whom he is in diplomatic intercourse; and therefore to undertake on any pretense whatever, or for any reason whatever, to enter that kingdom or republic, or however it may be defined and described, and overthrow the existing government is an act of war; and it is none the less an act of war that it is an act meditated, or proposed, or committed against a feeble and small government.

Now, Mr. President, the suggestion that the United States may have acted with undue haste in the recognition of this government or that it may have violated international law by taking part in the revolution that established it, will not in my judgment bear examination for a moment. If at some time in the past this country, even in violation of right, had aided in putting in power a government which has since that time been recognized by us and by other countries as a lawful government and is lawfully and peacefully exercising its functions, is it possible that because that might have happened there is any duty or any right under the law of nations, after the fact in the past has become established, to make war on that government and overthrow it and put in power another? If that be true, it was clearly the duty of France, whenever after our Revolutionary war she should see fit, to have joined Great Britain in overthrowing the United States and putting the Colonies under the English power once more. I suppose there can be no question that our treaty of alliance with France, which contributed so much to the establishment of our independence, was a violation of international obligation as between France and England.

The matter of the establishment of that government is a fact and not a question of right or wrong, as far as all other governments are concerned. There is scarcely a government on this continent south of us (and, indeed, we must include our own Government in the statement) that does not owe its existence to a revolution, as to the rightfulness of which there is debate and discussion and question, and in regard to which the defeated party and perhaps other nations may have something to say if they are to express an opinion about it. However, international

law recognizes nothing but the fact of government, and it can in the nature of things recognize nothing but the fact of government.

Now, Mr. President, if what the President implies in his message be true, that because he has concluded there was some wrongful action on the part of our minister under a previous Administration in aiding the establishment of the present government he thinks it is his duty to overthrow it and put another one in power, he is meditating an act of war against Hawaii and it is impossible to escape from that conclusion. I think the department of the Government with whom the power and duty under the Constitution of declaring war under proper circumstances are lodged is entitled to prompt and immediate knowledge of all the facts which bear upon the question.

There are some other things that seem to me singular and indefensible in this transaction. I shall not now go the length of declaring that under no circumstances ought the President of the United States to send a commissioner abroad without the authority of express legislation for the purpose or without the advice and consent of the Senate. But certainly the cases are very rare when that ought to be done. Its being done can be justified only in the case of a grave, imminent, and pressing emergency and public danger.

This gentleman was sent abroad when the Senate was in session, on the 7th of March, 1893, with full opportunity on the part of the President to consult this body. He was sent abroad with the duties practically of a diplomatic representative of this Government. The report to which the President alludes shows that he is in constant communication with the authorities of Hawaii and is informing them officially what this Government will do and will not do. His orders gave him paramount authority; and in addition to that he seems to have assumed the duty and the power of determining whether or not certain orders should be given to the naval officers of the United States in the port of Honolulu.

If the power to make diplomatic representations to foreign governments and the power to issue orders to our own naval officers and the power to pull down the American flag where it was peacefully floating be not an official power, I should like to know what definition can be given of official power as distinguished from personal agency. But if the President of the United States could exercise his own functions by a deputy, yet here, with the Senate in session and the three-months' session of Congress having since intervened, it is very strange that the Executive of the United States has undertaken to commit to this gentleman these delicate and important official responsibilities without even communicating the fact officially either to the Senate or to Congress. As far as possible the United States is to be dragged into a war in strict confidence, without the knowledge of its legislative authority.

It is said that the persons composing that provisional government, and supporting it, and represented by it, are Americans by birth, and that many of them retain their American citizenship. I suppose that is true. The dual citizenship which belongs to those persons under the peculiar condition of those islands is a citizenship conferred upon them by the express provision of the constitution of the kingdom of Hawaii, and in one of the official communications of Secretary Bayard, which will be found in the document laid before the Senate during his administration of the office of Secretary of State, it was expressly recognized and approved by him, doubtless by the direction of President Cleveland.

Now, unless I mistake the temper of those men, they will not yield the lawful government which they have established and which the whole civilized world has recognized, to one hundred or two hundred marines, acting under an unconstitutional and unlawful authority of the President of the United States. They have got something behind them which the Queen had not—the consciousness of a rightful cause, the knowledge that the true interests of that people and all its civilization are at stake; and it is not the wont and fashion of men of American birth and lineage to give up such a cause as that without a struggle. Then, according to the plain intimation of President Cleveland as to what he thinks his duty, there is war.

Now, Mr. President, I think it is manifest that this is a transaction which the Senate and the people are entitled to understand, and they are entitled to understand it without delay. If this thing has not been done yet, we want that the swift and indignant remonstrance of the American people shall make itself felt and shall be heard by Executive ears, however dull they may seem to be.

When President Grant proposed the plan, which he so honestly and so zealously approved, of initiating proceedings for the acquisition of San Domingo, he obtained, if I remember aright, legislative authority to send abroad his commission to inquire and ascertain the facts.

Now, was there any reason why President Cleveland should not have communicated to us at the late three-months session the fact that there was this trouble; that he feared the United States had done something wrong, or had made a mistake in the past, and asked for a fit and suitable legislative authority to have the facts ascertained?

I shall be curious to hear from any defender of the Administration on what precedents the Executive relies. I shall be curious to hear from him an explanation of this most extraordinary and most secret proceeding upon his part.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask the Senator if it is not the fact that the personal representative of the President, whatever may have been his title—Paramount Extraordinary Blount perhaps—returned to this country before Congress adjourned at the extraordinary session?

Mr. HOAR. I am not sure, but I think that is true. The President of the United States, I suppose, had months ago all the information which this gentleman could give him.

I do not wish to be understood as expressing any opinion in regard to the policy of annexing this distant territory to the United States. I do not wish to be understood now as entering into the discussion how far and on what condition and under what circumstances the United States may find it for the interest of both nations to establish, with the assent of Hawaii, a rightful and lawful protectorate there, or under what circumstances that group of islands may become a territory or dependency of the United States. All those questions are foreign to the present occasion.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the President of the United States is adopting and getting into the habit of adopting rather extraordinary language in his dealing with the other branches of Government when he tells us in his message after the history of the appointments, foreign and domestic, of the last six months, that Congress passed the civil-service law not because they thought it was right, but because they were afraid of popular opinion; and when he tells us that there is no serious doubt about this matter. He says this after the action of his predecessor, who never failed in courtesy to him, in the face of the utterances of the American press, in the face of what I believe to be the clear conviction and judgment of three-fourths of the American people, without distinction of party. I should like to be at liberty to relate to the President of the United States some things that I have heard said by Democrats in my part of the country, quite as honored and quite as distinguished and quite as high in the public esteem and confidence as any person holding any official position however illustrious. I think, I say, it is presumptuous when the President informs us that there can be no doubt—

> that the constitutional government of Hawaii had been subverted with the active aid of our representative to that government, and through the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States which was landed for that purpose.

That is in conflict with the declaration of the representative of the United States, an eminent and highly trusted citizen. It is in conflict with the fact that before those troops were landed the government buildings were in possession of the new government; and it is in conflict with the fact that the friends of the new government had at the moment (without saying anything about the difference of race or the habit of using weapons) the control and command of the larger portion of the military resources of that island; and it is in conflict with the public declarations of his predecessor. I should have no doubt whatever that if upon all the known facts, including the report of Mr. Blount, the question were submitted to this body, it would express a very different judgment from that of the Executive, and it would not be a party question.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I should much have preferred that this subject should have come up for discussion in the regular parliamentary method: that the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] should have been referred to the appropriate committee, and that that committee should have thoroughly investigated the whole subject and made an exhaustive report to this body in order that we might intelligently proceed to the consideration of the grave question presented to us.

It has not been thought proper, however, by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to await that orderly procedure of this body; and while the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts calls for information, he proceeds to shell the woods before he obtains the information and to charge the President of the United States with meditating an act of war without the authority of the Congress of the United States, the sole repository of the authority to declare war in this country.

I deny the statement. I say that the Executive has respectfully submitted the question to Congress and given them the in-

formation at his disposal, such as he thought appropriate to submit in his message, and his action in this matter has been strictly confined within the limits of executive authority.

It is useless, Mr. President, to go beyond the question now legitimately presented for our consideration. The discussion of others will only tend to confuse that presented by the message.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] has presented many views touching the question. He showed the importance of close relations between the Hawaiian Islands and the Government of the United States. He told us of the commercial advantages of the ownership and occupancy of those islands. He told us that the people are unfit for self-government; that corruption controls the enactment of their laws; that the Queen is immoral, and that the Christian people of the islands are behind the revolutionary government which has been established by the armed power of the Government of the United States; that the government overthrown was a monarchy and the one instituted is a republic; and that the President is meditating the overthrow of the republic and the reëstablishment of the monarchy.

It is not the first time in the world that a fraud attempts to justify itself by putting on the mask of morality and Christianity. The highest authority that we have on the subject of Christianity is the utterance of its founder when he said, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." If the government were instituted by the Hawaiian people, half-civilized as they are, unfit for the government that we have, but if it were their government it was right that that government should be respected by the officers of the United States who were sent accredited to it. It makes no difference that it is a monarchy.

Cæsar was a monarch when Christ said that tribute should be paid to him. It is not a question of the immorality of the Queen and whether her character is such as Cæsar would have had his wife to possess. The only one presented is, did the Government of the United States interfere and overturn the existing Government of Hawaii? If they did, it is the duty of the people of the United States represented in this Government to make prompt restitution and reinstate the government which they have overthrown.

The Senator from Massachusetts said the government was established without violence. Yes, Mr. President, if the Senator was going along the road with $100 in his purse and 100 armed men should spring from the bushes and level their guns in his face and demand it from him and take it, there would be no bloodshed, and according to his definition no violence. His pocketbook would only pass in revolution and without violence from his pocket to the pockets of his moral and Christian robbers. What are the facts about this? Mr. President, the Hawaiian people have been the most unfortunate people of whom we have any history. Our history with them began in 1820, and it began with missionaries who went to spread the light of Christianity and to elevate them in the scale of civilization. They were proceeding in the good work and had made great progress when in 1839 the wealth of that country attracted the French, who sent an armed force to compel the people of the Hawaiian Islands to accept French brandy and French religion. After having robbed them they went away, and in 1843 an English officer in command of an English vessel came to the conclusion that it was an easy thing to do and he would seize the islands and place the flag of Great Britain over them. He did it; he tore down the Hawaiian standard and placed over the islands of the group the standards of Great Britain.

An English admiral went afterwards and removed the English ensigns and restored the Hawaiian standard, and, Mr. President, it is a beautiful picture that is presented in that act of restoration by the English officer. He set apart a day, summoned the whole people to assemble and see the act. They came along—men, women, and children—with tears streaming down their cheeks. The banners began to float, the cannon to thunder from the land, and the vessels in the port saluted with twenty-one guns the national flag as he removed the English flag and restored the rightful flag of the Hawaiian people, and in their great joy the good ship Constellation of the United States joined with twenty-one guns. That was much more honorable action than to have conspired with the men who used the flag and power of the United States to overturn that government, and then place it by the edict of our minister under the protectorate of the United States.

We are told that the President of the United States has no power over this question, but a minister of the United States, without the authority of Congress, can say, "I am the state." Strong as the great king who sat on the throne of France, he raises the flag of the United States over the Hawaiian flag and himself declares a protectorate. What authority had he to assume for the people of the United States that we would protect those islands not only against all foreign powers (for that is what a protectorate means, certainly in an American sense), but to protect it against the right of the people to alter, reform, or abolish their existing government and institute another in its stead if they thought that other more conducive to the security of their happiness? When did it become an American idea that we could go anywhere and compel a people with our bayonets to have any form of government that we wished and that they did not wish? It is a doctrine, sir, that has grown up within the last few years in this Government.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to the proclamation of Minister Willis, published in the Evening Star at Honolulu, in which he says:

> The good order of this community will be kept undisturbed in the interests of humanity; that any attempt made by any person or persons to make trouble will be promptly checked and punished. You may put the matter more plainly and say that even if the Provisional Government discharged all its troops to-day no lawlessness would be allowed for one moment.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> No one need fear trouble and no lawlessness will be permitted.

Does the Senator, with whom I quite agree in what he seems to be advocating just now, tell the Senate where Minister Willis or the President of the United States, who instructs him, gets the power to keep order in Hawaii, and whether that is not itself an act of war on whatever government is the lawful one?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I am not discussing at this time Mr. Willis's utterances. The Senator is taking me away from the subject which I am discussing.

Mr. HOAR. But the Senator asks whether a certain doctrine was ever heard of, and I call his attention to the fact——

Mr. MILLS. And the Senator agreed with me.

Mr. HOAR. That President Cleveland through his agents, and through his diplomatic representatives, has just proclaimed it in the most offensive sense it can be put in, going very much beyond Mr. Stevens, and I ask him how he accounts for it, and to explain it, and whether he justifies it?

Mr. MILLS. Now, Mr. President, I will proceed. I do not know what Minister Willis has said to the Hawaiian people. I am dealing with authentic documents. I know that the ministers representing this or any other government have a right whenever their citizens can not be protected in a foreign port to assume that protection and preserve order so far as securing the lives and property of their own citizens, and I suppose that Minister Willis's language has reference to a fact of that kind.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will allow me to call his attention to the fact that Mr. Willis does not say that. He says, "I shall keep order, and I shall punish anybody who violates the order of that community."

Mr. MILLS. My friend may put what construction he pleases on Minister Willis's language. I want to go back to Minister Stevens, and I want to get through with Minister Stevens before I touch on Minister Willis. If Mr. Willis has announced to the Hawaiian people or to the American people that the people of Hawaii have no right by revolution to alter, abolish, or reinstitute a government suited to their own will, he has announced a doctrine that has hitherto never found any hold upon the American people. What is our creed, Mr. President? I am afraid we are drifting away from it. Let me read from an old book, the very first page of our rules, the Declaration of Independence, the creed of the American people:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;—

Not from foreigners, but from *the governed*—

> that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness.

I claim that we announced a truth not for the American people alone, but we announced a truth that is universal. It is announced here, but announced for the benefit of the human family, that there can be no just government except it shall come from the consent of the governed, and that the "governed" at all times have a right to change, reform, abolish, and reinstitute whatever government they think proper to establish.

Sir, the President has been arraigned because he says that the Queen of those islands has been illegally deposed by armed forces of our Government, and that she is yet the legitimate Queen in that country, and we are told that he is instituting a

monarchy. Unhappily, that language came from the lips of a Senator on the other side of the Chamber. We are to-day guarding a monarch in the Pacific Ocean. Three years ago we entered into a treaty with Great Britain and Germany, a triple alliance, contrary to the warning voice of the author of that Declaration of Independence against "all entangling alliances" with foreign people. This treaty was not made by Mr. Cleveland's Administration, or by any one appointed by or representing that Administration. It was negotiated under the Administration of President Harrison and by representatives appointed by him, and ratified by Senators who are now declaiming against monarchy.

We entered into a triple alliance to keep a king on the throne of the Samoan Islands, and in the execution of that treaty, which is to-day upon our statute books and which we are executing, we have aided in suppressing an armed insurrection against that king in the execution of the treaty, and we have helped to send off a rival who was striving, a pretender it may be, for that kingly throne, and he is to-day incarcerated in one of the Marshall Islands, and the Government of the United States is standing guard over that monarchy to support the throne of Malietoa.

That is not all, sir. We took possession of those islands with Great Britain and Germany and even made a tariff for them. They pay taxes, not according to the consent of the people of those islands, but they pay taxes according to the dictation of the armed power of the United States, Germany, and Great Britain, and the taxpayers of the United States have been contributing out of their pockets to pay the expenses of maintaining the monarchy. What has become of the old Revolutionary creed that taxation and representation go hand in hand? What has become of the doctrine of the inalienable right of self-government declared by our fathers to be the right of "all men"? Not only are we instituting and executing their tariff and other laws over their heads and against their consent, but the people of the United States are acting as jailors for the rival king who has been overthrown and incarcerated on another island. American bayonets are supporting the throne of one king and guarding the jail doors of another. All this was done by our friends of the other side, who are now so horrified at monarchy in Hawaii that they are willing to tear it down whether the people want it or not. It is nonsense to talk about the restoration of the Queen being the establishment of a monarchy by the United States. It is nonsense to talk about the military despotism established by the armed forces of the United States being a republican government. It lives upon the bayonets of the American troops. After the Government had been established it was found unable to support itself, and the Government so established, representing two or three thousand people out of 96,000, itself called upon Minister Stevens to protect and support it. It was unable to stand, and it is to-day unable to stand without the support of the United States.

How was that government overthrown, Mr. President? It is one of the singular things in history that a revolution should take place and a government possessing an army if not a navy—possessing an army and all branches of civil administration—should be overthrown without shedding a drop of blood, without an armed collision in its streets, without a battlefield. Is it not strange that it should surrender? Is it not something strange, yea, passing strange, that this Queen, with an army at her back, with an army in her palace grounds at the time of the revolution, with forts and places manned and armed, should have surrendered to those who had not a single gun to fire against it—not one?

It is something impossible to believe; and yet it was done; and it was done because the United States forces came upon the ground, and the Queen was told that if she resisted the insurgents she would declare war and wage war against the United States; and while the commander of her forces said he could drive the United States troops from the islands, he could not fight their 65,000,000 people; and some of the members of the committee on public safety advised her to yield under protest and appeal to the Government of the United States. She was reminded of the magnanimous conduct of the English admiral in 1843; that Great Britain did justice to her country, and asked if the people of the United States would not as readily render justice to her and restore her flag and her Government, and to these entreaties she yielded.

Mr. President, what was the necessity of Minister Stevens landing the forces at 4:30 o'clock, as Commander Wiltse said he did, on the 16th of January? I want to know what exigency made it necessary for the United States troops to land at that time? There was no disturbance. The people were as quiet as they are in New England on a Sunday morning when they are going to church. Why were those troops landed? Why did they go to the Government building, or to a building close to it, and within half pistol shot of that building, as some of the witnesses say, where they could command it with their arms? Why were the marines of the United States drawn up in line of battle with their guns trained upon the palace where the Queen had fifty soldiers to preserve order and protect life and property? Why did Capt. Wiltse tell his lieutenant that he would not permit any fighting in the streets? Why did Mr. Stevens refuse, on the application of the existing government, to aid in suppressing disorder and violence if that was in fact what he landed his troops for? And why did he refuse to aid her to maintain her government? When applied to by her for aid he said no; but he told the conspirators, "If you will go to the Government building, and if you will there proclaim that the Queen is deposed and organize a government, I will recognize you;" and at 2:30 o'clock the committee of public safety, consisting of 13 persons, 7 foreigners and aliens and 6 natives and naturalized people, went one after another to the Government building, afraid to go all together at once. They went by different streets, and before they went to the Government building to declare the Queen deposed they sent a messenger to see if anyone was there to hurt them. They were informed by their messenger that nobody was there, and that the business of the Government was proceeding quietly and orderly. Nobody dreamed of a revolution. One went by one street and another went by another street, and they slipped in and the Queen was deposed by the proclamation, and nobody knew it on the outside.

As soon as the Queen was deposed, then Minister Stevens recognized the revolutionary government, notwithstanding the Queen was there, with all her troops at the station-house, which was the arsenal and the place where the troops had concentrated and organized when former revolutions had been suppressed. More than 500 armed men were ready to suppress the insurrection, with the commanding officer saying he could easily do so and was ready to do it. In addition to that, he could successfully meet the troops of the United States and compel obedience to order and to the rightful authority of the Government, yet he could not fight all the troops of the United States that had not come upon Hawaiian soil. Conscious of his ability to suppress all disorder he refused to surrender until the Queen consented upon the entreaty of her advisers to surrender under protest to the arms of the United States. She was urged to surrender under protest to the United States Government and she surrendered to the United States Government, saying that she was not strong enough to cope with the armies of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator allow me to suggest to him that it appears in evidence, if it is to be relied upon, that prior to the promulgation of the Provisional Government a committee of the members of the committee of safety applied to Mr. Stevens to know whether he would, in the event of the Queen's government attempting to arrest them, protect them from such arrest, and that he replied he would. That promise was extracted from Mr. Stevens before they proceeded to declare a new government.

Mr. MILLS. Now, Mr. President, there have been various statements about the Queen's strength in the revolution and the number of her armed forces. I read as the most reliable from Secretary Foster. It is the most reliable because it is a statement against him. He was one of the principal movers in this annexation business, and he is stating his case most strongly for himself and for our friends on the other side. He says:

> On Saturday, the 14th of January, the capital was wholly controlled by the royal troops, including a large additional force of over 500 armed men not authorized by Hawaiian law.

Another statement shows that her regular force was equivalent to 500 men. Now, according to these statements, she had 1,000 men on that field, and those who instituted the new government, founded, it is pretended to be, upon the will of the people, had not one armed man on the islands when the revolutionists met on Monday. Yet the United States Government did nothing except to defend the consulate and legation! One of the strange things about it is, as Admiral Skerrett says, the position was well taken to support the Provisional Government, but very badly taken if it was the intention of the troops to defend the consulate and the legation. They were in a different part of the city; but here were these troops in line of battle right in the street, with their guns trained upon the palace, and ready to rain hail and desolation into the building. What a magnificent picture is presented by the representatives of 67,000,000 of the most powerful people on the globe with the muzzles of their guns upon a poor defenseless woman whose property is about to be stolen from her! And they tell us she is not a Christian and that the Christian people are not on her side!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The Senator from Texas will please suspend. It is the duty of the Chair to announce that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Calendar is now in order.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the pending resolution may be proceeded with until it is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the resolution now before the Senate be proceeded with until it is disposed of.

Mr. McPHERSON. Is not that quite a large latitude? Had the Senator better not make that request to run during the remainder of the day? "Until disposed of" would mean indefinitely.

Mr. MILLS. I yield the floor if Senators object, and shall ask leave to resume my remarks to-morrow morning.

Mr. HOAR. I do not object. I should like the Senator to go on.

Mr. MILLS. I know the Senator does not object.

Mr. McPHERSON. I have no objection to the Senator proceeding.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the Senator proceed without objection.

Mr. HOAR. Yes, the Senator may proceed without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the consideration of the resolution now pending before the Senate shall proceed. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLS. What a magnificent picture in our history, how entrancing it will be, how our children and our children's children will stand and gaze upon it, when some painter shall portray the scene for them, of this most powerful Republic, with power to cope with all the earth on its territory, standing with its guns shotted to the lips, trained upon the palace of a poor, half-civilized woman, who is the representative head of a weak and feeble people!

Why, Mr. President, has all this thing been done? Why has our minister been constantly informing his Government about the desirability of these islands? Why has he been writing letters telling us about how much sugar they produce, and what magnificent bananas hang from their trees? Why all this information about a country which did not belong to us? It reminds me of that incident in Roman history when Cato, who was after Carthage, took from the folds of his toga Carthagenian figs and laid them upon the table of the Roman Senate, and said, "This splendid fruit grows within three days' sail of Rome. *Carthago delenda est.*" Carthage must fall because she produced fine figs which the Romans wanted. The Hawaiian Islands must belong to the United States because the sugar planters of Hawaii want to bring these islands in and obtain a bounty out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

The great trouble with the Hawaiian people began after our civil war, when adventurous and intelligent American people, and some Europeans, went upon these islands and discovered how rich were their lands and how productive they would be of sugar. A struggle ensued in 1874 for the vacant throne. The American sugar-growers espoused the cause of Kalakua and the other inhabitants espoused the cause of the rival claimant, Queen Emma. The Americans had Kalakua installed. They carried the legislature, which had the decision of the question, and Kalakua was installed. He was invited to the United States, and an armed vessel of the United States was sent to transport him to this country. I was a member of the other House when he was received in that body by Speaker Blaine and complimented on the fact that he was the first king from the West who had honored this country by a visit. There was not much said about his monarchy at that time. They were caressing him. Before he left the sugar reciprocity treaty was made here in Washington, and that reciprocity treaty permitted Hawaii to bring her sugar free into the United States, while everybody else was charged about 2 cents a pound. I denounced the act then on the floor of the House of Representatives as an act of plunder of the pockets of the American people.

What has it done for Hawaii? The Hawaiian people sent their sugar to the United States and sold it for the price of the sugar plus the tariff duty. The result of that was estimated in the sixteen years that the treaty was in force at fifty-one million and odd dollars to those planters, and they grew immensely rich. There was then no talk about annexation. But after the McKinley bill was passed, on the 1st of October, 1890, their sugar had to be sold in open competition with the sugar of the world here in the markets of the United States, and they lost that 2 cents bounty that had been given them. But we had given a bounty in the same bill to sugar producers in the United States of 2 cents a pound. Then, all at once, they cried aloud for annexation to the United States, that they might come in and be part of the territory and citizenship of the United States, in order to filch $5,000,000 annually out of the pockets of the people of the United States.

A very singular and very remarkable feature of this whole proceeding is that that revolution started on the 16th day of January, culminated on the 17th day of January, and on the 18th day of January the Provisional Government was recognized and the commissioners started to the United States to annex the islands and to make a treaty and get the bounty. It was done in a hurry. The thing must be done before the other Administration went out of power, and they were to have their hands up to their shoulders in the pockets of the people of the United States for their sugar.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MILLS. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. FRYE. I think the statement which the Senator is making exceedingly unjust to the representatives of the existing government in Hawaii. I know, as a matter of fact, that in the treaty of annexation they not only did not ask that there should be any provision inserted that the sugar-raisers of those islands should receive a bounty, but I know further, as a matter of fact, that they said that they would be entirely content if a provision was inserted in the treaty that they should never receive any portion of the bounty which was paid by the United States.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know that I have it here, but if my friend will notice the letter that the commissioners wrote to our Government in proposing the terms of the treaty, he will see that they did want some bounty on sugar. I can not lay my hands on the letter at present, but I think I shall find it.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator will pardon me, I did not say they did not wish for the bounty. It is natural for men to wish for all that they can get.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. FRYE. But I do say that their anxiety was for annexation to the United States, and that to achieve that annexation they were entirely willing to have inserted in the treaty itself a provision that no bounty should be paid.

Mr. MILLS. It is exceedingly strange, Mr. President, that with all that willingness to give up the whole purpose of the revolution—it was talked of in private, and yet it does not appear in public—when that treaty was made why was not a provision disclaiming the bounty inserted in the treaty between them and our Government? Instead of that we find them amply cared for in the very first provision of that treaty. Article I provides:

> The Government of the Hawaiian Islands hereby cedes, from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, absolutely and without reserve to the United States forever all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies, renouncing in favor of the United States every sovereign right of which as an independent nation it is now possessed; and henceforth said Hawaiian Islands and every island and key thereto appertaining and each and every portion thereof shall become and be an integral part of the territory of the United States.

Does not the sugar-bounty law go to every integral part of the territory of the United States? If somebody is raising sugar in Alaska, is he not entitled to the bounty? Would they not be entitled to the bounty on the islands of Hawaii, or of Vancouver, or of Cuba, or of Newfoundland if they were a part of the territory of the United States? It was carefully provided for here, and it was said in the revolutionary meeting—where they spoke in whispers with bated breath, for it seems that outsiders did not know what was going on in that meeting—that the McKinley bill had produced a serious condition of things in the islands. The testimony of the witnesses shows that it was the condition of the sugar-planting interests upon the islands which provoked the revolution, and that annexation began to be the cry of the sugar planters after the 1st day of October, 1890, when the McKinley bill passed and sugar was put upon the free list and Hawaiian interests fell. Then the Hawaiian planters began to suffer in their pockets, and then they began to desire to become "an integral part" of the territory of the United States in order that they might plunder the pockets of the people of the United States.

We are told that the Provisional Government is a republican government—a government boosted and upheld by American bayonets and living under the shadow of the muzzles of American cannon. If our Government will get out of the way and let the people exercise the same rights that we claim, and which our fathers claimed were inalienable in the Declaration of Independence, the right to institute whatever government they pleased, they will institute a government which will be in accordance with their will, and they will not submit to the dictation of this sugar oligarchy.

Mr. President, it is a singular fact, as shown in the testimony, that while the troops of the United States and its minister were ready to aid the revolutionary party in that commonwealth, they were there for the purpose of repressing, suppressing, and strangling every effort of the existing Government to maintain its life.

Mr. Stevens in his letters to his Government says two or three times that it was fortunate that the Boston was there to prevent insurrection and trouble at various times, and doubtless he told the truth. The Queen wanted to restore her Government back to her people.

The people of Hawaii had their first constitution in 1840, adapted to their then condition. In 1852 they made another.

In 1864 still another. In all these constitutions the Queen appointed the nobles to one branch of her legislature and the Hawaiian people elected the others; but in 1884, under the lead of Mr. Thurston, the constitution of 1864 was overthrown and a constitution was adopted with a property qualification of $3,000. A property qualification was adopted for the nobles and for the voters of the nobles, which rendered it impossible for anybody except the sugar barons to get into the house of nobles, and from that time they controlled the Government and disfranchised the great body of the Hawaiian people, nine-tenths of whom were disfranchised.

The Queen proposed, in response to the repeated requests and importunate entreaties of her people, to restore the constitution and reënfranchise her people, and she agreed that she would do it. It is said that it was a revolutionary act; and it was. All the constitutions provided that they should be amended by the legislature; that amendments should be proposed and passed by one legislature; considered by the people, and repassed by another; but this was never enforced in a single one of the revolutions.

That was the provision in the constitution of 1864; and yet Mr. Thurston, the leader of this revolutionary movement, with his colleagues framed a constitution and compelled the King to take it in 1887, without going through the forms of law. If the people submitted to it, it was their constitution in the first case, and if they submitted it was their constitution in the second, and it would have been equally their constitution in the third.

What have we to do with it here? What have we to do with the question whether that constitution was formed in accordance with the existing law or not? Absolutely nothing. If we still maintain the right, as proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence, that every people have a right to institute their own government, then we have no right at all to interfere with that government.

It was this constitution of 1887 which took the ballot away from the Hawaiian people, which disfranchised the Hawaiian people, which gave control to the sugar interests of those islands and the government which they dominated after 1887. It was this government, against which the Hawaiian people protested, and for the amendment of which the Queen proposed the new constitution. When that was proposed, Mr. Stevens uncovered his powerful arm and threw his powerful sword into the scale and said: "Weigh that." In these perilous times the question was asked, "What will Mr. Stevens do?"

The Queen, poor and powerless, when matched against him, sat upon her rude throne and with her counselors around her asked, "What will Minister Stevens do; what will Minister Stevens say; what will Commander Wiltse do?" And every time they were asked by the existing government, "Will you do anything to aid us to maintain our authority and suppress any insurrection started against our government?" they received a baptism of ice water; but whenever any one said, "If we can get possession of one of the government buildings, if we can slip in in the quiet, in the cool of the evening, with no one knowing anything about it, if we can read in whispers the declaration deposing the Queen and destroying her government, will you protect us against her arms and her power and her people?" they said "yes" beforehand.

Here is a minister of the Government of the United States meeting with insurrectionists and conspirators to overthrow a government to which he was accredited and saying to them, "If you will do so and so, if you commit treason against your government, if you will depose your sovereign, I will stand by and guard you with the muzzles of the guns of the United States, and if your sovereign dares to come upon the ground I will riddle her palace over her head and destroy her troops." According to the statement of the witnesses our troops were so disposed that, if the troops of the Queen attempted to fire upon the insurrectionists, they would fire into the bosoms of the United States troops, and if the United States troops had attempted to fire, they would fire into the Queen's forces.

Here stands a commander of armed forces saying by his conduct, "I have not landed here for the purpose of preserving order; I have not landed here for the purpose of securing the life and property of the people; I intend to see that there shall be no fighting here." How could the Queen maintain her throne, how could that Government support itself, how could that people exercise the inalienable right to institute a government for themselves when the forces of the United States stand with their fuses lighted, and their guns trained and ready to send death and a desolating hail upon her palace, her army, and her people? Yet we hear upon the floor of the American Senate that there was no violence attendant on the introduction of this new government, that it was a peaceable, quiet affair, all orderly, and after it was all over Mr. Stevens writes to the Government of the United States, "All is profound peace and quiet here."

The Czar of Russia, after he had dismembered and desolated Poland and after his victim had expired in the bloody dust of Warsaw and her wretched people who had survived were on the road to the mines and caves of Siberia, congratulated the people that "order now reigns in Warsaw." Yes, order reigned in Hawaii, and it was the order of robbery; it was an act disgraceful to the Government of the United States, and Mr. Cleveland rose to the full stature of an American citizen and an American President when he said that the honor of the people of the United States demands that full restitution shall be made.

Mr. President, if we had gone on the island of Vancouver or Newfoundland and raised the flag of the United States it might not have been an act of great magnanimity for us to have taken it down again. We would have been compelled to take it down, because there was a power behind the rightful flag that represented a rightful government, which would have forced us, with whatever expenditure of blood and money, to take down the flag where it was not rightfully hung. But when you come to consider a poor people who have nestled, like the ewe lamb of Nathan, in our bosom, who have depended upon us for years for our friendship, and when an American minister, in the spirit of a filibuster and a buccaneer, goes to these islands, seizes them by the force of the arms placed in his possession, it will be an exhibition creditable to the Government and people of the United States to render justice to that poor, weak, and feeble people.

What course had the President left to him when he saw the facts laid before him, that the minister and the naval commander of the United States had seized those islands illegally, without authority, in violation of the neutrality laws, and in violation of the honor and integrity of the people of the United States, but to restore the Government to the people from whom it had been torn by this act of violence as far as it was in his power?

It is not in his power, Mr. President, to wage war against those people. He has not claimed that it was in his power. I am not afraid that he is going to open fire upon the supporters of the Provisional Government from the vessels in the harbor. I am not afraid that he is going to march our troops through the streets of Honolulu and depose this conspiracy which calls itself a provisional government and restore the Queen. That will require an act of Congress. Whatever power is placed in his hands as an Executive he can exercise, and has exercised. He has said that the Government was overthrown by the United States forces; that he has taken down the flag and put it where it belongs, on the decks of American vessels; he has removed the marines to their place on the quarter decks of the American vessels. He has said that the Queen is the rightful sovereign of the Government and was illegally deposed, not by her people, not by a revolution, but deposed by foreign aid and foreign power, wielded at the instance of the accredited minister of our Government. That is all the President can do. In doing it I doubt not that he reflects the sentiment of all the fair-minded people of the United States.

I know, Mr. President, how strong the sugar ring is. Out of some thirty thousand laborers on the islands, twenty-five thousand, in round numbers, are engaged in the cultivation of sugar. Twenty corporations, I believe, control over $20,000,000 of sugar values. Twenty-five million dollars' worth is American; some are private estates, and out of about thirty-nine or forty million dollars of value invested in those islands three-fourths of it is in sugar estates. The companies have interests all over that part of the United States where large capital lives. The stock is held all over the country. The people of the United States have large sugar interests in Hawaii. It is United States capital which has gone and bought the sugar estates. It was United States capital that compelled the negotiation of the treaty in 1876, and passed it through the Senate. It is United States capital which has obtained the bounty of $51,000,000 in the last sixteen years as the result of that treaty. It is nineteen hundred and some odd Americans on these islands out of ninety-six thousand people who are behind this movement.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to deny the superiority of the people of the Saxon race. I know very well that they have taken control and governed every country where they have come in contact with its people and where they are strong enough to do it. I know it is a question of time when they will take the Islands of Hawaii; it is a question of time when they will take everything else. If our Government lives and keeps together and continues to grow and expand and multiply its power and its civilization, it will take everything with which it comes in contact; but, in God's name, let us do it decently and in order. Let us wait until the time comes when we grow numerous enough and by the power of our numbers and of our intellect control the inferior populations among whom we live and build up government adapted to our condition; but the idea of thirteen gentlemen, seven of them foreigners, owing no allegiance to the Government of Hawaii, instituting a government under the muzzles of the

guns of the Government of the United States, and by threats and intimidation compelling the Queen to abdicate, and appealing to the people of the United States to indorse the act, is something that ought to be humiliating to the American people.

To see queens coming to Congress and appealing for their rights; to see princesses—because we had a Hawaiian princess—coming here and pleading for their rights, takes us back to the old days of the Romans, when conquered queens were chained behind chariots and led through the streets, weighed down with golden chains, to adorn the triumphs of conquerors who had overthrown them. Is that day coming when along Pennsylvania avenue we shall see a Hawaiian queen, not loaded with golden chains, but weighed down with sugar sacks on her back, coming to the Congress of the United States pleading in behalf of her poor, miserable, ignorant people for the right that we claim to have come direct from God to us, inalienable in its nature—the right to institute a government for themselves?

Mr. President, this appeal is made to us upon the strongest grounds that an appeal can be made to any free people. The weakest people on the globe is appealing to the most powerful, and appealing simply for a right which we have said over and over again, and read from all our platforms and in all our churches and on all our highways on the Fourth of July—the creed that is to live forever among our people. The appeal to us is for the enjoyment of the right to institute their own government, to alter, reform, or abolish it at their pleasure and institute another in its stead—the sacred right of self-government. The appeal is for the right of the governed to institute the government which they must support and whose laws are to be enforced upon them.

If we have not been false in all our teachings, if we have not been deceitful with ourselves, if we have not been playing the hypocrite, if we have been sincere in our teachings when we appealed to the deliberate judgment of the civilized world, if we have been in earnest in laying down this imperishable dogma of freedom in all lands, we should disclaim the action of our minister and our naval forces, and restore the Government that we overthrew.

I want to know, Mr. President, if this Queen was rightfully deposed, if she is no longer Queen, if the constitution has been strangled, if the Government is dead, if it has no legal existence and no legal claim, why in the treaty which was made between these conspirators and the representative of the United States there was a provision inserted that the taxpayers of the United States shall pay her an annuity of $20,000 as long as she lives? If that young princess has no right, if the Government of which she is a part is gone, if a new Government has come, if her rights have been confiscated and destroyed, why is it that this treaty provides that she shall be paid $150,000? Ah, Mr. President, remorse has been about the hearts and consciences of some of these people.

Here is recognition that they have done a great wrong; here is a recognition of rights slaughtered and trampled in the dust by a ruthless and irresistible foreign power; here was a confession of the wrong, and that we ought, in the sight of God and an enlightened and intelligent humanity, to do something to recompense these people for the wrongs which we have inflicted upon them; here is a confession of title; here is a confession of a right overthrown; here is a confession in these papers of a wrong committed. As American citizens, proud of our own country, a people ready to resist to the death the interference of any people on the face of the earth or all the people on the face of the earth, in our domestic concerns or our right of self-government, it behooves us to grant to these poor people that which we claim for ourselves, "to do unto others as we would have others do unto us;" and while we are taking the vail of Christianity to cover this monstrosity, let us remove the vail from before our eyes far enough to see the great truths taught by the great author of Christianity.

It is no part of the argument connected with the question submitted by the President to investigate whether or not our own self-preservation requires us to take these islands. Mr. Marcy's letters have been read, and the treaty negotiated with Mr. Marcy has been read, to show that he was in favor of annexing these islands, and that the Administration of which he was a member was in favor of it. Mr. Marcy represented, and perhaps that Administration represented, a large element of the American people, aggressive, adventurous; you may call them filibusterers, for in his day filibustering was a distinguished element of our population.

Mr. Marcy not only was after Hawaii, but he was after Cuba; and Mr. Marcy sent to the representatives of our Government in Europe, James Buchanan, Pierre Soulé, and John Y. Mason, and told them to meet at Ostend and confer upon the subject. They met at Ostend and addressed a letter to Mr. Marcy, in which they set forth the advantages of purchasing Cuba, the advantages to Spain of selling Cuba, and the advantages to us of the occupation of Cuba. Then they said that self-preservation was the first law of nature, and if, by reason of the refusal of Spain to sell at a price largely more than the value of the island, it became necessary for us, we would be justified in taking the island and paying for it on the same principle that a man would be justified in tearing down a burning house by the side of his own to save his own, upon the principle that self-preservation was the first law of nature: declaring that it was the key of the Gulf of Mexico, as Jefferson said it was in 1802, and as he said to Napoleon Bonaparte, through Minister Livingston, that the nation which owned the mouth of the Mississippi was the declared enemy of the people of the United States, and it was only a question of time when they would take it. Yet in 1856 our friends, who are so anxious to enforce the filibustering business to-day, in the Republican platform, when that party was in its youth, declared that the doctrine of the Ostend manifesto was the doctrine of highwaymen; and it did look a good deal that way. This is their declaration:

Resolved, That the highwayman's plea that "might makes right," embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

Mr. GRAY. What are you reading from?

Mr. MILLS. I am reading from the Republican platform of 1856.

Mr. Marcy was stretching out on the one hand to seize Hawaii and with the other hand he was stretching out to seize Cuba. Cuba lay at our door and guarded the vast commerce which went down the tributaries of the Mississippi River and emptied into the ocean. The Republicans declared that the Monroe doctrine when applied to Cuba was the doctrine of a highwayman, and yet when the armed forces of the United States seized the Hawaiian Islands, put the United States flag over them, and declared a protectorate over them, making the United States responsible for them, that that is wise policy, that that is a highly moral and highly Christian policy, and they have brought the ministers of religion here to prove that this is in accordance with the teachings of Christ!

If one is right the other ought to be right. If the doctrine of the Ostend manifesto was the doctrine of highwaymen, that might makes right, then the doctrine of Mr. Stevens, when he overthrew the Government of the Hawaiians and instituted a government of his own and supported that government with the bayonets of the United States until Mr. Blount removed them under the directions of the President, must have been the doctrine and the practice of highwaymen.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there is nothing for us to consider but whether the Government of the United States did take any part in the overthrow of the established Government of the Hawaiian Islands. If it did, and if that Government was overthrown by our armed forces, which it was, then both honor and justice demand that restitution shall be made, as much so as honor and justice would demand if we had taken the property of another, and especially of a weak people, who could not resent or resist—that we should make restitution of the property which we had wrongfully taken.

Mr. President, I confidently rely on the good judgment and quickened conscience of the American people, when they shall have heard all the facts in relation to this revolution, wrought by the armed forces and under the direction of the minister of the United States and not by the people of Hawaii, to say that full restitution shall be made for the wrong we have done, and the Government of the Hawaiian people shall be reinstated and that we will not destroy their independence, nor permit any other government to do it.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, I should like to take part at some time in the dicussion of this question, but it seems to me that it is due to all of us before a discussion proceeds, from which enlightenment of the people and benefit to ourselves and to the country should follow, that we ought to be in a position to deal with the facts and to know what are the trustworthy evidences of facts.

There can be nothing more desirable to the proper understanding of this question than the utmost fullness and completeness of information, and I desire most particularly that everything which is asked for in this resolution, and much more besides, shall be furnished to this body to enable our discussion of this question to proceed upon an intelligent basis.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that there are reasons why we ought not at this moment to adopt this resolution. In his message, read but the day before yesterday, the President made but a brief statement of his general position in reference to Hawaiian affairs. He said:

Additional advices are soon expected. When received they will be promptly sent to the Congress, together with all other information at hand, accompa-

nied by a special Executive message fully detailing all the facts necessary to a complete understanding of the case, and presenting a history of all the material events leading up to the present situation.

Mr. President, in view of that complete and ample proffer of information, which in the general terms employed would seem inevitably to comprehend all that this resolution specifically seeks, it occurs to me that it is a more dignified course for this body to pursue to defer making a request of the President, which, in the very terms in which it is made, defers until such time as he shall see fit to send the information we seek. It would be unreasonable to presume that the President would see fit to send forward some special items of information when he is contemplating bringing to the knowledge of this body the full and ample stock, in every aspect in which the subject can be considered, which he has at hand, and upon which he will stand for the proof of the facts and the wisdom of his action.

Mr. HIGGINS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me?

Mr. VILAS. With pleasure.

Mr. HIGGINS. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the information already accorded by the President contains the instructions under which the minister to Hawaii is now acting or proposes to act?

Mr. VILAS. I presume the Senator from Delaware is as well advised as the rest of us that the information which we individually possess in respect of this subject we hold now under the seal of confidence.

Mr. HIGGINS. But we can say what it does not contain. Further, I do not know that any confidence has been reposed in us.

Mr. VILAS. I do not understand that a confidence is to be preserved by answering questions in the negative, for a shrewd inquirer will very soon, by the process of *reductio ad infinitum*, find out what he desires.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. VILAS. With pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that Mr. Blount's report was published in the New York Herald weeks ago by the instrumentality of a Mr. Nordhoff, as I understand.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts could only understand that extra-officially from a source of information which he ought not to weigh in a discussion of this kind. We are entitled to have official information. We are advised by the President that, for the purpose of acquiring knowledge of the facts, he sent an accredited commissioner to these islands to seek for trustworthy information, avoiding the confusion of newspaper discussion and newspaper correspondence, which we all know is so liable to be colored by partisanship or particular interests. That information we ought to be able to employ and use in our discussion.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. VILAS. With great pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator what assurance we have, and what assurance the country has that, pending the information which may be sent to us in the President's own time, some act may not be committed by the representatives of the United States which would commit this country to a policy of which Congress and the people of the country would not approve?

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, this body of the people of the United States have the assurance that the Executive whom they chose will discharge his duty in the same manner in which he has in the past, with fidelity to his convictions, with courage, with uprightness and sincerity of purpose.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from Wisconsin contend that the policy to be pursued by the United States as to our relations with foreign countries in the matter of interference in their domestic affairs, or as to some overt act of war, is a question for the President of the United States alone to determine?

Mr. VILAS. That subject is one which we shall discuss at length, but is utterly foreign to the observations that for the time being I am making. The suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is not apt in any respect, for the reason that this proposed inquiry leaves the question of answer to it to the discretion of the President himself. It is a matter as to which the question suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island does not intervene. The President, in proper, respectful, and due official consideration of this body, need not answer this resolution at all. Therefore the inquiry into the question of whether it belongs to Congress or the President to determine the method with which the Government of Hawaii shall be treated is not a consideration which applies to the resolution now under discussion.

There is another circumstance to which I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, for I can affirm that no man can more desire than those upon this side of the Chamber desire the fullest and most complete illumination of the facts and from the most trustworthy sources of evidence; but at this time it happens that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is absent; that he who stands second upon that committee in the arrangement which the Senate made of it is also absent, and therefore the committee is not in a position to consider this question at this moment in the manner which is customary.

I would not in the least make a motion or propose a step which did not consider the right of every Senator to information full and complete, and all the usual methods by which it can be obtained; but under the circumstances it seems to me that the inquiry to the President should be pretermitted and that at some later day it should be made.

We can not discuss this question except upon some supposititious case. It is easy to put it, and it may be that it would be no breach of confidence to put it. The Senator from Massachusetts has seen fit to say that the President is making an act of war upon Hawaii.

Suppose it should be disclosed when the facts come to be known that Hawaii was at peace; that no step had been taken in the conduct of the public affairs of that nation which involved or had produced one single trivial act in breach of the peace, and yet at the request of a body of men who were but in part American citizens the minister of the United States, assuming some authority of which I do not know the origin, ordered troops upon the soil of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and so placed those troops that they were drawn up across the street from the government house of the Hawaiian Kingdom; and suppose it should turn out that he did this in confederacy with people resident in Hawaii, of whom but a portion were citizens of that Government and the rest strangers or foreigners prosecuting their individual courses with the authority or under the permission of that Government; and confederating with these he stood that body of people living there upon the platform of defense furnished by the troops of the United States, and then with the military power of the United States at its back a committee which had demanded beforehand of the minister of the United States his guaranty of protection read their proclamation that they were the Government of Hawaii and took possession of that island, with which we were at peace, and that they deposed the very constitution and the constituted authorities which have been made the pretext of objection, and thereby backed up by the minister of the United States, by the cannon of the United States, by the troops of the United States, they demanded the surrender of the Queen with her insufficient power, and thereupon she yielded, declaring her submission only to the power of the United States and her entire ability to suppress any insurrection in her own kingdom. Suppose——

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. VILAS. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Suppose that every circumstance which the Senator has been picturing were absolutely true and confessed to be true on both sides of the Chamber, does that create any reason why the President of the United States should not take the American people sufficiently into his confidence to state what instructions he has given to a person who is properly presumed to be their representative as much as his?

Mr. VILAS. The Senator from Rhode Island interrupts me when I am answering a suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts with a question utterly irrelevant and completely answered by the President's own message in the clause I have already read, in which he has promised the amplest information to the people of the United States on the subject.

Mr. HOAR. When he has got through?

Mr. VILAS. As soon as he can deal with the subject, upon information soon to be obtained. But I was about to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if such should turn out to be the facts in this case, when was the act of war leveled at the Hawaiian kingdom?

Mr. HOAR. I will answer the question with great pleasure.

Mr. VILAS. I will ask the Senator, then, if it was not an act of war to land the troops there and overthrow the Government by virtue of their force?

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator asks me the question I will answer it with immense satisfaction to myself. Whether it will be satisfactory to him I do not know.

There is no pretense that there was any act of force. Troops were landed. They were landed under the allegation that they were to be used to protect the lives and property of the American citizens. If the Queen was really yielding to those troops and not to the armed insurrection, there was nothing easier than for her to inquire of the American minister, who was within about 20 rods of her, or thereabouts, all the time, whether those troops were to be permitted to assail her or to prevent her from maintaining herself. She did not do it. So the mere fact is that those troops were landed under the declaration of a peaceful and law-

ful purpose and in accordance with law among nations, and without putting the question, without going so far to require the discharge of a musket or the presenting of a musket toward the Hawaiian Government, at once said, "I yield." There is not an instance in all history where a government was overthrown under such circumstances and was yielding to the force of another power. But now let me put the question——

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question right there, before he leaves that point? He spoke of the Queen yielding to an armed insurrection. What information has he that there was an armed insurrection there on the 16th of January?

Mr. HOAR. The statement of Mr. Stevens and the statement of the Provisional Government that they had the superior armed force at the time.

Mr. GRAY. There is not a bit of evidence of that.

Mr. HOAR. Now, I want to ask the Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. VILAS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that he is not at all answering my question. He is begging it. He is asserting a state of facts contrary to the state of facts upon which I put the supposititious question. He is assuming that certain things exist, and I am asking him what will be his answer if the contrary proves to be the truth, if the facts as I state them should be disclosed and be convincing upon the testimony?

Mr. HOAR. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. VILAS. Very well.

Mr. HOAR. If it were true that twelve months ago, in violation of right and of international law, the Government of the United States, or some official of the United States, misrepresenting the Government in Hawaii, had done that thing; and a government had been changed and had been in peaceful possession of its power during the interval of twelve months, and the Government of the United States in full knowledge of the facts had recognized the new Government, and the President of the United States had sent a letter to it addressed to my great and good brother, Mr. Dole, I say that it would be an act of infamy for the President of the United States by the same messenger to send an inquiry as to what had been done in the past and to send instructions to overthrow the Government. It would be an act of infamy only paralleled by the act of Joab when he stabbed his neighbor under the fifth rib and said, "Art thou in health, my brother?"

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts appears in almost the same instant in two very unsatisfactory characters, as a reluctant and a too-willing witness. He does not answer the question which he said he would answer, and he proceeds to testify with volubility in respect to an entirely different state of facts. The question put to the Senator from Massachusetts was whether, if the troops were landed there under the circumstances I suggested, and the revolution was accomplished by their force applied directly or indirectly, it was the commission of an act of war? That was the question.

Mr. HOAR. That would depend on the question whether such an act was authorized by the Government. If a United States official did that thing and the President of the United States did not so understand it, but he reported something else, I do not at all conceive that it would be the duty of the United States six months afterwards to overthrow the existing condition of things.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to finish the sentence? The whole argument of the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Texas would require us to give back Texas to Mexico to-day.

Mr. MILLS. The United States did not get Texas from Mexico. Texas came into the Union voluntarily.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator from Massachusetts flies from the defense of his own proposition. It was his proposition that here was an act of war, to be levied by the President of the United States, and he is declaring it without permitting the use of the evidence, which we hold under the seal of confidence, to show that the facts entirely overthrow it and prove the act of war to have originated under Minister Stevens and during a preceding Administration in this country.

But let me put a still further question to the Senator from Massachusetts in respect to his assertion about the act of war. Suppose under the circumstances I have mentioned it happened that the Queen of the Hawaiian Islands, supported by all her native subjects almost without exception, trusted and beloved by them, with the Government of which she was the head recognized as their Government, should yield to the demand made by the minister of the United States through his confederates for a surrender to the force of the United States and put that surrender in writing, in which he said, "I have entire command of all my troops, of all my powers, of all the places of this Government; I can suppress this little insurrectionary force on the instant, but I can not contend with the United States; if it be true, as is alleged, that the United States takes this position, I must yield; but distrusting the truth of it, I yield only upon condition that it shall be referred to the Government at Washington to inquire into the truth of this controversy and the justice and wisdom of this demand. Suppose that the insurgents, advised by the minister of the United States and fortified by the troops behind him, accept the condition and the Queen turns over the Government, not to a body of insurgents whom she could have trodden out with her forces, but to the power of the United States and in confiding submission to the justice of the United States to whom she yielded the question——

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to put him a question?

Mr. VILAS. No; let me finish. Then will the Senator from Massachusetts say that when the Government of the United States decides that question of submission it is engaged in an act of war upon the very people who accepted it and agreed to abide by the result?

Mr. HOAR. Now, allow me to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. VILAS. I should like to have the Senator answer whether that is an act of war.

Mr. HOAR. It is, in my opinion.

Mr. VILAS. An act of war?

Mr. HOAR. It is as flagrant an act of war the President is now proposing to do as can be. Going in in pursuance of such a pretense as that, and undertaking to preserve social order, saying that anybody will be punished who disturbs the peace, as Minister Willis seems to have said under his instructions, is an act of war. Now, I have answered that question.

Mr. GRAY. What does the Senator think of Mr. Stevens?

Mr. HOAR. I am not talking about Mr. Stevens.

Mr. GRAY. No; I do not believe you are.

Mr. HOAR. I am answering the question. The Senator from Wisconsin puts me a question about the present act of Minister Willis and the present Administration, and the Senator from Delaware seems to think it is a subject of taunt that I do not talk about Mr. Stevens. I am answering a question, and I have answered it. Now, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, suppose everything he has said is true, and every supposition he has made is sound, where does the President of the United States get his authority to do anything to right that wrong, if it be a wrong, without the consent of Congress, and to use the Army and Navy of the United States to do it? Will the Senator answer that question? Where is the authority for it in the President?

Mr. VILAS. The question which the Senator from Massachusetts puts is a question to which I hope at a future time to address some observations, fully, completely meeting it, at least so far as my judgment goes.

Mr. HOAR. Answer it; I can hear the Senator now.

Mr. VILAS. But at this point, precisely what I am saying is that we are not equipped to argue the question which is presented. We have not the facts at command to argue the question. Precisely what we want is a knowledge of the facts upon which we can argue the question.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator for his construction of the Constitution of the United States, not for the facts.

Mr. VILAS. Oh, for what the President of the United States has done, for what the President of the United States has instructed his minister to do, he has ample and complete and perfect authority.

Mr. CULLOM. What is it?

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Wisconsin is going to answer it in the future, but will he at this moment, if he can, imagine a state of facts under which the President of the United States has the constitutional authority to instruct Mr. Willis to go to Hawaii and preserve order and punish breaches of the peace when there is a *de facto* government there?

Mr. VILAS. I am under no necessity whatever to inquire into any question concerning an exercise of power by the President to send anybody to Hawaii to keep the peace or to keep the public order there. I have no idea the President has done anything of the kind, except as I learn in some way (perhaps I may say that, because I may have heard it outside of confidential information), that there was an attempt on the part of an American minister once to put troops on the island of Hawaii with a view of keeping the public peace there and discharging in that island, not the duty which the United States owes to citizens of the United States, but the duty which the peaceful Government of Hawaii owed to the citizens of that country.

But, Mr. President, I had no purpose to engage in any extensive discussion of the matter at this time. I was merely putting

to the Senator from Massachusetts a question which I supposed he would freely answer at once affirmatively, whether upon the state of facts which I suppose to have existed an act of war had been committed on Hawaii, not by the President of the United States, but under the former President of the United States, by the minister clothed with the authority of this Government then resident in that island.

I desire explicitly to disclaim any idea of discourtesy to the Senator from Massachusetts, and explicitly to disclaim any want of willingness to have the full information presented. I seek it always, but because of the reasons which I have suggested I think before this resolution is sent to the President the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to consider it in view of the peculiar circumstances. I therefore make a motion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not propose to cross the Hawaiian bridge until we get to it. I do not propose to discuss the wisdom of the original procedure on the part of Minister Stevens or the wisdom of what has been recently done by the present Administration. I do not understand that those questions are involved in the pending resolution.

I seldom agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] states, but I do agree with him in this particular, viz, that this is an ordinary and simple resolution asking for information from a department of the Government in reference to a most important matter. It is information which I think the American people wanted to ascertain from the President's message, and they were disappointed in the information not being furnished.

The question as to what has been done is the point involved. When we ascertain what instructions have been given and when we understand what the true situation was at the commencement of the difficulty, we can then determine what we ought to do.

I listened to the speech of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], or at least a portion of it. I did not understand that he opposed the passage of the resolution.

Mr. MILLS. No, I did not.

Mr. HILL. The Senator did not. I therefore assume that he recognizes the propriety of the passage of the resolution.

I do not propose to debate the question day after day for the purpose of allowing the Administration an opportunity to accomplish a certain result, so that thereafter the Congress of the United States may be powerless to apply whatever remedy it may see fit to adopt. Delay may be dangerous.

It is objected by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] that the passage of the pending resolution at this time will be a sort of discourtesy to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should be the last one here to suggest any discourteous act toward the distinguished chairman of that committee [Mr. MORGAN] or any of his associates, but I do not understand (although this is a very courteous body and understood so to be throughout the country) that there is anything improper for a Senator to propose a resolution involving the subject of foreign affairs and to press it in the absence of the chairman or in the absence of any one member of that committee.

No action is proposed except the bringing of desired information into this Chamber. That is all. What the Senate may see fit to do when that information shall be furnished is another and a different subject altogether. I therefore say that it is begging the question on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin to insinuate that there is some sort of discourtesy to the chairman of the committee by pressing the resolution at this time, and I think it affords him simply an opportunity to occasion delay in order that Congress may be powerless to take proper action in a certain event.

Mr. President, I have no reflections to cast upon the preceding Administration or upon the present Administration. I have no unkind word to utter in reference to the action of the previous minister or the present minister. We have a disputed state of facts as to what actually took place when the former government of Hawaii was overthrown. There is a dispute between the previous minister and the gentleman (Mr. Blount) who was sent to investigate the subject—sent not by Congress, but by the President alone. We have his statements. We have the statements of the previous minister. There is a disputed question of fact. Congress in its discretion may see fit to send a duly authorized commission to that Government to ascertain the true situation. Congress may conclude in its wisdom that it is proper to send more than one person for the purpose of ascertaining the true facts in regard to this matter.

The point that I make now is simply this: The President has informed us in his message that there has been given on the part of the Administration certain instructions as to what should be done. It is argued by some people that those instructions are of a pacific character, that something is to be accomplished by negotiation. It is said that the Provisional Government is to be undermined, perhaps by intrigue; that the people who are behind it are to be induced to surrender the Government they now control. Those means are pacific. Possibly the President has a right to give those instructions, and then again he may not. Other instructions, of a different character, are hinted at in the public press. I do not say they have been given. I hope they have not been given; but it is said that other instructions have been authorized, from which it is inferred that force may be used to restore the previously existing status. This brings up the question as to whether the present Administration or the President has the right, without the consent of Congress, by the use of the Army or the Navy of the country, to restore the previously existing status, even conceding that the present Government had been placed there by fraud, or even by force.

There are three departments of this Government, and the executive department is but one of them. We ask this information because we are entitled to it. We ask it now.

It is suggested that whether the President will comply with the resolution depends upon his own judgment and his own discretion. The resolution is so worded. It is respectfully worded. He can withhold this information if he desires. I can not imagine any good reason why it should be withheld from this body for a single moment after the resolution shall reach the White House.

Does any Senator around this circle intimate or suggest that there may be some special reason why the public interests will be jeopardized by having the Congress of the United States in possession of all the facts? What harm is to be done if this body shall know and the people shall know precisely what is now going on upon that unfortunate island? I suggest that no good reason has been presented or can be presented why the President should not promptly comply with the resolution.

For myself I see no actual necessity for the insertion of the words that he shall inform us in case he thinks the public interests will not be jeopardized; but, sir, it is well that the resolution should pursue the ordinary method. It is well that there should be no departure in this instance from the usual customary form of language used. Nevertheless I say no good reason exists why the information should not be furnished immediately.

Mr. President, there are reasons why the information should be given here and now. Perhaps at this very hour the Navy of the United States, cooperating with our American minister, may be seeking to destroy the Provisional Government by force, and I say the propriety of such action is a question to be determined by the Congress of the United States and by no one else and by no other authority. Therefore, sir, the public interests demand that we should have this information.

I do not desire to intimate that the actual instructions, whatever they are, are improper. I do not say they are unauthorized, because I know not what they are in fact. Senators may argue one side and they may argue the other. We may say that the President has done right and others may say he has done wrong. None of us know what he has done. The resolution simply says that he shall inform Congress what are those instructions. Are they to require our minister to negotiate for the destruction of the Provisional Government by intrigues, by negotiation, or by some arrangement, or have no instructions whatever been given of that character? Or has our minister been instructed to restore the existing status by putting the Queen back upon the throne?

There is no substantial objection to the pending resolution. Gentlemen may want time here for the purpose of allowing the instructions to be carried into effect by our minister, so that Congress may be powerless to remedy the wrong, because no other reason can be given here for delay. I think that nothing whatever should be done by our Navy or our minister until Congress shall have possession of all the facts, and I regret that the President of the United States did not see fit in his message to give us the instructions. Every other fact in regard to this transaction was given, every material matter of information relating to this whole transaction which we ought to know was given. Not the details, but the substance of it, has been furnished us and furnished to the people; but when it came to what is going to be done and what is being done now, we are told that certain instructions have been given, but they are withheld from us, and it is not even intimated that they are withheld for high or public reasons. They are simply withheld, and that is all.

Therefore, sir, I think it was proper for the Senator from Massachusetts, or any other Senator in this body, realizing the distinctions in the various departments of the Government, and knowing the constitutional limitations upon the Executive power, to offer such a resolution, and in my judgment it came none too soon. In saying this I do not propose to express a single opinion or intimate in the least what my sentiments may be in regard to the actual merits of this Hawaiian controversy.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend now to say one word in regard to the condition of affairs in Hawaii a year ago. There is a dispute between the executive officers and the present Administration and the minister of our Government at the time the event occurred. We have been advised in an indirect way or only informally to a limited extent of the nature of the controversy. We know that Mr. Blount was sent for some purpose to acquire information, and that information has come in. It has not been given to the public at large. The great amount of it is yet withheld from the people of the United States, and even from the Congress of the United States.

Whether Mr. Stevens was justified in the course he pursued I am not prepared to say, nor shall I decide that point until I have the fullest and fairest opportunity of examining all that can be said on both sides of the question. But here is the difficulty. The President of the United States tells us, and we are told in the newspapers, that there is a purpose to restore the Government of the Queen, to renew the *status quo*, and to set aside what is regarded by the Administration as the unlawful act of Mr. Stevens in having the troops of the United States on the island at the time of the revolution. All these are matters of controversy, and I do not intend to enter upon them.

But there is one thing which appears to me very plain, and that is, that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States have not been treated in the open, fair way in which an Administration or a part of the Government of the United States should treat the Congress of the United States. It is certain that these doubts about the condition of affairs a year ago were in the minds of the President and the officers of the Government when the present Congress met in extra session. It is certain that a gentleman of high standing no doubt, a former member of the other House, had been sent there for the purpose of acquiring information. That information has not been given to the public. It is certain also that the Administration had formed certain definite ideas of their duty.

It has been practically stated that the purpose of the Administration is to restore the *status quo* which existed before the revolution—put the Queen in power again—but we have not been informed that such is the purpose. The President of the United States and all the officers of the Government may as well understand that the people of the United States do not like this. That is a feature of the Hawaiian controversy that impresses itself upon the mind of the plainest citizen of the United States. Whatever facts exist or whatever suspicions exist in the mind of the President, whatever may be his ideas or his information, it ought to be conveyed not only to Congress, but to the public at large. There is no reason in the world why there should be any secrecy about this matter. All the facts are known or ought to be known to the Administration, and they ought to be communicated.

All I desire to say is, that if it is the purpose of the President of the United States by the use of the military force to restore the Queen to power in Hawaii, it will be, in my judgment, a fatal act of public policy, a great injustice to the people of the United States, and almost an insult to the Congress of the United States. This is the lawmaking power. The President of the United States has no right either to declare war, or to commit an act of war, or to precipitate in any way a controversy of this kind. It seems to me that not only the information called for by the resolution now pending, but all the information that can be given to us should have been communicated to Congress at the last session. Then we might have acted. The question of the appointment of Mr. Willis as minister came before us. There was nothing said in making that appointment as to any particular difficulty in Hawaii, as to any particular danger that might occur, as to any particular act that might be adopted by the executive authorities to restore the *status quo;* nothing of the kind.

It seems to me it is proper and just for the President of the United States and the executive authorities to give us this information at once, and it should have been at least sent in to us at the last session of Congress, when the public mind would have been prepared for the present condition of affairs.

Now, with these remarks I desire to take up the Hawaiian question and do what is just and fair. The people of the United States have no such interest in this matter that they can not deal fairly and impartially not only to the Queen, whatever may be said of her demerits, but to the people of Hawaii and also the Provisional Government. There is no reason why we should not deal fairly and justly by them. It appears to me if there had been less secrecy about this matter, a more open and fair-handed dealing with the Congress of the United States, there would be less suspicion and trouble. If it should so happen now that in pursuance of the policy of the Executive our troops should be landed in the island and a single life is lost there, it would be caused certainly by an unlawful act.

If the act of Mr. Stevens was unlawful and improper when he landed the marines upon the shores of Hawaii and put them in a position where they might overawe the Queen—if that position is true, then certainly it is equally wrong now for the present minister to land the troops of the United States there to intervene in the existing Government, directly or indirectly to overawe them in the slightest degree, or to take any step whatever to change the condition of affairs now existing. Whatever view may be taken of the action of a year ago, there can be no doubt about the view that will be taken by the people of the United States regarding any act now which involves violence or even the appearance of violence, or threats, or any act whatever done by the executive authorities without the consent of Congress and without the knowledge of Congress.

Therefore, with all the kindly feeling I have for the President, I would say he ought to communicate this information immediately. It ought not to have been delayed. As a Senator of the United States I feel justified in saying, with all due respect to the President of the United States, that this is the information which above all others should have been communicated to the people in his annual message; and I say frankly that when I first read that part of the message it seemed to me unsatisfactory. That is the point on which he should have communicated to us full information. He delayed it too long. All the information he possessed and all the suspicions which had been aroused in his mind as to what had occurred a year ago, ought to have been communicated in the first instance to Congress when it was in session. That is the point of criticism which it seems to me is running through the popular mind now.

The people of the United States would hear with profound regret that the troops of the United States had been compelled for any reason whatever to participate in any controversy that may exist in Hawaii; that the arms of the United States should be compelled to carry death to a single citizen or subject of Hawaii. There is a feeling of anxiety in the public mind evidenced by the public press throughout the country on this subject, and there is a feeling of strong resentment, it appears to me, because the Congress and the people of the United States have not been dealt with with more frankness.

Now, this is all I have to say. Whether the pending resolution passes to-day or to-morrow is a matter of comparative indifference, although I see no reason why the President of the United States should not at once send us the information; and if he has given orders, whatever may be their nature, which shall hereafter lead to trouble and physical violence, the people of the United States will hold him severely to an account for it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that there is no objection at all to the passage of the pending resolution. I, with him and with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], want all the information in an official form that can possibly be obtained in regard to this unfortunate fiasco in the Central Pacific. The only thing in the way of criticism in regard to the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts, if I had been present when it was offered, would have been to appeal to him to wait for a very little while to see whether we might not have the presence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. MORGAN]. But even his absence is not an insuperable obstacle to the passage of the resolution. It would be an act of courtesy which is not unusual in this body in a matter of such importance to a standing committee of the rank and grade of the Committee on Foreign Relations to wait a little, to "bide a bit," as the Scotch say, until the chairman of the committee and one or two important members of that committee who are absent shall be present. If they should be absent long, of course that is another question. But I am not disposed to make any point about that.

I think the resolution is a proper resolution. It is one that might well pass, although in view of the annual message of the President of the United States, and what he has said in that message, as was commented on by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], there is not that urgency or exigency which would otherwise, perhaps, obtain for the passage of such a resolution. We have the assurance of the President of the United States that this is a matter which is to be made the subject of a special communication to the Congress of the United States, and with that communication he says it is his purpose to send all the documents which relate to the whole matter of our relations to the Sandwich Islands to Congress for consideration. I think we could afford, if we chose to wait for a day or two, to see whether such a message comes.

The reason given by the President for the short delay he speaks of in sending that message is a very obvious one, it seems to me, because it is a matter of common knowledge that we have no cable communication with the Sandwich Islands. The only means of communication is by the slower process of the steamers that arrive periodically. One is expected to arrive in a few days, bringing information and dispatches from the minister to the

Executive, the first there has been an opportunity of receiving, which the President desires to have when he sends his message that he may include them among the important matters of which he wishes to inform the Congress

I think that that probably will be done. I think the President will be quite justified when he receives this resolution, couched as it is in the ordinary conventional language of such resolutions, to wait for a day or two to see whether he can not, when he sends in a copy of the instructions, also send the dispatches of Minister Willis.

But, Mr. President, it does seem to me that there is an amazing tenderness in certain quarters as to what the instructions to Minister Willis may be. There is an amazing solicitude on the part of some of our friends in this body as to whether the President of the United States has on the very first day of the session sent all the correspondence, all the diplomatic notes, all the instructions to ministers for our information.

I do not think there is any precedent (of course I do not speak by the book) for the President of the United States encumbering an annual message, dealing with all the affairs of this great country, with such special matters, especially when he tells us that he expects to make them the subject of a special communication to the Congress. I think that those Senators should bide their time who slept peacefully at night, who had no thorns in their pillows last January when this so-called revolution occurred, when commissioners appeared here with a treaty in their pockets, and were willing to wait the pleasure of the Executive to send to the Senate of the United States the communication that he did send in his own good time. The 15th day of February is the date of the communication sent by the President of the United States detailing the facts and all that led up to this wonderful revolution and the cession of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. Now, it may be that a new color will be put upon some of those facts by subsequent evidence. It may be that they will not contain exactly the color they had when they influenced the President of the United States to attach his signature to that treaty.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to make an inquiry of my colleague upon the Committee on Foreign Relations. Was not the communication from Mr. Blount on which the charge against Mr. Stevens is founded made to the executive authorities some two or three months ago? When did Mr. Blount return?

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the last session closed.

Mr. HAWLEY. In July.

Mr. SHERMAN. He returned some time in July, I think. Mr. Willis was appointed soon afterwards. The information upon which all the action is based is Mr. Blount's statement, which was made to the President in July. It has always appeared to me strange that that report was not sent to Congress.

Mr. GRAY. I am not discussing the merits of this situation, for the very reason that no communications have been sent to Congress and we have no official information as to what the attitude of the Executive is towards those islands. I am very anxious that we shall have that information, and for that reason I shall vote for the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts, not because I think it will hurry so much the communication that will come in due course from the Executive.

I merely alluded to this because I thought there was an asperity in the tone of those who are advocating the passage of the resolution which demanded some attention. I do not see that the Executive in this case (certainly there is no evidence to the effect) has transcended his powers or has in any way violated the usages which obtain in the diplomatic intercourse of the United States with foreign countries. On the contrary, he has told us that he expects to lay before the Congress within a few days every bit of information he has, and expecting that, and desiring it, I am quite content to abide until that communication comes before forming my own judgment or attempting to discuss the merits of the situation.

I do not sympathize with the exceeding haste and zeal of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], who is so anxious to throw this resolution at the President of the United States, that he even wants to take out of it the ordinary conventional language which accompanies all such resolutions. I do not suppose the Senator from New York was aware that all resolutions calling upon the President for information are framed in precisely this manner. It is the ordinary conventional language which obtains in all such resolutions.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I think I so expressly stated. The information which the Senator furnishes to me is not needed, because I stated it myself. I stated that while I was glad the usual form had been observed in this particular, it is simply unnecessary so far as giving the President a right to withhold the information. I can see no reason why the information should be withheld for any public consideration.

Mr. GRAY. I had hoped that it was ignorance on the part of the Senator from New York. It appears that it was not.

Mr. HILL. The ignorance seems to be on the part of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GRAY. I had hoped it was ignorance on the part of the Senator from New York when he suggested that the clause was unnecessary. It now appears that, for the first time in the history of intercourse between this branch and the Executive, we are to have this courteous language, which has been founded upon usage and upon good reason, taken out of a resolution. The Senator may see good reason for it, but I do not think any other Senator within the sound of my voice will see it.

Now, if the Senator from Massachusetts can not agree with me, as I hoped he might, that we should wait for a day or two merely, for the presence of our chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and one other important member of the majority of that committee on this side—if he does not think that that should be done, I shall vote with him for the passage of the resolution.

Mr. FRYE obtained the floor.

Mr. HOAR. Will the honorable Senator from Maine allow me to say one word in reply to the personal appeal to me?

Mr. FRYE. With pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. I merely wish to say that no man has a higher regard than I have for the Senator from Alabama who is now absent. I suppose the length of his absence, from the information I get, can not be predicted as yet; and I am very sure that he would be delighted to find this information here on his table awaiting him when he gets back.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Maine will allow me, I do not know how long the presence of the Senator from Alabama here may be deferred. I merely wanted to wait for a day or two. If it should prove that he is not to be here then, of course there would be no excuse for further delay. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will, in view of that fact, withdraw the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FRYE. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. VILAS. I have no objection at all to withdrawing the motion, and in view of the statement of the Senator from Delaware I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Wisconsin to withdraw the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The motion is withdrawn, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, under those circumstances and owing to the fact that I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the further fact that this subject has undoubtedly been referred to that committee in that portion of the President's message relating to Hawaii, I shall not enter upon any discussion of the merits of this case at the present time, hoping and expecting by and by, when the committee have considered the facts, to take part in a debate upon the Hawaiian question.

I will simply say at this moment, and content myself with the statement, that the greater part of the day I have been absent on a conference committee. I was informed on my return to the Chamber that some Senators, whom I do not know, had spoken with a great deal of bitterness about Minister Stevens, who was at Hawaii at the time of the revolution, and that they had attempted to throw discredit upon him. I merely desire to state that my colleague and I have known Mr. Stevens intimately since we were boys. He has been a prominent figure in Maine for the last thirty years. He is a man of the very highest character, and is entirely above reproach. No one familiar with him would question any statement of fact he made as coming within his own observation, nor would dream of doing so.

When this matter is further under discussion both my colleague and myself will with great pleasure defend Mr. Stevens against any attacks which may be made upon him from any quarter whatsoever.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to say a very few words upon this subject. It seems to me that we have gone very far out of the way to find some ground of objection to the President of the United States in respect to this matter of Hawaii. It seems to be assumed here that the President has no constitutional duty imperative upon him to perform in this respect. What is the provision of the Constitution? The President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

What are the laws? The Constitution declares that the laws passed under the authority of the Constitution and the treaties made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land.

We have a treaty guaranteeing the existence of the established Government of Hawaii. By what authority has that treaty been abolished that it is not imperative upon the President of the United States? By what authority is that treaty not the supreme law of the land, whose stipulations no minister and no President and no authority, except that of Congress, can destroy?

What is the President to do under his oath when there is a treaty guaranteeing the existence of the dethroned Government of Hawaii? Is there any doubt upon the subject that the tripartite treaty of 1889, the Berlin treaty, so requires? Then, if there is to be a change, it must be by authority of the Constitution. That treaty is obligatory upon the President of the United States until Congress shall change its provisions; yet we have gone out of the way to assail the President of the United States when an imperative obligation of law imposed by the Constitution rests upon him to respect and execute the provisions of this tripartite treaty of Berlin.

Mr. President, for one I am not opposed to extending protection in proper circumstances over governments distant from our own country whenever our commercial and financial interests shall require it. But that is not the question here. The question is, what was the obligation upon the President of the United States? Could a former Administration abolish that treaty and its obligations? Could a minister of the United States in any respect impair the obligation which that treaty, still existing, imposes upon the Executive of the United States?

I merely desired to say these few words, and will add that although this resolution may be a proper one, and that information may properly be asked for by Congress, and no doubt would be furnished by the President without any unnecessary delay, yet, in the existing status of things there is but one obligation upon the President; that is, to see that the laws as they exist and the treaties made are executed and carried into effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

The resolution was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 7, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6, 1893.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT.

William B. Hornblower, of New York, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Samuel Blatchford, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William A. Poucher, of New York, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of New York, vice De Alva S. Alexander, resigned.

CONSULTING ENGINEER.

Frank H. Dabney, of Louisiana, to be consulting engineer of the United States on the International Boundary Commission provided for in the convention with Mexico of March 1, 1889; to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONSULS.

H. Clay Armstrong, jr., of Alabama, to be consul of the United States at Grenoble, France, whose nomination failed to receive the concurrence of the Senate at its last session.

Newton B. Ashby, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Dublin, Ireland, whose nomination failed to receive the concurrence of the Senate at its last session.

Marcellus L. Davis, of Arkansas, to be consul of the United States at Merida, Mexico, whose nomination failed to receive the concurrence of the Senate at its last session.

Benjamin Lenthier, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Sherbrooke, Quebec, whose nomination failed to receive the concurrence of the Senate at its last session.

Frank W. Roberts, of Maine, to be consul of the United States at Barcelona, Spain, whose nomination failed to receive the concurrence of the Senate at its last session.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

John B. Riley, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Ottawa, Canada, whose nomination failed to receive the concurrence of the Senate at its last session.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

John R. Procter, of Kentucky, to be Civil Service Commissioner, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice George D. Johnston, removed.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

General officer.

Col. Elwell S. Otis, Twentieth Infantry, to be brigadier-general, November 28, 1893, vice Carlin, retired from active service.

Adjutant-General's Department.

Col. George D. Ruggles, assistant adjutant-general, to be adjutant-general with the rank of brigadier-general, November 6, 1893, vice Williams, retired from active service.

Capt. George S. Wilson, Twelfth Infantry, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of major, November 6, 1893, vice Ward, promoted.

Capt. William P. Hall, Fifth Cavalry, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of major, November 6, 1893, vice Volkmar, promoted.

Quartermaster's Department.

First Lieut. J. Estcourt Sawyer, regimental quartermaster Fifth Artillery, to be assistant quartermaster with the rank of captain, December 1, 1893, vice Wheeler, promoted.

Pay Department.

Capt. Charles E. Kilbourne, Signal Corps, to be paymaster with the rank of major, November 6, 1893, vice Roche, retired from active service.

Adjutant-General's Department.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Wood, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of colonel, November 6, 1893, vice Ruggles, appointed adjutant-general.

Maj. William J. Volkmar, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, November 6, 1893, vice Wood, promoted.

Medical Department.

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Byrne, deputy surgeon-general, to be assistant surgeon-general with the rank of colonel, December 4, 1893, vice Page, retired from active service.

Maj. Samuel M. Horton, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, December 4, 1893, vice Byrne, promoted.

Capt. Walter Reed, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, December 4, 1893, vice Horton, promoted.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. George F. Landers, Fourth Artillery, to be first lieutenant, November 14, 1893, vice Corthell, Fourth Artillery, deceased.

Infantry arm.

Lieut. Col. William H. Penrose, Sixteenth Infantry, to be colonel, November 28, 1893, vice Otis, Twentieth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general.

Maj. Edwin M. Coates, Nineteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, November 28, 1893, vice Penrose, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Clarence E. Bennett, Seventeenth Infantry, to be major, November 28, 1893, vice Coates, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles St. J. Chubb, Seventeenth Infantry, to be captain, November 28, 1893, vice Bennett, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur Johnson, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 28, 1893, vice Chubb, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Joseph B. Doe, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of War, vice Lewis A. Grant, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Paymaster Albert D. Bache, to be a pay inspector in the Navy from September 26, 1893, vice John H. Stevenson, pay inspector, retired.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Arthur Peterson, to be a paymaster in the Navy from August 15, 1893, vice Paymaster J. G. Barton, retired (subject to the examination required by law).

Passed Assistant Paymaster Ambrose K. Michler, to be a paymaster in the Navy from September 12, 1893, vice Paymaster John Macmahon, deceased.

Passed Assistant Paymaster William W. Galt, to be a paymaster in the Navy from September 26, 1893, vice A. D. Bache, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Samuel L. Heap, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from August 15, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster A. Peterson, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster John Q. Lovell, to be a passed assistant

paymaster in the Navy from September 12, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster A. K. Michler, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster James S. Phillips, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from September 26, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster William W. Galt, promoted.

Passed Assistant Engineer William S. Moore, to be a chief engineer in the Navy from August 10, 1893, vice A. S. Greene, retired.

Passed Assistant Engineer George Cowie, to be a chief engineer in the Navy from September 12, 1893, vice Chief Engineer Edward D. Robie, retired (subject to examination).

Passed Assistant Engineer Charles P. Howell, to be a chief engineer in the Navy from November 10, 1893, vice Chief Engineer Frederick G. McKean, retired.

Assistant Engineer William Strother Smith, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from June 27, 1893, to fill a vacancy in that grade.

Assistant Engineer Gustav Kaemmerling, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from August 10, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Engineer William S. Moore, promoted.

Assistant Engineer Kenneth McAlpine, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from September 12, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Engineer George Cowie, promoted (subject to examination required by law).

Assistant Engineer Clarence H. Mathews, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from September 27, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Engineer W. Rowbotham, retired.

Assistant Engineer De Witt C. Redgrave, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from October 1, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Engineer I. N. Hollis, resigned (subject to examinations required by law).

Assistant Engineer William W. White, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from November 10, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Engineer C. P. Howell, promoted (subject to the examinations required by law).

Assistant Engineer Bias C. Sampson, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from November 14, 1893, vice Passed Assistant Engineer William A. Mintzer, wholly retired.

Lieut. (junior grade) John G. Quinby, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from November 5, 1893, vice Lieut. Howard S. Waring, deceased (subject to the examinations required by law).

Ensign John A. Hoogewerff, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from November 5, 1893, vice Lieut. J. G. Quinby, junior grade, promoted (subject to the examinations required by law).

POSTMASTERS.

William T. Farley, to be postmaster at Tuscumbia, in the county of Colbert and State of Alabama, in the place of John C. Goodloe, jr., removed.

Samuel A. Cunningham, to be postmaster at Golden, in the county of Jefferson and State of Colorado, in the place of John F. Vivian, resigned.

William M. Kintner, to be postmaster at La Junta, in the county of Otero and State of Colorado, in the place of Thomas J. Howard, resigned.

Aurelius Steward, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of Julius W. Knowlton, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Samuel J. Reynolds, to be postmaster at Smyrna, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware, in the place of Thomas Jefferson, jr., whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Edgar B. Tage, to be postmaster at Boise City, in the county of Ada and State of Idaho, in the place of Emeric R. Leonard, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

John Beard, to be postmaster at Danville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois, in the place of William R. Jewell, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Charles I. Haskell, to be postmaster at Virginia, in the county of Cass and State of Illinois, in the place of Reuben Lancaster, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Joseph A. Beane, to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana, in the place of Lincoln H. Beyerle, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

William Corby, to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana, in the place of Edward Sorin, deceased.

Patrick C. Donovan, to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, in the county of Clark and State of Indiana, in the place of A. M. Luke, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

George D. Price, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Jackson and State of Indiana, in the place of Philipp Wilhelm whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

James Renie, to be postmaster at North Vernon, in the county of Jennings and State of Indiana, in the place of John Fable, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

John F. Wood, to be postmaster at Logan, in the county of Harrison and State of Iowa, in the place of John W. Stocker, deceased.

George T. Packer, to be postmaster at Ness City, in the county of Ness and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Thomas M. Blacklin, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota, in the place of Hans O. Haukness, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Lizzie G. Hunt, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Washington and State of Mississippi, in the place of W. S. Hamilton, resigned.

Robert L. Nelson, to be postmaster at Bethany, in the county of Harrison and State of Missouri, in the place of B. M. Prentiss, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

George P. Marvin, to be postmaster at Beatrice, in the county of Gage and State of Nebraska, in the place of Charles M. Rigg, resigned.

Charles A. Morse, to be postmaster at New Market, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Samuel H. Greene, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Anson Swett, to be postmaster at Antrim, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Elliott W. Baker, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

John H. Crane, to be postmaster at Bowling Green, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio, in place of George W. Gaghan, resigned.

Daniel Kirkpatrick, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Richland and State of Ohio, in the place of George W. Hoffman, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

B. Renkenberger, to be postmaster at Columbiana, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio, in the place of William Halverstadt, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Thomas J. Johnson, to be postmaster at Norman, in the county of Cleveland and Territory of Oklahoma, in the place of Daniel W. Marquart, resigned.

T. E. Doyon, to be postmaster at Redfield, in the county of Spink and State of South Dakota, in the place of Orville S. Basford, resigned.

Henry M. Noyes, to be postmaster at Hyde Park, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont, in the place of Roger W. Hulburd, resigned.

Frank D. McCoy, to be postmaster at Sistersville, in the county of Tyler and State of West Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Michael J. O'Kane, to be postmaster at Wheeling, in the county of Ohio and State of West Virginia, in place of William J. W. Cowden, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

John H. Levis, to be postmaster at Black River Falls, in the county of Jackson and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Iver Forkelson, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday a document was laid before the House by the Chair relating to appropriations designated as "Propagation of food-fishes, 1893," which was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Committee on Appropriations called for the statement in question, and it occurs to me that it should be referred to that committee.

The SPEAKER. The reference will be corrected, in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Texas, and the communication will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNUAL REPORT, BOARD OF ORDNANCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for the year ending October 3, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RAFT TOWING, GREAT LAKES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting a copy of the report of the board of officers

relating to raft towing on the Great Lakes; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

IMPROVEMENT OF CRAWFISH AND MILL CREEKS, OHIO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Chief of Engineers, transmitting preliminary examination and survey of Crawfish and Mill Creeks, Ohio, for location for ice harbor in the Ohio River; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

EMPLOYÉS, ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Attorney-General, reporting as to the standard of efficiency of employés in his Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COL. ANSON MILLS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the joint resolution (S. R. 42) permitting Anson Mills, colonel of Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this joint resolution. It has been considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the committee have directed it to be reported unanimously with favorable recommendation.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Anson Mills, colonel Third Regiment United States Cavalry, having been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as a commissioner of the United States under the convention between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, concluded and signed by the contracting parties at the city of Washington, March 1, 1889, is hereby permitted to accept and exercise the functions of said office of commissioner: *Provided*, Said officer shall continue to receive his emoluments in pay and allowances as colonel in the Army while holding said office of commissioner the same as he would receive were he performing such duty under military orders, and no other additional pay or emoluments for his services as such commissioner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DOCKERY. I would be glad if the gentleman would make a statement in reference to this matter.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Under the convention between the Governments of the United States and Mexico, to establish the boundary line between these two countries along the disputed territory on the Rio Grande, it was provided that a commission of each government should be selected for this purpose. Col. Anson Mills, an engineer in the employ of the Government, has served for a number of years in that region and is thoroughly familiar with the river and the changes which have occurred in it from time to time. He was selected because of his familiarity with the region in which this commission is to serve.

At present there is a strip of land on which the Mexicans occasionally arrest our citizens and carry them over into Mexico, and on which our officers also arrest Mexicans and bring them into Texas. It is desired to have the question settled as speedily as possible. Col. Mills, as the resolution provides, shall receive only the compensation which he would receive as an officer of the Army if detailed for this work. It provides, therefore, a saving to the Government by permitting him to exercise the functions of this office.

The necessity for this action arises because of the question as to the peculiar language used in the articles of convention. It says that the commissioners must be selected according to the constitutional provisions of the representative governments and there is some question as to Col. Mills filling both offices in the absence of this authority.

Mr. COOMBS. This is what the President referred to in his message?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. OUTHWAITE a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid upon the table.

REFERENCE OF HOUSE AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a joint resolution (H. Res. 86) with Senate amendments, to pay session and other employés and per diem employés, and that they may be retained during the coming recess; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the resolutions of the Senate with reference to the death of Hon. William Lilly, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania;

Also the resolution of the Senate with reference to the death of Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; which were severally laid upon the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOSEPH for three weeks on account of important business.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PENSIONS.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it was publicly stated by the Pension Office, and so published, that the following-named persons who had prior to the 4th day of July, A. D. 1893, been borne upon the pension rolls of the United States as pensioners, to wit:

* * * * * * *

And whereas it appears by official publication and information believed to be true that these pensioners were between said July 4, 1893, and the 1st pay of October, 1893, dropped from the pension rolls or suspended and deprived of their pensions;

And whereas between the 1st day of October, A. D. 1893, and the 4th day of November, A. D. 1893, the following-named persons, part of said list, and numbering upwards of 1,300 in all, were reinstated upon the pension rolls of the Pension Office; and

* * * * * * *

Whereas all of said list were residents of the State of Ohio, and were borne on the rolls of the pension pay office at Columbus, O.; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to inform the House of Representatives why and upon what ground the said 1,900 names stricken from the rolls aforesaid were so stricken off, and upon what evidence, information, or knowledge the Pension Office acted in striking from the rolls the aforesaid 1,900 names; and, furthermore,

Resolved, That the honorable Secretary of the Interior be requested to inform the House of Representatives upon what requests, evidence, knowledge or information the said 1,300 names, portions of said 1,900 names, were restored to the pension rolls; and especially to furnish the House of Representatives with any requests, applications, or letters which may have been received by the Pension Office requesting such reinstatement, and also such correspondence as passed from the Pension Office to said applicants in regard to such applications and reinstatements.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a memorial a few days ago, looking to an investigation somewhat in this direction, and had it referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I think this resolution ought to go to the same committee, because there may be some matters which that committee should consider.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution (H. Res. 77) conferring diplomas upon designers, inventors, and expert artisans; when the Speaker signed the same.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think this is the first enrollment under the new rule reported by the joint commission.

The SPEAKER. It is the first, and it is very handsomely enrolled.

CALL OF COMMITTEES FOR REPORTS.

The committees were then called for reports, but no reports of a public character were presented.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at eighteen minutes past 12 o'clock, and the call rests with the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The Committee on Indian Affairs presented no business.

The call of committees was resumed.

UNITED STATES COURTS, MISSISSIPPI.

The Committee on the Judiciary was called.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to call up the bill (H. R. 4245) to amend an act pertaining to the United States courts in the State of Mississippi.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for holding terms of the United States courts at Mississippi City," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows, to wit:

"That the counties of Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Marion, Pearl River, Perry, Greene, Jones, Wayne, Clarke, Jasper, and Covington, being a part of the southern judicial district of the State of Mississippi, shall be known as and constitute the southern division of said southern district; and circuit and district courts for the transaction of business pertaining to persons and property in said southern division shall be held at Mississippi City, Miss., on the third Mondays of February and August in each year."

SEC. 2. That all the provisions of the act to which this is amendatory shall apply to the added counties, Jones, Wayne, Clarke, Jasper, Pearl River, and Covington, in the same manner as to the original counties named in said act; and all cases, civil and criminal, arising in said added counties and now pending in the courts at Jackson, Miss., shall not be affected by this enactment, but shall be finally determined in said courts, unless removed to the courts at Mississippi City by consent of parties, in which case the courts at Mississippi City shall have jurisdiction to try and determine them.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE].

The SPEAKER. Are there any amendments?

Mr. STOCKDALE. There are no amendments. I ask that the bill be put upon its third reading.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STOCKDALE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SUPREME COURT, OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to call up the bill (H. R. 288) to provide for three additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will first report the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were read at length.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK].

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Speaker, owing to some errors in the bill that has been read, we submit the following substitute which is authorized by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] offers a substitute. The Chair will state that amendments to the original bill should be voted upon before the substitute. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma shall consist of a chief justice and four associate justices, any three of whom shall constitute a quorum; but three judges must concur to render an opinion.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the President to appoint two additional associate justices of said supreme court, who shall hold their office for the term of four years, or until their successors are appointed and qualified, and who shall receive the same compensation as now provided for the justices of the supreme court of Oklahoma Territory.

SEC. 3. That the said Territory shall be divided into five judicial districts, and a district court shall be held in each county, as now provided by law. The supreme court of said Territory shall define said judicial districts, and shall fix the times and places at each county seat in each district where the district court shall be held, and designate the judge who shall preside therein. Each judge, after assignment, shall reside in the district to which he is assigned. The supreme court of said Territory, or the chief justice thereof, may designate any judge to try a particular case or cases in any district when the judge of said district has been of counsel, or is of kin to either party to the action, or interested, or is biased or prejudiced in the cause, or if for any other reason said judge is unable to hold court.

SEC. 4. That the district court in each of said districts shall have the same jurisdiction that district courts of said Territory now possess.

SEC. 5. That no justice of the supreme court of said Territory shall sit as a member of said court in the trial of any case decided by him in the district court, or wherein he has any interest.

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Speaker, the original bill asked for three additional justices for the Territory of Oklahoma. That bill was referred to a subcommittee, who investigated the necessity for extra judges, and after an investigation they were satisfied that there should be two additional judges provided for. Hence they have recommended the relief provided for in the substitute which is submitted. One hundred and fifty thousand people went into that Territory in the month of September. Everything is in confusion, and the way is to be blazed by the judiciary. There is no question that the three judges provided for the Territory when it was originally organized can not do the judicial work necessarily arising in that new and growing community. Therefore there is no difference of opinion among the members of the committee as to the necessity for the two additional judges provided for in the substitute that has been submitted.

The SPEAKER. Certain amendments to the bill have been reported from the committee. If it is the desire of the committee, by unanimous consent the substitute might be considered instead.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments reported by the committee may be withdrawn and the substitute voted upon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendments reported by the committee will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is upon the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK].

The substitute was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BRODERICK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the title was amended to conform to the body of the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

Mr. MEYER (when the Committee on Naval Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the concurrent resolution, Miscellaneous Document No. 39.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas there are constantly before Congress numerous bills dealing with the question of rank and pay in the Navy, and other matters concerning the personnel of the same; and

Whereas the present laws relating to this subject are in many instances imperfect, inconsistent, unjust, and the result of piecemeal legislation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a special joint committee, consisting of three members of the House and three members of the Senate, be appointed respectively by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to fully investigate and consider the entire subject of the rank, pay, and all other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy; to have power to send for persons and papers, sit during the recess, if any, and during the sitting of both Houses, and to report at any time after it convenes as may be convenient what legislation, if any, is necessary in the premises; any bill so reported by them shall simplify, codify, and revise existing laws relating to the personnel of the Navy so far as may be found possible. And said joint committee is hereby authorized to employ a clerk at $6 per day and a messenger at $3 per day while employed, and any expenses incurred by said commission in performing the duties herein required shall be defrayed equally from the contingent funds of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I shall insist that it shall be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to inquire if this is a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. The resolution comes up for consideration in the second morning hour, as it is called.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will now report.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if this bill has ever been upon the Calendar?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is on the Union Calendar, and was reported on the 19th of October last.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to inquire if this resolution has not been once considered in Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question of fact. The Chair will endeavor to ascertain the fact. (After a pause.) The Chair is advised that this resolution has not been considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KILGORE. My information was that it was considered in the second morning hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The Calendar does not show that this bill has ever been considered in Committee of the Whole, although the impression seems to be general about the desk that some consideration, or attempt at consideration, has been given heretofore. The gentleman from Louisiana perhaps will state the fact.

Mr. MEYER. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that on behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs I asked for unanimous consent to consider that resolution some weeks ago, and objection was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE]. The resolution was then withdrawn, but no other action was had.

The CHAIRMAN. The resolution has not been considered in the committee. The Clerk will now report the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I never withdrew my objection to that measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana states that the request was for unanimous consent when the gentleman objected. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, now I have——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SAYERS. I have nothing to say, Mr. Chairman, against the constitution of the commission, but I shall insist that the latter clause of the resolution be stricken out. I mean that portion which refers to the employment of a clerk and messenger, for the reason that the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House already has two clerks, and I do not know how many clerks in

the Senate the same committee has. If the gentleman in charge of the resolution will consent to strike out the portion indicated I have no objection to the passage of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to that effect?

Mr. SAYERS. I move to strike out the last clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "possible" strike out the following language:
"And said joint commission is hereby authorized to employ a clerk at $6 per day and a messenger at $3 per day while employed, and any expenses incurred by said commission in performing the duties herein required shall be defrayed equally from the contingent funds of the two Houses."

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Naval Affairs, in recommending the passage of this resolution, believed that the expenses and the employment of a messenger and an additional clerk necessary; but, yielding to the judgment of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and to the views of other members of the House, we have concluded to accept that amendment.

Mr. SAYERS. I have no objection, then, to the adoption of the resolution as amended.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I am apprehensive that this is a snare, not to say a delusion. [Laughter.] This resolution has to go to the Senate, for it is a concurrent resolution, and they will stick that proposition back on it, when it will become a privileged question in this House. I am opposed to the adoption of any portion of it.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt, should the Senate decline to adopt this resolution as now submitted and insert such an amendment, that the conferees on the part of the House will in good faith represent the House and refuse to agree to any proposition to restore the clause which is to be stricken out.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, sir, if that is the arrangement [laughter], if these gentlemen will so put themselves on record as to estop themselves, I will be willing that the resolution should pass, otherwise I should not be.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, if this resolution shall pass and I should have the honor of being a member of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on this subject, I would in good faith try to carry out the understanding had with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in regard to the matter.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have not yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Louisiana will yield to me for a moment, I simply wish to ask him a question with a view of throwing some light on the joint resolution.

Mr. MEYER. Certainly; I yield with pleasure.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to have the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] or the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] state what necessity there is for the adoption of this joint resolution.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would suggest that the gentleman read the report of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I have looked at the report of the Secretary of the Navy; but this is a joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives, proposed to be passed here and sent to the Senate for adoption, and I would like to know the object and the necessity of it. I know that the two distinguished gentlemen [Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. MEYER] never offer or advocate resolutions without having good reasons, and I want to give them an opportunity in this case to state their reasons to the House.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The Secretary of the Navy, after detailing the reasons for recommending this action, says:

I am engaged in the preparation of a plan for the reorganization of the line of the Navy which I think will meet the requirements of the service, and I shall have the honor to present it to the Committee on Naval Affairs and also to the joint committee to investigate and consider the subject of the rank, pay, and other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy proposed in the concurrent resolution introduced by the Hon. Mr. MEYER, in case said concurrent resolution proposed becomes a law.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. And, in addition to that, I would refer the gentleman from Kentucky to the very able report on this subject by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Could not the communication which the Secretary of the Navy proposes to make be sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs instead of to a select committee?

Mr. CUMMINGS. The Senate is concerned in this matter as well as the House.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I admit that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. This joint resolution was drawn up in the last Congress by the present Secretary of the Navy, who was then chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, but he was unable to bring it up for consideration before the adjournment.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. My friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] and other gentlemen with whom I have served all know that I am a friend of the Navy. I have advocated an increase of the Navy, but we have reached a point now where, with a depleted Treasury, we ought to be very cautious about making appropriations that are not absolutely necessary.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will say to the gentleman that this joint resolution has nothing to do with an increase of the Navy. The select committee may even succeed in cutting down the expenses through the proposed investigation. At all events, there is no intention to increase those expenses. Let me say further to the gentleman that, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] being accepted, this inquiry will not cost the country one cent, and therefore I see no reason why the joint resolution should not be adopted.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman state the substance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CUMMINGS. The joint resolution provided for a clerk at $6 a day and a messenger at $3 a day, and the amendment of the gentleman from Texas cuts that out.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from New York that I, too, am friendly to the Navy. I am friendly to it because it has more guns and bigger guns than I have. [Laughter.] But I want to ask the gentleman from New York whether it is not the experience of Congress that these committees or commissions for the investigation of the rank and pay of officials under this Government generally recommend an enlargement of the rank and an increase of the pay? That has been their history, according to my observation. If there is going to be a new departure in that respect this will be a unique committee. I understand the gentleman from New York to say that it does not propose to enlarge the rank or increase the pay.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that if I am a member of the committee, so far as my personal influence is concerned it will not be used in favor of increasing the expense of the Navy Department.

Mr. MEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I believe this joint resolution as amended ought to pass. From time immemorial there has been disagreement between officers of the staff and the officers of the line of the Navy, and that disagreement has always been brought into the Committee on Naval Affairs. The object of this joint resolution is to provide for settling those differences between the line and the staff permanently.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Let me add that there are to-day about fifty bills in the Committee on Naval Affairs, private bills, having reference to these very differences between the line and the staff, and if this joint committee can be appointed these personal matters and grievances can be settled in the Navy Department instead of being brought before the Committee on Naval Affairs year after year.

The amendment offered by Mr. SAYERS was agreed to.

Mr. COX. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York why the Committee on Naval Affairs can not take charge of this matter and deal with it as well as a special committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Because we desire to act in concert with the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COX. Then this is to be a joint committee?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEYER. I move that the committee rise and report the resolution to the House with the recommendation that it be passed with the amendment.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 32, noes 37.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, 41 voting in favor thereof; and Mr. KILGORE and Mr. MEYER were appointed.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 64, noes 9.

Mr. KILGORE. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum being made, the Chair, under the rule, will cause the roll to be called.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll; when the following-named members answered:

Abbott,	Bailey,	Bell, Colo.	Boatner,
Adams,	Baker, Kans.	Bell, Tex.	Boen,
Aldrich,	Baker, N. H.	Beltzhoover,	Bowers, Cal.
Alexander,	Baldwin,	Bingham,	Brawley,
Arnold,	Barnes,	Black, Ga.	Bretz,
Avery,	Barthold,	Black, Ill.	Brickner,
Babcock,	Barwig,	Blair,	Broderick,

Brookshire,	Funk,	Lucas,	Ritchie,
Brosius,	Funston,	Lynch,	Robbins,
Bryan,	Fyan,	Maddox,	Robertson, La.
Bundy,	Gardner,	Maguire,	Russell, Conn.
Burrows,	Gear,	Mahon,	Russell, Ga.
Cabaniss,	Geary,	Mallory,	Sayers,
Campbell,	Geissenhainer,	Marshall,	Scnermerhorn,
Cannon, Cal.	Gillet, N. Y.	Martin, Ind.	Shell,
Cannon, Ill.	Gorman,	Marvin, N. Y.	Sibley,
Capehart,	Grady,	McCreary, Ky.	Simpson,
Caruth,	Grimn,	McDannold,	Smith,
Catchings,	Grosvenor,	McDearmon,	Snodgrass,
Causey,	Grout,	McDowell,	Somers,
Chickering,	Haines,	McGann,	Sperry,
Childs,	Hall, Minn.	McKaig,	Springer,
Clancey,	Hall, Mo.	McLaurin,	Stephenson,
Cobb, Mo.	Harter,	McMillin,	Stone, C. W.
Cockrell,	Hatch,	McRae,	Stone, W. A.
Cogswell,	Haugen,	Mercer,	Stone, Ky.
Conn,	Henderson, N. C.	Meredith,	Storer,
Cooper, Ind.	Hicks,	Meyer,	Strong,
Cornish,	Hilborn,	Milliken,	Talbert, S. C.
Cousins,	Hitt,	Montgomery,	Talbott, Md.
Covert,	Holman,	Moon,	Tarsney,
Cox,	Hooker, N. Y.	Morgan,	Tate,
Crawford,	Houk, Ohio	Morse,	Terry,
Cummings,	Hudson,	Northway,	Thomas,
Curtis, Kans.	Hulick,	Oates,	Turner,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hunter,	Outhwaite,	Turpin,
Dalzell,	Ikirt,	Page,	Updegraff,
Davey,	Johnson, Ohio	Paschal,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Davis,	Joy,	Payne,	Walker,
De Armond,	Kiefer,	Paynter,	Warner,
Dinsmore,	Kilgore,	Pearson,	Washington,
Dockery,	Kribbs,	Pence,	Weadock,
Dolliver,	Kyle,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wever,
Doolittle,	Lacey,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wheeler, Ala.
Dunphy,	Lane,	Perkins,	White,
Durborow,	Latimer,	Phillips,	Whiting,
Edmunds,	Layton,	Price,	Williams, Ill.
Ellis, Oregon	Lefever,	Randall,	Wilson, Ohio
English,	Lester,	Rayner,	Woomer,
Epes,	Linton,	Reilly.	Wright, Mass.
Erdman,	Livingston,	Reyburn,	
Everett,	Loud,	Richards, Ohio	
Fletcher,	Loudenslager,	Richardson, Tenn.	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having had under consideration a concurrent resolution of the House providing for a joint committee to investigate the personnel of the Navy, the Committee of the Whole had found itself without a quorum; whereupon the Chairman directed the roll to be called, and now reported to the House the names of the absentees.

The SPEAKER. The roll call showing the presence of a quorum, the committee under the rule would resume its session, but the morning hour has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

SALARIES OF DEPUTY COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE, ETC.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, by unanimous consent, the House proceeded to the consideration of Senate amendments to the joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893.

The amendments were read, as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 5, page 1, insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary;" so as to read, "$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to pay the salaries," etc.

In line 7, page 1, strike out the words "it may be found," and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be:" so as to read, "as many additional deputy collectors of internal revenue as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be necessary," etc.

Mr. SAYERS. I move concurrence in these amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

The SPEAKER. It now lacks but a few minutes of half past 1 o'clock, for which time there has been assigned a special order, which will be at once proceeded with if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

The special order was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Wednesday, the 6th day of December, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon be designated and set apart for the consideration of the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to the governor, and through him to the people of the State of Illinois, for the statue of Gen. James Shields, whose name is so honorably identified with the history of the State and of the United States.

Resolved, That this statue is accepted in the name of the United States, and is assigned a place in the old hall of the House of Representatives, already set apart by act of Congress for the statues of eminent citizens; and that a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed a resolution similar to that just read, and it will be communicated to the House in a few minutes. I shall ask that that resolution be adopted in lieu of the one now pending.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that in the meantime the gentleman proceed with his remarks.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of June, 1893, the Legislature of Illinois passed an act creating a commission to be appointed by the governor, which was authorized to purchase a heroic bronze statue of Gen. James Shields, and a bronze or granite pedestal therefor, properly inscribed and ornamented, and to transport the same to the Statuary Hall, in the Capitol at Washington, as one of the statues which the State of Illinois is authorized by law of Congress to place therein. The commission has performed the duty imposed upon it, and the governor of the State has informed Congress of the fact, in the communication which was laid before the House on yesterday. In pursuance of the custom which has been observed in other cases of this kind, I have submitted the concurrent resolution, which has just been read, and move its adoption.

There must have been special reasons for the action of the State of Illinois in paying this tribute to the memory of James Shields. The State which gave to the service of our country such illustrious statesmen and heroes as Lincoln, Douglas, Grant, and Shields was not wanting in citizens upon whom could be justly conferred the honor of erecting statues to their memory in Statuary Hall.

A brief reference to the life, character, and services of Gen. Shields will prove conclusively that in honoring his memory by placing his statue in Statuary Hall at the capital of his adopted country the State of Illinois has made no mistake.

James Shields was born in Dungannon, County Tyrone, Ireland, in 1810. In 1827, at the age of 17, he came to the United States. In 1832 he settled in the town of Kaskaskia, in the State of Illinois, and began the practice of law. He took great interest in politics, and in 1836, before he was naturalized, he was elected to the Legislature of Illinois. In 1839 Governor Carlin appointed him auditor of the State. Some question having arisen as to his citizenship, having come to this country when a minor, in order to remove all doubt on the subject he took out final naturalization papers in October, 1840. Afterwards this fact became very important to him, as will be seen later on in his eventful career.

In 1843 he was elected by the Legislature of the State a justice of the supreme court of the State of Illinois. At that time the constitution of the State provided for the election of the judges of the supreme court by a joint convention of the two houses of the Legislature. In 1845 President Polk appointed him Commissioner of the General Land Office. While discharging the duties of this office the war with Mexico began. This war furnished an opportunity for the display of his most remarkable talents. At the very beginning of the war he was made a brigadier-general, his commission bearing date of July 1, 1846. He was assigned to the command of the Illinois regiments. He served under Gens. Taylor, Wool, and Scott in the campaigns in different parts of Mexico, which they respectively carried on.

At the battle of Cerro Gordo, which occurred on the 18th of April, 1847, he bore a conspicuous part. Gen. Scott with a force of 8,500 men totally defeated the Mexican army of 12,000 men, under command of Gen. Santa Anna. The Mexicans lost over 1,000 in killed and wounded, and 3,000 prisoners. Gen. Shields was in the thickest of the fight. He received a gunshot wound which was believed at the time to be mortal, the ball having passed through his body, in the region of his lungs. His death was announced in American journals; but to the surprise of his surgeons and to the delight of his friends, he recovered, and was afterwards brevetted a major-general for gallant services. He did not avail himself, however, of his severe and almost mortal wound to return to his home. As soon as he could mount his horse he joined his command. Under Gen. Scott he took part in the battles in the valley of Mexico, commanding a brigade composed of marines, and New York and South Carolina volunteers. He was again severely wounded at Chapultepec.

Such was his soldiery conduct during that campaign, and especially at Churubusco and Chapultepec, that the State of South Carolina voted him a beautiful and costly sword, inscribed with the names of those battles, and the following sentiment:

From the State of South Carolina to Gen. Shields, in testimony of her admiration of his gallantry in the Mexican war, and a tribute of gratitude for his parental attention to the Palmetto Regiment.

He was mustered out in July, 1848, and soon after, having returned to the State of Illinois, he was tendered by the President of the United States the appointment of governor of the Territory of Oregon. This office he declined. There was a contest at this time in the State of Illinois for the seat in the United States Senate, then occupied by Sidney Breese. His contestants for the honor were Senator Breese and Gen. John A. McClernand. Senator Breese desired to succeed himself, and had the prestige of a successful Senatorial career. Gen. McClernand was then a popular young politician residing in southern Illinois, and had borne an honorable part in the Mexican war; but the military fame of Gen. Shields carried him triumphantly through the Democratic caucus, and he was elected Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1849. He presented his credentials, and, having a *prima facie* case, was sworn in and took the seat, notwithstanding the fact that a protest against his admission as a Senator was presented to the Senate on the ground that at the time of the election he had not been a citizen of the United States for nine years, as required by the third paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

After thorough investigation, the Committee on Privileges and Elections reported a resolution to the effect that Gen. Shields was not eligible at the commencement of the term for which he was elected and that his election was void. This resolution was adopted, and the seat was declared vacant. Before its adoption, however, he stated that he would appeal to the State of Illinois for a vindication, and asserted that if that State did not respond to his appeal that it was his intention, though he had endeavored to prove his fidelity to his country, never to offer himself again for office in the United States.

The question of his eligibility was thoroughly discussed, as was also the question as to whether the governor of the State had the right to appoint his successor. Mr. Douglas, then a Senator from the State of Illinois, held that the governor had the power to make the appointment; but Governor French took the opposite view, disclaiming any such power. Believing that he had no power to make an appointment under the circumstances, he called the Legislature together in extraordinary session October 22, 1849, for the purpose of electing a United States Senator; but included in his call some minor subjects of legislation.

At the time the called session assembled Gen. Shields had been a citizen of the United States for nine years, and the governor undoubtedly convened the Legislature at this time so that Gen. Shields would be rendered eligible if the Legislature should see fit to reëlect him. The same Legislature having been reconvened which had elected Gen. Shields, it was not unreasonable to assume that he would be renominated without a contest; but such was not the case. The prize was too glittering to be conceded to Shields without a contest. Twenty-one ballots were had in the Democratic caucus before a nomination was made. On the first ballot Shields received 28, Breese 21, and McClernand 18 votes; and, on the last, Breese received 20, McClernand 12, and Shields 37. Having a majority of all the votes cast, he was again made the nominee of the Democratic party, and was elected after a further contest continuing until the seventh ballot in joint convention of the two houses. He served to the end of his term, March 4, 1855. At the expiration of his term he removed to Minnesota, and when that State was admitted into the Union he was elected United States Senator, and drew the short term, taking his seat on the 12th of May, 1858, and served until March 3, 1859.

The discovery of gold in California had drawn to that State many of the brightest intellects of this country. Gen. Shields cast his lot for a time with the people of that State. In 1861 he drifted into Mexico and was engaged as superintendent of a mine. The war of the rebellion having broken out, the military spirit was rekindled in his veins, and he hastened to Washington and tendered his services to the President. He was appointed a brigadier-general of volunteers on the 9th of August, 1861, and was assigned to the command of Gen. Frederick W. Lander's brigade after the latter's death.

On the 23d of March, 1862, at the head of a division of Gen. Banks's army in the Shenandoah Valley, he opened the second campaign with victory at Winchester, having defeated Stonewall Jackson in one of the hardest-fought battles of the civil war, receiving in the desperate struggle serious wounds in the arms, shoulders, and side. He was congratulated by Gens. McClellan and Banks and Secretary Edwin M. Stanton "for the energy, activity, and bravery displayed on this occasion," and was further honored by Governor Curtin, of Pennsylvania, by an order directing that the flags of the Pennsylvania regiments be inscribed "Winchester, March 23, 1862."

On June 9th, however, at Port Republic, he was defeated by Stonewall Jackson in one of the most remarkable assaults of that intrepid leader. He resigned his commission in the Army on the 28th of March, 1863. He returned to California, but soon removed to the State of Missouri, where he took up his residence and resumed the practice of the law. He served as a railroad commissioner, and was a member of the Legislature of that State from 1874 to 1879. He was elected a Senator from that State to fill out the unexpired term in the Forty-fourth Congress of Louis V. Bogy, deceased, and served but a few months in this capacity.

Gen. Shields was a military genius. On the 10th of January, 1862, at the very commencement of the civil war, he addressed a letter to Maj. Gen. McClellan, commander-in-chief of the Army, in which he outlined at length the military operations which he deemed necessary for the suppression of the rebellion. This communication was evidently placed in the hands of President Lincoln, for his Secretary of State, William H. Seward, in an official communication under date of January 14, 1862, communicated it to the Secretary of War, inviting his attention thereto. This letter of Gen. Shields is published in the "Record of the War of the Rebellion," series I, volume 5, pages 701, 702, and 703.

It is one of the most important papers relating to the conduct of the war, and stamps its author as one of the ablest generals which the war produced. In brief, his recommendations were to the effect that Richmond and Memphis were to be the objective points of the campaign, and that all efforts should be directed toward their capture and occupation by the Union forces. He pointed out minutely the plan of a campaign which should be carried on against Richmond and urged the importance of exercising "such caution and steadiness as to preclude the possibility of any casualty, however insignificant, so that the whole army should arrive before that place in heart and spirit." He suggested that whether the occupation ought to be conducted by slow and certain operations or by rapid and irresistible assaults, must be determined on the ground and at the time, in view of all the circumstances.

There is no doubt but this plan was substantially the one which Gen. McClellan favored. In Gen. Shields' letter he states that after consultation with McClellan he agreed fully with him in reference to the conduct of the war. There is no doubt that President Lincoln and Gen. McClellan had great confidence in the military wisdom and skill of Gen. Shields, and that they esteemed his advice very highly.

Gen. Shields enjoys the distinction of having represented three great States in the Senate of the United States, and having achieved honor as a military chieftain in two great wars. Besides this, he held many offices of honor in the several States of which he was Senator, notably the position of justice of the supreme court of the State of Illinois, to which he was elected by the Legislature of the State when but 33 years of age.

In personal appearance he was dignified and commanding; socially he was genial, devoted to his friends, and affectionate to his family. He had the rare faculty of closely attaching to him all who enjoyed his friendship. He was thoroughly honest, quick to resent an injury, and fearless in the vindication of the right. His patriotism was unbounded by sectional lines, and his devotion to his adopted country was as great as ever was exhibited by one to the manor born. He loved liberty and believed in the equality of all men before the law. The State of Illinois has worthily bestowed the great honor upon his memory by causing a heroic statue in bronze to be erected and placed in Statuary Hall. There it will remain as long as time will endure to testify to the appreciation in which he was held by the State which he so ably served, and to commemorate his patriotism, self-sacrifice, and devotion to the welfare of his adopted country. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Gen. James Shields was born in Ireland in the year 1810; died at Ottawa, Iowa, in the year 1879.

He emigrated to the United States in the year 1826, read law, and commenced the practice of his profession at Kaskaskia, Ill., in the year 1832. He was elected to the Illinois Legislature in the year 1839, and was a contemporary of Douglas, Lincoln, Hardin, David Davis, Stephen T. Logan, Judge Breese, Lyman Trumbull, and Gen. E. D. Baker. He was auditor of the State in 1839, was subsequently judge of the Illinois supreme court, and in 1845 was appointed Commissioner of the General Land Office.

In the war with Mexico he was appointed a brigadier-general. He was shot through the right lung at the battle of Cerro Gordo, and was wounded at Chapultepec. After the close of that war he was appointed governor of the Territory of Oregon, and later was chosen United States Senator from the State of Illinois, his service expiring in 1855. He next became a citizen of the State of Minnesota and was chosen United States Senator from that State in 1858. In 1861 he was commissioned a brigadier-general in the Union Army, and served with the Army of the Potomac with distinguished honor. At Kenistown and Port Republic he defeated Stonewall Jackson. He resigned his com-

mission in 1863, settled in Wisconsin, and then removed to Carrollton, Mo., where he practiced law. He then served as railroad commissioner in 1874, next in the Missouri Legislature, and in January, 1879, was chosen United States Senator from the State of Missouri. He died in June of that year.

Peterson, in his Military Heroes, War of 1812 and the War with Mexico, says:

> Gen. Shields's life presented no event worth recording until his appointment as a brigadier-general on the commencement of the Mexican war.

The Mexican war gave to the United States a great empire, rich in soil and minerals. The eye of the seer can not cover or the tongue of the prophet can not foretell the importance of that acquisition to us and to those who follow after. In the war to preserve the Union, the fate of the nation—aye more, of a civilization—was at stake. In the arbitrament of battle Gen. Shields was a conspicuous figure in both contests. There were many greater statesmen, many greater generals; but in demeanor and personal courage, supplemented by that enthusiasm and leadership in action that command the admiration and touch the hearts of men, perhaps none excelled him. His place in his country's annals is fixed by his military service.

The respect and love of the people of Illinois after the Mexican war dictated his choice as United States Senator from that State over the late Sidney Breese—one of the builders of that Commonwealth, a great jurist and statesman, the impress of whose genius and ability is written on every page of that State's history for over sixty years. The greatest tribute that Illinois can pay to the memory of Gen. Shields is paid by placing his statue in the Nation's Capitol, side by side with the statues of Garfield, Allen of Ohio, and Ethan Allen, Winthrop, Trumbull, Samuel Adams, Muhlenberg, King, Kearney, and others. These statues constitute a part of the history of the country in stone and bronze. Casting our eyes along and over the whole history of the country, Gen. Shields, in the contests of his day and generation, is fairly typical of one of the forces that molded the Republic in its formative period, and that preserved our civilization in the crucial tests of battle. [Applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois [Gen. HENDERSON] had expected to address the House on this occasion, but he is unable, because of illness, to be present. He has requested me to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to print some remarks in the RECORD upon this subject.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the request of the gentleman from Illinois will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake to delineate either the history or the character of the great man whose memory we commemorate to-day, but shall simply speak of him as related to the great State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor.

After the close of the late war Gen. Shields came to the State of Missouri, bought a farm near the town of Carrollton, in Carroll County, and became a citizen of that Commonwealth. A few years later, in 1868, he was the candidate of the Democratic party for a seat in this House. That was during the reconstruction period, during which time one-half of the citizens of that district and State were disfranchised. Gen. Shields took up the cause of the people and advocated their liberty. Having been a soldier of distinction both in the Mexican war and in the late civil war, his character as a loyal citizen and a statesman lent charm and influence to that canvass.

To show the magnanimity of the character of this great soldier, it is related of him that on one occasion one of his admirers in introducing him to the people introduced him as the only man who had ever conquered Stonewall Jackson. In reply to that Gen. Shields modestly stated that although he had come nearer, perhaps, than any other soldier to whipping Stonewall Jackson, yet the truth of history impelled him to say that Stonewall Jackson was never conquered.

He was elected, Mr. Speaker, by the vote of the people of that district, but in one of the counties of the district, the county of Jackson, the whole poll was thrown out, and thus his competitor, Gen. Van Horn, was given the certificate of election.

Afterwards the people of Carroll County, availing themselves of his great ability, elected him to the Legislature of the State and he served one term in the general assembly of Missouri. In 1879 a vacancy in the United States Senate from that State having occurred on account of the death of Lewis V. Bogy, Col. Armstrong of Missouri had been appointed to fill the vacancy, but the Legislature of the State met in the mean time and before the vacancy expired elected Gen. Shields to the United States Senate. He was elected at the same time that our distinguished Senator VEST was first elected, Mr. VEST being elected to the long term of six years and Gen. Shields to fill out the unexpired term of Mr. Bogy. He took his seat in the United States Senate and served from January, 1879, until March of that year, and went to his home. He died at Autumwa, Iowa, in June, 1879, and was buried in the county of Carroll, near Carrollton, his old home.

All, Mr. Speaker, of mortality that remains of this great man sleeps in the bosom of my State. Mr. Speaker, as the Father of Waters rising in the great north State of Minnesota and flowing with majestic power through the whole breadth of this great nation on and on to the sea, laving the borders of Missouri and Illinois, it is but meet and proper that the people of these three great States that honored Gen. Shields with a seat in the councils of the nation may ask to be permitted to take a particular part in the effort of the whole people to commemorate the memory and the character of this great man. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the kindly insistence of my colleagues has assigned to me the pleasing task of speaking to the pending resolution, the purport of which is to accept from the State of Illinois, in behalf of the United States, a statue of one of her illustrious citizens.

The law devolved upon the Legislature of that State the duty of the selection of the man who was thus to be commemorated, and it was no easy task which thus fell to the General Assembly at Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, it was not an easy task to select the foremost man from among the men who for more than two hundred years have been part of the great procession of humanity which has swept across the borders of the State of Illinois, which State, by its geographical location, its extent, and the incidents of its formation, is peculiarly the central Commonwealth of the great American Republic.

Before Virginia had ceded to the Federal Union the territory from which Illinois was framed, the State had been the home of men of distinction and renown. Our counties, our cities, and our rivers bear record of the memory of our people for those who were working at the very foundations of the State in its youth.

There were dwelling for a time the devout Joliet, the chivalrous La Salle, the earnest Marquette; and after and with them, all that countless tide of men, undistinguished save perchance in the little circle of their own neighborhoods, who in their passing by, like the coral insects of the Southern seas, have by their lives wrought greatness and stability into an empire State.

After them there came the men who had made themselves distinguished in the war for independence and in the struggle of 1812. After the fitful fevers of their time, many of them chose their abodes with us and found the peaceful honors of the civic state.

For seventy-five years after the adoption of its first constitution by the State of Illinois its bench has been occupied by illustrious men. In those quiet regions where the mighty work of humanity is done, where the sound of passion is not heard and where the scales of justice are poised with true hands, there was an array of men of whom all the citizens of the State of Illinois are proud.

There sparkle the names of Breese, of Scofield, and of Walker, and there, too, is found the name of Davis, who was called from the circuit bench of Illinois to take his place upon the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, and who, from that Olympian height, at a time when it seemed as if in the exultation of victory civic rights were to be destroyed, dared hold the ermine of the judge before the face of victorious faction, to reestablish the writ of habeas corpus, and all over the land to give a new birth to civil law and set again upon lasting foundations the rights of the citizen.

And at that same epoch, greatest of the great of the great Republic, from the civil ranks of the citizens of that State, came that man whom no partiality can overpraise, whom no detraction can lower, who needs no monument, but whose character, rising beneath the central dome of heaven, will stand forever as a high type of justice and at the same time of magnanimity—the man who was President of the United States during the civil war. [Applause.]

Up among the clouds that gathered in '60 and '61 rise to immortal heights Lincoln and Douglas, rivals in all their early lives, leaders on opposing sides of the vast hosts of freemen, whose children still honor them and whose remotest descendants will turn with reverence to where these reconciled rivals stand side by side in glory.

And by them another Illinoisan, the leader surrounded by his chosen chiefs, Logan and Ransom, Rawlins and Wallace, that leader who in the hour of exultation, from the midst of the clouds of war, could stretch forth in mercy the mailed hand of battle not unnerved by remorse, but strong and vibrant with the love of country, and say in tones that will find echo in every home while America endures, "Let us have peace!" [applause]; who could, from the stricken field of war, turn and give to the vanquished all that their manhood required, and all that the

situation enabled him to bestow—the means of living and the rations from the haversacks of his soldiers.

These were among the sons of Illinois. These were men from whom a choice might well have been made for the statue that is to rise among the storied great of the Republic, but they need none. The world is their Pantheon, and time will be filled with the echoes of their fame. [Applause.]

I forbear to enumerate those who still abide with us. Great men of the State sit with the national judiciary, still add dignity to the debates and organization of the Senate and this House, and bring here in the advancing years the records of patriotic lives devoted wholly to the land and the people.

The State of Illinois has chosen Shields as its man for a reason that reaches to the philosophies of human life. It is because his character represented more fully the catholicity of American citizenship than that of any other man who had ever appeared in the annals of the Republic.

Our Government was founded upon the idea of equal and exact justice, the equality of all mankind, and that here against faction, against king, against intrigues, there should be a rallying point where humanity might stand and grow great enough to overthrow monarchy at such time as the contest came between Man and King.

And trust me, gentlemen, the Republic has not forgotten the lesson!

Born in a kingdom as he was, this man crossed the flaming gulf which separates despotism from liberty upon the bridge formed by the Declaration of the eternal rights of men. Coming among us voluntarily, he assumed all the burdens of citizenship; peaceful in time of peace, baring his breast among the foremost when the requirements of the country made sacrifice of life possible, he did all his work well and left an honored name; and Illinois presents him, Soldier, Citizen, Senator, and Jurist, as a representative of American citizenship. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution relative to the unveiling of the statue of Gen. James Shields in Statuary Hall; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

STATUE OF GEN. JAMES SHIELDS.

Mr. HALL of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the first United States Senator from Minnesota was Gen. James Shields. He came to us of the trans-Mississippi Northwest in the formative period of our statehood, before our North Star was set in the constellation of the Federal Union.

We knew his history, as he had written it with his sword upon the battlefields of Mexico; we knew his political capabilities, as he had demonstrated them in the Senate as the colleague of Stephen A. Douglas. We knew the man. We recognized his robust integrity and fervid patriotism; we realized that with his persistent restlessness and his restless persistency he possessed qualities of inestimable value to our stripling State as it modestly entered the sisterhood of the Union.

For this we honored him and honored ourselves by conferring on him the first Senatorial commission which bore the great seal of our new-born State.

For ten months only he served us in this capacity. Ever restless and always migratory, he left us for a new home upon the Pacific coast. There he heard the echo of the first gun which opened upon Sumter. It needed no proclamation to summon James Shields to the service of his adopted country. A soldier of ability and of undoubted courage, he played his part in the great national tragedy with conspicuous fidelity and success.

To me the most marvelous thing in that war, and indeed in all the wars in which this country has been engaged, is the earnest patriotism and unflinching fidelity of those citizens who have come over the seas and made their homes with us. On every battlefield, in every regiment and squadron, these men won with their bayonets their title-deeds to American citizenship. [Applause.]

Among the names of her adopted sons whom America delights to honor for their heroism and devotion none shines with brighter luster than that of this stalwart Irishman, James Shields.

The great State of Illinois, always just and never ungrateful, with intuitive recognition of her indebtedness to the hardy pioneers of whom Gen. Shields was an accurate type, has to-day placed his among the statues which tenant the old House of Representatives.

There in the nation's Pantheon, if you please, he stands, amid the men who created, protected, and preserved the American Union. Others may be greater, more eloquent, abler, or more renowned, but none was truer than he.

On the opposite side of that ancient Hall, whose marvelous echoes are the wonder of the guided and misguided people who enter there, Vermont has chisled in everlasting marble the stalwart hero of her Green Mountains, whose gorgeous eloquence and emphatic sword compelled the surrender of Ticonderoga. Facing each other these sturdy veterans stand, fine specimens both of the citizen soldiery of two war epochs, the one native and the other foreign born, but both preëminently and altogether American; steadfast and reliable when put to the test, self-reliant, resourceful, and full of enterprise; not absolutely great, but always useful; positive rather than eloquent, magnanimous, but determined; at home only when abroad hewing the paths for the more refined civilization which follows after them, and in its dilettanteism neither knows nor suspects that the work of such men alone renders its progress possible; typical both of a pioneer race to whose vigorous manhood and restless activity the nation owes much of its strength and most of its development. James Shields and Ethan Allen! It is with such rugged bowlders as these that the foundations of empires are laid. He does not read history well who fails to recognize the influence and the necessity of such characters as these in the progress of the nations and the onward march of civilization.

To us of Minnesota, who knew him briefly indeed, but loved him well, it has seemed that the present was a fitting opportunity to add our modest tribute to the memory of our first or pioneer representative in the United States Senate; and, in behalf of that State, I sincerely trust that these resolutions shall pass unanimously. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] asks to substitute the Senate resolutions for the resolutions offered by himself.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea of saying a word upon these resolutions until a minute or two ago; but as one of the soldiers of the late Confederacy who met Gen. Shields upon the battlefield, I desire to say a few words. On the first day of June, 1862, I was under the command of "Stonewall" Jackson, when we met the advance of Fremont from Romney, not far from Strasburg, in the Valley of Virginia. We turned back that advance, and after doing so retreated to the road we had left upon the heights; and for the first time I saw the army commanded by Gen. Shields in the distance upon the south side of the Shenandoah River, advancing for the purpose of cutting off the advance of Jackson up the valley.

Then for all the week there was a forced march by Jackson along that valley, with Fremont in his rear, an almost continuous engagement. Jackson was guarding 4,000 prisoners he had captured at Winchester and large herds of beef cattle and sheep and trains of wagons and other supplies. Shields was seen by our column several times, passing through Luray Valley, on the east side of the Shenandoah, endeavoring to effect a crossing for the purpose of intercepting Jackson and preventing his further advance up the valley. That was prevented only by the activity of Jackson's cavalry keeping ahead of Shields, burning and destroying the crossings of the Shenandoah River, until, on the 6th day of June, at Harrisonburg, when Jackson could proceed no further along the pike, because in his previous engagement early in the spring with Milroy at McDowell he had destroyed the bridge on the pike which led to Staunton. He then abandoned the pike, wheeled to the left, taking a dim little road to Port Republic, which was a small village in the forks of the Shenandoah River, several miles from that point.

On the 6th, the cavalry under the command of Fremont overtook the force under the command of Gen. Ashby and an engagement occurred, resulting in the death of Gen. Ashby and the capture of Sir Percy Windom, who commanded the Federal cavalry. From that point there was no activity until the morning of the 8th of June, when Fremont advanced and the battle of Port Republic took place, in which the Confederate force consisted mainly of Ewell's division and a part of the old division of Jackson. During this time Shields had made a circuit of the valley up the river so as to get before us, and he had a long march to make to reach Port Republic.

But he had pressed on until he had approached that village, and had he crossed his force into the forks of the two rivers and captured the bridge there was no escape for Jackson. He would have had an army in his rear and one in his front, and near the crossing of the river, with no road or bridge by which to escape; and it would probably have proved his destruction. He went personally with a part of his command, and before any of them had crossed the river he himself rode into Port Republic, a small village, and while he was reconnoitering the village a Federal captain commanding a battery had placed his guns at the foot of the bridge. He had crossed over the south fork and placed his guns so as to command the bridge completely. Jackson rode down and ordered him away, and the Federal officer, mistaking him for one of his own commanders for the time, started to obey, when Jackson, on his charger, darted like an eagle across the bridge, and was fired at with one of the guns, but, fortunately for him, without any effect. He then advanced

Gen. Talliaferro's brigade, who captured the bridge, effected a crossing, and, I believe, captured both of the guns.

The command I belonged to arrived when the battle was at its full height in the narrow plain between the mountain and the river on the east side of the south fork. We crossed over the bridge and then crossed the south fork upon a bridge constructed of wagons, a thing which had never occurred in the history of warfare, or was supposed never to have occurred, as most men understood, but I have since read that Gen. Lacourb, a very distinguished French general, considered the best commander of light troops in mountain warfare of his time, had accomplished the same thing a century before that. And by means of that bridge Jackson was enabled to get his forces across into the valley just in time to turn the result of the conflict. When I first beheld it there was no obstruction; our forces were being driven by those of Shields; a terrible conflict was going on by a Federal brigade, said to be composed of Irishmen, to the left at the foot of the hill where the celebrated Ringgold Battery (which had been used in Mexico) was playing upon our troops, and guarded by this brigade.

Our first brigade that assaulted them was broken and driven back. The guns were used with terrible effect across the plain to the river, slaying our men by hundreds at every discharge. It was there that I witnessed the formation of Dick Taylor's brigade of Louisianians and saw the charge that they made. He captured the guns, but they were recaptured and captured again, back and forth, three times, and one of the severest hand-to-hand conflicts of the war took place there. It was only by the brigade to which I belonged advancing and firing on the line immediately to Taylor's left that the Federal force was broken and the battery retaken the last time. That was the turning point of the conflict, and Shields was wounded and forced to retire. No man in the Federal Army ever commanded better or fought more valiantly than Gen. Shields did at the battle of Port Republic.

I happen to know about the relative strength of the forces. According to the reports, Shields had but 12,000 men, and Jackson had 13,000. Fremont had 20,000, but the bridge was in flames and he was compelled to witness from the heights on the north side of the river the defeat of Shields, who was driven away, but only after a battle which was greatly to his credit as a commander; and, from what I saw there, and from the knowledge of him that I have since acquired, I have entertained the greatest respect for the man, for his ability, and his character. He was a patriot and noble man. He was fighting in the cause of his country, and he believed as honestly and conscientiously in the cause that he was sustaining with his sword as I did in the cause in which I was engaged. I honor him and his memory as highly as though he had been upon my side. We were all Americans settling a great controversy between us which could never have been settled in any other way, and I heartily contribute these few words in honor of his memory upon this occasion. [Applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions which I introduced on this subject be laid on the table, and that the concurrent resolutions which have passed the Senate and have just been received by the House be taken up and considered in its stead.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Senate concurrent resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That the thanks of Congress be tendered to the governor, to the Legislature, and to the people of the State of Illinois for the statue of Gen. James Shields, whose name is so closely identified with the history of Illinois and of the United States by his eminent services as a soldier, jurist, and statesman.

Resolved, That the statue be accepted, and assigned to a place in Statuary Hall (the old Hall of Representatives), and that a copy of these resolutions, signed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of Illinois.

The Senate resolutions were concurred in.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolutions were adopted, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the ceremony of unveiling the statue of Gen. Shields will take place almost immediately in Statuary Hall. The governor of the State of Illinois and the commission under whose direction the statue was prepared, and also the governor of Minnesota, will be present. I have been requested by several members to move that the House do now adjourn in order that gentlemen may have an opportunity to witness the ceremony, which will occupy at least an hour. In compliance with these requests, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of Gen. Shields, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the announcement of the result,

Mr. WOLVERTON, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for this day on account of sickness.

The house then (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDZIER, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 3973) for the relief of the owners and occupants of Camp Tyler, in Cook County, Ill. (Report No. 171.)

By Mr. MAHON, from the same committee: The bill (H. R. 2721) for the relief of Wells C. McCool. (Report No. 172.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 3263) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of David Miller. (Report No. 173.)

Also the bill (H. R. 3260) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Susannah P. Swoope. (Report No. 174.)

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4417) for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Chouteau, Harrison & Valle, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4474) to fix the pay and allowance of the veterinarians of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4475) to amend section 4434 of Title L of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 4476) for ascertaining the feasibility and probable cost of constructing a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the navigable waters of the Hudson River—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4477) for the coinage of silver mined in the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 4478) to provide for a telegraph system under control of the Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4479) to amend the charter of the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4510) to provide for a final settlement with the Naalem band of the Tillamook tribe of Indians, of Oregon, in accordance with a certain agreement between the United States and the said Indians, dated the 6th day of August, 1851—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PASCHAL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGANN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 94) providing for an investigation relative to the work and wages of women and children—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a joint resolution (H. Res. 95) providing for an investigation relating to the effects of machinery on labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A resolution to print 10,000 extra copies of the report of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Museum—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HITT: A resolution calling upon the President of the United States for information concerning the instructions given the minister to Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution concerning the policy of this Government towards the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for information concerning the taking off the pension rolls 1,900 names in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4480) granting pension to John H. Foster, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4481) to correct the record of Levi S. Peters, late captain Company B, Twenty-third Kentucky Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4482) for the relief of William C. Watts, Boone County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4483) for the relief of R. F. Harrison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4484) to correct the military record of Levi S. Peters, late captain Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELDEN: A bill (H. R. 4485) for the relief of Thomas N. Molloy, United States consul at St. Johns, Newfoundland—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 4486) granting a pension to William D. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of Mathew Lynch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) for the relief of Henry Myers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYNUM: A bill (H. R. 4489) to pay James McCabe $500 for his expenses in contesting the seat of Godlove S. Orth of Indiana, in the Forty-sixth Congress—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4490) granting a pension to Henry C. Field—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 4491) for the relief of John O'Grady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4492) to provide an increase of pension to Hosea Brown, of the war of 1812—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4493) to correct the military record of Lewis Stanley, late of Seventeenth Ohio Battery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4494) granting a pension to James Brundage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4495) for the relief of William R. Ballard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) for the relief of E. I. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4497) for the relief of H. W. Throckmorton, of Fairfax County, Va., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 4498) for the relief of Francis J. Kelly, and other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: A bill (H. R. 4499) for the relief of Burks Fitzgerald—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 4500) for relief of W. S. Beck, administrator of Joshua Beck, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 4501) for the relief of Louisa E. McLean—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) for the relief of the estate of H. C. Singleton, deceased, late of Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Logan, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) for the relief of the estate of John Meals, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4505) for the relief of Thomas M. Hobbs, of Limestone County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4506) for the relief of Jeff. Eason, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 4507) for the relief of Witherby & Gaffney—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALLORY: A bill (H. R. 4508) for the improvement of the harbor at Tampa Bay, Fla.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 4509) for the relief of A. M. Scott, administrator of Sarah Slate, of Phillips County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of John O'Grady, for removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of citizens of Marshfield, Oregon, asking for an appropriation for a dredger for Coos Bay, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of Atlanta Clearing House, asking for relief of 10 per cent on certificates—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Georgia Banking Association, asking for relief of 10 per cent tax on clearing-house certificates—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of citizens of Schuykill County, Pa., in favor of amnesty for political offenses—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of William A. Wood, requesting reference of his claim for stores and supplies taken by the Federal forces during the late war to the Court of Claims for findings of fact—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Papers accompanying claim of Simeon S. Barrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev: W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

WILLIAM B. ALLISON, a Senator from the State of Iowa, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Government directors of the Union Pacific Railway Company for the year 1893; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in compliance with law, the annual report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua; which was, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented two petitions of soldiers of the late war, residents of Kingsville, Smithville, and Kinsman, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of 85 citizens of Maine, praying for the establishment of a governmental telegraph and telephone service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 112) to provide for the construction of a military and commercial telegraphic line along the coast between Yaquina, on Yaquina Bay, and Port Orford, to connect with Newport, on Yaquina Bay; Alsea Bay; Florence, on Siuslaw Bay; Gardiner, on the Umpqua River; Empire City and Marshfield, on Coos Bay, in the State of Oregon, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 98) to establish a military post near the town of Reno, in Washoe County, in the State of Nevada, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WALTHALL. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 731) for the relief of Maj. Gen. John C. Robinson, United States Army, retired, and to allow him the full pay of his rank, to submit an adverse report thereon.

Mr. HILL. What disposition is to be made of the bill just reported?

Mr. WALTHALL. It will be indefinitely postponed unless the Senator from New York desires it to go on the Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I desire it to go on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1159) to relieve James Poundin of the charge of desertion, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 527) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn., reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 192) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack;

A bill (S. 187) for the relief of Frederick Gramm;

A bill (S. 191) for the relief of George A. Orr;

A bill (S. 194) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings;

A bill (S. 193) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.;

A bill (S. 195) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens;

A bill (S. 176) granting the right of way to the Duluth and Manitoba Railroad Company across the Fort Pembina reservation in North Dakota;

A bill (S. 634) granting a right of way across the Scarboro Hill Military reservation to the Ilwaco Railway and Navigation Company; and

A bill (S. 189) for the relief of John M. Davis.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 1206) to correct the military record of George Whitaker, late a private of Company C, Twelfth New Jersey Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Laura C. Dodge; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1208) to provide for annual reports by certain corporations in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 1209) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 1210) granting a pension to Mrs. Martha Custis Carter, widow of the late Rear-Admiral S. P. Carter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1211) for the relief of Pay Inspector John H. Stevenson, of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1212) to set aside the verdict of a court-martial in the case of George J. Barnes, late private in Company F, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and Company H, Fifth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Fords Theatre disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

USE OF PUBLIC GROUNDS BY KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 44) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. VOORHEES. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution at this time.

By unanimous consent, the joint resolution was read the second time at length, and considered as in Committee of the Whole, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant permits to the executive committee, Knights of Pythias, for the use of the Monument grounds for temporary camp purposes, and the reservations or public spaces along the line of Pennsylvania avenue for the erection of stands with seats thereon on the occasion of the Pythian conclave and encampment to be held in the city of Washington in August, 1894, if, in his opinion, such use will inflict no serious or permanent injury upon such grounds, reservations, or public spaces; and the District Commissioners are hereby authorized to designate such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District as they may deem necessary and proper for the purposes of the occasion.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARANSAS PASS IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. COKE. I move that the bill (S. 1139) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass, which was reported from the Committee on Commerce on the 2d of November last, be recommitted to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

Mr. MORRILL submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That all parts of the President's message relating to the tariff, internal revenue, and income tax, together with that relating to those who, it is said, after a hard struggle for tariff reform, are solemnly pledged to it, be, and hereby are, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to have the resolution lie on the table, and on Wednesday next, after 2 o'clock, I shall ask leave to submit some remarks thereon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

PRINTING FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. VOORHEES submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed and bound such documents and papers for use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by this committee during the Fifty-third Congress.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to give notice at this time that on Monday next, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall move to take up for consideration Senate bill 412, known as the bill for the repeal of the existing Federal election laws. I will also state in this connection that House bill 2331, on the same subject, is now upon the table. I shall ask that the bill be considered as in Committee of the Whole, and I shall then ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill reported by me from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HOAR. I give notice that when that matter is up in regular order I shall move to refer the bill alluded to by the Senator from New York to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I ask leave to state now that the subject belongs to that committee by all the precedents of the Senate. There is a committee appointed to deal with that express class of subjects. It is a committee whose majority (to say nothing about the Republican members of it) is made up of very able and experienced lawyers. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. PUGH] is one member; the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is another, and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] is the chairman.

Now, at the late session, when no general legislation was expected to be entered upon and when the Senate was dealing with the great question of the currency, by what I am compelled to suppose was a mere inadvertence, in the absence of every Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary but one, with no quorum present except constructively and by representation, the important bill referred to was authorized to be reported to the Senate. It never has been considered in the Judiciary Committee. The minority, according to the custom of that committee, which has always prevailed in the past when the Republicans were in power, were entitled to have a full opportunity to express their views and suggest modifications in committee. I very strongly hope and expect, from the well-known courtesy of the Senator from New York, without speaking of any other consideration, that before the Senate is asked to act upon that bill it will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PLATT. A similar bill has been pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HOAR. There was a bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], which he had very properly referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which it would naturally belong to him to look after when it came back. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] was absent, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] was absent, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] was absent, and I was absent from the meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary when the report was authorized to be made. It was a mere inadvertence, I am sure.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, there is a bill before the Committee on Privileges and Elections now of a similar nature. It is the identical bill, verbatim, which was introduced by me over a year ago, and upon which I made some remarks on the 20th of last December. It is substantially the same as the House bill which the Senator from New York proposes to substitute for the

Senate bill reported by the Judiciary Committee. Such bills I believe almost without exception are sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I had it referred there upon consultation with committeemen, believing that to be the proper committee for it, as the Senator from Massachusetts says. I acted upon that principle, and substantially the same bill as that which passed the other House, having been introduced by me here a year ago and spoken upon, is now before the Committee on Privileges and Elections awaiting its action, and I hope it will soon be reported back so that we may have it before us.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to ask the Senator from New York whether the bill which he has reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee is accompanied by a written report or statement of reasons why the bill should pass?

Mr. HILL. There is no written report accompanying the formal report in favor of the bill. It was regarded, I assume, by the Judiciary Committee that the reasons for the passage of the bill were self-evident, and that it needed no elaborate or lengthy report to convince the Senate of the propriety of the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I do not propose at this time to discuss the question as to where the bill properly belongs, and I think there will be no controversy upon this side of the Chamber on the question as to the proper course to be pursued. I simply desire to say at present, and will postpone any further discussion of the subject until Monday next, that the original Federal election law was reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HOAR. There was no Committee on Privileges and Elections then.

Mr. HILL. That may be; but since the Committee on Privileges and Elections has been established amendments to that law have been reported by the Judiciary Committee also. I am frank enough to say that there are precedents on both sides, but there are more in favor of the Judiciary Committee than against it. But that is an immaterial question.

However, I can not allow the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts to pass without observing that there was present a majority of the Judiciary Committee when the bill was ordered to be reported. I think the record so expressly shows.

A Republican Senator was present. I asked him whether he desired delay, and he said he did not. He made no objection to a favorable report of the bill. I will not now say what he further stated on that occasion. The bill was reported favorably. Subsequently the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] desired to have it understood that the minority of the committee did not concur in the report. From that day to the present three months nearly of actual session have been had. There has been no request whatever from a single member of the committee that the bill should be referred back. This is the first suggestion made at any time that the bill should be recommitted for the consideration of that committee.

I have assumed, sir, that to a great extent this is a political question. I have assumed that the minority of this body, or at least the greater portion of them, intend to oppose the bill. If a hearing was desired, it strikes me that it would have been better for some Senator upon the other side to have made the suggestion two months ago, and not to wait until the time has been reached for the bill to be brought up for consideration.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from New York allow me a moment to call his attention to a fact?

Mr. HILL. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. When the election bill came over from the House of Representatives which the Senator now seeks to have substituted for his report, as the Chair will very well recollect and as the RECORD will show, I pointed out that the proper reference of that subject was to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and objected to the bill being sent to the Judiciary Committee. The suggestion was made, as some Senator was actually on the floor desiring to speak upon the silver question, that the bill should lie on the table for the time being, and that that matter should come up at a proper time. So the Senate had full notice two or three months ago of this view of mine about it.

Mr. HILL. I certainly was well aware of the contention of the Senator from Massachusetts that in his opinion the bill should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That is not the point I now make. There is before this body a bill already pending involving the same question, and with reference to that bill no Senator has moved that it shall be referred back to the committee for a hearing. Personally I care nothing in regard to the question as to which committee has charge of the bill. I shall have no controversy upon that point. I simply desire to speed the measure, that is all, and on Monday next I will resume the discussion of the subject upon any proper motion which may be made.

Mr. PLATT. On the day, I think, after the report was made I took occasson to state that as a member of the Judiciary Committee I did not concur in it, and also that if I had been present at the meeting of the committee I should have recorded my objection to the report. I was unable to attend the meeting of the committee that morning because I was obliged to be with another committee, but as soon as I knew that the bill had been reported I stated in the Senate that I did not concur in it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the resolution of the Senate tendering thanks to the governor, the Legislature, and the people of the State of Illinois for the statue of Gen. James Shields.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 3544) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof;

A bill (H. R. 4244) to confirm cash entries of offered lands; and

A bill (H. R. 4245) to amend an act pertaining to the United States courts in the State of Mississippi.

SUPPRESSION OF INDIAN HOSTILITIES IN NEBRASKA.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that it now consider the bill (S. 463) to reimburse the State of Nebraska the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890–'91.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, through the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, to audit and pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred by and for the National Guard of the State of Nebraska, called into the service of that State by Governor Thayer in the year 1890 and 1891, to repel a threatened invasion and raid, then imminent, by the Sioux, on presentation by the governor or other proper authorities of said State of statements of the actual and necessary expenses incurred by said State for said purpose, accompanied, so far as possible, with the proper vouchers and satisfactory proof of the correctness thereof; and that the sum of $42,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the pay and allowances to the officers and enlisted men of said National Guard shall not exceed the pay and allowances of the Army of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report, which is not very long, be read.

Mr. MANDERSON. All right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, October 5, 1893, as follows:

This bill passed the Senate at the last Congress and was reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. The committee report the bill favorably and adopt its last report, as follows:

"The Sioux Reservation, with its 18,000 square miles, occupied by about 22,000 Sioux Indians, is located in great part in South Dakota, along the northern border of Nebraska, and in part in the last-named State. Brave and warlike, and retaining much of their original savagery, they are a foe to be feared, and their outbreak or threat of war causes dreadful anticipation among all settlers in their vicinity. The events of the winter of 1890–'91 are too notorious and of too recent a date to need more than the faintest reference to them. Trouble threatened during all of the summer and fall of 1890, and in November was so imminent and a threat of such magnitude that, with Gen. Miles in command, a large body of United States troops was placed within striking distance of the hostile Indians.

"The whole border was greatly alarmed and many settlers fled from their farms, taking refuge in the towns in northwestern Nebraska. Indeed, such action was recommended by the officers of the Government, and the War Department distributed arms among the frontiersmen for their better protection. The latter part of December, 1890, after the battle of Wounded Knee and the retreat of about 4,000 hostile Indians to the Bad Lands, along White River, about 15 miles from the Nebraska line, a general Indian war, involving all the tribes of the powerful Sioux Nation, seemed unavoidable, and danger to life and property was great. On January 2, 1891, the governor of Nebraska ordered the First Brigade of the Nebraska National Guard to the frontier to coöperate with the United States troops under Gen. Miles. The First and Second regiments responded promptly, and under the command of Gen. L. W. Colby took positions as indicated in the following plan:

"These troops were moved by rail from different parts of the State, and Company A, light artillery, and Troop A, of cavalry, were placed and held in readiness to move. The headquarters of the brigade were established at Rushville, Nebr., and the danger was threatening for a distance of 150 miles east and west and for 30 miles north and south. Hundreds of settlers had fled from their homes, leaving their stock and property uncared for. At Chadron alone there were 130 families of settlers gathered in from the neighborhood, dependent upon the public for shelter and food, and much the same condition obtained in all the frontier towns. Gen. Colby established a line of fortified posts or camps north of the line of towns on the Elkhorn Valley Railroad, with a reserve force at each important town.

"The appearance of the State troops gave encouragement and confidence

to the people, and the National Guard was a valuable adjunct to the troops of the Government stationed on the Indian reservation. Gen. Miles approved of the disposition of the State troops. Many of the settlers returned to their homes. Strict military discipline was maintained in all the camps, and the National Guard of Nebraska won additional credit by prompt, cheerful, and able performance of their duties. On January 12, 1891, Gen. Miles communicated with Gen. Colby that the Indians showed every disposition to comply with the orders of the authorities. He said: 'I feel that the State troops can now be withdrawn with safety, and desire, through you, to express to them my thanks for the confidence they have given your people in their isolated homes.'

"On January 13, Gen. Victor Vifquain, adjutant-general of Nebraska, wired Gen. Colby:

"'Your command will remain at the front until the lives and property of citizens are perfectly secured. Be more vigilant than ever; advise me daily. You will withdraw your command when everything is safe, not before.'"

"On January 14, with the approval of Gen. Miles, Gen. Colby moved the troops to their homes. The campaign was made in the depth of winter, in a country affording the severest of weather, and officers and soldiers vied with each other in the performance of their duty.

"The following letter, lately received from the adjutant-general of Nebraska, is self-explanatory:

"STATE OF NEBRASKA, OFFICE OF ADJUTANT-GENERAL,
"*Lincoln, March 5, 1892.*

"DEAR SENATOR: I mail you this day the report of the Indian campaign of 1890-'91, as submitted to the Legislature, duly certified to by the governor. The Legislature loaned the money, so to speak, until the Federal Government should refund the same. I call your attention to pages 17 and 19 for dispatches of Gen. Miles, especially page 17, the last sentence of which commences: 'I feel that the State troops can now be withdrawn with safety, etc.' This shows that the State troops were needed; that they did not go to a picnic in midwinter. The truth is that the position occupied by the Nebraska National Guard cut off the last chance for the escape of the Indians west of the Black Hills.

"The Legislature appropriated $37,200; I asked for $40,000. They thought they knew better than I did and they were mistaken; it will certainly take $42,000 to settle everything.

"I do not think that you wish to be burdened with one thousand different vouchers. The appropriation clause can read '$42,000, or as much thereof as necessary, the same to be at the disposal of the Secretary of War, to be paid to the State after the vouchers have been submitted to that official,' or words to that effect. We will then take steps to present the vouchers which I am now compiling for the purpose. Do you not think this the best way?

"I am, Senator, yours, respectfully,

"VICTOR VIFQUAIN,
"*Adjutant-General.*

"Senator CHAS. F. MANDERSON,
"*Washington, D. C.*"

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I submit a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to report to the Senate what amounts of money have been paid in each year since January 1, 1873, to the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York other than payments on account of salary, as compensation for examining titles to lands, and as compensation in prize causes, and the authority for such payments.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HILL. I ask whether that resolution was reported by a committee?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. No, sir; it was not reported by a committee. I offered the resolution, which merely asks for information.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator explain exactly what is meant by the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have reason to believe that there have been very large amounts of money paid for the last twenty years to the district attorney for the southern district of New York, and I have some question about the authority for the payments and why they were made. I want the information as to the amounts paid and on what authority they were paid by the Secretary of the Treasury. I offer the resolution to obtain the information I desire, and which I think will be of value to the Senate and to the country.

Mr. HOAR. I do not rise to oppose the resolution, but I wish to inquire of the Senator from Arkansas, as he is probably better informed than I am about it, whether the compensation paid in prize causes is not paid by an adjudication of the court from the fund for which the prize condemned is sold, and not from the Treasury. If that be true, should not the resolution include not only payments from the Treasury, but all other payments?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. I will not make any motion——

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I shall not make any objection to such a modification of the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I merely ask the Senator if the resolution as it stands covers all he desires?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no objection to making the resolution broader, and I am willing to modify it as the Senator from Massachusetts suggests.

Mr. HOAR. Putting in after the word "paid" the words "from any source."

Mr. HILL. I do not know of any objection to the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, and will modify the resolution in that way.

Mr. HOAR. The record will probably show what has been paid.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4244) to confirm cash entries of offered lands was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands; and

The bill (H. R. 4245) to amend an act pertaining to the United States courts in the State of Mississippi was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FORFEITURE OF RAILROAD LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3534) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senate Committee on Public Lands have reported a similar bill, which is Order of Business No. 84 on the Calendar. I have consulted with the chairman of the committee and with all the members of the committee, and it is agreed that there is no objection to the House bill, which only makes a formal change by adding "acts supplementary thereto," and "persons entitled to purchase," instead of "persons in possession." I ask, therefore, that the bill from the House of Representatives be taken up for consideration at the present time.

Mr. WALTHALL. I ask the Senator if there is any difference between the two bills?

Mr. DOLPH. There is no difference, except the House of Representatives have added the date of the act of forfeiture and the several supplementary acts thereto, and instead of saying "persons in possession," they have said, for greater caution, "persons entitled to purchase." It is merely a formal change.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof, so as to extend the time within which persons entitled to purchase lands forfeited by the act shall be permitted to purchase the same in the quantities and upon the terms provided in section 3 at any time prior to January 1, 1897; but nothing herein shall be so construed as to interfere with any valid adverse claim that may have attached to lands or any part thereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask that the House report on this bill, which is very brief, be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report referred to, submitted by Mr. ELLIS of Oregon, October 31, 1893, is as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands have had under consideration House bill 3544, and find it to extend to such persons as are now authorized to purchase certain lands under the act of September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof, the permission to make such purchase at any time prior to January 1, 1897.

From the information before the committee we are satisfied that the failure to give persons entitled to purchase under the act referred to would work a great hardship upon a deserving people and doubtless be the means of many of them losing their homes.

It is well known that recently great financial distress has fallen upon the country, and that this condition has borne with especial hardship upon the settlers upon the frontier. In addition to being affected by the aforesaid condition, the information before the committee shows the parties interested have suffered from a partial failure of crops during the past few years, and taking into consideration that, by reason of the first-named consideration, men of wealth are so generally asking for an extension of time upon their current obligations, it is nothing more than simple justice and right that the poor settler who has taken upon himself the hardship of making a home upon the public domain should be extended the same lenity.

Your committee think the extension asked is a just one, and therefore report the bill back with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendments:

After the word "purposes" in the title of the bill, add "approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof."

After the word "purposes," in line 5, insert the words "approved September 29, 1890," and the several acts amendatory thereof."

In line 7, strike out the words "in possession of," and insert in lieu thereof the words "entitled to purchase."

And, in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, after the word "ninety-seven," in line 10, add the following:

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to interfere with any adverse claim that may have attached to the lands or any part thereof."

With the foregoing amendments it is desirable that this bill should be promptly passed.

The committee appends the letters of the Commissioner of the General Land Office in relation to this bill and S. 945, which is identically the same as House bill 3544.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt by reference from the Department for report of House bill 3544, "To amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes.'"

This bill is identical with Senate bill 945, a report on which has this day been submitted, and I accordingly inclose a copy of said report as embodying the views of this office upon the subject.

The bill and the letter accompanying it are herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner*.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1893.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt by reference from the Department for report of Senate bill 945, "To amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes.'"

This act proposes to amend section 3 of the act of September 29, 1890, known as the general-forfeiture act, so as to extend the time within which persons in possession of lands forfeited by said act shall be permitted to purchase the same in the quantities and upon the terms provided in said section to January 1, 1897.

Said section provided for the purchase by persons possessing certain qualifications as to citizenship, who were in possession of the lands under deed, written contract with, or license from the State or corporation to which such grant was made, or its assignees, executed prior to January 1, 1888, or persons who had settled said lands with bona fide intent to secure title thereto by purchase from the grantee State or corporation, when earned by compliance with conditions and requirements of the granting act, of the land claimed by them not to exceed 320 acres, at the rate of $1.25 per acre, at any time within two years from the passage of the act. By act of February 18, 1891, it was provided that the two years within which the purchase must be made should begin to run from the date of the promulgation of instructions for the restoration to entry and disposal of the forfeited lands by this office. These instructions were given in a large number of the grants in February, 1891, but in cases where questions were pending necessary to be determined before the restoration could be made, the instructions were issued at various times, and in some cases they have not yet been issued.

By act of June 25, 1892, the time for purchase by claimants under said section 3 who were actual residents upon the land, was extended to September 30, 1893, and by act of January 31, 1893, the time within which persons entitled to purchase the forfeited lands on the line of the Northern Pacific Railroad between Wallula, Wash., and Portland, Oregon, was extended to January 1, 1894.

With the exception of the claimants opposite the forfeited portion of the Northern Pacific Railroad, the rights of persons entitled to purchase under section 3 of the act of September 29, 1890, are governed by the acts of February 18, 1891, and June 25, 1892, those of persons in possession under deed, written contract with, or license from the grantee State or corporation by the former and actual residents who settled with bona fide intent to purchase from such grantee, by the latter.

Therefore, excepting in the case of claimants for the forfeited lands of the Northern Pacific road, and in the cases where the restorations have been recent, or not made at all, the time within which a preference right of purchase was allowed has already expired.

The bill under consideration proposes to extend the time for all claimants under section 3 to January 1, 1897, and by the passage thereof, uniformity, which is much to be desired, would be secured, and all claimants given equal rights. And as no one can be injured by its provisions, excepting possibly some persons who may have settled on the lands after the expiration of the time allowed for the purchase thereof, I think the bill should be passed with a proviso that nothing therein shall be so construed as to interfere with any valid adverse claim that may have attached to the land or any part thereof.

The copy of the bill transmitted by you is herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the Senate bill on the same subject be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, Senate bill 945, on the same subject, will be postponed indefinitely. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

FORT TOTTEN MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 171.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MANDERSON. Let the bill be reported by title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 171) granting to the State of North Dakota certain lands heretofore set apart as a wood reservation for Fort Totten military reservation for the use of the militia of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether the reservation referred to in this bill is an abandoned military reservation which has passed under the general law into the control of the Interior Department?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It is.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M'GARRAHAN.

Mr. HUNTON. Mr. President, may I ask what was done with the bill (S. 341) to submit to the Court of Private Land Claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes, which is No. 13 on the Calendar?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Calendar is not being called in regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Virginia that the Calendar is not being called in regular order. The cases disposed of have been taken up by unanimous consent.

MARGARET KENNEDY.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 333) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let the report be read in that case.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. BERRY, September 6, 1893:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 333) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, report the same back to the Senate with a recommendation that the bill pass. The committee adopt the report made by Mr. ALLEN in the Fifty-second Congress (Senate Report 403), except no amendment is required to the present bill to make it conform to the recommendation made by the committee in the Fifty-second Congress.

[Senate Report No. 403, Fifty-second Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred S. 448, for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, having had the same under advisement, respectfully make the following report:

Margaret Kennedy is the widow and sole executrix of John Kennedy, deceased. In his lifetime John Kennedy, a citizen of the District of Columbia, whose loyalty was unquestioned, owned a tract of 26½ acres of land on the northeast bank of the Eastern Branch of the Potomac, in the District of Columbia. At the breaking out of the war the land was inclosed with a post-and-rail fence. A portion of the farm was cultivated to orchard, garden, flowers, and shrubbery. The remainder was covered with a growth of oak, pine, and chestnut forest. The land was taken possession of by the Government and used throughout the war for military purposes. Fort Sedgwick was erected upon it, around which rifle pits and other excavations were made, covering in all about 12 acres.

The effect of this military appropriation was practically to destroy the larger part of the tract of land as a farm, and for all purposes of cultivation. In the course of the occupancy of the land the fences were consumed by the Army as fuel; so, too, the orchard, consisting of several hundred fruit trees of many choice varieties which had come to bearing but three years before. The flowers and shrubs which were cultivated to meet the demands of the city market were completely destroyed. The occupancy continued until after the close of the war. The timber, covering many acres of the place, was of a choice and valuable quality, and commanded a good price for firewood, owing to the nearness of the farm to the market of this city. Competent witnesses placed the value of the land at $300 per acre, and the loss of the fruit trees, consisting of apple, cherry, peach, pear, and other fruit trees, with the smaller fruits, as high as $5,000; the value of the forest trees, situated as they were, at $4,500; and the value of the fencing at $1,000.

While the committee recognize the value of these premises, and the serious loss sustained by Mr. Kennedy by reason of their appropriation to military uses, they regard most of such injuries as the result of military necessity and for which compensation can not be allowed. Most of the timber grown upon this land was used in building the fortifications, and the remainder for fuel for the Army, or was sold by the Government. It was not a matter of military necessity to thus appropriate the timber, but simply the choice of taking it or purchasing other timber available for the purpose in market. Regarded simply as supplies made use of for the support of the Army or material required with which to construct the fort, the forests, orchards, and fences were worth $3,000 at the lowest estimate. For certain parts of these things an allowance of $1,378.44 was made and paid, which deducted from $3,000 leaves a balance of $1,621.56. The resulting damages to the real estate, as such, the committee decline to make any allowance for.

The committee therefore recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "ten," in line 6, and inserting the word "three," in lieu thereof, and that, after being so amended, it do pass.

Mr. MANDERSON. The reading of the report has shown the nature of this claim. Some years ago, in the early part of my service in this body, I was a member of the Committee on Claims, and my recollection is that the uniform practice of the committee had been not to report favorably on the payment of claims of this character. Where property was taken for the consumption of the Army in the District of Columbia, then, I think where cases of this character passed the scrutiny of the committee, a bill for their payment was passed by both Houses; but where it was a claim for the use of land or the taking of timber or going upon land for the purpose of erecting forts which surrounded the city of Washington, my recollection is that the uniform practice was to report against that class of bills. It may be that since that time there has been a change in the practice of the committee, and a change in the action of Congress in that

behalf. I should like to ask the Senator who reported the bill whether there are precedents for this action?

Mr. BERRY. I will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the bill does not propose to pay for the use of land, nor does it propose to pay for timber used in constructing forts, as I remember, but for timber a large part of which was used by the Army for firewood—fence-rails—which were taken by the Army and burned.

I will state to the Senator that this is an old claim. It passed Congress several years ago. In the shape in which it originally passed, the bill required the Quartermaster General to estimate the damages to which the claimant was entitled. Upon that report the claimant was allowed, I think, $1,300 or $1,100, I do not remember now which, of the amount of the claim, which was for $5,000. The Senator from Nebraska will see from the report that the actual damage was so many thousand dollars, but the committee does not propose to pay it, but only that portion which is usually paid for by the Army under similar circumstances.

A similar bill has been heretofore twice reported to the Senate and passed this body on two occasions. The amount which it is proposed to pay is sixteen hundred and odd dollars. Mr. Allen, the then Senator from Washington during the last Congress, made the report, and the committee at this time simply adopt the report made by Mr. Allen. The bill passed the Senate during the last Congress, but failed to pass the other House.

Mr. MANDERSON. The bill proposes, then, to pay nothing except for that which was used by the Army directly?

Mr. BERRY. The bill proposes to pay nothing else. The committee decline to recommend the balance of the claim, which amounts to much more.

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator explain a little more fully how it is that this matter has passed two or three Congresses and payments have been made upon the claim in pursuance of bills passed by Congress, and now another amount is required to be paid? I did not exactly catch his statement.

Mr. BERRY. I will state to the Senator from Connecticut that a bill did pass Congress, the amount of damages not being specified, but referring that question to the Quartermaster-General for a statement of the value. He reported certain values for this property, for which it was admitted the Government was liable; but his report was so grossly unjust, as was believed by the committees which have since examined it, as to the amount which should be paid for the fence rails, that they have reported in favor of giving the amount proposed in this bill as an additional sum to that which the Quartermaster-General reported and for which Congress appropriated.

For instance, there was testimony taken as to the price of cord wood at that time, and, as overwhelmingly shown by the proof before the committee, the amount estimated by the Quartermaster-General for cord wood was not the price of cord wood, and was no compensation for the property taken. There is no dispute about that, and no member of the committee will contend that the estimate of the amount allowed was adequate or in full payment of the claim. That is the reason the committee propose to pay the sum reported in the bill.

The damages were even far beyond those which will be paid by this bill to these parties. They have been kept out of the money now for twenty-five or thirty years, and the committee were of the opinion that the report of the Quartermaster-General was beyond question contrary to all the proof which has since been taken as to the value of wood at that time, and that it was just and fair that this additional allowance should be made. Therefore the bill was favorably reported.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator if, when the comparison was made between the new proof and the judgment of the Quartermaster-General, the Government or the Quartermaster-General was in any way represented so as to adduce the evidence on which he acted?

Mr. BERRY. I can not say as to that. The testimony which was taken by the Quartermaster-General was not before the committee or considered by me, except his statement. He simply made a statement that he found the value so and so; but the testimony was afterwards taken of merchants here and of a large number of disinterested persons as to the price of the material at that time, which showed that the Quartermaster-General had certainly underestimated. For instance, I think he only allowed, as I now remember, $2 a cord for cordwood. The proof from all the testimony showed that it was worth from $8 to $10 a cord at that time. I remember that one item in regard to the value of cordwood in the year 1864 and 1865, I think it was, here in the city of Washington. I am very clearly of the opinion, and the committee were unanimously of the opinion, that this bill will not begin to compensate the party in truth and in fact for anything like the amount of property which was destroyed or the injury inflicted; and they came to the conclusion as to that part of the claim for which the United States was in the habit of paying, that it would be just to allow this additional sum of sixteen hundred and odd dollars.

I am inclined to think that the Senator from Massachusetts was a member of that committee when a similar bill was reported at a former session of Congress. It was reported, I know, during the last session, and I am decidedly of the opinion that it was reported at the preceding Congress. It has been twice reported by the Committee on Claims while I was not a member of the committee, but it was reported after a very careful examination by the Senator from the State of Washington, Mr. Allen, during the last Congress.

Mr. HOAR. The only question in my mind as to the principle is this: I understand the well-settled policy of the legislative department of the Government to be that the occupation of land or the destruction of what makes up the value of real estate by military occupation is not a matter for which the Government is bound to make compensation to its citizens. It is a part of defense against a public danger, and the condition of having the property occupied for such defense as it is by having property injured by the marching of armies across the country is a condition on which all real estate is held by the citizen; but where military supplies were taken for the Army by the military authorities, there the value of the supplies to the Army is allowed, as, for instance, if a valuable and costly dwelling house were taken for fuel its value as fuel is paid the citizen, and that is all.

But the question here is whether Congress ought to go behind the report of the Quartermaster-General, Congress having once referred the question to the Quartermaster-General and the citizens having accepted the Quartermaster-General's report. I suppose there are millions upon millions of claims which have been adjudicated in the Quartermaster-General's Office and paid, where the person who received the pay thinks the allowance was exceedingly small and unjust.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me one moment?

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my statement. It must be a very gross and peculiar case indeed, a claim so strong that Congress would be satisfied, if the matter were sent back to the Quartermaster-General he would himself concede he had made a mistake, to warrant such legislation as is proposed. If the Senator from Arkansas, on his responsibility as a member of the committee, a gentleman in whose judgment as a lawyer we all confide, says that, on the examination of the question, he is satisfied it is a case so clear that if it were sent back to the Quartermaster-General's Department, he could come to but one conclusion, and that that a mistake had been committed, I will not interpose an objection, nor do I wish to be understood that we are making a precedent for any other case.

Mr. BERRY. I will state that when the parties received the sum that was allowed by the Quartermaster-General, they received it under protest, and the receipt shows that they were unwilling to accept it as a final settlement. I will state, furthermore, what was my own judgment, and I think in it the committee agree with me. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], is present. The testimony which was taken showed to my mind clearly that the estimate put upon the property by the Quartermaster-General was not only inadequate but grossly inadequate.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas one question. Either he or the chairman of the committee can answer. Does the committee, as at present constituted, so far as the Senator from Arkansas understands its purpose, mean to reopen all the judgments of the Quartermaster-General in cases in the past alike to this, where the party can show by *ex parte* testimony that there was a mistake and that the old allowance was too small?

Mr. BERRY. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the committee has no such purpose, nor are there any cases of this kind peculiarly, because this case was referred by Congress to the Quartermaster General. It is not a case where he estimated at the time and paid for property, but it was referred to him to take testimony. It is a peculiar case within itself, and there is no desire, or disposition, on the part of the committee, or any member of it, I think, to go back and reëxamine the questions which were settled long ago.

Mr. HOAR. I propose, on the statement of the Senator from Arkansas, to support the bill, but I wished to have on record at this early period in the Congress the declaration which the Senator has just made, because the Senator will see that it is a matter of vast importance.

Mr. BERRY. I have one word more to say, Mr. President. This is not alone the action of the present committee, but we simply followed the action of the committee as organized in the last Congress, when it was presided over by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], who is now present in the Chamber.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, I am a member

of the Committee on Claims now, and in the last Congress I happened to be chairman of the committee. I was not present in the Senate when the pending bill was considered or reported at the late extraordinary session. I was present when a similar bill was under consideration in the last Congress. The bill at that time was assigned to Senator Allen of Washington, who was then a member of the Senate and a member of the committee, and it was carefully investigated by him, as all cases were carefully investigated that were referred to him. It was, on his report, examined with more than ordinary care by the full committee, owing to the fact that it proposed to reconsider a matter which had really been passed upon before, on a report made by the Quartermaster-General.

My recollection of the case is in accord with the statements just made by the Senator from Arkansas. I think it was the deliberate conclusion of every member of the committee that the report of the Quartermaster-General in connection with the testimony before the committee showed conclusively on their face that the allowance made by the Quartermaster-General was grossly erroneous, to say the least. As a matter of course, it has not been the custom of the Committee on Claims to reconsider and open cases which have been adjudicated either by the Court of Claims or by the Quartermaster-General; but in this particular case there seemed to the committee to have been an injustice done by the previous action, and it was the unanimous opinion of the committee at the last Congress that it was no more than an act of simple justice that an additional allowance should be made this claimant.

Mr. HOAR. A case strong enough to reverse the decision of a court?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes, sir; I considered it myself a case so strong as to have justified a court to set aside the verdict, as would have been the case in a judicial court. This is not a case where property was taken through military necessity. It is a case simply as to the choice upon the part of military commanders in the purchase of property that was needed by the Army. It could have been purchased at perhaps a hundred other places, but was taken off this farm and used for the benefit of the Army. The claim is not for the destruction of trees, or anything of that kind. So, taking it altogether, I am inclined to think that the bill is right and ought to receive the sanction of the Senate.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I do not know but this is a fair valuation of the property, but when the matter has been to the Quartermaster-General and he has fixed a valuation upon it and there is no claim that he has not fairly considered the question of value of the property, it seems to me rather a harsh proceeding to pass a bill which says the Quartermaster-General in considering the case did not allow half what the property was worth. It appears to me there ought to be some evidence on this subject. We ought not to take it for granted that the Quartermaster-General, when the claimant acquiesced in the reference of the claim to him, was so grossly unjust as not to allow half the Government ought to pay, without any evidence as to the value which the Quartermaster-General specifically put upon the property. We are simply asked to say that the Quartermaster-General, to whom this matter was referred, has not allowed half enough. It seems to me we ought to have a little more investigation of the subject. There were but 26½ acres in all the farm, and the report says:

> The land was inclosed with a post and rail fence. A portion of the farm was cultivated to orchard, garden, flowers, and shrubbery. The remainder was covered with a growth of oak, pine, and chestnut forest.

The report does not state what proportion of the 26½ acres was covered with forest, but it does state that the value of the forest trees was $4,500 and the value of the fencing $1,000. I do not know but that is true. However, it is rather a remarkable value to place upon forest trees growing upon a portion of a farm of 26½ acres, a considerable portion of which is cultivated. Then the report says:

> Most of the timber grown upon this land was used in building the fortifications, and the remainder for fuel for the Army, or was sold by the Government.

Then, competent witnesses having placed the value of the forest trees at $4,500, and the value of the fencing at $1,000, the committee think they were worth $3,000. I submit that anywhere within 3 or 4 miles of the Capitol in the District of Columbia it would be pretty difficult to sell on the stump trees growing on a portion of a farm of 26½ acres for $3,000.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will permit me, I will state that it included a large amount of post and rail fence. Besides, a part of the trees were fruit trees; they were apple trees.

Mr. PLATT. I do not know much about post and rail fences, but I venture to say that a new post and rail fence could be built around 26½ acres of land for less than a thousand dollars.

Mr. BERRY. But taking the orchard itself and the timber sold off the land, I think instead of being an overestimate it is far under the real value at that time.

Mr. PLATT. But the point I make is that after the matter has once been referred to the Quartermaster-General and he has upon evidence said what he thought was the value of the property taken, which the Government ought to pay for, we ought not to say in this hot haste that he did not estimate it justly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator kindly read the prior law?

Mr. PLATT. The act of October 19, 1888, is as follows:

> That the Quartermaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to ascertain and state the value of all timber, fences, and fruit trees on the farm of John Kennedy, deceased, situate in the District of Columbia, upon which Fort Sedgwick was erected, taken, and used for firewood by the Army of the United States, and also the value of all timber sold by the Government which had been taken from said farm and used in the construction of said fort. And the amount so stated shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Margaret Kennedy, the widow and sole executrix of John Kennedy, deceased.

Mr. CHANDLER. With all due deference to the Committee on Claims, I am obliged to conclude as a reason for my own vote that the judgment of the Quartermaster-General that $1,378.44 was the value of the property is a better judgment than that of the committee that it was $3,000. The estimate of the committee is $3,000 in round numbers, and the careful and accurate sum made up by the Quartermaster-General, $1,378.44, being taken out, the committee propose to pay the claimant $1,621.56. I think under the circumstances of this claim the claimant ought to be content with what she had received. She had her bill; she had her adjudication; and she has received the amount.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. My information is that the Quartermaster-General fixed an estimate of the supposed value of a certain number of cords of wood used for fuel. Is not that the fact of the case?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Arkansas states that, I have no doubt it is.

Mr. BERRY. That is the exact fact.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Arkansas upon my left says that is the exact fact. Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New Hampshire if they think cutting down and consuming a large orchard of choice and valuable fruit, and estimating it as cordwood, and paying for it simply at the supposed value of so many cords of wood for fuel, even approximates the measure of justice this Government should render to the person whose orchard the Government had thus destroyed?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will make to the Senator from Tennessee the same answer I have made before. The claimant came here; the bill was reported; it passed Congress, and presumably by the will and wish of the claimant an adjudication was made by the Quartermaster-General, and he found so many cords of wood used, of a certain value, so many dollars and so many cents; and now Congress is asked to intervene and upon the judgment of the committee fix the value that ought to be paid this woman at $3,000. I submit that it is a very dangerous way to legislate upon such claims. I submit that it is dangerous for Congress to undertake to take up such claims and appropriate a round number, $2,000, $3,000, $4,000, and $10,000 to pay to parties who received injuries to their property by reason of the war for the Union.

Mr. President, I do not think I have ever voted upon a yea-and-nay vote for the passage of any bill of this kind. I do not believe that it is a wise policy for the Government to pay war damages. It is not pretended in this case that when the farm was occupied by the military forces of the United States and the property which is now to be paid for was used, that any accurate account was kept of the timber that was cut and used. The destruction and use of the timber was part of the total damage and destruction which the military occupation of the property occasioned and there was no specific account made of what was done. There was no quartermaster's certificate issued, I understand; and at this time, thirty years after the military occupation, the Congress of the United States is asked to estimate that $3,000 worth of cord wood and of timber fit to be used in the fortifications was taken from this estate, which in equity and in good conscience the United States ought to pay for because the claimant was a loyal woman, or because her husband was a loyal citizen of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not believe in this class of claims. I do not believe in opening the Treasury to cases of this sort. I believe the rule should be adopted that damage done by military forces during the war should not be paid for from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That is the rule now. The Com-

mittee on Claims has reported no such bill as that since I have been a member of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I dissent from the system which has grown up, even if it has the high sanction of the Committee on Claims, of turning the taking of property for military use, and the occupation of real estate for military use, and the doing of damage to real estate and to personal property into some kind of a purchase of that property for the use of the Government of the United States.

I do not believe that it ever was wise to pay any of these claims; and I do not believe in what I regard as in some sort a legal subterfuge by which, when a piece of property was occupied, the fences destroyed and burned, the trees cut down and used for fortifications and for fuel, the Government is put into the attitude of having purchased the property and is now to be asked to pay for it. For one, I dissent entirely from that doctrine and that practice.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, just a word. One listening to the speech of the Senator from New Hampshire would imagine that it has been the custom of the Senate and of Congress to pay a class of claims which have never been recognized by any committee of this body and have never been recognized by the Senate nor by Congress. Nobody has ever proposed, so far as I know, to pay for trees, fences, flowers, and other ornamentations destroyed by the Army in time of war. That is not this case at all. This is a case where it is proposed to pay a loyal citizen for certain trees and fences alleged to have been taken by the Army and used for the benefit of the Army while engaged in an effort to put down the rebellion.

Mr. HOAR. At their value, for the use.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. At the value at the time they were taken for the use to which they were put; that is to say, if apple trees were taken for fuel, no greater value is put by the committee upon those apple trees than if they had been ordinary trees from the forest. The value placed upon the property taken is the value for the use to which the property was put. That is this case. I admit that it is a delicate matter and one that ought to be approached with a great deal of caution to open up a case which has once been acted upon. I concede that all which has been said by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New Hampshire in regard to that matter has been well said; but the committee did consider this to be an exceptional case.

Mr. PLATT. If the Senator will permit me, I will ask him whether he does not think, when we are called upon to reverse the action of the Quartermaster-General, that we ought at least to have a statement of the account, what the Quartermaster-General allowed, and the value he put upon the articles, and whether we ought to reverse it without any statement as to what his valuation was?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I confess it would have been better if the report had been more elaborate and more specific and had given all the information to the Senate. That would have been better, I concede. However, all those matters were before the committee and they were considered, as I remember, with more than ordinary care, owing to the fact that the case had been passed upon at one time. I know it was the judgment of all the members of the committee that from some cause an injustice had been done this party in the failure on the part of the Quartermaster-General to allow even one-half of what the committee believed from the testimony on file ought to have been allowed for the property taken and used by the Army in this particular case. My memory does not serve me fully, and I am not certain whether the act of Congress submitting this case to the Quartermaster-General did not restrict him to a certain extent.

Mr. PLATT. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am not sure how the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster-General was restricted, and although I would not speak certainly on that point, some items were perhaps omitted from consideration by the Quartermaster-General. At all events, my memory is very distinct that after a very thorough examination of the matter a year ago it was the deliberate judgment of every member of the committee that the bill ought to pass.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, this is an exceptional case. It has been a case of great difficulty. It has been before the committee a number of times, and the conclusion which was reached in the bill now before the Senate was reached during the last Congress. The report was made by our former colleague, Mr. Allen of Washington, a very careful and accurate man and a good lawyer. It was made after a very thorough and exhaustive examination of the case. His report might have been a little fuller, but the matter was before the committee at a number of its sessions and great care was taken before the report of the committee was finally agreed upon.

This man Kennedy in his lifetime lived in the District of Columbia within sight of the Capitol during the war, at a time when he was fully entitled to the protection of the United States Government. He had no connection whatever with the Confederate cause, but lived in the District. His property was damaged probably ten times the amount that can be recovered under the laws and the rules of the committee, for the committee are only authorized to grant recovery for so much material as was actually used for quartermaster's stores. If the report had been read throughout it would have been seen that this limitation was placed upon the recovery in the present instance. The committee say expressly in the last lines of the report:

> The resulting damages to the real estate, as such, the committee decline to make any allowance for.

When this matter came before the Senate some years ago, long before I was a member of the Senate or of the Committee on Claims, it was referred to the Quartermaster-General and a report was made, and some $1,300 or more paid. But the parties were never satisfied with that allowance. Mr. Kennedy is dead, and the widow now living is a poor woman. She never was satisfied with the amount, and has been knocking at the doors of Congress since then for further relief; and the committee, on examining into the facts, became satisfied that the amount granted to her by the Quartermaster-General was insufficient.

Mr. DOLPH. What was that amount?

Mr. PASCO. The amount was some $1,300.

Mr. DOLPH. How much more does the committee propose to give her?

Mr. PASCO. The committee decided that instead of $1,300 she ought to have received $3,000, the market price of the timber that was destroyed, taking the market price of it as cord wood.

Mr. CHANDLDR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. How did the committee reach a conclusion that the round sum of $3,000 was the amount which under the rule laid down this woman was entitled to receive?

Mr. PASCO. It was based upon the estimated number of cords of wood and the amount that should have been allowed per cord.

Mr. DOLPH. What amount was proposed to allow her per cord?

Mr. PASCO. I can not give the figures because they are not in the report, and an exhaustive discussion of the matter this morning was not anticipated; but, as I said before, the report was made by one of the most careful members of the committee. I stated before the Senator from Oregon came in that the report was made by Mr. Allen of Washington. It was a matter he had before him for a number of weeks. He went over the matter again and again, and finally concluded that the number of cords of wood taken at the market price was worth fully $3,000, and that was fixed as the amount that should be recovered. The difference between the $1,300 allowed by the Quartermaster-General and $3,000 is the amount that he reported should be granted to her. That is the amount contained in the bill, and it is the amount the committee propose to give this poor widow for the wood taken from her husband's land.

The committee are very careful with reference to any matter that has been reported upon by one of the Departments, and it was only upon abundant evidence in the opinion of the committee that they decided that the report of the Quartermaster-General should be opened. It is an exceptional case. The action of the committee during the last Congress was unanimous with reference to the matter. The report now brought in by the committee, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], copies in full, as will be seen from the head of it, the report made by the Senator from Washington in the last Congress.

I say this because there seems to be a suggestion or an intimation thrown out that there is a disposition on the part of the committee under their present organization to take a different view of cases of this kind from what had been taken in years gone by. But there has been no change in the policy of the committee. This is simply the same report that was made during the last Congress; and the lines which the committee have followed in the past will necessarily be the lines that will be followed during the present organization of the committee. We are governed by the laws and regulations which have been made relating to such claims.

This is not properly a Southern war claim in any sense of the word. This man lived in the District of Columbia. As I said before, he lived within sight of the Capitol. There was no reason at all why his property should have been taken for war purposes, and it was ruin and destruction to his little home here in the District to strip him of his fruit trees and of the trees around his place for army purposes. If the poor widow gets $1,600, in round numbers, as the committee now proposes, it will

be scant justice for the great injury done to her husband and to her husband's estate, and to her as the beneficiary.

There can be no doubt that the claim is a just and a fair one. The amount this poor woman gets will be small in comparison with the injury which her family has suffered; and although the report is not as full as it might have been, there can be no doubt but that it is a fair and a just claim.

The Senator from Connecticut spoke of the hot haste with which this matter is being brought up. Certainly the haste has not been so very great. Thirty years have elapsed since the damage was done, and this poor woman has been knocking at the doors of Congress for years to get relief. Her bill was passed in the Senate at the last Congress, and she is now here again endeavoring to get relief. Certainly there has been no haste. The case has been on the Calendar for many weeks. There has been ample time for every Senator to examine into the justness of the claim, if Senators were not satisfied with the report of the committee, and I trust there will be no delay in the action which the Senate may see fit to take with reference to the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Notwithstanding the care with which the Committee on Claims have examined the bill I still think it would be a dangerous precedent for the Senate to adopt. I know that the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Arkansas, and also the late Senator from Washington, Mr. Allen, are careful in all investigations which they make into cases which come before them; and if the Senate is to vote upon the guess of any committee, that $3,000 is a sum about right to give to this woman, then I would sooner act upon their guess than upon that of any other body of men whatever.

But I still say that the Senate ought not to pass a bill giving this round sum when the claimant has had the passage of a bill by Congress and a deliberate adjudication as to the value of the property by the Quartermaster-General. The law of October 19, 1888, for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, is explicit. It authorizes and directs the Quartermaster-General "to ascertain and state the value of all timber, fences, and fruit trees on the farm of John Kennedy, deceased, situate in the District of Columbia, upon which Fort Sedgwick was erected, taken, and used for firewood by the Army of the United States, and also the value of all timber sold by the Government which had been taken from said farm and used in the construction of said fort." Thereupon it directs that the amount shall be paid to Margaret Kennedy, the widow of John Kennedy.

That was in 1888, five years ago. The examination has been made by the Quartermaster-General. There has been evidently a careful and minute ascertainment of the facts, and the Quartermaster-General reported $1,378.44 as the value of the property taken. That amount was paid to Mrs. Kennedy, and now it is proposed to pay her $1,621.56 more, in order to make the amount received by her in round numbers $3,000. I think that the Committee on Claims ought not to ask us thus to overrule the deliberate judgment of the Quartermaster-General as to the value of the property without more minute and specific evidence upon which to substitute their judgment for that of the Quartermaster-General.

But I again recur to my main objection to the payment of this kind of a claim. The Senator from Florida says that this man and his property were within sight of the Capitol at Washington, and I therefore infer the Senator meant to suggest that the capital had not been the seat of war, so that the taking of property by the Army within the District of Columbia would not be an act of military appropriation. This very property was occupied, as the act of 1888 shows, for Fort Sedgwick. When war was flagrant there were half a dozen or a dozen military fortifications in the vicinity of the capital; and I had an idea that, notwithstanding all those fortifications, the forces of the United States at the capital were in considerable danger of capture at one time. Yet the Senator from Florida wishes us to conclude that because there was a military occupation of the grounds upon which Fort Sedgwick was erected it was not a military taking within the meaning of that term. Take the language of the report which was made in the last Congress and let us see whether the Government can afford to go on paying twice claims of this description. The report sets out the fact that—

> The land was taken possession of by the Government and used throughout the war for military purposes. Fort Sedgwick was erected upon it, around which rifle pits and other excavations were made, covering in all about 12 acres.
>
> The effect of this military appropriation was practically to destroy the larger part of the tract of land as a farm, and for all purposes of cultivation. In the course of the occupancy of the land the fences were consumed by the Army as fuel; so, too, the orchard, consisting of several hundred fruit trees of many choice varieties which had come to bearing but three years before.

There was nothing but a military occupation and a military taking possession of the land to build a fort upon it, taking possession of the timber to put in the fortifications, and cutting down the trees and building fires to keep the Union soldiers warm; and, for all I know, when Gen. Early approached the city some of the fuel may have been used to keep the Confederate forces warm, before Gen. Wright and the Sixth Corps made it so hot for them that they concluded to retire.

Now, Mr. President, to evolve from this sort of a military taking a contract obligation or an equitable obligation on the part of the United States to pay for the tree sthat were cut down at that time seems to me to be an unwise use of legislative power. Mark the language of the report and the theory upon which the United States is to pay for this military damage and destruction and consumption of property:

> Most of the timber grown upon this land was used in building the fortifications, and the remainder for fuel for the Army, or was sold by the Government. It was not a matter of military necessity to thus appropriate the timber, but simply the choice of taking it or purchasing other timber available for the purpose in market.

If all the operations of the Army are to be judged by that rule, and wherever we find that the Army erected a fort and cut down trees and used them for fortifications and for fuel the Government must pay the bill as if it had purchased the property on the ground, because if it had chosen to do so it might have gone and purchased timber somewhere else and hauled it to the ground and then erected the fortification—if this is to be the rule, as seems to be considered by the report which the Senator from Washington made in the last Congress and which is adopted by the committee in the present Congress, certainly there will be many thousands, not to say many millions, of dollars that will have to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States in order to recompense loyal citizens of the United States for what I conceive to be, notwithstanding the glosses that are put upon the transaction in the report of the committee, nothing but military occupation and the destruction or use for military purposes of property found at the seat of war.

Mr. President, I say I am aware that some claims of this kind have passed. I have never voted for one of them. I do not intend to vote for one of them upon any issue made in the Senate. I do not believe that the condition of the Treasury or the condition of the country is such that it is wise to make haste to put this class of claims upon the Calendar of the Senate, and when a claimant of this kind has been once paid all that she is entitled to receive by some other adjudication to ask that we shall give her by act of Congress as much more as a committee of Congress may guess she ought to have in equity and justice.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, instinctively I am inclined to oppose all claims of this kind. I would, if I had the power, adopt a constitutional rule of limitation, so that at some time we would hear the last of claims made by citizens for damages done and for property taken during the war. The only reason why I take part in the discussion now is because upon the facts I expect to vote for the bill, and I desire to state the reasons which influence me, not only to justify myself for my vote, but to exclude any possible conclusion that I would go further than this case suggests.

The facts as I understand them are that John Kennedy was a citizen of the District of Columbia, over which the United States had not only legal but actual jurisdiction during the war. That he was loyal is stated in the report, and being within this District he would be presumed by public law as well as the law of the land to be loyal, because he was not living within a district which had been recognized as disloyal by the authorities of the United States. The case is one very much the same as if he had lived in New York, or Illinois, or New Hampshire. The necessities of the Army were such that his lands, the lands of a peaceable, loyal citizen, were occupied from military necessity or public necessity. I hold beyond all doubt that for mere consequential damages a peaceable citizen of the United States must submit; but in a case where the property of the citizen has been taken and applied to public uses, whether taken by judicial condemnation or by the brief methods of military condemnation, the public obligation to pay for the property taken and used and applied to the purposes of the Government is complete.

Congress at a former session recognized the justice of this claim. It recognized its general propriety, and directed that an estimate should be made of the actual losses sustained by this peaceable citizen whose property was taken and converted to public uses by the authorities of the United States. It is not now an open question as to whether the claim is well founded or not, because Congress recognized it by creating a tribunal with limited jurisdiction to determine the amount which shall be paid. The parties appeared presumptively before this commissioner, a quasi judicial officer. They offered their testimony and he made his report. It was not judicial, but only quasi judicial.

The claimant, the representative of a loyal citizen living in this District, makes an application to Congress now simply that an investigation may be instituted which will determine the amount of the actual value of the property taken by the Govern-

ment in the manner I have described. It was referred to an intelligent—as we are all supposed to be intelligent—committee of this body. That committee made an examination upon the testimony, again examined that testimony, and the crucial point was suggested by a question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts of the Senator from Oregon, "Was this evidence such as would have authorized a new trial in a judicial proceeding?" The Senator answered, "It was." Then this application is that Congress shall give to this claimant the benefit of a rehearing under circumstances where a rehearing or new trial is a right, and that the Senate shall make an appropriation, which is according to the report of the committee of this body which has complete jurisdiction over the subject as the representative of the Senate.

Now, shall the claim be paid? Why not? It is argued that it is an example of many claims which may hereafter be presented. I confess that that is true, but theoretically it is an example of a class of claims which ought to be paid, because it is for the property of a citizen not living within a State which was declared to be in insurrection or in rebellion, but in a community under the complete and exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, protected by all consitutional rights by which property is so carefully guarded.

If it had been proposed to take this property for any civil purpose, no one would claim that it could have been taken without a judicial condemnation and full compensation, It was taken by a public authority as distinctly as where judicial condemnation was imposed, and the duty of making compensation seems to me as clear as if it had been taken for any civil purpose.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. PALMER. With great pleasure.

Mr. CHANDLER. Do I understand the Senator to state his opinion so broadly that he would be willing in all cases to have the United States pay for all the trees cut down to make fortifications and used for fuel for the Army during the whole rebellion and wherever the taking may have happened?

Mr. PALMER. I should not; but I would be in the condition of a reluctant debtor admitting the obligation, but disliking to pay it exceedingly. I am putting this upon the distinct ground that the citizen living within the actual, as well as the legal, jurisdiction of the United States, having done no act to forfeit his right to protection, and his property being taken for public uses and distinctly appropriated to public purposes, demands the payment of its mere money value. Can that be resisted upon any legitimate ground?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, certainly if it is a military taking and destruction. Now, I ask the Senator whether he draws any distinction as to places, whether the property should be paid for because it happened to be in the District of Columbia and should not be paid for if it happened to be in the State of Texas?

Mr. PALMER. There is a very wide distinction in my mind. We have made exceptions in favor of presumptively loyal persons in the jurisdiction of States and compensation has been allowed to them under a great many circumstances, but in a hostile country the burden of proof is upon the claimant, because the legal conditions were such that all were presumed to be disloyal, and the burden of proof would be cast upon everyone or anyone to establish loyalty.

I come back again to the main point. I deprecate the going back a quarter of a century in respect of the possible and actual injuries which grew out of the war. With my present convictions, I should not favor the payment of property taken in any of the States which, by their own acts, were in opposition to the authority of the United States; but in this District the people were all loyal to the Government, and this property was taken precisely as if it had been distinctly taken for a civil purpose.

I have but very little to add to what I have said. My own purpose now is most distinct. While I avow my readiness to support the pending bill upon well-established principles, as I think, I am anxious to protect myself from such inferences as have been suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. I make a clear distinction, first, between the inhabitants of loyal districts or States or Territories, and the inhabitants of States which were in recognized rebellion. I make a clear distinction between the mere consequential injuries which result from military occupation and the value of the property actually taken and used of a loyal, peaceful citizen, one who is entitled to the protection of the Government and is under no obligation to contribute to the Government other than such as applies to every other citizen, with this accidental exception, where the land of a citizen may be favorable for purposes of offense or defense in military operations. In that case I assume that he must submit to that purely incidental consequence; but where his property is taken, whether it is personal property—for I can suppose that to be true, as the wants of the Army might require that his cribs should be emptied, and that his stock should be taken and slaughtered; all those things happen—the right to compensation, he being under no other obligation to contribute except the incidental necessity calls upon him, I can see no reason why he should not be paid. It was our practice during the war when in States which were not in legal opposition to the Government, where property was taken to pay for it upon the very simple ground that those persons were contributing their due proportion by the payment of taxes and military service to the defense of the Government, and that it was unreasonable and unjust to impose upon them any exceptional hardships growing out of the fact that they resided near a defensive or offensive point needed for military operations.

I therefore vote for this bill upon the distinct ground that this was a peaceable citizen in the peaceable possession of his property, which was taken by the authority of the United States Government for public purposes, and from that results the obligation of the public to pay for it its reasonable value; and, secondly, upon the ground that Congress has recognized this claim and made some provision for its payment. By an appeal to Congress the representative of this citizen asks that his cause may be reheard; he makes the application to the department of the Government which has authority to give him that rehearing with a view of estimating the value of that which Congress has already recognized as being an obligation of the Government.

I vote for the bill upon the further incidental ground that a committee of this body has, after an intelligent and careful examination of the facts, assured the Senate that the facts now presented are such as give to this claimant an equitable and moral right to a rehearing, and that this equitable and moral right of the claimant can only be satisfied by the passage of the pending bill.

Having thus stated the reasons why I support this bill and the distinction which I think properly exists between this and the class of cases which have sometimes been presented to Congress and in some instances paid, and disavowing, as I do most distinctly, agreeing with the Senator from New Hampshire that I would pay for property under the circumstances which he describes, I do maintain that the pending bill is as equitable and just as if this had been a judicial inquiry for condemnation of private property to be taken for public uses.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CHANDLER. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire calls for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill. Is the demand seconded? [Putting the question.] The demand is not seconded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am afraid the Chair did not notice that there was no quorum present. I ask that the roll may be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had not observed that. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the lack of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bate,	Faulkner,	Lodge,	Pasco,
Blackburn,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Peffer,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Platt,
Call,	Gray,	Manderson,	Power,
Carey,	Hale,	Martin,	Ransom,
Chandler,	Harris,	Mills,	Roach,
Cockrell,	Hill,	Mitchell, Oregon	Sherman,
Coke,	Hoar,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Cullom,	Hunton,	Morrill,	Washburn,
Davis,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	White, La.
Dolph,	Kyle,	Palmer,	Wilson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from New Hampshire calls for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill. Is the call seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAREY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], who is not present, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. DOLPH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], but I have now an understanding with him that I may vote to make a quorum, and I shall exercise that right on all matters which are not political, where my vote may be necessary to make a quorum.

My vote is now necessary to help make a quorum, and I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I inquire whether the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not yet voted.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think the Senator from Idaho may vote upon this question, notwithstanding his pair with my colleague.

Mr. DUBOIS. Then I vote "yea."

Mr. GORMAN (when Mr. GIBSON'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. GIBSON] is detained from the Chamber by illness. He is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE].

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SHOUP (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE], who is not present, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON], but I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. GEORGE], who is absent. I make this arrangement with the concurrence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH], who is paired with my colleague. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 11; as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bate,	Faulkner,	Kyle,	Power,
Berry,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Ransom,
Blackburn,	Gray,	Martin,	Roach,
Caffery,	Hansbrough,	Mills,	Vest,
Call,	Harris,	Mitchell, Oregon	Voorhees,
Coke,	Hill,	Mitchell, Wis.	Walthall,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Murphy,	Washburn,
Dolph,	Hunton,	Palmer,	White, La.
Dubois,	Jones, Ark.	Pasco,	

NAYS—11.

Chandler,	Hale,	Morrill,	Proctor,
Frye,	Lodge,	Peffer,	Sherman.
Gallinger,	Manderson,	Platt,	

NOT VOTING—39.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	Lindsay,	Stewart,
Allen,	Davis,	McMillan,	Stockbridge,
Allison,	Dixon,	Morgan,	Teller,
Brice,	George,	Perkins,	Turpie,
Butler,	Gibson,	Pettigrew,	Vance,
Camden,	Gordon,	Pugh,	Vilas,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Quay,	White, Cal.
Carey,	Higgins,	Shoup,	Wilson,
Cockrell,	Irby,	Smith,	Wolcott.
Colquitt,	Jones, Nev.	Squire,	

So the bill was passed.

FRANCES CORSE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 63, being the bill (S. 882) granting a pension to Frances Corse, widow of Gen. John M. Corse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitation of the general pension laws, the name of Mrs. Frances Corse, widow of late Bvt. Maj. Gen. John M. Corse, at the rate of $100 per month.

Mr. HARRIS. Has the bill been reported by the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say in behalf of the committee that the bill has been unanimously recommended by the committee and reported by myself, a somewhat lengthy printed report having been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WALTHALL. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the report which accompanies the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER October 11, 1893, but before concluding was interrupted by

Mr. WALTHALL. I do not care to have the report read further.

Mr. HOAR. The report has been half read and will have to go into the RECORD. I therefore suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that it all go in.

Mr. WALTHALL. I suppose it will be printed in the RECORD anyhow.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to have the report go into the RECORD.

Mr. WALTHALL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HOAR. My suggestion was that, half the report having been read, the whole of it should be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WALTHALL. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

The report of the committee is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 882) granting a pension to Frances Corse, widow of Gen. John M. Corse, have given the matter careful consideration, and respectfully report:

Mrs. Corse is the widow of the late Bvt. Maj. Gen. John M. Corse, the "hero of Allatoona," who died at his home in Winchester, Mass., in April last. Gen. Corse was severely wounded at Allatoona, but he refused to leave the field, and his gallant defense of that post against heavy odds undoubtedly saved Sherman's army from great embarrassment and probable defeat, and made possible without delay the completion of the arrangements for the great "march to the sea."

Gen. Corse received in all five wounds, and was so injured in the limbs as to prevent him taking proper exercise. He suffered great pain at frequent intervals, and was often confined to his house and bed, to the great injury of his business activity. Notwithstanding this, Gen. Corse performed many public duties, and after four years' service as postmaster of Boston his reappointment was asked in 1890 by the leading business men of that city, without regard to party.

As bearing on the exceedingly valuable military services performed by Gen. Corse, your committee submit the following extracts from the memoirs of the late Gen. William T. Sherman:

"We crossed the Chattahoochee River during the 3d and 4th of October, rendezvoused at the old battlefield of Smyrna Camp, and the next day reached Marietta and Kenesaw. The telegraph wires had been cut above Marietta, and learning that heavy masses of infantry, artillery, and cavalry had been seen from Kenesaw (marching north), I inferred that Allatoona was their objective point, and on the 4th of October I signaled from Vinings Station to Kenesaw, and from Kenesaw to Allatoona, over the heads of the enemy, a message for Gen. Corse, at Rome, to hurry back to the assistance of the garrison at Allatoona. Allatoona was held by a small brigade, commanded by Lieut. Col. Tourtellotte, my present aid-de-camp. He had two small redoubts on either side of the railroad, overlooking the village of Allatoona and the warehouses, in which were stored over a million rations of bread.

"Reaching Kenesaw Mountain about 8 a. m. of October 5 (a beautiful day), I had a superb view of the vast panorama of the north and west. To the southwest, about Dallas, could be seen the smoke of camp fires, indicating the presence of a large force of the enemy, and the whole line of railroad from Big Shanty up to Allatoona (full 15 miles) was marked by the fires of the burning railroad. We could plainly see the smoke of battle about Allatoona and hear the faint reverberation of the cannon.

"From Kenesaw I ordered the Twenty-third Corps (Gen. Cox) to march due west on the Burnt Hickory Road and to burn houses or piles of brush as it progressed, to indicate the head of column, hoping to interpose this corps between Hood's main army at Dallas and the detachment then assailing Allatoona. The rest of the army was directed straight for Allatoona, northwest, distant 18 miles. The signal officer on Kenesaw reported that since daylight he had failed to obtain any answer to his call for Allatoona; but while I was with him he caught a faint glimpse of the tell-tale flag through an embrasure, and after much time he made out these letters: 'C.,' 'R.,' 'S.,' 'E.,' 'H.,' 'E.,' 'R.,' and translated the message: 'Corse is here.' It was a source of great relief, for it gave me the first assurance that Gen. Corse had received his orders and that the place was adequately garrisoned.

"I watched, with painful suspense, the indications of the battle raging there, and was dreadfully impatient at the slow progress of the relieving column, whose advance was marked by the smokes which were made according to orders; but about 2 p. m. I noticed with satisfaction that the smoke of battle about Allatoona grew less and less, and ceased altogether about 4 p. m. For a time I attributed this result to the effect of Gen. Cox's march, but later in the afternoon the signal flag announced the welcome tidings that the attack had been fairly repulsed, but that Gen. Corse was wounded. The next day my aid, Col. Dayton, received this characteristic dispatch:

"'ALLATOONA, GA., *October 6, 1864—2 p. m.*

"'Capt. L. M. DAYTON, *Aid-de-Camp:*

"'I am short a cheekbone and an ear, but am able to whip all h—l yet. My losses are very heavy. A force moving from Stilesboro to Kingston gives me some anxiety. Tell me where Sherman is.

"'JOHN M. CORSE,
"'*Brigadier-General.*'

"Inasmuch as the enemy had retreated southwest, and would probably next appear at Rome, I answered Gen. Corse with orders to get back to Rome with his troops as quickly as possible.

"Gen. Corse's report of this fight at Allatoona is very full and graphic. It is dated Rome, October 27, 1864; recites the fact that he received his orders by signal to go to the assistance of Allatoona on the 4th, when he telegraphed to Kingston for cars, and a train of thirty empty cars was started for him, but about ten of them got off the track and caused delay. By 7 p. m. he had at Rome a train of twenty cars, which he loaded up with Col. Rowett's brigade and part of the Twelfth Illinois Infantry; started at 8 p. m., reaching Allatoona (distant 35 miles) at 1 a. m. on the 5th, and sent the train back for more men; but the road was in bad order and no more men came in time. He found Col. Tourtellotte's garrison composed of 890 men; his reënforcement was 1,054; total for the defense, 1,944. The outposts were already engaged and as soon as daylight came he drew back the men from the village to the ridge on which the redoubts were built.

"The enemy was composed of French's division of three brigades, variously reported from four to five thousand strong. This force gradually

surrounded the place by 8 a. m., when Gen. French sent in by flag of truce this note:

"'AROUND ALLATOONA, *October 5, 1864.*

"'COMMANDING OFFICER, UNITED STATES FORCES, *Allatoona:*

"'I have placed the forces under my command in such positions that you are surrounded, and to avoid a needless effusion of blood I call on you to surrender your forces at once and unconditionally.

"'Five minutes will be allowed you to decide. Should you accede to this, you will be treated in the most honorable manner as prisoners of war.

"'I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

"'S. G. FRENCH,

"'*Major-General, Commanding Forces Confederate States.*'

"Gen. Corse answered immediately:

"'HEADQUARTERS FOURTH DIVISION, FIFTEENTH CORPS,

"'*Allatoona, Ga., October 5, 1864—8:30 a. m.*

"'Maj. Gen. S. G. FRENCH,

"'*Confederate States, etc.:*

"'Your communication demanding surrender of my command I acknowledge receipt of, and respectfully reply that we are prepared for the 'needless effusion of blood' whenever it is agreeable to you.

"'I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"'JOHN M. CORSE,

"'*Brigadier-General, Commanding Forces United States.*'

"Of course the attack began at once, coming from front, flank, and rear. There were two small redoubts, with slight parapets and ditches, one on each side of the deep railroad cut. These redoubts had been located by Col. Poe, United States Engineer, at the time of our advance on Kenesaw the previous June. Each redoubt overlooked the storehouses close by the railroad and each could aid the other defensively by catching in flank the attacking force of the other. Our troops at first endeavored to hold some ground outside the redoubts, were soon driven inside, when the enemy made repeated assaults but were always driven back. About 11 a. m. Col. Redfield, of the Thirty-ninth Iowa, was killed, and Col. Rowett was wounded, but never ceased to fight and encourage his men. Col. Tourtellotte was shot through the hips, but continued to command. Gen. Corse was, at 1 p. m., shot across the face, the ball cutting his ear, which stunned him, but he continued to encourage his men and to give orders. The enemy (about 1:30 p. m.) made a last and desperate effort to carry one of the redoubts, but was badly cut to pieces by the artillery and infantry fire from the other, when he began to draw off, leaving his dead and wounded on the ground.

"Before finally withdrawing, Gen. French converged a heavy fire of his cannon on the blockhouse of Allatoona Creek, about 2 miles from the depot, set it on fire and captured its garrison, consisting of 4 officers and 85 men. By 4 p. m. he was in full retreat south on the Dallas road, and got by before the head of Gen. Cox's column had reached it; still several ambulances and stragglers were picked up by this command on that road. Gen. Corse reported 231 rebel dead, 411 prisoners, 3 regimental colors, and 800 muskets captured.

"Among the prisoners was a Brig. Gen. Young, who thought that French's aggregate loss would reach 2,000. Col. Tourtellotte says that for days after Gen. Corse had returned to Rome his men found and buried at least a hundred more dead rebels, who had, doubtless, been wounded and died in the woods near Allatoona. I know that when I reached Allatoona on the 9th I saw a good many dead men, which had been collected for burial.

"Corse's entire loss, officially reported, was:

Garrison.	Killed.	Wounded.	Missing.	Total.
Officers	6	23	6	35
Men	136	330	206	672
Total	142	353	212	707

"I esteemed this defense of Allatoona so handsome and important that I made it a subject of a general order, viz: No. 86, of October 7, 1864:

"'The general commanding avails himself of the opportunity in the handsome defense made of Allatoona to illustrate the most important principle in war, that fortified posts should be defended to the last, regardless of the relative numbers of the party attacking and attacked. * * * The thanks of this army are due and are hereby accorded to Gen. Corse, Col. Tourtellotte, Col. Rowett, officers, and men, for their determined and gallant defense of Allatoona, and it is made an example to illustrate the importance of preparing in time and meeting the danger, when present, boldly, manfully, and well.

"'Commanders and garrisons of the posts along our railroad are hereby instructed that they must hold their posts to the last minute, sure that the time gained is valuable and necessary to their comrades at the front.

"'By order of Maj. Gen. W. T. Sherman:

"'L. M. DAYTON,

"'*Aid-de-Camp.*'"

Gen. Corse never applied for a pension, and refused to patiently listen to the suggestion that he ask for one. He would have been entitled to a high rate of pension from the close of the war to the time of his death, and would probably have drawn from the Treasury more money than the Government will ever be called upon to pay under the pending bill. The widow was not willing at first to have the question of a pension for herself considered, but eventually consented to have her friends present the matter, especially on behalf of her boy of 9 years. It is with the purpose of giving him a proper education as the son of a brave man who "held the fort" at Allatoona, greatly contributing to the success of Sherman's march to the sea, that she is willing to accept the grateful recognition of Congress.

Gen. Corse's wounds and other physical disabilities prevented him from giving proper attention to business after his retirement from the postmastership of Boston. He died very poor, his estate having inventoried, as your committee is informed, only $60.

There are numerous precedents for this pension, and your committee is earnestly of the opinion that the bill should be enacted into law without amendment, and accordingly recommend its passage.

MILITARY RECORD OF GEN. CORSE.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, October 4, 1893.

Statement of the military service of John Murry Corse, late of the United States Volunteers, compiled from the records of this office.

He was a cadet at the United States Military Academy July 1, 1853, to April 23, 1855.

He entered the service as major, Sixth Iowa Infantry, July 13, 1861; promoted lieutenant-colonel May 21, 1862; colonel March 29, 1863, and appointed brigadier-general of volunteers August 11, 1863. He received the brevet rank of major-general of volunteers October 5, 1864, for long and continued service and for special gallantry at Allatoona, Ga.

Served with his regiment from June to December 14, 1861; provost-marshal at Laurine Cantonment, Missouri, to February 1, 1862; on staff of Gen. Pope as inspector-general district of central Missouri to April, 1862, and the Army of the Mississippi to May, 1862; commanding his regiment in the Army of the Tennessee to January, 1863; in the Seventeenth Corps, Department of the Tennessee, to August 27, 1863; commanding Fourth Division, Fifteenth Corps, to October 25, 1863, and Second Brigade of same division to November 25, 1863, when wounded at Missionary Ridge, Tennessee; absent, sick on account of wounds, to January 18, 1864; commanding draft rendezvous at Springfield, Ill., to February 6, 1864, when relieved on account of not having sufficiently recovered from his wounds; absent, sick, and awaiting orders, to April, 1864; on staff of Gen. Sherman as acting inspector-general, Division of the Mississippi, to July 26, 1864; commanding Second Division, Sixteenth Corps, to September 25, 1864, and Fourth Division, Fifteenth Corps, to July 24, 1865; in command of the District of Minnesota, August 22, 1865, to April 30, 1866, when honorably mustered out of the service.

R. WILLIAMS,
Adjutant-General.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. AND JOSEPH M. CORNELL.

Mr. DOLPH. I have some little bills, which will be reached in a moment when we go to the Calendar regularly, and, as there is no objection to them, I wish that we might now go to the Calendar of unobjected cases.

Mr. COKE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. DOLPH. I hope the Senator from Texas will let me have a bill or two considered and passed. If the Senator will withdraw his motion, I will ask unanimous consent to take up a bill.

Mr. COKE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Texas to withdraw his motion.

Mr. COKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 73.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 73) for the relief of William J. Cornell and Joseph M. Cornell.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is there a report in that case?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a report.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to hear the report read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the report which accompanies the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Public Lands, September 4, 1893, but before concluding was interrupted by——

Mr. DOLPH. Is it necessary to read the letters which accompany the report? It is merely a case of money wrongfully required to be paid into the Treasury.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to dispensing with the further reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the further reading of the report will be dispensed with.

Mr. HOAR. The report, at the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], was partially read. It all ought to go into the RECORD, or it all ought to go out of the RECORD.

Mr. DOLPH. I have no obection. Let the entire report be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the report will be printed in the RECORD in full.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred Senate bill S. 73, have examined the same and recommend that the bill be passed.

The committee adopt the report of the committee upon a similar bill at the second session of the Fifty-second Congress, as follows:

[Senate Report No. 1149, Fifty-second Congress, second session.]

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3649) for the relief of William J. Cornell and Joseph M. Cornell, have examined the same, and report that the bill be passed as amended.

William J. Cornell was required by the register of the land office at La Grande, Oregon, to pay $2.50 per acre on land entry numbered 4298, for the south half of section 27, township 3 north, of range 30 east; and Joseph M. Cornell was required to pay $2.50 per acre on land entry numbered 4292, for the north half of section 27, township 3 north, range 30 east, when the legal price of the same was $1.25 per acre, as will appear by letters of the Commissioner of the General Land Office hereto attached and made a part hereof.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office holds that the overpayments can not be refunded under existing laws.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1892.

SIR: In reference to the matter of the application of William J. Cornell for return of $1.25 per acre on cash entry Lagrande, Oregon, No. 4292, for the S. ½ sec. 27, T. 3 N., R. 30 E., which was denied by my predecessor in letter to the register and receiver at Lagrande, of October 1, 1891, being the subject of your late inquiry, I have the honor to state that the case in question appears to be governed by the principles of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of Joseph Brown (5 L. D., 317), which holds that the Department is not clothed with power to make repayments except by specific statutory authorization.

The existing legislation providing for repayments in cases where parties have paid double minimum prices for land which has been found not to be within the limits of a railroad land grant, viz, the act of June 16, 1880, 21 Stats., 287, does not apply so as to cover a case of this kind in which the land is actually within the limits of a railroad land grant. I can not, therefore, do otherwise than adhere to the conclusion of my predecessor above mentioned.

The copy of his letter of October 1, 1891, is herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

W. M. STONE, *Commissioner.*

Hon. J. N. DOLPH,
United States Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1892.

SIR: In answer to your verbal inquiry of this date, in the matter of the claim of William J. Cornell and Joseph Cornell, respectively, for repayment of $1.25 per acre, paid on certain entries made at Lagrande, Oregon, I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of a letter addressed to the register and receiver, Lagrande, relative to the case of William J. Carnell, dated October 1, 1891. A similar letter was written on October 3, 1891, in the case of Joseph Carnell.

Very respectfully,

M. M. ROSE,
Assistant Commissioner.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH,
United States Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 1, 1891.

GENTLEMEN: Referring to your letter of 14th ultimo, transmitting application of William J. Cornell for return of $1.25 per acre on cash entry No. 4222, for the S. ½ sec. 27, T. 3 N., R. 30 E., you are advised that said entry was made under the third section of the act of September 29, 1890, and the party should have only been required to pay $1.25 per acre. But the party paid $2.50 per acre, making a total of $960, under the impression of your office that the land was double minimum in price.

This land was within the granted limits of the Cascade Branch of the Northern Pacific Railroad, from Wallula to Tacoma, which road has been constructed. By the act of September 29, 1890, the land within the granted limits of the unconstructed portion of the Northern Pacific Railroad was forfeited to the United States.

As the Cascade Branch has been constructed, the railroad company took as a moiety the alternate odd sections from 1 to 5, etc., but the vacant lands within the limits of said branch were only subject to entry at the price of $2.50 per acre, except to parties coming under the third section of said act, and the party should have entered the land at $1.25 per acre.

The amount overpaid on said entry can not be refunded under the act of June 16, 1880, as said act provided, "In all cases where parties have paid double minimum price for land which has been found not to be within the limits of a railroad land grant, the excess of $1.25 per acre shall in like manner be repaid to the purchaser thereof, or to his heirs or assigns." In the case now under consideration, although the railroad grant has been forfeited to the United States, said road has been constructed, but the lands have never been restored to the minimum price, and the vacant lands formerly within the limits of the branch lines are only subject to entry at $2.50 per acre, except as is specifically provided in certain cases under said act.

This is a case of an erroneous exaction of $1.25 per acre on the part of the local land officers, but, under the law, this office could not afford the party any relief. The application is denied.

Very respectfully,

THOS. H. CARTER, *Commissioner.*

REGISTER AND RECEIVER,
Lagrande, Oregon.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 288) to provide two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

THOMAS GUINEAN.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 75, which is a bill of similar character to the one just passed. The bill was reported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. It has several times passed the Senate, but failed in the House of Representatives.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 75) for the relief of Thomas Guinean. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Thomas Guinean, of Oregon, the assignee of Bradley S. Hoyt, deceased, of California, $160, paid the United States on account of land entry at Shasta, Cal., and which entry was subsequently canceled.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there no provision of law for repayment where an entry is canceled?

Mr. DOLPH. The Department say not. A bill similar to this has two or three times passed the Senate,

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that; but the single question with me is whether there is not a general law which would authorize the repayment of money where an entry has been canceled?

Mr. DOLPH. Not in this case.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then the Committee on Public Lands ought to report such a bill.

Mr. DOLPH. This action has been recommended by the committee, and a similar bill has passed the Senate a number of times.

Mr. PALMER. What is there peculiar in this case to except it from the operation of the general law?

Mr. DOLPH. It is a case where land was entered as desert land, and when the authorities came to pass upon it they held that it ought not to be classed as desert land, and canceled the entry; but the money had gone into the Treasury, and it can not be got out of the Treasury without an appropriation.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not see that there is any report in the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No report accompanies the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. This was a desert-land entry?

Mr. DOLPH. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was it canceled because of noncompliance with the law?

Mr. DOLPH. No, sir; but because the Department held, according to the evidence they had, that the land ought not to be entered as desert land, but ought to be classed as agricultural land, and so have refused to refund the money.

Mr. COCKRELL. If it were desert land——

Mr. DOLPH. No, it is not that. The matter has been examined by the Committee on Public Lands, and I believe the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL] or some Senator on the other side of the Chamber examined it.

Mr. WALTHALL. The pending bill was examined by the chairman of the committee [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. DOLPH. The chairman of the committee reported the present bill, but I was speaking of a previous bill.

Mr. WALTHALL. I remember something of the bill, and I think it was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. DOLPH. It has been unanimously reported every time it has been before the committee.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 288) to provide two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WALTHALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 7, 1893.

POSTMASTERS.

Washington Hesing, to be postmaster at Chicago, in the County of Cook and State of Illinois, in the place of James A. Sexton, resigned.

Frederick J. Nirider, to be postmaster at Kinmundy, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Benjamin F. Moberley, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois, in the place of Charles Voris, removed.

John F. Fulton, to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Huntington and State of Indiana, in the place of James M. Rogers, removed.

Charles H. Leach, to be postmaster at Kokomo, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana, in the place of George W. McKinsey, resigned.

William T. Phillips, to be postmaster at Oakland City, in the county of Gibson and State of Indiana, in the place of James M. Cockrum, removed.

John M. Turner, to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of White and State of Indiana, in the place of Granville B. Ward, resigned.

Walter M. Beadel, to be postmaster at Lenox, in the county of Taylor and State of Iowa, in the place of David B. Herriott, removed.

John L. Comstock, to be postmaster at Sac City, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa, in the place of Joseph W. Garrison, removed.

William W. DeWolf, to be postmaster at Reinbeck, in the county of Grundy and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

William W. Gardner, to be postmaster at Avoca, in the county of Pottowattamie and State of Iowa, in the place of J. Ledwick, removed.

John H. Howell, to be postmaster at Eagle Grove, in the county of Wright and State of Iowa, in the place of Omar H. Brooks, resigned.

O. Ira Jameson, to be postmaster at Columbus Junction, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa, in the place of John L. Grubb, removed.

Thomas W. Killion, to be postmaster at Moulton, in the county of Appanoose and State of Iowa, in the place of Almer Swift, removed.

Matthew M. Lenon, to be postmaster at Panora, in the county of Guthrie and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Henry Moore, to be postmaster at Sioux Rapids, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Charles Perry, to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Marion and State of Iowa, in the place of John Bush, removed.

William A. Todd, to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, in the county of Ringgold and State of Iowa, in the place of Hugh A. White, resigned.

John T. S. Williams, to be postmaster at Ogden, in the county of Boone and State of Iowa, in the place of Earl Billings, removed.

Andrew J. Arnold, to be postmaster at Topeka, in the county of Shawnee and State of Kansas, in the place of Frank S. Thomas, removed.

John Lynch, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Marion and State of Kansas, in the place of Fred Lewis, resigned.

Green A. Denham, to be postmaster at Williamsburg, in the county of Whitley and State of Kentucky, in the place of E. E. Watkins, removed.

Joseph E. Grobmyer, to be postmaster at Carrollton, in the county of Carroll and State of Kentucky, in the place of John T. Lewis, removed.

George H. Richard, to be postmaster at Donaldsonville, in the parish of Ascension and State of Louisiana, in the place of Gustave Israel, removed.

Thomas Shannon, to be postmaster at Morgan City, in the Parish of St. Mary and State of Louisiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Hosea S. Merrifield, to be postmaster at North Berwick, in the county of York and State of Maine, in the place of Daniel A. Hurd, removed.

Horace B. Tibbits, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of York and State of Maine, in the place of William H. Rice, removed.

Jesse K. Willett, to be postmaster at Waldoboro, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine, in the place of James H. Stanwood, removed.

James B. Elder, to be postmaster at Emmitsburg, in the county of Frederick and State of Marylan d, in the place of Samuel N. McNair, removed.

William F. Cass, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of William H. Merrill, removed.

Reuel H. Cooper, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan, in the place of Erastus W. Clark, removed.

Levant A. Vickery, to be postmaster at Flushing, in the county of Genesee and State of Michigan, in the place of William Hosie, removed.

John H. Driscoll, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota, in the place of A. D. Brown, resigned.

Stephen M. Wilder, to be postmaster at Spring Valley, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota, in the place of William L. Kellogg, removed.

Alvin C. Frisbie, to be postmaster at Stanberry, in the county of Gentry and State of Missouri, in the place of Vinson T. Williams, removed.

John L. Shelton, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Henry and State of Missouri, in the place of Newton E. Carpenter, removed.

James Curran, to be postmaster at Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in the place of C. Kiel, jr., removed.

Hudson Ausley, to be postmaster at Salamanca, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, in the place of E. B. Vreeland, whose commission expired March 27, 1893.

John D. Brennan, to be postmaster at Medina, in the county of Orleans and State of New York, in the place of Graham H. Hill, resigned.

Charles H. Dunning, to be postmaster at Rome, in the county of Oneida and State of New York, in the place of William E. Scripture, resigned.

Charles L. Elwood, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in the place of Ira Dorrance, whose commission expired March 13, 1893.

Henry O. Fairchild, to be postmaster at Hammondsport, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in the place of L. H. Brown, removed.

Charles A. Hull, to be postmaster at Binghamton, in the county of Broome and State of New York, in the place of George W. Dunn, whose commission expired March 13, 1893.

Michael A. Leary, to be postmaster at Penn Yan, in the county of Yates and State of New York, in the place of John T. Andrews second, resigned.

Jonas Shays, to be postmaster at Owego, in the county of Tioga and State of New York, in place of William Smyth, removed.

Henry L. Storke, to be postmaster at Auburn, in the county of Cayuga and State of New York, in the place of John N. Knapp, resigned.

Daniel V. Teller, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Wayne and State of New York, in the place of F. C. Zimmerlin, resigned.

Lewis W. Terwilliger, to be postmaster at Hancock, in the county of Delaware and State of New York, in the place of S. F. Wheeler, whose commission expired March 30, 1893.

William H. Brunk, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon, in the place of A. P. Hammond, removed.

Patrick J. Birmingham, to be postmaster at Girardville, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

Arthur C. Randall, to be postmaster at St. Johnsbury, in the county of Caledonia and State of Vermont, in the place of William W. Sprague, removed.

Bert Russell, to be postmaster at Pocahontas, in the county of Tazewell and State of Virginia, in the place of D. J. Taylor, resigned.

Edward J. Doneen, to be postmaster at Oakesdale, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, in the place of George S. McWilliams, removed.

John Horwege, to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1893.

Thomas F. Meagher, to be postmaster at Sprague, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington, in the place of E. G. Pendleton, removed.

George G. McNamara, to be postmaster at Port Townsend, in the county of Jefferson and State of Washington, in the place of A. F. Learned, removed.

George H. Watrous, to be postmaster at Fairhaven, in the county of Whatcom and State of Washington, in the place of S. H. Keeler, resigned.

Oliver P. Hanna, to be postmaster at Sheridan, in the county of Sheridan and State of Wyoming, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEFICIENCY, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the Government Printing Office, submitted

by the Government Printer; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF INTRUDERS, CHEROKEE OUTLET.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the appraisal of improvements and removal of intruders in the Cherokee Outlet, submitted by the Secretary of the Interior; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ENLISTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICE CLERKS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, inclosing a copy of Executive Document 199 and a draft of a bill, with a favorable recommendation, relative to the enlistment of general service clerks for the infantry and cavalry schools at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and the artillery school at Fortress Monroe, Va.

The SPEAKER. This will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the title of the communication with reference to the artillery school at Fortress Monroe. Should not that go to the Committee on Appropriations?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title again.

The Clerk again reported the title.

The SPEAKER. This will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ANNUAL REPORT, QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the Quartermaster-General of the Army for the year ending June 30, 1893.

The SPEAKER. This will be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, ought not that to go to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was informed that it had in previous years been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. The inclination of the Chair would be to send it to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Chair will refer it to the Committee on Military Affairs. The accompanying documents will not be printed unless the committee desire it, as they are quite voluminous.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Very well; let it be so ordered.

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a supplementary statement of requisitions issued in favor of the late chairman of the citizens' executive committee, twenty-sixth national encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, together with an additional list of expenditures; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CIVILIAN ENGINEERS, IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a statement showing the name of each civilian engineer employed in the improvement of rivers and harbors, compensation, and where employed, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

ACCOUNTS OF THE FIRST COMPTROLLER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Treasurer of the United States, transmitting copies of the accounts rendered to and settled with the First Comptroller for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

The SPEAKER. This will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The accompanying documents will not be printed unless their printing is requested by the committee after they are referred. They are very voluminous.

CLAIMS UNDER THE BOWMAN ACT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of cases referred to the court under the Bowman act in which the claimant was not loyal to the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting his annual report to Congress; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

E. L. CURRIER AND GEORGE JENISON.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint E. L. Currier and George Jenison as special messengers, to be employed generally in and about the business of the House, during the Fifty-third Congress, commencing with the first regular session of said Congress, and who shall be paid a salary of $100 per month out of the contingent fund of the House until other provision shall be made for such payment by order of the House or of Congress."

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution, having duly considered the same, recommend its passage, inasmuch as it makes no increase in the present force of the House, and it has been the custom of previous Houses to give recognition to the minority of the House on the Doorkeeper's roll.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RUSK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYÉS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Speaker, I have another report from the Committee on Accounts for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized to employ one clerk at $1,200 per annum, and three laborers at $720 per annum each; that the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to employ eight folders at $900 per annum each, and four folders, during the session, at $75 per month each; that the Postmaster of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to employ three messengers at $1,200 per annum each, and two messengers during the session at $100 per month each; and that the Clerk of the House be directed to pay the above employés out of the contingent fund of the House until they are otherwise provided for.

Resolved, further, That the board of Capitol police be authorized to employ six additional policemen at a salary of $1,100 per annum each, and four additional watchmen at a salary of $900 per annum each, one-half of which salary shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for; *Provided*, That the Senate agrees to pay the other half of the expenses of the additional policemen or watchmen.

Mr. RUSK. The committee recommend a substitute for that resolution.

The SPEAKER. The substitute will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, having considered the accompanying resolution, offer the following in lieu thereof, and recommend the passage of the same:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized to employ one clerk at $1,200 per annum, to be assigned to the disbursing department of the Clerk's office, and two laborers at $720 per annum each; that the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to employ eight folders during the session, and one month thereafter, at $75 per month each; that the Postmaster of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to employ one messenger at $100 per month and one laborer at $75 per month during the sessions of the Fifty-third Congress; and that the Clerk of the House be directed to pay the above employés out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard for a few moments in connection with this report. It will be observed that there is a marked difference between the substitute of the committee and the original resolution. The original resolution was offered at the suggestion of the officers of the House, who thought the increase of force set forth in the resolution was necessary in their respective departments to bring the offices up to a proper standard of efficiency. The committee investigated the matter very carefully, and the pending substitute which they recommend for adoption is the result of that inquiry.

They find in the Clerk's office that the force is inadequate as far as the disbursing department is concerned, the clerks being required frequently to work at nights and on Sundays to keep up the business of the office. This has been especially the case since the provision went into effect authorizing the employment of clerks by members.

The Clerk of the House has eighteen or nineteen rooms under his control and has no force whatever for the janitor's work. The clerks of the House have heretofore contributed themselves to have this work done; and it was thought proper, in view of the circumstances, to allow two laborers to be provided for that service.

So far as the office of the Postmaster is concerned, after an investigation made by an inspector from the General Post-Office Department and in accordance with his recommendation, it is determined to allow the office two extra men, one to be assigned at the city post-office to prevent what has frequently occurred heretofore, the blocking of mail matter there, and one extra man on the wagons. The original resolution asked for five. The committee determined after their investigation to recommend the employment of two, believing the others can be dispensed with.

In the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms there was a request for an increase of six in the Capitol police force and four watchmen. The committee determined in view of the examination made to make no increase in that direction.

So far as the Doorkeeper's department is concerned, it has been usual during the second or third month of each regular session to increase the force by twelve or fourteen men to do the work of the folding room. The Doorkeeper, however, preferred the

assignment of a less number if they were given to him at an earlier stage in the session; and we have, therefore, recommended the employment of eight during the session and for one month thereafter. The Doorkeeper of the present Congress finds himself unusually burdened with work by reason of the extra session, having upwards of one million of speeches to fold ready for shipment, and there are other documents in large numbers to be handled. As I have said, he prefers to have a smaller number of men assigned at once, and the committee, therefore, recommend the employment of eight. In point of expenditure the salary of the eight will amount to no more than the salary for the larger number if employed at the usual time.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. RUSK. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand from the reading of the resolution that it provides for an additional clerk in the office of the Clerk?

Mr. RUSK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that under recent regulations—the regulation providing for the printing of the enrolled bills—that under that provision we are able to dispense with three or four clerks in the office of the Clerk of the House. It occurs to me, therefore, that it will be unnecessary to increase the force in the Clerk's office at this time. There is no longer any necessity for these enrolling clerks. I know something about this matter, having been on the committee, and I would like to have the gentleman explain why it is considered necessary to have an increased force when the work has been greatly reduced recently.

Besides, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that it looks to me as if we were going along rather recklessly, considering that the Government is "broke"—ready to go into bankruptcy as soon as the bankrupt bill gets through! [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSK. In response to the gentleman, I will state that the Clerk of the House was before our committee on several occasions, and insisted that it was absolutely necessary to have an extra man in the disbursing office in order to keep up the accounts.

Mr. SAYERS. When the Clerk of the House was before the committee, was it not prior to the passage of the joint resolution authorizing the printing of engrossed and enrolled bills?

Mr. RUSK. Probably it was.

Mr. SAYERS. Then I suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw that portion of the resolution referring to this extra clerk until the matter can be inquired into more thoroughly.

Mr. RUSK. Let the gentleman move to strike out that clause.

Mr. SAYERS. Very well; in order that the Committee on Accounts may have an opportunity to inquire into the necessity of an additional clerk in the Clerk's office, in view of the passage of the joint resolution for the printing of engrossed and enrolled bills, I move to strike out so much of the resolution as provides for an additional clerk in the Clerk's office.

Mr. RUSK. That amendment is acceptable to me.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "one clerk at $1,200 per annum, to be assigned to the disbursing department of the Clerk's office, and."

Mr. KILGORE. Now, if some one will move to strike out the balance it will be all right. [Laughter.]

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RUSK] will allow me a moment, I would like to say——

Mr. RUSK. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I merely wanted to ask the gentleman whether the force of this House is not now larger without this increase than it ever has been?

Mr. RUSK. No, sir; the force of the House at present is the same as at the last session, less the extra folders who were then employed. Counting those extra folders, the force of the last House was larger than that of the present House. We are now providing for eight of these folders as against fourteen provided for in the last House.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Do you not make an increase in the post-office and Clerk's office?

Mr. RUSK. We allow two additional men, one at the city post-office and one on the wagons; and this has been done in furtherance of the report of an inspector from the Department, who considered these men absolutely necessary in order to prevent a blocking of the mails at the city post-office.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am not prepared, even if I had the power, to antagonize the gentleman's proposition in regard to the force of the House, but I do wish to say that I believe an intelligent and thorough overhauling of the whole force of the House and the Senate would enable both these bodies to be served with probably one-half to two-thirds of the present force.

I feel I ought to say that; I do not apprehend it will do any good after I have said it. Still I had hoped that in this era of "reform," with our Democratic friends in complete possession of the Government and with a President who calls attention to the fact that there is a deficit in the Treasury, and that we have at last reached that point so long hoped and prayed for when there could be reform all along the line—I had hoped that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RUSK] and my friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], and in fact the Democracy generally, would make that reform—and would begin right here in our midst where, it seems to me, it is quite as badly needed as elsewhere.

Mr. RUSK. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will give me his attention.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me quite strange that the gentleman from Illinois during the Fifty-first Congress, when he had control of this matter, should not have reformed and reduced this force to one-half, as he thinks might be done now. I am disposed, however, to concur with the gentleman that there ought to be a thorough reorganization of the force both of the Senate and the House; I believe that a reduction could be effected, and that after such reduction the work would be more efficiently done. But I hope the gentleman before he begins to criticise this side of the House will recall the administration of his own party in the Fifty-first Congress and will explain to the House why he and his political associates did not then do what he complains of the Democrats for not doing now.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If my friend will allow me——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If the Reporter will add "the gentleman from Illinois smilingly said, thus and so," it will make this debate more easily understood.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman will allow me, what else could I do but so smile, in the presence of 100 majority on that side of the House. And I will say to my friend, when he refers to the reform that is being made upon what was done in the Fifty-first Congress, we had a bare majority——

Mr. DOCKERY. Which was rapidly increased.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And we did accomplish a great deal by beneficent legislation, as I think; but we were the "wicked Republicans," so long in power, that you have at last overthrown; and now it seems to me that it is time that you bring forth some fruits along with your profession; and I wanted to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance.

Mr. SAYERS. I will remind the gentleman that his small majority was very rapidly increased. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, yes.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman will permit me to say that he had an opportune occasion, when we put two Republicans on the roll a minute ago, to make these comments.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to state, to correct the impression that we are making a great increase in the force of the House, that the committee declined to act on the resolution which was referred to it, or report it favorably, which did make a marked increase, and that we only reported in favor of making an increase that we deemed absolutely necessary to properly perform the duties the House has imposed on the various officers of the House.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman in charge of the measure state to the House the increase, both as to number and amount, carried by this proposition over the force of the Fifty-second Congress?

Mr. RUSK. In the Clerk's office we allow three messengers at $720 each; in the post-office there is an increase of one messenger at $1,200 and another at $900. In the Doorkeeper's office, instead of allowing fourteen men during three or four months of the session, for the remainder of the session, we have allowed eight men from the beginning of the session. The amount in full will probably be less than the fourteen men usually borne on the roll for a few months.

Mr. MORSE. How about the laborers employed about the Capitol?

Mr. RUSK. We have allowed three laborers in the Clerk's office.

Mr. MORSE. Has not the increase of the force been necessitated by the increase of the membership of the House?

Mr. RUSK. The increase of membership, of course, always tends to create a necessity for an increase in the force to do the work. We have been as careful as possible, and have only allowed men who are absolutely necessary. The total number is two in the post-office, two in the Clerk's office, and eight under the Doorkeeper, as against fourteen for the latter part of the session.

Mr. DOCKERY. What is the net increase in numbers?

Mr. RUSK. It would not be a net increase, but a decrease.

We appoint twelve men instead of fourteen which are usually allowed to the Doorkeeper at a later period of the session, and this session there is a special necessity for it, because all the work of the extra session is now in the hands of the Doorkeeper. Formerly there has been no necessity for such an increase until the second or third month of the regular session, because Congress would not get to work until January.

Mr. DOCKERY. Can the gentleman state the total number of the employés of the House during the Fifty-second Congress?

Mr. RUSK. I can not state the total number. We propose the appointment of twelve people in all. I ask the previous question on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RUSK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The original resolution will lie on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the standing committees for reports.

The committees were called.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 88), providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893; when the Speaker signed the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 3544) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes."

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (S. R. 42), permitting Anson Mills, colonel of Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States; when the Speaker signed the same.

SAN PEDRO HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.

Mr. CANNON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, by the House of Representatives, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to report to this House at the earliest practical moment the greatest depth of water that it is feasible to obtain in the inner harbor at San Pedro, on the coast of Los Angeles County, Cal., and the probable cost thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. SAYERS. I think it should go to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The morning hour begins at half past 12, and the call rests with the Committee on Naval Affairs, who have a resolution before the House.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, which will be read by the Clerk.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas there are constantly before Congress numerous bills dealing with the question of rank and pay in the Navy, and other matters concerning the personnel of the same; and

Whereas the present laws relating to this subject are in many instances imperfect, inconsistent, unjust, and the result of piecemeal legislation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a special joint committee, consisting of three members of the House and three members of the Senate, be appointed respectively by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to fully investigate and consider the entire subject of the rank, pay, and all other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy; to have power to send for persons and papers, sit during the recess, if any, and during the sitting of both Houses, and to report at any time after it convenes as may be convenient what legislation, if any, is necessary in the premises; any bill so reported by them shall simplify, codify, and revise existing laws relating to the personnel of the Navy so far as may be found possible.

The CHAIRMAN. When this concurrent resolution was last under consideration in Committee of the Whole, the committee had divided upon a motion made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] to report to the House the resolution as amended, with the recommendation that it do pass. Upon that division no quorum voted, and, pending the division, the morning hour expired. The resolution, therefore, comes over for action at this time, and the tellers will resume their places.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, if there be no objection, I ask unanimous consent that before the count by tellers is resumed the report upon the concurrent resolution be read.

There was no objection.

The report (by Mr. MEYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to investigate and consider the subject of the rank, pay, and other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy, have the honor to make the following report:

The importance of the subject has been continuously recognized by the Navy Department and by preceding Congresses, and has remained unacted upon, except in special instances and by piecemeal only, for want of time and proper concert of action. With the growth of the *material* of the Navy, the necessity of reorganization is becoming yearly more pressing. Inasmuch as it is impossible to deal adequately with the subject by reference to one branch of the service, or with regard to especial cases, it is deemed that a joint committee, empowered to investigate fully and thoroughly and as a whole, can most satisfactorily ascertain the best method to remedy the difficulties of the situation.

Various measures have been proposed for the reorganization of the service, or a part of it. These can all be thus considered in special relation to each other; and by this means Congressional action will rest upon a broad basis of the requirements of the whole Navy, instead of fragmentary reforms affecting only particular branches of the service.

Much conflict of opinion exists as to the organization and status of the staff of the Navy, which should receive further legislative action. This is more especially the case with the Engineer Corps, some maintaining that the present authorized force is greater than needed; others that the number is inadequate and that an enlargement is necessary. The contention being, in the first instance, that skilled and trained engineers are needed mainly for the purposes of construction and scientific work on shore, and that a separate corps of sea-going engineers, drawn from the most competent members of the machinist grade, would prove sufficiently efficient, under the general supervision of the line officers. The great ocean steamers, such as the Paris, the Campania, and others, are handled most successfully and at the highest speed, not by the scientific, but by men who have been trained as, and who have the practical skill of, machinist. England, whose actions and systems are based upon the most careful investigation and are the result of the most practical tests, is gradually, it is claimed, coming to the plan of relying upon machinists for engine-room duty on her war ships; and it is now proposed to give them rank of warrant officers as a reward, and to inspire them with a higher sense of their responsibilities for their important duties.

On the other hand, it is claimed that scientific engineers and no others are competent to run modern engines. It is advanced, with much force, that a modern man-of-war is a vast and complex machine, needing intelligent and trained minds to insure a perfect working of all the parts, failure in any one of which may be fatal at a vital moment; and the sense of responsibility, the physical and nervous strain upon the engineer-officer charged with the care and supervision of this network of machinery is very great; his duties are not only of the highest importance, for upon him depends the efficiency of the motive power, but they are at the same time arduous and dangerous. Manual labor and subordinates are at his service, but he can not be everywhere, and he should have the assistance of men like himself, and commissioned like himself, to share his responsibilities. Our new vessels embrace all that is most advanced in high-class machinery. There are a multitude of engines and devices by means of which steam, electrical, and mechanical appliances are made to do the work of man; under this view, it would seem, then, to be a false economy to provide an insufficient number of officers to control them, and hazardous to rely upon any but men of the highest and most thorough training.

In reference to the line officers the argument in favor of measures for a change is strong, and must convince any impartial body that a radical modification of existing laws must be made to prevent the personnel of the Navy from becoming totally inefficient from congestion and paralysis; and a correct apprehension of the serious character of the existing evils, of their inevitable effect, must be followed by the admission that some immediate remedy is needed.

The causes of the present stagnation in promotion and efficiency are deemed as follows:

1. Owing to an excessive and enormous number of appointments as midshipmen in 1841, very few were made from that year to 1846, and these few have wholly disappeared. The survivors of 1841 date have very recently retired, and a cessation of retirements has followed, corresponding to the original cessation in appointing. This block to promotion has about disappeared; analogous to this cause of difficulty and operating in the same way, is the fact that the number of officers now remaining on the active list from those who entered between 1846 and 1859 is, owing to the civil war, considerably less than would normally survive. In consequence of this the annual retirements from the head of the list are now, and must for some years continue to be, below normal, and promotions correspondingly fewer.

2. By the act of August, 1882, a reduction of twenty-nine was made in the number of rear-admirals, commodores, captains, and commanders. This put a stop to promotion in taking away so many possible vacancies; and these being at the head of the list, the effect was felt through every grade. An immediate and absolute stoppage was avoided by a provision of the act allowing one promotion for every two vacancies; but the actual loss of promotion still exists, though the effect was distributed over several years. The grade of lieutenant-commander was reduced by six at the same time, with a similar effect upon all below it. The grades remaining smaller, the waste from them is less, and the yearly promotions consequently fewer; and, as the number now allowed in flag rank bear less than their proper proportion to the whole Navy, and are not adequate to the requirements of the service, the rate of promotion, under existing conditions, will, from this cause alone, continue smaller than it should be.

3. The most serious cause for stagnation and one affecting a part of the service to which the country must, in a very few years hence, look for its leading naval officers is this:

During the eight years preceding 1860, from 1852 to 1859, both inclusive, the number graduated from the Naval Academy was less than the annual waste. During this period occurred also the scrutiny of the list in 1855, in conse-

quence of which a large number of officers were removed from the active list and their places filled from the passed midshipmen of the Navy. The effect of this was to reduce the number of officers, below the grade of lieutenant, from 258 in 1854 to 78 in 1857; rising in 1861 to no more than 91, among whom are included all graduated midshipmen. Under this state of things the war came, bringing a great number of resignations from all grades of the Navy, creating at once a large number of vacancies in the grades from lieutenant upward, to fill which from the usual and proper sources of supply there existed only the meager provisions of 91 junior officers. The great necessary expansion to the fleet increased the embarrassment of the Department for officers, and particularly for watch and division officers, to meet the emergency. The comparatively simple character of the armaments of that day, and the fact that the enemy had no Navy with which to assume an active attitude, enabled the Government to supply its wants in a fairly satisfactory manner from the merchant marine; but, without in the least detracting from the zeal and maritime experience of the officers who flocked from the latter into the Navy, it was perfectly plain that such a lack of young men, trained to military habits and drill, would have been utterly disastrous had our ships been called upon to confront a regular service.

To the experience of actual want for watch officers is to be attributed the natural but most inconsiderate policy which prevailed from 1860 to 1867, inclusive, and to which the most serious features of the present distress are attributable, the numbers under instruction at the Naval Academy were kept at the highest possible limit, and the cadets pressed through to graduation with the utmost rapidity—the classes even being divided, according to the apparent ability of certain members to be pushed through in a shorter time than the average. On the 1st of January, 1865, when the war was about to close, there were 455 midshipmen in the Academy, of whom, and 31 others already graduated, a total of 486 had entered since the war began. In January, 1866, there were in the Academy 450, of whom 147 were in the lowest class. In that year 73 graduates entered the Navy. In January, 1867, the number at the Academy was 421, and in June there graduated 84. In June, 1868, graduated 78.

It should have been evident as a matter at the most of simple calculation, that the service could not, under any ordinary conditions of waste, absorb such large numbers and give them proper promotion. In 1862, the necessities of the war, and in 1866 a necessary reorganization, had each contributed to increase the numbers, and consequently the openings for promotion to graduates. The head man of the 78 who graduated in 1868 became a lieutenant in 1872, as did 15 others of his class, at an average age of 24. In 1893 they are still lieutenants at an age of 45. At the same time that this mass of graduates, so disproportionate to the probable openings of the future, were rushed into the Navy, the dates of 1860 and 1861, falling within the congested period, were further increased by the admission of a number of officers from the volunteer navy, whose services and proved ability were considered deserving of such recognition on the part of the Government.

Too few officers in one part of the list and too many in another, both operate to check promotion from below. The facts point to the same conclusion, viz: that in a healthily constituted service the rate of diminution in numbers from year to year should approximate to the rates calculated by actuary's rules.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

The condition of the Navy but ten years hence, if the present system continues, may be illustrated by the following:

1. Of those who entered the service prior to 1860 there are now 18 who will not have retired from age by the end of 1903. Calculation based upon statistics, made according to actuaries' rules, show that this number will be reduced in ten years to 12. These 12 will be the 6 rear-admirals and 6 of the commodores. Of the 295 now remaining who entered in 1860 to 1867, inclusive, 22 will retire from age, leaving 273. The latter number will, by casualties other than retirements from age, be reduced to not less than 180. This is also reached by calculation based upon statistics and made according to actuaries' rules. The senior of these 180, who will be at the head of the date of 1860, will be the seventh commodore; and the junior, who will be at the foot of the date of 1867, will be the forty-fifth lieutenant-commander. The latter officer will have been in the service thirty-five years, and if entered at the age of 16 will be 51 years old.*

If the rate of advancement at this point of the list be placed at 10 per year (and this is a large allowance), this officer will reach the grade of commander 39½ years after date of entry, and at the age of 55½ years. He will have 6½ years more of active service, during which he will pass through the grades of commander, captain, commodore, and rear-admiral.

2. Seventy-seven commanders, all the lieutenant-commanders (74), and 22 lieutenants, entered the service within a period of three years. Twenty-five years ago the senior of these commanders was at the head of the list of lieutenants (that is 2 numbers higher than the junior of these lieutenants now is.)

3. Part of the date of 1861, the date of 1862, and a part of the date of 1863, that is, practically, 2 classes, fill the entire grade of the lieutenant-commanders through which it has taken the senior 10½ years to pass.

4. The twentieth and eighty-fourth commanders are one year apart in date of entry. The difference between the dates of their commissions as commanders is twelve years and six months.

5. The head of the date of 1861, is a commander of seven years' standing; the foot of the same date is No. 10, on the list of lieutenant-commanders. If the latter be promoted in one year there will be eight years difference in the dates of commissions of two officers having the same length of service.

Many similar illustrations might be cited, but this is deemed sufficient.

In considering the effects upon the Navy of the existing conditions of the lists, which are partially illustrated by the examples just cited, the committee wishes to give prominence to the evident truth that the great aim of every system of naval promotion should be to produce thoroughly efficient commanding officers. The gathering of all the powers of a military command within the hull of a single moving body, making them wholly dependent for their exertions upon its movements, invests with singular importance the functions of the officer to whom those movements are intrusted; and the ability of any subordinate to use successfully the particular weapons committed to his charge rests ultimately upon the manner in which the captain handles the ship, and the position in which he puts her.

It is also historically established that from the conditions of sea warfare the control of an admiral over the individual vessels of his fleet has been, in battle, less than the control of a general over the divisions of his army. This is due to many conditions, but chiefly to the necessity of immediate action in naval battles, which does not allow time for the transmission of particular orders in an emergency. This condition, which has always obtained, is much enhanced by the greater power of movement possessed by modern vessels, and it can safely be affirmed that, while very much will depend upon the first tactical combinations of an admiral, the combat will mainly be determined by the power of initiation upon the part of captains to meet those emergencies of combat which the admiral can not possibly foresee.

So much depends upon the captain's skill, and that skill is made up of many factors, the presence of some of which, it must be confessed, can not always be affirmed before tested in battle. The highest order of fearlessness, readiness, and presence of mind are only revealed by trial. But one factor, and that of the greatest importance to the average man, can be known and assured, and that is practice—the habit of commanding and directing the movements of a ship. Granting average original aptitude, and upon such an average only can general dispositions be based, the subsequent ability to command will depend almost wholly upon the opportunity for commanding. This implies, of course, a sufficient length of time in command rank, and recognizes implicitly the aptitude of youth to acquire habit, and the growing indisposition of advancing years to rise to tasks and responsibilities unknown to its earlier age. This implicit recognition should receive explicit avowal by prescribing a minimum age at which command rank should be reached, as well as by providing a proportion of vessels adequate to impose constant practice of sea service and drill upon officers in command rank.

Unquestionably much might be accomplished in the direction of giving command at an early age, and so insuring the necessary habit by a system of purely personal selection, similar to that employed habitually in private business life; but independently of the difficulty of recognizing, in time of peace, the best men for war, it is not possible to supply in governmental selection (unless in war) that pressure of immediate personal interest in the efficiency of the person selected, which, in other pursuits, corrects the tendency of favoritism. This is especially true in our country, where the infrequency of war places military interests at a discount, and, even in military affairs, tends to allow political influence to preponderate over military. It is certain that the apprehension of this predominance mainly accounts for the repugnance heretofore manifested in the Navy to promotion by selection.

Nevertheless, selection of some sort and by some rule must be applied if command rank is to be reached at an age when responsibility can be assumed and readily formed, and the habit of command readily formed and efficiently acquired. A selection by age is already operative in almost every naval service. In our own, for over twenty-five years back, the retirement of officers at 62 has been a practical selection against them and in favor of their juniors.

Under some form of qualifications a selection by age or by length of service based upon average ages seems to be the means best suited to obtain the great desideratum, the one thing absolutely essential to an efficient service, viz, command at a specified minimum age, assuring a career as captains and admirals of an average sufficient length of time to give a well-formed habit of command and practice in handling ships among the officers of those grades. Unless selection in some form is practiced, it necessarily follows, from the promotion of officers under command rank to those holding it, that, with the best distribution of numbers among the grades, promotion by seniority alone will gradually advance the age at which command is reached, until a condition of block will recur similar to that now existent. The latter is simply an enormous exaggeration, a caricature, of the evils resulting from promotion by seniority alone.

The effects upon junior officers, junior, that is, in rank up to the verge of late middle life, can scarcely be understood by those unfamiliar with the service and the recognized theory of a captain's responsibility. The theory is that the captain is always on duty and at all times responsible; whatever is done by another is, so far as responsibility goes, done by him. This theory, which is apparently inseparable from the unity essential to all military command, works in two ways. The captain shrinks from permitting to others, his juniors, the charge of movements. If harm results he will be responsible to the Department. The junior shrinks from assuming any responsibility without the express permission, which the captain is unwilling to give. Thus is unconsciously but inevitably formed on the part of the junior a habit of constant reference, in cases of even slight difficulty, to the judgment of another, and of constant disregard of his own judgment. Upon promotion to command rank the change of position is violent, but the old habit remains; and if the change takes place late in life the habit will not be thrown off with the ease of earlier years, if at all. If it remain in the common form of self-distrust, lack of confidence in one's own judgment, it constitutes a very serious defect in that efficiency of the commanding officers, to produce which has been asserted to be, as it undoubtedly is, the great aim of any system of promotion.

"I consider it a great advantage," wrote the late Admiral Farragut, "to obtain command young; having observed as a general thing that persons who come into authority late in life shrink from responsibility, and often break down under its weight." (Life of Admiral Farragut, page 81.)

By the conditions thus shown the United States Navy has reached a state of things which during the next twenty years must exist in a most aggravated form. Nor is this all, for the officers who thus reach command and flag rank at a very advanced age will also have so short a period to remain in them they will neither have time to change their habit, nor the inducement to do so, arising from a reasonable length of active career before them.

It is, therefore, now high time to seek and apply a remedy. If much longer delayed the efficiency of our Navy will assuredly be jeopardized.

ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY.

Much can be and should be done to improve the status of the enlisted men of the Navy. Under the present method and system the service offers but few if any rewards for them. They are its bone and sinew, and yet the opportunities for advancement are more difficult than exist under many of the monarchical governments of the Old World. However high may be his qualifications, however great his zeal and worth, even though he may possess and have acquired all the attributes essential for an officer's duties, a commission is denied him. A petty officer's badge, or at the most the warrant of a gunner, is the extreme limit of his preferment.

The American youth of spirit, proud of his country and its free institutions, finds no allurement in a service which thus bars to him its glittering and highest prizes. Promotions from the ranks are quite frequent in the Army, and these opportunities have undoubtedly attracted a better element into its ranks. Why should we not, in democratic America, apply a similar system to the Navy?

Now, our vessels are manned mainly by foreign seamen. Our American boys of stamina and spirit will not enlist unless they see some hope, some encouragement that an officer's commission is not beyond the reach of the meritorious seaman.

MEASURES OF ENCOURAGEMENT TO REMAIN IN THE NAVY.

Some system of retirement after long and continuous service would make it more attractive, and by some such action a remedy may be found for the present necessary employment of foreigners and aliens to man our warships. The Navy of our country should be manned by its loyal and patriotic youth, representing its best progressive manhood, a bulwark of strength and moral force, such as contributed to its glory and success in its earlier history, and which gave to its ranks a John Paul Jones, and a Bainbridge, a Hull, and a Preble.

Your committee recommend the passage of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers will resume their places.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 130, noes 8.

*All quotations of present number of officers from the Navy Register of January 1, 1893.

Mr. KILGORE. No quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called and the following-named members failed to respond:

Abbott,	Crain,	Jones,	Richardson, Mich.
Aitken,	Dalzell,	Joy,	Robinson, Pa.
Apsley,	De Forest,	Kem,	Ryan,
Babcock,	Dunn,	Kribbs,	Scranton,
Baker, Kans.	Edmunds,	Lapham,	Sherman,
Baldwin,	El is, Ky.	Lisle,	Sickles,
Belden.	Epes,	Livingston,	Sipe,
Bell, Colo.	Fellows,	Lockwood,	Snodgrass,
Bell, Tex.	Fithian,	Maddox,	Somers,
Bower, N. C.	Fletcher,	Magner,	Springer,
Bowers, Cal.	Forman,	Maguire,	Stallings,
Branch,	Funston,	Marsh,	Strait,
Brattan,	Gerry,	McCall,	Swanson,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Gillett, Mass.	McCleary, Minn.	Talbott, Md.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Goodnight,	McKaig,	Tarsney,
Brown,	Graham,	McKeighan,	Tawney,
Bunn,	Gresham,	McNagny,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burnes,	Grosvenor,	Meredith,	Tyler,
Bynum,	Hammond,	Millik en,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Caminetti,	Hare,	Money,	Wanger,
Catchings,	Harris,	Neill,	Warner,
Chickering,	Hartman,	Newlands,	Washington,
Childs,	Heard,	O'Ferrall,	Wever,
Clark, Mo.	Henderson, Ill.	Page,	Wheeler, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, Iowa	Paschal,	Williams, Miss.
Cockran,	Hendrix,	Pence,	Wolverton,
Cogswell,	Hooker, Miss.	Pendleton, Tex.	Woodard,
Compton,	Hooker, N. Y.	Powers,	Wright, Pa.
Conn,	Hopkins, Ill.	Ray,	
Cooper, Wis.	Hopkins, Pa.	Rayner,	
Cousins,	Houk, Tenn.	Reed,	

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union having had under consideration a concurrent resolution of the House providing for a joint committee to investigate the personnel of the Navy, had found itself without a quorum, whereupon the Chairman had directed the roll to be called, and now reported to the House the names of the absentees.

The SPEAKER. The roll call showing the presence of a quorum, the committee under the rule will resume its session.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, as it is within three minutes of the time, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be considered as having expired.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOLVERTON, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. LIVINGSTON, for this day, on account of sickness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill known as the bankruptcy bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair.

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill (H. R. 139) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has an hour and a half; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] an hour and forty-three minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I had agreed to divide the time remaining to me into three parts; but the gentlemen with whom I had made the division have declined to take the part allotted to them, and insisting that it shall all be consumed in a single speech against the pending bill, they have very kindly devolved it upon me to close the discussion for our side.

In almost every community in this land to-day there are men hopelessly involved in debt—so hopelessly, indeed, that their creditors indulge no reasonable expectation of receiving any payment; and the unfortunate debtors themselves, realizing how impossible it is to pay everything, are making no effort to pay anything. Many of these men are energetic, intelligent, and honest; but under this enfeebling paralysis of debt their energy, their intelligence, and their integrity, are lost as factors in the progress and development of their country. Each year increases their number and their despondency, and appeals to us more strongly to deliver them from a bondage which is almost as humiliating as personal servitude itself. I conceive that Congress was authorized to enact a bankrupt law to meet precisely a condition of this kind; and while I can not agree with gentlemen who maintain that because the power has been granted to Congress the Federal structure is therefore incomplete until it has been executed, yet I do believe that if there was ever any wisdom in conferring the power at all, there has seldom been greater need of its exercise than there is at the present time.

It is true, sir, that the country has not recently experienced one of those sudden and violent financial shocks which sometimes overwhelm thousands in a single convulsion; but within the last fifteen years we have suffered several stringencies, all of them more or less severe, and each counting its own victims, until the aggregate has grown to be a very considerable one. Even now we are undergoing a pressure which, though not as acute as others may have been, yet, when considered with reference to its length as well as its severity, it is almost unparalleled in our history. These "financial perturbations," as the President calls them, have stranded many thousands of industrious and enterprising American citizens and left them in a condition where their only refuge from their creditors is a bankrupt court, and their only hope of an opportunity to earn and save a modest competence is a beneficent and wisely guarded bankrupt law. The passage of such a law can work no possible detriment to the creditor, because as matters now stand the debtor will not and can not pay. But if you unfetter his strength and he can hereafter accumulate property, though he hold the judge's certificate of discharge, that does not prevent an honest man from paying his honest debts.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the phase of the question upon which it is my purpose to dwell, because I am confident that a majority of this body are as deeply impressed as I am with the necessity for some proper measure of relief. There are, however, some very radical differences among us as to what constitutes a proper measure of relief; and that is the point to which I desire to address myself during the time that I shall occupy the attention of the House.

Before proceeding to specify what I regard as the vices of the bill under consideration, I will endeavor to briefly state what I consider ought to be the principal object and essential condition of all bankrupt legislation. In the first place, the law ought to be intended primarily for the benefit of debtors; but having emancipated them from their burdens, it ought then, of course, to provide for a fair, cheap, and speedy distribution of their assets among their creditors. I am perfectly sure that eight-tenths of the disinterested men in this country who would vote for a bankrupt law at all would vote for it upon this theory; and it was my own concurrence in it which has prompted me to introduce a bill without any provision for involuntary bankruptcy.

That bill was in such strict conformity with this view, it was so explicit in its terms, and would have been so simple in its operation, that the most serious criticism which the committee have ventured to make upon it is that it blends State and Federal jurisdiction. Mr. Chairman, if that objection is well founded, it is a fatal one; and I would be the first man in this House to insist that no other merit could be sufficient to overcome it. But, sir, if that is the most convincing argument which its adversaries can urge against it, I do not think that it will be a very difficult task to vindicate it against their attack.

The bill provides that any debtor owing $200 or more may make an assignment, valid according to the laws of the State, Territory, or district where he resides, and as to property situated elsewhere, valid according to the law of the place where such property is situated. It further provides that this assignment shall include all of the debtor's property except such as may be exempt from forced sale under the law of his domicile, and shall be for the benefit of all his creditors without preference, except as to debts due for labor and to the State and General governments.

It further provides that a debtor having made this assignment can then file his petition in the Federal courts, alleging under oath a full compliance with the law and praying to be discharged from all further liability for his debts. His creditors are cited to appear and are offered the opportunity to contest his right to this discharge. The Federal court has no more control over the debtor's property than it might have over the property of any insolvent debtor under our existing laws. The only question submitted to it for its determination is the single and simple question whether the debtor has complied with the law in making his assignment. If he has, the judge must discharge him; if he has not, the judge must refuse to discharge him. But in either event the administration of the bankrupt's property is conducted exactly as that of an insolvent assignor to-day. Questions may arise pending its disposition which could be adjudicated either in the State or Federal courts, according as the interested parties might select the one forum or the other. But

while this is true under the bill which I have presented, it is not one whit more true than under our present law.

This bill necessitates no change in the forms of practice and pleading now prevailing in the various States; it does not alter in the remotest degree the time, the place, or the manner of settling insolvent estates; it creates no new office, fixes no new charges upon the property, and establishes no new crime. It simply provides that when a debtor has surrendered all of his property for the benefit of all his creditors he shall be entitled to obtain a judgment of acquittance in the Federal court, because the Federal court alone has the power to pronounce such a judgment. How any gentleman can bring himself to believe that this mixes State and Federal authority I confess is entirely beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to say that the bill which I have introduced—but for which I claim no credit, because it is the same bill which was introduced in the Fifty-first Congress by my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CULBERSON]—is one of the shortest, simplest, least vexatious, and most economical bankrupt laws ever proposed in this or in any other country, and at the proper time I shall offer this bill with some additions and omissions as a substitute for the pending measure.

I assume, sir, that if all debtors were honest there could not be found a Representative on this floor who would contend for the cumbersome, complex, and costly system of involuntary bankruptcy provided for in the bill of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] as against the simple, brief, and inexpensive system of voluntary bankruptcy provided for in the bill which I shall offer as a substitute. But gentlemen have witnessed the occasional dishonesty of a debtor, and in order to protect creditors from their fraud, have worked themselves up to the point of advocating a measure which can be used to the great injury of honest men. I abhor dishonesty as much as they do, but the difference between me and them is that I esteem it infinitely more important to protect the honest debtor than it is to punish the dishonest one. Besides this, there is already in every State in the Union a law for the collection of debts and for the punishment of dishonest debtors, and I am not willing to add another one which can be and will be employed to oppress and ruin honest and responsible merchants. But, Mr. Chairman, there is nowhere any law under which an honest but unfortunate man can give up his property and be released from all of his debts; and therefore I am willing to vote for one and give these men a fair chance to begin life over again.

I am not perfectly certain, sir, but what the substitute is even better calculated to deal with dishonest debtors; for it appeals to their selfishness and offers them a reward for being honest. It places them in this situation: before they can apply for a discharge they must make a surrender of all of their property. If they act honestly in this transaction they receive their release. If they act dishonestly their property goes for the benefit of their creditors and they are still bound for the balance of their debts. Environed thus I believe that even the dishonest debtor would, as a general rule, disgorge because he will perfectly understand that honest behavior will bring him his release, while dishonest conduct would absorb his property without canceling his debts.

Passing from this hurried review of the bill which I think the committee ought to have favored, but which they have recommended should lie on the table, and coming to the bill which they have reported with a favorable recommendation, I shall confine myself chiefly to a discussion of its second section, because that embraces its most obnoxious features.

It is pertinent, however, to observe in this connection—and this is my answer to the invitation so frequently extended by the gentleman from Alabama, that if we do not like the bill in its present form we ought to amend it—that these objectionable clauses are so interwoven with the entire text, and partake so closely of the nature of the bill that it is impossible to remove them by amendment, because the bill is prepared in consonance with their spirit and to serve their purposes, and any material change in this particular would involve a complete revision of his whole plan.

Taking the provisions for involuntary bankruptcy in the same order in which they appear in the bill, we find that the very first subdivision recognizes three distinct and separate grounds, and each ground independent of all question of the debtor's solvency or insolvency, and without reference to his conduct, at the time the suit may be instituted. Clause 1 provides that—

An act of bankruptcy shall consist of his having within six months prior to the filing of a petition against him (1) concealed himself, departed or remained away from his place of business, residence, or domicile with intent to avoid the service of civil process and to defeat his creditors.

Five months ago a debtor might have found himself in a position that he did not want to face a judgment and he absented himself. He is back at his home to-day, coming in and going out of his place of business, with all of his property in full sight of the officers of the law; and yet if a creditor is willing to allege that five months ago he concealed himself, or that five months ago he departed and remained away from his place of business to avoid process, they can make him a bankrupt and administer upon his solvent estate.

CLAUSE 2.

The second ground is that a "debtor has failed for thirty days while insolvent to secure the release of any property levied upon under process of law for $500 or over, or if such property is to be sold under such process then until three days before the time fixed for such sale and until a petition is filed."

This second clause presents, if possible, a more serious objection than the first; and the principle which it involves is simply this, that whenever a man finds it impossible to meet his debts as they mature, his property shall be taken from his possession and control, and although he has made and is making no effort to conceal it, or to defraud his creditors, and although he has done and is doing no dishonest act, yet simply because he is unfortunate and can not release that part of his property which has been levied upon, he is to be deprived of the management of his entire estate, and it must all be devoted to the tedious, expensive and wasteful process of administration in a bankrupt court. The hardship of that section becomes more apparent when you reflect that on many occasions a man's property is attached upon disputed claims. In some States his property can be attached in action of tort, and yet it is written in this bill of abominations that unless he releases the part of it which has been attached, his entire estate must be put into bankruptcy, and he himself disgraced as a dishonest trader.

Many lawyers of great ability and learning have doubted if Congress does not exceed its power when it enacts a bankrupt law which includes a case like this, and they contend that a bankrupt law, as understood by the men who framed our Constitution, contemplated involuntary bankruptcy only in the case of fraudulent conduct on the part of a debtor.

The debate on this provision in the Convention of 1789 was so very meager that no satisfactory conclusion can be drawn from that. Indeed, the only two expressions which I have ever been able to find were, first, the very brief statement of Mr. Sherman—

That bankruptcies were in some cases punishable with death by the laws of England; and he did not choose to grant a power by which that might be done here.

And the equally brief statement of Mr. Morris, that—

This was an extensive and delicate subject; he would agree to it, because he saw no danger of abuse of the power by the Legislature of the United States.

It is certainly true that in England bankrupt laws were originally intended to reach dishonest and absconding traders, and they were regarded as penal in their nature. It was this circumstance which provoked Lord Coke to declare that the English people had "fetched as well the name as the wickedness of bankrupts from foreign nations."

The Federal judge for the district of Missouri, in an elaborate opinion, held the law of 1841 unconstitutional, upon the ground that the only kind of a bankrupt law which Congress could pass was one modeled upon the English system, but Mr. Justice Catron, of the Supreme Court, subsequently announced a different rule, and declared that the Constitutional Convention had in view the State laws as well as the English statutes. My own opinion is that the power of Congress over the subject is, within its other limitations, plenary; but, waiving all question as to the extent to which Congress may go, I affirm that it is a gross abuse of the power to provide that an honest man, simply because he is unfortunate and finds himself unable to pay his debts, shall be dragged into the courts and made a bankrupt against his will. There is not a gentleman on this floor who does not very well understand that there has always existed, and always will exist, a prejudice against a man who once becomes a bankrupt, and every honest citizen ought to be spared that odium unless he is willing himself to attach it to his name. The debtor's misconduct ought to be punished: but it is wanton cruelty to aggravate his misfortunes by supplementing his pecuniary losses with the stigma of involuntary bankruptcy.

CLAUSE NO. 4.

Clause No. 4 makes an assignment without preference, and for the benefit of all creditors alike, a ground for involuntary bankruptcy. In other words, it makes an act which is now lawful in every State in this Union, a ground for this harsh proceeding. If this bill should become a law, an insolvent debtor might owe citizens of his own State, and might have sufficient property to pay such a per cent of his indebtedness as is provided in the State laws shall be sufficient to discharge him; and yet, if he were to make an assignment of all his property for the equal benefit of all his creditors, stripping himself even of his exemp-

tions and leaving his wife and children homeless, yet under this bill his creditors could force him into a bankrupt court without the slightest allegation of fraud against him.

Surely a moment's reflection will deter this House from subjecting an unfortunate man to this criminal process for having done a perfectly honest and lawful act. What good reason can be given for such a course? Statistics show that creditors receive better dividends from assignments made under State insolvent laws than they do under Federal bankrupt laws, and it can not, therefore, be possible that this procedure is expected to directly secure better financial results. What then can be the purpose of it? Is it an indirect result which they aim to accomplish? The true explanation of it is that the bill will subject the retail dealers of the country to a species of judicial duress, and it can be used to coerce them into doing the wholesale merchant's bidding. If the retail debtor refuses to comply with the wholesale creditor's demand, it transfers the controversy to the Federal courts, and this fact is relied on to bring the recalcitrant debtor to terms. For years there has been a growing tendency in all of the great centers of trade to decry State tribunals and State laws, and many gentlemen of the bar who have been extensively employed by wholesale merchants have joined in this unjust and indiscriminate disparagement of the courts in their own States. This deliberate effort to destroy public confidence in the State judiciary has been repeated so often, and with such emphasis, that many men have come to doubt both their justice and their wisdom. This bill crystallizes that sentiment into law, and its evident purpose is, as its inevitable effect must be, to denude State tribunals of their proper jurisdiction, and to concentrate the entire commercial business of the country in the Federal courts. This means that the fees which have heretofore gone to the support of State and county officials must henceforth go to the vast army of functionaries which it creates. This would be bad enough if it stopped here, but this is not all, nor is it the worst. The change is pregnant with a greater mischief. It remits all questions arising out of mercantile transactions to Federal judges for decision, and this means that the whole body of our commercial law is to be revolutionized.

I may exaggerate the importance of this point, but unless Democrats have been playing the demagogue in their immemorial resistance to the extension of the Federal judiciary, it is not easy to compute the possibilities of evil with which this bill is fraught. It ought to be styled a bill to convert Federal courts into debt-collecting agencies.

CLAUSE NO. 5.

Clause No. 5 is an effort to legislate, in an indirect way, against a practice which many of us believe to be hurtful, but which may or may not have the slightest reference to the solvency or misconduct of the man who engages in it. If there is any desire on the part of Congress, and if Congress possesses the power to suppress trading of this kind, it ought to be done in an open and direct way, and not be made a part of a bill which has no necessary connection with the evil.

CLAUSE 6.

Clause 6 provides for involuntary bankruptcy where the debtor attempts, either by an assignment or by process of law, to give one creditor a preference over another.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a legislative decree that hereafter all debts shall stand upon exactly the same footing. As for my part, I do not belive that it is true in morals, and I do not believe that it ought to be made true in law, that all debts are of equal obligation. Certainly all of them bind the conscience of the debtor to pay them if he can, but there has been an almost unanimous agreement among men for centuries that debts contracted for trust funds, and debts incurred to creditors who have dealt with the debtor for his accommodation and not for their profit, are of higher sanctity than other debts.

Indeed, I can conceive a case where both debts are contracted in the usual course of trade and where profit was equally the incentive of both creditors, and yet any honest man would prefer to pay one rather than the other. The instance which presents itself to my mind is this: If I owed $5,000 to a man who possessed nothing else and I owed $25,000 to a man who was many times a millionaire, and I found myself in such a situation that it was impossible to pay them both, I would not hesitate a single moment about my duty. I would pay the man who would be reduced to poverty by my failure to pay, and I would leave unpaid the man who could suffer the loss without the least inconvenience, or even an abatement of the luxuries which he now enjoys.

There is still another case, and one of frequent occurrence. It often happens that a business man finds himself embarrassed by being unable to readily realize upon his property. In such a contingency he goes to some friend, lays before him his financial condition, and solicits the advance of a sum sufficient to tide him over his present difficulties, and the friend consents to aid him upon an agreement that if the debtor finds it impossible to safely adjust his matters, he will under all circumstances protect the man who loans him the money, not for profit, but purely for the sake of helping him. If you make an act like that a quasi criminal one, as this bill does, thousands of honest merchants will hereafter find themselves forced into bankruptcy because they could not procure an accommodation at the critical time when it would have saved both their credit and their fortune.

And again: It frequently happens that one man indorses for another without the least thought of pecuniary advantage, and I undertake to say that there is not an honest man who does not feel in his heart that the debt upon which his friend is security is of higher obligation than the one to some other man which represents less than the profits which were made on the transaction in which it was given.

Permit me to state an illustration that will enforce my position better than any argument I can make. Suppose the gentleman from Alabama had bought a piece of property in the city of Birmingham three years ago for $50,000 and that he had paid $20,000 in cash, and given his three notes for $10,000 each, stipulating that the failure to pay one should mature all. When the first became due, he found it impossible to meet it, it was extended until now and the creditor demands payment; but in the depressed condition of the market he can not pay; the creditor in default advertises and sells under his deed of trust, and bids it in—as he easily could do at the present time—for $20,000, thus leaving a balance due upon the notes of $10,000, and the interest. Now mark the result of this.

The creditor was paid $20,000 when the property was purchased, but under the depreciation in market values he has been able to keep the purchaser's $20,000; to buy the property in at a forced sale, and to leave the purchaser still in debt to him. Now let us go a step further and suppose that when the gentleman was raising the $20,000 to make the initial payment, he found it necessary to borrow $5,000, and a friend had indorsed his note for that sum. It is impossible for him to pay that note on which his friend is security and to pay the $10,000 balance on the property.

Will any man contend that the creditor who has his $20,000 in money and the property also should be permitted to share the remnant of his estate equally with the creditor to whom his friend is an accommodation indorser? The question answers itself. There may be men who will vote to let him do so, but there is not a man amongst us who will have the hardihood to rise and say he ought to do so.

But, sir, there is a stronger case than all these. Suppose a widow, feeling her incompetence to manage her own affairs and realizing how helpless she would be if her little fortune should be swept away, were to intrust it to her dead husband's friend, thinking it would be safer with him than with other people. His business might then be prosperous and he might not be willing to impair his credit by recording a mortgage for her security. Indeed, his condition might be such at that time as to render such precaution unnecessary, and yet the whirligig of Time, which brings in his revenges as well as his revenges, might soon reduce the prosperous merchant to the point where he found it impossible to pay all of his debts. Will any man insist that the New York wholesale merchant who had dealt with him for years purely for the profit of his trade, and who had realized immense profits upon his sales to the unfortunate debtor, should be paid equally with the widow?

Will any man contend for such a proposition as that? The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], in the course of his speech upon this subject at the last session, said, with some show of indignation, that the law recognizes no distinction between rich and poor creditors, and he seemed to think that a satisfactory answer to this suggestion which I then made. But the gentleman misunderstood my proposition. I have never said and I do not now say that the law ought to establish these distinctions, but what I said then and what I say now is, that the law ought to permit the debtor himself to make them if he desires to do so. This is no innovation. It is no novel doctrine. It is consonant with the principles of the common law, which during its long growth of centuries has attained the perfection of reason as well as of justice. If he is right, then, sir, the wisest judges and the most upright chancellors that ever adorned the bench in this country and in England have for two hundred years been wrong, but if I err, I do so with men in whose company it can be no discredit to be found.

The difference between us is perhaps more a difference of legal training than of moral fiber. The gentleman from Louisiana was trained in the civil law, which regards the property of the debtor as a trust fund in which all his creditors must equally share. I studied the common law, which permits a man in failing circumstances to discriminate among his creditors and to prefer those having the highest or most peculiar claims upon him.

I am willing that a debtor who prefers one creditor over another should be denied the benefit of a discharge from the debt which he has postponed. But when we have gone this far we have gone far enough. In ordinary cases the desire to be relieved will be an ample inducement to prevent all preferences, but in extraordinary cases the debtor should be free to judge the moral obligation upon him, and if in respecting that he pays one creditor and leaves others unpaid, it is sufficient to exclude him from the benefit of the law.

I think an American citizen ought to be left some option even in dealing with his creditors. I do not believe he ought to be reduced to a state of pupilage, or put in a judicial strait-jacket and compelled to do everything according to the directions of a statute. I believe in allowing him some choice; and if you deny him the benefaction which the Constitution has provided he may enjoy, unless he consents to let the rich, who possess no especial claim upon him, share equally with the poor, to whom he owes everything and who would be ruined by a failure on his part to meet his obligations to them, then I believe that most of the honest debtors of this land would prefer to remain in their present condition.

These peculiar and extraordinary cases will occur, and they have occurred in the lives of most of us. Many of us have been under obligations which we would have canceled, if in so doing we should leave ourselves steeped in poverty to our lips for the remainder of our lives; and I simply plead for the right of the American citizen to respect the moral obligations which all men must recognize and every man ought religiously to keep.

CLAUSE 10.

Clause 10 probably finds its proper place by coming last, for it is the crowning infamy of an infamous section. It provides that an insolvent person who has suspended and not resumed for thirty days the payment of his commercial paper, aggregating $500 and over, may be made a bankrupt. It has been attempted to mitigate the rigor of this section by a special definition of the word "insolvent," in what has been aptly called "the dictionary" of this bill. In the bill as reported to the last Congress, this clause stood exactly as it now appears, without any attempt to define "insolvency."

Under it as then proposed, 80 per cent of the business men in America to-day could be despoiled of their property. Not that I intend to say that 80 per cent of our business men are insolvent within the ordinary meaning of the term, but I do say that more than 80 per cent of them are insolvent within the meaning of that word as understood in bankrupt legislation. It does not mean that a man must have less property than enough to pay his debts, but within the meaning of a bankrupt law any man who can not meet his liabilities from day to day and from time to time as they mature, is insolvent.

In order that there shall be no misunderstanding on this point, I desire to read to the House a paragraph from a decision of the Supreme Court, made in the case of Buchanan *vs.* Smith, and reported in 16 Wallace. The court in that case declared:

> Insolvency in the sense of a bankrupt act means that the party whose business affairs are in question is unable to pay his debts as they become due in the ordinary course of his daily transactions.

In view of the well-settled definition of "insolvent" within the meaning of a bankrupt law, the friends of this bill have been compelled to substitute the vague and indefinite one, that "insolvent" "shall hereafter mean that a man has not sufficient property at a fair valuation to pay his debts." The objection to this is that during a time like this, which is the very time when men would be most threatened with these proceedings, a "fair valuation" of any man's property would be less than one-third its value under ordinary circumstances.

Gentlemen do not need to be admonished that the courts will exercise no liberality toward the debtor in construing this provision. On the contrary, the construction is certain to be against the debtor's interest. I say that it will be under this law, because we all know that it was under the other law. They went so far in construing the word for which this definition is now a substitute as to give it a meaning in bankrupt proceedings entirely different from its meaning in the other transactions of life. The court itself declares in Toof *vs.* Martin, 13 Wallace 47:

> The term "insolvency" is not always used in the same sense. It is sometimes used to denote the insufficiency of the entire property and assets of an individual to pay his debts. This is its general and popular meaning. But it is also used in a more restricted sense to express the inability of a party to pay his debts as they become due in the ordinary course of business. It is in this latter sense that the term is used when traders and merchants are said to be insolvent, and as applied to them it is the sense intended by the act of Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. I submit, then, that it is a fair inference if the Supreme Court gives the word "insolvent" a different meaning when applied to bankrupt proceedings from what it possesses in ordinary transactions, by the same rule they must construe "fair valuation" more strictly in bankrupt proceedings than in other lawsuits. Assuming that to be true—and it is certain that it will be true—then it must follow that many solvent and responsible men will be embarrassed whenever a financial crisis like the present overtakes the country.

Mr. OATES. What does my friend say about the rule of interpretation which requires a statute which is in derogation of rights under the common law to be construed strictly or latitudinously?

Mr. BAILEY. The decision from which I have quoted was rendered in a statutory proceeding; and if they construed the term in derogation of the common law in that, why would they not be expected to construe it the same way in reference to the same character of a statute?

Mr. OATES. But the language used in this provision is different and more liberal.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; but the courts have established the rule that certain words mean one thing in ordinary transactions and another and different thing in bankrupt proceedings.

Mr. OATES. This bill——

Mr. BAILEY. I must decline to yield. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama, but it will be impossible, even if I am permitted to continue without interruption, to conclude the argument I had desired to make.

Mr. Chairman, fortunately we are not left to speculate as to what will be the effect of such a law in such a time as this. We are justified in asserting that it will embarrass many responsible men, because it, or rather a milder law did embarrass many responsible men throughout the country under similar circumstances. In proof of this I send to the Clerk's desk an extract from the message of President Grant transmitted to Congress in 1873, and I especially commend this to the Republican side of the House. The Clerk will please read what I have indicated with pencil marks.

The Clerk read as follows:

> I have become impressed with the belief that the act approved March 2, 1867, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," is productive of more evil than good at this time. Many considerations might be urged for its total repeal, but if this is not considered advisable I think it will not be seriously questioned that those portions of said act providing for what is called involuntary bankruptcy operate to increase the financial embarrassments of the country. Careful and prudent men very often become involved in debt in the transaction of their business, and though they may possess ample property, if it could be made available for that purpose, to meet all their liabilities, yet, on account of the extraordinary scarcity of money, they may be unable to meet all their pecuniary obligations as they become due, in consequence of which they are liable to be prostrated in their business by proceedings in bankruptcy at the instance of unrelenting creditors.
>
> People are now so easily alarmed as to monetary matters that the mere filing of a petition in bankruptcy by an unfriendly creditor will necessarily embarrass, and oftentimes accomplish the financial ruin of a responsible business man. Those who otherwise might make lawful and just arrangements to relieve themselves from difficulties produced by the present stringency in money, are prevented by their constant exposure to attack and disappointment by proceedings against them in bankruptcy, and beside the law is made use of in many cases by obdurate creditors to frighten or force debtors into a compliance with their wishes and into acts of injustice to other creditors and to themselves. I recommend that so much of said act as provides for involuntary bankruptcy on account of the suspension of payment be repealed.

Mr. BAILEY. The President suggested the entire repeal of the law, but concludes that if it is not deemed advisable to attempt this that at least there should be stricken from it the provision similar to the one which I am now discussing. I submit to the dispassionate judgment of the House whether they are willing to incorporate into this law a provision more drastic than the one which the President advised Congress to eliminate from the old law. Gentlemen, I do not doubt your sincerity or your integrity, but I do doubt—and you must pardon me for doubting, your capacity to make the worst bankrupt bill ever submitted to Congress produce better results than the better laws which have gone before it.

This section of the bill contains another and a very serious danger. It invites a man's enemies to take advantage of a time like this and to drive an honest debtor of ample resources either to sacrifice his property or become a bankrupt. I have in my mind at this moment a gentleman who owns more than a half a million dollars' worth of property, consisting largely of valuable lands, and who owes less than $200,000, and yet under this bill he could be forced into bankruptcy and his splendid fortune wasted.

Ah, but gentlemen say his creditors would not proceed against a man in his condition. That does not satisfy me. I am not willing to put it in their power to do so, because a creditor's generosity is not always a safe reliance. Some of them are just and liberal, but many of them are cruel and vindictive, and the worst among them can easily set the machinery of this law in motion.

Mr. HUDSON. They are generally the men that do it.

Mr. BAILEY. And they are generally the men who do it, as my friend near me suggests. The motives of revenge frequently impel a creditor as well as other people, though the committee

seem to have wrought themselves into a belief that creditors are men of surpassing magnanimity, and in their report, written last year and ratified this year, they fall into a poetic mood, and with hearts overflowing in compassion for the unfortunate, they repeat Portia's beautiful and famous panegyric on mercy.

I regret that the distinguished gentleman in charge of this bill should have missed the moral which that great play was designed to teach. With all of his sordid love for gold, a still stronger passion possessed the mind of Shylock. It could not have escaped an attentive reader that it was not the money which moved the Venetian Jew to insist upon the hard conditions of his bond; for he refused that thrice over. It was his desire to be revenged on Antonio, who, as he said, had rated him about his usuries and railed against his sacred nation. [Laughter and applause.]

It is as true to-day as it was in the time of which Shakespeare wrote—indeed, that marvelous-minded man inculcated none but enduring truths—and it is as true now as it was then that the creditor is sometimes as remorseless in his study of revenge as he is in his pursuit of gain.

There are other provisions in this bill equaling in their outrage the ones which I have enumerated. On page 11 they reestablish the barbarous custom of imprisonment for debt. It is true they do it under another name, and they call it a detention; but it is none the less true that it restrains the American citizen from coming and going as he pleases; and this though he is guilty of no crime and is charged with none. His creditors may file an involuntary petition against him, may take his property from him, destroy his business, ruin his credit; broken down and humiliated among his old friends and at his old home, he might desire to seek a new place in which to rehabilitate himself and regain his fortune, and yet one of these same creditors who had inflicted this unspeakable distress upon him could file an affidavit that the debtor was about to leave the district, and that his departure would defeat the proceedings, and the judge would forbid him to go.

He may sit for weeks at the bedside of a sick child, watching the roses fade out of its cheek and the light die out of its eyes, and he may have spent what little the law, in merciful exemption, had allowed him, and when it is gone he dare not go to find a new employment because the judge has forbidden him to leave the jurisdiction of that bankrupt court.

I do not want to be offensive to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], but he will permit me to marvel that, in the evening of the nineteenth century, there can be found an American Democrat who will champion a provision of such heartless cruelty as that.

Not only will they detain the bankrupt against his will while they divide his property among his creditors, but even after a full trial and a solemn discharge from all further liability for his debts the relentless creditor still has two years in which to reopen the question and recommit the debtor to a condition of bankruptcy. It has been asserted that this is the law in other cases, but I take it that no man who is careful of his reputation as a lawyer will be willing to express that opinion in the records of this Congress. If it were the general law, then there would be no need for it as a special provision in this bill, but it is not the law in any other instance and it ought not to be the law in this.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], in a colloquy with my colleague [Mr. KILGORE], demanded to know if my colleague thought that a man who had obtained his discharge by fraud or perjury ought to be permitted to enjoy it. My colleague very promptly answered no, and I join him in that answer. But I am not willing to stop there, because that is entirely too narrow a view of the question. I concede to the gentleman from Louisiana that a man who has obtained his release by fraud or perjury ought not to have the advantage of it, but it is equally true that a man who has been honestly discharged ought not to be subjected to a second suit by an implacable creditor. The perjured man ought not to go free. The honest man ought not to be vexed a second time. It is impossible to permit a reopening of the question in order to uncover the dishonest debtor without at the same time providing the dissatisfied creditor with an opportunity to persecute the honest debtor. Therefore, I say, the matter having once been fully tried, that ought to be an end of it; and in this opinion I am sustained not only by the reason and the justice of it, but by the decision of the highest courts in this and other countries.

The Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon this question in the case of The United States *vs.* Throckmorton; and as ready as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] may be to dispute with my colleague about a legal proposition, I assume that he will not be swift to differ with the Supreme Court of the United States, especially when it follows the authorities both in this country and in England.

One of the earliest cases in England, as I recall it, was a case in which a direct and absolute perjury had been committed as to a question of value, and it was sought to set aside the judgment because it had been obtained by the perjury of a partner of the successful litigant; but the court said: "It must have been known that the question of price would be an issue of fact in this case, and the parties ought to have been prepared to prove it; and the case will not be reopened."

The main question here is the fraud of the bankrupt. That is the very issue in the proceeding to discharge him; and yet they provide that after the matter has been fully tried, creditors can go back into the court and say they want it retried. Twenty-three months after the first trial, when the discharged bankrupt has gone about his business and accumulated more property, the rapacious creditor can say to him, "Bring it back into the bankrupt court. You were not fairly discharged in the first instance." And this law requires the debtor to come back and bring his property with him.

I commend to the gentleman from Louisiana the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States against Throckmorton. It declares:

> There are no maxims of law more fully established and more valuable in the administration of justice than the two which are designed to prevent repeated litigation between the same parties in regard to the same subject matter.

And after quoting the two Latin maxims that "it is to the public interest that there shall be an end to litigation," and that "no man should be vexed the second time in reference to the same question," it then goes on to say:

> But there is an admitted exception to this general rule in cases where by reason of something done by the successful party to a suit there was in fact no adversary trial or decision of the issue in the case. Where the unsuccessful party has been prevented from exhibiting fully his case, by fraud or deception practiced on him by his opponent, as by keeping him away from court, a false promise of a compromise, or where the defendant never had knowledge of the suit being kept in ignorance by the acts of the plaintiff, or where an attorney fraudulently or without authority assumes to represent a party and connive at his defeat, or where the attorney regularly employed corruptly sells out his client's interest to the other side, these and similar cases which show that there has never been a real contest in the trial or hearing of the case, are reasons for which a new suit may be sustained to set aside and annul the former judgment or decree, and open the case for a new and a fair hearing.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> On the other hand, the doctrine is equally well settled that the court will not set aside a judgment because it was founded on a fradulent instrument, or perjured evidence, or for any matter which was actually presented and considered in the judgment assailed.

I have here the case of Smith *vs.* Lowry, reported in the first volume of Johnson's Chancery Reports. It is a leading case and Chancellor Kent lays down the same doctrine. The Supreme Court of the United States, in a long discussion of the question, quotes the decision of Chancellor Kent with approval. I have here the celebrated and leading case of Green against Green, reported in 2d Gray's Mass. Reports; and it holds the same doctrine. It is the uniform and unvarying rule of all the courts that after a full hearing the decision shall conclude the matter between the parties; and yet these gentlemen, in their anxiety for creditors and in their determination to despoil the debtors of the land, have reversed the rules which were framed for the repose of society and which have stood for a hundred years.

They do not stop there. In the very next section of the bill they insert another innovation for the creditor's benefit. Section 15 provides that—

> The liability of a person who is a co-debtor with, or guarantor or in any manner a surety for, a bankrupt shall not be altered by the discharge of such bankrupt.

That would be just and reasonable and in accordance with the well-settled principles of the common law if it simply provided that the surety should not be discharged when the principal obtained his own release by a voluntary bankruptcy; but it is a principle as old as the law of suretyship and as just as it is old, that when the payee himself and by his own conduct discharges or procures the discharge of the principal he can not then recover from the surety. Under this bill, however, the creditor can drag the debtor into a bankrupt court, can waste his estate, can release him from all his obligations, including his obligation to reimburse his surety, and yet he can still hold the surety upon a contract which on his own application the law has annulled.

All this makes it manifest that the bill is a creditors' bill; but if any further evidence were needed to satisfy any sensible man on that point it could be found in the methods of procedure which are legalized. In this part of their work the authors of this iniquity have exhibited a facility in hedging about the debtor that would do credit to the devilish ingenuity of the monks of the feudal ages. They have provided that almost everything that the court can do at all can be done summarily and without giving the defendant a fair opportunity to prepare for his defense. The bill says that "upon the filing of an involuntary petition process shall issue and shall be returnable within fifteen days".

Three hundred miles may intervene between the place where it must be served and the court to which it is returnable, but after it is returnable the defendant has only ten days in which to plead. Then they provide that in controversies pending upon appeal they shall within ten days after they are returnable, be set down for hearing at a day as soon as possible. In the case of appeals or writs of error they shall be taken within ten days after the order from which they are taken has been granted. All through this bill, Mr. Chairman, there runs this heartless purpose to do this brutal work with as much dispatch as possible.

All the other business of the courts must wait upon these bankrupt proceedings. Yes, sir, the orphan may hunger while the faithless guardian withholds her portion; the American citizen may languish in a common jail awaiting his tardy trial upon a false accusation; the condemned man may stand within the shadow of the scaffold, but all these must wait the law's ordinary course and its disheartening delay, while the clamors of a conscienceless creditor must be heard and determined with almost indecent haste. [Applause.]

Aye, sir, and more; the judge must always be ready to pass upon these questions—"in term time and in vacation." His court must never close, but its doors, like the gates of hell, must stand forever open to receive their victims, and it is fitting that over their archway should be written the inscription which the imperial imagination of Dante traced over the portals of the Inferno: "All hope abandon ye who enter here." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I appeal especially to the Democrats of this House. Are you willing to vote for a law like this—such a law as the Democratic party in all its history has never dared to pass? Every party that has ever obtained control of the Government has passed one except the Democratic party. The first bankrupt law was passed by the Federalists in 1800, and by its terms it was to continue in force for five years, but it was so unpopular that it was repealed in less than three years by a vote of 99 to 13 in this House. The Whigs, having been swept into victory on the great tidal wave of 1840, signalized their accession to power by the enactment of the bankrupt law of 1841. It was argued in favor of the law that conditions had changed, and that what might have been unwise and inexpedient in 1800 might be extremely desirable in 1841. The passage of that bankrupt act contributed more to the destruction of the Whig party than any other single circumstance except their disagreement with President Tyler. The law became so abhorrent to the country that absolutely the same Congress which passed it repealed it within eighteen months. In 1867 the Republicans enacted their bankrupt law. In six years after its enactment their great leader and chieftain, in a solemn message to Congress, advised its repeal. You have tried three involuntary bankrupt laws. You have tried them at three different periods in your history. You have tried them under three different conditions. You have tried them under the administration of three different sets of officers, and every one of them has proved a signal failure.

In the face of that history, I appeal to you, will the Democratic party, in the present condition of the country, pass the only bankrupt law that it has ever been inclined to pass, and that the worst law that anybody has ever dared to propose? Will you do it? If you do, the consequences shall not be upon my head.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning there ought to be some relief measure passed. Let us try to frame such a measure. We know that an involuntary one will not do, because we have tried it and found it wanting. Let us try what never has been tried in the history of this country—a simple voluntary bankrupt law, under which an honest man can give up all his property and be emancipated from all his debts. I am willing to take my share of responsibility for the trial of a measure of that kind, because if it does disappoint the people in its results, they can not charge us with the infatuation of disregarding all the lessons of history.

I am exceedingly anxious to see this Congress pass a bankrupt law, and while I would prefer to have one purely voluntary in its character, yet, rather than have none at all, I am willing to yield something. Indeed, I am willing to yield everything which can be safely yielded without sacrificing the solvent debtors of the land in an effort to relieve the insolvent ones; but anxious as I am to lift from the shoulders of worthy and helpless citizens the great burden which is crushing out their manhood and their spirit, I can not and will not vote for this bill, because it is certain to destroy more men in the future than it can possibly save at the present time.

It is intended for the benefit of creditors, with scarcely more than incidental benefit to debtors. In other words, and in plain words, sir, it uses the power vested in Congress to enact a bankrupt law merely as a predicate on which to construct a worse than Federal attachment law. I say it is worse, for the very good reason that it permits involuntary bankruptcy for causes where the laws of no State have ever permitted an attachment, and those who invoke its aid against their debtors are not required to give a bond, as they are in attachment cases, and are not amenable in damages for the wrongful institution of their suits.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill must pass, for God's sake let us end this disgraceful farce of legislating always in the name of the debtor and for the benefit of the creditor—mocking one with an empty profession of our good will and giving to the other the law which his avarice craves. It may be, sir, that the creditors of this land are entitled to additional remedies in the collection of their debts; it may be that the debtors deserve to be harassed with new and penal statutes, but if so let us boldly proclaim the fact, and like men let us meet our responsibility for acting in accordance with it.

If we can not be wise and we will not be just, let us at least be bold; for courage more than half redeems a sin. Let us discard the miserable and false pretense that this bill has been framed and is supported in the interest of the debtors, and let us avow what all of us know to be the truth, that it is intended for the better security of men to whom all the courts are now open and whose process all the officers of the law are ready and willing to execute. That is its object. Many gentlemen have been candid enough to say so. Ah, sir, throughout the entire course of this debate it has been iterated and reiterated that the passage of this bill is demanded by the business interests of the country. That many wholesale dealers demand it, I have no doubt; but I do most seriously doubt if it finds any favor with millions of conservative retail dealers scattered all over the land.

I do not believe that it can promote the real commercial prosperity of all classes and of the whole country. But even if I thought it would accomplish that result, I could not be reconciled to its support in its present shape, because it violates in many particulars what I deem to be the fundamental principles of natural and political justice. It subordinates the highest interests which can concern a people like ours to the mere matter of collecting the trader's dollars and cents. That, sir, is not the kind of legislation which commends itself to my judgment. In fact there is no tendency of this time better calculated to alarm the thoughtful and patriotic observer than the disposition manifested everywhere—in legislative assemblies as well as in business circles—to regard money-making as the chief end of law making, and material progress as the surest means to make a nation great and render its institutions perpetual. This mercantile spirit is a withering curse, and the people whom it once enthralls are lost. It is a political leprosy whose deadly taint never has been and never can be eradicated, and I am not ready to hand over the laws and customs of my devoted country to its baleful influence.

I am not insensible to the advantages of national wealth and commercial supremacy, but all the fabled riches of the Orient multiplied a thousandfold, and the unrestricted commerce of every land and of all the seas are not comparable to that peace and that content which consecrate the hearts of a brave and free people to the service of a just and frugal government. [Applause.] We are already consuming too many of the vital forces of individual and national life in this nervous and ceaseless struggle to become richer. Instead of yielding to the tendency, the legislator's first and highest duty is to resist it, and reverse it if it still be possible to do so. We need to be educated in an opposite direction from that in which we have been going for thirty years. We need to know that opulence breeds idleness, and idleness breeds decay. Strive as we will, we can not altogether subdue that greed which has been the bane of all free governments, and which infects the blood of a republic with a poison more fatal than all the precepts and examples of communists and madmen.

There is among the traditions of Venice a beautiful legend of a wonderful painting by Michael Angelo. As I recall it now, it tells the story of how a young girl, after years of patient waiting and vain entreaty for her father's consent to a marriage with the man she loved, finally despaired, and stepping from a gondola she sought to bury herself and her sorrow beneath the waters which make the streets of her native city. She was rescued by a stranger, to whom she revealed her grief, and who, becoming interested in her fate, interceded upon her own and her lover's behalf. The father was inflexible. The great artist guessed the secret of the old man's opposition to be that the boy was poor, and asked if the marriage could be consummated when the youth had acquired a competence. The father said "no;" but his looks returned a different answer. As they sat there discussing the young people, the wonderful genius took from his pocket a tablet and with fingers defter than ever touched a canvas he drew the picture of a miser's hand and holding it up to the old man's astonished gaze he wrung from his unconscious lips the startled exclamation, "Why, that is my hand! That is my hand!" And so it was. With its grasping and eager lines, with its palm half open as if waiting to catch a shower of gold, it portrayed the miser's ruling passion. Angelo gave it to

the disconsolate lover and told him to sell it to the library of St. Mark's; and its price became the ransom of a true and noble wife. In after years that picture became the most famous of that famous collection; and historians say that it helped to make the vice of avarice still more detestable in that republic.

We need some new Angelo in this age and country who, gifted with a divine inspiration, can put upon the painter's canvas the hideous features of modern greed and help us to relearn the lesson which our sturdy and self-reliant fathers taught, that freedom is better than commerce, and justice is better than gold. [Loud applause.]

Mr. OATES. Mr. Chairman, in rising to close the general debate on this bill I intend to review briefly the most pungent charges which have been made against the measure. Having charge of this bill as the representative of my committee, I have a duty to perform; and I am going to discharge that duty fairly. I intend to review the most salient features of objection that have been interposed to the measure; and I invite the attention of gentlemen to what I have to say.

THE "BULLS" AND "BEARS" OF LEGISLATION.

We have in this country, as I suppose there are in every other, two classes of statesmen or legislators. The one class are the originators, those who frame and introduce bills of an important character, or endeavor to perfect bills originated by others, for the benefit of all the people over whom and on whom such legislation operates. Those who undertake to do this usually have a most difficult task to perform. Those who succeed in obtaining the enactment of laws for the benefit of mankind are in fact the Franklins, the Morses, the Fultons, and the Edisons of legislation. Some who have sufficient inventive genius or originality of thought do not possess the courage to withstand criticism. These originators are unfortunately fewer and further between than those of the other class, which is composed of gentlemen many of whom make much reputation simply by being in the negative and exercising their ingenuity not in inventing or introducing measures, but in defeating and tearing down those originated by others. The Democratic members of this House have so long been accustomed to doing battle in the negative that they can not realize that the laboring oar of legislation is now in their hands and they are expected to do something for the relief of the people. One class I may characterize as the "bulls" and the others as the "bears" of legislation.

Now, who is entitled to the most reputation? Which of the two has the more difficult task in earning a reputation? Infinitely the first. Many men can fit themselves for negative work with but little preparation or study. They do not have to originate anything, except to study criticisms and rules by which they can embarrass others who undertake to originate important legislation. Suppose that we were all of this class? It is hard to originate and build up, but comparatively easy to tear down and destroy. I do not claim to be distinctively either, but if we were all of this negative class we would certainly carry out the doctrine of some gentlemen that the wisdom of legislation is to do nothing at all. If that were the case, what would become of the country? That some legislation is necessary all will admit.

MR. BAILEY'S MISAPPREHENSIONS.

I have listened to this debate very attentively; and my young friend who has just preceded me I am glad to say has not misrepresented so many of the provisions of this bill, nor to such an extent, as many of his more experienced associates in opposition who have preceded him. But I wish to notice a few of the misrepresentations or misconceptions made by him. And I want to say just here that in replying to the criticisms and objections made to the bill I do it in the best of spirit and not with the intention of wounding the feelings of any gentleman, for I respect all.

Now, my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has compared the bill, or the spirit in which it was constructed, to that of Shylock; and said that I and others who advocated the bill had not read that play to advantage; that the animus of the Jew was not to obtain his money, but to gratify his malice. Well, it may have been delightful to the gentleman to have used this figure of speech, but how much truth is there in it? Is there a man here who believes that anyone who will record his vote for this bill has the slightest possible particle of malice toward anyone in so doing? Where is the creditor who wants legislation in order to enable him to use it as a gratification of the mean passion of malice? Why, the comparison is utterly inappropriate. It has no application whatever to the question before us, and therefore I shall not consider it in connection with the bill.

What a creditor wants is his money, and where is the creditor who does not want his money? That is the great stimulus of all of us so far as our connection with business affairs is concerned. That is the stimulus that moves the wheels of government and of all human institutions. But we certainly are agreed that, as the representatives of an honest people, we will only do our duty if we undertake to pass any law affecting debtor and creditor so that it will operate justly and not harshly upon either. What right have we as legislators, in view of justice, to assume the cause of either the debtors or creditors as such? What we want and what we should desire is the enactment of law which will do justice as far as it is within the limits of human power to administer justice between man and man.

On the question of the speed or haste with which this law is to be executed, said my friend from Texas, "It is indecent," and that remark was met by the applause of some gentlemen who have not studied to any great purpose the bill or the facts of legislative history in this connection in the United States or elsewhere.

Why, my friends, look at the judicial systems of your States. They are not to-day as they were when you and I were born. There is a constant spirit of progress, and there ought to be. Some of the newer States are found to be far in advance of the older ones for the speedy administration of justice.

Take California, for instance, the furthest west where the creditor brings his suit in the court of common law to recover his money. The debtor must respond in ten days or an office judgment goes. The case is at issue, and if a jury is demanded it is drawn and the trial proceeds; and yet, according to my friend from Texas, that would be "indecent haste." The Constitution of my State declares that justice shall be administered without sale, denial, or delay; and that declaration is found in most of your State constitutions. Is it carried out when the courts are postponed and creditors are denied the right of bringing their suits and having them heard until the claim is so old that it has become worthless? Speedy administration of justice is called for in the States, and yet the opponents of this bill denounce it and call ten days ("or such further time as the court may allow") "indecent haste."

Mr. Chairman, in their criticisms made by the gentleman from Texas and several others who preceded him, they have taken occasion to comment upon section 8 of the bill which provides that—

a bankrupt shall be exempt from apprehension upon civil process, except upon a warrant from a court of bankruptcy, (1) unless the same is founded upon some debt or claim from which his discharge in bankruptcy would not be a release—

And the comment is made that this is imprisonment for debt without inquiry as to what it is from which he is not released, or in what case a debtor may be arrested. I never in my life favored imprisonment for debt. On the contrary, I have ever vigorously opposed it. It was a barbarous practice, and I rejoice that it has been abolished. Can any man read the story of Dickens' chancery prisoner and afterwards favor imprisonment for debt? It was a barbarous practice. And then—

(2) When in attendance upon such a court or at the first meeting of his creditors, or when actually engaged in the performance of a duty enjoined by this act or prescribed by order of court.

The disobedience of that would be contempt of judicial authority, and that may always be dealt with; and to deprive the court of it is at once to set up in opposition a disrespect to our courts, which would render them unable to administer justice.

The debts from which they will not discharge are such as a man owes which are of a fiduciary character, such as guardian and trustee, and some others named, which no bankruptcy law should discharge.

Some of the newspapers have denounced those who support this bill as being absolutely wanting in humanity because it is said they favor imprisonment for debt. This has resulted from the grossest kind of ignorance or malice.

Section 8 further provides:

b The judge may, at any time after the filing of a petition by or against a person and before the expiration of six months after he has been adjudged a bankrupt, upon affidavit of any party in interest that such bankrupt is about to leave the district and—

Not as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] said, if he had a sick child that he could not go to it, but in cruelty is to be held and let his child die without ever seeing it, but—

upon affidavit of any party in interest that such bankrupt is about to leave the district and that his departure will defeat the proceedings therein—

That is, in that case; then what?

issue a warrant to the marshal directing him to bring such bankrupt forthwith before the court; if upon hearing the evidence it shall appear to the judge that the allegations of such affidavit are true, and that it is necessary—

What then?

He shall order such marshal to keep such bankrupt in custody, but not imprison him, until he shall be released or give bail conditioned for his appearance, from time to time, as required by the court and for his obedience to all lawful orders.

Is that imprisonment for debt? Why, it negatives the idea and says he shall not be imprisoned. It is simply a detention of him when he is about to depart from the jurisdiction of the court, and such departure or running away will defeat the proceedings against him; when that fact is shown by affidavit, and

that his departure would defeat the proceedings in the cause, if he does not negative it he can be held, but not imprisoned, yet the manufacturers of facts say it is imprisonment for debt when they know better. Then he is to be brought before the court, and the court then and there inquires into the allegations of the affidavit to see whether they be true. If not true, or if the man had a dying child outside of the jurisdiction of the court, and was to show or to make affidavit to the court that that was his object in going, where is the judge who would require his detention? There is no one so inhuman. I have opposed imprisonment for debt all my life and always will.

It is an easy matter to pervert the English language so as to make it mean just the reverse of what it does mean, and the enemies of this bill have been most artful therein, though it is the only measure yet brought before Congress for the relief of the debt-burdened people.

All I ask is that you look into it and give it its true meaning; and all through this bill, if you find that in the drafting of it a mistake has been made, so that on a fair construction it conveys a meaning contrary to that intended, or one which will operate harshly against justice to either creditor or debtor, or any party in interest, you will have an opportunity when I conclude my remarks to correct that error by amendment. I intend to propose some amendments myself.

No man is so perfect, and no number of men are so perfect that they can draft a bill of sixty-odd pages of print and have every clause and provision free from error. There may be some error discovered by such a number of learned gentlemen as we have here in this House; and I, as the custodian of this bill, for this purpose, am ready to meet gentlemen and discuss every proposition, and if anything is shown to be erroneous, I will myself offer an amendment to correct it.

But I shall not follow my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] or others who have preceded him in the discussion of the details of the bill, which properly come up as we reach the paragraphs under the five-minute rule. That is what that rule is for, and as the sections are read, if any gentleman has a criticism to make upon anything that is found in any paragraph, let him make it. Let him offer his amendment and I am ready to give the reasons of the members of the committee who favor the bill, why it should be sustained; and then it is for the Committee of the Whole and the House to determine whether they will have that provision or not. Well, I assert that from my examination of this measure, it contains no harsh provisions. If so, they have escaped my attention.

I do not claim to be the best lawyer in the country, but I am a lawyer of some experience, and in the last Congress the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOLVERTON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK], and myself spent the greater part of our mornings for two months in the examination of this bill and in perfecting amendments to it, most of which were adopted by the committee. The full committee originated some others and after three months' consideration reported to this House a substitute for the original Torrey bill, which I had opposed in the form in which it had been presented in the Fifty-first Congress. The substitute was free from the objectionable features of the original bill, which Mr. CULBERSON says was a Republican measure because it was introduced into the House by a Republican.

NOT A POLITICAL MEASURE.

Now, I wish to say a few words about the political aspect of this matter. I was astonished that my learned friend from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] should assert that this was a Republican measure or a political measure. I have never heard of a bankruptcy bill standing in that attitude heretofore. The great reputation of my friend ought to have led him to observe that in the past politics have had nothing to do with bankruptcy bills and ought never to have any.

This reference to the political aspect carries me beyond the few years that I have spent in this House. From my earliest connection with the Judiciary Committee, more than ten years ago, a bill upon the subject of bankruptcy has been before that committee; usually has been reported by a majority thereof to this House and considered, and on one occasion it was passed through this House. Sometimes the bill has been in charge of a Democrat and sometimes in charge of a Republican. That never seems to have entered into the question; and the members of the committee are divided always upon these measures, and so is the present committee, but not on party lines. Some of each party favor and some of each oppose the bill; not by their political faith, but by their peculiar views of the measure.

My friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] says the first bankruptcy bill was passed by Federalists. I will not undertake to discuss that, though one of the ablest commentators who lived in that day, Judge Story, declared that that was a good law, but that it was repealed before it was ever given a fair trial, so the country could not judge of its effect.

I will call attention to this fact, that at that day the condition of this country did not demand any such legislation as it does now. It was sparsely settled, and States greatly distant from New York and Massachusetts, for instance, were not connected as they are now by railroads, telegraphs, and telephones.

The States then, commercially as well as otherwise, were distinct and different communities, distant from each other. To-day, while every State has and ought forever to retain every right not delegated by it to the Union, yet Congress ought to exercise the power conferred by the Constitution to enact a bankruptcy law which will be a just and equitable uniform judicial regulation of commercial dealings throughout the Union. A mere voluntary law is one-sided, inequitable, and subject to great abuse.

This whole country has become one in a commercial way. These instrumentalities have connected the most remote States so that the space or distance between them is practically annihilated. They are brought near together and their commercial interests are such that, in my judgment, there ought to be one wise, judicious system extending to the whole of the forty-four States, the Territories and the District of Columbia rather than to have them judged by different systems of commercial law.

In 1841, when the bankruptcy bill was under discussion (it may be that I have read a little further than my friends on the other side of this question, who assert that it is a political measure), it was said by them that it was passed by the Whigs. It was not. The Whigs triumphed in the election of their candidate, who lived but a short time, when Mr. Tyler succeeded, became a Democrat and approved the bill.

VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY.

In the great debate which occurred upon the law of 1841 in the Senate, I have read what was said by the great lights of the time—Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and Benton. When my young friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] asserts that the substitute which he is going to offer for a system of voluntary bankruptcy is new, the gentleman betrays the fact that he has not read that great debate, or he would have found that Clay and Webster used all the power of their eloquence in favor of a bankruptcy law of a voluntary character merely, and that Calhoun spoke against any voluntary law, and declared that under the Constitution Congress had no power to pass any except an involuntary law; and that is in accordance with the holding of the judge in the case cited by the gentleman from Texas—the Missouri case.

Mr. Calhoun took that position on the ground that when the Constitution was framed authorizing Congress to enact a uniform system of bankruptcy, that it was in view of what was bankruptcy in Great Britain at that time, and which had extended to this country before the Revolution and freedom of the States from the rule of that country—and that was involuntary; while Mr. Benton, according to my recollection, favored the bill with both clauses in it; and what was the result? Notwithstanding the eloquence of Clay and Webster in favor of merely a voluntary law, they were overruled, and a law was passed with the involuntary clauses as well as voluntary clauses.

Why is it that every legislative body in this country that has ever passed upon the question has placed in the bill both kinds, voluntary and involuntary? It is because a sense of justice required them to do it, and because a purely voluntary law would ruin the credit of debtors. While we all sympathize with the poor debtors and want them to have a means of escape from the burden of debts that is crushing the life out of them, at the same time we can not turn a deaf ear to justice and turn our backs upon honest creditors, leaving them to be robbed of what they possess by dishonest schemers and give them no remedy whatever?

MR. STOCKDALE'S MISAPPREHENSIONS.

Another attack that was made, and furiously made, by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] on this bill was that in the first chapter of it there was a dictionary clause. I have heard that dropped out by some others as an objection, who have asserted that the bill was a wonderful product, and that this dictionary clause is ominous of the evil it contains. "Why look at the cussed thing; it has got a dictionary clause in it." I simply say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have here the code of his own State, and he will find in chapter 31 a definition of rules much more extensive than the dictionary clause of this bill. What has he to say to that? He is familiar with the code of his own State, I presume. Does he condemn it as a thing of evil because it has a "dictionary" chapter? I have here also the code of Alabama, in the first chapter of which is a dictionary of the definition of terms. This bill, in setting forth the definition of terms used in the bill, has but borrowed from well-digested codes of the States throughout the Union that which is necessary in order to make certain its language and to free it from difficulties of construction.

NOT "PATERNALISM."

Now, another feature that I wish to notice for a moment. My friend and distinguished colleague [Mr. DENSON], a good lawyer and an able speaker, saw proper to assail this as a measure of paternalism; and that was copied by my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. Is it paternal? What is paternal-ism? The power which a State exercises is paternal, because all legislative powers not delegated to the Government of the United States by its Constitution nor reserved from the Legislature of the State is vested in the Legislature of the State to be exercised over the domestic affairs of the people. The State's powers are original and those of Congress are derivative.

The legislation of Congress is paternal only when it exceeds its powers and undertakes to regulate the domestic affairs of the people where you can find no grant of power in the Constitution to do such things. Read the Constitution of the United States, where it says Congress shall have the power to enact a uniform system of bankruptcy, and then say if this measure is paternal. It is nothing of the kind, and no one who fully understands the application of the word and wishes to be fair in argument will say that this bill is paternal.

Indeed, there is not a particle of paternalism in connection with it. It is a Constitutional measure, and the question first to be considered is whether our country is now in a condition requiring that such legislation should be enacted, and secondly whether the bill is a proper exercise of the power which we have beyond all question.

THE NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION CONCEDED.

My young friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] conceded, and most of the gentlemen who have been heard against the bill have conceded, that they would like to see some kind of bankruptcy legislation by this Congress, but generally they want it restricted to voluntary bankruptcy.

In other words, these gentlemen, overflowing with sympathy for the poor people, desire an instrumentality by which those people, both the honest and the dishonest, can be freed from all their obligations, while creditors must depend for the vindication of their rights upon the ordinary processes of law. Why, gentlemen, this bill is intended to be not for to-day or to-morrow, this year or the next, but a permanent enactment. Some have said, "Oh, you can not do that, because we have tried it three times, and every one of the bankruptcy laws heretofore passed was shortly afterwards repealed." And they attribute that result to the inability of Congress to enact a satisfactory law upon the subject. I maintain that some Congresses have sufficient ability among its members to do it, and it remains to be seen whether this one has. I have had occasion to look somewhat into the history of those laws.

Most of the gentlemen who oppose this bill say that it is in the interest of the creditor class and is intended to oppress the poor, which is not true. It is chiefly demanded by men who are at the same time debtors and creditors; it is also demanded by those who are only creditors or debtors. I have received private letters from numbers of gentlemen who would welcome the passage of such a law as a relief to them or to their friends; and I may remark that, as a general proposition, it is true that there are always more of the creditor class asking for bankruptcy legislation than of the debtor class. Another fact which some gentlemen here may not have thought of is this: every one of our bankruptcy laws was repealed either for false political reasons or at the instance, not of the debtor, but of the creditor class.

The act of 1867, which was passed, as has been stated, by a Republican Congress soon after the close of the war, was repealed at the instance of whom? Of the debtor class? Not so. You never heard of a debtor who had been discharged under that law who complained of it. Men were discharged under that law from the burdens of debt that hung over them, and which would have kept them ground down for the balance of their days. It was the creditors who complained, and they had a just right to complain. Especially in the Southern States had they that right, for it was in reconstruction times, and the Federal officials in many courts in those States, regardless of the provisions of the law, stole and appropriated to their own purposes the funds belonging to the estates of debtors which should have gone to the creditors.

The creditors in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and other cities, mostly in the North, complained bitterly against the administration of the law in the Southern States, and it was repealed at their instance. My friend [Mr. DENSON] and myself, who were then practicing lawyers, know that in our State that law was badly administered, not against the debtor, for in some cases, through the officers of the courts, corrupt bargains were made with debtors who were thus allowed to retain more of their property than they ought to have had, and also obtain a discharge from their debts.

Mr. DENSON. And will my colleague state whether some of that, at least, was not done with the connivance of the judge?

Mr. OATES. I have no defense to make of that judge.

Mr. DENSON. Do you not know that he said that bankrupt court was never established for the benefit of creditors but simply to administer the estates of the debtors for the benefit of the officers of the court? [Laughter.]

Mr. OATES. Well, that was Dick Busteed, and everybody knows him. But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that, fortunately for the country, the same state of affairs does not exist to-day. We have better men for judges and also for court officials generally, infinitely a better class of men than we had at that time. Throughout the Southern States—I wish to speak of them because my friends who are fighting this bill most strenuously are from the South—throughout the Southern States the judges are mixed in politics, and as a general rule, I believe, are honest men, without regard to their politics.

Alabama has one Democratic judge and one Republican; Georgia has one Democrat and one Republican. There is a vacancy now in Louisiana. Missouri has two Democratic judges. In South Carolina there is one Democratic judge, the only judge they have. In Texas there is one. In West Virginia there is one, the only judge they have. Then, in several of the Northern States there are Democratic judges. But among the Republican judges I know of none at this time such as we had when the last bankruptcy law was in force. Besides, under that law relatives of judges could be appointed to offices, which enabled them, if gentlemen will pardon the expression, to gobble up a large share of the estates that went into their custody. Under this bill the judge can not appoint as a court official anyone who is related to him within the third degree.

There are pains and penalties affixed in this bill to dishonest acts, and the compensation, except the filing fee, is not payable until the estate is administered. The court officials can not buy any of the property belonging to the estate of the bankrupt. All the avenues which they formerly traveled to robbery are closed by this bill.

MR. DENSON'S MISAPPREHENSIONS.

On the 24th of October last my honored colleague and friend [Mr. DENSON] said of this bill that it would reach all interests of this country of a financial or property character.

Sir, the gentleman has the reputation of being, as I said a while ago, a good lawyer, and I know he is; and how he could ever arrive at such an erroneous conclusion about the extent of the operation of this bill I am unable to see. Why, sir, its involuntary clauses can only be made to reach, if they should stand as they now are, two classes of people: those other than farmers and laborers who are insolvent and fail for a given time to pay their commercial paper, or being in such condition fail to release their property after thirty days when seized under legal process, and those who commit frauds upon their creditors. Sir, that class of business men and merchants who fail, according to the highest number given in statistical reports, have not in an average of thirteen years past reached 2 per cent. It is but a fair estimate that for the causes enumerated in the bill those subject to be proceeded against would be those who commit dishonest or fraudulent acts with reference to their creditors.

Well, sir, if a man is guilty of a fraud in fact, or a dishonest act, what is there in humanity which appeals to this Congress to shield him from the consequences of such act? According to the estimate of my colleague these cases must be so numerous as to reach perhaps 50 per cent of the population—a most egregious error in calculation.

Mr. DENSON. My colleague will allow me to state that my argument was based upon the remote effect which the bill would have upon the farmers, because of their indebtedness to these local merchants.

Mr. OATES. I am not through with the statement.

Mr. DENSON. And I can not see how it could be otherwise than oppressive to them in their present condition.

Mr. OATES. This measure would not reach 5 per cent of the people of my colleague's district, although he says it would ruin all of them. I think it would benefit them.

Then as to persons of the debtor class who may voluntarily apply for the benefits of this law, if, as the gentleman contends, this bill is to reach and affect all the interests of the country, that class must be equal to 50 per cent of the population. If they are all in debt and unable to pay, and all the property of the country is to come under the control of this bill——

Mr. DENSON. I will ask my colleague how he gets at the fact that only 5 per cent of my constituents would be involved?

Mr. OATES. That is my argument. I judge by past experience and all reasonable calculation.

Mr. DENSON. I say that 95 per cent of them would be.

Mr. OATES. I know; that is the difference between us upon

the facts. I do not see how anyone can rationally arrive at such a conclusion as my colleague has reached.

Mr. DENSON. I only wish the gentleman were right.

Mr. OATES. My colleague undertook to show, and did show by his assertions, that his constituents are in a terrible condition, covered with loads of indebtedness which they are utterly unable to pay—involved to such an extent that the passage of this bill would deprive them of their homes and all the other property they possess. Why, sir, there never was a greater mistake. This bill embodies provisions for the relief of honest people who are overburdened with debt, as my colleague pictures his constituents to be; and I do not see how any lawyer of his reputation can, upon a fair examination of its provisions, deny that it would bring to such people the relief which they so much need from their burdens. It was not under this law that they sank to the level where he represents them as being. They got there under the State laws; and he seems to oppose any law by Congress for their relief unless it be a law for the free coinage of silver.

Mr. DENSON. I certainly contend for the free coinage of silver.

Mr. OATES. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. DENSON. And inasmuch as silver has been demonetized, in part by your vote, I think you ought to relieve us now on this bankruptcy question and give us a fair chance.

Mr. OATES. I shall have something to say about that a little further on. I deny that my vote aided in demonetizing silver. It is not demonetized.

The gentleman opposes this measure because he says it tends to paternalism. There is no paternalism in it. For my part, I think he greatly overestimates the financial embarrassments of his people; but if his view be true, this bankruptcy bill which he so vehemently denounces (as I think, without justification in fact or logic) is the measure needed to give them relief. It would be to them a white-winged messenger of peace rather than an engine of oppression. It would give to the honest insolvents an honorable discharge from the mountain of debt which is now, according to my colleague's statement (much of which is doubtless true), crushing the life out of them. It would give to every man in his district a more extended credit than he can now secure, and thereby give an impetus to trade, develop an individual prosperity——

Mr. DENSON. If my colleague will pardon me, I would like to ask him this question: After the debtor has had all his property taken under the involuntary clauses of this bill——

Mr. OATES. I am coming to that.

Mr. DENSON. You say he may protect himself by voluntary bankruptcy. How would he have any money with which to start proceedings in voluntary bankruptcy?

Mr. OATES. The gentleman anticipates my argument a little.

Mr. DENSON. You put the vultures upon him, and then you abandon him; you do not give him a decent burial.

Mr. OATES. I will come to that a little further on.

It would give to every man in his district a more extended credit than he can now secure, and thereby give an impetus to trade development and individual prosperity. But in his conception there is no way for them to be relieved—nor for any other people overburdened with loads of debt in this country—except by the enactment of a law for the free coinage of silver. What infatuation is it that blinds him to the true interests of his constituents? I would gladly join him in the enactment of a law for the free coinage of silver at a parity ratio. But if a law for free coinage existed, the gentleman did not inform us and his constituents how that silver money would ever reach their pockets. The Government does not make free gifts of the silver coined at its mints. It is paid out only in exchange for equivalents, and if their condition is as bad as represented they have nothing to give in exchange for it.

Mr. DENSON. I will tell my colleague how the silver will reach their pockets. If you will increase the metallic circulation of the country, the price of all products being controlled by the amount of money in circulation—gold and silver—the prices of cotton will be increased, the prices of what our farmers raise will be increased, and their day's labor will bring a better price. Increase the volume of currency in this country and they will get a larger price for all the products that they have to sell and for their labor than they do now. In that way the money will go into their pockets.

Mr. OATES. That argument is true if the money of the country is sufficiently inflated, but, like a bubble, will burst if raised too high.

This bill is intended to allow his constituents and mine, weighed down with burdens of debt more than they can pay, and hence doomed to labor from year's end to year's end to pay the interest on what they owe and obtain indulgence from their money masters to whom they are indebted, and relief from that species of slavery. He would allow the country merchant who has obtained the goods of some wholesale dealer by fraud or upon a misrepresentation of his financial condition and ability to pay, which he does not intend to do, to sell the same to his poor constituents for waiver notes or mortgages upon their homes and crops, and thus to hold them in perpetual bondage while he dictates his own terms of payment to the man whose goods he has sold to the poor farmers and virtually deprived them of their liberties and all prospect of future prosperity. And such acts on the part of some merchants cause honest ones and their customers to have to pay higher for the goods they buy. It makes honest men pay for the rascality of others. How can it be prevented except by a well-considered bankruptcy law having uniformity of operation throughout the Union?

Mr. DENSON. How is the farmer to get into this court?

Mr. OATES. I will stop just here to answer that question. If the farmer has got nothing to surrender it is but a very small fee that he must pay in order to avail himself of the benefit of the law.

Mr. DENSON. Ah, but after you have dispossessed him of his homestead, what has he got? You know very well that no man gets credit now amongst the farming community in our part of the country, unless he waives his homestead right and mortgages even his knives and forks and spoons to the merchant. Now, if you have taken everything and he has not any money left him even to buy a winding sheet, how is he going to get into that bankrupt court?

Suppose a creditor here desires to give him a little better chance, to give him time until a Democratic House can get here and remonetize silver—and the people of the country, I tell you, will assert their right some time, and send men here who will do that, and in the near future—but if the creditors are willing to extend the time until we get silver in circulation as money, then we will get higher prices for our products and better rates for our labor, then the farmers will reap the benefit in that way, why prevent them?

Mr. OATES. My friend thinks this is not a Democratic House?

Mr. DENSON. Not on the money question, I assert most positively.

Mr. REED. Or any other. [Laughter.]

Mr. OATES. Well, I will accept my friend's statement, especially as it is backed up by the testimony of the gentleman from Maine. He is a good judge of Democracy (?) I am sure. If you will read subdivision (2) of Sec. 51*a* you will see that although a man has no money he can secure the benefits of the act. But I wish to request my colleague, and I do it most respectfully, as I am limited in time, to make his interruptions as brief as possible.

Mr. DENSON. I beg my colleague's pardon. I did not know that his time was limited.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman seems to think that because no bankruptcy law hitherto enacted by Congress has proven satisfactory to the country it is an impossibility to enact one that will, which is a fallacy. He said that the law of 1841 was approved by a President elected by the Whigs, but who went astray and abandoned his party. That President, Mr. Tyler, in the estimation of my colleague went astray when he abandoned the Whig party and joined the party to which my colleague and myself belong. It seems to me that it was one of the most virtuous political moves the President could have made. And the last bankruptcy law which was enacted by a Republican Congress was likewise repealed by a Republican Congress. The dishonest administration of that law during the period of reconstruction in the South, particularly in our State, was, I presume, what created in the mind of my colleague such a bitter prejudice against all bankruptcy legislation.

I bear willing witness with him to many of the flagrant outrages perpetrated upon the people in the administration of that law, but all of the outrages, be it remembered, were upon the creditors and not upon the rights of debtors. What right have we, then, here to set up the complaint and the denunciation of this proposed legislation on the ground that it is going to oppress the debtor? Why, the wrongs that have been perpetrated by bankruptcy laws have always been heretofore on the creditor classes.

That law came to us just after the close of the civil war; with the changed condition of the people, the labor system having been revolutionized, and though badly administered as to creditors, it relieved many unfortunate debtors of loads of debt which they never could have paid by their honest toil, and allowed them to enter again the highway of progress and prosperity. But in the mind of my colleague there remains only recollections of the evils wrought by the law, and he seems to have forgotten that much good was accomplished by it, to just such people as those he now claims would be ruined by this law. He seems to think that this bill would take the place in rascality of the

other's administration, and would but duplicate upon our people all the wrongs which were done in the administration of that measure, forgetting that these wrongs were to the creditor class, whom he denounces as would-be tyrants and oppressors under this bill.

Why, sir, this bill is infinitely superior to that of 1867, and we have a different set of officials to administer it. They are generally much better men and with less opportunity to do wrong. I have already referred to the list of judges.

Then my colleague [Mr. DENSON] made another assault upon this bill, saying:

These debts are due mostly to the local merchants and secured by mortgages upon the homesteads of the debtors, and notes waiving all exemptions of personal property subject to payment of debts.

Thus it is at once discovered that my constituency are at the mercy of the creditor, his home is in peril, and the personal effects necessary to secure a livelihood are jeopardized.

I admit that the farmer, the agriculturist, and the wage-earner are not embraced in the involuntary clause of this bill, but this does not relieve them from its baneful effects. They are in a painful degree subjected to its merciless ravages, and are made the defenseless victims of an expensive, and, in my district, of an *alien and partisan court*.

They being the debtors of the local merchants, who are subject to the provisions of this bill, their homes and personal effects will be at once exposed to forced sale, amid the dearth, stringency, and contraction of money, the medium of exchange, and standard of value.

Mr. DENSON. How do you propose under a bankrupt law to administer their exemptions when they have waived them?

Mr. OATES. I will come to that before I take my seat. In the gentleman's characterization of the court which would have the administration of this bill, should it become a law, over such of his constituents as became interested therein, he said that they would be the "victims of an alien and partisan court." This is inconsistent with the estimate which he placed upon the judge on a former occasion. Judge Bruce is the judge of the Federal court referred to. In the investigation of alleged abuses of power by judges and court officials made by the special subcommittee of the Judiciary in the Fifty-first Congress, it fell to my lot to take the testimony of my colleague, who was at that time United States district attorney over the same territory in which his district now lies, and he testified in regard to Judge Bruce as follows:

Q. What is your opinion of Judge Bruce as a judge?

A. I can give it. Judge Bruce is a man of cultured intellect. He only practiced law five years, so he informed me, when he quit and never went back to the practice until he was appointed district judge by President Grant. With the improvement that I discovered in the four years that I was with him, and his manner of trying cases in the court, he was on a par with any of the State judges (circuit) in Alabama; his legal ability was on a par with them. While I served under him as district attorney I never discovered in him any disposition to be oppressive to anyone. Bruce is a very sympathetic man. I considered him a very conscientious man in the discharge of his duties as judge. I have seen many abler men on the bench than Judge Bruce. I know abler men as judges than Judge Bruce, but take him all in all he is just such a judge as I say ranks with the judges of the State circuit court. Judge Bruce is of a mild and gentle nature, very sympathetic, indeed, and it is hard for him to say "no." If he committed any errors in these matters it was on the side of mercy, and not to disregard the law or shirk his duties.

Mr. DENSON. Now, will my colleague permit a question here?

Mr. OATES. In just a moment. The difference in my friend's statement is that he was swearing then, and when he made his speech here recently he was simply talking. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENSON. Now, let me ask a question? Are you not making a speech yourself?

Mr. OATES. Yes.

Mr. DENSON. And did you not cuss Judge Bruce all over Alabama, and did you not fail to speak to him on account of his decision in a bank case against you?

Mr. OATES. No; I never refused to speak to him, but I did use some un-Christian expressions about him. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENSON. Was it not on account of his decision against you in that case?

Mr. OATES. Yes; and I thought his ruling was wrong. I thought it so strongly that I appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, and that court decided against me and sustained Judge Bruce.

Mr. DENSON. Then you were wrong?

Mr. OATES. It seems so, but I have always thought the decision wrong and still think so.

Mr. DENSON. I was not wrong in saying Judge Bruce was a Christian gentleman and a very good lawyer. I here reiterate all my testimony in regard to him.

Mr. OATES. You were swearing then, but here you were simply making a speech and did not think so well of him.

Mr. DENSON. I was swearing then, and I am speaking now. The difference between me and my friend is that his was a personal interest and mine was for the general welfare. I stand by the general welfare. He was aroused by his personal feeling. As to that examination about Judge Bruce, I would like to ask my colleague this question: Which was true, what I stated in the speech or what I stated in the examination?

Mr. OATES. I think what you stated in the examination was true. You swore to it and I have no right to doubt it.

Mr. DENSON. Perhaps the virtue of my testimony originated in the fact that my friend administered the oath to me.

Mr. OATES. I always believe you when under oath. I would like to believe you all the time, but when you get to speaking you get warmed up above your subject.

Mr. DENSON. That is just the reason people will not believe you in your speech here. You are simply speaking now.

Mr. OATES. That may be, but still I am not affected as much as the gentleman was by the refusal of the House to adopt the free coinage of silver.

Mr. DENSON. There may be a refusal here, but there will not be in Alabama, which my friend will find out, if he does not mind.

Mr. OATES. I am in favor of free coinage just as much as you are, only I differ as to the ratio. I propose that when the dollar is coined it shall be a dollar—a good dollar.

Mr. DENSON. Did not you vote for the restoration of the Bland-Allison act here in August?

Mr. OATES. I did.

Mr. DENSON. Was not that at a ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. OATES. It was, but the coinage was limited, and it was the only chance I then saw for any coinage of silver.

Mr. DENSON. Was it not limited in the Sherman bill, too?

Mr. OATES. Not at all, except in the amount purchased; not in the coinage.

Mr. DENSON. Of course; how could you coin more than you purchased?

Mr. OATES. It could not be done. The mints have not sufficient capacity to coin it as fast as purchased, and that law was condemned by our platform. It would seem, upon a fair construction, that my colleague thinks Judge Bruce quite as fair, as impartial, and as able to administer this law as would be any judge of the courts of our State. As to Judge Bruce's kindness of heart and capacity, I could read from a letter of Mr. Roulhac, a prominent Democratic lawyer who practices in his court, and the testimony of ex-Supreme Court Judge R. W. Walker, but deem it unnecessary.

SUPPORTED BY CHIEF-JUSTICE STONE.

I wish to say at this point, although it be a slight departure from the gentleman's language upon which I am commenting, that the most distinguished judge in our State, George W. Stone, the chief justice of the supreme court, who but recently celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his services as a judge, and who is universally respected in the State, and acknowledged to be the head of our judiciary, has corresponded with me for years upon the subject of this bill, and made several useful suggestions of amendment which are now incorporated in it, and I take great pride in saying as the bill now stands it meets his hearty approval. I think that his legal opinion is certainly as weighty as that of my distinguished colleague or that of either of the gentlemen from Texas.

The chief justice said:

In the present condition of the country and the commercial habits of the people, I consider a national bankruptcy law a great and pressing want, because the giving of fraudulent preferences by failing debtors has become so frequent as almost to bring discredit upon commercial pursuits. I want a bankruptcy law in order to put a check to that very prevalent habit of giving what I conceive to be improper, if not fraudulent, preferences.

Concerning this bill Judge Stone Says:

I have conferred with Col. OATES upon the subject of that measure, and am familiar with it as at present perfected. In the great elements of simplicity, inexpensiveness, and expediency of administration, checks and guards against frauds and oppression in its execution, I consider it almost incalculably superior to any bankruptcy bill that has ever been enacted in the United States or presented to Congress for its consideration.

Mr. DENSON. Is it a question of legal opinion or one of proper and legitimate legislation? The gentleman knows that a very fine lawyer may be a very poor legislator.

Mr. OATES. That is true; but a legal opinion is necessary in order to fully understand this bill, and my colleague as a lawyer has failed to properly understand it.

A COMPLETE LAW DEMANDED.

All the commercial bodies in Alabama have declared in favor of this identical bill. I have here the resolutions of the Mobile Cotton Exchange, the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, the Commercial and Industrial Association of Montgomery, and others. I also have hundreds of letters from citizens of my own and of other States of the Union, and of nearly every class and condition

favoring this bill. Among them I have just received the following telegram from Dallas, Tex.:

DALLAS, TEX., *December 7, 1893.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. OATES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

The business men of Texas want equal justice to creditor and debtor, and favor the involuntary as well as voluntary features of bankrupt bill. We regard a purely voluntary bill as unjust, unfair, and unmanly, and hope Congress will take favorable action on pending bill.

A. T. Watts Armstrong Company, wholesale grocers; Dallas Packing Company; J. T. Trezevant, L. R. Andrews, Thos. Scurry, Chas. Fred Tucker, The J. W. Crowdus Drug Company; Howell Bros. Shoe Company, by S. J. Howell, president; W. J. Bellertin; J. Q. Armstrong, president State National Bank, and many others; Thos. Field.

MR. DENSON'S FURTHER MISAPPREHENSIONS.

But my colleague said that as his farmer constituents, engaged chiefly in the very honorable avocation of producing cotton, were the debtors of local merchants, who held against them their promissory notes, waiving the right to claim their property as exempt, and mortgages upon their homesteads, would, under the operations of this bill, be deprived of their homes and their substance, as they would be utterly unable to pay their debts in view of the contraction of the money medium of exchange and the standard of value.

Sir, while there is, I know, an unequal distribution of the money in circulation, owing to a wrong in our general financial system—which certainly ought to be corrected by this Congress—the gentleman's assertion of the contraction of the circulation is not true as to the amount of money. The circulation is now over $25 per capita, larger than it has been in the last twenty years; but still I, as well as my colleague, wish it increased for the reason that I do not think our people can have too much good money, and there is in fact a great scarcity of circulation in our section of the country.

But I want no fiat money. I want money, every dollar of which is the equal of every other, and, like my colleague, I would not object to having a large part of that in silver. But there is nothing in this bill to interfere with that. The failure of free coinage is a reason why this bill ought to pass, so as to benefit his and my poor constituents who are in debt more than they can pay. He assumes that, because under our laws and the practice in our State the farmers frequently give mortgages to the local merchants upon their homes, and notes waiving the right of exemption as to their personal property, that in case the local merchant is adjudged a bankrupt all these papers will pass to the trustee appointed by the creditors, who will enforce the notes and foreclose the mortgages and at once expose for sale the homes of the mortgagors and their personal effects for the purpose of paying the debts of the bankrupt local merchant. They could not be inconvenienced except by enforcing their own contracts after their maturity. Why, sir, nothing but a stay law for forty years or the free coinage of silver could satisfy him that the country is safe!

Mr. DENSON. I ask my colleague if the sentiment of Alabama is not for the free coinage of silver?

Mr. OATES. Oh, yes; it is; and I am in favor of the free coinage of silver. I am only referring to what I believe would satisfy my colleague.

Mr. DENSON. I never said anything about "nothing would satisfy me but the free coinage of silver."

Mr. OATES. That I said by way of comment on your wonderful speech.

Mr. DENSON. Oh; you are just making a speech, and not swearing at all.

Mr. OATES. Oh, no. I am not under oath, but I am trying to get at the truth. Let us look at the bill and see whether this conclusion is strictly correct.

Section 5 reads as follows:

This act shall not affect the allowance to the bankrupts of the exemptions which are prescribed by the State laws in force at the time of the filing of the petition in the State wherein the adjudication is made.

The intention of this is in all cases to leave with the bankrupt all his property exempted from sale under execution by the law of the State of his residence. My colleague indulged in a criticism upon the language of this section to show that in States other than the residence of the bankrupt he might be adjudged such and by that law entitled to no exemption.

Sir, in order to put this beyond cavil, and to carry out the real meaning of the section, I propose to amend it so as to say "in the State wherein the bankrupt resides at the time of the adjudication." That will make it clear.

Now, I admit that there is much force in what my colleague said with reference to mortgages upon homesteads, and notes waiving the right of exemption, falling into the hands of the trustee of the bankrupt creditor of people thus unfortunately in debt; but where people have seen proper to waive their right of exemption, or give mortgages upon their homes for the purpose of obtaining credit and means with which to conduct their farms, it is in each case a voluntary action on their part, caused in some cases, I admit, by necessity.

Poor laboring people in such condition have my sincere sympathy, but are we a people, and have we governments of law which recognize the right of every competent person to contract and to enter into such obligations as he sees proper to make? My colleague speaks as though the law should never be enforced for the collection of any debt contracted by a poor person, nor should any mortgage ever be foreclosed upon the homestead or other property of a poor laboring man, nor should any note which he has seen proper to give waiving the right of exemption of his personal property, be enforced through the courts of the country.

Mr. DENSON. Will my colleague permit me to ask him a question right there? In view of the President's message, in which he says that we should take time to see what the effect of the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act will be, I ask him that the consideration of this bill be postponed until we do see. The price of everything has gone down since the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, and perhaps they do not know everything about the bankruptcy, just as they did not know everything about silver, although they professed to know.

Mr. OATES. I have not heard of the fall in prices, but I ask my colleague to withhold his commentary until we come to the discussion of the time at which this bill is to go into effect. He made his speech heretofore. It is my time now.

Mr. DENSON. I know it is after six months.

Mr. OATES. But you can move to amend it and make the time such as you desire, if the House will agree to it.

Mr. DENSON. But I do not want to have anything to do with it. I do not want to be in bad company.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman then ought to avoid it. He speaks as though all of the country merchants would be doomed under this law to be adjudged bankrupts. Such a conclusion is certainly not justified and is in no way complimentary to the country merchants. It would be a very large calculation, sir, to suppose that 5 per cent of these would be adjudged bankrupts. My colleague seems to forget or purposely ignores the fact that whenever a petition is filed alleging that such a merchant or dealer is a bankrupt that the question of insolvency, as well as the question of the failure to pay his debts, would have to be determined by a jury of his peers if he demanded it.

MR. CULBERSON AND THE JURY SYSTEM.

But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] ridicules the idea of obtaining a fair and impartial jury. If that can not now be done, why does not the gentleman employ his great talents and a part of his valuable time in providing for a better jury system rather than in ridiculing the one we have? He is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I make this suggestion that the gentleman proceed to adopt a plan or bring into this House a recommendation for the improvement of the jury system, if in fact it be half as bad as he represents it. I am a believer in the fairness and honesty of jurors and I think that as a general rule the Federal district judges are as honest and competent as the judges of the State courts. If there is anything wrong in the Federal judicial system—judges or jurors—I will join the gentleman from Texas in an effort to correct and purify it. Remember that the laboring oar is now in the hands of our party and the Democracy is responsible for the conduct of the Government now.

To determine the question of insolvency no such rule as they contend for would be applied to the language of the bill. If the defendant's property, at a "fair valuation," would be insufficient to pay his debts, then the jury would have to determine that he was insolvent. My colleague and the gentleman from Texas contend that a "fair valuation" would be only what it would sell for at public outcry, which would not be the rule. The question would be what was the defendant's property worth "at a fair valuation" at the time the petition was filed? The jury would arrive at the valuation like appraisers of the property of decedents find the valuation, which is according to what they think it is fairly worth.

It is what they believe on oath the property is really worth, and not what it might sell for under the hammer in times of depression; and, sir, when the jury were thus passing upon the alleged insolvency of the country merchant, or defendant, whoever he might be, all of the mortgages and waiver notes belonging to him would be estimated by the jury at their face value, if the makers thereof had property for their satisfaction, so that, including these, at a fair valuation of all of the assets of the alleged bankrupt's estate he was found to have enough property to pay his debts, the petition would be dismissed and he would be triumphant, and the petitioners would be mulcted in the cost. But both my colleague and the gentleman from Texas insist that he would be a ruined man in reputation, although he

was successful, simply because his creditor had made a false charge against him.

Indeed a new phase as to the effects of litigation. By the same reasoning a person who is sued for slander is forever disgraced, though he gain the suit. The question of his insolvency would not be running through every minute of time of the thirty days, as alleged by my gifted colleague, but it would be his actual condition on the day and hour of the filing of the petition. According to all rules of pleading that would be the issue. Is there any reputable lawyer who will dispute the proposition? If he had been insolvent the week before, and on that day "at a fair valuation" of his property—not what it would sell for under the hammer—he was found to be solvent, the petition would necessarily have to be dismissed. The question for decision would be, was he insolvent when the petition was filed? The court would not inquire into his condition at any other time. It would be foreign to the issue.

"THE HAMMER OF THE SHERIFF."

The gentleman said that one of the clauses of the Democratic platform is "to stop the hammer of the sheriff on the mortgages of the people," and he said that—

This bill, originated in a Democratic House, from a Democratic source, is inaugurating the crucial performance of the sheriff's hammer, with silver demonetized and destroyed.

Sir, I never heard of any platform, unless it possibly may have been one adopted by the Populists, which declared the foreclosure of mortgages to be unlawful. I have never heard of one before which declared the foreclosure of mortgages past due to be an unlawful and outrageous act. I have never heard of a political party which declared against "the sheriff's hammer" in execution of the legal processes of the courts on the foreclosure of a mortgage; and if there be any political party which declares against the foreclosure of honest mortgages past due, or coercing the payment of honest debts contracted for a fair consideration within a reasonable time after they fall due, I would like to know it, and I certainly will not belong to such dishonest organization.

Mr. PENCE. You remember, do you not, that the Democratic platform denounced the sheriff industry on account of its extent?

Mr. OATES. I do not, and I do not believe you can find it therein. I am a Democrat on principles which are always consistent with honesty. I have been a member of the Legislature of my State, and my record there will show—as it will here—that I have ever been the friend of the farmers and the poor laboring men of the country, and have done whatever I could by legislation for their benefit; but I do not propose any dishonest methods of relief to them, nor do any of my constituents desire that I should.

I have always regarded the wealthy as more capable of taking care of themselves than the poor, and hence I have in legislation watched the interests of the latter more than the former; but God forbid that I shall ever lend my energies to the enactment of any unjust law to deprive the creditor class of their rights because they are supposed to be owners of property. I would no sooner sanction the enactment of such laws than I would sanction one for the oppression of the poor or to enable the wealthy to impose upon or to oppress them, and that I will never do while reason and justice hold a place in my brain.

The gentleman says that the Torrey bankruptcy bill is "the most crushing and damnable instrumentality to oppress farmers, laborers, debtors, and small dealers of his section that the avaricious greed and soulless cupidity of a Shylock could suggest." This is but asseveration, and not a particle of proof has been submitted to sustain it. My colleague said:

"The bill is offered for all the pledges and promises of financial relief and aid made to his people."

And then, when I asked him the question as to whether he charged me with bringing forward this bill in lieu of all the pledges made to the people at the last election, he replied:

I do not intend to make any charge against members of this House in my remarks upon this bill. * * * I acquit my colleague [Mr. OATES] of all partnership, of all connection with this bill outside of his legislative duty.

This I expected from our long and uniform personal and political friendship, but if the bill is such a diabolical monstrosity as he characterizes it it is no compliment to my intelligence to be its advocate.

And when he sanctioned Mr. SIBLEY'S summing up of his argument—

That the silver legislation is the seed which was sown to produce this great crop of ruin, and this bankrupt bill follows as a harvester, a thresher to enable Shylock to gather in his crop—

I knew that he was making a heavy draft upon the code of the Populists.

I asked him if it could be true that this was offered to the Democracy in fulfillment of all our Democratic financial promises during the last campaign, when the present bill, in one form or another, had been before Congress, considered and acted upon for the last six years? My colleague replied:

I say again I do not want my colleague [Mr. OATES] to think that I am impugning him in any way. I exonerate him entirely. I know him too well not to know that he would never engage in the oppression of any man in Alabama or anywhere else.

I thanked him for the compliment, though indeed it was a doubtful one when he adopted the simile of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY]. While he acquitted me of any purpose to do wrong, what he said was an implied charge of ignorance on my part, and makes me guilty of a double political crime by advocating this bill and voting for "the Voorhees repeal bill passed in this House, which is the sum total of all the iniquities and crimes perpetrated against the people."

Mr. Chairman, that is a measure for which I voted, and I claim that in that vote I exhibited as much intelligence and patriotism as my distinguished colleague did in voting against it, notwithstanding I concede he is a gentleman who usually displays a high order of intelligence. The platform of my party demanded the repeal of the Sherman law, and in obedience to that pledge I voted for the repeal bill.

A large majority in this House and in that of the other end of the Capitol seem to have been in accord with me rather than with my colleague upon that subject. I, sir, am capable of differing with any gentleman upon this floor without arraigning him or calling in question his intelligence or patriotism. I can differ with him, as I do with my colleague, and still believe that he is as honest as I am whether he reciprocates that courtesy or not.

MR. DENSON AGAIN.

My esteemed colleague further said:

Mr. Chairman, this bankrupt bill is but another cruel and destructive instrumentality employed by the demon Money to crush out the farmers, the laborers, and the masses of the country, and make them subservient and obedient slaves to the privileged classes, the capitalists and money power of this land.

This is a revelation to me. I never heard before that there were any privileged classes in this country.

Sir, I deny the correctness of that conclusion. It originated in the fertile imagination of my friend, or he borrowed it from some of our calamity paraders. It has no existence in fact, and must have been born of an overwrought imagination or it never would have found utterance by a good Democrat.

The purpose of the bill is, and the effect of it as a law would be, infinitely more for the release of debtors from their obligations than to enable creditors to collect their debts. A greater number of debtors than creditors would be benefited thereby, though the bill is a just and equitable measure to both classes. All three of the bankruptcy laws enacted in this country were enacted largely at the instance of the creditor class and repealed at their instance, and not on the complaint of the debtors. Then what ground remains for the assertion that this would be a law merely for the collection of debts?

He also said:

I here raise my voice against this infernal engine of ruin, slavery, and destruction to the masses. I look upon it, in connection with the financial system now established and administered in this Union, as the last stroke necessary to destroy free institutions and drive home the last screw in the coffin of liberty.

"O liberty, what crimes have been committed in thy name!" said Madame Roland at the guillotine.

I agree that the financial system is not a good one, and is sadly in need of decided change and improvement, which I am doing all I can by proper means to remedy. But, sir, if I believed all this which my colleague asserts to be just as he states it, I would, in a spirit of patriotism and love of my fellow-men, including his constituents as well as my own—notwithstanding I am on the sunset side of life and my body maimed—again take up arms and incur whatever danger there might be to life and limb in defense of my people against such tyranny as he alleges; nor would I acquit or hold blameless any man who would advocate such a diabolical measure as he describes, except upon the plea of idiocy.

My friend from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is nearly as extreme in denunciation and misrepresentation of the bill as my esteemed colleague, but not quite so vituperative; in that my colleague excels. He, too, is wild upon the subject of free coinage as well as upon bankruptcy legislation. I am unable to discover any relation between the two subjects. It seems to me that only a disordered imagination can suppose them to be parts of the same thing or to have any connection with each other.

Why, sir, my colleague characterized this bill as "the consummation of a revolution by which the liberties of the people would be forever destroyed," and said that no people ever lost their independence who owned their homes; that a land owner was never known to become a slave or dependent so long as he

could retain the unincumbered ownership and peaceful possession of his land.

Well, does anyone doubt this; is there anything in the bill contrary to that doctrine? But he complained that many of his constituents owned incumbered homes; that they were incumbered by mortgages. Well, who gave the mortgages? Would he, in order to make each of them a free man, take away from him the right to give a mortgage upon his home whenever he sees proper to do so? Would he take away from the owner of the property the right of disposition or to incumber it? If so the owner would cease to be free whenever the disposal of his own property was taken away from him. That would be paternalism of the strongest character.

Yet such is the course of his logic. Are not the poor people of his district and mine free men, who have the right to sell or mortgage their homesteads if they wish? Would he deprive them of this right? If so, he would deny to them the liberty which I concede to exist in them and for which I will ever contend. I want this bill passed for their benefit.

He says, in criticism of the bill, that the "trustee sets apart the bankrupt s exemptions and reports the items and estimated value there of to the court," which is by no means all, but only a part of the proceedings in that connection. He claims that the bankrupt court determines all claims of exemption, and then says:

> These provisions of the bill are unconstitutional because the amounts involved are of more than $20 in value, and that there is no provision made to try the same by a jury.

When the bill, in section 6, line 22, says that the bankrupt in his schedule shall file a claim for "such exemptions as he may be entitled to," and subdivision c of section 19 declares that "the right to submit matters in controversy or an alleged offense under this act to a jury shall be determined and enjoyed according to the United States laws now in force upon that subject, or such as may be hereafter enacted, except as herein provided," thereby giving a trial by jury upon the value of the exempted property in event there should be a controversy in relation thereto, and overturning completely the gentleman's point of unconstitutionality.

Remember, that a law that is not perfectly clear and overwhelming in its demand for the right of jury trial, if at all susceptible of such construction, will be so construed by the courts as to make it in harmony with the Constitution of the country. If there are simply doubts about whether the law gives the right to a trial by jury, when it is a matter in which the Constitution requires a trial by jury, the courts would so construe the statute as to give it, and thus sustain its constitutionality.

And if this is not broad enough, construed in the light of the Constitution to secure it, we can amend it and make it so. He seems to forget that this bill is amendable if any part of it is shown to be wrong.

They claim that this bill would be an engine of oppression placed in the hands of the creditor class to put debtors and their property under the control of the creditor, and that "this is but another means, another instrumentality, to be set on foot in connection with the demonetization of silver to put the property and personal liberty of the citizen under control and direction of the money and creditor classes."

Silver has not been demonetized since 1878. It is to-day a legal tender in payment of debts, as much so as gold. If the 10 per cent tax were repealed, so that we could have good State-bank bills, we would be very well satisfied, as we will have about $700,000,000 of silver anyway; but my colleague—I say it respectfully—seems to be as much enamored of free silver as was Master Slender with the beauties of sweet Ann Page.

Why, sir, this bill is nothing of the kind. It never was a conspirator against silver. A bill on the subject of bankruptcy in one form or another has been before the Judiciary Committee and the House of Representatives for the last ten years. The first was the Lowell bill, which Pat Collins, a great Democrat, had charge of, and the question of such a law has all the time been advocated by some of the ablest members of this House, while others have honestly opposed it, without division on party lines. At the present time some Democrats and some Republicans and Populists are in favor of this bill and some opposed to it. It is not a party measure at all.

The bill at the present time is in the mildest and most humane form that a bankruptcy bill was ever presented to the American Congress. I make this assertion notwithstanding the bitter denunciations of it by my colleague and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. And as to the demonetization of silver, no law of the kind has passed or is likely to pass, according to my understanding of that term. Silver was demonetized in 1873 when it was deprived of its legal-tender quality, but that was restored in 1878 and still remains. Refusing to coin it would be wrong, but would neither demonetize nor destroy it. My colleague speaks of it not only as being demonetized, but destroyed.

Why, sir, the repeal bill renews the declaration of the law that the silver dollar is a legal tender in the payment of debts, and declares that it shall so remain. I am, sir, in favor of the free coinage of silver on a parity with gold; but that subject is altogether foreign to the present one. Yet my colleague declared that the legislation then about to be consummated not only demonetized, but destroyed silver.

Another of his criticisms of the bill: When speaking of the exemptions which he alleged were to be tried alone by the bankruptcy court without a jury, he used the following language:

> In Alabama a debtor has got to file a statement of his liabilities and of his assets to be entitled to exemptions.

That is not correct. But he says:

> Under the laws of Alabama a debtor desiring to claim the benefit of the exemption laws may at any time file his written declaration in the probate court asking such exemptions to be allowed him. Of course this amounts to a written statement admitting his inability to pay his debts.

That is the language of the bill—

Said he—

> and if he makes a declaration of that kind on the records of the country or anywhere else, that is, that he is unable to pay his debts, he can be petitioned into bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, to show how utterly erroneous this statement is, I quote from section 2 of the bill. The ground of involuntary bankruptcy which my colleague was referring to is as follows:

> Made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors or filed in court a written statement admitting his inability to pay his debts.

Now, sir, by the statute law of Alabama, section 2515 of the code, it is declared that—

> Any resident of this State entitled to and desiring to claim a homestead or other exemption from levy and sale under execution or other process may at any time make and file in the office of the judge of probate in the county in which the property is situated, if a homestead, or if personal property, of the county in which such resident resides, a declaration in writing, subscribed and sworn to by him, describing the property selected and claimed by him as exempt, item by item, in case of personal property, with its value; and other declarations may from time to time, as occasion may require, be made and filed.

Defendant is not required to say one word about his inability to pay his debts; no, sir. A man may claim whatever property is allowed him by law from the payment of his debts, even when he has other property that is likewise subject. It is also provided by statute that the failure to file such exemption is no waiver of the right of the defendant in execution to claim it; and here, sir, my learned colleague claims that the filing in a probate court of a statutory declaration that the property of the defendant is claimed as exempt from sale for his debts is the equivalent of the fourth ground of involuntary bankruptcy set forth in this bill.

The conclusion is utterly unsound.

Mr. Chairman, my able colleague's speech abounds in the denunciation of nearly everybody who is blessed with a respectable share of this world's goods, or who may be considered plutocrats, bristles with assertions of the oppressions of the poor, parades before the country their calamities and the more prosperous man's supposed rascalities. Such language is calculated to array the poor people against the wealthy. Sir, I had to meet on the stump and to controvert similar charges made against the Democratic party in the last campaign by the extremists of the Farmers' Alliance and Populists who endeavored to encompass my defeat, and I was amazed to hear such language from a good Democrat as I know my colleague to be. The shaking of a red flag at a bull never more thoroughly angered him than does the reading of this bill my esteemed colleague.

Mr. DENSON. My colleague objected to my interrupting him awhile ago. I have been absent from the Hall, and therefore have not heard all of the gentleman's speech. Am I correctly informed that the gentleman charges me with being a Populist?

Mr. OATES. Oh, no; I say you are a good Democrat.

Mr. DENSON. And as good as you are.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman has always been a very good Democrat, but I do not undertake to set myself up as a judge in my own case as to which of us is the better Democrat.

Mr. DENSON. What was it that you stated that had inflamed my mind?

Mr. OATES. I said that the denunciations which have been made and a good many things which you had said had probably inflamed your imagination; so that I was amazed to hear such language from such a good Democrat as I knew you to be.

Mr. DENSON. I state, Mr. Chairman, that the inflammation of my mind, if any at all occurred, resulted from the iniquity and oppression of that bill, and nothing else.

Mr. OATES. Well, the free-coinage question, too, had something to do with it.

Mr. DENSON. That has inflamed your mind, it seems. You are trying to get out of it, and to explain your vote.

Mr. OATES. I quote your language. I do not travel outside the record at all. I quote exactly what you said in your speech. I am proud of my vote and stand loyally by it.

Mr. DENSON. My language was thoroughly orthodox on the free coinage of silver and there can be no mistake about that. My speeches and my votes have always corresponded, to the letter.

Mr. OATES. I stated while you were out that we agreed on free coinage, except that we differed about the ratio. But we differed widely in our votes as to the repeal of the Sherman law.

Mr. DENSON. I do not see how we could differ on the ratio, when you voted to substitute the Bland-Allison act for the Wilson law.

Mr. OATES. That question is not pertinent here, but I will say that a revival of the Bland-Allison act was the only prospect I saw for silver coinage, and it was limited. Perhaps I did a foolish thing to keep company with you.

Mr. DENSON. I was informed that you said I was populistic. If being populistic means that I am for the people, I am for that; but in the offensive sense in which the word is now used in politics, that I utterly deny.

Mr. OATES. I said some of the statements made by you were populistic, and that I was surprised to hear them, because I knew you were a Democrat.

Mr. DENSON. You drew the inference that they were populistic. Populistic may be descending, but some of yours might be considered ascending populistic—in the ascendancy. What are the statements of mine that are populistic?

Mr. OATES. That may be, but of course all such things are to be judged by others. We form our opinions from what we have to go by. I think that the quotations I am making from your speech will be sufficient to show that I have drawn the correct conclusion, and if I have not, the readers of what we both say will form their own opinions. Such appeals do not pour oil upon the troubled waters in our country. They do not draw the attention of our people, and especially the poorer classes, to the beneficence of our governments, State and Federal. In Europe the toilers labor in the fields for from 10 to 20 cents per day, and have their homes in hovels, and their children reared in comparative ignorance for the lack of public schools. Here our Federal and State governments secure to each citizen his rights of life, liberty, and property, giving them all equal chances.

Such utterances as I refer to do not impress the minds of the masses with these facts, nor do they call attention to the beneficence of the United States in having tendered to the destitute homes upon the public lands, nor to the State governments, which provide for the education of their children and the exemption of a reasonable amount of property from liability to execution, in order that they may have a maintenance independent even of the claims of their honest creditors.

Sir, I believe that the agriculturist, though of moderate means, should be the happiest man of any class in our country, when he is free from debt and reasonably prosperous.

A little farm well tilled,
A little house well filled,
And a little wife well willed—

should bring to him the greatest measure of contentment.

Show our people their superior condition over those of similar classes in other countries, and bring to them contentment, and make them, with all of the errors of our laws, shout praises to the flag of our country, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," and we will perform a far more patriotic and praiseworthy duty than we will by arraigning before them all the wrongs they may be made to suffer, either real or imaginary.

TO PROMOTE THE BEST INTERESTS OF HONEST PEOPLE.

The bankruptcy bill will promote the best interests of honest people and prove a beneficent measure to thousands of people overwhelmed with debt.

Sir, the provision of the Federal Constitution committing to Congress the power to pass a bankruptcy law was inserted in that instrument as originally drafted, and was adopted as a matter of course when it was submitted for ratification. A similar provision was inserted in both the provisional and permanent constitutions of the late Confederate States, which shows that the framers thereof were not opposed to bankruptcy laws.

As a practical question it is immaterial whether we agree or disagree with our constitutional fathers or with the men who formulated the scheme for the government of the Confederacy as to the expediency for such a provision in the organic law—the fact remains that Congress has the power to enact such a law, and we are confronted with the proposition to exercise it whenever necessary on the condition of the country requiring it, as I think it does now.

The only question under the circumstances which will influence me is what is best for the interests of the people—the people of my district—the people of my State—the people of the whole country.

OPPONENTS OPPOSED TO DISCHARGES.

The present conditions are that every community contains honest men who have been unfortunate in promoting the enterprises of the country; men who can not pay their debts and who are kept out of business by their unfortunate circumstances. The fact that these men are thus circumscribed in their usefulness to the community and to their families is no benefit to their creditors—it is an absolute detriment to the communities in which they live. An enlightened public policy requires that they should be given their financial freedom. This bill would accomplish this result and enable this great class of good men to again become aggressive factors in the development of the country, the promotion of its enterprises, and to the comfort of their families. It would also be better for the creditor if he but realized a small percentage of his debt than for it always to remain in doubt.

Every member, therefore, who opposes this bill arrays himself against this class of men, and in doing so denies them the rights which it was intended by the framers of the Constitution they should enjoy.

OPPONENTS OPPOSED TO INCREASING CREDIT.

Mr. Chairman, the business of every community of this country is conducted by men who, to a greater or less degree, are dependent upon their credit. How will this bill affect this class of men? As the laws of most of the States are framed at present many men might be ruined by a fright among their creditors, or even by a misapprehension on the part of one of such creditors as to the financial condition of their debtor. This condition follows because there is not now any law which can enforce the rules of equity with uniformity and fair dealing between the creditors of a common debtor.

I received a letter to-day from New York, presenting a very striking case which has been hung up in the courts ever since 1884, where there are probably $1,000,000 worth of property involved, and one debtor who controls a claim of $8,000 is so circumstanced that he prevents a distribution of that property and keeps the creditors from getting that which belongs to them. Under the operation of a bankruptcy law this would not be the case. Under present conditions the result is that the credit of everyone of this class is restricted and whenever they are situated at obscure points or at a great distance from whom they ask or obtain credit they must of course pay a higher price, including freights, for goods than they would be compelled to pay for them if they lived nearer to the place of their purchases.

If we had a uniform commercial probate law, as this bill would be if enacted, the seller and buyer would each find therein the measure of their legal rights, and a uniform system alike enforceable in every State of the Union. In it they would find a complete system of equity and justice. Now that railroads, telegraphs, and telephones have annihilated distances and brought all the States of the nation into one great commercial community, is it not infinitely wiser and better to secure such judicial uniformity rather than to allow all commercial transactions to be administered by the forty-four different systems of the States of this Union? This bill forbids the spiriting away or fraudulently disposing of goods. It requires at the hands of every debtor an honest course of business with reference to goods which he has purchased on credit, and prevents debtors from giving preferences.

I wish to say that no preferences can be given under the laws of my State—made so by recent legislation.

All these regulations are consistent with equity and inspire confidence in those who have goods to sell, and hence secure better credit and lower prices for the purchasers of the same.

Who will deny the wisdom of such provisions?

Every member, therefore, who opposes this bill arrays himself, whether intentionally or not, against this class of men, and in so doing denies to them the increased credit, or in effect the enlargement of their capital, and prevents them from deriving a benefit which was intended to be their inheritance.

OPPONENTS OPPOSED TO REDUCING PRICES TO CONSUMERS.

Sir, all of the trade and manufacturing centers of this country have establishments which give employment to large numbers of the working classes, and, in the ordinary course of business, distribute the things we eat, the clothes we wear, the machinery we use, the tools and implements of industry, and the various other articles the distribution of which constitutes the commerce of our country. These manufacturing and jobbing con-

cerns, under the existing imperfect State enactments, experience severe losses on the part of mercantile adventurers and those who subsist by committing frauds in their various forms.

To the thoughtless person it might appear that these losses are borne by the manufacturers and jobbers, but it is not so; they know by years of experience about what these losses will be, and they add a percentage to the price of their output to meet them. This percentage is paid not by the dishonest and fraudulent adventurers, but by the honest people—by our constituents. This law is designed to promote justice, which is always consistent with morality, and to prevent these abuses. As a result, the losses to the manufacturers and jobbers will not be so great; they will not, therefore, add so large a percentage and the great body of honest people will be correspondingly benefited. This bill would thus have a tendency to make manufactured goods cheaper to the consumer.

Every member, therefore, who opposes this bill, though unconscious of the fact, arrays himself against these beneficent results.

OPPONENTS ADVANCE THE INTERESTS OF THOSE WHO THRIVE BY DISHONESTY.

Sir, there is in every community of any considerable size, and I regret to say in some of the very small communities, men to whom honesty is an unknown proposition; men who are strangers to the word integrity; men who do not seek to establish a good character, and to assist in building up the community in which they live by personal industry, but whose sole end and aim is to lead an existence at the expense of those who accumulate property by honest toil. This bill aims a blow of extermination at that class of men.

It prescribes penalties for whoever cheats, wrongs, or defrauds irrespective of whether they are bankrupts, bankruptcy officers, or creditors. It seems to me high time that such a statute should be enacted, as one has but to read the daily papers to realize that from day to day and week to week, the year round, frauds of every nature and description are practiced, and their perpetrators go unwhipped of justice.

Every member, therefore, who opposes this bill will in so doing throw his influence practically on the side of that class of men who, to the detriment of the best interests of the honest members of every community in the country, are now, and have been for years, living on the fruits of dishonesty.

THE PEOPLE ARE HONEST AND WANT AN HONEST LAW.

Sir, I am sorry to see that there seems to be on the part of some of my Congressional brethren an inclination to legislate upon the theory that the enactment of a law granting discharges, enforcing the rules of equity, and forbidding rascality is in derogation of the rights of the people.

For myself, I wish to stand or fall upon the statement of fact that the great body of the people are absolutely and unconditionally honest; that they do not wish for themselves the exercise of any rights which they are not willing, under like circumstances, others may exercise. It would be an insult to intelligent and honest people to say that they do not want laws to condemn wrong and to promote justice, morality, and humanity, which are the purposes of this bill.

The proposed law was contemplated by the founders of the Government; it is sound in principle; it is humane and equitable in its provisions; it is in the interest of the unfortunate debtor and the honest creditor, and repels oppression; it is designed to lessen the burdens of the weak and curb the power of the strong; it will promote honesty and discourage dishonesty; it will benefit good people in every part of the country and in every station in life, and hence, I earnestly hope that it will be passed, with both voluntary and involuntary provisions of a reasonable and just character.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended.

Mr. OATES. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, but will not accept an extension of time as it is already quite late. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not near through with the replies I have prepared in explanation of the bill and to the criticisms uttered against the same by several of the gentlemen who oppose the measure. If the House will grant me leave to do so I will hereafter print these with some tables I have applied for and not yet fully obtained, separately from this and as a subsequent speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] asks leave to print the remainder of his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the leave is granted.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on this bill is now closed by order of the House.

Mr. OATES. I move that the committee do now rise; and I wish to give notice in that connection that on to-morrow, or when the bill is taken up again, it will be read under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Just at that point I suggest that if we could take the sense of the House as between the voluntary and involuntary systems, we might dispense with the necessity for the five-minute debate; and if we should agree to it I would be glad on to-morrow to offer a substitute which I intend to propose, and take the sense of the House on that. If it should be adopted it would then relieve the House from the necessity of considering the present bill under the five-minute rule, and we might save two or three days in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that the committee do now rise.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to hear the gentleman's response.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman's proposition will not be in order at that time, and it is one-sided.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course it is not in order; I was suggesting an arrangement by unanimous consent.

The question was taken, and the committee determined to rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OUTHWAITE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 139) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENCAMPMENT OF KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. No. 93. To authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant permits to the executive committee Knights of Pythias for the use of the monument grounds for temporary camping purposes and the reservations or public spaces along the line of Pennsylvania avenue for the erection of stands and seats thereon on the occasion of the Pythian conclave and encampment, to be held in the city of Washington in August, 1894, if in his opinion such use will inflict no serious or permanent injury upon such grounds, reservations, or public spaces; and the District Commissioners are hereby authorized to designate such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District as they may deem necessary and proper for the purposes of the occasion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this joint resolution. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

On request of Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, to Mr. COMPTON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. MCGANN, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. CORNISH, until Monday, on account of important business.

Mr. OATES. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAWLINS: A bill (H. R. 4511) providing for the opening of the Uintah and Uncompahgre Indian Reservations, in the Territory of Utah—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 4512) for the erection of a public building at the city of Muskegon, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4513) for the construction of a steam fog signal and pier-head light and steam fog-signal station at Ludington, Mich.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4514) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Bureau of Labor and to create an executive

department to be known as the Department of Labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FIELDER: A bill (H. R. 4515) to amend section 4887 of the Revised Statutes, in relation to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McALEER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4516) to remove the bar of the statute of limitation and give the right of appeal in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4562) to repeal all provisions of the law for the payment by the United States of one-half of the appropriations for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4563) for the construction of a public building at Port Angeles, State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 4564) for the punishment of train-wrecking—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: A concurrent resolution to print the eulogies upon the late William Mutchler, a representative from the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CANNON of California: A resolution directing the Secretary of War to report to the House of Representatives the feasibility and cost of obtaining an additional depth of water in the inner harbor at San Pedro, State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 4517) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Risley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4518) for the relief of John Dieters—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 4519) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pulaski, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 4520) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Duffy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) for the relief of Francis Moon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 4522) for the relief of Omer Baudry, of St. John the Baptist Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DURBOROW: A bill (H. R. 4523) for the relief of Mary P. Mullin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 4524) for the relief of J. W. Elston, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 4525) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Horace J. Rowell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) granting a pension to Eliza K. Starr—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) for the relief of Henry Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: A bill (H. R. 4528) to authorize and direct the auditor for the Post-Office Department to credit the account of George H. Tice, postmaster at Perth Amboy, N. J., for postage stamps and money-order funds stolen from his office—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4529) for the relief of Antoinette Acken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 4530) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Augustus P. Burditt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 4531) for the relief of George H. Jewett, Arlington, Washington County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 4532) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church at Grand Junction, Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) for the relief of Daniel Butts, Moscow, Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) for the relief of Arthur P. McKinney, administrator of John F. McKinney, deceased, late of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen P. Palloy, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of Thomas V. Brady, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of J. Harvey Mathes, administrator of Benjamin F. Cash, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4538) for the relief of Richard Love, administrator of D. W. McKenzie, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) for the relief of Mary E. Bates, administratrix of James K. Bates, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4540) for the relief of James A. Richardson, administrator of Ezekiel T. Keel, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of C. F. Beezley, administrator of John C. Lanier, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4542) for the relief of H. L. Thomas, administrator of B. R. Thomas, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of Abner East, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Fayette J. Pulliam, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4545) for the relief of M. A. Gober, administrator of Joseph T. Abernathy, deceased, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) for the relief of Washington East, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) for the relief of Edward J. Tucker, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) for the relief of M. V. Dalton, administratrix of Carson R. Dalton, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PENCE: A bill (H. R. 4549) for the relief of the legal representatives of Royal M. Hubbard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) for the relief of Horace A. W. Tabor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4551) for the relief of William M. Keightley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4552) for the relief of John Palmier, Pine Ridge, Shannon County, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 4553) for the relief of Emily J. Fardy, Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Woodworth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAUGH: A bill (H. R. 4555) to correct the military record of Abraham Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) to correct the military record of John Shannon, alias Thomas Buckley, and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of Charles A. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting a pension to Melvin Seward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4559) granting a pension to Mary Collins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) restoring Julia L. Roberts, late Julia L. Doty, to the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting a pension to Harriet T. Vosburgh—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 4565) to increase the pension of John M. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, urging the passage of Senate bill 869 and House bill 2795—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition, to accompany House bill 4494, granting a pension to James Brundage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 8, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman rise in relation to the Journal?

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I desire to offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker's desk will first be cleared. If there be no objection, the Journal as read will be approved.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

JOURNAL OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF OKLAHOMA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies of the journal of the first session of the first Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. This communication will lie on the table, and the journal of the Territory of Oklahoma will be filed by the Clerk in the library for the use of the House.

REPORT OF MARITIME CANAL OF NICARAGUA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, in accordance with the act of Congress approved February 28, 1889: which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT DIRECTORS OF UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the directors of the Union Pacific Railway for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS W. CAMPBELL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Thomas W. Campbell against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I desire to offer a resolution and have it read, after which I will ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to consider the resolution which he sends up.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the extra session of Congress was adjourned on the 3d day of November last, mainly on the ground that the committees had no business ready to bring forward, certain committees being authorized on that account to sit during the recess, especially the Ways and Means and Banking and Currency Committees; and

Whereas nothing was done during said extra session to relieve the people; and

Whereas since the convening of Congress in regular session there still seems to be a disposition to delay matters, as suggested by the President in his message: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Ways and Means Committee be requested to bring forward at once the tariff bill, and the Banking and Currency Committee be requested to bring forward some financial measure for the relief of the masses, so that the Democratic party may redeem the pledges so often made the people.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDZIER. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY.

Mr. BOATNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill (H. R. 4568) to revive and amend an act "to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States and acts amendatory thereof," as a substitute for the bill (H. R. 1965) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of captured and abandoned property acts, and for extension of time in which to bring suit; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed. The original bill was ordered to lie on the table.

BRIDGE OVER THE TENNESSEE RIVER AT CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. GEARY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 291) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn.; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees. The morning hour begins at ten minutes after 12. The call rests with the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The committees were called.

ADMISSION OF UTAH INTO THE UNION.

Mr. KILGORE (when the Committee on Territories was called). Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman of the Committee on Territories intended to call up a measure this morning; but he does not seem to be in his seat.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman call it up?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, sir; I will call it up, as I know it was intended to have it done.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, is this bill called up in the morning hour for the consideration of bills?

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill for the admission of Utah.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Division.

The House divided: and there were—ayes 61, noes 3.

Mr. DINGLEY. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] makes the point that no quorum has voted, and the Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Texas, Mr. KILGORE, and the gentleman from Maine, Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 6, not voting 200; as follows:

YEAS—147.

Alderson,	Coombs,	Kiefer,	Price,
Alexander,	Cooper, Ind.	Kilgore,	Reilly,
Arnold,	Cooper, Tex.	Kribbs,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bailey,	Cox,	Kyle,	Ritchie,
Baldwin,	Culberson,	Lane,	Robbins,
Bankhead,	Cummings,	Latimer,	Robertson, La.
Barnes,	Davey,	Lawson,	Russell, Ga.
Bartlett,	Davis,	Layton,	Ryan,
Barwig,	De Armond,	Lester,	Sayers,
Bell, Colo.	Denson,	Lockwood,	Schermerhorn,
Beltzhoover,	Dinsmore,	Lynch,	Sheli,
Black, Ga.	Dockery,	Maddox,	Sibley,
Blanchard,	Donovan,	Mallory,	Simpson,
Bland,	Dunn,	Marshall,	Snodgrass,
Boatner,	Dunphy,	McCreary, Ky.	Somers,
Boen,	English,	McDannold,	Springer,
Branch,	Enloe,	McDearmon,	Stallings,
Brawley,	Epes,	McEttrick,	Stone, Ky.
Bretz,	Erdman,	McKaig,	Talbert, S.C.
Brickner,	Everett,	McKeighan,	Talbott, Md.
Brookshire,	Geary,	McLaurin,	Tate,
Bryan,	Geissenhainer,	McRae,	Taylor, Ind.
Bynum,	Goldzier,	Meyer,	Terry,
Cabaniss,	Goodnight,	Montgomery,	Tracey,
Cadmus,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Tucker,
Campbell,	Grady,	Moses,	Turner,
Cannon, Cal.	Haines,	Mutchler,	Tyler,
Capehart,	Hall, Mo.	O'Ferrall,	Warner,
Caruth,	Hare,	O'Neil,	Weadock,
Catchings,	Hatch,	Outhwaite,	Wells,
Causey,	Hayes,	Page,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clancy,	Holman,	Patterson,	Whiting,
Cobb, Ala.	Houk, Ohio	Paynter,	Williams, Ill.
Cobb, Mo.	Hudson,	Pearson,	Williams, Miss.
Cockran,	Hunter,	Pence,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cockrell,	Hutcheson,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wise.
Coffeen,	Ikirt.	Pigott.	

NAYS—6.

Griffin,	Haugen,	Pendleton, Tex.	Randall.
Hall, Minn.	Martin, Ind.		

NOT VOTING—200.

Abbott,	Bower, N. C.	Clarke, Ala.	Doolittle,
Adams,	Bowers, Cal.	Cogswell,	Draper,
Aitken,	Brattan,	Compton,	Durborow,
Aldrich,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Conn,	Edmunds,
Allen,	Breckinridge, Ky.	Cooper, Fla.	Ellis, Ky.
Apsley,	Broderick,	Cooper, Wis.	Ellis, Oregon
Avery,	Brosius,	Cornish,	Fellows,
Babcock,	Brown,	Cousins,	Fielder,
Baker, Kans.	Bundy,	Covert,	Fitch,
Baker, N. H.	Bunn,	Crain,	Fithian,
Bartholdt,	Burnes,	Crawford,	Fletcher,
Belden,	Burrows,	Curtis, Kans.	Forman,
Bell, Tex.	Caldwell,	Curtis, N. Y.	Funk,
Berry,	Caminetti,	Dalzell,	Funston,
Bingham,	Cannon, Ill.	Daniels,	Fyan,
Black, Ill.	Chickering,	De Forest,	Gardner,
Blair,	Childs,	Dingley,	Gear,
Boutelle,	Clark, Mo.	Dolliver,	Gillet, N. Y.

Gillett, Mass.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Moon,	Stevens,
Graham,	Johnson, Ohio	Morse,	Stockdale,
Gresham,	Jones,	Murray,	Stone, C. W.
Grosvenor,	Joy,	Neill,	Stone, W. A.
Grout,	Kem,	Newlands,	Storer,
Hager,	Lacey,	Northway,	Strait,
Hainer,	Lapham,	Oates,	Strong,
Hammond,	Lefever,	Paschal,	Swanson,
Harmer,	Linton,	Payne,	Sweet,
Harris,	Lisle,	Perkins,	Tarsney,
Harter,	Livingston,	Phillips,	Tawney,
Hartman,	Loud,	Pickler,	Taylor, Tenn.
Heard,	Loudenslager,	Post,	Thomas,
Heiner,	Lucas,	Powers,	Turpin,
Henderson, Ill.	Magner,	Ray,	Updegraff,
Henderson, Iowa	Maguire,	Rayner,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Henderson, N. C.	Mahon,	Reed,	VanVoorhis, Ohio
Hendrix,	Marsh,	Reyburn,	Wadsworth,
Hepburn,	Marvin, N. Y.	Richards, Ohio	Walker,
Hermann,	McAleer,	Richardson, Mich.	Wanger,
Hicks,	McCall,	Robinson, Pa.	Washington,
Hilborn,	McCleary, Minn.	Rusk,	Waugh,
Hines,	McCulloch,	Russell, Conn.	Wever,
Hitt,	McDowell,	Scranton,	Wheeler, Ill.
Hooker, Miss.	McGann,	Settle,	White,
Hooker, N. Y.	McMillin,	Shaw,	Wilson, Ohio
Hopkins, Ill.	McNagny,	Sherman,	Wilson, Wash.
Hopkins, Pa.	Meiklejohn,	Sickles,	Wolverton,
Houk, Tenn.	Mercer,	Sipe,	Woodard,
Hulick,	Meredith,	Smith,	Woomer,
Hull,	Milliken,	Sperry,	Wright, Mass.
Johnson, Ind.	Money,	Stephenson,	Wright, Pa.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state in behalf of my colleague [Mr. NEILL], that he is absent on account of sickness. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. JONES] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. ABBOTT] be excused on account of sickness in his family.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. There is no quorum voting.

The following-named members were announced as paired:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. GRESHAM with Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. SWEET.

Mr. JONES with Mr. POST.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

For this day:

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama with Mr. RAY.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. BERRY and Mr. MARSH were announced as paired on this vote.

The SPEAKER. Upon this vote the yeas are 147 and the nays are 6. No quorum has voted.

Mr. KILGORE. I move a call of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 33, not voting 163; as follows:

YEAS—157.

Alderson,	Caruth,	Geary,	Lynch,
Alexander,	Catchings,	Geissenhainer,	Maddox,
Arnold,	Causey,	Goldzier,	Mallory,
Bailey,	Chickering,	Goodnight,	Marshall,
Baker, Kans.	Clancy,	Gorman,	McCreary, Ky.
Baldwin,	Cobb, Ala.	Grady,	McCulloch,
Bankhead,	Cobb, Mo.	Griffin,	McDannold,
Barnes,	Cockran,	Grosvenor,	McDearmon,
Bartholdt,	Cockrell,	Haines,	McEttrick,
Bartlett,	Coffeen,	Hall, Mo.	McKaig,
Barwig,	Coombs,	Hammond,	McLaurin,
Bell, Colo.	Cooper, Ind.	Harter,	McRae,
Beltzhoover,	Cooper, Tex.	Hartman,	Meyer,
Black, Ga.	Covert,	Hatch,	Montgomery,
Blanchard,	Crawford,	Hayes,	Moses,
Bland,	Culberson,	Heard,	Mutchler,
Boatner,	Cummings,	Hepburn,	O'Ferrall,
Boen,	Davey,	Hicks,	O'Neil,
Bower, N. C.	Davis,	Holman,	Outhwaite,
Branch,	De Armond,	Houk, Ohio	Page,
Brawley,	Denson,	Hudson,	Patterson,
Bretz,	Dinsmore,	Hutcheson,	Payne,
Brickner,	Dockery,	Ikirt,	Pearson,
Brookshire,	Donovan,	Kilgore,	Pence,
Brown,	Dunphy,	Kribbs,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Bryan,	Durborow,	Kyle,	Pigott,
Bynum,	English,	Lane,	Price,
Cadmus,	Enloe,	Latimer,	Rayner,
Campbell,	Erdman,	Lawson,	Richardson, Tenn.
Cannon, Cal.	Everett,	Layton,	Ritchie,
Cannon, Ill.	Fellows,	Lester,	Robbins,
Capehart,	Fyan,	Lockwood,	Robertson, La.
Russell, Ga.	Springer,	Tracey,	Whiting,
Ryan,	Stallings,	Tucker,	Williams, Ill.
Sayers,	Talbert, S. C.	Turner,	Williams, Miss.
Shell,	Talbott, Md.	Tyler,	Wilson, Wash.
Sibley,	Tarsney,	Warner,	Wise.
Simpson,	Tate,	Weadock,	
Snodgrass,	Taylor, Ind.	Wells,	
Somers,	Terry,	Wheeler, Ala.	

NAYS—33.

Caldwell,	Lefever,	Morse,	Thomas,
Dingley,	Linton,	Oates,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Ellis, Oregon	Loud,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wanger,
Gear,	Lucas,	Randall,	Waugh,
Hager,	Martin, Ind.	Russell, Conn.	Wheeler, Ill.
Hall, Minn.	Marvin, N. Y.	Smith,	Woomer,
Haugen,	McCleary, Minn.	Stone, C. W.	
Hulick,	Meiklejohn,	Storer,	
Hull,	Mercer,	Taylor, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—163.

Abbott,	Curtis, N. Y.	Houk, Tenn.	Ray,
Adams,	Dalzell,	Hunter,	Reed,
Aitken,	Daniels,	Johnson, Ind.	Reilly,
Aldrich,	De Forest,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reyburn,
Allen,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ohio	Richards, Ohio
Apsley,	Doolittle,	Jones,	Richardson, Mich.
Avery,	Draper,	Joy,	Robinson, Pa.
Babcock,	Dunn,	Kem,	Rusk,
Baker, N. H.	Edmunds,	Kiefer,	Schermerhorn,
Belden,	Ellis, Ky.	Lacey,	Scranton,
Bell, Tex.	Epes,	Lapham,	Settle,
Berry,	Fielder,	Lisle,	Shaw,
Bingham,	Fitch,	Livingston,	Sherman,
Black, Ill.	Fithian,	Loudenslager,	Sickles,
Blair,	Fletcher,	Magner,	Sipe,
Boutelle,	Forman,	Maguire,	Sperry,
Bowers, Cal.	Funk,	Mahon,	Stephenson,
Brattan,	Funston,	Marsh,	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Gardner,	McAleer,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gillet, N. Y.	McCall,	Stone, W. A.
Broderick,	Gillett, Mass.	McDowell,	Stone, Ky.
Brosius,	Graham,	McGann,	Strait,
Bundy,	Gresham,	McKeighan,	Strong,
Bunn,	Grout,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Burnes,	Hainer,	McNagny,	Sweet,
Burrows,	Hare,	Meredith,	Tawney,
Cabaniss,	Harmer,	Milliken,	Turpin,
Caminetti,	Harris,	Money,	Updegraff,
Childs,	Heiner,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Clark, Mo.	Henderson, Ill.	Morgan,	Wadsworth,
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, Iowa	Murray,	Walker,
Cogswell,	Henderson, N. C.	Neill,	Washington,
Compton,	Hendrix,	Newlands,	Wever,
Conn,	Hermann,	Northway,	White,
Cooper, Fla.	Hilborn,	Paschal,	Wilson, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.	Hines,	Paynter,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cornish,	Hitt,	Perkins,	Wolverton,
Cousins,	Hooker, Miss.	Phillips,	Woodard,
Cox,	Hooker, N. Y.	Pickler,	Wright, Mass.
Crain,	Hopkins, Ill.	Post,	Wright, Pa.
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Pa.	Powers,	

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. BARRY with Mr. MARSH on this vote.

The SPEAKER. Upon the vote the yeas are 156 and the nays are 32. The yeas have it, and a call of the House is ordered. The morning hour has expired. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk began the call.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the morning hour has expired.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour has expired, but a call of the House has been ordered. By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call can be dispensed with.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote ordering a call of the House be reconsidered.

Mr. PENDLETON. The last vote shows the presence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. WELLS. I object.

Mr. PENDLETON. Then I move that further proceedings be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The vote ordering the yeas and nays on the question of ordering a call of the House was reconsidered, the yeas and nays were refused, and the motion for a call of the House was rejected.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 3544) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof; when the Speaker signed the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CAUSEY, for three days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. WOLVERTON, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. FELLOWS, indefinitely, on account of important business.

BERT W. KENNEDY.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution that I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it has been the usual custom to allow the minority an extra messenger, and as the Republican caucus has asked that Mr. Bert W. Kennedy act as such; therefore,

Resolved, That Mr. Bert W. Kennedy be authorized to continue as messenger for the House of Representatives from this date and until the meeting of the Fifty-fourth Congress, and to receive compensation therefor at the rate of $900 per annum, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution; which was adopted.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. I ask unanimous consent that members of the District Committee having reports authorized by that committee may be permitted during the day to hand them to the Clerk. I make this request for the reason that next Monday will be District day, and unless bills which are ready be reported to-day, they may not get on the Calendar for action on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD]?

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

The following reports of committees were handed in at the Clerk's desk, referred to their appropriate calendars, and otherwise disposed of as indicated below:

APPOINTMENT OF SEALER AND ASSISTANT SEALER OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. COBB of Alabama, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SERVICE CONNECTIONS WITH WATER MAINS AND SEWERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back in the nature of a substitute for House bill 2360 the bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALLEYS IN SQUARE NO. 751, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square No. 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. OATES. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 139) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Pending that motion I desire to submit a proposition to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES]. I wish to inquire whether he is willing that we take a vote now upon a motion to substitute a bill which I shall offer for the bill which he has reported. I wish to say to him that I make this proposition in perfectly good faith, because if the House should determine to adopt the substitute it would dispense with the debate under the five-minute rule, and that would save not less than three days of valuable time.

Mr. OATES. In reply to the gentleman's proposition, I will say that I have no right to make an agreement outside of the rules of the House; it is not in order.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. OATES. I say that I have no right to make an agreement for other members outside and independent of the rules of the House. The gentleman's substitute will be in order after awhile, and he can then offer it.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly; but I wanted to save time. In view of the gentleman's response I will ask unanimous consent that the House now take a vote on a motion to substitute a bill which will be offered for the bill which has been reported and is now pending. I think this proposition ought to be voted on before proceeding to the discussion of the bill under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The proposition requires unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir; and I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. OATES. I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bankruptcy bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 139) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I suggest that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. I do not think this reading necessary if the gentleman from Alabama will consent to allow the consideration of the bill to proceed at once. The bill will be read by sections at any rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk was about to begin the reading of the bill by sections for the consideration of amendments.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then, before the first section is read, I wish to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama, in charge of the bill, that the consideration of this section be postponed for the present. This section embraces definitions of words or phrases used throughout the bill. A number of gentlemen wish to offer amendments to this section; but that can not be done intelligently until the remainder of the bill has been considered. I suggest, therefore, to the gentleman from Alabama that the reading and consideration of this first section be postponed until the remainder of the bill has been read and considered.

Mr. OATES. I have no objection to that whatever. In accordance with the gentleman's suggestion I ask that the first section be passed over——

Mr. BLAND. I move to strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] has the floor.

Mr. OATES. I ask that this section be passed over with the privilege of returning to it hereafter.

Mr. BLAND. I want to save the right to move to strike out the enacting clause. I might not have that right after the first section is read. I have no objection to the reading of the first section if this right be reserved, or I will make the motion now. If in order, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to postpone the reading of the first section of this bill. Pending that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] moves to strike out the enacting clause.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. BLAND, there were, on a division—ayes 70, noes 72.

Mr. BLAND. No quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask for tellers?

Mr. BLAND. I have made the point that no quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint tellers.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. OATES were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 101, noes 91.

So the motion to strike out the enacting clause was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. OATES. I give notice that I shall demand the yeas and nays in the House on that vote.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the committee rises now and the House refuses to concur with the committee in its recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out, will the House then again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to further consider the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be for the House to determine.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then no further steps could be taken if the House acquiesces in the action of the committee except to dispose of the one recommendation? Am I correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. If the Chair will direct the Clerk to read clause 7 of Rule XXIII it will be found to explain fully the status of this question.

Mr. BLAND. It is a question for the Speaker to determine in the House, and not for the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. This explains the action that the House will take.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will direct the Clerk to read the clause of the rule referred to by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

7. A motion to strike out the enacting words of a bill shall have precedence of a motion to amend, and, if carried, shall be considered equivalent to its rejection. Whenever a bill is reported from a Committee of the Whole with an adverse recommendation, and such recommendation is disagreed to by the House, the bill shall stand recommitted to the said committee without further action by the House. But before the question of concurrence is submitted, it is in order to entertain a motion to refer the bill to any committee, with or without instructions, and when the same is again reported to the House it shall be referred to the Committee of the Whole without debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OUTHWAITE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 139, had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House concur in the action of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BLAND. I presume that is the only question before the House?

The SPEAKER. That is the question that the House is to consider.

Mr. OATES. And I demand the yeas and nays on that vote.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I desire to be recognized on this question.

Mr. BLAND. On the pending motion I demand the previous question.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have the floor for a minute, I suppose, or an hour, if I choose to occupy the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has been recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I only want to say that if I understand the question—and I shall not occupy the attention of the House but for a very few minutes only, unless some gentleman wants time—I wish to say but a few words on the situation in which we find this bill.

In common, Mr. Speaker, with many other gentlemen of this body, no doubt during the last session and during this session we have heard—I at least have known—that this bill was under discussion. I have heard two or three speeches made under the hour rule touching the merits of the same. But we understand, all of us, that the real debate upon any bill, general in its character like this, is not the debate under the hour rule, but is that debate which arises under the five-minute rule in Committee of the Whole when the bill is read section by section for amendments and consideration.

Now, I say no new thing to the membership of this House when I tell them, performing the duties upon our respective committees as we do—duties which are committed to us, and being thus enabled from time to time upon matters reported from the committees, to give information to the House—that in the main the membership of the House not upon the committees having in charge important bills know but little of these measures, and can know but little of the general measures reported to the House until they come before the great Committee of the Whole for discussion under the five-minute rule. I want to be honest with the House, and so, speaking for myself, I will say frankly that I have not yet read this bill.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I was going to give a guess about it I would guess that about two-thirds of the membership of the House have not read it either. I intended to become familiar with its provisions under the five-minutes rule in the Committee of the Whole, as we usually do upon great bills of this kind. Now, we went into Committee of the Whole, but before one amendment had been offered to the bill or any attempt to offer an amendment so as to reach the real debate on the bill, a motion is made by the gentleman from Missouri to strike out the enacting clause; which motion is carried. The committee rises and makes that recommendation to the House, and we now proceed to vote upon the striking out of the enacting clause of this great bill without a majority of the House having ever heard it read.

I do not believe that it is wise to take such action; and I say now that I am not speaking as an advocate of this bill. I do not know whether I am for it or against it, because I have not read it, and have not had the time to read it while performing the duties of my committee and my duties as a member of this House, with which I am specially charged.

Mr. HATCH. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Debate is not in order upon the motion made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I believe I have an hour. I think I want about five or ten minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order that debate is not in order upon the report made by the Committee of the Whole; and if the Chair will read paragraph 7 of Rule XXIII, there is no other conclusion. I appeal to the experience of the Chair and of every member on this floor that debate is never allowed on a report coming from the Committee of the Whole to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is simply because usually in such cases the previous question is ordered by the House, and it has not been ordered in this instance.

Mr. HATCH. The previous question never has been considered as necessary to stop debate upon such a proposition as this.

Mr. DINGLEY. Always.

Mr. HATCH. The House must vote directly upon the proposition. The paragraph reads—

A motion to strike out the enacting words of a bill shall have precedence of a motion to amend; and, if carried, shall be considered equivalent to its rejection. Whenever a bill is reported from the Committee of the Whole with an adverse recommendation, and such recommendation is disagreed to by the House, the bill shall stand recommitted to the said committee without further action by the House. But before the question of concurrence is submitted, it is in order to entertain a motion to refer the bill to any committee, with or without instructions, and when the same is again reported to the House it shall be referred to the Committee of the Whole without debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that paragraph contemplates an immediate vote upon the motion made by my colleague [Mr. BLAND] to concur in the action of the Committee of the Whole, and there is but one motion in order taking precedence of that motion, which is a motion to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee that the House may determine upon. Debate is not in order.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In reply to that, this is a motion to concur in the recommendation of a committee of this House. It is like all other propositions. It is subject to debate and consideration by the House, at the pleasure of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. Unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman in charge of the motion [Mr. BLAND] failed, as I thought purposely, to move the previous question, in order that it might have some little discussion and debate in the House. If the position of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] is correct, then we have a rule that would take it out of the power of the House, when this motion comes before it for the first time, to have one word of debate, and nothing could be left to us but to vote. The rule does not say so.

Mr. HATCH. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question right there?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. With great pleasure.

Mr. HATCH. Does not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] bear in mind that general debate upon this bill has been closed by the action of the House? General debate upon the merits of the bill has been closed and concluded in the Committee of the Whole, and after passing that stage the action of the Committee of the Whole composed of the same members as the House, has determined the fate of this bill so far as that committee was concerned by voting for the proposition to strike out the enacting clause. Now, when such action has been reported to the House heretofore. I challenge the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to name one single instance in his long experience in the House, and to prove it by the RECORD, where this motion has ever been under debate.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that there never has been one minute of debate as to the details of this measure in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that under our system of rules all matters are debatable unless there is some express limitation in the rules. The general rule is that any proposition is debatable. Debate was exhausted in Committee of the Whole, but not in the House. The House instructed the committee to close debate, but this is in the nature of an amendment. True, if it is concurred in by the House, it finally disposes of the bill; but in the absence of the previous question the Chair thinks the matter is debatable. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] in order that he might have an opportunity to move the previous question if he desired to do so. The gentleman did not move it, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Gentlemen will observe in the Digest a statement on page 352:

A motion to strike out the enacting clause of a bill is debatable in like manner as are other amendments.

This does not refer to any specific authority, but it is the view of the compiler of the Digest.

Mr. HATCH. I beg to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that it does not say that a report from the Committee of the Whole, making such a recommendation, is debatable.

The SPEAKER. Where is the rule that prohibits it?

Mr. HATCH. The statement of the Digest evidently refers to an original motion in the House itself.

The SPEAKER. Where is there any rule which prohibits debate? The general rule of the House is that all propositions are debatable unless there is something in the rules which negatives the right.

Mr. HATCH. I called the attention of the Speaker to, and read, clause 7 of Rule XXIII, which, in my judgment, according to that rule, determines it. In the universal practice of the House, if a bill was pending in the House, and an amendment made to strike out the enacting clause, and the previous question was not ordered, certainly it would be debatable; but this is a report from the committee.

The SPEAKER. Every amendment reported from the committee to the House is debatable, unless the previous question is ordered, on any bill.

Mr. HATCH. This is a report of the committee, and paragraph 7, Rule XXIII, does not treat it as an amendment; and that clause of the rule specifies directly how it shall be disposed of by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks, so far as he has considered the rule, that this matter is debatable, unless the previous question is ordered. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to resume at the point where I was interrupted——

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman allow me for a moment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. With pleasure.

Mr. PATTERSON. It seems to me that the gentleman from Illinois does not state the proposition correctly. We have had a general discussion of this bill. Now, it is very proper to offer a motion to strike out the enacting clause, which brings the issue up squarely whether or not this House is prepared at all to pass a system of involuntary bankruptcy. I fully concur with my friend from Illinois that, if a majority of the House is in favor of a system of involuntary bankruptcy at all, this motion should be voted down, and then this bill should be taken up for consideration by sections; but if it be a fact that a majority of the House is in favor at all of a system of involuntary bankruptcy, it seems to me that this is the proper method now to dispose of it, and it is not premature, that being the exact question to be determined.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, while I have not read the bill, yet I have heard two or three speeches, so that I think I am warranted in saying that this bill is a bill for voluntary as well as involuntary bankruptcy; that it covers both voluntary and involuntary bankruptcy; and it is not a question whether you have a bill for involuntary bankruptcy proceedings, but whether you will have a bill for either voluntary or involuntary bankruptcy. That is the question, because this motion goes to the whole bill, and if it prevails in this House further consideration is out of order, and the bill for voluntary or involuntary bankruptcy is dead. If, however——

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. A little later on.

Mr. BAILEY. Just at that point.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Very well.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if he believes that, should this motion prevail, that will prevent the House from subsequently considering and passing a bill for a purely voluntary system of bankruptcy?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. A bill might be introduced, go to the Committee on the Judiciary, receive consideration there, and come in for either voluntary or involuntary bankruptcy, or both; but if this motion is concurred in, this bill is as dead as a door-nail; and there can be no parliamentary motion made touching it under the rules of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. But a new bill could be introduced and passed?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, yes; the millennium might be brought about, too.

Now, then, if we go back to the Committee of the Whole, reversing the recommendation of the committee, we have a bill that is already printed, on which notice of amendments have been given, and in Committee of the Whole, where the only real debate is had, under the five-minute rule, every member has unlimited power, until he is cut off by a majority, of amending or striking out or substituting in Committee of the Whole, and making such a bill as the committee desires to make, and reporting it back to the House; and that is the proper course, in my judgment, to pursue. It saves time and disposes of the whole question when we get through its consideration, and gives us a bill for voluntary bankruptcy alone, if such is the wish of the House, or a bill for involuntary as well as voluntary.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that the great difficulty in his proposition is this, that the provisions of involuntary bankruptcy and voluntary bankruptcy are so interwoven together and so dependent upon each other, so far as the administrative features are concerned, that it would be utterly impossible for the Committee of the Whole to carve one out from the other and have an actual, substantial system left.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Why, my friend from Texas, with his long experience, certainly can not be sincere in that suggestion, or else he has not given this situation his usual attention. It is in order, at the proper stage in Committee of the Whole, to move a substitute for this whole bill, presenting the feature of voluntary bankruptcy alone, and if that is the sense of the committee they will report it to the House. The gentleman is on the Judiciary Committee; he is one of the best lawyers in the House, and has given this subject consideration. Let him, at the proper stage in Committee of the Whole, give us the bankrupt bill that he favors, and in all probability he will find that the majority of the committee will favor it. I do not stand here pleading for this bill, but I do stand for an orderly consideration of the subject by the great committee of the House, where we can have real debate and unlimited amendment and a disposition of this important question.

Now, having said that much as to the grounds of my opposition to concurring in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, let me talk a very few minutes about the necessity of legislation along this line. Gentlemen know the condition of this country. Gentlemen understand that this Congress was convened in an extraordinary session, which lasted three months, in which there was important legislation, in which, at least, we came together in this House and passed a bill far-reaching in its consequences. I do not propose to discuss that bill now; it was discussed during the special session. It was passed, under practical duress, with the whole business of the country breaking up, with banks suspending everywhere, and business men going to the wall. The people, like drowning men, caught at straws, and demanded that there should be some legislation, without understanding clearly whether it would give relief or not, going upon the theory that nothing could make things worse than the then status.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We did make them worse, though.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will not discuss at this time the question of whether we did or not; I am speaking now of the present condition of the country. Mr. Speaker, who is it that moves the business of this great country and of the world? That business is not moved in your bank parlors; it is not moved by the capitalists. True, it is necessary to have capital, and to preserve it, and give it all the rights to which it is entitled. Capital constitutes part and parcel of our great commercial civilization. I stand not here to inveigh against it.

But, gentlemen, if you wait for the business of this country to be moved by those who have accumulated great blocks of fixed capital, you will wait in vain. It is the labor of the country, it is the man that follows the plow, the man that works in the factory from day to day, that he may produce, that he may live, who consumes and who moves the wheels of commerce and of production. Then there comes in another class between the man who lives in the sweat of his face and the man that has an accumulation of labor in the shape of capital, the promoter, the wide-awake business man who ventures something, who takes the capital upon loan and puts it into a thousand different enterprises. At this time a very large percentage of those men who are connected with the active life of commerce have been driven to the wall and are powerless, burdened down with debt and misfortune which ordinary wisdom did not enable them to avoid. They are in every State, in every county, in every town of this broad land.

Now, the sooner this country gives that class of men, so essential to its prosperity, a chance to start anew and run a business course, without being subjected to daily embarrassment from debts they can never pay, so much the sooner we shall have cleared the decks for action. A vote to strike out the enacting clause of this bill, on the plea that the bill provides an involuntary bankrupt system, strikes out the voluntary part of it at the same time. I am not for that. It may be that there ought to be a well-advised involuntary bankrupt provision which would reach the dishonest man, the vulture, the thief, that once in a while creeps into commerce.

We will consider that if we get back into the committee and

insert it or strike it out as may seem best to a majority; but for one I will not shut the door in the face of multiplied thousands who make the very lifeblood, so to speak, of the business of this country, by saying that there shall be no legislation whatever providing for either voluntary or involuntary bankruptcy. I stand here in the minority, not responsible for legislation except for my own vote. You gentlemen upon the other side have to pull the wagon, and I am content, after you and we understand the position, that you shall pull it in whatever direction a majority of the House sees fit; but I say to you in all candor that it seems to me that, for the good of the common country, you had better call a halt before you refuse all legislation upon this subject. Wise, right-minded men throughout the length and breadth of this country believe that the present condition north and south, east and west, is a condition that, economically considered, need not and ought not to exist.

I believe, just as much as I believe that I stand here this afternoon talking in the American House of Representatives—I believe that if the people of this country could realize at this hour that there would be no economic legislation during this Congress or during this Administration they would take a new hold; that a thousand factories would start before next week, and that the 150,000 men who are ready and willing to work in my own city of Chicago alone would have work at a fair wage before the sun went down on Saturday of next week. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I can not say that I hope any such assurance will be given by either of the coördinate branches of this Congress. We know that the President will not give such assurance, because he has dealt with this matter plainly and directly in his message, instructing this House and informing the House and the country for the first time what should be and would be done by an obedient House and an obedient Senate. So that I can not hope for prosperity or commercial peace or confidence along the lines of sound policy. Therefore, as you are to journey in the valley of despondency, to journey along without remunerative employment of labor or of capital, in God's name, gentlemen of the majority, as you make your victims, at least pull off from them, as they fall by the thousands in the highways of trade and production, the shackles that they wear, and which can not be removed except by the Congress of the United States, acting under the Constitution, and enacting a bankrupt law under which they may be so relieved, that on the morrow they may take up the burden of life, and, though under onerous conditions, make bread for themselves, their wives, and their children.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS].

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the country demands a bankrupt law. It is not so particular as to what that law shall be. Any law by which an equitable execution can be worked upon the property of an insolvent debtor, and that property reduced to money, and the money divided among the creditors, and the insolvent discharged from his indebtedness, is a bankrupt law. Everything else is incidental and matter of detail.

Now, I wish to say just a word in favor of the much-abused bankrupt law of 1867. There never was a bankrupt law framed that had more careful or able consideration than that law. One of the ablest lawyers of the country framed that law. It was perfected by eleven years of amendment in Congress and by eleven years in construction of its provisions by the courts; so that, on the 7th of June, 1878, when that law was repealed, it was the most perfect bankrupt law that ever graced any statute book.

If this motion shall prevail, there will be no opportunity to vote, even to restore the bankrupt law of 1867; and in my judgment that is the thing to do. Repeal the repealing act, and we have a full-fledged bankrupt act ready at our hands to go into operation at once. Any new law that you may pass will require ten years of judicial construction to mature its provisions. There are a set of reports, consisting of eighteen or twenty volumes of decisions, under the bankrupt law of 1867; and you are going to fling them all away. They cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Why not, when we have such a law as that right at our doors, simplify the business by repealing the repealing act, and going on under the old law?

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no opportunity under the pending motion to present any substitutes for this bill. If the motion shall prevail, that is the end of the matter—neither the substitute of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], nor one I intended to offer, restoring the old law, can come before the House.

As my time is about to expire, let me say in conclusion that I hope this motion will be defeated, and the bill perfected under the five-minute rule, or if that can not be done, that the bill be referred back to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to report some other measure, so that in some shape we may relieve the insolvent debtors of the country. Mr. Speaker, there are to-day thousands of successful business men who took the benefit of the bankrupt law of 1867. Under that act they were freed from the slavery of their debts, and they have become successful in business. Many of them have paid their old debts in full.

We do not want to drive men out of business. When a man after becoming insolvent has given up all his property to his creditors, let him go ahead and do business again in his own name. Let us say to this large class—enormously increased by the hard times of the present year—"We will give you some relief." Let us not act in the interest of those repudiating States, that are fearful that a bankrupt law will operate in the interest of the creditor as well as the debtor. Such a law should be in the interest of both. A uniform system of collecting debts all over the country, in every one of the forty-four States, is in the interest of honesty in the interest of commerce, in the interest of everything that subserves the good of society.

Mr. BLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I reserve the residue of my time.

Mr. BLAND. How much time has the gentleman remaining?

The SPEAKER. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] states this proposition very clearly, I think, when he says that it is not to the capital piled up in the banks of the country that we must look for the revival of business or that should receive our main regard in our legislation with reference to the prosperity of the country. But, sir, this bill, if I conceive it aright, is a bill to compel the debtors of the country to go to the banks that have their capital piled up and borrow from them at large rates of interest, or else go into bankruptcy. Gentlemen who are interested in banking capital, not in farming or manufacturing concerns, may very properly advocate this bill.

At a time of panic and distress, when manufacturers, farmers, mechanics, and persons engaged in all branches of industry are simply asking a little time, a little postponement, with an opportunity to secure their property from confiscation and to enter again upon business enterprises, we propose by this bill to put the whole business interests of this country into bankruptcy and let the bankers loot those interests. That is the effect of the measure. Thousands of men throughout the country who are in debt, who are a little cramped in their business operations, and desire a little further time will recover themselves if we will let them alone, if we will permit them to go on in the usual manner under State laws without interfering with them, and they will finally get out of debt and become prosperous.

But here is a bill declaring all of these debts practically due at this time, and if a man can not meet his obligations, pay his expenses, or liquidate all of his debts from day to day, he is subject to be declared a bankrupt and his business and property confiscated. It is simply putting in bankruptcy the whole people of the country and subjecting them to be fleeced by the bankers and the banking capital of which the gentleman from Illinois speaks.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a demand for a bankruptcy system in the United States at all, it certainly is not a present demand. It is not asked for at this time. It is not demanded by the business men engaged in manufacturing and business enterprises.

It is demanded, if at all, by the mercantile community and by the banking community, who desire to go out upon the shores of our financial distress and reap their rich reward from the wrecks of the business and fortunes of the masses of the people. It is pressed here by that class of people, and not by the laboring people, by the manufacturing, the farming, or business people of the country. There is no question about that. The vote in the Committee of the Whole and the record of the rolls of this House will show the interests which are involved in it.

Now, sir, the gentleman talks about striking out the enacting clause of the bill as though it was something unusual. I have seen it done frequently in this House. I have seen, sir, the enacting clause of a tariff bill stricken out in committee and the bill so reported back to the House. If the House is not ready for this bill, if it does not wish to pass a bankruptcy bill at this time, why spend the time of the House in further discussion of it? My own experience about these amendments of which the gentleman speaks as perfecting the bill is that it is not unusual in the Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule, when the members are inattentive, when they are in the cloak rooms or scattered about, that amendments are placed on the bill making it ten times worse than it was before. For my own part I would rather take the present bill, bad as it is, if we are to have a bankruptcy bill at all, than to run the risk of what may be added to it in Committee of the Whole.

All of this special plea, Mr. Speaker, about involuntary bankruptcy comes from a source that is well understood. We know where the plea comes from. The gentleman from Illinois, when he stated that there ought to be some involuntary bankruptcy proceedings as well as voluntary proceedings, if I understood him correctly, meant——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman will allow me, I suggest, first, that there ought to be a voluntary system of bankruptcy, and a bill providing for that purpose passed. I think it entirely likely, also, that there might be an involuntary provision, and there ought to be such a provision to catch dishonest men. I think, though, from the little talk I have heard during this debate, that it is altogether likely the involuntary part of this bill is not wise, and I stand ready, if it is subject to that criticism, to help to perfect it. But for a voluntary bankruptcy bill, and an involuntary provision, if it shall be enacted, I stand ready.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the beginning of the long session of Congress. If this House determines that it wants no involuntary bankruptcy bill, now is the time to determine it: and the Committee on the Judiciary can then frame and introduce here a voluntary bankruptcy bill, and if the gentleman from Illinois wishes to vote for it, it is in his power to do so. But I take it for granted that the membership of this House want no part of this bill, and that it is dangerous to go into Committee of the Whole to undertake to amend a bill that has been already condemned by the House.

Now, sir, I do not desire to take up the time of the House in any further discussion of the bill, and if there is no gentleman desiring to speak upon the subject I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the enacting clause of the bill be stricken out, and on that the gentleman from Missouri demands the previous question.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Is a motion to refer in order?

The SPEAKER. It is not, pending a demand for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question recurred on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole to strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

Mr. OATES. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 111, not voting 99; as follows:

YEAS—143.

Alderson,	Cousins,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Ritchie,
Alexander,	Cox,	Kilgore,	Robbins,
Arnold,	Crawford,	Kribbs,	Robertson, La.
Avery,	Culberson,	Kyle,	Russell, Ga.
Bailey,	Daniels,	Lacey,	Sayers.
Baker, Kans.	Davis.	Lane,	Schermerhorn,
Bankhead,	De Armond,	Latimer,	Shell,
Barnes,	Denson,	Livingston,	Sibley.
Barwig,	Dinsmore,	Lucas,	Simpson,
Bell, Colo.	Dockery,	Lynch,	Sipe.
Bell, Tex.	Donovan,	Maddox,	Snodgrass,
Beltzhoover,	Duan.	Maguire,	Somers,
Berry,	English,	Mallory,	Springer,
Black, Ga.	Enloe,	Martin. Ind.	Stallings,
Black, Ill.	Epes,	McCreary, Ky.	Stockdale,
Bland,	Funston,	McCulloch.	Stone, W. A.
Boen,	Fyan,	McDannold,	Talbert, S. C.
Bower, N. C.	Geary,	McDearmon,	Talbott, Md.
Branch,	Geissenhainer,	McKaig,	Tate,
Brawley,	Goodnight,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Ind.
Bretz,	Grady,	McMillin,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brickner,	Grout,	McRae,	Terry,
Brookshire,	Hager,	Montgomery,	Tucker,
Brown,	Haines,	Morgan,	Turner,
Bryan,	Hall, Mo.	Moses,	Turpin,
Bynum,	Hammond,	Mutchler,	Tyler,
Cabaniss,	Hartman,	Paschal,	Washington,
Cadmus,	Hatch,	Patterson,	Wells,
Cannon, Cal.	Heard,	Paynter,	Wheeler. Ala.
Capehart,	Henderson, N. C.	Pearson,	Wheeler, Ill.
Caruth.	Hepburn,	Pence,	Whiting,
Cobb, Ala.	Holman,	Pendleton, Tex.	Williams, Ill.
Cockrell,	Hudson,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Williams, Miss.
Coffeen,	Hunter,	Pickler,	Wise,
Cooper, Ind.	Ikirt,	Reilly,	Wright, Pa.
Cooper, Tex.	Johnson, Ind.	Richards, Ohio	

NAYS—111.

Adams,	Davey,	Lester,	Richardson, Tenn
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Lockwood,	Robinson. Pa.
Babcock,	Doolittle,	Loud,	Russell, Conn.
Baker. N. H.	Draper,	Mahon,	Ryan,
Baldwin,	Dunphy,	Marshall,	Shaw,
Bartholdt,	Durborow,	Marvin, N. Y.	Smith,
Bartlett,	Erdman,	McAleer,	Sperry,
Blair,	Everett,	McCall,	Stephenson.
Boatner,	Fletcher,	McCleary, Minn.	Stone, C. W.
Boutelle,	Funk,	McDowell,	Storer,
Broderick,	Gardner,	McEttrick,	Strong,
Brosius,	Gear,	Meiklejohn,	Tarsney,
Bundy.	Goldzier,	Milliken,	Tawney,
Caldwell,	Gorman,	Moon,	Tracey,
Campbell,	Griffin,	Morse,	Updegraff,
Cannon. Ill.	Hainer,	Northway,	Van Voorhis, N.Y.
Childs,	Hall, Minn.	Oates,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Clancy,	Harmer,	O'Neil,	Wadsworth,
Cobb, Mo.	Haugen,	Outhwaite,	Walker,
Cockran,	Hicks,	Page,	Wanger,
Cogswell,	Hitt,	Payne,	Warner,
Coombs,	Hooker, N. Y.	Perkins,	Weadock,
Cooper, Wis.	Houk, Ohio	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Covert,	Hulick,	Pigott,	Wilson, Wash.
Cummings,	Joy.	Price,	Wilson, W. Va.
Curtis, Kans.	Kiefer,	Randall,	Woomer,
Curtis, N. Y.	Lawson,	Reed,	Wright, Mass.
Dalzell,	Layton,	Reyburn,	

NOT VOTING—99.

Abbott,	De Forest,	Hines,	Neill,
Aitken,	Dolliver,	Hooker, Miss.	Newlands,
Allen,	Edmunds,	Hopkins, Ill.	O'Ferrall,
Apsley,	Ellis, Ky.	Hopkins, Pa.	Post,
Belden,	Ellis, Oregon	Houk, Tenn.	Powers,
Bingham,	Fellows,	Hull,	Ray,
Blanchard,	Fielder,	Hutcheson,	Rayner,
Bowers, Cal.	Fitch,	Johnson, Ohio	Richardson, Mich.
Brattan,	Fithian,	Jones,	Rusk,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Forman,	Kem,	Scranton.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gillet, N. Y.	Lapham,	Settle.
Bunn,	Gillett, Mass.	Lefever,	Sherman,
Burnes,	Graham,	Linton,	Sickles,
Burrows,	Gresham,	Lisle,	Stevens.
Caminetti,	Grosvenor,	Loudenslager,	Stone, Ky.
Catchings,	Hare,	Magner,	Strait,
Causey,	Harris,	Marsh,	Swanson,
Chickering,	Harter,	McGann.	Sweet,
Clark, Mo.	Hayes,	McKeighan,	Thomas,
Clarke, Ala.	Heiner,	McNagny,	Waugh,
Compton,	Henderson, Ill.	Mercer,	Wever,
Conn.	Henderson, Iowa	Meredith,	White,
Cooper, Fla.	Hendrix,	Meyer,	Wolverton,
Cornish,	Hermann,	Money,	Woodard.
Crain,	Hilborn.	Murray,	

So the recommendation of the committee to strike out the enacting clause was concurred in.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JONES] is detained from the House by illness in his family.

Mr. MERCER. I am paired with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON]. If I were not paired I would vote "no."

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until Monday next:

Mr. HUTCHESON of Texas with Mr. MERCER.

On this question:

Mr. CAUSEY with Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. STEVENS with Mr. HULL.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky with Mr. RAYNER on the bankruptcy bill. Mr. RAYNER would vote for the bill and Mr. STONE against it.

For the rest of this day:

Mr. BUNN with Mr. BINGHAM.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BLAND, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. NEILL, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

And then, on motion of Mr. BLAND (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1893, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the bill (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to Guy W. Gibson. (Report No. 177.)

By Mr. HARE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the bill (H. R. 1313) to increase the pension of John Scott. (Report No. 178.)

By Mr. LACEY, from the same committee, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 855) to amend chapter 243 of the laws of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress. (Report No. 179.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) granting an increase of pension to John Stockwell. (Report No. 180.)

By Mr. COOPER of Indiana, from the Committee on the District of Columbia: A bill (H. R. 4013) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia. (Report No. 183.)

By Mr. HEARD, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 213) to pay for alley condemned in square No. 493 in the city of Washington, D. C. (Report No. 184.)

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on the District of Columbia was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4234) for the relief of John O'Brien, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 4566) to secure harmony

in the decisions of State and Federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKNER: A bill (H. R. 4567) establishing a fog signal at Kewaunee, Wis.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4569) to amend an act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4570) to repeal "An act to repeal the bankrupt law," passed June 7, 1878—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of West Virginia: A concurrent resolution to print special report of Bureau of Statistics on imported merchandise entered for consumption for 1890 and 1893, inclusive—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings relating to the acceptance of a heroic bronze statue of Gen. James Shields—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina: A resolution requesting the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Banking and Currency to report certain measures of relief—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 4572) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 4573) for the relief of John B. Moulton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN: A bill (H. R. 4574) for the relief of Thomas H. Pressnell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 4575) for the relief of the estate of J. A. Mulhouse, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) to repair monument of Merriwether Lewis—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4577) granting a pension to Lawrence H. Boyle—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLISH: A bill (H. R. 4578) for the relief of Alexander Wishart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITCH: A bill (H. R. 4579) to authorize the President to place upon the retired list of the Army Sergts. Connell, Frederick, and Long, and Hospital Steward Bierderick, late of the Signal Corps, United States, survivors of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 4580) to extend letters patent No. 183716, for improvements in water-closets, granted October 24, 1876, to William Smith—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H.R. 4581) for the relief of Emma C. and Charles J. Gotshall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) for the relief of Jane Thomas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) for the relief of Andrew B. Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4584) for the relief of R. M. Underwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) for the relief of Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of the late Rev. W. P. Duvall, deceased—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Henry Fishering, late private Company D, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting payment to John Shearer for the burial and funeral expenses in the interment of John G. Kyle, lieutenant, First Regiment United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4588) to provide pension to Ralph E. Summers for services in the Oregon Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 4589) to restore William F. Peck to the rolls of the Navy and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. IKIRT: A bill (H. R. 4590) granting an honorable discharge to Samuel Johnston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 4591) for the relief of E. H. Flory, Abbeville, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) for the relief Kate Gibbons, of Franklin, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona (by request): A bill (H. R. 4593) to correct the naval record of John C. Dull—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4594) for the relief of Isaac Esterley, Cocke County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4595) for the relief of the estate of William Porter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4596) for the relief of Reese Pritchard—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 4597) for the relief of Piromis H. Bell, administrator of Marcus A. Bell and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4598) for the relief of Theodore D. McCaddon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Abraham Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4601) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Porcella—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARUTH: Papers to accompany House bill 4517 granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Risley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of the Society of Veterans, of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking a pension for Francis Moon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: Remonstrance of the Pacific Pine Lumber Company, against placing lumber on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the Pacific Pine Lumber Company, of San Francisco, in opposition to placing lumber on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union of Alleghany County, N. Y., for relief from the oppressions and exactions of the Bell Telephone Company, of Boston—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Morse and Willis Manufacturing Company, of Friendship, N. Y., asking a reduction in letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. P. Putnam, of Jamestown, N. Y., for reduction of postage on letters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Chautauqua County Council, National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, praying for relief from the oppressions of the Bell Telephone Company—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of C. M. Wellons, administrator of James Willoughby, deceased, late of Hardeman County, Tenn., asking reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Protest of the Pacific Pine Lumber Company, of San Francisco, Cal., against placing lumber on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Remonstrance of 36 citizens of Warren, Pa., producers of American petroleum, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Vice-President being absent, the President *pro tempore* (Hon. ISHAM G. HARRIS, of Tennessee) took the chair.

JOHN T. MORGAN, a Senator from the State of Alabama; GEORGE C. PERKINS, a Senator from the State of California; ALFRED H. COLQUITT, a Senator from the State of Georgia; WILLIAM LINDSAY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky; JAMES Z. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Mississippi; J. L. M. IRBY, a Senator from the State of South Carolina; and WATSON C. SQUIRE, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of soldiers of late war, citizens of Marion County, Lancaster, Gnadenhutten, Wrinkle, Wheelersburg, Millersport, Baltimore, Barlow, Neptune, Germano, Leesburg, McComb, Lowellville, Adams County, Gallia County, Milford, and Jefferson County, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Volunteer Post, No. 715, Grand Army of the Republic, of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the suspension of pensions except in case of fraud, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of 175 citizens of Amesville, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the so-called Geary Chinese law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a petition of Chicago artists and engravers in reference to the revenue bill now under consideration at the other end of the Capitol, praying that the duty on lithographic work be changed from an ad valorem to a specific duty—that the duty on lithographic plates be increased from 25 to 50 per cent ad valorem. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I also present a petition signed by the pastors of a pretty large number of churches in Chicago, praying Congress to make an appropriation (I understand from outside sources that the sum required will not be over $10,000) for a small chapel in connection with the marine hospital located at Chicago, and on the ground which belongs to the Government, and is in part occupied by the marine hospital. The proposed chapel is to be for the accommodation of sick persons who are in the hospital, so that they may have an opportunity to attend church. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER presented a memorial of importers, dealers, and manufacturers of tin and terne plates in the city of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against a change in the duty on those articles from specific to ad valorem, as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of John Cowdon, of Washington, D. C., praying for certain action by Congress relative to the improvement of the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Geographical Society of the Pacific, of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made to determine the currents of the Golden Gate (California) and the approaches thereto; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Tulare Grange, No. 98, Patrons of Husbandry, of California, praying that, should Congress enact an income tax, the profits on all investments already paying a tax to support a State and county government be exempt therefrom; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of citizens and merchants of Oakland, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called Mitchell bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, praying for the passage of the Sunday rest bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., praying that an appropriation of $10,000 be made to be expended by the United States engineers upon a reconnoissance of the principal tributaries of the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio Rivers above the mouth of the Little Kanawha River, including that river, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fernandina, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to hasten the work of improvement at the entrance of Cumberland Sound, and that the work be placed in the list of permanent appropriations; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. IRBY presented two petitions of the Farmers' Alliance of Kershaw County, S. C., praying for the issue of legal-tender Treasury notes and for the abolishment of national banks; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce, of Chattanooga, Tenn., remonstrating against the placing of iron ore, coal, coke, and lumber on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Iron Molders' Union, of Nashville, Tenn., and a petition of Local Union, No. 463, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CALL presented the petition of Robert G. Gamble, of Florida, praying that a pension be granted him, and that favorable action be taken on his papers now on file in the Pension Department; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 752) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1005) to prevent the recording of the subdivisions of land in the District of Columbia in the office of the recorder of deeds reported, it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 443) to provide for the sale of new tickets by the street-railway companies of the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 445) supplementary to an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the District of Columbia," approved February 21, 1871, and also an act entitled "An act for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 891) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept payment without interest of certain special assessments, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HUNTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 354) relating to acknowledgments of instruments affecting real estate within the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark., reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the qualifications of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification, reported it with an amendment.

SETTLERS ON MILLE LAC INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands to report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota.

Mr. WASHBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered at the present time.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to hear it read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to be informed as to the effect of the joint resolution. I understand that it proposes to establish entries within an Indian reservation. I inquire whether that would not defeat one of the objects of the reservation by introducing white settlers, with title of property, within the reservation. I should be sorry to see a measure adopted that would, to some extent, break up an Indian reservation by introducing white settlers with title to land among them.

Mr. WASHBURN. I will state that the joint resolution affects only some three hundred settlers who filed their claims during the last four or five years and have made improvements. The Mille Lac Reservation is really no longer an Indian reservation. The Indians are remaining there only through sufferance. Under the act of January 14, 1889, there was an arrangement made whereby those Indians are to be entirely removed to the White Earth Reservation. So the joint resolution does not in any way affect the rights of Indians, or anybody else, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if there is any contest on the part of the Indians against being removed from the reservation.

Mr. WASHBURN. None whatever. There is no contest that I know of anywhere.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLETS ON NEBRASKA.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the usual number of the pamphlets known as the Discovery of Nebraska and A Visit to Nebraska in 1662, communicated by Hon. James W. Savage to the Historical Society, be printed for the use of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1213) to provide for the relief of injured and disabled employés of the Railway Mail Service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1214) to prevent unauthorized persons from interfering with railroad trains carrying the United States mails by authority of the Postmaster-General or officers of the Post-Office Department; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1215) for the relief of Leunes A. Jackson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 1216) increasing the pension of Alexander Williamson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1217) to continue in force the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1885, and entitled "An act to protect the fish in the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, and to provide a spawning ground for shad and herring in the said Potomac River;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1218) to enable purchasers at judicial sales under mortgages or deeds of trust of the road and property of railroad corporations organized under the laws of the United States, to reorganize as a new corporation, vested with all the franchises and privileges of the old corporation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1219) to amend an act entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, approved the 3d day of March, A. D. 1893; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1220) concerning the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy having served a full term as chief of a bureau in the Navy Department; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introdced a bill (S. 1221) for the relief of the Rev. William J. Larkin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1222) for the erection of a monument to the late Edwin M. Stanton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1223) for the improvement of the harbor at Tampa Bay, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1224) granting a pension to Irvin B. Wright; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 1225) granting a pension to Mary Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1226) granting a pension to Sarah F. Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1227) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Neuman, widow of Siegfried Neuman, late acting veterinary surgeon, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1228) for the relief of Charles W. Cronk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1229) to correct the military record of George Whitaker, late a private of Company C, Twelfth New Jersey Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1230) for the relief of Maria T. Karge; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Betts, Nichols & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1232) for the relief of George T. Dudley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1233) for the relief of Henry Lane; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1234) making an appropriation for the collection and distribution of commercial information by the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 1235) to authorize the sale of property situated in the city of Georgetown, District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROACH introduced a bill (S. 1236) granting to the State of North Dakota certain lands heretofore forming a part of the Fort Abraham Lincoln military reservation, for the use of the reform school of said State of North Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (H. R. 1237) providing for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as Salbwort or Russian thistle or cactus; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I request that the bill lie upon the table until Monday next, when I shall ask the consent of the Senate to submit some remarks in explanation of it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will lie on the table at the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the Monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

The bill (H. R. 3544) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof; and

The joint resolution (S. R. 42) permitting Anson Mills, colonel of the Third Regiment, United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN HAWAII.

Mr. HOAR. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if in his opinion it be not inconsistent with the public interest, whether any person whose name has not been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, and if so, what person, has been appointed since the 4th day of March, 1893, to represent the United States in the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whether such person has been accredited to the President of the Executive and Advisory Council of the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whether such person has been presented to the head of the Government of the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whether any, and if so what authority has been given to such person touching the relations of this Government to the then existing or other government of the Hawaiian Islands and the protection of American citizens therein; and

Whether any discretion or power has been committed to such person to determine when the naval forces of the United States should be landed therein or withdrawn therefrom; and

Whether any authority has been committed to such person to use physical force in the territory of said Government, or to land an armed force there; and

Whether such person has been authorized to, or has in fact corresponded in regard to the public affairs of the Government of the Hawaiian Islands with any private person, newspaper, or other periodical; or has been authorized to, or has in fact undertaken to receive in said Hawaiian Islands the testimony of any private person, or has requested or received written communications from any private person in regard to the lawful and existing Government there, or the circumstances under which said existing Government was established; or any other matter relating to the public affairs thereof; and

If any such appointment or authority has been made or given, further to inform the Senate whether the same was made or given at a time when the Senate was in session, or has continued in force during any session of the Senate, or of Congress, or of any part thereof; and further

Whether such appointment or authority was communicated to the Senate during any session thereof; and further

Whether any person has accepted, or undertaken to accept, the office of a commissioner or public minister with the power aforesaid, or any of them, or has undertaken in any correspondence with the Government of Hawaii, or with any private person, to describe himself as commissioner of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. I hope——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the resolution be considered at this time. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAY. Let it go over.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution being objected to——

Mr. HOAR. I should like, before the resolution goes over——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his objection?

Mr. HOAR. I should like to make some remarks to announce the purpose of the resolution if the Senator from Delaware has no objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his objection?

Mr. GRAY. I think the resolution, so far as I can gather from imperfectly hearing it read at the desk, is of sufficient importance to go over, and any discussion that is to arise, as naturally it may, had better go over with it.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose the custom of the Senate is without an exception that whenever a Senator introduces either a resolution or a bill and desires to make some remarks explanatory of its purpose he is allowed to do so without waiting for the time when the bill or resolution comes up under the rule. I never knew in my long experience here an objection raised to such an explanation. I wish it understood that I merely desire to make a few remarks pointing out the purpose of the resolution to accompany it.

Mr. GRAY. The resolution is upon a matter of very great public interest, in which the people are much concerned, and it will naturally provoke discussion, because, if we may judge from the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts the other day, upon a similar resolution, he had a great deal to say in a very emphatic way, which will naturally provoke some discussion, interlocutions, and what not. I think the resolution had better go over until to-morrow. I am always very glad, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, to hear him on any public question, and if I thought it would interfere with hearing him I should be the last one to interpose an objection. But I know we shall hear him.

Mr. HOAR. I wish simply to have the question understood, Mr. President. The Senator from Delaware, whether——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his objection?

Mr. GRAY. I withdraw my objection for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Massachusetts to explain his resolution.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; that is all I wish to do.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, if the Secretary will send me the resolution which is before the Senate I desire to make some brief observations in explanation of it.

I suppose every Senator understands that certain allegations in regard to public facts have been extensively made in the press of this country and of foreign countries. They have been the subject of comment by members of this body and by persons addressing the people on public questions in the recent campaign, both members of this body and others, and have been assumed to be true. They have met with no denial or question from any quarter; and yet they have not been communicated to this body or to the public from any official source.

If there has been any communication made to the members of this body as individuals that communication has been marked "confidential," and I am informed beyond question, while that communication marked "confidential" was in the possession of Senators, without any withdrawal of the confidence, a high officer of the Department of State communicated the same information to the representatives of four newspapers, not being marked "confidential" so far as they were concerned, and on being applied to by the representatives of other newspapers declined, on the alleged ground that the newspaper applying would not make good use of the information. Those four newspapers were zealous, thoroughgoing, and I had almost said unscrupulous supporters of the Administration.

Mr. President, one of those allegations is that the President of the United States, on the 7th day of March, 1893, the Senate then being in session, commissioned a person to proceed to the island of the Hawaiian group in which Honolulu is situated, and accredited him by letter as a commissioner of this Government to that Government; that he gave the officer instructions to represent the purposes and opinions of this Government to that Government; authorized him to have full access to the archives; said in the letter of instructions that he was to be paramount as the representative of the United States in that island, and directed the ordinary minister of the United States there to that effect. If that allegation be true, it seems to me as gross a violation of the Constitution of the United States as was ever charged upon or imputed to any public official.

The Constitution of the United States expressly enumerates "ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls" among the persons who must be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. If anybody be a public minister within the meaning of the Constitution, it is certainly a person whose authority is paramount in representing the United States over other public functionaries in the kingdom or power to which he is accredited. A person accredited to a foreign friendly power, with authority to command the Navy of the United States to preserve order, to protect the rights of the citizens of the United States, there to be presented to that government, and who the ordinary representatives, both consul and ambassador, are ordered to treat as paramount to them, would seem to be a public minister.

But that is not left to this inference, plain and clear though it is, because the Legislature of the United States has expressly dealt with that question. Section 1674 of the Revised Statutes, after enumerating the powers of consuls and commercial agents and consular officers, goes on to say:

"Diplomatic officer" shall be deemed to include ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, ministers plenipotentiary, ministers resident, commissioners, chargés d'affaires, agents, and secretaries of legation, and none others.

So by the express legislative enactment of the Revised Statutes, copied from an earlier statute, this commissioner was a diplomatic officer of the United States, and no other, unless one of the persons otherwise enumerated in that section should be such officer.

Mr. President, it is not necessary to say here nor to say to the American people that an attempt to usurp the power of appointing and commissioning such officer, without the consent of this body, is an attempt to usurp a power over all the diplomatic relations of this Government, which otherwise would require the assent of this body or the assent of the two legislative departments of the Government.

That, too, is not left to any inference of mine. When the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States established the provision for the appointment of foreign ministers, including ambassadors and other ministers, the power of such appointment was, in the first place, separated from the other constitutional powers of the President and lodged in Congress; and Mr. Madison, I think it was, declared that the man who could create the judges of a country would have exclusive power over their laws. So the power which could create by its own unchecked will the foreign officers of the country would have exclusive control of the foreign policy of the country. After full discussion the power was shared with the two branches of the Government as it now stands.

Mr. President, what, if these statements which unchallenged and unquestioned have passed current in the country for the past three months be true, has been the purpose for which that diplomatic officer has been sent to the Hawaiian Islands, and what has been his conduct there? I wish the Secretary to read a single section of the Revised Statutes of the United States in regard to the powers of these officers. I call attention to section 1751 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which I ask the Secretary to be kind enough to read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 1751. No diplomatic or consular officer shall correspond in regard to the public affairs of any foreign government with any private person, newspaper, or other periodical, or otherwise than with the proper officers of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, if the statements which have been taken for granted on both sides of this Chamber be true, this diplomatic officer, unconstitutionally appointed by a gross usurpation of power when the Senate was in session, on the 7th day of March, 1893, proceeded to Hawaii, and proceeded to open correspondence with private persons there in regard to the public affairs of that country. He called before him certain citizens, he addressed letters to other citizens, he took their replies orally, requested them to reduce their oral communications to writing, and transmitted that private correspondence to the President of the United States.

If there can be conceived a case which this legislation was intended to prohibit, it would be the entry upon the territory of a foreign government and the corresponding with private persons or taking their testimony in regard to the lawfulness of the establishment of that government.

Does anybody suppose that the United States of America would submit for a moment to the presence of a British minister, or the minister of any other power, who should establish headquarters and invite correspondence with disaffected private persons in re-

gard to the character or the lawfulness of the established Government of the United States, or in regard to the title of the existing Executive to his office?

Mr. President, the one thing above all others at which that legislation was aimed is the thing which is said to have been done. The United States would never have dreamed—I will not say would never have dared, but it would never have dreamed—in its scrupulous regard for its own honor at any time before the year of our Lord 1893 of sending an envoy to open correspondence in regard to the public affairs of the nation to which he is accredited with its private citizens, or denizens there not citizens.

So this act charged—I will not say whether truly or not, but charged by the press of the United States and not denied—the usurpation of the functions of appointing a foreign ambassador or minister in violation of Constitution and law alike, was followed by an equally gross violation of the express law of the land as found upon our statute books by the person so unconstitutionally appointed.

Mr. President, the public belief goes further than this. It goes so far as to suppose—I do not say whether truly or not—that this official reported his gross and palpable violation of the law of the United States to the authority from which he derived his appointment, and, instead of being reproved, instead of being instantly recalled, he was rewarded, or at any rate the act was followed by a regular and ordinary diplomatic appointment to the same Government.

It seems to me that the honor of the United States, that the dignity of the Senate, that the honor of the Executive itself requires a prompt and immediate and indignant refutation of these charges, which are so extensively made. Our statutes are full of safeguards and precautions against a usurpation of this kind. Section 1684 of the Revised Statutes says:

To entitle any charge d'affaires, or secretary of any legation or embassy to any foreign country, or secretary of any minister plenipotentiary, to compensation, they shall respectively be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

There is a further provision in regard to the receiving of salary by other diplomatic officers. Section 1760 of the Revised Statutes provides:

No money shall be paid from the Treasury to any person acting or assuming to act as an officer, civil, military, or naval, as salary, in any office when the office is not authorized by some previously existing law unless such office is subsequently sanctioned by law

Mr. President, there is another matter to which I should like to have the reflections of my honorable friend from Delaware address themselves before this resolution comes up to-morrow. It is this: As I have said, no communication upon this subject has yet been received by the Senate in its official capacity. Whatever public communications have been made, have been made to the press, and to favored members of the press; and yet, perhaps, I am stating more than I ought to state in regard to that matter, because if the reports in the New York World of yesterday, and I think in the New York Evening Post of Saturday afternoon, be true, our ambassador to England, who understands too well diplomatic propriety and precedent by long experience in the office of Secretary of State and long experience in this body to violate them, has been instructed to make a communication to the English public, in which the information withheld from the American people and withheld from us is most freely communicated. I ask the Secretary to read from the New York World of Sunday, December 10, beginning with "London December 9."

The Secretary read as follows:

LONDON, *December 9.*

A representative of the Associated Press showed United States Ambassador Bayard the special dispatch to the Associated Press from Auckland, and Mr. Bayard, after reading it with great interest, said:

"President Cleveland will deal with the weak Hawaiians in the most magnanimous manner, and will not force upon them a government which they have not had a full chance to discuss."

Regarding dispatches published in the Times and Standard to-day indicating that President Cleveland is about to reverse his Hawaiian policy and that new instructions to this effect have been sent to Hawaii, adding that the whole question would be sent to Congress, Mr. Bayard said:

"There can be no reversal of a policy based simply upon justice and magnanimity. President Cleveland's policy is one of noninterference. He had no intention of entering the island and deposing the Government. The policy of the United States toward Hawaii is not a selfish one. On the contrary, President Cleveland's intention is that no advantage shall be taken of the weakness of the Queen's party, and that the Queen shall have a full and fair chance to get on her feet if possible. Hawaiian native autonomy has been so enfeebled by late events that I hardly know whether the Hawaiians can avail themselves of the offer of the President to restore the Queen to the throne."

Mr. HOAR. Now, Mr. President, if that report be authentic, which I hope will turn out not to be the case, all I have to say is this: The opinion of the honored representative of the United States at the Court of Great Britain that the present President is magnanimous I suppose is an opinion which he entertains *ex officio*, and which all good Democrats entertain *ex parte*, and I have no quarrel with that. But if he has stated to the British public that President Cleveland has offered to restore the Queen to her throne in Hawaii he has stated it of course upon full authority from the Administration that commissioned him, and therefore if that be true it is also true that for some reason of state, which we are entitled to understand, Great Britain is taken into a confidence which neither the Senate nor the people of America share.

When we heard that the President's message was published in London in the morning papers in advance of its delivery to the Senate we all supposed that one of those accidents for which nobody was specially responsible had taken place in not keeping documents secret which were intended to be secret until officially made public, but we may not assign such an explanation as that to an official communication.

Mr. President, I want this matter to be separated from all questions of our dealing with Hawaii; from all questions of annexation or protectorate or dependency; from all questions in regard to which the two parties are divided. If it be true that the President of the United States, the Senate being in session, authorized an officer to exercise paramount diplomatic authority in another country with which we are at peace, directed the consul and the resident minister to promote his success by every means in their power, placed the archives under his complete and untrammeled inspection, authorized him to employ at his discretion the naval power, and to land or to withdraw the forces of the United States at his will, and gave him the title which is enumerated as one of the titles of diplomatic officers in the act of Congress, he is standing, in my judgment, upon very slippery gound, and he had better step on to terra firma rapidly and at once.

If, in the next place, such an official entered that territory and established a correspondence with private persons about its public affairs, taking testimony, making written communications, receiving replies thereto, that officer violated in a most gross and palpable manner the express written law of the American people. And if he reported that action to the President and it was approved, and the President made himself an accomplice after the fact in that violation of law, he is standing upon ice not only very slippery but very thin, especially if after that act of this public commissioner he proceeded to decorate him with a new diplomatic appointment.

Mr. President, the ostrich puts his head in the sand and thinks his body will not be seen. The rhinoceros hides in his mudpuddles and breathes through the tip of his nose and thinks he will not be seen. But neither of those is a fit and suitable precedent for the Executive of the United States. The people have a right to know, wish to know, and will know, let me say to my honorable friend, the truth in this matter. If in addition to all this the public policies in regard to grave foreign matters now, when the third session of the Senate has gone on for a week—it having been three months in session before, and six weeks in session in the spring, from the 4th day of March, 1893—the first communication of a purpose to restore that queen has been made by the American minister to the people of Great Britain when we are groping after it in vain, while no Constitution or no statute may have been violated, something else has been violated which I will not now attempt to specify.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I do not intend to be drawn into a discussion of this Hawaiian matter, even though the Senator from Massachusetts could not, even according to the precedents and customs of the Senate, withhold or restrain himself from an indulgence in his habit of scolding an Admistration belonging to a party opposite to his own. This is the commencement of the opportunities that will come to him in this second Administration of Mr. Cleveland. He scolded all through the first Administration and has scolded him back into the White House again. I do not think the Senator is to gain anything from that sober second thought of the American people, which after all has vindicated itself time and time again in our history, by putting up hypothetical cases in regard to which he is to deliver himself of the well-conned vituperative phrases that he has entertained us with this morning. Nor do I think that our honored representative, as he justly calls him, at the court of St. James, will take much detriment by his share of this scolding: for I recollect that when that honored representative occupied another high position in the Government of the United States he came in then for the vehement—what shall I call it—lecturing of the Senator from Massachusetts; and he actually has survived it, and stands as high to-day in the estimation and in the honorable regard of his fellow-citizens as he did prior to that lecture of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I have said this much because I think that it would be better taste all around if the Senator from Massachusetts had quietly waited until the official information, which was asked for a day or two ago (and which he must know from the character of the request made there has been no opportunity yet

to properly and sufficiently answer), comes to the Senate, in order that we may really have the facts, consider them, and discuss them in the light of our patriotic duty, leaving partisanship behind us in the dark places to which it belongs in a discussion of this kind. I know no partisanship where the honor of my country and of her flag is concerned.

I want to know whether the statements the Senator from Massachusetts has alluded to, with which the public press has teemed for weeks past, be indeed true; whether it be a fact that the flag of the United States has been disgraced and dishonored by a superserviceable agent of this Government and made to symbolize an act of piracy and aggression for which every honorable American ought to hang his head in shame, if indeed it be true, to use the hypothetical language of the Senator from Massachusetts.

It is very well for him and for others who agree with him to ask us again and again to avert our gaze from what is said to have gone on upon those far-distant islands in the Pacific in the middle of last January. We want to know something about that; and it was for that purpose that I cordially coöperated with the Senator from Massachusetts last week in passing a resolution of request addressed to the President of the United States that we might have as speedily as possible the information he promised us in his message. Until I feel that the giving of that information has been unduly delayed I shall possess my soul in patience, fully believing that the honor of this great Government, in which he and I are interested, is safe in his hands.

Mr. President, without attempting to go into a discussion of any of the hypothetical cases made by the Senator from Massachusetts as laying ground for the animadversions upon the Administration of his Government, I would simply remind him and the Senate and the people of the United States that the special commissioner was sent to the Hawaiian Islands because there was a transaction in those islands involving the honor of the United States between the Government of the Queen and the so-called revolutionists, in which it was made the duty of the United States to possess itself of the information that it sought to acquire by sending out a gentleman who could see with his eyes and hear with his ears what it was impossible for the President of the United States and for the Secretary of State to see with their eyes or hear with their ears, and they would have been derelict in their duty if they had not availed themselves of the ample authority they have at all times to acquire that information through an agent duly authorized by the Executive of the United States to procure it.

It will not be forgotten, Mr. President, that the so-called revolution instituted by five or six foreigners, three or four natives, and, so far as we have any information now, the accredited minister of the United States, resulted in the abdication of the then reigning Queen of those islands, and that abdication, sent to us by Mr. Stevens, the minister, and communicated to the Senate by President Harrison when he sent his message, was in these words:

> That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, his excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed in Honolulu and declared that he would support the said Provisional Government.
>
> Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces, and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest and impelled by said force yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.
>
> Done at Honolulu the 17th day of January, A. D, 1893.
>
> Signed by the Queen.
>
> (Indorsed:) Received by the hands of the late cabinet this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893. Sanford B. Dole, chairman executive council of Provisional Government.

So the Provisional Government, which informed the Government of the United States that it came into existence to continue only until a treaty of annexation had been made with the United States, also sent to this Government the abdication of the Queen, submitting her case on her side to the President of the United States without a word of comment, explanation, or difference as to the intent or meaning of that abdication.

Mr. President, without dwelling further (and I do not intend to be drawn any further into this discussion), it will stand as the patent fact before the American people until we get better and further information that this Executive of ours was compelled by every consideration of his high duty, by every consideration pertaining to the honor of the Government of which he is the executive head, to inform himself as to the state of facts surrounding this transaction in those distant islands before he attempted to deal with it himself, or before he attempted to give information to the legislative branch of the Government.

So I think that the resolution should properly go over until to-morrow under the rule, and I ask that that order be taken.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I wish to make one observation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw for the present his objection?

Mr. GRAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has pursued certainly a very singular course in this matter. I said if it should turn out that the honored representative of this country in Great Britain had made a public communication he undoubtedly did it with full authority to do it; and the Senator from Delaware——

Mr. GRAY. I beg pardon, I did not hear what the Senator has just said.

Mr. HOAR. I said that if the honored representative of this country in Great Britain had made a certain communication to the people there he undoubtedly did it with full authority; and that is what the Senator from Delaware calls scolding at him. That is all I said about him.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Massachusetts forgets what he said about him.

Mr. HOAR. I do not forget. That is all I said about him. I said that if a high diplomatic officer, paramount in all diplomacy, had been sent abroad when the Senate was in session, it was a violation of the Constitution and statute of the United States, and if that person had corresponded with private persons in that country about its public affairs, that was a violation of our statute, and the Senator from Delaware does not venture to deny either of those propositions.

Mr. GRAY. I do deny them, Mr. President. If the Senator will allow me, I expressly said that I do not intend to be drawn into a discussion now, but if I did not deny them, I deny them now; and I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that at the proper time he will find that the ground upon which he has made this arraignment of the Administration is something very different from his hypothetical cases; and he will find that the law of the hypothetical cases is something very different from what he has stated.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator has plucked up a good deal of courage since he rose before. He thought it was safer then and wiser to talk about what under a former Administration the United States minister did or did not do in Hawaii. The question being whether a diplomatic officer has been appointed and commissioned without the advice and consent of the Senate, on which we are simply asking information, and the further question being whether that officer has corresponded with private citizens there about its public affairs, the Senator thinks that suggesting that if that has been done it is a violation of our Constitution and laws is scolding, and he seems to think the proper and dignified answer to it is to indulge in some very coarse personalities about me. Well, I am willing that he should try that style of speech as long as he thinks fit. The question which we are to deal with is an American question, a question of the privileges and dignity of the Senate, a question of the prerogative of the Executive, a question of Constitution and law as applicable to a grave public occasion, and it is not in the least affected by the merits of our relation with the Government at Honolulu.

The Senator talks about my hypothetical case turning out very differently from the real one. The Senator knows the facts in this matter. He knows what instructions were given to Lord Paramount Commissioner Blount. He knows what that gentleman did; he knows what that gentleman reported; and he knows what decoration was placed upon his brows after the affair was accomplished; and it is utterly idle for him to say that certain hypothetical cases will or will not turn out to be true.

Now, Mr. President, I am very willing that the resolution shall go over until to-morrow.

Mr. GRAY. I never professed to know as much as the Senator from Massachusetts, and I never expect to know as much as he knows about everything.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me——

Mr. GRAY. But I had a right, I suppose, in my own way, to protest against the course which the Senator took in not telling us all he knew, which would take a great while of course, but to put hypothetical cases as a groundwork for what I ventured, without any intentional disrespect to the Senator from Massachusetts, to call his scolding. I think that is a very parliamentary word and a very moderate word. Surely, if the Senator takes offense at it and thinks it is a word which is disrespectful to him, I will withdraw it; but I am at a loss how to characterize it. What am I to say? The Senator says, in effect, that the course of conduct of the ambassador at the Court of St. James is infamous.

Mr. HOAR. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator says the President of the United States has committed an act which is only equaled in infamy by one of the worst characters of the old times in history given in

the Bible, and yet I am to sit still, and Senators on this side are to sit still, and say nothing about it, and if they mildly and in a moderate manner say that they think it is scolding, out of place, and is now a little premature, they are to be called to account as indulging in coarse personal abuse.

Now, I submit to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I submit to every one within the sound of my voice, whether the language that I indulged in with reference to the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts could be characterized as "coarse personal abuse." I am willing that the Senator from Massachusetts shall have a monopoly, if he wishes, of that kind of language. It may not be "coarse personal abuse" to say that the President of the United States—who is trying to do his duty (whether mistakenly or not) we all believe and the American people believe—has committed an act of infamy; it may not be "coarse personal abuse" to say that the honored representative of the United States at the Court of St. James has, in violation of every canon of diplomatic intercourse and of the proprieties of his station, taken the people of Great Britain into his confidence and given them information which is denied to the Senate, all founded upon an alleged interview with him in the newspapers, which alleged interview, even if it be true, like the hypothetical cases, does not bear out the inferences or animadversions made by the Senator from Massachusetts, and is nothing more than an expression of the private opinion of that sagacious and patriotic statesman as to what ought to be the attitude of his country. He is not represented as saying a single word as to the intentions of this Government. He merely gives voice to what rises naturally in his patriotic heart, as it would rise naturally, I believe, in the patriotic heart of every American, that when the flag of the country has been used for the purposes of dishonor, and when the authority and power and prestige of the United States have been made to cover an act of piracy, that the wrong should in some way at some time and some how be rectified. That is all.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator to read the last sentence of that interview.

Mr. GRAY. I will read it all:

President Cleveland will deal with the weak Hawaiians in the most magnanimous manner.

The Senator from Massachusetts, I suppose, will deal with the weak powers in anything but a magnanimous manner if he differs with the minister at the Court of St. James.

And will not force upon them a government which they have not had a full chance to discuss.

The Senator differs from the minister to the Court of St. James. He, I suppose, would force upon them a government which they had not a chance to discuss.

Regarding dispatches published in the Times—

Not regarding information he had received in a diplomatic way, but regarding those things about which all intelligent men and women, too, occupy their minds, the items of public information discussed in the public press, Mr. Bayard ventures to say this:

Regarding dispatches published in the Times and Standard to-day indicating that President Cleveland is about to reverse his Hawaiian policy and that new instructions to this effect have been sent to Hawaii, adding that the whole question would be sent to Congress, Mr. Bayard said:

"There can be no reversal of a policy based simply upon justice and magnanimity."

That is a horrible offense to commit. Why should he not be recalled? I suppose we can impeach him; and if we follow out the policy which the Senator from Massachusetts seems to uphold, then it will become an offense to believe or to proclaim that there should be no reversal of a policy based simply upon justice and magnanimity.

President Cleveland's policy is one of—

What?

Of noninterference.

Is that the crime which Mr. Bayard has committed?. I believe that. I say here in my place in the Senate that I believe that we ought never to have interfered. I may be mistaken, but I believe, as Mr. Bayard believes, that President Cleveland's policy is one not only of justice and magnanimity, but one of noninterference.

He had no intention of entering the island and deposing the Government.

Was that the private information he was conveying to the English people, obtained officially through his diplomatic intercourse with the Department, which was his chief?

The policy of the United States toward Hawaii is not a selfish one. On the contrary, President Cleveland's intention is that no advantage shall be taken of the weakness of the Queen's party, and that the Queen shall have a full and fair chance to get on her feet, if possible. Hawaiian native autonomy has been so enfeebled—

Says Mr. Bayard—

by late events that I hardly know whether the Hawaiians can avail themselves of the offer of the President to restore the Queen to the throne.

Mr. HOAR. That is the point. Let us hear about that.

Mr. GRAY. Very well. I have read all of the alleged interview, the last sentence and all. The Senator gets some comfort, I am afraid, in the last three lines of that patriotic utterance of Mr. Bayard, that he is afraid that the Queen's party among the Hawaiians have been so enfeebled that they can not avail themselves of the offer to restore the Queen to the throne. What does that mean, even taking this as an authentic account of what Mr. Bayard actually said? It means that when Mr. Cleveland, through the authorized diplomatic agent of the United States, disavowed the flagitious conduct of the representative of the United States last January and said we do not support the Government which deposes you any longer, that the Queen or her party will not be able to assert the physical power to restore her. That is all that the utmost ingenuity of even the Senator from Massachusetts can make out of that.

Mr. HOAR. Oh, no. The Senator will pardon me. It is not all.

Mr. GRAY. I have read the whole dispatch.

Mr. HOAR. I know; but the Senator now says that all of it is that the Queen can not restore herself. What is added is that she will be unable to avail herself of the offer of the President to restore her.

Mr. GRAY. Does the Senator from Massachusetts suppose, if the United States were to offer to restore the Queen by physical force, that it could not do it? Why could she not avail herself——

Mr. HOAR. I did not use that language.

Mr. GRAY. Why could she not avail herself of the offer of the President of the United States to restore her? That would be absurd.

Mr. HOAR. I will tell the Senator why, as he asks the question. If the President were not only to offer to restore her, but were to restore her, unless he maintained her there by the power of the United States she would go off her throne in twenty-four hours. That is the trouble.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator reads all that in those three lines?

Mr. HOAR. No; but I am pointing out what I will not say the Senator perverts, but omits and misstates unconsciously to himself in his zeal to rush to the defense of this matter; the one thing, which is that there is a specific allegation that the President of the United States has offered or is about to offer to restore that Queen. That is the whole of it.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Massachusetts unconsciously misstates, I will not say perverts, the language of this dispatch. There is not one line in it, not one word or one syllable that could be wrested into the meaning that Mr. Bayard, as our minister at the Court of St. James, or as a private and patriotic citizen of the United States, ever made the declaration or intended to be understood as conveying the information that the President of the United States had offered to restore the Queen to the throne by force. It is all based upon the dispatches in the public newspapers which this reporter had brought to his attention and founded upon them. They had stated that.

Mr. HOAR. Had they stated that the President offered to restore the Queen?

Mr. GRAY. According to this interview they had.

Mr. HOAR. Oh, no.

Mr. GRAY. According to this interview they had, and Mr. Bayard is discussing the dispatches.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator point that out?

Mr. GRAY. I have not the Times, but Mr. Bayard is discussing the—

Dispatches published in the Times and Standard to-day indicating that President Cleveland is about to reverse his Hawaiian policy and that new instructions to this effect have been sent to Hawaii, adding that the whole question would be sent to Congress.

Upon that this reporter puts this language—I do not know whether rightfully or wrongfully—into the mouth of the American ambassador, and that seems to boil down at last only to those three lines:

That I hardly know whether the Hawaiians can avail themselves of the offer of the President to restore the Queen to the throne.

If Mr. Bayard had intended to convey the information that the President intended to restore the Queen to the throne—and he is not to be put in the category of those men who do not understand the use of language or the meaning of words—why should he have said that the Queen was not in a condition, owing to recent events, to avail herself of that offer, when we all know it would simply take a squad of marines and a corporal's guard to depose the Provisional Government and place the Queen upon the throne?

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senator whether he does not agree with me, that if Mr. Bayard, the representative of this

country to Great Britain, announced there that the President had offered to restore the Queen, if my view of that language is correct, he would not have done it without authority? That is all I said about it. Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. GRAY. No, I will not answer that question, because I do not propose to answer hypothetical questions. I do not know but if the Senator from Massachusetts was in a judicial frame of mind, if he were not so zealous and eager to get his lance at rest and run a course against the Administration and if he were not so willing to take for granted every possible phase which is put upon this question which he thinks is discreditable to the Administration, then I might believe that he would agree with me that it would be decent, at least, when we are considering matters which concern the honor of the Government and its flag, that we should wait until we get official information of all the facts and then address ourselves to them as patriotic Senators of the United States ought to do.

The Senator from Massachusetts has founded all that he has said upon the fact that there had been certain accounts of what has gone on in the Hawaiian Islands and what has been done by this so-called special commissioner of the President upon the statements in the public prints of the day. He has quoted them, or their substance, matters which have been discussed perhaps at every fireside throughout this land, and it seems to me hardly fair—indeed it seems pretty hard lines upon this patriotic American, who is exiled from his country and called upon to perform the high duties of his station in a foreign land, that he should not be allowed to have in him the sentiments and opinions which patriotic Americans at home entertain, and when he expresses himself in the freedom of intercourse, which it is his characteristic to observe to the representatives of the press—if that indeed be an authentic interview—that he should be called to account here in the Senate of the United States by those who knew and served with him; who know his high standards of duty; who know his intelligence, his ability, his probity, and his thorough Americanism, that he should be denounced here on the faith of that interview as having done something to betray the secrets of the Government which he represents, and all because the Senator from Massachusetts chooses to believe, before the evidence is submitted and anticipating the facts, that some great wrong has been done or is about to be done by the Executive who happens to have been elected by a party opposed to his own.

I never gained my own consent, and I pray God I never shall, to draw the partisan line in a matter which concerns the foreign affairs of this Government, no matter how I may differ with the Executive who, for the time being, wields the authority of the whole people of the United States. Although I believe the policy of annexation which was avowed by Mr. Harrison, the predecessor of Mr. Cleveland, to have been a wrong policy; though I believe it was a mistake to have made that treaty, I never allowed myself to forget that he was the President of the United States and the President of this whole country, and that for the time being he was my President and entitled to fair play, fair treatment, and fair criticism at my hands.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware being asked whether he agreed with all that I said in regard to our minister at Great Britain refused to answer the question. The question was put to him once, twice, and thrice, and he will not say now that everything that I said about that high officer is not entirely true. All that I said was that if he had made a certain statement attributed to him by the foremost Democratic newspaper in the country, he undoubtedly was authorized to make it. That is all I said.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator forgets.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not forget.

Mr. GRAY. I think he does.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator misstates.

Mr. GRAY. No, I do not misstate.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator misstates. *Litera scripta manet.* Every word I have said is recorded and can not be changed.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator will find it in the RECORD.

Mr. HOAR. And I abide by it. I said that if that representative of this Government had made a communication, he being a man who understood diplomatic usage from long experience here and in the Department of State, he made it being fully authorized to make it, and I added a little pleasantry, that his statement about the President being magnanimous was a statement which every Democrat made *ex parte*, and the Senator from Delaware replied in the same vein, that every Republican would dissent from it or that I would dissent from it *ex parte*, or something of that kind. That is all.

The attempt, Mr. President, the wretched failure of an attempt to turn this discussion of a great constitutional question and of the dignity and authority of the Senate and of the usurpation of the power to appoint executive officers, into a personal attack on a member of the Senate, and the attempt to represent, in the teeth of my recorded words, that I had said something about the minister of Great Britain, which I never said and which there was nothing to suggest in what I said, and which when the Senator alluded to it I disclaimed again and again, and which I disclaim now—the Senator will have twenty-four hours to look over it, and I should like to see whether he will repeat the statement again to-morrow when this resolution comes up—I say the attempt is a wretched attempt, and the failure is a wretched failure.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that attempts and failures are inferences, not facts in this case. It depends upon who uses the word "failure" and who uses the word "attempt." I could, if I chose to imitate the manners of the Senator from Massachusetts, use the same words, but I refrain.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution being objected to, will go over until to-morrow, and be printed.

PROSECUTIONS UNDER ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to offer a resolution, to which I feel sure there will be no objection, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be directed to communicate to the Senate the total number of indictments found for violation of the Federal election laws since the year 1870, with the States in which such indictments were found, also the number of convictions and the nature of the punishment inflicted.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PALMER. I suggest that there should be added to the resolution the words "and the expenses of such prosecutions and convictions."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire accepts the amendment, and the resolution will be so modified. The question is on the resolution as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

REVENUE FROM INCOME TAX.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer another resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to communicate to the Senate the amount of revenue collected annually in each State during the time that the income tax law of 1863 was in effect.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PEFFER. I move to amend the resolution by adding:

And the number of persons in each State from whom the income tax was collected.

Mr. GALLINGER. I see no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire modifies his resolution by accepting the amendment. The question is on the resolution as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

CLOSING OF SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. PEFFER. I desire to offer a resolution, which I ask may may be read and lie over under the rules.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to rescind an order recently issued requiring that the Senate Chamber be closed to visitors.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie on the table at the request of the mover.

USE OF PUBLIC GROUNDS BY KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS.

Mr. VOORHEES. A few days ago I introduced a joint resolution, which the Senate adopted, in regard to allowing the use of public grounds in behalf of the Knights of Pythias. I understand exactly a similar resolution has come over from the House of Representatives, having been adopted by that body. I ask the Senate to take up that joint resolution and concur in it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the Monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the joint resolution be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana what earthly objection there can be to making this a general power in the Secretary of War? He is a very high officer of the

Government, whom we all respect and trust. Every cavalcade or public association of any sort in procession seems obliged to come to Congress for this authority, and when Congress is not in session I suppose the authority can not be obtained. I suggest that the joint resolution be made a general law or general resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to exercise full authority in this matter always and at all times.

I shall not, however, interfere with the resolution now if for any reason the Senator is in a hurry to get it through.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am inclined to think that this subject had better be held specifically in hand and this authority granted to organizations with which we are somewhat familiar. To generalize the question would take in a very extensive scope; how extensive nobody can tell.

Doubtless there will be no organizations but what are meritorious who will ask such permission; but at the same time it seems to me that I should rather have this joint resolution passed as it is, and we can consider hereafter the suggestions of the Senator from Massachusetts. They are certainly valuable suggestions and I should be glad to act upon them, but I would rather act upon this joint resolution now in the shape in which it is.

The resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar of General Bills and Resolutions is now in order. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

Mr. HILL. I gave notice last week that at this time I should move to take up for consideration what is known as the bill for the repeal of the Federal election law, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and is now on the Calendar of this body. It was suggested in the discussion of last week by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that the bill having been introduced by me at the extraordinary session and referred to the Judiciary Committee, it having been reported at that session, and as the minority had not, as the Senator thought, an opportunity to present their views before the committee, the bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I briefly explained then how the bill came to be reported at that time. A majority of the committee were present. The only Republican member who was present did not object to the report of the bill at that time. No motion has ever been made for its recommittal from that day to the present. In the mean time——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from New York that a motion to proceed to consider is not, under the rules, debatable.

Mr. HILL. I am proceeding by unanimous consent, as I understand, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, of course the Senator will proceed. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. In the mean time the House of Representatives has passed a somewhat similar bill, there being very little difference between the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and the bill known as the Tucker bill, which has passed the House of Representatives. That bill came here at the same extraordinary session, and, I think, at the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts was laid on the table, where it now remains.

The Senator from Massachusetts appealed to me last week that the minority should have an opportunity to submit their views to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think the minority should have that right, and for the purpose of affording that opportunity I move to take from the table the Tucker bill, so called, and have it referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Then I propose to move that the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee be also committed to the same committee.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Senator to allow his motion to lie over until to-morrow. I should like to submit some remarks on the bill or bills before the proposed reference is made.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances I hardly think I can consent. I assumed that the bill was to be referred this morning. I will adopt, however, the suggestion the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] makes to me, that the Tucker bill, so-called, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that my bill may remain here, so that the Senator may make his remarks upon that.

Mr. CULLOM. That will suit me. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. HOAR. At the end of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, unless some other Senator wishes to make remarks—which I believe will not be the case—then let the bill of the Senator from New York also go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New York moves that the bill, the title of which has just been read, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Now, I move to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee, simply for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to submit some remarks upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection that bill will now be reported by its title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 412) to repeal Title 26 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, known as the Federal election law.

Mr. CULLOM. I give notice that to-morrow at the earliest opportunity I shall ask the Senate to allow me to submit some remarks upon that bill.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator desire to speak to-morrow?

Mr. CULLOM. To-morrow, unless there be some reason why I should not. I think I shall be ready to speak to-morrow if it shall be then agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Then, let the bill lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

INCREASE OF NATIONAL-BANK CIRCULATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the first bill on the Calendar of General Orders.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 453) to provide for the issue of circulating notes to national banks.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I ask that that bill may go over, as the chairman of the committee is not present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will go over, if there be no objection, without prejudice?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will go over without prejudice.

WILLIAM E. WOODBRIDGE.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (S. 418) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852; which was read.

Mr. GORMAN. This is rather an important bill. There is a very large amount involved in it. I should like to hear the report read, and I should like to hear from the Senator who reported it something in regard to the bill. There have been before former committees some statements about it. It is a matter of great controversy and of a great deal of interest, I have no doubt, to the claimant, but we have rather a thin Senate, and, if the Senator from Connecticut does not object, probably he had better let the bill go over.

Mr. PLATT. Without prejudice?

Mr. GORMAN. Without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the Senate is now proceeding under Rule IX. Of course, if there be no objection, upon the request of the Senator from Maryland the bill will go over without prejudice.

Mr. GORMAN. That will leave the status of the bill the same as it was before.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill goes over upon the request of the Senator from Maryland.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-eight minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1893.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Charles H. Simonton, of South Carolina, to be United States

circuit judge for the fourth judicial circuit, vice Hugh L. Bond, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles Parlange, of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Edward C. Billings, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles D. Fullen, of Iowa, to be attorney of the United States for the southern district of Iowa, vice Lewis Miles, resigned.

CONSULTING ENGINEER.

Frank B. Dabney, of Louisiana, to be consulting engineer of the United States International Boundary Commission provided for in the convention with Mexico of March 1, 1889.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Commodore Francis M. Ramsay, to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in the Department of the Navy, from December 16, 1893.

SECOND ASSISTANT ENGINEERS, REVENUE CUTTER SERVICE.

Carl. M. Green, of New York, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue Cutter Service, to succeed E. A. Jack, promoted.

John J. Herrick, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue Cutter Service, in place of J. M. O'Donovan, deceased.

COMMISSIONER DISTRICT OF ALASKA.

Henry W. Mellen, of Boonville, Ind., to be a commissioner in and for the district of Alaska, to reside at Juneau City, vice William R. Hoyt, resigned.

CLERK DISTRICT COURT, ALASKA.

Charles D. Rogers, of Sitka, Alaska, who was appointed November 10, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be clerk of the district court for the District of Alaska, vice Nicholas R. Peckinpaugh, removed.

PENSION AGENT.

Daniel A. Carpenter of Knoxville, Tenn., to be pension agent at Knoxville, Tenn., vice William Rule, resigned.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Charles E. Davis, of Mount Auburn, Ill., who was appointed November 9, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Colorado River Agency, in Arizona, vice Captain Augustus G. Tassin, Twelfth Infantry, detailed to act as Indian agent, deceased.

George S. Doane, of Washington, D. C., to be agent for the Indians of the Quapaw Agency, in the Indian Territory, vice Thomas J. Moore, to be removed.

George W. Harper, of Carrollton, Ga., who was appointed November 9, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Umatilla Agency in Oregon, vice John W. Crawford, removed.

Isaac J. Wootten, of Laurel, Del., who was appointed November 9, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Nevada Agency, in Nevada, vice Charles C. Warner, removed.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Albert E. Amsbary, of Delta, Colo., who was appointed November 23, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Montrose, Colo., vice Richard D. Mobley, deceased.

John P. Clendenin, of Gassville, Ark., to be register of the land office at Harrison, Ark., vice Charles M. Greene, whose term of office will expire January 2, 1894.

Frank M. Hopkins, of Roscoe, S. Dak., who was appointed November 10, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Aberdeen, S. Dak., vice John Q. A. Braden, resigned.

Henry D. Ross, of Flagstaff, Ariz., to be register of the land office at Prescott, Ariz., vice John C. Martin, to be removed.

Jesse Ross, of Arkadelphia, Ark., to be register of the land office at Camden, Ark., vice James R. Hudson, resigned.

John C. Slack, of Folsom, N. Mex., who was appointed November 10, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Clayton, N. Mex., vice William W. Doyle, removed.

Andrew F. Snelling, of North Yakima, Wash., to be register of the land office at North Yakima, Wash., vice Luther S. Howlett, resigned.

Frank W. Walls, of Phœnix, Ariz., who was appointed November 10, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Tucson, Ariz., vice Herbert Brown, resigned.

William P. Wooten, of Russellville, Ark., to be register of the land office at Dardanelle, Ark., vice William A. F. May, whose term of office will expire January 2, 1894.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank M. Broome, of Alliance, Nebr., who was appointed November 10, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Alliance, Nebr., vice James H. Danskin, resigned.

John A. Bunch, of Kingston, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Harrison, Ark., vice Felix S. Baker, whose term of office will expire January 21, 1894.

Benjamin H. Crowley, of Paragould, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Little Rock, Ark., vice Mifflin W. Gibbs, to be removed.

David Dixon, of Magnolia, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Camden, Ark., vice Alfred A. Tufts, whose term of office will expire January 15, 1894.

Joseph S. Halland, of Clapham, N. Mex., who was appointed November 10, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Clayton, N. Mex., vice Henry C. Pickles, removed.

John F. Hughes, of Pierre, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Pierre, S. Dak., vice Edmond W. Eakin, to be removed.

Terence Martin, of Fargo, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Fargo, N. Dak., vice Nehemiah Davis, to be removed.

Edward R. Monk, of Wilcox, Ariz., to be receiver of public moneys at Tucson, Ariz., vice Charles R. Drake, to be removed.

POSTMASTERS.

William C. Bush, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Pike and State of Illinois, in the place of George Sanderson, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Edward S. Bryan, to be postmaster at Maywood, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in the place of James H. Merrill, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

William B. Davis, to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, in the county of Brown and State of Illinois, in the place of Jacob Friendlech, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Samuel L. Day, to be postmaster at Paxton, in the county of Ford and State of Illinois, in the place of Edgar A. Stevens, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

M. J. Howley, to be postmaster at Cairo, in the county of Alexander and State of Illinois, in the place of John Wood, deceased.

George C. Agnew, to be postmaster at Central City, in the county of Merrick and State of Nebraska, in the place of Christopher Hostetter, resigned.

William R. Boughn, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Cedar and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1893.

Hugh L. Cooper, to be postmaster at Tecumseh, in the county of Johnson and State of Nebraska, in the place of William A. Campbell, resigned.

Frederick E. Roper, to be postmaster at Hebron, in the county of Thayer and State of Nebraska, in the place of John M. Fitchpatrick, resigned.

Isaac F. Travis, to be postmaster at Weeping Water, in the county of Cass and State of Nebraska, in the place of Milton M. Butler, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Gustav A. Altenberg, to be postmaster at Tomah, in the county of Monroe and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Charles K. Erwin, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

James M. Keys, to be postmaster at Richland Center, in the county of Richland and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Jesse G. Bunnell, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

George W. Porth, to be postmaster at Milwaukee, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Winslow A. Nowell, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

John H. Rooney, to be postmaster at Kewaunee, in the county of Kewaunee and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

C. G. Wilcox, to be postmaster at De Pere, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin, in the place of William Armstrong, resigned.

A. O. Wilson, to be postmaster at Janesville, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin, in place of Charles E. Bowles, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate December 11, 1893.

Frank H. Dabney, of Louisiana, to be consulting engineer of the United States on the International Boundary Commission provided for in the convention with Mexico, of March 1, 1889.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 1893.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Joseph B. Doe, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of War.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

General Officer.

Col. Elwell S. Otis, Twentieth Infantry, to be brigadier-general.

Adjutant-General's Department.

Col. George D. Ruggles, assistant adjutant-general, to be adjutant general.

Capt. George S. Wilson, Twelfth Infantry, to be assistant adjutant-general.

Capt. William P. Hall, Fifth Cavalry, to be assistant adjutant-general.

Quartermaster's Department.

First Lieut. J. Estcourt Sawyer, regimental quartermaster Fifth Artillery, to be assistant quartermaster.

Pay Department.

Capt. Charles E. Kilbourne, Signal Corps, to be paymaster.

Adjutant-General's Department.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Wood, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general, with the rank of colonel.

Maj. William J. Volkmar, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Medical Department.

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Byrne, deputy surgeon-general, to be assistant surgeon-general.

Maj. Samuel M. Horton, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general.

Capt. Walter Reed, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Artillery Arm.

Second Lieut. George F. Landers, Fourth Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

Infantry Arm.

Lieut. Col. William H. Penrose, Sixteenth Infantry, to be colonel.

Maj. Edwin M. Coates, Nineteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Capt. Clarence E. Bennett, Seventeenth Infantry, to be major.

First Lieut. Charles St. J. Chubb, Seventeenth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. Arthur Johnson, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. and was called to order by the Speaker. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read.

Mr. CABANISS. Mr. Speaker, I am reported in Friday's Journal as not having voted on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] for a call of the House. I desire to say that I was present and voted aye.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the recorded vote on the bill known as the bankruptcy bill, I am recorded as having voted in the negative. I voted aye on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in the Journal of Friday's proceedings, and on page 107 of the RECORD, I am recorded as not voting. I was present, and voted aye on the motion to strike out the enacting clause of the bankruptcy bill.

The SPEAKER. These corrections will be made. If there be no further objections, the Journal as amended will be approved.

There was no objection.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, 1891.

The Speaker laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed statement of the receipts and expenditures of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

UNSETTLED ACCOUNTS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the First Comptroller, transmitting, in compliance with section 272, Revised Statutes, a report of such officers as have failed to make settlement of their accounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I think that letter ought to go to the joint commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] asks that the letter be referred to the Joint Commission of the two Houses Investigating the Executive Departments. Without objection it will be so referred and printed.

There was no objection.

ESTIMATES OF DEFICIENCIES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations required to meet urgent demands upon the Government for the fiscal years ending 1893 and 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. WHITING, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. DURBOROW, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. SPERRY, for three days, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO SIT.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I am directed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to ask unanimous consent for the passage of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be, and hereby are, authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

There being no objection the resolution was, by unanimous consent, considered and agreed to.

CALL OF COMMITTEES FOR REPORTS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called, when bills of the following titles were severally reported, read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying reports, ordered to be printed and referred to the calendars named below.

NEW ORLEANS, NATCHEZ AND FORT SCOTT RAILROAD COMPANY.

By Mr. GEARY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: A bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Boeuf River, in Louisiana—to the House Calendar.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE HIWASSEE AND OTHER RIVERS.

By Mr. GEARY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: A bill (H. R. 4611) to amend an act approved January 26, 1893, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Hiwassee, the Tennessee, and Clinch Rivers, in the State of Tennessee, as a substitute for the bill (H. R. 1912) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Hiwassee, the Tennessee, and the Clinch Rivers, in the State of Tennessee. The bill (H. R. 4611) was referred to the House Calendar, and the bill (H. R. 1912) was ordered to lie on the table.

BOARD OF REVIEW.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (H. R. 199) to authorize the Secretary of War to appoint a board of review in certain cases—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TITLE TO LANDS UNDER THE DONATION ACT.

By Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under the act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "Donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants of said lands—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

SALE OF LIQUOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

By Mr. HEARD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia: A bill (H. R. 4569) to amend an act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the House Calendar.

LAND SCRIP.

By Mr. SOMERS, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 73) supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled "An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives"—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

BRIDGE ACROSS BŒUF RIVER, LOUISIANA.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will read, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bouef River, in Louisiana.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved September 4, 1890, entitled, "An act to authorize the construction of two bridges across Bouef River, Louisiana," be, and is hereby, amended so that the time within which the actual construction of said bridges may be commenced is hereby extended for the period of one year from the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 5 strike out "Bouef" and insert "Bœuf."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the title will be amended in accordance with the recommendation of the committee.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

On motion of Mr. BOATNER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at fifteen minutes past 12. The call rests with the Committee on Territories.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill H. R. 352.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to say to the gentleman from Alabama that it seems to some of us that this is a bill of too much importance to be brought up in the morning hour. It is a bill of such importance, differentiating so much from all other bills for the admission of States, that it ought to have a thorough discussion of the entire facts that bear upon it. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill at some other time when there will be due opportunity given for debate. I hope, therefore, that the gentleman from Alabama will not insist upon its consideration in the morning hour.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow and the next day be set aside for the consideration of all bills from the Committee on Territories that have been reported and are on the Calendar.

Mr. REED. I do not think that is a fair proposition. Why not confine it to Utah?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I will simply say the Utah bill. I have no intention of bringing up any other bill when the persons interested are not here. I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow and the next day be set aside for the consideration of the bill H. R. 352, for the admission of Utah.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that to-morrow and the next day be set apart for the consideration of the bill for the admission of Utah as a State. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. That will be understood to be after the second morning hour.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Then we pass over the committee.

ROBERT TRAVILA.

Mr. HERMANN (when the Committee on War Claims was called). I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 894) for the relief of Robert Travila for loss of carbine in the late war.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to settle with and, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, pay to Robert Travila, late of Company K, First United States Cavalry, the sum of $75.60, the amount overcharged him for loss of a carbine.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, from what committee is this bill reported?

The SPEAKER. From the Committee on War Claims, and it is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. HERMANN. Then I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill H. R. 894.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill which the Clerk will now report.

The bill was again read.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to have the report on that bill read.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes the payment of $75 to Robert Travila, who at the time of the loss of the carbine (for that is the property for which payment is claimed) was a cavalryman in the service of the United States. The carbine was lost in the Territory of Arizona while the soldier was traveling among the mountain defiles, and was lost without any negligence on the part of the soldier. The carbine was charged up against his pay to the extent of $100, under the law which provides that the loss of a carbine shall be charged for at that rate. The soldier comes before the committee and shows that the carbine was not lost through his negligence or carelessness; that he used due diligence in properly strapping it to his saddle, and that the loss was without any fault on his part. He now asks to be paid the difference between the cost of the carbine and the amount charged against him.

The Chief of Ordnance says that at that time the cost of the carbine was about $25. The same weapons can now be manufactured for about $10.60; but the committee concluded that it would ask for the difference between the original cost, about $25, and the amount charged, which would leave to his credit $75. The showing is quite conclusive that it was due to no negligence on his part. The Government has received the full cost of the carbine and the soldier would receive the balance.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to know from the gentleman from Oregon what evidence he has that this carbine was not lost from carelessness. There is no statement here at all but the report of the committee.

Mr. HERMANN. I will answer the gentleman from Texas by saying that the evidence before our committee, in the shape of affidavits, is conclusive——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I rise to a question of order. There is so much confusion I can not hear anything that is said.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The committee will be in order, and gentlemen in the aisles engaged in conversation will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, my answer to the interrogatory of the gentleman from Texas was that ample evidence is before the Committee on War Claims tending to show that this soldier had provided himself with every arrangement by which this carbine was well taken care of, but in passing through the mountain defiles in Arizona the weapon was struck by coming in contact with a rock, was disengaged or loosened from the saddle, and lost in one of those great precipices; so that it was lost without any negligence on his part.

The cost to the Government, as I before stated, was only $25, and the same weapon can now be manufactured for $10.60. This man was charged $100 for the loss of this carbine under a law which provides that that sum shall be deducted from the pay of a soldier in the event of the loss of his weapon through carelessness, but he has proved conclusively that this was not lost through carelessness. The bill has been reported several times in the Senate and it has been on the House Calendar for a long period, but the amount involved being so small, I could not afford to use my right to recognition to call up this bill to the neglect of more important matters, and the consequence has been that this poor fellow has been put off from year to year for the last ten years. I think there can be no question about the propriety of the bill. I move that the committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 894), and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HERMANN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COURTS IN NEBRASKA.

Mr. CULBERSON (when the Committee on the Judiciary was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 108) to fix the times and places for holding the Federal courts in the State and district of Nebraska.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States within and for the State and district of Nebraska shall be held at the times and places following, that is to say:

At Omaha City, on the first Monday in May and the second Monday in November in each year;

At the city of Lincoln, on the third Monday in January in each year;
At the city of Hastings, on the third Monday in April; and
At the city of Norfolk, on the fourth Monday in April of each year.
SEC. 2. That the passage of this act shall not operate so as to change any existing law, except as to the change of time for holding said courts.

The committee recommended an amendment to the bill, adding, in line 10, after the word "year," "and the first Monday in June in each year."

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] has an amendment which he desires to offer to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. BRYAN. I can state the amendment. It is to strike out the words "the first Monday in June," and insert "the third Monday in September," so that the provision will read: "At the city of Lincoln on the third Monday of January in each year and the third Monday in September." The committee are willing that this amendment shall be made.

Mr. MERCER. There is no controversy about the amendment. It has been unanimously agreed to.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to, and the committee amendment as amended was then adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CULBERSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CLAIMS FOR CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4568) to revise and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof.

The bill was read.

Be it enacted, etc., That the right of action in the Court of Claims under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the collection of abandoned property, and for the prevention of frauds in the insurrectionary districts within the United States," approved March 12, 1863, and acts amendatory thereof, be, and the same is hereby, revived and extended for two years from and after the passage of this act, including all cases of seizure under said acts, or under color thereof, either before or after June 30, 1865, whether adjudicated by the Secretary of the Treasury or not, and without regard to any statute of limitations or the loyalty of the claimant at the time of seizure.

SEC. 2. That the benefits of the foregoing section be, and the same are hereby, extended to those claimants whose claims have been adversely determined by said court upon the ground of disloyalty; and all suits on claims which have been so rejected shall, on motion of the claimants or their legal representatives, be reinstated on the docket of the Court of Claims and proceeded with according to law: *Provided*, That no liability of the United States to the parties in interest shall be created by the judgments of the Court of Claims beyond the fund now in the Treasury, realized by the sale of property taken under the provisons of the act to which this is a supplement: *And provided further*, That in all cases in which claimants trace the proceeds of their property into the Treasury the judgments shall be for the full amount of said proceeds, and the balance of said fund, if any, shall be distributed pro rata among those claimants who shall prove that their property was seized under said acts or under color thereof, but who are unable to trace or identify the proceeds thereof in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure, and one which I think ought not to be considered in the morning hour. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that next Tuesday week be set apart for its consideration.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a bill which not only ought not to be considered in the morning hour, but, which, if it is to be considered at all, ought to be considered under the regular rules of the House. The facilities which those rules afford for the consideration of meritorious measures like this are so well known to the gentleman from Texas that I am sure he can not object to my suggestion.

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, we want a day set for the consideration of this bill, and we know of no other way to reach it under the rules of the House except in the morning hour.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from Texas helped to make these rules and they are very valuable, and they should be preserved in their integrity and entirety.

Mr. BURROWS. I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas that, under the rules, he will have no difficulty in obtaining a special order fixing a time for the consideration of a measure of this importance.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am aware of that. I ask unanimous consent that Tuesday week next be set apart for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. REED. I object. I call for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill ought to be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. It belongs on the Union Calendar.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering this bill, and I state now that I make this motion for the purpose of having printed in the RECORD the report that I made upon this bill in the last Congress.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman's only object is to have his report printed in the RECORD, that may be done by unanimous consent without going into committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, I ask unanimous consent that my report may be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. REED. Do I understand that the gentleman proposes to withdraw the bill?

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BURROWS. I should like to know whether consent has been given for the printing of the views of the minority on this bill?

Mr. BOATNER. There is no minority report. The report is unanimous.

Subsequently the following proceedings took place:

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the bill which has gone over on request of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it is stated that there are no views of the minority in that case. That is true, but the chairman of the committee calls my attention to the fact, which he did not then observe, that the committee at this session adopt the report of the committee submitted at a previous session by the distinguished chairman of the committee. At that time there was a minority report prepared by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR], and I ask that, inasmuch as that report is adopted, that the views of the minority submitted at that time be published in the RECORD in connection with the committee report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection that order will be made so as to allow the views of the minority to be printed.

The report [by Mr. CULBERSON] and the views of the minority are as follows:

House Report No. 1377, Fifty-second Congress, second session.

CLAIMS ARISING UNDER THE CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY ACT.

May 12, 1892—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary have considered the bill (H. R. 455) in relation to claims arising under the captured and abandoned property act and for the extension of time in which to bring suit, and recommend its passage for the following reason:

A large amount of property in the States in rebellion or insurrection was seized during the war and immediately after the cessation of hostilities, without regard to the ownership of such property, or the political status of its owners, or the possession of the property at the time of the seizure, by the military and other Federal authorities. The seizure and sale of this property were made under the acts of March 12, 1863, and July 2, 1864, known as the captured and abandoned property acts, and other measures amendatory and supplementary thereof.

The law required the property to be sold and the proceeds placed in the Treasury to the credit of the property.

The third section of the act of March 12, 1863, under which the bulk of the property was seized, provided as follows:

"Any person claiming to have been the owner of any such abandoned or captured property, may at any time within two years after the suppression of the rebellion, prefer his claim to the proceeds thereof in the Court of Claims, and on proof to the satisfaction of said court of his ownership of said property, of his right to the proceeds thereof, and that he has never given any aid or comfort to the present rebellion, to receive the residue of such proceeds, after the deduction of any purchase money which may have been paid, together with the expense of transportation and sale of said property, and any other lawful expenses attending the disposition thereof."

Under this provision of the statute many suits were instituted in the Court of Claims by persons claiming to be the owners of property seized under the acts referred to, and when the proof required by the statute was made judgment was rendered in their favor and the money paid.

Over $30,000,000 were placed in the Treasury on account of sales of property under the act of March 12, 1863, and other kindred acts.

The amount now on hand of this fund is $10,512,007.96.

The following statement is believed to be substantially correct and will show the whole amount of money received into the Treasury on account of captured and abandoned property and the amounts paid out from time to time:

Whole amount of abandoned and captured property sales		$31,722,466.20
Cost of collecting, sale, and other expenses	$6,551,000.00	
Transferred to Freedman's Bureau	243,000.00	
Internal-revenue taxes and commercial intercourse fees	1,406,000.00	
Released to claimants by Secretaries Chase, Fessenden, and McCulloch	2,550,675.24	
		10,750,675.24
Balance covered into Treasury under resolution of March 30, 1872		20,971,790.96
Paid on special acts of relief	$290,906.32	
Paid on judgments against Treasury agents	64,557.27	
Paid on judgments under act of March 12, 1863	9,833,423.16	
Paid by Secretary of the Treasury under act of May 18, 1872	195,896.25	
Disbursed for expenses under joint resolution of March 30, 1868	75,000.00	
		10,459,783.00
Balance in Treasury		10,512,007.96

It is understood that the application of the ruling of the Supreme Court, in an opinion delivered since this statement was made, to this fund will materially reduce the amount of this balance, but to what extent can not, with the information at hand, be stated with certainty.

The Government has had the use of this money for more than twenty years, and if it is ever to be distributed to its owners some additional legislation is required. Congress, at every session, is asked to permit individual claimants to bring suit in the Court of Claims to establish their rights in this fund. This privilege has been accorded to some and denied to others.

Further legislation is necessary in order to distribute this fund, because

the limitation of two years from and after the close of the war in which claimants of this property were required to prefer their claims has long since expired, and there is now no means provided by law by which the claimants of the fund can enforce their rights.

Formerly there was much contention upon the status of this fund in the Treasury, especially that portion of it derived from the sale of property belonging to those who adhered to the rebellion. It is evident from the terms of the act of 1863 that it was not the intention of Congress that the title to the property seized under it should be divested from the loyal owners. They were allowed two years from and after the close of the war in which to prefer their claims to the property, and because no provision was made by which persons who had been disloyal could prefer their claims in the property and enforce their rights, it was contended that the seizure and sale of so much of this property as belonged to disloyal persons worked a divesture of title and absolutely transferred the proceeds to the Government. On the other hand, it was contended that such seizure and sale of property of disloyal persons did not divest the title of the original owners, and that the fund derived from such sales was placed in the Treasury to be kept there to await the determination of the Government whether it should be returned to the owners of the property or not.

Your committee believe that this contention has been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Klein *vs.* The United States, reported in 13 Wallace, page 128, and the following quotations are made from the report of the case:

"1. That it was not the intention of Congress, by the enactment of that statute, that the title to property seized under it should be divested from the loyal owners.

"2. That the proceeds of the property should go into the Treasury without change of ownership.

"3. That the same intention prevailed in regard to the property of owners who though then hostile might subsequently become loyal.

"4. That it was for the Government itself to determine whether those proceeds should be restored to the owner or not.

"5. That the President's proclamation of pardon and amnesty, with restoration of rights of property, and particularly that of July 4, 1868, was a decision on the part of the Government which decided affirmatively the right of all the owners of such property to the proceeds thereof in the Treasury; and the restoration of the proceeds became the absolute right of the persons pardoned.

"6. And that 'the Government constituted itself the trustee for those who by that act were declared entitled to the proceeds of captured and abandoned property, and for those whom it should thereafter recognize as entitled.'"

And in its opinion the court uses this language:

"That it was not the intention of Congress that the title to these proceeds should be divested absolutely out of the original owners of the property seems clear upon a comparison of different parts of the act.

We have already seen that those articles which became by the simple fact of capture the property of the captor, as ordnance, munitions of war, and the like, or in which third parties acquired rights which might be made absolute by decree, as ships and other vessels captured as prize, were expressely excepted from the operation of the act; and it is reasonable to infer that it was the purpose of Congress that the proceeds of the property for which the special provision of the act was made should go into the Treasury without change of ownership. Certainly such was the intention in respect to the property of loyal men. That the same intention prevailed in regard to the property of owners who, though then hostile, might subsequently become loyal, appears probable from the circumstances that no provision is anywhere made for confiscation of it, while there is no trace in the statute book of intention to divest ownership of private property not excepted from the effect of this act otherwise than by proceedings for confiscation.

"It is thus seen that, except as to property used in actual hostilities, as mentioned in the first section of the act of March 12, 1863, no titles were divested in the insurgent States unless in pursuance of a judgment rendered after due legal proceedings. The Government recognized to the fullest extent the humane maxims of the modern law of nations, which exempt private property of noncombatant enemies from capture as booty of war; even the law of confiscation was sparingly applied. The cases were few indeed in which the property of any not engaged in actual hostilities was subjected to seizure and sale.

"We conclude, therefore, that the title to the proceeds of the property which came to the possession of the Government by capture or abandonment, with the exceptions already noticed, was in no case divested from the original owner. It was for the Government itself to determine whether these proceeds should be restored to the owner or not. The promise of the restoration of all rights of property decided that question affirmatively as to all persons who availed themselves of the proffered pardon. * * * The restoration of the proceeds became the absolute right of the persons pardoned on application within two years from the close of the war. It was, in fact, promised for an equivalent, 'Pardon and restoration of political rights' were 'in return' for the oath and its fulfillment."

And then the court adds this strong language:

"To refuse it would be a breach of faith not less cruel and astounding than to abandon the freed people whom the Executive had promised to maintain in their freedom."

It will be observed that the court decides that the title to the proceeds of the property which came to the possession of the Government by capture or abandonment, with the exception of property used in actual hostilities, was in no case divested from the original owner.

The question therefore arises whether the Government ever determined that the proceeds of the sales of property under the captured and abandoned property acts which belonged to disloyal persons should be restored to them.

Whatever of occasion for dispute there may have been upon this question at one time, there seems to be none now.

Under the act of July, 1862, known as the confiscation act, the President was authorized at any time thereafter, by proclamation, to extend to persons who may have participated in rebellion in any State or part thereof pardon and amnesty, with such exceptions and at such time and on such conditions as he should deem expedient for the public welfare.

On the 8th day of December, 1863, the President issued his proclamation, in which he referred to the act of 1863, relating to captured and abandoned property, and offered pardon and amnesty, with restoration of all rights of property, except as to slaves and property to which third persons had acquired rights, to all persons who had participated in the rebellion who would take an oath to support the Constitution and the laws. Certain classes were excepted from the benefits of pardon and amnesty under that proclamation.

On the 29th of May, 1865, another proclamation was issued, extending pardon and amnesty, with a full restoration of all property rights, except as to slaves, etc., to all persons who had participated in the rebellion. A similar oath was required, and fourteen classes of persons were excepted from the benefits of the proclamation.

On the 7th of September, 1867, another similar proclamation of pardon and amnesty was issued, which reduced the excepted classes from fourteen to seven. Finally on the 4th day of July, 1868, a proclamation was issued by the President extending pardon and amnesty to all, with some exceptions, who had participated in the rebellion, with restoration to all rights of property except in slaves, and on the 25th of December, 1868, without exception, unconditionally, and without reservation. No oath was required.

The legal effect of the proclamations to which reference has been made was to wipe out all disability by reason of disloyalty and to present the offender before the law as a new man, as innocent as if he had never been charged with treason. These proclamations also serve to show that the President of the United States, authorized by the Constitution and by statute, determined to restore the proceeds of the sales of captured and abandoned property belonging to disloyal owners to them upon condition that they would comply with the requirements of the proclamations. Those who complied with the conditions of those proclamations were instantly rehabilitated as citizens, restored to equality before the law, and to all rights of property. In the language of the Supreme Court before quoted:

"The promise of the restoration of all rights of property decided that question affirmatively as to all persons who availed themselves of the proffered pardon. * * * The restoration of the proceeds of captured and abandoned property became the absolute right of the persons pardoned, on application within two years from the close of the war."

Those who had failed to avail themselves of the proffered pardon extended by the proclamations containing conditions (if there were any such) were covered and embraced by the proclamation of July 4, 1868, which extended pardon and amnesty to all, without condition, with full restoration to property rights.

Your committee submit the following, taken from the decision of the Supreme Court in Padelford's case, reported in 9 Wallace:

"In the case of Garland this court held the effect of a pardon to be such "that in the eye of the law the offender is as innocent as if he had never committed the offense;" and in the case of Armstrong's foundry we held that the general pardon granted to him relieved him from a penalty which he had incurred to the United States. It follows that at the time of the seizure of the petitioner's property he was purged of whatever offense against the laws of the United States he had committed by the acts mentioned in the findings and relieved from any penalty which he might have incurred. It follows, further, that if the property had been seized before the oath was taken, the faith of the Government was pledged to its restoration upon the taking of the oath in good faith. We can not doubt that the petitioner's right to the property in question at the time of the seizure was perfect and that it remains perfect, notwithstanding the seizure.

"But it has been suggested that the property was captured in fact, if not lawfully; and that the proceeds having been paid into the Treasury of the United States, the petitioner is without remedy in the Court of Claims, unless proof is made that he gave no aid or comfort to the rebellion. The suggestion is ingenious, but we do not think it sound. The sufficient answer to it is that after the pardon no offense connected with the rebellion can be imputed to him. If, in other respects, the petitioner made the proof which, under the act, entitled him to a decree for the proceeds of his property, the law makes the proof of pardon a complete substitute for proof that he gave no aid or comfort to the rebellion. A different construction would, as it seems to us, defeat the manifest intent of the proclamation and of the act of Congress which authorized it. Under the proclamation and the act the Government is a trustee, holding the proceeds of the petitioner's property for his benefit, and having been fully reimbursed for all expenses incurred in that character, loses nothing by the judgment, which simply awards to the petitioner what is his own."

But for the bar made by the statute of limitations of two years it seems that all persons, loyal and those who had been disloyal, might prefer their claims to this property, and upon proof of their right to the property obtain the proceeds.

Pardon and amnesty relieved claimants of captured and abandoned property from proving their adhesion to the Government of the United States during the late war.

The following is the whole of the opinion of the court in Pargoud's case, 13 Wallace:

"We have recently decided, in the case of Armstrong against the United States, that the President's proclamation of December 25, 1868, granting pardon and amnesty unconditionally and without reservation to all who participated directly or indirectly in the late rebellion, relieves claimants of captured and abandoned property from proof of adhesion to the United States during the late civil war. It was therefore unnecessary to prove such adhesion or personal pardon for taking part in the rebellion against the United States. The judgment of the Court of Claims dismissing the petition is reversed."

It follows, from what has been said, that this fund in the Treasury does not belong to the Government, but is the property of citizens of the United States, and held in trust for them by the Government. Ought the Government longer refuse to distribute this fund among the owners of it?

Your committee believe that it is true, as alleged, that the bulk of this fund yet remaining in the Treasury belongs to persons who participated in the late rebellion, but in view of the fact that under the Constitution and the laws of the United States, as declared by the Supreme Court, the restoration of the proceeds of this property became the absolute right of the persons pardoned, the former political status of the owner can afford no just reason for withholding the money.

No laches can be imputed to this class of claimants.

The statute authorized claims to the proceeds of sales of captured and abandoned property to be preferred in the Court of Claims at any time within two years from the suppression of the rebellion. When was the rebellion suppressed? That became a question for the courts, in order to apply the statute of limitation. In December, 1869, the Supreme Court decided, in Anderson *vs.* United States (9 Wallace, page 56), that the rebellion was suppressed on the 20th of August, 1866, the date of the President's proclamation declaring the final and complete suppression of the rebellion. The limitation of the right to commence suit therefore expired on the 20th day of August, 1868.

Some claimants who had participated in the rebellion filed suits in the Court of Claims before the bar of limitation was complete, but a large majority of that class of claimants did not commence suit, because it was generally understood that, notwithstanding the proclamations of pardon and amnesty, the claimant would be required to prove his loyalty before he could have a standing in the court.

It was a matter of doubt among the members of the legal fraternity as to what effect would be given by the Supreme Court to the proclamations of pardon and amnesty. In 1869 the Supreme Court decided that the necessity of proving loyalty in order to recover the proceeds of captured and abandoned property had been removed by the proclamations of pardon and amnesty.

This decision came too late to benefit that class of claimants. The limitation had already expired and the bar was complete.

In view of the law and the facts as above stated, your committee deem it unwise for the Government, and unjust to the claimants of this fund for Congress to decline longer to make some provision by which they may establish and enforce their rights.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

[House Report No. 1377, part 2, Fifty-second Congress, first session.]

CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY.

May 13, 1892.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Ezra B. Taylor, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following as the views of the minority:

The undersigned, differing with the majority of the committee, beg leave to state their reasons for such dissent, and as the views of the minority of the committee upon a like bill in the Fifty-first Congress were drawn by one of the undersigned and expresses our present views, we adopt that statement, to wit:

"The history of Congressional legislation and judicial decision touching the subject of captured and abandoned property is correctly given by the majority in their report; still it does not follow that the bill should pass.

"By statute of March 3, 1863, any person claiming to have been the owner of any such abandoned and captured property might, at any time within two years after the suppression of the rebellion, prefer his claim to the proceeds thereof in the Court of Claims, and on proof of his ownership of said property, of his right to the proceeds thereof, and that he has never given aid or comfort to the rebellion, receive the residue of said proceeds, after the deduction of any purchase money which may have been paid, together with the expense of transportation and sale of said property, and any other lawful expenses attending the disposition thereof.

"Under the provisions of that statute many suits were successfully prosecuted, and said claims were paid; but the two years within which claims were to be preferred expired, leaving a large number of claims outstanding. This bill is to give further time for preferring such claims. The fact is, that the outstanding claims were and are held almost exclusively by men who could not prove that they had 'never given aid or comfort to the rebellion.' The subsequent decision of the Supreme Court, however, construed the President's proclamation of pardon and amnesty, of July 4, 1868, as restoring such men to loyalty and to all the rights which loyal citizens were entitled to under the act of March 12, 1863. That is, they, thinking themselves to have been disloyal in rebellion, and as having given aid and comfort to the rebellion, preferred no claim until too late; but finding after the expiration of two years after the suppression of the rebellion, that they were technically loyal, now ask Congress to remove the legal bar to their claims.

"They had their day in court, but did not avail themselves of it by reason of their ignorance of law, which excuses no one, and by reason of their knowledge of their disloyalty. The limitation of actions is a necessary and wholesome provision of law, not necessarily inequitable or obnoxious to the sense of common justice. It may, however, be removed or extended in proper cases. The only question to be considered in regard to this bill is whether it presents a proper and equitable case for the removal of the limitation, which took effect nearly twenty years ago.

"Legally the parties in interest in this bill have no standing in court. Ought they to be given such standing?

"Their property was taken by the United States and sold, and the proceeds thereof are in the Treasury.

"They were in fact in arms against the Government from which they now demand 'justice.' Considering their numbers and influence, it will not be denied that they did great injury to that Government, its property, and citizens. They caused it more expense and loss, doubtless, than the amount of the property covered by this bill. Their offense was serious and the wrong done the Government by them great. They have been dealt generously with by the United States Government, but the undersigned are unable to appreciate their claims for further consideration as presented by this bill.

"Again, the lapse of time since the transactions to be investigated by the Court of Claims under this bill, and the nature of the transactions and the circumstances surrounding them, will inevitably, as we think, result in findings of the court largely in excess of the amount in the Treasury arising from the sale of abandoned and captured property, and will call for unlimited subsequent appropriations by Congress.

"E. B. TAYLOR."

LIGHT AND FOG SIGNAL, BUTLER FLATS, MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. WISE. I call up the bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. WISE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to resume the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be established, on or near Butler Flats, entrance to the lower harbor of New Bedford, Mass., a light and fog-signal station, at a cost not to exceed $45,000.

Mr. WISE. It is only necessary, I think, for me to state to the House that the chairman of the Light-House Board has reported that this work is indispensable. His letter is at the desk and can be read if desired.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to have the letter read.

Mr. WISE. Then I call for the reading of the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE LIGHT-HOUSE BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1893.

SIR: Replying to your note of to-day to the chairman of the Light-House Board, I have the honor to inform you that the board considers the light-house at Butler Flats, Massachusetts, as being indispensable to navigation and as one which should be built at the earliest possible moment.

Respectfully yours,

F. A. MEHAN,
Captain of Engineers, U. S. Army, Engineer Secretary.

Hon. GEORGE D. WISE,
Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce if it is to be the policy of his committee to recommend the construction of no light-houses except such as are indispensable.

Mr. WISE. We have determined that we will recommend the construction of none of these works except those which are indispensable—which are so reported by the Light-House Board.

Mr. SAYERS. And this bill contains no appropriation?

Mr. WISE. No, sir.

Mr. SAYERS. All right.

Mr. WISE. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass., had directed him to report the same back with a recommendation that it be passed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ENGINEERS, ETC., ON STEAM VESSELS.

Mr. WISE. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], in order that he may call up a bill.

Mr. MALLORY. I call up the bill (H. R. 411) to require steam vessels of the United States, of 1,000 tons or more, to have one engineer and helper on watch in their engine rooms while under way, and to require all steam vessels of the United States, continuously under steam for more than ten hours, to carry two licensed engineers.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every steam vessel of the United States, of 1,000 tons or more, shall at all times, while under way, have one engineer and one helper on watch in the engine room, and every steam vessel of the United States that is under steam continuously for more than ten hours shall carry two licensed engineers.

Mr. MALLORY. I ask that the report be read.

The report (by Mr. MALLORY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 411) entitled "A bill to require steam vessels of the United States, of one thousand tons or more to have one engineer and helper on watch in their engine rooms while under way, and to require all steam vessels of the United States, continuously under steam for more than ten hours, to carry two licensed engineers," having carefully considered the same, respectfully report and recommend the passage of said bill, with the following amendments, viz:

In line 7 of the bill, between the words "hours" and "shall," insert the word "daily."

After the word "engineers," in line 8 of the bill, insert the following, viz: "*Provided, however*, That the last clause of this act shall not be construed to apply to ferryboats or to steam vessels whose usual or regular employment does not exceed ten hours daily."

Amend the title of said bill by striking out the word "continuously," in line 4 of the title.

Strike out the word "all," in line 3 of the title, and insert the word "certain" in lieu thereof.

In line 5 of the bill, between the words "helper" and "on," insert the words "or oiler."

In line 6 of the bill, after the word "steam," insert the words "and is navigated."

In line 7 of the bill strike out the word "continuously."

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes merely to require that all vessels of 1,000 tons or more shall carry an engineer and helper or oiler; and it also provides that all vessels which are navigated daily under steam for more than ten hours shall carry two licensed engineers. There is a proviso to the effect that the last clause of this act shall not be construed to apply to ferryboats or to steam vessels whose usual and regular employment does not exceed ten hours daily.

The committee having considered the bill has reported the amendments which have been read, which I think are all that have been suggested by the Treasury Department. I hold in my hand the report of the Supervising Inspector. It is somewhat lengthy, but if any gentleman desires to hear it I am perfectly willing it shall be read.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does this bill apply to steam vessels on our inner waters—our rivers?

Mr. MALLORY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. It applies to all steam vessels of 1,000 or more tons?

Mr. MALLORY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is it recommended by the officers of the Treasury Department?

Mr. MALLORY. The report from the Department is rather a peculiar one. It is not in direct terms a recommendation; but it suggests the amendments which the committee have reported.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is not this matter already provided for by laws of most of the States?

Mr. MALLORY. No laws of any State can control this question; it is a matter of Federal law.

Mr. BALDWIN. I supposed that, with reference to the chain of lakes, for instance, a law similar to this was already in force.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that the bill be read with the amendments proposed by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every steam vessel of the United States, of 1,000 tons or more, shall at all times, while under way, have one engineer and one helper or oiler on watch in the engine room, and every steam vessel of the United States that is under steam and is navigated for more than ten hours daily, shall carry two licensed engineers: *Provided, however*, That the last clause of this act shall not be construed to apply to ferryboats or to steam vessels whose usual or regular employment does not exceed ten hours daily.

Mr. MALLORY. If there is no desire on the part of any gentleman to discuss this matter, I move the adoption of the amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before that is done I wish to make an inquiry. Is the proviso in the last clause of this bill clear enough as to what it refers to?

Mr. MALLORY. I think so.

Mr. DINGLEY. The first part of the bill provides that every steam vessel of 1,000 tons or more shall have one engineer and one helper on watch, and that every steam vessel navigated for more than ten hours daily shall carry two licensed engineers. Is it the intention of the committee to confine the proviso to steam vessels navigated for not more than ten hours daily?

Mr. MALLORY. Yes, sir; except ferryboats and vessels which may be employed not more than ten hours a day, which are wholly excepted.

Mr. LOUD. The latter portion of that bill is already the law, is it not?

Mr. MALLORY. No, sir.

Mr. LOUD. Are these vessels not now required to have two licensed engineers?

Mr. MALLORY. No, sir. This provision, I will state, is suggested by the Supervising Inspector.

Mr. SIMPSON. What is the idea of compelling these vessels to have a helper on watch?

Mr. MALLORY. Well, it is necessary to have some person who is thoroughly competent to run the engine or to stop it if necessary in case of the temporary absence of the engineer. If the engineer should be away from his post at any time, it is essential to have some one who knows enough about running the engine to at least stop it if necessary.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is it not a fact that very few of the vessels on the Great Lakes carry this additional helper?

Mr. MALLORY. The law says "a helper or an oiler." It is not necessary to have a helper if an oiler is employed. It is a fact that the large Atlantic steamers, and I suppose the Pacific steamers also, carry two licensed engineers now.

Mr. DINGLEY. All ocean steamships do.

Mr. SIMPSON. On the Great Lakes there are many large steamers that do not carry a helper at all. This will force an additional expense upon them.

Mr. MALLORY. This says "helper or oiler." They are not obliged to have this additional helper if they employ an oiler, and most of the steamboats do employ an oiler. This is the suggestion of the Supervising Inspector of the Treasury Department, who says in his communication to the committee:

> In order to prevent any misconstruction of the law in this respect, I should advise that the language of the proposed law be amended by adding, after the word "helper," the words "or oiler."

which recommendation we adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments recommended by the committee be adopted.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended in accordance with the recommendation of the committee.

On motion of Mr. MALLORY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FORT CUMMINGS MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. McRAE (when the Committee on the Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 356) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from sale certain land in the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, and for other purposes.

I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to withdraw from sale so much of the land of the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, in the Territory of New Mexico, as may be necessary to secure perpetually for public use the spring upon said reservation; the land to be reserved, as aforesaid, to embrace not only that upon which the spring is situated, but such other portions for right of way as may be necessary to secure to the public the right to have all the advantages of the spring aforesaid.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the Rio Grande, Mexico and Pacific Railroad Company a license to so much of the water of said spring as may be necessary for the operation of the road of said company, and to grant to said company a right of way for a pipe from said spring to the road of said company by the most direct line; to be located under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That said right of way shall not exceed 40 feet in width, and when the same is located the land covered by the right of way shall be withdrawn from entry, and after due appraisal shall be paid for by said company and be dedicated to the right of way aforesaid.

SEC. 3. That the license aforesaid shall continue as long as the existence thereof may be deemed not injurious to the public interest by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall at all times have the right to regulate the quantity of water to be used by said company, so as not to deprive the public of the benefits of the dedication to public use hereinabove made. Upon the cessation of the license the right of way for the pipe line aforesaid shall revert to the United States, upon refunding by the United States the sum of the appraised price thereof which may have been paid to the United States by said company under the previous provisions of this act, and Congress reserves the right at any time to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

Mr. McRAE. In explanation of the bill I ask the Clerk to read the report made by Mr. GRESHAM.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 356) "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from sale certain land in the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, and for other purposes," have had the same under consideration and report it back with the recommendation that it pass.

The first section of this bill authorizes the reservation for the use of the public of a large and valuable spring of water on the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, in New Mexico, with a reservation of such land for right of way as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Interior to secure to the public the right to have all the advantages of the spring.

Sections 2 and 3 of this bill authorize the Rio Grande, Mexico and Pacific Railroad Company to use water from the spring for the operation of its trains, under certain conditions and reservations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

In 1881, and when the military was still in occupation, the War Department permitted the railroad company to develop this then unused spring, which the company did by walling it up and placing a pump therein, whereby the water was taken to a large trough used by the post, and the overflow pipe from the trough connected with the water tank at the company's station some miles distant, and used there by the company in the running of its trains. After the abandonment of Fort Cummings by the military, the reservation was turned over to the Interior Department for survey and sale, in accordance with the general laws upon that subject. This spring of water has a large capacity, and is the only available spring for a distance of some 30 miles. Its use to the public and to the railroad, freed from private right, was essential.

In the last Congress a bill was passed by the Senate and favorably reported by the House committee (as per copy of the committee's report herewith) which is identical with the pending bill. The bill was prepared by Senator WHITE of Louisiana, a member of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, after careful consideration. His purpose was to dedicate this spring to public use and to permit the railroad company to continue, as it has for years past, to use the surplus or overflowed water therefrom, carried through the pipe line to its station some miles distant. The road named is a part of the Atchison system.

The loss of use of this water would seriously interfere with the operation of the trains of the railroad company. The company originally offered to buy this spring and use the water therefrom in connection with the public, but the Senate and House committees of the last Congress concurred in the proposition that the water should not be sold to anyone, but continue, as under present conditions, dedicated to the use of the public and to the company.

The suggestion of the Department's report, that the particular subdivision on which the spring is located should be named in the bill, is objectionable, because the spring is widely known in that section of the country, is readily identified, and if the survey should be found erroneous, so as to locate it upon some other subdivision, the act would be ineffectual.

The further suggestion made by the Department that the company's pipe line should name the termini, is made without understanding of the facts. The pipe line runs through several miles of public land after it leaves the line of the reservation, before it reaches the railroad station and water tank. The conditions sought to be perpetuated by the bill have continued for years without complaint from any source, and for the continuing benefit of the public and the company. The act proposes to leave that situation unchanged for the continuing benefit of all concerned.

Mr. McRAE. I think the report is sufficiently explicit, and move that the committee rise and report the bill favorably to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 356, had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McRAE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

METHOD OF ACCOUNTING, POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this time a bill for reference to the Joint Commis-

sion, and also that the Commission have leave to report upon the same at any time.

The SPEAKER. The title of the bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, this bill will be referred to the Joint Commission, with leave to report at any time.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MUTCHLER.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged report from the Committee on Printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. William Mutchler, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, 8,000 copies, of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco, to be delivered to the family of the deceased, and of those remaining 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said William Mutchler to accompany the said eulogies.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee have considered the House concurrent resolution to print the eulogies delivered in Congress on the Hon. William Mutchler, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and report the same with the recommendation that it do pass.

The estimated cost of same is $2,625.

The report was adopted.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I send up a resolution providing for the printing of certain documents asked for by the Committee on Ways and Means relative to the tariff.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution submitted by the Committee on Printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there be printed of the document entitled "Imported merchandise entered for consumption in the United States during the years 1890 to 1893, with the rate and amount of duty collected," prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; 4,000 copies for the use of the House, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Statistics.

The report of the Committee on Printing was read. It recommended the adoption of the resolution, and stated that the estimated cost of the printing called for was $1,016.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 44) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the Monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 882) granting a pension to Frances Corse, widow of Gen. John M. Corse;

A bill (S. 463) to reimburse the State of Nebraska the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890 and 1891;

A bill (S. 333) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy;

A bill (S. 171) granting to the State of North Dakota certain lands heretofore set apart as a wood reservation for Fort Totten military reservation for the use of the militia of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 75) for the relief of Thomas Guinean; and

A bill (S. 73) for the relief of William J. Cornell and Joseph M. Cornell.

EXTENSION OF NORTH CAPITOL STREET.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, this being the second Monday in the month, which under the rules is accorded to the Committee on the District of Columbia for business reported from that commiteee, I claim the day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, and he will indicate what bill he desires to call up.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to open and grade North Capitol street from T street to the Soldiers' Home, and are hereby authorized and directed to condemn, in the manner provided by law prior to March 2, 1893, for the condemnation of land in the District of Columbia, such of the lands of the Prospect Hill Cemetery and of Annie E. Barbour as may be necessary for the extension of said street, and the amount of money necessary to pay the judgment of condemnation and the cost of grading is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That one-half of the said sum shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That this appropriation shall be immediately available.

The committee recommended the following amendment:

In line 14, after the word "act," insert "but the cost of grading shall not exceed $10,000."

Mr. HEARD. I ask for the reading of the report of the District Commissioners——

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HEARD. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of the consideration of this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home, with Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], who reported this bill and who is familiar with its details.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this bill is very short, and its object is very fully explained on its face. It is intended to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home. This street, in its course to the north, runs up against property owned by the Prospect Hill Cemetery. This bill is intended simply to open this street through that cemetery, and to extend it on to the Soldiers' Home. There will only be a few hundred feet through that cemetery. There is no objection upon the part of anyone, so far as I am informed.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Do I understand that this street will go through a cemetery?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes; it will go through this cemetery the length of a square.

Mr. KILGORE. Does this cemetery belong to any church or association?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It belongs to an incorporated company known as the Prospect Hill Cemetery.

Mr. KILGORE. Have they assented to this proposition?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. They have assented to it. They have never used the portion of the cemetery for burial purposes where the street will run. It will cut off a few thousand feet to the west of the street—I do not remember the exact quantity, and that part of the cemetery property will be put upon the market for sale by the cemetery company. The proposed action will leave the property to the east of the street, however, still to be used for cemetery purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Are there to be any condemnation proceedings under this bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. In the general law there is a provision for condemnation proceedings and payment to the owners of the price of property taken. That is provided for if there are any damages, and they would be paid; but in the law as it now stands the Commissioners, or the jury of condemnation, are directed to take into consideration the value of the property that is left. That is to be considered. One is to be set off against the other; and it is not believed that it will amount to anything one way or the other. The limitation put in the bill for grading amounts to $10,000.

Mr. KILGORE. What will be the distance of this street that will have to be opened? What length will the new work be?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is about two blocks, and would be 400 or 500 feet—say 600 feet.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand it fixes the limit in the appropriation, and that limit is $10,000?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is to be paid for, one-half out of the District revenues and one-half out of the Treasury.

Mr. KILGORE. Now, if it should turn out that it would cost $100,000 instead of $10,000, they would have to go along and complete it?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. They could just use the $10,000 provided.

Mr. KILGORE. But it would be a work already commenced, and it would take another bill; and they would come in here with one.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. They could not do that without coming back to the House of Representatives for authority.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. HEARD. I want to say, for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas, that under the general law the Commissioners apportion the amounts to the different streets that they regard as

necessary to be improved; and according to the report of the Commissioners in this case they have set apart the sum of $10,000 for the improvement of this street, and they think it will be sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the District of Columbia to pay the entire $10,000?

Mr. HEARD. No, sir. One-half is to be paid out of the Treasury, as in every case of condemnation proceedings for street improvements in the city.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have already set apart $10,000 for this purpose?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No; they have not appropriated it to this purpose, but they recommend that amount.

Mr. HEARD. I should have said that they recommended that apportionment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The necessity for this bill, if the gentleman will pardon me——

Mr. SAYERS. Hold on a minute; I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri another question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will yield for any inquiry.

Mr. SAYERS. Now, I understood the gentleman from Missouri to say that $10,000 has already been set aside for this purpose.

Mr. HEARD. I corrected that, and say that the amount was recommended by the Commissioners in their report. They have recommended the setting aside of $10,000 for this purpose.

Mr. SAYERS. So that no appropriation has been made for this purpose.

Mr. HEARD. Not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. None at all.

Mr. SAYERS. Did the committee inquire into what would probably be the actual cost of constructing this street?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir. The estimate put upon it by the District Commissioners is $10,000, and they say that it will not exceed that sum.

Mr. HEARD. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say——

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I yield to a question.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I understand that a provision in this bill, which I have not had an opportunity to read, is for the appraisement of this property and the assessment of damages.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The law provides for that. There is no provision of that kind in this bill, if the gentleman will look at it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say as to the passage of this bill——

Mr. GOODNIGHT. This is the question I wish to ask the gentleman. Does the bill provide that in the estimation of the amount of damages they may be offset by the benefit? Is there any provision in this bill which prevents the offsetting of damages by benefits?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Not at all. I have just said that.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. Well, I think there ought to be. That is the reason why I think the bill is at fault. There can be no benefit at all to that cemetery property.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I think not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes; and I will tell you why. The opening of this street through the cemetery will cut off a piece of land to the west containing, say, 50,000 feet, where there have been no burials, and which can then be put upon the market for residence purposes. The cemetery will be benefited to that extent, because that piece of land will be made available in that way, and the cemetery people do not object to this bill.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I understand that they do.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I have it from them that they do not. That is all I know about it. Perhaps the gentleman has other information.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. This part of the cemetery will be cut off by the opening of this street and it will be done for the purpose of benefiting the property beyond and for no other purpose, and the part cut off from the cemetery will be so small that it can not be sold.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman is mistaken as to that.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I so understood from the gentleman near me [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] has told me that the cemetery people do not object.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that question settled now. My colleague [Mr. BARTHOLDT] did tell the gentleman from Tennessee that, and he also told me that the cemetery people did not object. Now, I understand the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOODNIGHT] to say that he has told him that they do object.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. No; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] has not stated that to me, but others have.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] applied to me and to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] for a hearing for the cemetery people on this subject, but subsequently he came and told us that they did not desire a hearing.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] stated to me this morning that there was no objection to this bill on the part of the cemetery people.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. Yes; I understand that. He has told me that.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Provided that the bill retained its original form.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Certainly; that there was no objection to the bill as it now reads.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. Some of the people connected with the cemetery did complain last year.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, they did object a year ago.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I have not had any talk with them upon the subject to-day nor during this session.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, their objection has been removed; so I am informed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT]. Now, as to the necessity for this bill, it provides a means of getting to the Soldiers' Home by a street railroad which runs directly up North Capitol street. At present you can not get to the Soldiers' Home without taking a carriage or other such means of conveyance. The street railroad at present stops on North Capitol street at the line of the cemetery grounds, and this bill simply authorizes the opening of the street through the grounds; and when it is opened the railroad will extend its line up to the Soldiers' Home, thus affording a cheap mode of transportation for the people.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, from such information as it is possible to obtain from this report, that the purposes of this bill are simply to enable the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company to construct its road to the Soldiers' Home as cheaply as possible to itself, at the expense of the Government. It is stated in this report that the $10,000 will not grade the street 40 feet in width, but that it will do just about enough to permit the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company to construct two tracks. Now, unless there is some estimate of the exact cost of the construction of this road and the complete grading of the street to the full width of the part of it that runs through the city, I do not think we ought to make this appropriation, simply for the purposes which I claim will be effected by this bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I can not see the force of the gentleman's argument. It certainly will be a matter of great convenience to the public to have a street railroad opened up to the Soldiers' Home. I do not understand that we are legislating for the benefit of this railroad company at all. North Capitol street is one of the main thoroughfares of this city, a very beautiful drive, running directly north from this Capitol building. The street at present stops at the cemetery grounds, and now when it is proposed to open it through those grounds somebody comes here and says that it is for the benefit of the railroad company. The railroad company is not asking this at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. What I say is that the proposed appropriation does not undertake to grade that street to a sufficient width for the passage of vehicles. It simply limits the grading to 40 feet in width, and says that the appropriation will probably not permit more.

Mr. HEARD. Does not the gentleman know that 40 feet is greater than the existing width of the roadway in most of the streets of the city?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I understand that; but I am speaking of the width of North Capitol street in the city. You do not propose to continue it at its full width.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The street will be opened 40 feet wide; and this appropriation, the Commissioners say, will be sufficient to open it to that extent. Now, when the gentleman makes the point that the existing part of that street in the city is more than 40 feet wide, and that therefore we ought to appro-

priate enough to open it up to the same width all the way through, I think his argument is unfair. It is not necessary to open the street wider than 40 feet, because that gives sufficient width for present purposes; and if there is incidental benefit to property holders by the opening of this street, why, that is only fair and legitimate.

Mr. HEARD. Has not the fact been shown before the committee that the persons owning property beyond this cemetery have dedicated land for this improvement for a distance of 1,800 feet, in view of the benefit which they are to derive from the opening of the street?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is true. The owners of the property on North Capitol street beyond the Soldiers' Home have, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] has stated, dedicated property for street purposes for the space of 1,800 feet. Hence the Government will be put to no expense for that if this proposition be now accepted and this street be now extended through that cemetery.

An inquiry was made a moment ago by my friend from Kentucky as to the quantity of ground which will be left west of North Capitol street to be put upon the market if this street is opened under this bill. The quantity left will be 160,000 feet, which can be put upon the market at once at an enhanced value by reason of this street being opened.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that we should afford all facilities for opening streets and constructing street-car lines. I do not wish to criticise any effort on the part of any street-railway company for such extension of their lines, because the public is thereby accommodated. But when it becomes necessary to make an appropriation for opening a street, to raise and level it, largely in the interest of a street-car line, another question is presented. It strikes me this company should contribute something itself for this improvement. The proposition here, as I understand, is to make an appropriation of $10,000, $5,000 of which is to come out of the funds of the District at a time when we have not the money.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, we have plenty of money in this District; there is no trouble about that.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. There is some equity in the suggestion of my friend from Texas; but the law requires that these street-railroad companies shall grade the streets which they use in this way and shall lay concrete or such other pavements as may be required by the orders of the Commissioners not only between the tracks, but for two feet beyond the outside rails of the double track.

Mr. KILGORE. That they do in consideration of the right of way?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir. Thus the public obtains a splendid concrete driveway not only the width of the two tracks, but two feet beyond on each side without any expense to the city.

Mr. KILGORE. But any person driving has to get out of the way of the street cars when they come along.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Of course, persons using the road do not want to be run over by the street cars.

Mr. Chairman, I presume there is no objection to this bill——

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will hear the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The amendment I propose is to strike out in line 16 the words "one-half of," so as to provide that no part of this expenditure shall be contributed by the United States Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If there be no objection, I ask that the general debate on this bill be closed. After the general debate is closed the bill will be open to amendment and debate under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the general debate on this bill will be considered as closed.

There was no objection.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment, if adopted, would be to require that this payment of $10,000 be made entirely from the revenues of the District of Columbia, instead of half from the District revenues and half from the United States Treasury. It was suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] that the United States Government is at this time short of revenues and has no extra $5,000 lying around to expend for grading tracks for the street railways of this city. In response to that suggestion, another was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], that the District of Columbia has an abundance of money. Putting the two together, and keeping in mind the fact, which ought not to be disregarded, that the people of the United States have no interest in this street or railway, or in condemning a right of way through the cemetery mentioned in the report of the District Committee, I think, if this bill is to go through, it should be so framed that the burden shall rest where it properly belongs.

Let me say now, Mr. Chairman, that I for one am opposed to the policy which has been followed so long, that of compelling the people of the United States to pay one-half of the taxes of the people of the District of Columbia. How long that policy will be continued I know not; that is for Congress to say. It will not be continued or extended with my concurrence. Whenever this question arises and whenever I shall have an opportunity to cast a vote upon the subject, I shall vote for excepting the people of my own district and the people of the United States at large from the burden of paying expenses properly belonging to the District of Columbia.

In every city of this Union, whenever it becomes necessary to open or widen a street, the city pays, if there be payment made beyond what is contributed by individual citizens and property owners along the line. Nowhere else within the Union is it the policy to pay with general public funds for local improvements of this character.

If this street is to be opened in the city of Washington or District of Columbia, let it be done as it would be if in New York, St. Louis, Chicago, or anywhere else. So far as these improvements for municipal purposes go, so far as the grading to prepare the roadbed for the street railway is concerned, if the expense is to be borne by the public at all, let it be borne by the public immediately concerned and interested in it. Do not involve the people of the whole United States in an expenditure in which they have no interest whatever.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to extend every facility to the public; but if a bill of this character is to pass, let it pass with those concerned footing the expenses. While the part that would fall upon the people I represent would be small the principle is the same, and in a little time we shall have a bill before the House appropriating five or six millions of dollars for the annual expenses of the District of Columbia, one-half, perhaps, to be borne by the people of the District and one-half to be paid by the people of the United States at large.

I give notice now, Mr. Chairman, that I shall oppose the half-and-half policy at every opportunity and by every means within my power. It shall make no difference to me in that course whether it be popular or unpopular; whether approval or criticism shall follow or attend. I know that it is right for a man representing a people already burdened with taxation, who have to contribute to all sorts of local expenditures in their own cities and towns in their own States, and have to contribute their portion to all needed expenditures of the General Government, to oppose compelling them to pay also half the taxes of the good people of the District of Columbia. It is burden enough upon the people to support the General Government and their own State and local governments. They should not be required to pay half of the expenditures of the people of the District of Columbia, in the way of taxation.

Now, then, while perhaps this is not exactly the time to try the main issue, there is fair opportunity to test the principles of taxation involved, and so I offer for consideration the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes that the gentleman from Missouri would not have proposed that amendment on this bill. If he desires to correct the law which has been in force for a great many years, taxing the revenues of the District of Columbia one-half and the revenues of the United States one-half for the support of the government of this District, it seems to me he ought to make it on the general law when it is before the House for consideration, and not on the first special bill presented to it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have but five minutes; the gentleman can get recognition in his own right. However, I will yield to him for a question.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to ask simply this: This improvement, I believe, is outside of the city of Washington?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No, sir; I think not.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think it is. It is beyond the boundary, is it not?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is beyond the boundary.

Mr. HOLMAN. Did we not pass an act last Congress expressly providing that improvements hereafter made beyond the limits of the city of Washington should be borne by the District?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. This comes in conflict with that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am not prepared to say that it does. The gentleman, however, can refer to the law; or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] can perhaps inform him on the subject.

The policy suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE

ARMOND], providing that the District of Columbia should pay all of the expenditures for the District, ought to be more fully discussed than we can discuss it here under the five-minutes rule. I undertake to say that the Government is not paying more now than it ought to pay. The Government, in other words, owns fully one-half of the property in the District of Columbia, and it ought to be assessed on that property that it owns just as the individuals are assessed on the value of their property; and if you are going to make an examination of the matter, and tax each party according to its value, the Government, it will be found, is not paying now more than its proportion of the taxes in the District.

The gentleman from Missouri made this fight in the last Congress. He made it on an appropriation bill, and I hope my friend will not now insist on the amendment to this bill. It is a small one, and relates only to one little appropriation. Let him make it on the general appropriation bill, and if the change is then made in that regard, why it will be applicable to this bill as to all other appropriations made by this Congress. It is unnecessary to take the time of the committee, it seems to me, to enter upon a question which should be considered on the general law.

But if the gentleman insists on a vote I want to say as I intimated that when you take the taxable property of the District of Columbia and then take the property owned by the Government of the United States, you will find that as far as values are concerned there is no great difference between them. The Government owns about half the taxable property of the District of Columbia, and certainly we do not want to sit here and let that property pay no taxes while the citizens' property in this District must foot all the bills. You certainly do not expect, in other words, the people who own property here shall pay all of the expenses of the District of Columbia, and the Government get all the benefits and pay nothing.

It seems to me that without some statistics, without some data, which the gentleman does not submit to us, he ought not to ask to have this long-established rule changed upon a mere bill of this kind, carrying only $10,000. I appeal to the gentleman to make his fight upon the general law, and not upon this special bill. Members are not prepared to vote upon it now. To many, I have no doubt, this is a new question. They ought not to be asked arbitrarily, without figures, without any kind of calculation, to decide that the Government is paying too much, and the District of Columbia too little, of the revenues. Let us wait until we got to the law that settles this question, and then we can decide it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to reënforce my brother from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] on this proposition. It strikes me that it is just as good an opportunity to pass on a principle when you have one bill up, as when you have another one up, and sometimes a litt'e more so. The people who do not want this principle changed will be making it appear that you have not got time enough to change it then; but we have time enough to-day. Now, it may be difficult to tell how the taxes ought to be levied in the District of Columbia, but there certainly can be some fairer way than just simply to lump it all and say that the people of the United States shall pay one-half, while the people of the District of Columbia pay the other half.

I am opposed to having this Government regarded as a general pap institution for the benefit of some two or three hundred thousand people who happen to live here within the limits of the District of Columbia. If, as a matter of fact, this particular bill ought to be passed, then we ought to pass it, but if the whole principle that underlies it is wrong, why we ought to beat this bill and every one like it that comes up. "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation," just as much as any other day. As a colleague suggests, "procrastination is the thief of time."

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt a discussion of the fairness or the unfairness, the equity or inequity, of the provisions of the law, passed a long time ago, which provides that half the expenses of carrying on the Government of the District of Columbia should be paid by the General Government and one-half by the people of the District of Columbia. I do not attempt to say whether that was a fair basis of settlement or not. I do say, and whether my colleague, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, has examined the question or not, I know that my colleague, Mr. DE ARMOND, has examined the facts and knows that that is the law, that that basis was fixed by law, not by this Congress, but some twelve or thirteen years ago.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that if that principle is wrong, that if that basis is wrong, it should be attacked as a general proposition, and it should be changed along the whole line.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest against the statement made by my colleague [Mr. DE ARMOND], which is not true in point of fact, and which is not fairly stated by him, although three times repeated, that the committee are recommending the opening of this street to give the right of way to a railroad company. That is not true in point of fact. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] mentioned as an argument, as a fact which would show the utility of the street, that a certain railroad company which had a charter to run its road to the Soldiers' Home on the line of this street, would be enabled thereby to extend its line and furnish means of transportation to the people; but it is grossly inaccurate to say that this is asked for the purpose of giving a right of way to the railroad company. It is asked for by the people of this city, as we understand, because of the accommodation that will come to the general public from the opening of this, one of the principal streets of the city.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman right there allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEARD. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that the purpose is to extend the line of this railroad over this street. That is all right enough, but the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is that the railroad in constructing this line will grade the street and pave it with concrete and make a splendid driveway. Now, I have made some inquiry into this since the gentleman's speech was made, and I find that this company has constructed a road running from Seventh street out along New York avenue to the Soldiers' Home, and they have actually destroyed the street, so that it can not be used for any purpose, for pedestrians, or for vehicles, or for any other purpose except for their street-car line.

Mr. HEARD. The general proposition stated by the gentleman from Tennessee is correct. The law compels the railroad company to grade the street between its tracks, and for 2 feet on either side, with concrete.

Mr. KILGORE. Have not the Commissioners the authority to remit that obligation and allow them to put down cobblestones?

Mr. HEARD. Not that I am aware of. I know of no such law.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will state that this company have made a splendid drive out Seventh street. I am familiar with it, live right by it.

Mr. KILGORE. That is not my information.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is my information, and I live right by it.

Mr. HEARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have the floor I desire to yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. My information is, and I desire to ask if that be correct, that a law was passed by Congress in 1883 which obligated the Government of the United States to pay one-half of the expenses of the improvement of streets of this kind?

Mr. HEARD. One-half of the general expenses for carrying on of the government of the District of Columbia. One-half of the expenses in the District of Columbia are assumed by the Government on the ground that the Government is assumed to hold one-half of the property in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. Then I wish to ask my colleague this question: If that statute is in existence does not that create an obligation, in the nature of a vested right, on the part of the Government to meet one-half of these expenses?

Mr. HEARD. That is the existing law, but the ordinary phraseology of appropriations, where they are for the expenditure of money for improvements in the District, is that one-half shall be paid out of the District revenues, the other half to come out of the revenues of the Government.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HEARD. A considerable portion of my time having been consumed by interruptions I wish to ask the indulgence of the House for five minutes more. I shall not take up much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes further. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to repeat, I am not here to defend the basis, fixed by a previous Congress long before I came here, upon which the expenses of the District government should be carried. It is not analogous to any other city in the United States, as my colleague [Mr. DE ARMOND] would argue by inference; for it is well known that the Government owns a very large proportion of the property here, and as my friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] very properly says, no fair-minded man would insist that we should tax the people of the District for the improvements of streets and the paving of alleys for the benefit of the Government as well as for the benefit of the residents of the District, and not tax the Government for any part of the expenses. But, Mr. Chairman, let it be understood that the people of this District pay taxes, and the rate of taxes

in this District is as great or greater than that which prevails in other cities of this country. I think the regular rate here is $1.50 on the $100, which is exactly that which prevails in the city of my residence, a place of less than 20,000 people.

Mr. WASHINGTON. It is $1.65.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue the general proposition as to the correctness of that basis, but I do insist that if that principle is to be attacked and discussed it should be on broader lines than will be afforded in the discussion of this bill.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that so far as the opening of this street is concerned, I regard it as one of the most important improvements in the city. The people who own the property intervening between the cemetery grounds and the Soldiers' Home, a distance, as I am advised, of 1,800 or 2,000 feet, some years ago dedicated to the public the grounds necessary to make the extension, and they had the right to expect that it would be opened through the grounds of the cemetery and the other tract mentioned, so that these people could get the benefit of the extension which they contributed the ground to make and that the general public could have the benefit of the entire street. They have given up the ground they had for the improvement, and in good faith and as a matter of public utility my view is that we should order the street opened. Whether it is opened or not it does not concern me a farthing which statement I am sure it is not necessary for me to make to this House; but I now say that in my judgment it is a work of such utility as will fully justify the expenditure. Beyond that I have nothing further to submit.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] to this fact. At an early day in the last Congress a bill was introduced the title of which, I think, is as follows:

An act to provide a permanent system of roadways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities.

Meaning, of course, the cities of Washington and Georgetown. That bill was pending during the larger portion of last Congress, and was in charge, I think, of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEARD. Yes.

Mr. HOLMAN. It was before the House repeatedly. The bill as originally introduced provided as this does, as I remember, that one-half of the expenses of opening these streets should be borne by the District of Columbia and one-half by the United States. That was the point in controversy; and I must call the attention of my friend on the Committee of the District of Columbia to the fact that no measure has been more carefully considered or more frequently before the House than that measure, and it resulted in this provision. After a long enumeration of the methods of opening streets outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown the following provision is found:

That the amount awarded by said court [trying the question of condemnation] as damages for each highway or reservation, or that part thereof condemned and established under this act, shall be one-half assessed against the lands benefited thereby and the other half shall be a charge upon the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after the careful consideration of that very important measure and its enactment by the last Congress, is it fair or proper for the Committee on the District of Columbia to come in here at this early day, at the very next session, and propose to overturn it?

Mr. HEARD. I will be frank with my friend from Indiana, and state that when this bill was before the committee I had lost sight of the act from which he has just read. I remember now that I presented the report of a conference committee on the bill here, and resisted the contention made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], and the report of the committee of conference was rejected. At the close of the session, however, the conference was resumed, and the bill came back and was passed in the shape in which it now stands as a law. That being the case, I can not consistently contest the point now made by the gentleman, and I will not undertake to do so. I had lost sight of that enactment at the time I voted to report this bill from the committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. My recollection is that the report charging one-half of the expense upon the United States Treasury was twice rejected.

Mr. HEARD. It was rejected once, I am sure.

Mr. HOLMAN. Twice, I think; and finally this proposition was adopted. Now, I know that my friend from Missouri will not desire or consent that that deliberate act of Congress, adopted after careful consideration, shall be disregarded or virtually repealed at the very next session.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that, like the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, I had failed to remember the passage of that law. It was generally overlooked in the committee; and under the circumstances, inasmuch as this proposed improvement is within the District of Columbia and outside the city of Washington, it is probably right that the expense should be charged to the District instead of to the United States.

Mr. HEARD. I had lost sight of the fact that it was outside of the city limits that the improvement was proposed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. So had I: but it is outside of the boundary. I will make no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, there ought to be an amendment inserted in line 13 to harmonize with the one which I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the question be first taken on the pending amendment.

The amendment of Mr. DE ARMOND was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "that," strike out the words "one-half of;" so as to make the provision read: "That the said sum shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 13 of the printed bill, by inserting after the word "moneys," the words "of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia upon this subject be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I move that the committee rise and report the bill as amended to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 146) "to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home," and had directed him to report the same with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The report of the Commissioners, referred to by Mr. RICHARDSON, is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 26, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia herewith return House bill 146, "to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home," which was referred to them at your instance for their views thereon, and have to make the following recommendation on the subject:

The extension of North Capitol street through the lands of the Prospect Hill Cemetery and of the Barbour tract is contemplated in the plans of street extensions now being drawn under act of March 2, 1893, for a permanent system of highways outside of cities.

The present extension of part width of North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home is desirable, as it will afford a route for convenient and cheap transportation from Washington to the Soldiers' Home. The Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company is authorized by the act of April 30, 1890, to extend a branch of its system from New York avenue via North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home; the act requires this branch to be built and operated within one year after the opening of North Capitol street; the tracks of the branch are laid from New York avenue to T street, but have not yet been operated. T street is the sixth street north of Florida avenue.

The street-car company has not applied to the Commissioners for the opening of North Capitol street, neither is it known that the company desires to extend its branch up that street, but it is considered by the Commissioners that such extension would be advantageous to the public. The present system of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway is extensive, and permeates the thickly settled part of Washington. The route via North Capitol street is the shortest available one therefrom to the Soldiers' Home.

There is no present necessity for grading to full width the part of North Capitol street proposed to be opened. It is therefore recommended that a provision be inserted in the bill limiting the cost of street grading to $10,000; this will permit the opening of the street to a width of 40 feet, or nearly 40 feet, giving sufficient room for double tracks for street railway.

The amount named is the same as that which the Commissioners propose to recommend for appropriation for 1895 for extending each of the principal avenues and streets whose extensions have been commenced.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. ROSS,
President Board of Commissioners.

Hon. JOHN T. HEARD,
Chairman of Committee on the District of Columbia,
House of Representatives.

SEALER OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I

am not sufficiently familiar with the provisions of this bill to know whether it requires to be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HEARD. Then I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if there is nothing in the bill requiring that it be considered in Committee of the Whole, is it necessary to go into committee?

The SPEAKER. The bill has been referred to the Committee of the Whole. If it has been improperly referred the reference can be corrected.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I do not think there is anything in the bill that would necessarily send it to the Committee of the Whole. It does, however, provide for certain fees.

The motion of Mr. HEARD was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to appoint a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures for the District of Columbia, who shall have the custody and control of such standard weights and measures of the United States as now are or as shall hereafter be provided by the District of Columbia, and which shall be the only standard for weights and measures in said District until Congress shall otherwise provide.

SEC. 2. That the sealer of weights and measures or his assistant shall seal no dry measures unless the same shall conform in all respects to the standard dry measures deposited in the office of the Commissioners. He shall examine all dry measures now used in the District of Columbia, and all dry measures not conforming to the said standard for dry measures shall be by him condemned: and any person or persons obstructing him or his assistant in the discharge of his or their duties under this act shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than $5 nor more than $20 for every such offense, to be collected and applied as other fines are collected and applied.

SEC. 3. That the sealer of weights and measures shall rectify or brand and seal with the letter W all scalebeams, weights, and measures that may be brought to his office for that purpose, as near the upper edge or ends thereof as possible, for each of which he shall receive from the respective owners thereof 10 cents, and double that sum for rectifying, branding, or sealing at any other place; and if he shall neglect to rectify, brand, or seal any scalebeams, weights, or measures within three days after the same shall have been brought to his office he shall incur a penalty of $5 for every such offense, to be recovered as other fines and penalties are recovered.

SEC. 4. That the sealer of weights and measures shall, under a penalty of $20 for each neglect, at least once in every six months, between the rising and setting of the sun, enter every store, shop, market, or other place where goods are sold within the District of Columbia and examine the scales, weights, and measures, if any therein, and if any scalebeams, weights, or measures shall be found without the official stamp, brand, or seal of the sealer of weights and measures, or deficient or exceeding in weight or measure, the same shall be seized by the sealer of weights and measures, and the person in whose possession such scalebeam, weight, or measure shall be found shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars for every such offense, and the sealer of weights and measures shall be entitled to receive for every such examination $1, to be paid by the owner of such scale: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent any manufacturer or other person from keeping scalebeams, weights, or measures for sale: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to require the sealer of weights and measures to enter into any United States establishment in the District of Columbia and examine any scale or measure.

SEC. 5. That it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to sell any article by dry measure within the limits of the District of Columbia unless the same shall be measured in dry measures made to conform in all respects to the standard measures of the United States deposited with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and any person or persons within the limits of the District of Columbia selling or offering for sale by dry measure any article by any other form or size of measure shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the District of Columbia, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than $5 nor more than $10 for every such offense, to be collected and applied as other fines are collected and applied.

SEC. 6. That if any person shall refuse to produce his or her scalebeams, weights, or measures for examination when required by the sealer of weights and measures or his assistant, or refuse to relinquish the same when seized, the person so refusing shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars, to be collected and applied as other fines are collected and applied.

SEC. 7. That any person who shall by any scalebeam, weight, or measure not certified and stamped, branded, or sealed by the sealer of weights and measures or his assistant shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars for each and every offense; and if the sealer of weights and measures shall pass any scalebeam, weight, or measure which shall not correspond to the standard herein prescribed he shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more ten dollars, to be recovered as other fines are collected.

SEC. 8. That if any person shall sell by the steelyard and the sealer of weights and measures (who is hereby authorized to examine any steelyard which he may see in use) shall, on examination, find the same not to agree with the standard aforesaid, he shall seize the same, and the person found selling therewith, or the owner thereof, shall incur a penalty of not less than five nor more than ten dollars, and the said sealer of weights and measures shall twice every year examine and adjust every public hay scale in the District of Columbia, and he shall be entitled to receive from said District for such examination the sum of $2.

SEC. 9. That the sealer of weights and measures shall keep a book wherein he shall enter the names of persons who shall have scalebeams, weights, and measures adjusted, the number and description of the same, and the times when adjusted, and he shall report annually to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the operations of his office.

SEC. 10. That all weights and measures which shall have been seized by the sealer of weights and measures and adjusted, shall, whenever practicable, be delivered to their respective owners upon their paying the legal fees of the sealer of weights and measures for sealing, stamping, and branding the same.

SEC. 11. That it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to use, for weighing any article for sale in the several markets or elsewhere in the District of Columbia, any spring-balance scale, unless the same shall have been examined and certified to by the sealer of weights and measures, or his assistant, to be accurate, which certificate shall be attached to said scale on a conspicuous part thereof, with the seal of the sealer of weights and measures stating the fact of its accuracy, and the date of the examination and certificate, and no such certificate shall be valid for a longer period than three calendar months, and for each examination and certificate the sealer of weights and measures, or his assistant, shall be entitled to charge and receive from the owner of such scale the sum of 25 cents, and every person offending against the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars, one-half to go to the use of the informer, to be collected and applied as other fines are collected and applied.

SEC. 12. That the sealer of weights and measures, or his assistant, is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to examine all measures, weights, and scales of all hucksters or other persons retailing produce within the limits of the District of Columbia at least once in every three months, and to seal the measures, weights, and scales of such hucksters and retailers of produce, for which he shall be entitled to receive a fee of 25 cents for each scale, weight, or measure so sealed, and any huckster or other person offering produce for sale who shall have in his possession any measure, weight, or scale not having been sealed within three months by the sealer of weights and measures, or if such measure, weight, or scale shall have been altered with intent to defraud, such huckster or other person shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars for every such offense, one-half to go the use of the informer, to be collected and applied as other fines are collected and applied.

SEC. 13. That it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to use for weighing any article for sale any counter scale, unless the same shall have been examined and certified by the sealer of weights and measures to be accurate, which certificate shall be attached to such scale, in a conspicuous part thereof, with the seal of the sealer of weights and measures thereon, stating the fact of its accuracy and the date of the examination and certificate, and no such certificate shall be valid for a longer period than six calendar months, and for each examination and certificate the sealer of weights and measures shall be entitled to receive 25 cents, and any person offending against the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars for every such offense, one-half to go to the use of the informer, to be collected and applied as other fines and penalties are collected and applied.

SEC. 14. That the sealer of weights and measures, or his assistant, is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to inspect and test the weight of all butter offered for sale within the limits of the District of Columbia, and all butter offered for sale in prints, professing to be a pound or half pound in weight, and falling short half an ounce or more in the pound, shall be seized by him and sold, one-half of the proceeds of such sale to go to the informer and the other half to be applied as other fines and penalties are applied.

SEC. 15. That the sealer of weights and measures, or his assistant, shall annually examine every yardstick or measure for use in the measuring of any dry goods offered for sale in the District of Columbia, and if found correct shall seal the same with the year of the inspection, and he shall be entitled to receive for each inspection and seal the sum of 10 cents from the owner thereof, and it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to use any yardstick or measure in the sale of dry goods that has not been sealed within a year, and any person offending against the provisions of this section, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than five nor more than ten dollars for each and every such offense, one-half of such fine to go to the use of the informer, and to be collected and applied as other fines are collected and applied.

SEC. 16. That all laws and ordinances inconsistent with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

"*Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall affect the law now applicable to the large railroad scales, but the same shall remain unrepealed and unaffected by this act."

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in reference to this bill be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, September 10, 1892.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners transmit herewith draft of a bill "for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," and recommend early and favorable action thereon. This bill has been prepared after a conference with the sealer of weights and measures and the attorney for the District.

The inclosed copy of a communication from the sealer of weights and measures presents a few of the more important reasons for the proposed legislation.

Very respectfully,

MYRON M. PARKER,
Acting President Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Hon. JOHN T. HEARD,
Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEARD. It will be observed from the communication just read that this bill was furnished to us by the Commissioners, it having been prepared, as they state, in consultation with the present sealer of weights and measures and the District attorney. It not only has the approval of the Commissioners, but was prepared under their direction and according to their views of the exigency of the case. I will now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB], who is familiar with the points involved in the bill.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. This bill, Mr. Chairman, does not provide for the creation of any new office. There now exists in the District of Columbia the office of sealer of weights and measures. The only purpose of the bill is to reform the existing law in certain particulars, and to provide against certain abuses which have grown up in this District in consequence of the dis-

position on the part of hucksters to evade the laws, and to sell by short weights or measures. The bill gives to the sealer of weights and measures additional power with reference to the arrest of parties guilty of these fraudulent practices, so that they may be brought to the same tests as regular dealers in this District. The provisions of the bill are in the interest of purchasers of produce in the District, and are designed to prevent imposition or swindling by dealers. That is all there is in the bill. It is simply a reënactment of the old law with these additional provisions.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to ask whether there is any such officer now in the District as this sealer of weights and measures.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Of course there is; and there has been all along.

Mr. KILGORE. What, then, is the purpose of this bill; to extend the duties or authority of that officer?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. If the gentleman from Texas had given attention to my remarks he would not have had occasion to ask these questions.

Mr. KILGORE. I could not hear a word the gentleman was saying.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I stated in the first place that this bill creates no new office. In the second place, I said that it does increase in certain particulars the power or authority of the present sealer of weights and measures. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, if he is undertaking to protect his constituents in this regard, that the bill makes no appropriation from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, the Government we know is "dead broke," and therefore I think we ought to be a little particular in that matter.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Well, according to the gentleman's idea the traders in the District of Columbia are becoming very wealthy. Now, by this bill they are required to pay the sealer of weights and measures certain fees for seeing that they act honestly in their trading.

Mr. KILGORE. Could they not be honest without having this officer to look after them?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. They ought to be, and perhaps if the gentleman from Texas would supervise them a little they would be; but as the matter now stands it seems that they are not, or at least some of them are not.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the bill provide for an assistant that has not heretofore been provided for?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I think there is an assistant now.

Mr. HEARD. I believe there is.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. But whether that is so or not, the bill has reference simply to the sealer of weights and measures.

Mr. KILGORE. It might make this difference, that if there is an assistant the principal simply sits back while the assistant does the work.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. At any rate, the expense is paid by the District; the constituents of the gentleman from Texas do not pay it.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the people of this District ought not to be improperly taxed.

Mr. HEARD. I feel very sure there is already an assistant under the law.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. The whole gist of the matter is that my distinguished friend from Texas thinks that every bill coming from the Committee on the District of Columbia is liable to attack and ought to be defeated.

Mr. KILGORE. That seems to be a good theory to work upon.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. The gentleman can afford to attack the people of this District because his constituents are not directly interested. That is about the whole of the matter.

Mr. KILGORE. One other question. This bill defines a great many offenses and imposes a great many penalties. Are not these new features of legislation?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. To some extent they are.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman from Alabama will allow me to say that the penalties are only such as the District attorney and the sealer of weights and measures have recommended to the Commissioners as necessary for the purpose of making this legislation effective.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Under the provisions of this bill no honest man will be affected. The criminal laws never reach an honest citizen.

Mr. KILGORE. That is a mistake. It very often happens that an honest, innocent man is prosecuted unjustly. No lawyer should make such a statement as the gentleman has just made.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I have never known an honest man to be prosecuted unless his associations were not exactly what they should have been.

Mr. FUNK. I should like to ask, for information, what fee is to be paid for examining these various weights and measures?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Different fees.

Mr. FUNK. Yardsticks, for instance?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Ten cents.

Mr. FUNK. For each yardstick?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Yes, sir.

Mr. FUNK. Does this officer get one-half of that fee?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Yes, sir; I think he does.

Mr. FUNK. Well, is not that an enormous fee? Is it not in many instances more than the service is worth?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I do not know about that. The work of this officer is the same without regard to the value of the yardstick. The object of the bill is to prevent the dealer from using a yardstick which does not conform to the law.

Mr. FUNK. The object is all right. I have no objection to that if the price is not exorbitant. Why, how many can this man examine in a single ten minutes' I would ask? Perhaps a hundred, and so he gets $10 for about ten minutes' work. It seems to me that it is quite an exorbitant price. I am not objecting to a fee, if it is a proper fee. There ought to be, of course, some fee in connection with it. But the idea of 10 cents for each and every yardstick. Why, perhaps some merchants have thousands of them.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Not in use, of course.

Mr. COX. How many yardsticks has he got to examine?

Mr. FUNK. All, I understand.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Oh, no; only those used in his trade.

Mr. FUNK. Then I missunderstood the proposition, and beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It does not affect those that he sells.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why should it not?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. It is only those used in selling his own goods to other people.

Mr. FUNK. Well, even in that case he may have a number of them, twenty or thirty.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman from Alabama why they should not be required to have inspected and stamped the yardsticks they are going to sell for somebody else to use?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. They may never be used.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, they are using them for sale, at all events. Why not have them stamped?

Mr. FUNK. That is right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why should they not be stamped or branded?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. The object is to prevent the use of a yardstick without being stamped in transactions made by a merchant here. Of course, if these yardsticks are sold, and somebody else undertakes to use them here they have to be stamped.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is a legitimate and profitable business to be carried out according to the provisions of this bill, then it ought to extend to all.

Mr. HEARD. It will extend to all that are used. The conditions are the same in all cases.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the cost of making that examination and stamping the measure?

Mr. HEARD. I am not able to answer the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I will say to my friend that so far as the compensation for the service is concerned I have paid but little attention to it, because the matter has been passed in review before the Commissioners. They examined it all, and have consented to the fees. Presumably they know something of the amount that ought to be allowed for this purpose.

Now, I move——

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if in order I would like to offer an amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman from Alabama to have yielded the floor.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I did not. I was about to make a motion, but will yield to the gentleman if he wishes to make a suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. It is for the purpose of improving the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that general debate has not yet been closed, and until that is done amendments would not be in order.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that general debate be considered as closed.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment in line 2 of section 3, on page 2 of the bill. I desire to offer an amendment there and will state why, with the consent of the Chair.

Section 3 provides that the sealer of weights and measures shall rectify or brand and seal with the letter "W" all scalebeams, weights, and measures that may be brought to his office for that purpose as near the upper edge or ends thereof as possible," etc.

Now, I suppose the object in the sealer's examining the scalebeams, weights, and measures is for the purpose of benefiting or protecting those who may purchase or buy from persons using such weights or measures and having products to sell by them, and that every precaution ought to be taken to protect the public, and, therefore, that the intent of the law should be carried out.

It seems to me that if the sealer simply stamp, or print, a small letter "W" on a weight or measure that it would be of very little importance or benefit to me when I went to buy a yard of calico, a bushel of potatoes, or a pound of sugar. I could not tell whether that scale, or that yardstick, or that measure had been examined and approved by the sealer or not. It would probably take me a longer time to find the little letter "W" on the measure than it would take me to earn a peck of potatoes, and it seems to me, therefore, if Congress is going to try to protect purchasers—and I am not running protection into politics—that we ought to have the sealer put such a brand on the measure as that when a person goes to buy anything measured by it he will be able to determine that the weight, measure, or yardstick, has been properly examined and sealed. It ought to be marked in a conspicuous way, and hence for the purpose of making more distinct what we are trying to reach I offer an amendment, to which I think there can be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 2 of section 3 the words, "with the letter 'W,'" and insert, "approved by the District sealer."

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. It has been suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] that this plan of sealing or branding with the letter "W" has been in use for several years, and that this would make trouble.

I do not see that we are to consider the little trouble that might be caused by furnishing to every purchaser from a dealer in any kind of goods, wares, or merchandise, an opportunity of knowing that he is having his purchases weighed or measured by scales or measures that have been approved by the District Commissioners or by the sealer of the District. It would certainly cost but very little to make such a stamp; and I thought of inserting the sealer's name, but as I suppose the sealer changes every once in awhile, there would have to be a new stamp made every time the sealer changed if his name was put on, hence I thought the insertion of the words, "approved by the District sealer," would answer for all time and under all sealers. That would cost but a very small sum.

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. COBB of Alabama. It would not happen once in a hundred times that any purchaser would want to examine these weights or measures; but this stamp is put there to enable the purchaser, if he sees proper, to ascertain that these measures are correct. In ordinary trafficking we would not examine them.

Another and more important purpose is to enable the sealer of weights and measures, from time to time, to tell whether these men are conforming to the law. We must depend upon the faithfulness of the sealer of weights and measures to keep these traders correct in their dealings.

Now, if a man desires to ascertain whether or not the dealer is conforming to the law, all he has to do is to ascertain what the law is, and what particular sign the law provides to be put upon these measures. In this case it is the letter "W." He looks for it and easily ascertains whether it is there. It is just as effective as anything else you could put upon the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. As I understand from this bill there is nothing but the letter "W" placed upon the measure?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. But if we know the law, we know what that means.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Why can not the man who is selling the goods put the letter "W" on his own measure?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. He would incur a penalty if he did so.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Is there any law to prohibit him from putting it on?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Is there anything that would prevent him from putting on the words proposed by the gentleman in his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Probably not; but then he would not go to that trouble.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. It is only then a question of convenience to the dealer, whether he puts on the one or the other.

There is no force whatever in the argument, because whether you use the letter or the word, the effect is the same, and the opportunity is the same to the purchaser to ascertain whether the law is being complied with by the seller.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. If it is of no interest to the purchaser, there is no use in taking all this trouble.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I move to lay the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois on the table.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] that in Committee of the Whole a motion to lay on the table is not in order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH], which the Clerk will again report.

The amendment was again reported.

The question being taken on the amendment, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division, demanded by Mr. SMITH of Illinois, there were—ayes 20, noes 29.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I move that the bill be laid aside, to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment to this bill reported by the committee.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Yes, I overlooked that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall affect the law now applicable to the large railroad scales, but the same shall remain unrepealed and unaffected by this act.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the House that that language was omitted. Under the existing law the the sealer of weights and measures was obliged to inspect the railroad scales as well as other scales. In the draft prepared of this bill those scales were omitted inadvertently, and this is to perfect the bill, making it retain supervision of these scales as now provided for by existing law.

The amendment recommended by the committee was adopted.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill favorably to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLANCHARD, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had instructed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment and with recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the amendment recommended by the Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was read and agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEARD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SERVICE CONNECTIONS WITH WATER MAINS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. HEARD. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill which the Clerk will now report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized, whenever the roadway of a street is about to be paved or macadamized, to make service connections in such street for all abutting lots and premises with the water mains and sewer provided for the service of said lots and premises. The entire cost of the said connections shall be paid from the current appropriations, respectively, for the extension of the sewer and water-supply systems and shall be assessed against the abutting property and collected in like manner as assessments which are levied under the compulsory permit system; the sums so collected shall be credited to the respective appropriations for the extension of the sewer and water-supply systems,

Mr. HEARD. I desire to have a letter of the Commissioners read.

The letter was read, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, September 26, 1893.

SIR: Referring to H. R. bill 2360, "to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia," which was referred to the Commissioners at your instance for their report thereon, the Commissioners have to recommend that the inclosed amended bill be substituted therefor, as the original bill does not fully nor properly provide for the desired result.

The object sought to be obtained is a worthy and necessary one. The present law provides that the Commissioners shall require connections to be made with sewers and water mains before the pavements are laid, but makes no provision for the enforcement of this requirement, thus allowing the Commissioners to do no more than notify property owners of contemplated improvements, and request them to make prior connections with sewers and water mains.

This request, however, is very frequently disregarded and new pavements are often torn up and patched as the result of subsequent sewer and water connections. The enactment of the proposed bill will obviate this difficulty and thus prove beneficial not only to the District in the preservation of new improvements, but to the property owners in preventing the expense of cutting and repairing the pavement. It will also be the means of checking the damage and danger consequent upon the leaking of poorly laid service pipes, which now frequently necessitates the tearing up of large portions of the pavement in order to properly remedy the trouble. If the connections were put in by the District, as the amended bill provides for, the work would be done with the same care and skill with which water mains are laid, and leaks in service pipes would be as rare as they are in the mains.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. ROSS,
President.

Hon. JOHN T. HEARD,
Chairman Committee on District of Columbia,
House of Representatives.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, the reasons for the passage of the bill are so clearly stated by the Commissioners in their communication that I deem it unnecessary to offer anything further in explanation, unless some gentleman desires to ask me some questions.

The object may be stated in a very condensed form, and it is simply that when a street is to be paved the owners of the abutting property shall be notified and compelled to put in the connection before the pavement is laid down. The change sought to be effected in the law is this. The present law does not enable the Commissioners to have that done. The Commissioners show in this communication that if they notify the owners to make the connection they sometimes do not comply. The Commissioners then go on and pave the street, after which the owners cut up the street in making the connection.

This bill authorizes the Commissioners to expend the money necessary to put in the connection where the owners make default and assess the money against the property. That is the nature of the bill; and in consonance with the suggestion made by the Commissioners there is a substitute offered for the original bill, the bill sent to us by the Commissioners, which I now ask have to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that the Clerk has read and the committee has been considering the substitute reported by that committee in lieu of the original bill, and the original bill is not before the committee.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEARD a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the Monument Grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation, in Minnesota.

MRS. MARY O. AUGUSTA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, for the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BLANCHARD in the Chair.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 4013) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States of America hereby quitclaims and releases to Mary O. Augusta, devisee of Alexander T. Augusta, deceased, her heirs or assigns, any title or interest which the United States may have by reason of any escheat, or supposed escheat, in and to the following-described real estate, situate and being in the city of Washington, D. C., known and designated on the public plat of said city as the west half of lot numbered 3, in square numbered 247, as subdivided into lots 54 and 55.

Mr. HEARD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the report in this bill sets forth the facts clearly and I think in sufficient detail, and I ask that it be read.

The report (by Mr. COOPER of Indiana) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4013) "to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia," recommend that the same do pass.

Said bill was referred to the District Commissioners, who favorably reported it, and accompany their report with the following opinion of the attorney of the District:

"WASHINGTON, *October 30, 1893.*

"GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to return to you herewith House bill No. 4013 (Fifty-third Congress, first session), to release to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia, which was referred to this office for advice as to the propriety of recommending the passage of the bill.

"It appears that in 1866 one Caroline Hill died in this District, intestate and unmarried, possessed of the west half of lot 3 (since divided into lots 54 and 55) in square 247. In the same year a bill was filed in the supreme court of the District of Columbia by Louisa Warren against Jane R. Brent and Eliza Miller, who were alleged to be Caroline Hill's heirs at law, to subject said property to the payment of an alleged indebtedness of Caroline Hill. The case was referred to the then auditor of the court, Hon. Walter S. Cox, now one of the justices thereof, for a preliminary report on the matters of the bill. The auditor took some depositions and reported to the court that it appeared that Caroline Hill left no children, and that her nearest relatives were Jane R. Brent and Eliza Williams, grandchildren of her paternal grandfather, who were defendants to the bill. That Caroline Hill's father was a white man and that her mother was a black woman, and that, inasmuch as intermarriage between the two races was forbidden by the laws of Maryland, the presumption was that the parents of the deceased were not married, and that she was an illegitimate child, and hence never inherited the property from her father, and that the same had consequently escheated to the United States. Notwithstanding this report, the court appears to have ordered a sale of the property and appointed a trustee to make the same.

"In 1868 the trustee reported a sale to Alexander T. Augusta. The purchaser declined to take the property on the ground of defective title, and a rule to show cause why he should not complete his purchase was issued. He answered, setting up information communicated to him by his counsel, Mr. Ward, then a leading examiner of titles in this District, to the effect that the title was defective. Notwithstanding his answer and the report of the auditor, the court ordered Augusta to comply with the terms of sale. He then complied, and the trustee, Mr. Saunders, conveyed the property to him by deed dated June 24, 1868, which was duly recorded in the proper office in this District.

"I am satisfied that the title of Mrs. Augusta, who takes the property under the will of her husband, is defective; that Caroline Hill never inherited the property from her father, and had no interest in it, and that the court was without jurisdiction to decree a sale of it for the payment of her debts.

"On the facts and circumstances of this case I think it would be manifestly unjust and inequitable for the United States to claim this property, which Mrs. Augusta's husband was compelled to take by force of the decree of a court of the United States, for which he paid his money in good faith, supposing he was getting a good title. The interest of the United States should be released to Mrs. Augusta. The bill is a proper one, and one which should be favorably recommended to Congress.

"Very respectfully,

"S. T. THOMAS,
"*Attorney District Columbia.*

"The COMMISSIONERS, ETC."

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the report which has just been read by the Clerk states the facts quite fully. This bill has had the careful consideration of the District Commissioners and the District attorney, and the Committee on the District of Columbia have unanimously reported in its favor. If there is no objection and if no one desires further information concerning it, I move that it be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask whether it is the purpose of the Committee on the District of Columbia to call up other bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. I understand that there are others to be called up.

The motion of Mr. COOPER of Indiana was agreed to.

ALLEY IN SQUARE 493, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 213) to pay for alley condemned in square No. 493, Washington, D. C.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved March 1, 1889, entitled "An act to reappropriate to pay for alley condemned in square numbered 493," be amended by striking out all the words after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof insert:

"That, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there be, and the same hereby is, appropriated a sum sufficient to pay, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from August 6, in the year 1870, to the date of the approval of this act, the persons entitled to the amount awarded by the jury of condemnation for the land taken for an alley so far as the same relates to lots numbered 2, 3, 12, 13, and 15, in square numbered 493, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia."

Mr. HEARD. I ask that the report in this case be read.

The report (by Mr. HEARD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 213) entitled "A bill to pay for alley condemned in square No. 493, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia," has considered the same and makes the following statement of facts:

The alley referred to is one of those condemned between the years 1865 and 1875. As shown by the report of the Committee of the District of Columbia in the Fifty-first Congress, there was appropriated in 1881 by Congress a certain sum for amounts due property owners for ground condemned and used for alleys of the city. The amount due to owners of square No. 493 was never called for, and was covered into the Treasury as a surplus.

The Commissioners of the District, to whom a copy of the bill was sent for their approval, said:

"The land has been condemned and taken for public purposes, and should be paid for."

The act referred to reads, as follows:

"An act to reappropriate to pay for alley condemned in square numbered 493.

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That of the surplus that has been covered into the Treasury of the sum appropriated by the act approved June 30, 1880, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1881,' for amount due property owners for ground condemned and used for alleys, there be, and the same is hereby, reappropriated so much as will be sufficient to pay, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from August 6, 1870, to the date of the approval of this act, the persons entitled to the amount awarded by the jury of condemnation for the land taken for an alley through square numbered 493, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

"Approved March 1, 1889."

This act became inoperative because the appropriation out of which the money was to be paid had already been disposed of, half of it to the surplus fund and the other half to the District of Columbia, as reported by the First Comptroller of the Treasury, whose letter is hereto attached.

This letter of the First Comptroller is as follows:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, FIRST COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., January 24, 1889.*

"SIR: Your letter of this date has been received, and in reply thereto you are respectfully informed that the act of March 1, 1889, entitled 'An act to reappropriate to pay for alley condemned in square numbered 493' (Stats. at L., vol. 25, p. 751), can not be carried into effect, because before the passage of that act the 'surplus' mentioned therein had been disposed of as follows: One-half thereof had been carried to the surplus fund of the United States as provided by section 3690, Revised Statues, and the other half had been reappropriated by act of June 30, 1884, and carried to the credit of the District of Columbia, on account of the sewer debt of the District of Columbia to the United States.

"Very respectfully,

"A. C. MATTHEWS,
"*Comptroller.*

"By J. R. GARRISON,
"*Deputy Comptroller.*

"DANIEL O. C. CALLAGHAN,
"*Washington, D. C.*"

Upon a reference of the bill to the Commissioners by this, your committee, the board in its reply says:

"The Commissioners have recommended to several former Congresses that the relief contemplated by this bill be granted."

In the light of the foregoing facts, the committee therefore recommends that the bill do pass.

Mr. HEARD. Reports have been made upon this measure at three or four different times, but I think the one that was made in 1890 by the Commissioners when the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] was chairman of the District Committee, contains the information by which the House will probably be guided, and I therefore ask that it be read, and also the one made in September last.

The reports were read, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 1, 1890.

SIR: The Commissioners have the honor to make the following report relative to H. R. bill 4768, "to pay for alley condemned in square 493, Washington, D. C.," referred to them at your instance.

A law, having in view the payment contemplated in the bill under consideration, was approved March 1, 1889, but failed to afford the relief intended, because the unexpended balance of the appropriation out of which the payment had been directed to be made had been used in 1887, with other then existing balances of appropriations, to reimburse the United States the amount advanced under the act of June 30, '84, entitled "An act making an appropriation for the completion of the sewerage system of the District of Columbia."—*United States Statutes at Large*, volume 23, page 63.

Respectfully,

J. W. DOUGLASS, *President.*

Hon. WILLIAM W. GROUT,
Chairman Committee on District of Columbia,
House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, September 21, 1893.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners recommend favorable action upon H. R. bill 213, "to pay for alley condemned in square 493, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia," which was referred to them on the 6th instant, at your instance, for their views. The Commissioners have recommended to several former Congresses that the relief contemplated by this bill be granted, and their reasons will no doubt be found on the files of your committee. If their previous letters have been mislaid or destroyed they will furnish others if so requested.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. ROSS,
President Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Hon. JOHN T. HEARD,
Chairman Committee on District of Columbia,
House of Representatives.

Mr. HEARD. The Government condemned certain property for use as alleys and appropriated the money to pay for it, but when it was called for it had been expended for other District purposes. The Commissioners have made recommendations no less than three or four times in favor of the reappropriation of the money.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I wish to ask the gentleman how long this money remained subject to the call of the property owners.

Mr. HEARD. I am not prepared to state, but I think that information substantially is contained in the report which has been read. The money was appropriated, and the call was made for it, but when the call was made the money had been expended for other purposes and was not available.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Was the money which was called for by the other owners of land in the alley paid with interest?

Mr. HEARD. It was. The land was bought by the Government, and the original appropriation carried a sufficient amount to pay for it with interest. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this is the last bill pertaining to the District of Columbia that is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEARD. It is the last. I therefore move that the committee rise and report this bill and the preceding one to the House, with the recommendation that they do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 4013) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia, and had directed him to report the same back with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HEARD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved that the motion be laid on the table. The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANCHARD also, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 213) to pay for alley condemned in square No. 493, Washington, D. C., and had directed him to report the same with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HEARD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table. The latter motion was agreed to.

ALLEYS IN SQUARE 751.

Mr. HEARD. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C., be closed and the land contained therein revert to the owners of the abutting property.

The amendment reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia was read, as follows:

Add to the bill the following:

Provided, That any conveyance of title in this act contained shall be operative only so long as the land is used for charitable purposes.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, the object of this bill is to vacate certain alleys in a block of ground which is now owned almost entirely by the charitable institution known as "The Little Sisters of the Poor." This institution owns the ground on both sides of these alleys, and in fact all the block except one

corner. The report of the Commissioners, which I will ask to have read in a moment, states that although the Commissioners gave notice by advertisement in the city papers to all parties concerned to appear, if any desired to appear in opposition to this proposition, nobody appeared to oppose, but several persons appeared to support the measure.

Along with these papers is a letter from the person owning that corner of the block which is not owned by this charitable institution; and said party assents to this proposed vacation. The only owner of property touching these alleys and having an easement over them is the institution I have named. The amendment reported by the committee provides that this act shall be operative only so long as the land is used for charitable purposes.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] has the papers in the case, and I yield to him for further explanation of the measure.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, after the explanation which has been given by the chairman of the commit ee [Mr. HEARD] there is very little further to be said on this bill. Its object is to vacate certain alleys in square No. 751. The property abutting on these alleys belongs to a charitable institution known as the Little Sisters of the Poor. They have spent a large amount of money in improving this block; they now desire to improve it still further, and there being no other interests involved than theirs, they ask Congress to vacate these alleys so that they may use the ground or a portion of it for building purposes. A lot on one corner of the block is owned by an individual (the only property owner in the entire block, except this institution) who has given his assent to this proposition. As has been stated, an amendment reported by the committee provides—

That any conveyance of title in this act contained shall be operative only so long as the land is used for charitable purposes.

The measure has received the full sanction of the committee; and I think there can be no possible objection to it.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the length of this alley? Does it extend through the whole block?

Mr. BABCOCK. This alley is in three sections, and is irregular in its course. I have here a map showing the situation of the land, with all the measurements. This map is open to the inspection of any gentleman who desires to examine it. I can hardly explain the matter except to a gentleman who will make such personal examination.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand from the gentleman's explanation that this alley is not a passageway from one street to another.

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. DINGLEY. So that no public convenience would be affected by the vacation of the alley?

Mr. BABCOCK. Not at all. The public has really no interest in the matter.

The question being taken on the amendment reported by the committee, it was agreed to.

Mr. HEARD. I move that the bill as amended be laid aside to be reported favorably to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEARD. I move that the committee now rise and report its action to the House; but before that motion is put I desire to make a statement. My attention has been called to the fact that a bill which we shall ask unanimous consent to consider will have to be considered in Committee of the Whole. It is a bill not on the Calendar. I desire at the conclusion of this statement to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill at this time.

Last Friday the Committee on the District of Columbia received from the Commissioners of the District a bill which they requested us to introduce and have passed at the earliest practicable moment. The object of the bill is to constitute two members of the board of Commissioners, when sitting as an excise board, a quorum to do business. It seems an unusual state of case that a majority of the board does not now constitute a quorum: but that seems to be the judgment of their attorney, and the Commissioners desire an authoritative declaration of law to the effect that two members of the board of Commissioners sitting as an excise board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The point to which I desire to direct attention is this: As is well understood, a bill which has not been regularly referred to the committee and reported back can not be considered exc pt by unanimous consent.

That bill was referred to the committee and a favorable report was authorized to be made, but it was not made in time to go upon the Calendar. I ask unanimous consent of the House that it may be considered now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that the pending motion is that the committee rise and report favorably the bill H. R. 3629. The Chair does not think that in Committee of the Whole unanimous consent, such as he has asked for, can be granted.

Mr. HEARD. Then I move that the committee rise and report the bill just considered favorably to the House.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if that bill would authorize two of the District Commissioners, sitting as an excise board, to grant licenses for the sale of liquor?

Mr. HEARD. That bill is not now before the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. I am asking as to this bill.

Mr. HEARD. The bill considered in committee relates to a different subject.

Mr. PICKLER. But is there not a bill before the committee to allow two members of the Board to exercise that authority?

Mr. HEARD. I have withdrawn that bill temporarily.

The motion of Mr. HEARD was then agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANCHARD reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3629), had directed him to report the same to the House with an amendment, and as so amended that the bill do pass.

The amendment recommended by the Committee of the Whole was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEARD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

EXCISE BOARD, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to ask unanimous consent of the House for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4569) to amend an act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to call it up.

Mr. HEARD. I was not certain about that, for the reason that the bill, although reported, is not upon the printed Calendar. It has been reported by the committee, but the report has not yet been printed.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration in order that there may be no question about the right to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

SEC. 2. That there shall be, and there is hereby, constituted an excise board of the District of Columbia, which shall consist of the three Commissioners of the District, any two of whom shall constitute a quorum for business, and the duty of which shall be to take up and consider all applications for license to sell intoxicating liquors, and to take action on such applications, and the action of said board shall be final and conclusive, and only on the granting by the said board of a license to an applicant to sell intoxicating liquors shall the assessor issue a license to such applicant; and the said board shall make such rules and regulations for carrying into effect this act as they may deem requisite and proper. And said board shall make an annual report to Congress, setting forth the number of applications for license, both favorably and unfavorably acted on, the number of persons convicted for violations of this statute, and the number of fines collected and uncollected.

Mr. PICKLER. I object to the consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. Its consideration does not require unanimous consent. The gentleman has a right to call it up.

Mr. PICKLER. But the gentleman asked unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Rule XXVI, clause 2, provides as follows:

The second and fourth Mondays in each month shall, when claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by said committee.

Mr. PICKLER. I understood this bill was not on the Calendar. The gentleman asked unanimous consent to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The bill was reported this morning on the call of committees for reports. It was referred to the Calendar. It is not yet on the printed Calendar, having been only reported this morning.

Mr. PICKLER. But could it be considered until it is placed on the Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It could when called up by the committee having it in charge. The gentleman probably confuses this with the proceedings under the hour rule. That rule provides that the committee may call up a bill reported on a previous day. But this is a different case. The Committee on the District of Columbia has the right to consider any business presented by the committee. The committee favorably reports this bill and calls it up for consideration.

Mr. KILGORE. Do I understand the Speaker to hold that the committee would have the right to call up for consideration a bill not reported by it?

The SPEAKER. This bill has been reported by the committee.

Mr. KILGORE. But not yet printed and placed on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. No; it was reported this morning.

Mr. PICKLER. Why does the chairman of the committee ask unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know.

Mr. HEARD. I will state the reason, Mr. Speaker. I stated before that this bill was not yet on the Calendar, that is to say, not on the printed Calendar. While it has been reported by the committee it was not to be found on the Calendar; and I called attention to the fact so that if there was any possible doubt of the right of the committee to call it up that would be satisfied by the consent of the House. I did not myself believe that it was necessary to ask unanimous consent, but I did not wish to ask for the consideration of a bill under the circumstances where there may have been some doubt.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Can not it wait until another day?

Mr. HEARD. I wanted a declaration as to whether or not the bill should be considered. Now, I hope the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] will be content to let the bill be called up. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4569).

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKLER) there were—ayes 15, noes 29.

Mr. HEARD. I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused, 30 members, not a sufficient number, voting therefor.

Mr. PICKLER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The noes have it, and the House refuses to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill.

SALE OF LIQUORS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 3740) to amend an act entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia."

The bill was read at length.

Mr. DINGLEY. Should not this bill be considered in Committee of the Whole? It is an amendment to the same act which we have just refused to consider in Committee of the Whole. It is a bill relating to revenue.

The SPEAKER. The other bill created a board. This does not. It merely provides a regulation as to the issue of licenses.

Mr. DINGLEY. But this makes certain regulations with reference to the issuing of these same licenses, affecting the revenue. If we should have gone into committee on the other bill, we certainly should on this.

The SPEAKER. The rule refers to bills raising revenue. This bill is merely to put a limitation upon the issuing of licenses by providing that no retailer shall be located within a certain distance of any school, etc.

Mr. DINGLEY. But it has the effect to increase the number. It practically gives certain men licenses who are not authorized to have licenses under the existing law.

The SPEAKER. This would be a limitation.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the provision of this is to increase the number when read in connection with the original law.

Mr. PICKLER. An increase or decrease in the revenue of the District will depend on the passage or failure of this bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. The law passed on the 3d of March last provided that no license should be granted for the carrying on of the liquor traffic within 400 feet of a schoolhouse or church. Now the proposition is to put in an exception, that all those who had licenses on the 3d of March last shall now be entitled to receive licenses, thus increasing the number entitled to receive them over the number who would be entitled to receive them under the existing law.

The SPEAKER. Still it is a regulation.

Mr. HEARD. There is no proof that it will make any difference in the amount of revenue to be received.

Mr. DINGLEY. It appears on the face of the bill that it does increase the number.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It makes a difference in the revenues of the District.

Mr. HEARD. I do not know whether it does or not.

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me any amendment to this law, which is a law relating to the revenues of the District, ought to be considered in the Committee of the Whole, just the same as the tariff bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE. This is a revenue bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will direct it to be referred to the Committee of the Whole, out of abundant caution. It is rather a difficult question to determine. The rule refers all bills or resolutions involving a tax or a charge on the people to the Committee of the Whole. This is an amendment to the tax act, as the Chair understands it, and the act itself would have to be considered in Committee of the Whole because it is a tax act. Therefore the Chair will refer this bill to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can move to go into the Committee of the Whole, if he wishes to.

Mr. HEARD. In view of the fact that the House has just refused to go into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of a bill, simply because that bill had the word "excise" printed in the title, I apprehend that the House is hardly ready to go into Committee of the Whole to take up this bill. Therefore I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the announcement of the vote,

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. MOSES, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. HEARD (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1893, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4583) for the relief of Andrew B. Keith—the Committee on Military Affairs discharged and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill H. R. 3722) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Marcellus Pettitt—the Committee on Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWERS of California: A bill (H. R. 4602) to prohibit officers and employés of national banks from holding any office in any savings bank and to prohibit the location of any national bank or its continuance in business in any building in which the business of a savings bank is conducted—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4603) to establish a postal savings bank department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4604) granting certain section of land to Buena Vista Cemetery Association, of Yuma, Ariz., for cemetery and park purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) granting chief justice of United States courts in the Territories power to appoint commissioners to take proof in land cases, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EVERETT: A bill (H. R. 4606) to amend sections 5365 and 5366 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDZIER: A bill (H. R. 4607) to amend section 467, chapter 15, Revised Statutes, relating to the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4608) to revise and amend an act entitled "An act for the final adjustment of private land claims in the States of Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1860—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 4609) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes—to the Joint Commission of Congress to inquire into the Status of Laws Organizing the Executive Depratments.

By Mr. SOMERS: A bill (H. R. 4612) to amend section 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 4613) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a high wagon bridge at or near Sioux City, Iowa," approved March 2, 1890, as amended by acts of April 13, 1890, and February 7, 1893—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4614) to establish an army post at Rochester, N. Y., and making appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAWLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4615) to amend section 707 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4616) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 4617) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRIBBS: A resolution authorizing the printing of the digested summary and alphabetical list of private claims presented to the House of Representatives from the Forty-seventh to Fifty-first Congresses inclusive—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WEADOCK: A concurrent resolution to print the eulogies upon the late J. Logan Chipman, late a Representative from the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 4618) to correct the military record of Charles Murray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4619) for the relief of George F. McReynolds, late of Company B, Tenth Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of Georgia (by request): A bill (H. R. 4620) for the relief of John M. Boone—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRAWLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4621) for the relief of Joseph B. Seabrook, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of William H. Cayce, of Miller County, Ark.—to the Committee on Private Land Claims

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 4623) for the relief of Joel F. Willis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4624) for the relief of Augustus Fitch—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4625) disposing of four condemned cannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) for the relief of Joshua P. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4627) for the relief of Rev. William J. Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4628) for the relief of Commander Edwin T. Woodward, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 4629) granting a pension to Levi Sharman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEAR: A bill (H. R. 4630) for the relief of R. A. Schellhous—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4631) for the relief of B. J. Van Vleck, administrator of Henry Van Vleck, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 4632) granting a pension to Levi G. Fessenden, late leader of the band, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteers and First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) granting a pension to Isaac Holdbrook, private Company G, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of George W. Mannix—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) granting a pension to Joseph B. Arbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOCKWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4636) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Philip Ely—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) to grant a pension to Elizabeth Deshler Whiting, widow of Lieut. Henry Whiting—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McDANNOLD: A bill (H. R. 4638) for the relief of Charles Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) for the relief of Richard S. Taylor, late private Company F, Fifty-first Illinois—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) for the relief of Samuel G. Cabell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4641) for the relief of Stephen Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNTER: A bill (H. R. 4642) granting a pension to Carrie V. Harn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 4643) granting a pension to Rose Doherty, mother of Daniel Doherty, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Rhode Island Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 4644) to increase the pension of James A. Morrison, late first lieutenant Fourth Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of C. C. Miner, late a first lieutenant in the Ninth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4646) for the relief of L. G. Faxon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) for the relief of H. Wilhite—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4648) for the relief of legal representatives of Anthony Koon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4649) to free Elias J. Brown from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4650) to place on the pension list the name of Dr. David S. Pinnell, late hospital steward Tenth West Virginia Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of William F. Wilson, of Martinsburg, Berkeley County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 4652) for the relief of Thomas Tucker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of William J. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) for the relief of Albert Olde—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) for the relief of A. W. Hager—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 4656) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of William B. Isaacs & Co.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of Oliver Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Protest of the Chamber of Commerce of New York against the passage of the New York and New Jersey bridge bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of 474 citizens of Coos and Douglass counties, Oregon, praying that Congress may pass an act of forfeiture of the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant for failure to comply with the terms of the grant—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. IKIRT: Petition of Encampment No. 64, Union Veteran Legion of the United States, located at New Lisbon, Ohio, in support of House bill 4590, for the removal of the disabilities of Samuel Johnson, late private Company F, One hundred and fourth regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEIL: Petition of Foss & Co., 575 Atlantic avenue, Boston, against putting woolen rags on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Petition of M. A. Lewis, a citizen of the State of Tennessee, requesting that his claim against the United States be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): Petition of Reese Pritchard, of Little Rock, Ark., requesting that his claim against the United States for the use of his steamboat Yuba in transporting soldiers of the United States Army in 1855 be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of the Fort Smith (Ark.) Chamber of Commerce, requesting the speedy passage of a bill authorizing the Fort Smith and Van Buren Electric Railway Company to build a bridge across the Arkansas River between Fort Smith and Van Buren—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Petition of Joseph Lynn and 485 other employés of the Farr Alpaca Manufacturing Company, of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of Amanda Collins, widow of Daniel Collins, deceased, of Davidson County, Tenn., for services rendered by her deceased husband to the United States during the late war, asking reference of the claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Jordon Overton, of Davidson County, Tenn., for services performed in the Quartermaster's Department during the late war, asking reference of the claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

CALVIN S. BRICE, a Senator from the State of Ohio, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PURCHASES OF SILVER BULLION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of November 1, 1893, a statement of the aggregate amount of silver bullion purchased in October, 1893, the cost thereof, etc.; which was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication being an answer to a resolution submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], not now present, if there be no objection, will be printed, and, with the accompanying document, lie on the table until the return of that Senator.

Mr. COCKRELL. Would it not be well that the accompanying document be printed? It seems to me that course should be pursued.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In view of the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, the communication, with the accompanying document, will be printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not a very large paper.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST SURVEY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, stating the progress made in the work by that Survey during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893; which was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication will be printed. The report is accompanied by maps illustrating the general advance in the operations of the Survey. What disposition shall be made of the communication and accompanying document?

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the letter of transmittal be printed, and that it with the accompanying document, be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting a statement of all final judgments in claims arising from Indian depredations under the act approved March 3, 1891; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Maritime Exchange, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for maintaining in active service the life-saving stations upon the sea and gulf coasts of the United States from the 1st day of August in each year until the 1st day June succeeding; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 276, of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of Cyrus J. Long Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elizaville, Ind., praying for the enactment of such legislation as will insure the settlement of all claims in the Pension Department prior to December 1, 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KYLE presented a petition of the South Dakota Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Brookings, S. Dak., praying for the repeal of the so-called Geary Chinese law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, of the State of Washington, praying for the employment of labor for the erection of fortifications in that State, setting forth the great need of fortifications on Puget Sound and the condition of things there, and suggesting that laborers might be well employed by the Government now in the erection of such fortifications, thereby giving employment to needy laborers. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington, praying for the establishment of a national park to be called the Washington National Park, in that State, in a body of land now comprised in what is called the Pacific Forest Reserve, where, as is represented in the petition, the beautiful native trees are being destroyed and there ought to be protection afforded, a keeper provided, routes laid out, and paths made, and that beautiful body of forest trees preserved. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1190) granting an increase of pension to David S. Corser, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 872) to make service connections with the water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1238) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Marshall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1240) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1241) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1242) for the relief of the estate of the late William L. Scott; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1243) granting a pension to Mary E. Chamberlin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1244) to amend section 22 of an act to regulate commerce as amended March 2, 1889; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1245) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to investigate the claim made for fuel alleged to have been taken and used by the United States Army during the war from the property in Chattanooga known as "Cameron Hill," and to provide for the payment thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1246) to amend the charter of the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUNTON introduced a bill (S. 1247) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1248) granting a pension to John R. Kendall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1249) granting a pension to Jacob Grobb; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1250) to set apart certain lands, now known as Pacific Forest Reserve, as a public park, to be known as the Washington National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1251) to accept, ratify, and confirm certain agreements heretofore concluded with certain Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1252) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places to hold terms of the United States courts in the State of Washington;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1253) to promote Lieut. A. B. Wyckoff, United States Navy, retired, to the grade of lieutenant-commander on the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. IRBY introduced a bill (S. 1254) to permit Agnes A. Niver

to bring a suit against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COKE introduced a bill (S. 1255) to authorize the construction of an additional story to the public building in Fort Worth, Tex.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 1256) to make Anclote, in the State of Florida, a subport of entry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1257) granting a pension to John M. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1258) to revive the grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the Chair). I, by request, introduce a bill to amend the act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquor in the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1259) to amend section 2 of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1893, entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquor in the District of Columbia," was read twice by its title.

Mr. HARRIS. I submit a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia approving the bill, and asking that early action be taken thereon. I move that the bill and accompanying letter be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE OF CAPITOL POLICE FORCE.

Mr. BRICE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Board of Capitol Police be, and they are hereby authorized and directed to appoint twelve additional policemen at an annual salary of $1,100 each, one-half to be paid by the Secretary of the Senate, and the other half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, out of the appropriations for miscellaneous items of the respective Houses, until otherwise provided for.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CULLOM. If the morning business has concluded, I will ask the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is concluded.

Mr. PEFFER. There is a resolution coming over from yesterday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. CULLOM. There is perhaps a resolution upon the table that comes over from yesterday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that there are two resolutions upon the table that come over from yesterday.

Mr. CULLOM. If it is not important that they be acted upon at this time, as I have an engagement to meet the joint commission in reference to the reorganization of the Departments, I should like to occupy the attention of the Senate for a while.

Mr. PEFFER. I have no objection to passing the resolutions over, provided they will retain their present position and come up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If passed over by consent the resolutions will hold their position on the table, to be presented either to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair repeat his announcement?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the resolutions are passed over at this time by consent, they will be laid before the Senate either to-day or to-morrow morning, holding their place on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 4,000 copies of the document entitled "Imported merchandise entered for consumption in the United States during the years 1890 to 1893; with the rates and amount of duty collected;" in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 8,000 copies of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. William Mutchler, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 42) permitting Anson Mills, colonel of Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, yesterday I gave notice that if agreeable to the Senate I would ask leave to occupy the time of the Senate for a little while to-day, mainly with reference to the question of the repeal of the election laws, so called. I supposed when I determined to ask the attention of the Senate to-day that the Senate bill which was then upon the Calendar or laid on the table I believe, and which is now I think by consent on the table, would remain subject to general discussion without reference, as I understood that to be the desire of a portion at least of the Senate. Since that time the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], who has charge of the bill now before the Senate, consented that the House bill should be referred.

As the bill now before the Senate is, as stated, substantially the same as the bill which has passed the House of Representatives, and the Senate bill having been before the Judiciary Committee, it is probable, at least, that the same bill or one very much like it will come back from the Committee on Privileges and Elections after it has been considered there. So I feel justified in asking the attention of the Senate upon the question at this time.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Illinois for information what is the matter before the Senate on which he is speaking?

Mr. CULLOM. The bill proposing to repeal the election laws.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Illinois that the title of the bill now on the table be read.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 412) to repeal Title XXVI of the Revised Statutes, known as the Federal election law.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, the subject of the protection of the elective franchise from fraud, having been one which has engaged the attention of the body politic for many years, and having been a matter upon which the power of all branches of the Government has at various times been invoked and exercised in behalf of right, justice, and public decency, it will be well to give a brief consideration to the history and record of such exercise.

Preliminary to this it will be instructive to consider briefly the discussion in the convention of 1787, indulged in by the framers of the Constitution, and to quote the clause of that great instrument which empowers the Congress to enact laws of the kind in question. It reads as follows, viz:

Article I, section 4: "The time, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

In the Madison Papers, volume 3, page 1281, the position taken by Mr. Madison, Mr. King, and Mr. Gouverneur Morris, respectively, upon the then pending question is given as follows:

Mr. MADISON. The necessity of a general government supposes that the State Legislatures will sometimes fail or refuse to consult the common interest at the expense of their local conveniences or prejudices. The policy of referring the appointment of the House of Representatives to the people and not to the Legislatures of the States supposes that the result will be somewhat influenced by the mode. This view of the question seems to decide that the Legislatures of the States ought not to have the uncontrolled right of regulating the times, places, and manner of holding elections. These were words of great latitude. It was impossible to foresee all the abuses that might be made of the discretionary power. Whether the electors should vote by ballot or *viva voce*; should assemble at this place or that place; should be divided into districts or all meet at one place; should all vote for all the Representatives or all in a district vote for a number allotted to the district—these and many other points would depend on the Legislatures, and might materially affect the appointments.

Whenever the State Legislatures had a favorite measure to carry they would take care so to mold their regulations as to favor the candidates they wished to succeed. Besides, the inequality of the representation in the Legislatures of particular States would produce a like inequality in their representation in the National Legislature, as it was presumable that the counties having the power in the former case would secure it to themselves in the latter. What danger could there be in giving a controlling power to the National Legislature? Of whom was it to consist? First, of a senate to be chosen by the State Legislatures. If the latter, therefore, could be trusted, their representatives could not be dangerous.

Secondly, of Representatives elected by the same people who elect the State Legislatures. Surely, then, if confidence is due to the latter it must be due to the former. It seemed as improper in principle, though it might be less inconvenient in practice, to give to the State Legislatures this great authority over the election of the Representatives of the people in the General Legislature as it would be to give to the latter a like power over the election of their representatives in the State Legislature.

Mr. KING. If this power be not given to the National Legislature, their right of judging of the returns of their members may be frustrated. No probability has been suggested of its being abused by them. Although this scheme of erecting the General Government on the authority of the State Legislatures has been fatal to the Federal establishment, it would seem as if many gentlemen still foster the dangerous idea.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris observed that the States might make false returns, and then make no provisions for new elections.

The view of these gentlemen as condensed in the language of the section above quoted, was agreed to by the convention, and is now a part of our fundamental law.

Some may have fallen into the error of supposing that Congressional authority under this section of the Constitution is limited to include merely the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives; but such supposition is not correct. Congress is given full power to make and alter any State regulation governing the time and manner of electing Senators; and it is a pertinent fact that under this very constitutional provision Congress did enact the law of July 25, 1866, fixing specifically the time and manner of electing Senators. (Revised Statutes of the United States, Title II, chapter 1, sections 14 to 19, inclusive.)

The necessity for this legislation had become apparent by the occurrence of some of the very conditions predicted by Mr. Madison, viz: that the State Legislatures "might fail or refuse to consult the common interest." The necessity for the law of Congress referred to will be found discussed in the debates of the Thirty-ninth Congress, when the law was passed.

It may be observed in passing that, in view of the fact that certain States now have but a partial representation in this Senate, it is a matter worthy of careful consideration whether additional legislation by Congress ought not to be enacted, under this same power, looking to the prevention in future of the occurrence of such an anomaly as that now existing—evidenced by the vacant seats now seen in this Senate, from Washington, Montana, and Wyoming.

There has never been any serious question as to the scope and meaning of this constitutional provision among statesmen and jurists, and if there had been such question, the contemporaneous construction given by the Constitution-makers a century ago, as has been before stated, ought to be sufficiently explicit. But if this construction were not definite and conclusive as determining the true interpretation, the concurrent opinions of great constitutional authorities, followed by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, have so emphatically and explicitly sustained the constitutionality of the election laws which are now sought to be repealed, that their continuance upon the statute books is simply a question of necessity or propriety, and not of constitutionality.

An eminent writer upon constitutional questions, Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, in his Constitutional History of the United States, referring to this section of the Constitution, says:

This provision originated with the committee of detail; but as it was reported by them, there was no other authority reserved to Congress itself than that of altering the regulations of the States, and this authority extended as well to the place of choosing the Senators as to all the other circumstances of the election. In the Convention, however, the authority of Congress was extended beyond the alteration of State regulations, so as to embrace a power to make rules as well as to alter those made by the States. But the place of choosing the Senators was excepted altogether from this restraining authority and left to the States. Mr. Madison, in his minutes, adds the explanation that the power of Congress to make regulations was supplied in order to enable them to regulate the elections if the State should fail or refuse to do so. But the text of the Constitution, as finally settled, gives authority to Congress "at any time" to "make or alter such regulations;" and this would seem to confer a power which, when exercised, must be paramount, whether a State regulation exists at the time or not. (Constitutional History of the United States, volume 1, pages 479, 480.)

Observe Mr. Curtis's language, "must be paramount whether a State regulation exists at the time or not." This construction or interpretation accords precisely with that found in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered by Justice Bradley, Justices Clifford and Field dissenting, in the case of Siebold (*Ex parte* Siebold, 100 U. S. R., 371), from which the following extracts are taken:

After first authorizing the States to prescribe the regulations, it is added, the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations. "Make or alter!" What is the plain meaning of these words? If not under the prepossession of some abstract theory of the relations between the State and national governments, we should not have any difficulty in understanding them. There is no declaration that the regulations shall be made either wholly by the State Legislatures or wholly by Congress. If Congress does not interfere, of course they may be made wholly by the State; but if it chooses to interfere, there is nothing in the words to prevent its doing so, either wholly or partially.

On the contrary, their necessary implication is that it may do either. It may either make the regulations or it may alter them. If it only alters, leaving, as manifest convenience requires, the general organization of the polls to the State, there results a necessary coöperation of the two governments in regulating the subject, but no repugnance in the system of regulations can arise thence, for the power of Congress over the subject is paramount. It may be exercised as and when Congress sees fit to exercise it. When exercised, the action of Congress, so f r as it extends and conflicts with the regulations of the State, necessarily supersedes them. This is implied in the power to "make or alter." (Pages 383, 384.)

So in the case of laws for regulating the elections of Representatives to Congress. The State may make regulations on the subject; Congress may make regulations on the same subject, or may alter or add to those already made. The paramount character of those made by Congress has the effect to supersede those made by the State so far as the two are inconsistent, and no further. There is no such conflict between them as to prevent their forming a harmonious system perfectly capable of being administered and carried out as such. (Page 386.)

The objection that the laws and regulations, the violation of which is made punishable by the acts of Congress, are State laws and have not been adopted by Congress is no sufficient answer to the power of Congress to impose punishment. It is true that Congress has not deemed it necessary to interfere with the duties of the ordinary officers of election, but has been content to leave them as prescribed by State laws. It has only created additional sanctions for their performance, and provided means of supervision in order more effectually to secure such performance. The imposition of punishment implies a prohibition of the act punished. The State laws which Congress sees no occasion to alter, but which it allows to stand, are in effect adopted by Congress. It simply demands their fulfillment. Content to leave the laws as they are, it is not content with the means provided for their enforcement. It provides additional means for that purpose, and we think it is entirely within its constitutional power to do so. It is simply the exercise of the power to make additional regulation. (Pages 388, 389.)

In the case, *Ex parte* Siebold, the court ruled in regard to the power of Congress to treat State officers, while conducting elections, as officers of the United States. The court says:

It is objected that Congress has no power to enforce State laws or to punish State officers, and especially has no power to punish them for violating the laws of their own State. As a general proposition this is undoubtedly true, but when in the performance of their functions State officers are called to fulfill duties which they owe to the United States as well as to the State, has the former no means of compelling such fulfillment?

In view of the fact that Congress has plenary and paramount jurisdiction over the whole subject, it seems almost absurd to say that an officer who receives or has custody of the ballots given for a Representative owes no duty to the National Government which Congress can enforce, or that an officer who stuffs the ballot box can not be made amenable to the United States. If Congress has not, prior to the passage of the present laws, imposed any penalties to prevent and punish frauds and violations of duty committed by officers of election it has been because the exigency has not been deemed sufficient to require it, and not because Congress has not the requisite power. (Pages 387, 388.)

They also decided that it conferred upon Congress the power to appoint officers of its own to act as police at the polls where a member of Congress is being chosen, for the preservation of order, and for the protection of the electors in their right to freely and peaceably cast their ballots.

The counsel for the petitioners concede that Congress, if it sees fit, assume the entire control and regulation of the election of Representatives. This would necessarily involve the appointment of the places for holding the polls, the time for voting, and the officers for holding the election; it would require the regulation of the duties to be performed, the custody of the ballots, the mode of ascertaining the result, and every other matter relating to the subject. Is it possible that Congress could not, in that case, provide for keeping the peace at such elections, and for arresting and punishing those guilty of breaking it?

If it could not its power would be but a shadow and a name. But if Congress can do this, where is the difference in principle in its making provision for securing the preservation of the peace, so as to give to every citizen his free right to vote without molestation or injury, when it assumes only to supervise the regulations made by the State, and not to supersede them entirely? In our judgment there is no difference; and if the power exists in the one case it exists in the other. (*Ex parte* Siebold, p. 396.)

In *Ex parte* Yarborough (110 U. S. R., 657), in the opinion of the court, delivered by Justice Miller, without dissent, the power of Congress under this clause of the Constitution was quite fully discussed.

The court says:

That a government whose essential character is republican, whose executive head and legislative body are both elected, whose most numerous and powerful branch of the legislature is elected by the people directly, has no power by appropriate laws to secure this election from the influence of violence, of corruption, and of fraud, is a proposition so startling as to arrest attention and demand the greatest consideration.

If this Government is anything more than a mere aggregation of delegated agents of other States and governments, each of which is superior to the General Government, it must have the power to protect the elections on which its existence depends from violence and corruption.

If it has not this power it is left helpless before the two great natural and historical enemies of all republics, open violence and insidious corruption. (Pages 657, 658.)

Will it be denied that it is in the power of that body to provide laws for the proper conduct of those elections? To provide, if necessary, the officers who shall conduct them and make return of the result; and especially to provide in an election held under its own authority for security of life and limb to the voter while in the exercise of this function? Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes from personal violence or intimidation and the election itself from corruption and fraud?

If this be so, and it is not doubted, are such powers annulled because an election for State officers is held at the same time and place? Is it any less important that the election of members of Congress should be the free choice of all the electors because State officers are to be elected at the same time? (*Ex parte* Siebold, 100 U. S. R., 371.)

These questions answer themselves; and it is only because the Congress of the United States, through long habits and long years of forbearance has, in deference and respect to the State, refrained from the exercise of these powers that they are now doubted.

But when, in the pursuance of a new demand for action, that body, as it did in the cases just enumerated, finds it necessary to make additional laws for the free, the pure, and the safe exercise of this right of voting they stand upon the same ground and are to be upheld for the same reasons. (Pages 661, 662.)

If this were conceded, the importance to the General Government of having the actual elections—the voting for those members—free from force and fraud is not diminished by the circumstance that the qualification of the voter is determined by the law of the State where he votes. It equally affects the Government; it is as indispensable to the proper discharge of the great function of legislating for that Government that those who are to control this legislation shall not owe their election to bribery or violence, whether the class of persons who shall vote is determined by the law of the State or by the law of the United States, or by their united result. (Page 663.)

If the Government of the United States has within its constitutional domain no authority to provide against these evils, if the very sources of power may be poisoned by corruption or controlled by violence and outrage without legal restraint, then, indeed, is the country in danger, and its best powers, its highest purposes, the hopes which it inspires, and the love which

enshrines it, are at the mercy of the combinations of those who respect no right but brute force, on the one hand, and unprincipled corruptionists on the other. (Page 667.)

These quotations from the law of the land (for I apprehend that no Senator will insist that any final decision of the Supreme Court is not the law of the land) would seem to be complete in substance and in terms as to the fact of the constitutionality of the so-called Federal election laws.

What, then, Mr. President, is the cause of the present demand for the repeal of those laws? Has any man suffered any injustice by reason of their existence or because of their enforcement? Has any person been wronged by laws which were intended to prevent wrong? Has any citizen been hindered or prevented from the exercise of any of his constitutional rights or prerogatives by statutes which were intended solely to preserve and maintain those rights? Every Senator will concede and claim that the exercise of the elective franchise should be maintained free from intimidation, fraud, and wrongdoing; should be protected by some adequate and competent authority.

In all elections where officers of State concern alone are being voted for it is no doubt the province and duty of the State to provide such legislative safeguards as may be required. But in elections where the interests of the United States are involved so closely, as in the case of Representatives or Senators, where the person elected is to be charged with the duty of legislating for the United States, who is to be sworn in as a legislator of the United States, and whose oath of office binds him solely to the execution of the office to which he is elected, and to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," it seems to me to be conclusive as to the power and right, as well as to the duty of the Congress of the United States, to provide by appropriate legislation the proper safeguards for such elections as well as to adequately protect alike the individual citizen and the aggregate body politic of the United States.

The contention of those who urge the repeal of these laws seems to be based mainly upon the theory that the States alone are charged with the matter of police control of elections and that the Federal Government has no call to interfere even for the protection of its own direct and most important interests. They insist that the United States must rely upon the several States for the guaranty that the elections of Representatives and Senators in Congress shall be properly and honestly conducted. If this be the true rule, Mr. President, why does the Constitution give to Congress the right to "make or alter" the prescription of the State Legislatures regarding the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives?"

Is it to be presumed that the fundamental law of a government will preclude that government from maintaining itself and leave it subject in its most vital and important part to the possible neglect or unfriendly act of an individual recalcitrant member; in other words, to the dictation or adverse action of a single State?

I apprehend that no Senator will fail to perceive that this discussion brings us back to the identical question which our friends in the South attempted to settle at Sumter on that April day in 1861, and which reached a final settlement in 1865. It is the question of State rights and State sovereignty as against and above the power of the United States. It is the question whether this Government is simply a league between the States, revocable at the will of any State, or a Government having the right to exist and the power to control the means necessary to its existence.

Shall the election of its Representatives and Senators in Congress be subject alike to the frauds and outrages of the judicial ruffians and the ward bullies to be found in imperial States and in metropolitan cities? Shall the mandate of a corrupt judge, or the order of a Maynard, determine the complexion of a Legislature which elects a Senator to this body? Shall the brawn and muscle of a McKane, in defiance of courts and laws, control next year the election of Representatives in Congress, and Congress have no power to protect by law the integrity of its own membership?

In other words, Mr. President, is there to be no power in the hands of Congress, by which it may maintain in a degree the integrity and purity of the determination of its own membership, or must it be ever subject to the frauds and wrongs which State laws have failed to prevent?

I beg to call the attention of the Senate to an instance within my own observation and in my own State where the value and importance of the law creating supervisors of election was fully demonstrated. It may not be so generally known throughout the country as it is in Illinois and in Chicago that, but for one feature of this law, a feature simple and proper, the political complexion of this American Senate would in the year 1885 have been fraudulently changed from Republican to Democratic. I am not sure whether it would have actually changed the majority, but it was very close at that time. This important and far-reaching result would have unquestionably followed from a theft of a few ballots and the forging of a tally sheet in a single voting precinct of the Eighteenth ward in the city of Chicago had not the personal and record evidence of the two assistant supervisors who officiated in that precinct pointed out the fraud and forgery in the investigation of this important case by the United States authorities in the court presided over by Judge H. W. Blodgett, who is now or has been one of the counsel for the United States in the recent Bering Sea arbitration case.

The facts were developed that a sufficient number of ballots cast for Henry W. Leman for State senator had been abstracted from the sealed package returned to the county canvassers from the second precinct of the Eighteenth ward in Chicago; that a large number of fraudulent, false, and forged ballots had been substituted therefor, bearing the name of Rudolph Brand for State senator, to defeat Leman and carry the senatorial election in favor of Rudolph Brand. Had this fraudulent return been sustained and Brand been seated as State senator, the Illinois Legislature would have had a Democratic majority, and the seat in the Senate of my lamented colleague and friend, Gen. John A. Logan, would have been filled by a Democratic Senator, and, if I remember correctly, this would have made the United States Senate Democratic in politics at that time.

The sworn and honest returns of the two assistant supervisors, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, furnished the proof which pointed out the manner of the fraud, and immediately directed suspicion to the guilty persons. In due time the entire chain of evidence was developed, and after an exhaustive trial in the United States court they were convicted and sentenced to prison. The trial was presided over by United States District Judge H. W. Blodgett, to whom I referred a while ago, and among the counsel for the defendants was a renowned lawyer from an adjacent State, who is now a distinguished Senator in this body.

This noted case, widely known as the "Mackin election fraud," is only a single one of a long list of election outrages committed in many of the large cities of the country, a recital of which would only emphasize the need for more efficient Federal control of such elections as may affect the membership of either of the two Houses of Congress.

It is a matter of indifference which of the great political parties may be charged, for the time being, with the execution of these laws; but it is a matter of the highest importance that somebody, some official authority, of whatever shade in politics, shall be required to enforce laws for the protection of the franchise.

It is idle for the Congress of the United States to sit supinely down, contented with the false theory that the States have full control of the franchise and the protection of the ballot; until by adverse State legislation, or by nonlegislation, the very highest privilege of the sovereign citizen is violated or rendered nugatory and valueless. It is a policy fundamentally wrong and indefensible in that, if carried to its legimate extent, it falls in line with the arguments once used in justification for the disruption of the Union, the secession of the several States.

I desire to emphasize the statement that a national government which has not the power within itself to protect its own membership, and to have some control over their election, is as weak as water and can not very long endure.

This great country has reached its present high position by its constant jealousy of and impatience with everything which tends to narrow the boundaries or limit the scope of the rights of the peaceful citizen in his exercise of the sovereignty, which is his inalienable prerogative. By implication every voting citizen is not only entitled to cast an honest ballot, but have it honestly counted. If this right is liable to be infringed and interfered with, is it not the duty of the Government to protect it by legislation, using only such statutory machinery as shall seem adapted to effect the purpose?

The necessity for some ample and competent authority, with recognized power behind it, to enforce lawful enactments; an authority dictated by enlightened civilization for the protection of the agency which above all others should be maintained pure and unstained; to see that the paper ballot, from the time it leaves the hands of the voter until it has reached an honest count and an honest announcement, shall be inviolable and unimpeachable, would seem to be imperative and unquestionable. Such necessity is so apparent, as a matter of popular concern and not as a partisan claim, that I am astonished that any serious opposition to the principle should develop here as a partisan measure. I can not believe that any Senator who now listens to me will disagree with me upon the abstract question of the power of the Government to legislate for the protection of that ballot which may affect the election of a Representative in Congress.

If the existing Federal election laws are imperfect, or work injustice, amend or modify them, but do not sweep from the

statutes all legislation which tends to effectuate the honest expression of the will of the people.

An honest American ballot is the strongest, the most herculean power in the world. That ballot, that great agency which creates an American President and an American Congress, builds a structure which the powers of the earth can not destroy. The American people, endowed with the honest ballot, are omnipotent against emperors and kings. But how weak and puny, how powerless and unrespected is that ballot which bears the taint of fraud or wrong. Those who profit and benefit by it are ashamed of it, and those who lose or suffer by it are outraged and injured. Only one power may properly prevent; only one authority can protect and remedy. Logically and rightfully the Congress of the United States must maintain and protect the integrity of the election of members of the House of Representatives under that constitutional clause which gives to Congress the power to make or alter State regulations prescribing the times, place, and manner of electing Senators and Representatives, except only as to places of choosing Senators.

Let me add that the power given to Congress carries with it the power to use whatever force may be necessary in the protection of the voter and of the vote when it is attempted to be cast.

A very ardent advocate of the repeal of the election laws, in a recent speech in another forum, urges that the "right of suffrage and conditions of suffrage are subject to the laws of the State of the citizen, and must be prescribed and limited by such State." This premise may in itself be correct, but the deduction, that the question of the right to vote being left to the State the determination of such right ought therefore to be exercised *only* by the power that gave it, viz, the State, does not follow.

There are various rights and privileges granted by the State, but it does not follow that the State *alone* shall determine the exercise of such right and privileges. Some State officers are elected solely by the State, and their powers and duties are usually governed and directed by State laws, yet from the year 1787 down to this day, they have been charged with duties and responsibilities by the Federal Government; duties and responsibilities adhering to them by virtue of their qualification as State officers under State laws. By the Constitution of the United States we find that—

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land, * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State notwithstanding. The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and all judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath and affirmation to support this Constitution.

By Federal statutes, enacted as early as the years 1789 and 1793, offenders against the United States may—

by any justice of the peace or other magistrate of any State where he may be found, and agreeably to the usual mode of process against offenders in such State, and at the expense of the United States, be arrested and imprisoned or bailed, as the case may be, for trial before such court of the United States as has cognizance of the offense.

Here is a case where by direct operation of one of the oldest existing statutes, a State officer is clothed with Federal jurisdiction. Does this work any hardship or detract in any way from the power of the State? So, by analogy, may not and do not the Federal statutes bearing upon the election of Representatives in Congress confer upon the election officers appointed by the State a specific Federal duty? And if so, may not Congress with equal authority appoint specially supervisors and marshals or other agents to protect the interest of the General Government?

In the case of the Chicago election frauds, heretofore referred to, the trial court specifically decided during the progress of the trial that the officers of the election, as well as the county clerk and his subordinates, charged under State law with the custody of the ballots after the election, were amenable to the Federal law, although the frauds committed upon the ballots, and the forgery of the tally sheets as well as the fraudulent return, did not defeat the election of the Representative in Congress who was voted for upon the genuine ballot.

A notary public in a State is a State officer, but he may administer the oath of office to a Federal official, as also may a judge or justice of any State court. So it will be seen that these magistrates are charged with certain Federal functions. So in the election of Senators the act of July 25, 1866, directs the time and manner of such elections, and specifically fixes the duty of the executive of the State and of each legislative house in connection with such election and its certification. For these purposes the governor and State legislator are properly charged with a Federal duty.

In cases of contested elections of members of Congress, the Federal statutes have for many years authorized State and municipal magistrates and notaries public to issue subpœnas, and to take and verify testimony, for a distinctively Federal purpose, and to prescribe penalties for violation. The Presidential electors of each State are chosen by the voters of the State, but the Congress, by law, directs as to the manner by which they shall perform their duties. The messengers appointed to convey the certificates of their votes to the President of the Senate are compensated by the United States, and for any neglect to perform properly the service required are subject to a penal forfeiture of a thousand dollars to the United States, although upon the theory of those who urge the repeal of the election laws the State alone has the power to direct and control the exercise of the functions of the Presidential elector, because the State controls the election of such officers.

There are various other illustrations of the theory which has recently been set up by those favoring the breaking down of the barriers separating lawlessness and crime from decency and an honest ballot.

It occurs to me that our Democratic friends are not exercising their usual shrewdness, just upon their accession to political control of the country, by overthrowing salutary regulations which will be placed under their own control. As a Republican, I would much rather have such a system of laws, meant and intended solely for the proper protection of the honest and legitimate voter, even if every official agency for their enforcement shall be of the Democratic party. I have not so lost faith in American citizenship as to believe that the sworn officers of any political party will ignore the requirements of wise and just election laws. Better such a system, by whomsoever it may be administered, than to be without law and without hindrance to the criminal acts of the vicious and depraved class. Do not break down and destroy the restraints and barriers which offer some obstruction to the frauds and crimes which seek the ballot as the weak point in the political armor of the American system.

Are our politicians so pure as to walk always in the straight and narrow path of honesty? Is it true that no laws are needed to protect the purity of the ballot, and to punish outrages thereon? To this question it is not necessary to go back to the early days to find the answer. It is not necessary to go to Arkansas, or to Mississippi, or to those other places in the South where the people think they have grievances sufficient to justify them in stifling a free ballot. It is not necessary to go into the black parishes, where it may be supposed that the ignorance and vicious habits of the colored voters require the wholesome restraint of the White Caps to insure that they vote right, or that their votes be counted right.

No, indeed; it is only necessary to go into the enlightened State of New York to find volumes of proof of the inability, of the indisposition of the State to guarantee an honest casting and true counting of honest votes. Does it not bring the blush of shame to the cheek of American Senators to think even of the public fact of the gigantic frauds upon decency, the monstrous outrages upon the elective franchise which have been perpetrated within the last few months in that great Commonwealth whose borders are almost within sight of the statue upon the Capitol? What a disgrace to the American bar and what a humiliation to the judiciary of a noble State has become the name of that judge, the tool and willing agent, who sold his judicial birthright for a mess of miserable political pottage! A high officer of the State of New York, a deputy attorney-general, to effectuate a gigantic outrage, is said to have abstracted from the office of the State comptroller the sacred records or returns of an election which had given a Republican majority in a certain senatorial district, and by this theft, aided by collateral acts similar in character affecting other districts, succeeded in reversing the political status of the State senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CULLOM. I do, though not for a speech.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the result of the contested-election case to which he refers could not have controlled the membership of the senate of the State of New York?

Mr. CULLOM. So far as that interrogatory is concerned, if the Senator simply proposes to justify that action by the declaration that that contested election would not have controlled the politics of the State of New York, I regard it as no sufficient question to be asked in this case, because if it was a crime, whether it decided the party majority in the Legislature of that State or not, neither the Senator nor any other man should justify it.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator indulge me in a further observation?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Whether or not there was anything irregular or

criminal in the action in that senatorial district is a question which will be discussed at the proper time, and one as to which the Senator, of course, does not expect me to answer him now; but the point he was trying to make seemed to be that the action in that district had effected the control of the senate of the State of New York; and upon that point I beg to inform the Senator that his statement is not true.

Mr. CULLOM. Whether the statement is exactly true or not——

Mr. HILL. It is neither exactly true nor substantially true.

Mr. CULLOM. I did not say that it was actually true; but it probably required two or three changes in order to get control of that Legislature and secure in one way or another the election of a senator friendly to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. The election of United States Senator had nothing whatever to do with that question, except in a very slight degree. If the district to which the Senator refers had been given to the Republicans, or two of the districts which were contested, the Democratic majority in the assembly was sufficient to elect my distinguished colleague to this body. That question had nothing whatever to do with the control of the Senatorship from the State of New York.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I understand the facts to be—of course I yield to the Senator so far as familiarity with the facts is concerned——

Mr. HILL. I do not say that the Senator wilfully misstates the facts.

Mr. CULLOM. No.

Mr. HILL. I presume he has simply taken the partial accounts in the partisan newspapers of our State.

Mr. CULLOM. I have not relied especially upon newspaper accounts, but I have understood, and I think the country has understood, that the action of that man, who afterwards became a judge, inaugurated a scheme which resulted in changing the character of that Legislature.

Mr. HILL. I desire to inform the Senator, and the country at the same time, that that is not a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. CULLOM. We shall see.

Mr. HILL. At the proper time I shall reply to the Senator; but I do not wish to further interrupt him now.

Mr. CULLOM. I shall proceed.

In the course of events this man very soon became, by appointment, an associate justice of the court of appeals of the State of New York, a court which, by tradition and by the merited high character and reputation of its members, had ranked as high as any judicial tribunal in America, except the Supreme Court of the United States. As a further repayment for the miserable crime to which I have referred, the State convention of a great political party, held at Saratoga on the 15th of September last, by a vote of 398 to 1 nominated Isaac H. Maynard for its candidate, to continue in office as judge of the court of appeals. Six or seven weeks later the people of the State of New York constituted themselves a higher court of appeals, and by a majority approximating a hundred thousand votes they said to Isaac H. Maynard, as Sir Matthew Hale, chief justice of the king's bench, said to a corrupt and dishonest judge: "Take off your judicial robes and come down from that seat which you are in no wise worthy to hold."

Mr. President and Senators, what Joseph Mackin attempted and nearly accomplished in Chicago in 1884 by the theft, fraud, and forgery which I have before alluded to was, as I believe, consummated in New York in 1892 by Maynard and his associates. It is believed that a seat in the American Senate has to trace its title to an act upon which the people of New York have fixed the indelible stamp of infamy and wrong and crime. And the seal of lasting condemnation bears the verification, not of Republicans alone, but of high minded, able, honest, and most respected Democrats. The Bar Association of the State of New York, the highest unofficial fraternity of legal minds in this country, out of respect to their own honor and integrity, took cognizance of this infamy.

That bar association appointed a committee to consider the question not of political propriety, but of professional decency involved in the possible election of such a man to that exalted judgeship. That committee was composed of such men as Frederick R. Coudert, Democrat: James C. Carter, Democrat; John E. Parsons, Democrat; Clifford A. Hand, Democrat; William B. Hornblower, Democrat; Albert Stickney, Democrat; Edmund R. Robinson, Democrat; Elihu Root, Republican.

And after much consideration and care they reported that Maynard and his confrères had tainted an honored profession, and had filled seats in the New York Legislature by infamous outrage and fraud.

This Congress has nothing to do with Maynard's alleged crime, except as it presents a most marked instance of the necessity of providing all possible safeguards for the ballot, even in our most enlightened States. It gives me great pleasure to say that in this noted case in New York, as well as in the one referred to in Chicago, many of the very best Democratic citizens took earnest and positive part in bringing to justice the perpetrators of the great wrongs. Many of them felt that the reproach which attached to their party on account of it was so great that it was a duty that they owed to an outraged public to do their utmost towards its punishment. And the voice of the November election showed that thousands of conscientious Democrats waived their partisanship to give emphatic earnestness to their votes.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. Do I understand the Senator from Illinois to claim that the United States Government ought to regulate the election of members of the Legislatures of the various States because the senators and members of those Legislatures participate in the election of United States Senators?

Mr. CULLOM. I have not claimed any such thing.

Mr. HILL. I thought the drift of the Senator's argument was in that direction.

Mr. CULLOM. I said, upon the contrary, that Congress has nothing to do with Maynard's crime except as it presents a most marked instance of the necessity of providing all possible safeguards for the ballot, even in our most enlightened States.

Mr. HILL. What has that to do with the question of the repeal of the Federal election laws?

Mr. CULLOM. As I have already said, while the Congress of the United States may not have any power to control the election of State legislators, it has the unquestionable power to control the elections for members of the National House of Representatives, and it has under the Constitution also the power, when the Legislature comes to elect a Senator, to control that also, as we have already done by the act of Congress passed in 1866.

Even now, within a week, upon the complaint of a New York Democrat, an honest high court has been found which has rendered a decision bringing the violators of the law and decency nearer and nearer to the penitentiary, as evidenced by the following paragraph cut from a New York newspaper:

SENATE STEAL TO BE PROBED—THE STATE BOARD OF CANVASSERS MUST ANSWER FOR CONTEMPT.

ALBANY, *December 6.*

The general term has overruled Judge Edwards in the Mylod return cases. Judge Mayham dissenting. Judge Herrick wrote the opinion.

The case was the People, *ex rel.* Platt, against the State board of canvassers, and was for an order to show cause why the board should not be punished for contempt in canvassing the Dutchess County returns in 1891, by which the Democrats were enabled to steal control of the senate.

But wrongdoing and crime run at high speed, while justice follows at a walk. While justice and law are being invoked to punish the perpetrators, what do we see as a result of their crimes? Where do we find the culmination of all this fraud, rascality, thievery, and outrage? What was its ultimate purpose and object? I hesitate to voice the answer; but it is here. I feel shocked to even think of it. I pause at its utterance when it involves a spectacle which almost challenges the credulity of the imagination. I would for the honor of American citizenship, for the respect I have for American manhood, that I might give some other answer, but the fact is plain.

The crystallized result of all this venality and infamy is blazoned upon the roll of membership of the Senate of the United States, and all the frantic zeal of a partisan majority can never efface it. It blots the page of history, and shrouds in shame the proud commonwealth which had honored this Chamber by names like De Witt Clinton, William L. Marcy, Silas Wright, John A. Dix, and William H. Seward. It is no reflection upon the personal or official honor of any member of this body that he may happen to be the innocent beneficiary of his seat because of some wrongdoing by another, for according to law and precedent he may legally and rightfully hold his seat without question. But the offense and the punishment remain subject to the law of the land. President Arthur was the rightful President of the United States, although he became such by a cruel murder. The punishment of Guiteau cast no reflection upon the title to the Presidency. But the offense remained, and it must be dealt with by the legal power.

So I say, all good people everywhere in America, regardless of their political affiliations, should join as one man to perpetuate, to make stronger and more efficient every guard and protection for honest elections. Do not relapse into barbarism, but keep pace with the age in which we live. Break down anarchy and build up society.

And now, Mr. President, to my brother Senators upon the other side of this Chamber I have to present some words of earnestness, not specially bearing upon the election laws alone. I wish calmly and without disrespect to say to you what my fel-

low Senators upon this side believe, what the great majority of the people of many of the States believe, and what I candidly and sincerely believe, in regard to the present situation in the United States.

The present Administration, and the majority party in this Congress are building up a feeling in every neighborhood, hamlet, town, and city in the Northern States, which will, whenever it can find expression, reach every man who by his voice or vote is aiding the direct warfare now being made upon the prosperity of the people of this country. The public indignation, not confined by any means to the members of my own party, has reached an intensity almost unequaled since 1861. The people are alarmed, and, Mr. President, their apprehension and alarm are justified by the unprecedented action of the Executive and the impending reckless legislation which is threatened. The entire country, without regard to locality, and the great mass of the people, without regard to party affiliation, stand aghast at the evidences which are piling higher and higher every day of the total incapacity of the party in power to deal with public questions of the most vital importance to the people of a suffering country.

The proposed repeal of the election laws is an important one of the proposed steps in the mad rush toward barbarism which the irresponsible elements of the Democratic party advocated and adopted at Chicago. But important as this may be, its effect is but a ripple upon the surface of public sentiment, compared with that which has raised the very ocean of public indignation. The public welfare is menaced by an attempt to break down a most wholesome tariff system. Vast interests are frightened into stagnation, and ruin threatens the industries of a great people. Mills are idle, our shops are closed; while the agents of foreign countries, the manufacturers of England and the Continent, and the importers of foreign goods and wares, are jubilant and joyous, in the prospect that the acts which strike terror over our entire country are going to start afresh the looms and spindles and hammers of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and Hamburg.

We have scriptural authority for saying that the man who does not provide for his own "is worse than an infidel," and quite as true must be the statement that the legislator who does not protect the interests of his country is worse than a traitor. This reference to British interests and foreign influence can not be met by sneers and ridicule. Is there no significance in the fact that every British newspaper of consequence, on the day following the delivery of the President's message in Congress indulged in laudation of the President's tariff policy, and rejoiced in the bright prospect of the adoption of the work of the House Ways and Means Committee? And as a counterpart to these expressions from across the Atlantic, I intend upon a proper occasion soon to present to this Senate quotations from some of the letters I am daily receiving from anxious citizens all over the Mississippi Valley, bearing the touching story of the universal fear, which has truly reached the stage of terror, at the future prospect shadowed out in the course outlined by the majority of this Congress.

What else than terror and despair can we expect judging by the policy which could wantonly crush American industry and shipwreck the interwoven interests of American capital and American labor with one hand, while with the other it tears down the American ensign which had spread its protecting folds peacefully over a struggling colony upon an island of the sea?

An act which all the powers of monarchical Europe could not have accomplished was committed by an order of an American President upon the advice and recommendation of a newly baptized Democratic Secretary of State. Should it hereafter appear that the present envoy to Honolulu, Mr. Willis, has duly performed his appointed duty, and caused the reënthronement of the ex-Queen of the Sandwich Islands, the President and the Secretary will wish that the Hawaiian mountains might speedily fall upon them.

To what element of the people of this country has this Administration endeared itself by its pension policy? Where in all the broad domain of this Union will be found the single precinct or district which shall sustain it, unless it be some locality where no soldier of the Union is to be found?

Then, in addition to the tearing down of the election laws, the tearing down of the protective tariff, the tearing down of the American flag, and the tearing down of the pension policy, the national-bank system is to be torn down, and the 10 per cent tax upon State-bank issues is to be torn away.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator expect to prevent the country from realizing the dire effect he has mentioned by a continuance of the Federal election law?

Mr. CULLOM. As I say, that is one of the steps that is taken, the end of which will be the destruction of every single act that I have referred to, which will break down the industries and the very life of this nation. Does the Senator desire to ask any further questions?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will permit me, I will avail myself of the opportunity. I understood the Senator a few moments ago to refer to the recent election in the State of New York as a condemnation of certain political methods or results. I understand him now to claim that the election was a vindication of the Republican protective policy.

Mr. CULLOM. Is that all?

Mr. HILL. I should like to have the Senator define specially which it was.

Mr. CULLOM. I do say that the conduct which I have described as having occurred in the State of New York, which, in my judgment, gave a majority to the Democracy in that State and which resulted in the election of a Democratic Senator, has been condemned by the people of the State of New York by nearly a hundred thousand majority in defeating the Democratic candidate for judge of the court of appeals.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has not answered the question.

Mr. CULLOM. I think I have.

Mr. HILL. Had the election anything to do with the question of the tariff?

Mr. CULLOM. The election had nothing to do with the question of the tariff except that the Democratic party declared in convention, and have been ever since declaring, that they intend to carry out what they had proclaimed in their platform at Chicago, and that alarmed the people and helped to give the majorities which have been recently cast in favor of the Republican party and against Democracy.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the Senator, then, he thinks the question of the tariff was only very remotely involved in the recent election in New York. I desire to state to him, what I think the country well knows, that the question of the tariff was directly, substantially, and wholly involved, in connection with the issue of a larger and more extensive election law in the election of 1892, when the State of New York by nearly 50,000 majority cast its vote for tariff reform, and on a full vote, too.

Mr. CULLOM. I have not said at any time, and do not say now, that the election went off upon the question of the repeal of the election laws. I do say, however, that as to the candidate for judge, who seemed to be so much the friend of the honorable Senator from New York, he was defeated by a larger majority because of the belief on the part of those people that he had been corrupt in his office than he would have been if he had not been so regarded.

Mr. HILL. Allow me again——

Mr. CULLOM. But I desire to say furthermore——

The PRESIDENT *protempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CULLOM. I do not want the Senator to interrupt me all the time.

Mr. HILL. I will not.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to say, furthermore, that while that is true, the people of New York, as the people of Massachusetts and Iowa, felt that if it was to be the policy of the Democratic party to carry out its platform they would vote against the party, as they did in those States, and also in the State of Ohio, because they wanted to put their seal of condemnation upon the policy that was intended to be carried out by the Democratic party.

Mr. HILL. I desire to inform the Senator——

The PRESIDENT *protempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator need not lie awake nights over any anxiety upon the subject as to whether the Democratic party proposes to carry out its platform upon the question of the tariff. I can assure him that the party does intend to carry it out faithfully, honestly, and impartially. So much for that.

Mr. CULLOM. Well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken of the recent candidate for judge of the court of appeals in my State as my friend. I do not deny that he was and is my friend, but I say in the changes in political affairs which are incident to politics it does not necessarily follow that because a party is defeated there is a personal condemnation of men. Charles J. Folger was your friend, sir, and the friend of your side, and yet in the incidents of politics he ran for governor of our State against the present Chief Executive of the nation, and the party to which you belong was beaten by the largest majority ever given in the history of the Empire State—192,000 majority. But I never heard anyone say that it was a personal condemnation of the distinguished man who was defeated.

Mr. CULLOM. Neither have I.

Mr. HILL. Then we agree. [Laughter.]

Mr. CULLOM. Now, if the Senator is through I want to assure him that I am not lying awake nights as much as he is on account of what the Democrats are going to do.

Mr. HILL. I thought you were.

Mr. CULLOM. Not at all. I think the Senator himself is a good deal more disturbed by the condition of affairs as it affects the Democratic party.

Mr. HILL. Not the slightest. The worry is all on your side.

Mr. CULLOM. I am glad to know the Senator is so quiet and calm. Now, I repeat that the people, where they had the opportunity of voting in the recent election, voted with the facts staring them in the face, not only in New York as to the election of a judge, but that the tariff laws, the banking laws, the election laws were all to be put in jeopardy if the Democratic party carried out its pledges at its national convention at Chicago, and because they believed that they voted more largely the Republican ticket than they have done for a good many years past.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me again?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; if it will please the Senator, I will.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator to concede that the question in reference to the election laws, the question of the tariff, and the other questions to which he alluded were all directly involved in the election of 1892.

Mr. CULLOM. I had not said anything about those elections, but I agree to it.

Mr. HILL. I am specially referring to the election of 1892, the Presidential election, upon a full vote. I think there were some national questions involved in that election.

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. It was not merely a question of personality between candidates.

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly not.

Mr. HILL. Upon those questions which were involved on a full vote throughout the country the people voted with the Democratic party in spite of all your Federal election laws. Is not that true?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Now, does the Senator say that because of the election held this fall in four or five States, most of them Republican, some of whom did not cast their votes for the Democratic candidates, there was any change in the sentiments of the great majority of the people of this country?

Mr. CULLOM. Is the Senator through now?

Mr. HILL. For the present.

Mr. CULLOM. Well, Mr. President, it is true that a majority of the people voted the Democratic ticket in 1892; a plurality, rather, not a majority. But as soon as they woke up the day after the election and found what had happened, they repented, and they have been repenting ever since.

As if the other acts of destruction were not sufficient to satisfy the demon of organized ruin, the currency of the country, the last relic of stable value, is to be demoralized and destroyed. What, in God's name, will be left to make the United States worth living in if, after the other cyclones have done their worst, the country is to be once again put at the mercy of a multitude of State-banking systems, as it was prior to the war of the rebellion? State Legislatures are to be left free to charter unlimited and uncontrolled banks of issue, and the choice securities for their circulating notes will be found to be the bonds of school districts, small municipalities, and other corporations, grading in market value from zero to par. How long will it be till sharp bankers will control the sparse population of some remote section in Arizona or elsewhere and issue bonds upon valueless territory as the basis for the issue of money "to help the farmers to move their crops," as I believe the Populists say.

In the State of Illinois and other States of the West we have gone through all that experience, and we had hoped that the hateful thing known as a "State-bank" system had gone to stay.

Mr. President and Senators, I may speak earnestly upon this subject, but the present unusual state of public affairs demands some proper recognition at the hands of this Congress. If any existing legislation works harshly or unjustly towards the peaceful citizen, change it, modify it, or correct it. But this crusade of general repeal, of general warfare upon systems under which we have been happy and prosperous is not the part of wisdom or of statesmanship. It is true such a policy as is now being pursued in this regard is driving the people by the thousands and hundreds of thousands into the Republican party, yet I am not so much a partisan as to wish success to my party to be built upon the ruin of my country.

I entreat the serious thinking men of the Democracy to call a halt in the wild campaign of error, and cause their reckless following to keep their hands from despoiling the work which has stood the test of time and which bears the stamp of value.

Every word spoken here reaches the open ears of millions of anxious and earnest Americans. The warm blood of every American heart pulsates in ready response to every vote given in this Congress, which bears upon interests and rights that have grown dear and almost sacred to all.

Let me say, Mr. President, according to the report made by officials in our own State, as I understand it, there are not less than 117,000 men out of employment and without bread in Chicago to-day, and the State is moving in the direction of trying to take care of those people until the industries can be started.

Mr. PALMER. Will my colleague allow me?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to his colleague?

Mr. CULLOM. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. PALMER. Will my colleague kindly answer me two questions? The first is whether this speech of his is being made with a view to the Chicago election to occur next week?

Mr. CULLOM. I have not been considering the Chicago election since I have been on the floor.

Mr. PALMER. If it is, I shall have to withdraw the little arrangement between myself and my colleague, and go to Chicago and answer the speech there.

Mr. CULLOM. I will release the Senator if he desires to go.

Mr. PALMER. Still, I wish to ask the Senator if he can indicate what has been done by the Democratic party to produce the results he describes so well.

Mr. CULLOM. I can answer the Senator according to my judgment. The fact that the Democratic party is pledged and is moving in the direction of destroying the protective tariff laws this hour results in the fact that the mills and factories, and mines, if you please, are substantially closed, waiting to see what the action of this Congress is going to be upon that subject, and the result is that tens of thousands of laboring men are out of employment and can not get work.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CULLOM. Assuredly, if he will make his question a little shorter than he usually does.

Mr. McPHERSON. I shall make no speech. I shall simply ask a question.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

Mr. McPHERSON. Is it not true that a great many people were influenced to go to Chicago during the Fair time in the hope and expectation of getting employment?

Mr. CULLOM. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. McPHERSON. Is that short enough?

Mr. CULLOM. That is very short.

Mr. McPHERSON. Probably a hundred thousand and more of those out of employment, of whom the Senator speaks, went there under such circumstances. Is it possible for the Senator to believe that after the Fair had ended, after the labor and employment which they sought there and did perform and were paid for, places can be supplied for the 117,000 additional people by the industries of Chicago?

Mr. CULLOM. Is that all?

Mr. McPHERSON. That is all.

Mr. CULLOM. Are you through?

Mr. McPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I want to be entirely candid with the Senator from New Jersey. I have no doubt that there are many men in Chicago who came there when mills and mines in other places were closed, hoping that they might find work because we had the World's Fair there. Probably a good many thousand people who are now out of work there came in in that way, as I have stated; but the testimony comes from all directions that mills and mines are closed and laboring men are out of work, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. McPHERSON. Yes; but if the Senator will bear with me, it was due very largely to a financial panic which afflicted this country during the past summer, all of which was owing to the unwise and vicious legislation of the party to which the honorable Senator belongs. If there had been no Sherman law upon the statute books probably we would have had no financial panic, and when the Senator undertakes to charge the Democratic party with this condition of things he is undertaking a very, very big job.

Mr. CULLOM. Now, is the Senator through?

Mr. McPHERSON. There was no panic in 1892 immediately after the vote was counted and canvassed, and President Cleveland was declared elected. No panic occurred until May or June of this year. If it is the tariff policy of the Democratic party which has produced the panic, why did not the panic start in November of last year, after President Cleveland had been declared elected upon the platform of which the Senator complains?

Mr. CULLOM. I am glad the Senator has asked me that ques-

tion. I am aware that the Senator has insisted from the beginning that the law known as the Sherman act was responsible for all the ills that have befallen the country since Mr. Cleveland was elected, and I have no doubt the Senator will continue to repeat that story until Mr. Cleveland goes out of office, which will be in about three years. But, in the beginning, while I voted to repeal that act because many people believed it ought to be done and might be in the way, I said then in the remarks I made in the Senate, and I adhere to it now, that when the American people rose the next morning after the 8th of November a year ago and found that Mr. Cleveland was elected, with a Senate and a House both to support him, and that the President was put upon a platform in favor of repealing the protective tariff laws, in favor of repealing the 10 per cent tax on State banks, in favor of repealing the election laws, and almost every other thing that they could think of that the Republican party had ever done which gave to this country prosperity, right then the panic began slowly until it became a volume that shut up almost every mill and factory and mine in the country.

Mr. PALMER. Will my colleague allow me? We get along very nicely.

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly we do.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to ask my colleague if he thinks it is possible in our State for a State bank to be established?

Mr. CULLOM. We have a constitutional provision in our State that prohibits State banks at present. That constitutional provision might be removed. Of course I do not know what the Legislature of our State may do; neither, I suppose, does my colleague.

Mr. PALMER. We can not tell, but I can say this: I do not like to state to the galleries how long ago I opposed State banks; and the present constitution is one that will not be changed as long as the present generation lasts. When it will be done after that time I can not tell. State banks are not possible in Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. That is true at present, and I hope the policy will never be changed. My colleague says he is against State banks and has been always against them, and I have no doubt he states exactly what he means. The Representative from my district, Mr. SPRINGER, said he was against them, but I find he is chairman of a committee the majority of which is in favor of repealing the 10 per cent tax and the establishment of some sort of quondam State banks. So whatever may be the position of my colleague or any other individual member, the Democratic party in its convention declared in favor of the repeal of the 10 per cent tax, and the other House, if I may be allowed to refer to it, is taking steps in that direction.

Mr. PALMER. Will my colleague allow me to state another fact?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. He misstates the position of the Democratic party. In certain States the Democratic party favors State banks and the Democratic party in other States does not. The Democratic party in Illinois does not favor State banks. The Democratic party believes that the exercise of the power of taxation as a means of suppressing evils is wrong in principle. The Democratic party believes, if Congress has the power, which I think it has, to suppress State-bank issues, that power should be exercised directly and not indirectly, and that it is an abuse of the taxing power to employ it to suppress that which is intended to be prohibited; that it is dangerous as a precedent. While I am satisfied that the Democratic party opposed the taxation of the issues of State banks, in many of the States it is opposed to State banks.

Mr. CULLOM. I merely referred to this, first, because, as I understand it, it is in the Democratic platform at Chicago that that tax must be repealed; and, secondly, because in the next place a bill, I understand, is partly if not entirely agreed upon for that purpose. While there are doubtless individual Senators in that party who are against the re-establishment of State banks, I suppose as a matter of fact the majority of the party in the Senate on the other side of the aisle are in favor of a repeal of the 10 per cent tax on State-bank issues. I may be mistaken in that, however, and I sincerely hope that I am.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator now be so kind——

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. McPHERSON. If I am not intruding too much——

Mr. CULLOM. Not at all.

Mr. McPHERSON. To answer the question I put to him some time ago.

Mr. CULLOM. I shall be very happy to answer any question, if I can do so.

Mr. McPHERSON. The question which I asked the Senator was whether the 117,000 new laborers of whom he speaks could hope or expect to find employment among the industries of Chicago, let the tariff be what it may; and the Senator proceeds then to a generalization and evades the question. Will the Senator please answer that question now for the information of the people of Chicago, and for mine?

Mr. CULLOM. I should be very glad to give the Senator such an answer as he desires if I knew what the exact fact was; but he knows and I know that neither of us can tell exactly how many men could be employed of the 117,000 if all the mills and factories and business establishments there were in full operation. I do not know how many could be employed. I wish to suggest to the Senator that while, as I have said, there may be more there than could be employed with all the industries in operation, the men who are there hear the same story from everywhere else, because it is the same story in almost every manufacturing town, as I understand it. Therefore it is impossible for me to state exactly what the fact would be if the Democratic party had not succeeded last fall and all those mills were running as they used to be running under Republican rule.

Mr. McPHERSON. Then, if I understand the Senator correctly, it was the fear of the striking down of the present tariff that deprived labor of employment. If that be true, and the Senator will bear with me further, with a bill just prepared in another place which represents more completely the protective principle in tariff legislation (which is incidental protection) than any bill which has ever been made by any Congress in this country, a bill which will open a hundred factories where it will close up one—I want to know, then, in the presence of such a bill, how it is that the Senator pretends to say that it frightens the industries of the country?

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator is making a statement with which I take issue. I have no right to say yes or no absolutely; but I say to him that in my judgment the bill he refers to will, instead of giving protection, shut up almost every mill that is not already shut in this country. It is substantially a free-trade bill. And I want to say another thing, that while I have it not in my possession here, I have just received a communication from a gentleman engaged in a special line of manufacturing in which he says he knows nothing about the application of that proposed law to other business, but as to the business in which he is engaged it is a mere run and jump without any sense or reason in it in the tabulation of its rates; and that is what I believe as to most of the proposed changes to be found in the bill.

Now, then, let me read a little here about the laboring people. The Senator is anxious to know about where they are.

THE UNEMPLOYED.

This is from a newspaper, I do not vouch for it, but it is a statement, which I will read:

While WILLIAM L. WILSON regales the readers of the Sunday Press with solemn free-trade platitudes and dilates on the havoc which the scramble for spoils and the Sherman silver law have played with the country, the tariff bill which bears his name is bringing the industrial population of our great cities face to face with starvation. Careful estimates made by capable statisticians and published in yesterday's Sunday Press bring to light the appalling fact that the number out of work in New York is not less than 110,000.

Our people in Chicago can not go there.

In Chicago, over 100,000; in Philadelphia, not less than 90,000; in Boston, probably 40,000; in Cincinnati, over 15,000. Here we have in these five cities at the present moment no less than 360,000 unemployed. These are the great manufacturing cities of the country, and the proposed free-trade legislation will strike the severest blows at the industrial populations of such centers of industry. Including the ordinary increase since 1890, the number engaged in the manufacturing industries of these cities should to-day be as follows:

City.	Hands employed.	Wages paid.
New York	360,000	$250,000,000
Philadelphia	260,000	150,000,000
Chicago	225,000	130,000,000
Boston	160,000	60,000,000
Cincinnati	95,000	45,000,000
Total	1,040,000	635,000,000

The actual figures published by the census for one hundred and thirty-seven cities give the average amount of yearly earnings per head at $637, so the above estimate is undoubtedly within the mark for the five leading cities. Nearly one-third of the industrial population of these cities is out of work, which means an annual loss of wages of more than $200,000,000, or a sum of $16,600,000 per month. The unhappy condition existing in these cities extends, with hardly an exception, throughout the manufacturing regions of the country.

I see in the proceedings of the labor convention now in session in the city of Chicago the president of that convention, whatever it is called, says that there are not less than 3,000,000 laboring men out of employment to-day in the United States.

Mr. President, there never was such a condition of affairs existing in this country in all its history with reference to the laboring classes as exists at this very hour. What is the matter? The reason of it is that you are threatening the industries of this country so that nobody is willing to spend his money and open the doors of his factory or mill. That is one great reason.

Mr. MCPHERSON rose.

Mr. CULLOM. Now, I am nearly done, if the Senator will let me say ano her word or two.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not complain of the interruption at all. Mr. President, we are all American citizens, free to approve and free to criticise. We watch closely every act of our public servants, and we feel proud of our country and its institutions. We do not want them disturbed. We revere the country and the flag. Not a man or woman but feels proud of the honor of giving due allegiance to the flag of our country, and any sacrilege done to that glorious symbol will never be condoned.

Mr. President, I beg pardon for having occupied so long the time of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH HAWAII.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The morning hour not having expired, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday. By consent the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] occupied a portion of the morning hour in addressing the Senate upon the subject-matter discussed by him.

Mr. MANDERSON. My recollection is that at the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] those resolutions went over until to-morrow morning and they will then come up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The two Senators offering the resolutions consented that they should be withheld at the particular time.

Mr. MANDERSON. I then ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be passed over until to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the resolutions will go ovor until to-morrow morning.

Mr. FRYE. To which resolution does the Chair refer?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER]. The Senator from Nevada is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. The suggestion was made to me from the other side of the Chamber this morning that it might be well to let the resolution submitted by me go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It calls for some matter not called for in the resolution which has heretofore passed the Senate, but it is quite possible that the answer to the resolution which has passed the Senate will bring the answer to this resolution. So I said to the Senator who made the suggestion to me that I should not object to the resolution going to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The matter may, however, go over until to-morrow and then be disposed of as we shall agree.

Mr. CALL. I only wish to say that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] was not in the Chamber this morning when consent was given that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] should occupy the morning hour. I think it was understood that the Sentor from Delaware desired to submit some remarks.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Delaware is the Senator to whom I referred and with whom I had the conversation. Let the matter stand until he comes in then, Mr. President.

Mr. FRYE. Is there objection to the resolution going over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. HOAR. Not the slightest.

Mr. FRYE. I desire to occupy the attention of the Senate for a little while to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that there is no objection to both resolutions going over until to-morrow morning, holding their right of then being presented to the Senate.

Mr. CALL. I should object simply for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Delaware to be heard to-day if he desired. I do not, however, see him in the Chamber.

Mr. HOAR. He will be here to-morrow morning undoubtedly.

M. CALL. Very well. I have no more to say.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] is entitled to the floor on the bill (S. 412) to repeal Title XXVI of the Revised Statutes of the United States, known as the Federal election law.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the Federal election law does not involve the question of honest elections, but does involve in what jurisdiction the question of honest elections shall be determined, whether by the States or the General Government. Inasmuch as the power to legislate with regard to the election of members of the House of Representatives is possessed both by the State and the General Government, it is a question of expediency and good government where that power should be exercised. It is manifest that the power, if exercised by the General Government, should never be exercised to interfere with the election of State officers, but primarily by the Constitution it was intended that the States should regulate all elections. The language of the Constitution is as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

By an examination of the debates in the convention for the formation of the Constitution, it will be observed that so far as the convention was concerned, the object of the latter clause was a specific object. It was suggested that the States might not pass any laws providing for the election of either Senators or members of the lower House, and that the Union might thus be dissolved by mere negation, by the failure to act; and I believe some cases were cited where such failures had occurred during the existence of the Continental Congress. To place it in the power of the General Government to preserve its own existence this clause was inserted. The primary authority was in the States. It was recognized by the Constitution throughout that the States should have full and ample control of their local elections, and this clause was placed in the Constitution solely for the purpose of meeting the contingency of nonaction, and for no other purpose.

No case exists in the United States where a State has not provided ample laws for the election of Members of the House of Representatives and Senators, particularly the election of members of the other House. The States have ample laws for that purpose.

The Federal election law relates solely to the election of Members of the House of Representatives, but does not apply to the election of Senators. It is provided that the qualifications of voters to elect Members of the House of Representatives shall be the same as those in the States for the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. The whole theory of the Constitution is that the State shall regulate.

The question arises, Does any emergency exist calling for Congressional interference? There certainly does not such an emergency exist as was contemplated in the Constitution, because all the States have election laws on their statute books.

It is said, however, that there are frauds in the States, and therefore Congress ought to interfere to secure pure elections. I am not satisfied that our elections would be improved by Congressional interference. It has a tendency to remove from the people of the States that individual responsibility which the conducting of local elections involves. There undoubtedly have been frauds in every State and irregularities in elections, and there will continue to be irregularities in elections in the future; but the public sentiment of the people in every State is against unfair dealing at the polls. The people desire honest elections, and they must be trusted to procure them. If they can not be trusted, our Government is at an end. The foundation of republican government is local elections, local self-government. That is the foundation of free institutions.

I know that those high in power have always supposed they could govern better than the people; and here comes in the very distinction between monarchy and republicanism. In a republican form of government the theory is that the people can be trusted; in a monarchical form of government the theory is that the people are incapable of governing themselves. We are trying the experiment, and have been more successful than any other people thus far in carrying out government and trusting to the people in their local capacity to govern themselves. If we take that responsibility from them which justly belongs to them in a republican government there is danger of their depending upon the General Government and trusting to it to accomplish results which they alone can accomplish in a republican form of government.

I think the danger to this country comes from Federal power and Federal usurpation and not from local self-government. The bad condition of things which now exists in this country can be traced to the unjust exercise of Federal power as plainly as anything which exists in nature. For twenty years the people have demanded financial reform and protested against the destruction of one of the precious metals and the abandonment of the automatic theory of regulating the quantity of money by the quantity of the two metals.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. STEWART. Not right here. I do not wish to be broken into at this point.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair). The Senator from Nevada declines to yield.

Mr. STEWART. I decline to yield until I get through with this branch of the subject.

During all this time the Federal power has been used to thwart the will of the people and prevent the restoration of silver. The Federal veto and the Federal patronage have been the lion in the path, and the Federal patronage and the Federal veto have finally launched this country upon the single gold standard and sent misery and want to the homes of the great mass of the people. No other substantial reason can be given for want and starvation in this land of plenty, after twenty-five years of peace and abundant harvests, but a vicious monetary system enforced upon this country by Federal power, by the Executive.

The members of Congress are sufficiently dependent upon the Executive for their reëlection; the Federal patronage is regarded as a necessity to the successful politician; and whatever his pledges may have been to his constituents, however strong his conviction of right may be, when he comes to Washington he finds himself confronted with the alternative to forego all the rewards of his party or submit to Federal dictation. You place in that same Executive another great power when you give him control of local elections. You say it is done by the judges, the marshals, and the supervisors, but the marshals who form the greatest number of these officials are immediately under the Federal Executive; the judges are appointed by the Chief Executive, and become, I am sorry to say, as a rule strongly tinctured with a sense of the superiority of the Federal over the State governments as soon as they receive their commissions.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STEWART. I do not like to be interrupted, but I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I simply wish to ask the Senator from Nevada, inasmuch as he took a distinguished part in the enactment of the Federal election law, what has led him to change his mind? I wanted to ask him that before he came to the silver question, and that is why I interrupted him at the time I did.

Mr. STEWART. The original Federal election law was placed upon a bill of which I had charge, and I voted for it. Since that time I have watched its operation. It undoubtedly has prevented some fraud, as any law against frauds might do. It may have worked well in certain instances, but I have observed its operation and have observed the operations of the Government for the last twenty-two years since I voted for the law, and am thoroughly convinced that it was a mistake even then, although its enactment was at the close of the war, when the normal condition of the country had not been fully restored. I believe it was a mistake even then, and I am more and more satisfied that Federal interference in local elections is vicious in practice, vicious in principle, and vicious in results. I have arrived at this conclusion by observing the operations of this law, by observing the dependence of States upon the Federal Government to obtain fair elections, and by observing the divided responsibility which it has created.

We have in the last two or three years since the proposed Federal election bill was defeated, ample evidence to show that the people can be trusted. Look at the South. We hear now of frauds in Virginia and Alabama. The people come against each other there face to face. Does anybody doubt that the frauds will be rectified? This contest in the South is no longer between parties; it is not between the Republican party and the Democratic party; it is not a contest to place the colored man in power over the white man, but it is a contest for good government, in which all the whites are interested, and they will again, as they have in the past, secure a pure ballot, and if there are frauds they will expose them.

The Democratic papers of Virginia are criticising the late elections with the greatest severity, whether justly or unjustly I do not know. I am speaking of the fact that the newspapers have taken hold of the complaints which the people make, and that old Virginia will have just and equitable laws to protect the right of suffrage in the near future, as she had in the distant past, I have no doubt. The same will be true in every Southern State, and will be true in Illinois. That great State is abundantly able, without the assistance of the Federal Government, to maintain the law. So is the State of New York. There is complaint in all large cities, it is true. It is a difficult problem, but what jurisdiction is best to deal with it?

The great people of the State of New York, with their interests interwoven in every election, with the local knowledge of frauds, if frauds are committed, with ample power physically, morally, and intellectually, are able to control the question. Does anybody believe that New York will submit to fraudulent elections to the injury of the Republic? If these great States can not protect the ballot box, the Government of the United States is certainly powerless to do so. Does anybody suppose that officers who are strangers to the vicinage, who are not responsible to their neighbors, who are appointed by Federal authority, will be purer and fairer than those who are held accountable in the locality where they live? I believe that it was never the intention of the Government of the United States to interfere in any local election whatever, and that this power when given was given for a specific purpose, to be used in a certain contingency, to wit, when a State refused or neglected to provide for the election of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

If you add to the executive influence another great power—the control of elections—a member of Congress will come here entirely dependent upon the Executive; and if the Executive does not happen to possess all the wisdom or all the patriotism in the country, if he has not a monopoly of everything good, if he is not something more than human, he will wield the power you place in his hands. It is human nature that he should do so. If he wield the veto power and the patronage, and also the control of the Federal elections, what voice can the people have in these Halls?

I am opposed to interfering in any way with local self-government. The more I study the necessity of maintaining it, the more I see that republican government rests alone upon the right of the people to regulate their own local affairs, to regulate their own elections, and without that right a republic can not exist except in name.

I shall not stop here to discuss this fraud or that fraud. I say that there can be no fraud in any State sufficiently important to affect its prosperity without arousing the indignation of the best people of that State. The newspapers will inevitably call attention to it; good men will condemn it; and when you take the Federal power away and leave the people free, I have absolute confidence in their love of right, their love of fair play, their love of a republican government, which depends upon pure elections.

We must trust them. We cannot assume that we in the General Government are better than the States, because we are composed of representatives of the States, and those whom the people themselves send without Federal interference will be best qualified to represent the will of the people; and it is the will of the people which ought to govern and which must govern if the Republic is to be maintained, not the will of the Chief Executive, not the will of those who manipulate elections, but the will of the people. How can that will be best expressed? Through the representatives of the General Government or by the people themselves in their own local forum, where the witnesses are known and where the great mass of the people have cognizance of the facts?

This Constitution was wise; it left the subject with the States; and because it provided for a certain contingency, in which it would be proper for the General Government to interfere, it was by no means intended that the General Government should usurp the power intended to remain in the States.

The Senator from Illinois has discussed the financial question in connection with the repeal of the Federal election law, and has assumed that alleged frauds in local elections in certain States have produced the universal distress which now exists. Under these circumstances it is proper for me to call attention to the real cause of the want and misery which prevail throughout the land. In order to do that, I will call attention to the real source of all the trouble—vicious financial legislation—the result of cunning on the one side and ignorance on the other.

The word "value" is the stumbling block in monetary science. The advocates of the gold standard contend that "value" is intrinsic and consists of the qualities of a thing which render it useful. The economists who assert that, other things being equal, the quantity of money in circulation determines the purchasing power of each dollar or other unit of money, define the term "value," when used in monetary science, to be the comparative worth of property exchanged as estimated by buyer and seller in the consummation of a contract of purchase and sale.

INTRINSIC VALUE THEORY.

If "value" is intrinsic and adheres in money, the quality of the material of which money is made is all that need be considered. The intrinsic quality of gold is always the same and its value, if intrinsic, must be the same now as it was in the beginning and as it will be to the end of time.

Mr. McPHERSON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. STEWART. I would prefer not to be interrupted now.

Mr. McPHERSON. I merely wanted to know whether the Senator was discussing the value of money in elections?

Mr. STEWART. The discussion on the Federal election law has taken a wide range. It has been assumed that the financial depression in the country was in some way connected with this election law, and I am showing how the financial question is connected with the financial embarrassments which have brought the country on the brink of ruin.

The entire argument of the "intrinsic value" school may be stated as follows: The value of gold is the intrinsic quality of gold itself. The quality of gold can never change, therefore the "value" of gold is always the same. If we admit the premises, the conclusion is inevitable.

If all the rocks could be converted into gold, an ounce of gold would be worth just as much as it now is. Under this theory gold is the true and unchangeable measure of value of all other things. A gold dollar would buy no more if there was only one gold dollar in existence than if there were ten thousand millions of such dollars, because the intrinsic quality of gold (which determines its value) would be the same whether the quantity were great or small.

The legislation of the United States and Europe for the last twenty years has been on the intrinsic-value theory. Silver was demonetized and more than one-half of the metallic money of the world rejected on the theory that quality alone determines the "value" of money. If this theory be correct, why sell bonds and buy gold? Is not the quality of gold we now have the same as the quality of the gold which it is proposed to buy? Is not the proposal to buy more gold an admission that quantity is an element in the value of money? How can such an admission be harmonized with the policy of the legislation of the extra session and the mandates of the London and New York syndicate?

The goal of sound money (according to the authority of the President and his advisers) has been reached, and every gold dollar is as good as every other gold dollar of the same weight and fineness. No poor laboring man can now be defrauded because his gold dollar is not just as good as the gold dollar of his rich neighbor. The demand for good money, so urgently pressed by the gold kings in behalf of labor, has been answered by appropriate legislation.

Why should the laboring man complain? Have not the gold press, the Executive, the ex-Executive, and all the gold advocates on both sides of the Atlantic yielded to the demand of labor for good money? Why should not the gold advocates be astonished at the dissatisfaction of the starving millions of the unemployed? What right have the masses to complain of starvation while the money in the banks is dear gold? Why should the advocates of sound money tolerate legislation to increase the supply of money in response to the false and exploded idea that if there were more money more people might get some of it?

An increase of the quantity of money would not improve its quality, but it might enhance the danger of its distribution among the masses.

Why should the gold advocates be annoyed after they have spent so much money and time to secure legislation to make money good and dear? Why should not every good citizen be thankful because no money except good money exists in the coffers of the rich? What a debt of gratitude (in addition to other debts) the wealth producers of this country owe to the money-changers of London and New York for removing all money out of the reach of all producers to prevent loss by shrinkage of the value of money in their pockets! What a consolation it must be to all true patriots to know that there is now no money but good money, and that all good money is in the safe keeping of the gold combine, where the touch of the common herd can not contaminate, defile, nor mar its shining beauty!

The "intrinsic value" theory, if true, is a full justification for the demonetization of silver; for if quantity has nothing to do with the value of money there was no use for the four thousand millions silver coin in the world.

Is this bill reported from the Finance Committee to increase national-bank circulation consistent with the intrinsic value theory? Will the intrinsic value of national-bank notes be any greater than that of gold? What excuse can be given for putting out more national-bank circulation if quality, without regard to quantity, is the only requisite of good money?

The "intrinsic quality" of money has not been impaired by the rejection of silver. Why should the money function of silver be restored? Why mine more gold? New gold will not improve the quality of the gold we have. Why object to the absorption of gold in the arts if the intrinsic value of what remains will not be affected by a reduction in quantity?

THE QUANTITATIVE THEORY.

The school of economists who believe that the quantity of money in circulation, other things being equal, regulates the value of dollars or other units of account, learn from the street corners that the "value" of a thing is what it will fetch. Inasmuch as there must be a buyer and a seller and a contract of purchase and sale before an article can fetch anything, the definition already given fits the case. I repeat, value is the comparative worth of property exchanged, estimated by buyer and seller in the consummation of a contract of purchase and sale.

"Value" neither adheres in nor pertains to any one thing. It is a comparison of the desirability of two or more things. Such comparison is an operation of the mental faculties of the buyer and seller resulting in an exchange of property for property, no matter what the property exchanged is. It may be money, services, or commodities, but an estimation of the relative worth of the things exchanged must be made before the contract is consummated. Every actual transaction forms some basis or guide for estimates of what would probably be the exchangeable value for other articles or services in a contract of barter or in the selling price of commodities in money.

Price is a synonym for "value," and commercial price is also the comparative worth of property exchanged as estimated by buyer and seller in the consummation of a contract of purchase and sale. The difference between "price" and "value" does not arise from any essential difference in the meaning of the terms, but from a difference in their application. "Value" is applied to money and "price" to the exchangeable worth of commodities into money.

There are two conditions precedent to either "price" or "value." There must be a demand and a limitation of quantity. If there is no demand there can be neither commercial value nor market price. If the quantity is unlimited, like the air we breathe, and the thing desired can be obtained in unlimited quantities, without money and without price, then there can be no comparative worth of property exchanged to be estimated by buyer and seller in the consummation of a contract. But when demand and limitation of quantity exist, the value or price is determined by the supply and demand.

All property for sale is a demand for money. The demand for money is, therefore, equal to the demand for all other things, and is always a maximum demand. The aggregate of property for sale is not only the total demand for money, but it is also the supply of property, and all the money in circulation is both the demand for property and the supply of money. A reduction of the volume of circulation diminishes the supply of money and (the demand remaining the same) enhances the value of each dollar or unit of money. An addition to the circulation increases the supply of money and (the demand remaining the same) reduces the value of each dollar or unit of money. Conversely, a reduction of the amount of property for sale (the volume of money remaining stationary) increases the general price of property. An increase in the property for sale (the volume of money remaining the same) reduces general prices.

The demand for everything except money is limited. The demand may be greater or less than the supply. If the demand be greater than the supply, the price of the commodity will rise above the general level of prices; if less than the supply, the price of the article will fall below that level.

A variety of causes affect the relative price of commodities, and also their relative value in money. But fluctuations in the demand and supply of particular articles do not affect the aggregate demand for all property for sale or the aggregate supply of the money in circulation, because, as we have already seen, the property for sale and the money in circulation are reciprocally the demand and supply of each other. When the aggregate of all the property for sale and the volume of money are stationary, the general level of prices will also be stationary.

If the property for sale increases in quantity and the volume of money remains the same, general prices will fall. If the aggregate of property is stationary and the volume of money is increased, general prices will rise. If the increase in quantity of property for sale and the increase in the volume of money are equal, general prices will remain stationary and stability in values will be maintained, which is the end and aim of monetary science. We have already seen that the value in the aggregate of money in circulation is measured by the aggregate of property for sale.

The property for sale remaining stationary, the value of money in circulation will be the same whether the volume of circulation be large or small. It makes no difference what number of dollars or units may be required to make up the volume of money in circulation, the value in the aggregate will be the same so long as the total amount of property offered in exchange is neither increased nor diminished. What part of such aggregate demand one dollar will be depends upon the number of dollars into which the circulation is divided. Hence, the value of each dollar depends upon the number of dollars in circulation. Any increase or decrease in the property for sale (the volume of money remaining the same) will increase or decrease the value of each dollar or unit of money.

Hence, the increase of property for sale and the decrease in the volume of money produced by the demonetization of silver are the cause of the decline of general prices about 50 per cent in the last twenty years.

When money is increasing in value and prices are falling,

everybody seeks investment in money or bonds, or other credits which are money features. When prices are rising everybody seeks the acquisition of or investment in property. In other words, when money is rising and property falling, everybody desires to go long on money and short on property. When prices are rising and the value of money falling, everybody desires to go long on property and short on money. Individuals can not create money, and can only go long on money by the acquisition of money or bonds and credits, which are money features. Individuals can acquire property both by labor and by investments. No wealth can be produced by going long on money. All wealth is produced by going long on property by the use of labor.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, this is a very important discussion that is going on. I think there ought to be a quorum present.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, no; I do not want a quorum. Senators would know the cause of all the trouble outside if they were here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question of a quorum being raised, it becomes the duty of the Chair to direct the Secretary to call the roll.

Mr. STEWART. I regret it very much. I do not want Senators to be compelled to come in.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bate,	Gray,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Berry,	Harris,	Martin,	Stockbridge,
Call,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Turpie,
Camden,	Hill,	Palmer,	Vest,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Pasco,	Vilas,
Cockrell,	Hunton,	Peffer,	Voorhees,
Coke,	Irby,	Perkins,	Walthall,
Cullom,	Jones, Ark.	Platt,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	White, La.
Frye,	Kyle,	Pugh,	Wilson.
Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Roach,	
George,	Lodge,	Sherman,	
Gorman,	McMillan,	Squire,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. STEWART. The value of money depends, as we have already seen, upon the volume in circulation, which is now fixed, as we shall hereafter see, by legislation. If legislation would supply a sufficient volume of money to take away the profit of going long on money, and would thereby encourage the accumulation of property, every willing hand would find employment and wealth and prosperity would increase.

I am aware of the fact that habits of thought, education, and prejudice attach much importance to the precious metals without examining what, if any, necessary functions they perform. The conversion of either metal into money withdraws it from use as a commodity. It can not be employed as money and at the same time used as a commodity. The use of it as money deprives it of use as a commodity, and the use of it as a commodity deprives it of its money function.

The use of gold and silver in the arts does not increase their utility as money. On the contrary, their absorption for non-monetary purposes decreases the supply of money metal, produces contraction, and interferes with the equity of contracts and the stability of general prices. The growing demand for gold in the arts already absorbs about all of the annual output from the mines and threatens serious inroads upon the stock of gold on hand. If gold could be used for no other purpose but coinage into money, the evils of the gold standard would be greatly mitigated.

The only important function which either of the precious metals performs, and which could not be performed equally well by many other commodities, especially paper, is limitation of quantity. Rude nature limited the quantity of metallic money by the precious metals for thousands of years and never during all that time permitted man to obtain too much of either gold or silver, or of both. The accumulations of all the ages up to 1873 amounted to only about $7,000,000,000 of gold and silver coin distributed among all the nations of the earth. But this accumulation was sufficiently large to render the output of the mines in any one year a very small percentage of the whole and to prevent violent fluctuations.

The mines in 1873 were and still are reasonably productive, but not sufficiently so to furnish a supply of money which would more than keep pace with the increase of population. If all the gold and all the silver produced from the mines had been coined during the last twenty years, the percentage of increase of metallic money would not have been equal to the growth of population. The gold from California and Australia between 1848 and 1873 about doubled the metallic money of the world; but the increase of general prices was only about 18 per cent. After supplying the arts the total output of gold and silver available for coinage since silver was demonetized has not exceeded 30 per cent of the coin of the two metals which was on hand in 1873, which is a less per cent than the growth of population.

If both metals had been freely coined, there would have been no expansion of the volume of money as compared with population; there would probably have been some contraction. If the demonetization of silver is consummated, gold must also be demonetized to prevent inevitable disaster. The function of limiting and regulating the volume of standard money which the two metals performed can not be performed by one. The limitation, when both were used, was too narrow and contracted; stagnation, and often barbarism, followed a failure of the output of the mines.

The rejection of silver as a money metal is an abandonment of the automatic theory by which the volume of money was regulated by the quantity of the two metals. The demonetization of one metal by legislation proves that there is nothing sacred either in gold or silver, or in the automatic theory itself. The rejection of silver as a money metal will lead to the disuse of both much sooner than the demonetization of gold would have done; because silver is the more plentiful metal, with a more regular and permanent supply from the mines, and because a large amount of the output of gold (probably one-third) is obtained from silver mines, and also because the arts now consume nearly if not all of the annual output of gold. The limitation of the volume of standard money of the world to gold alone must so enhance the value of gold and reduce the price of property and wages as to produce such disaster as must end either in revolution or financial slavery of the masses.

Since the function of regulating the volume of money by the aggregate of the two metals (which seemed so important) has been destroyed by legislation, it is essential to inquire if both gold and silver may not be discarded as money? The argument was that legislation could not be trusted to regulate the volume of money, but rude nature might safely dole out gold and silver in proper quantities to furnish the requisite supply of money of ultimate payment. The plan of adopting the accumulations of the precious metals, with their annual additions from the output of the mine, has been abandoned.

The legislation rejecting one of the metals, issuing paper money, and establishing national banks is an assumption of absolute control by Congress over the quantity and quality of the circulating medium. Every question relating to money is now a subject of legislation.

We have seen that the volume of circulation as compared with the aggregate of property for sale is the paramount question for consideration. Why may not some limitation be ascertained and adopted which will preserve the equity of time contracts and maintain stability of general prices? Why may not some system be devised, based on principle, which shall control legislation on the most important subject which affects the human race? Why should the money changers be allowed to control, for selfish purposes, the finances of the civilized world, and why should legislators grope in the dark and pass tentative and experimental laws, if a system can be devised which will maintain equity between debtor and creditor and secure general prosperity?

Suppose the United States should stamp upon properly engraved and prepared paper the words "one dollar" and make it the unit of account and a legal tender in payment of all debts and dues, public and private, and should also stamp upon other like pieces of paper words and figures which should be multiples of such dollar of such denominations as might be required, and make all such pieces of paper so prepared and stamped a full legal tender in payment of debts and redeemable in taxes and in all the property for sale in the United States. Would not such dollars be good money? Suppose a hundred millions of such legal-tender money was prepared and covered into the Treasury to meet the present deficiency and avoid an increase of taxation, would not that relieve the present situation and have a tendency to revive business?

Suppose further, that enough of such legal-tender money should be prepared to take the place of every other kind of money, whether paper or gold or silver, which is now in circulation, and that when paper money now outstanding is received in the Treasury it should be destroyed and such legal-tender money issued in lieu thereof, and that when either gold or silver coin should be paid into the Treasury it should be melted up and sold as bullion and such legal tender-money issued in its place.

Suppose further, that such a process should be continued until all the present circulation of the United States should be retired and one kind of money redeemable in debts, taxes, and all exchangeable property should be substituted for it.

Suppose further that a sum of new money equal to 3 per cent of the volume of money existing on the 1st day of July in each year should be issued annually and covered into the Treasury in lieu of taxes, so as to increase the circulation to keep pace with

the increase of population; and suppose further that a board of statisticians should be organized to investigate prices and report from time to time whether such increase of 3 per cent per annum was sufficient to maintain stability of prices; and if not sufficient, suppose more legal-tender money should be covered into the Treasury and more taxation relieved until stability of prices, according to such statistical investigations, should be maintained, would not the United States have a good financial system? If not, why not?

Why would not such money be as good as paper redeemable in gold with the constant fear of want of gold for redemption?

Would not money clothed with the exclusive power of legal tender and the exclusive right of redemption in all debts, taxes, and property in the United States be good money in any part of the world and convertible without loss, except the price of exchange, into the money of any foreign country? Why would not the only money which would pay debts and taxes and buy property in the richest country in the world, buy anything that might be produced in the United States or any other country? Whatever objections might be made to such a financial system, would it not be better than the gold standard, which means perpetual contraction, falling prices, stagnation, hard times, and misery?

If silver can not be remonetized, and the former system of regulating the volume of circulation automatically by the quantity of gold and silver attainable restored, the interests of the human race require the speedy demonetization of gold and the substitution of some other kind of money of sufficient volume to maintain the equity of contracts, supply the necessities of the people for money, and prevent inevitable disaster.

Now, Mr. President, I admit that this was a digression from the election bill; but I think what I have said is quite pertinent when two Senators stand on the floor, one on one side and the other on the other, and claim that the universal ruin that is abroad in the land resulted from the election of A or B or from some trifling irregularity in some local election. When this great question is treated with such trifling nonsense as we have heard it is time we commenced to investigate the money and see what really is the matter. The country is suffering from the gold standard. There is no money to do business with, and what there is is congested in the money centers. No man dare use it. It was formerly invested in bonds, and money futures were formerly sought; but the foundation of so many of those money futures has been removed by bankruptcies of railroads and other corporations that men fear to invest even in bonds.

The example of the ruin of the mass of business by contraction, by falling prices, deters others from entering into enterprises; and here you have $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 of idle money that nobody dares use, and the men who have it will not let it go for any legitimate purpose. They demand United States bonds or something of that kind before they will let it go. A man who has any property dare not borrow money to put in enterprises for fear of losing all he has. The man who has money dare not risk it for fear of a further fall in prices.

That is the condition. It is contraction all the time. Prices do not fall in an incline plane, because everybody having property holds on to it to the last moment until the crash comes and then it drops below where the volume of money would maintain it. Prices fall, property is sacrificed, and the country stands appalled at the ruin that has taken place, and that ruin is a warning to others to keep out of business, and nothing is done.

In a few months there will be a seeming prosperity again when the money gets out, but the iron hand of contraction will check enterprises again and again. The history of the last twenty years is a history of slight prosperity and spasms of bankruptcy, and it will so continue as long as we continue to adhere to the gold standard, and falling prices which must follow that standard as certainly as night follows day.

When this appalling condition has been produced by events as logical and certain as mathematics we hear it attributed to a threat to repeal an election law. We hear hard times attributed to the fact that we do not put more power in the Executive. How has he used the power he has had? Let the history of the last twenty years bear testimony. For twenty years, if the majority had been untrammeled in the two Houses, there has been no time when they would not have given relief to the people, but they had confronting them the threat of an Executive veto; they had confronting them a threat to take away the Federal patronage and destroy them at home: and now they say that things would be benefited by placing before them another threat to control local elections and deny to the States the right to send their representatives here.

Mr. President, I do not propose to prolong the discussion at this time. The President of the United States, in his message to the extra session, promised us a comprehensive financial policy. He now tells us that we must wait for a policy until we see how the gold standard will work; that we shall not be students in history; that we shall abandon our mathematics and let the country suffer, and fill your streets with tramps and your homes with hunger while we have an opportunity to study the object lesson.

Have we not a sufficient object lesson? Unfortunately while he tells us that he has not disclosed the entire sum and substance and full extent of the gold-standard policy, he does not state the case truthfully. At the extra session he demanded and secured the repeal of the only law that recognized silver bullion as a money metal and adopted the gold standard. He now recommends the issuance of bonds, to borrow money to redeem the ten or eleven hundred million dollars of silver and paper in circulation. That is the gold policy. I so stated when the extra session met. They have no policy but the gold standard and further taxation, falling prices, bonds to be used by the national banks, bonds for gilt-edged investments, bonds for money futures to enable those who want to go long on money to have a safe place to put their money, bonds for those who control the money of the world, taxation, falling prices, starvation, and misery for the masses.

That is the policy which is disclosed and set forth, and it is the full extent of the policy of the gold men. They have nothing else to offer. They have made no other suggestion but taxation, falling prices, and hard times, in or out of Congress, but the utter destruction of silver as money, the limitation of the money to gold, and promises to pay gold. Believing that the United States can grind the people enough to comply with almost any promise, they proposed this policy and no other: and here we have misery abroad in the land resulting from a vicious financial system, and no man who speaks by authority for the Administration dare give us a suggestion of any relief but gold and bonds.

Whether it has been the case with the President or not, the people have had sufficient of this object lesson, and his command to them to delay and see what the gold men will work out of it is cold comfort in these cold nights to men who have nowhere to lay their heads and have not food to eat.

I shall at a future day take occasion to make some further remarks on the gloomy aspect foretold in the President's message. The only hope is further misery, further hard times, further falling prices; and that is a sad spectacle to those who have got to meet the coming hard winter.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MUTCHLER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. William Mutchler, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, 8,000 copies, of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco, to be delivered to the family of the deceased, and of those remaining 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives: and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said William Mutchler to accompany the said eulogies.

STATISTICS OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the document entitled "Imported merchandise entered for consumption in the United States during the years 1890 to 1894, with the rates and amount of duty collected," prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, 4,000 copies for the use of the House, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Statistics.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3259) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey; asked for a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GEARY, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. FLETCHER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 108) to fix the times and places for holding the Federal courts in the State and district of Nebraska;

A bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home;

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.;

A bill (H. R. 213) to pay for alley condemned in square numbered 493, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (H. R. 356) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from sale certain land in the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 411) to require steam vessels of the United States, of 1,000 tons or more, to have one engineer and helper on watch in their engine rooms while under way, and to require all steam vessels of the United States, under steam for more than ten hours, to carry two licensed engineers;

A bill (H. R. 894) for the relief of Robert Travila for loss of carbine in the late war;

A bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (H. R. 4013) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bœuf River, in Louisiana; and

A bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

WILLIAM M'GARRAHAN.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar is now in order. The Secretary will announce the first bill on the Calendar not called at the last call of the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 341) to submit to the court of private land claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read at length as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who has not been present this session, reported the bill, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who does not favor it, requested me, if it should be called up in his absence, to ask that it be passed over until some future time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over if there be no objection. Hearing no objection, the next bill on the Calendar will be announced by the Secretary.

Mr. HUNTON. The case on the Calendar that has just been called is in charge of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and he desired that when reached on the Calendar it should be passed over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill has just been ordered to be passed over without prejudice.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw the motion and let us have an executive session.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly; I withdraw the motion in favor of that course.

Mr. BERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 13, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1893.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Charles W. Dabney, jr., of Tennessee, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Edwin Willits, resigned.

DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

Robert E. Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Mint, to succeed Edward O. Leech, resigned.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

D. M. Kilpatrick, of Louisiana, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, to succeed Andrew Hero, removed.

ASSAYER.

Guy Bryan, of Missouri, to be assayer in charge at the United States assay office at St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, to succeed Eliot C. Jewett, removed.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

O. M. Welburn, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of California, to succeed John C. Quinn, removed.

William J. Mize, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois, to succeed Christopher Mamer, resigned.

Joshua Jump, of Indiana, to be collector of internal revenue for the seventh district of Indiana, to succeed Joseph P. Throop, resigned.

James Phelan, of Michigan, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Michigan, to succeed J. H. Stone, resigned.

Charles Speck, of Missouri, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, to succeed C. F. Wenneker, resigned.

Webster Withers, of Missouri, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri, to succeed H. F. Devol, resigned.

Calvin Page, of New Hampshire, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Hampshire, to succeed James E. French, resigned.

Valentine Fleckenstein, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the twenty-eighth district of New York, to succeed Charles E. Fitch, resigned.

Kope Elias, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of North Carolina, to succeed W. W. Rollins, resigned.

Furnifold M. Simmons, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of North Carolina, to succeed Elihu A. White, resigned.

Louis W. Pratt, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, to succeed Robert W. Hunter, resigned.

S. M. McMillen, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio, to succeed Marcus Boggs, resigned.

Louis P. Ohliger, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio, to succeed William H. Gabriel, resigned.

J. Edward Kauffman, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of Texas, to succeed J. W. Burke, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION.

Eugene T. Chamberlain, of New York, to be Commissioner of Navigation, to succeed E. C. O'Brien, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

A. M. Dahlgren, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi, to succeed William G. Henderson, removed.

David G. Browne, of Montana, to be collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho, in the State of Montana, to succeed Jeremiah Sullivan, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

True L. Norris, of New Hampshire, to be collector of customs for the district of Portsmouth, in the State of New Hampshire, to succeed James E. Dodge, removed.

William J. Bulger, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Oswego, in the State of New York, to succeed Henry H. Lyman, removed.

Peter C. Doyle, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Buffalo Creek, in the State of New York, to succeed William J. Morgan, resigned.

George S. Weed, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Champlain, in the State of New York, to succeed Stephen Moffatt, removed.

Nelson Baldwin, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for the district of Erie, in the State of Pennsylvania, to succeed John M. Glazier, removed.

Frank B. Earnest, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Corpus Christi, in the State of Texas, to succeed Calvin G. Brewster, removed.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

William D. English, of California, to be surveyor of customs for the port of San Francisco, in the State of California, to succeed Paris Kilburn, removed.

John D. Stocker, of Georgia, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Atlanta, in the State of Georgia, to succeed Christopher C. Wimbish, removed.

George G. Tanner, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the

port of Indianapolis, in the State of Indiana, to succeed Philip M. Hildebrand, resigned.

George W. Haynie, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Evansville, in the State of Indiana, to succeed C. E. Scoville, removed.

J. Scott Harrison, of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Kansas City, in the State of Missouri, to succeed Ross Guffin, resigned.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Walter H. Bunn, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed Marville W. Cooper, resigned.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

James B. Stevens, of California, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of San Francisco, in the State of California, to succeed James E. Tucker, promoted to appraiser.

James McCaffery, of Missouri, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise at the port of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, to succeed Lyne S. Metcalf, removed.

Emil Rose, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed J. Stanley Isaacs, removed.

John W. A. Strickland, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, in place of Dennis F. Burke, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

John A. Hinkle, to be postmaster at Batesville, in the county of Independence and State of Arkansas, in the place of James P. Jones, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

C. H. Wilmans, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Jackson and State of Arkansas, in the place of James C. Grubbs, deceased.

J. A. Jamison, jr., to be postmaster at Ukia, in the county of Mendocina and State of California, in the place of George W. Critchfield, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

James H. Jordan, to be postmaster at Denver, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado, in the place of John Corcoran, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

James B. Chapman, to be postmaster at Hartford City, in the county of Blackford and State of Indiana, in the place of Alexander Gable, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

John M. Jackson, to be postmaster at Peru, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana, in the place of John T. Stevens, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Thomas J. Kelleher, to be postmaster at Waukon, in the county of Alamakee and State of Iowa, in the place of Francis H. Robins, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Matthew M. McAlpin, to be postmaster at Denison, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa, in the place of Reuben Heffelfinger, resigned.

Samuel F. McConnell, to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Davis and State of Iowa, in the place of Albert H. Fortune, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

W. L. Parker, to be postmaster at Sibley, in the county of Osceola and State of Iowa, in the place of Hezekiah G. Doolittle, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

John H. Sherman, to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Clarke and State of Iowa, in the place of Wallace G. Agnew, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

W. J. Stonebreaker, to be postmaster at Hampton, in the county of Franklin and State of Iowa, in the place of Levi B. Raymond, resigned.

George W. H. Lucas, to be postmaster at Cherokee, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas, in the place of Joseph Lucas, resigned.

Amos K. Bradley, to be postmaster at Madisonville, in the county of Hopkins and State of Kentucky, in the place of John B. Earle, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Myers C. Shook, to be postmaster at Preston, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota, in the place of Christian Peterson, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Dorin G. McConnell, to be postmaster at Holden, in the county of Johnson and State of Missouri, in the place of Peter C. Van Matre, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Richard S. Wooldridge, to be postmaster at Harrisonville, in the county of Cass and State of Missouri, in the place of Rachel O. Aiken, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Charles C. Collings, to be postmaster at Gloucester City, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey, in the place of John Gourley, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Philip E. Tufts, to be postmaster at Rahway, in the county of Union and State of New Jersey, in the place of Henry B. Rollinson, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

George A. Elston, to be postmaster at Port Jervis, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in the place of Stephen St. John, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

James W. Forbis, to be postmaster at Greensboro, in the county of Guilford and State of North Carolina, in the place of Jonathan D. White, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

George B. Snyder, to be postmaster at Youngstown, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio, in the place of Edw. H. Hosmer, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Orson A. Carlin, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Louisa Keck, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Benjamin A. Donovan, to be postmaster at Manheim, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Samuel M. Long, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Thomas J. Eakin, to be postmaster at Emlenton, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Henry A. Hamilton, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

James Kleckner, to be postmaster at Mifflinburg, in the county of Union and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George W. Shock, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

William H. Peffer, to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of A. A. Thomson, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Maggie M. Moore, to be postmaster at Yorkville, in the county of York and State of South Carolina, in the place of William A. Moore, whose commission expired May 15, 1892.

D. L. Smith, to be postmaster at Sweetwater, in the county of Monroe and State of Tennessee, in the place of Jesse F. Owen, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

John W. Hogg, to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of Wise and State of Texas, in the place of William W. Barber, resigned.

John W. Lipscomb, to be postmaster at Luling, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas, in the place of Jacob D. Leonard, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

J. L. Phelan, to be postmaster at San Angelo, in the county of Tom Green and State of Texas, in the place of Samuel L. S. Smith, resigned.

James M. Robins, to be postmaster at Mineola, in the county of Wood and State of Texas, in the place of Thomas Breen, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

George B. Zimpelman, to be postmaster at Austin, in the county of Travis and State of Texas, in the place of J. C. De Gress, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Bernard Wilkinson, to be postmaster at North Yakima, in the county of Yakima and State of Washington, in the place of Robert Dunn, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 1893.

CONSUL.

Newton B. Ashby, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Dublin, Ireland.

POSTMASTERS.

Joseph A. Beane, to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana.

Charles I. Haskell, to be postmaster at Virginia, in the county of Cass and State of Illinois.

Edgar B. Tage, to be postmaster at Boise City, in the county of Ada and State of Idaho.

Samuel J. Reynolds, to be postmaster at Smyrna, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware.

George D. Price, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Jackson and State of Indiana.

Patrick C. Donovan, to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, in the county of Clark and State of Indiana.

William Corby, to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

George P. Marvin, to be postmaster at Beatrice, in the county of Gage and State of Nebraska.

John F. Wood, to be postmaster at Logan, in the county of Harrison and State of Iowa.

James Renie, to be postmaster at North Vernon, in the county of Jennings and State of Indiana.

Lizzie G. Hunt, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Washington and State of Mississippi.

John H. Levis, to be postmaster at Black River Falls, in the county of Jackson and State of Wisconsin.

Frank D. McCoy, to be postmaster at Sistersville, in the county of Tyler and State of West Virginia.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1893.

PENSION AGENT.

Daniel A. Carpenter, of Knoxville, Tenn., to be pension agent at Knoxville, Tenn.

POSTMASTERS.

John H. Crane, to be postmaster at Bowling Green, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio.

William T. Farley, to be postmaster at Tuscumbia, in the county of Colbert and State of Alabama.

George T. Packer, to be postmaster at Ness City, in the county of Ness and State of Kansas.

Aurelius Steward, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Washington Hesing, to be postmaster at Chicago, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

B. Renkenberger, to be postmaster at Columbiana, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio.

Daniel Kirkpatrick, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Richland and State of Ohio.

Charles H. Leach, to be postmaster at Kokomo, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana.

John F. Fulton, to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Huntington and State of Indiana.

Fred. J. Nirider, to be postmaster at Kinmundy, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois.

Walter M. Beadel, to be postmaster at Lenox, in the county of Taylor and State of Iowa.

John M. Turner, to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of White and State of Indiana.

William T. Phillips, to be postmaster at Oakland City, in the county of Gibson and State of Indiana.

William A. Todd, to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, in the county of Ringgold and State of Iowa.

Henry Moore, to be postmaster at Sioux Rapids, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa.

John L. Comstock, to be postmaster at Sac City, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa.

James B. Elder, to be postmaster at Emmitsburg, in the county of Frederick and State of Maryland.

Thomas Shannon, to be postmaster at Morgan City, in the parish of St. Mary and State of Louisiana.

George H. Richard, to be postmaster at Donaldsonville, in the parish of Ascension and State of Louisiana.

James Curran, to be postmaster at Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey.

Levant A. Vickery, to be postmaster at Flushing, in the county of Genesee and State of Michigan.

Reuel H. Cooper, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan.

William C. Bush, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Pike and State of Illinois.

Patrick J. Birmingham, to be postmaster at Girardville, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

Charles L. Elwood, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

Samuel L. Day, to be postmaster at Paxton, in the county of Ford and State of Illinois.

William B. Davis, to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, in the county of Brown and State of Illinois.

Edward S. Bryan, to be postmaster at Maywood, in the county of Cook, and State of Illinois.

William R. Boughn, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Cedar and State of Nebraska.

George C. Agnew, to be postmaster at Central City, in the county of Merrick and State of Nebraska.

M. J. Howley, to be postmaster at Cairo, in the county of Alexander and State of Illinois.

Isaac F. Travis, to be postmaster at Weeping Water, in the county of Cass and State of Nebraska.

Frederick E. Roper, to be postmaster at Hebron, in the county of Thayer and State of Nebraska.

Hugh L. Cooper, to be postmaster at Tecumseh, in the county of Johnson and State of Nebraska.

George W. Porth, to be postmaster at Milwaukee, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

James M. Keys, to be postmaster at Richland Center, in the county of Richland and State of Wisconsin.

Gustav A. Altenberg, to be postmaster at Tomah, in the county of Monroe and State of Wisconsin.

A. O. Wilson, to be postmaster at Janesville, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.

C. G. Wilcox, to be postmaster at De Pere, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin.

John H. Rooney, to be postmaster at Kewaunee, in the county of Kewaunee and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FISH COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

FREEDMEN SAVINGS AND TRUST COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Commissioner of the Freedmen Savings and Trust Company, submitting report for the year ending December 2, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

PYTHIAN CONCLAVE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate joint resolution (S. R. 44) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the Monument grounds and reservations and public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This joint resolution will, without objection, be indefinitely postponed, the House having passed a similar resolution, in which the Senate has concurred.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate bills, which were severally read a first and second time and referred as indicated below:

A bill (S. 73) for the relief of William J. Cornell and Joseph M. Cornell—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 75) for the relief of Thomas Guinean—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 171) granting to the State of North Dakota certain lands heretofore set apart as a wood reservation for Fort Totten military reservation for the use of the militia of North Dakota and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 333) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 463) to reimburse the State of Nebraska the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890 and 1891—to the Committee on Claims. and

A bill (S. 882) granting a pension to Frances Corse, widow of Gen. John M. Corse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, the press dispatches sent forth on Friday last announcing the individual vote upon the bankruptcy bill inadvertently did me injustice by omitting my name, and thereby creating the impression that I had dodged the vote upon that measure.

The truth is, I was not only in my seat during the debate on that measure, but I voted every time in Committee of the Whole, and also on the roll call in the House; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Saturday bears me out in that by recording my name in the negative on the proposition to kill the bill by striking out its enacting clause. I have always been an advocate of a just bill, such as would protect the honest debtor and creditor alike, a measure providing for a uniform and national system of bankruptcy, and the purpose of my remarks is, I desire it understood that I voted in accordance with those convictions.

POSTAL REVENUE.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Commission to inquire into the status of the Laws Regulating the Departments to present a privileged report, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4310) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes, requiring deposit of receipts with the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

Mr. DINGLEY. The Clerk will please read the report of the Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Joint Commission of Congress to Inquire into the status of Laws Organizing the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the bill (H. R.

4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes, having considered the same, report it back herewith and recommend that it do pass, with the title amended so as to read as follows:

"A bill to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department."

Section 407 of the Revised Statues now requires that the certificates of deposits by postmasters shall be sent by the depositories, through the office making the deposit, to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, and from that office to the Auditor.

The accompanying bill changes the law so as to require the certificate to be sent directly to the Auditor's Office, obviating the delay now experienced, which is to no purpose, since the work in the Third Assistant's office is that of merely entering the amount of the certificates of deposit in books arranged by quarters to accord with the alphabetical arrangement of offices making deposits, but which are neither balanced, proved, nor checked against anything else, and which necessarily afford an imperfect guide to the status of any account, being, as will be seen, credits for money only, and does not include credits from other sources or any of the debits.

The certificates are needed to make a complete and final check by the Auditor; and to avoid delay in the adjustment of postal accounts should go direct to that office.

The proposed change will facilitate the settlement of postmasters' accounts by at least one month.

ALEXANDER M. DOCKERY,
JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
NELSON DINGLEY, JR.,
Members on the part of the House of Representatives.
F. M. COCKRELL,
JAMES K. JONES,
S. M. CULLOM,
Members on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is recommended by the Postmaster-General, and I will ask the Clerk to read his letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. A. M. DOCKERY,
Chairman Joint Commission of Congress, etc., Washington, D. C.:

SIR: I have examined the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require certificates of deposits by postmasters to be sent direct to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, and desire to say that its passage will greatly facilitate the settlement of accounts of postmasters, and I therefore earnestly recommend its passage by Congress.

Very respectfully,

W. S. BISSELL,
Postmaster-General.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the only change that this bill makes in the statutes is to require the postmasters to send certificates of deposits directly to the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury, in charge of the postal affairs, instead of to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General; and the Commission have ascertained that this will greatly expedite the settlement of postmasters' accounts. The Postmaster-General also recommends it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes requiring deposit of receipts with the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 407 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 407. The postal revenues and all debts due the Post-Office Department shall, when collected, be paid into the Treasury of the United States under the direction of the Postmaster-General, and the Treasurer, Assistant Treasurer, or designated depository receiving such payment shall give the depositor a duplicate receipt therefor, to be retained by him in his office as a voucher, and shall forward the original to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, to be placed to the credit of the depositor in audit of his accounts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the title will be amended in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission.

There was no objection, and it was ordered.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Upon request of Mr. CUMMINGS, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to the Committee on Naval Affairs to sit during the sessions of the House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. OUTHWAITE, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 297) to authorize a retired list for enlisted men and appoint petty officers of the United States Navy; and the bill was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GOLDZIER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence, for two weeks, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to print in the RECORD remarks upon House bill 384.

NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY BRIDGE BILL.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Committee on Commerce to the bill (H. R. 3389) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey, having met, after full and free conference, have failed to agree.

T. J. GEARY,
FRANKLIN BARTLETT,
LOREN FLETCHER,
Conferees on the part of the House.
G. G. VEST,
A. P. GORMAN,
WILLIAM P. FRYE,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement, and ask for a further conference.

The motion was agreed to, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. GEARY, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. FLETCHER.

BANKRUPTCY.

The committees being called for reports,

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported with amendments a bill (H. R. 4609) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT COURTS.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported with amendments a bill (H. R. 1-92) to limit the jurisdiction of district and circuit courts of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The call of committees for reports was completed.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour for consideration begins at twenty-six minutes past 12 o'clock. The call rests with the Committee on Territories.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

Mr. MEYER (when the Committee on Naval Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up for present consideration the concurrent resolution in relation to the personnel of the Navy.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas there are constantly before Congress numerous bills dealing with the question of rank and pay in the Navy, and other matters concerning the personnel of the same; and

Whereas the present laws relating to this subject are in many instances imperfect, inconsistent, unjust, and the result of piecemeal legislation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a special joint committee, consisting of three members of the House and three members of the Senate, be appointed respectively by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to fully investigate and consider the entire subject of the rank, pay, and all other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy; to have power to send for persons and papers, sit during the recess, if any, and during the sitting of both Houses, and to report at any time after it convenes as may be convenient what legislation, if any, is necessary in the premises; any bill so reported by them shall simplify, codify, and revise existing laws relating to the personnel of the Navy so far as may be found possible. And said joint committee is hereby authorized to employ a clerk at $6 per day and a messenger at $3 per day while employed, and any expenses incurred by said commission in performing the duties herein required shall be defrayed equally from the contingent funds of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to know what is the status of the amendment that was offered by me and, I believe, accepted by the Committee on Naval Affairs in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the Committee of the Whole agreed to an amendment. Whenever the resolution is reported to the House that amendment will be reported with it.

Mr. SAYERS. The amendment has been adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. By the committee, but not by the House. The concurrent resolution is still in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Committee on Naval Affairs has accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] striking out the provision for the employment of a stenographer and a messenger, I wish to ask whether it would not be in order to consider this resolution in the House instead of going into Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The resolution has not been reported by the committee to the House.

Mr. MEYER. Then I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of this concurrent resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MEYER. I ask for a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 45, noes 3.

Mr. KILGORE. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] makes the point that no quorum has voted. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. MEYER, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. KILGORE.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 177, noes 1; so the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole to consider the concurrent resolution, which will now be read.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out the last sentence of the resolution, as follows:

"And said joint committee is hereby authorized to employ a clerk at $6 per day and a messenger at $3 per day while employed, and any expenses incurred by said commission in performing the duties herein required shall be defrayed equally from the contingent funds of the two Houses."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment which the Clerk has just read was agreed to by the Committee of the Whole at a former sitting, and it will be so reported to the House.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to consume time during this morning hour in making any extended remarks. There appears to be a mistaken impression on the part of members of the House as to the purpose and scope of this resolution. During the last session of Congress the gentleman who is at present Secretary of the Navy introduced in this House a resolution of similar character to this; and it only failed of passage because of lack of time. In his recent report the Secretary of the Navy alludes again to this subject in language which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PERSONNEL.

I can not too strongly recommend Congressional action in reference to the personnel of the line of the Navy. Its present condition is too serious to be neglected any longer, and unless remedies are adopted looking to some system of promotion which will produce a regular flow from the bottom to the top of the list, the consequences not only to the service, but also to the Government will soon be nothing less than alarming.

The object of any scheme of promotion in the Navy should be to produce efficient commanding officers, the accomplishment of which necessitates that officers of the line be made to bear the responsibilities of actual command by or before the time they have reached the prime of life, while they are still young enough to accommodate themselves to the demands upon intellect and energy which are made by the assumption of control of a modern man-of-war.

A clear understanding of the necessity for immediate action in this matter can only be gained by a statement of the principal causes heretofore existing which have led to the present stagnation in promotion, which statement will also show that neither the evils themselves nor the necessity for removing them are open to dispute. The principal causes which have led to the present condition of affairs are, briefly stated, as follows:

First. In 1855 Congress authorized a scrutiny of the active list which resulted in the removal of a large number of officers, the vacancies thus created being filled from the passed-midshipmen of the Navy. The immediate effect of this was the reduction of the number of officers below the grade of lieutenant from 258 in 1854 to 73 in 1857. This number had only increased to 91 when the outbreak of the civil war occurred, an event which caused a great number of resignations from all grades of the Navy, creating at once many vacancies all through the line, to fill which there existed only the small number of junior officers mentioned above. The resulting embarrassment of the Department for officers in the junior grades forced the Government to supply its wants from the merchant service.

To this lack of officers in a time of sudden need was due the unfortunate policy which prevailed from 1860 to 1867, inclusive, and which has contributed, more than any other cause, to the present stagnation in promotion. During most of this period the numbers in the classes under instruction at the Naval Academy were kept at the highest possible limit, the cadets being pressed to graduation in large numbers and with the utmost rapidity. On the 1st of January, 1865, there were 486 midshipmen in the service, all of whom had entered since the war began. In January, 1866, there were in the Academy 147 midshipmen in the fourth or lowest class alone. Midshipmen were graduated during the years 1866-'67-'68 at an average rate of about 78 per year. In 1862 the demands of the war, and in 1866 a necessary reorganization had each contributed to so increase the numbers as to make promotions to the grade of lieutenant very rapid, but only for a few years to follow. The senior 16 midshipmen of the 78 who were graduated in 1868 became lieutenants in 1872, at an average age of 24. The 12 seniors of this class have been promoted to lieutenant-commanders since the beginning of this year at an average age of 45, and after having served twenty-one years in the grade of lieutenant.

At the same time that this disproportionate number of graduates entered the active service the dates of 1860 and 1861 were further increased by the admission of a number of officers from the volunteer Navy, whose ability and services had entitled them to such recognition on the part of the Government.

Second. The effect of an act passed in 1870 which largely increased the numbers in the lower grades of the line.

Third. The effect of an act passed in August, 1882, which largely decreased the numbers in the higher grades of the line.

The present result of the combined causes mentioned above is shown in the following table, which gives the average ages at which officers of the line now reach the several grades:

Grade.	Age.
Rear-admiral	61
Commodore	59
Captain	50
Commander	48
Lieutenant-commander	46
Lieutenant	36
Junior lieutenant	33

I have endeavored to impress you with my deliberate conviction that this most important branch of the public service, which may properly be termed the right arm of the Republic for external defense, now suffers from two great evils, viz.:

First, a large proportion of the officers of the line of the Navy, at a time when mind and body ought to be at the best, are serving in the lower ranks without command and the habit it begets.

Second. No method now exists whereby the Government can get the very flower of its personnel into those positions where they can be of the greatest service to the country, in consequence of which a dull mechanical movement takes the place of healthy progression led by merit and fitness.

I am engaged in the preparation of a plan for the reorganization of the line of the Navy which I think will meet the requirements of the service, and I shall have the honor to present it to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and also to the joint committee, to investigate and consider the subject of the rank, pay, and other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy proposed in the concurrent resolution introduced by the Hon. Mr. MEYER, in case said concurrent resolution becomes a law.

Mr. MEYER. I think this subject is pretty well understood by the Committee of the Whole; and, unless some gentleman who is opposed to the resolution desires to speak——

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to submit a few remarks.

Mr. MEYER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. KILGORE. I will not consume any time needlessly. I do not desire more than ten minutes.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, at what time will the morning hour expire?

The CHAIRMAN. At 25 minutes after 1 o'clock; there are still twenty minutes remaining.

Mr. MEYER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas. I hope that will be sufficient.

Mr. EVERETT. I am anxious to say a very few words on this subject.

Mr. MEYER. I will yield later five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] has the floor for five minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. That does not do me any good.

Mr. MEYER. There are only twenty minutes of the morning hour remaining. I would like to oblige the gentleman from Texas——

Mr. KILGORE. I am not asking any favors.

Mr. MEYER. If the gentleman from Texas will be satisfied to have a vote taken at the proper time, I will yield him ten minutes with very great pleasure.

Mr. KILGORE. I did not understand the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MEYER. If you will consent that a vote be taken——

Mr. KILGORE. I do not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MEYER. I will yield the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not know that I shall occupy so much time. I want it understood, however, that in asking ten minutes from my friend from Louisiana I am not making any concession in regard to allowing him to put this matter through without a proper showing on the record.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution, as I understand it, is to secure the appointment of a joint committee of members of this House and the Senate to investigate the rank and pay of the Navy, or as my friend from Arkansas said this morning, to codify the personnel of the Navy. Now, I know so little about this business that I am hardly prepared to give a reason for my opposition to it.

I can say, however, that I am always opposed to an investigation by a Congressional joint committee of any subject within the jurisdiction of a regular standing committee of the House or the Senate. If there were any want of authority in the House Committee on Naval Affairs or the corresponding committee of the Senate to deal with this question, to make this investigation and to formulate a measure as the outcome of the investigation, I might be willing to agree to the appointment of a joint committee to do this work. But there is no such want of authority. My experience is that these special investigating committees are a sham, a fraud, a false pretense, a snare, and a delusion.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas whether the report of a joint committee, if such committee should be constituted by Congress, giving the result of its careful deliberations, would not be as valuable and ought not to be considered as effective as the report of a standing committee of either House.

Mr. KILGORE. Responding to the inquiry of the gentleman from Louisiana, I will say it is barely possible that the report of this joint committee or commission, or whatever it may be called, would be just as full and satisfactory as a report from a standing committee of the House and Senate on the same subject. But that is no reason why the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House or the Senate should abdicate its authority in favor of such a joint committee or commission.

I am opposed to investigations by select committees unless, as I said before, it be on some questions which are not within the jurisdiction of the committees of the House or Senate. Now, if these gentlemen were anxious to reorganize the Navy, and or-

ganize some people out and organize some others into higher rank, that might be done by a bill. That is the purpose of this legislation. I think the Navy ought to be reorganized from what they say about it—not what I know, for I confess I do not know much about that. On one or two occasions in the years gone by the Navy was reorganized. In 1855 it was done, if I remember aright, on the same plan and for the same purpose now proposed by the pending resolution, and it was done then on a bill introduced to that end. They did not need a special commission to do the work for the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House or Senate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to tell the gentleman that this is not a resolution looking towards a reorganization of the Navy Department at all. It is simply a resolution brought here by the advice of the Secretary of the Navy, a resolution which he himself drew up in the last Congress, asking for a joint committee of both Houses to investigate the personnel of the Navy, an effort to settle troubles connected with the rank, pay, and organization of the Navy. It refers to its personnel—nothing else. The resolution has been brought in here and the gentleman in charge has kindly withdrawn a proposition for a clerk and an attendant, intending to use the force of the committee in the investigation. Therefore the gentleman is misstating the proposition, unintentionally, no doubt.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, the gentleman is consuming my time and running a speech into mine—a very good way to get to the country.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am only trying to give the gentleman information. He said he knew nothing about the matter.

Mr. KILGORE. I am obliged to the gentleman.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the gentleman from New York. The purpose of the resolution is to investigate the matters and things that I have said, "make an investigation," as they say; and that investigation must have some purpose in it. If not, then it may as well be dropped entirely. If it has any purpose it is to do the very things I have said—that is, to recommend legislation looking to a reorganization of the Navy, a readjustment of the rank of the officers or reassignment of pay, to determine who ought to be promoted, perhaps, and their pay, and who ought to go upon the retired list.

All of this could be accomplished in a direct method by the introduction of a bill in both the House and Senate providing for the very things which they say ought to be done, and let the report be made on it. In that manner let it come before the country and let the country thus be advised as to the intention of Congress in this regard. But the theory is that if they can get a commission, or a joint committee of the House and Senate, to make this investigation and report in favor of a particular scheme or character of legislation—possibly a unanimous report—put it into this House with the sanction of the joint committee of the House and Senate, they can get it through in spite of any opposition which it may encounter in this body.

Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, that these gentlemen can formulate a measure looking to the very purpose embodied in this resolution, and they ought to do it in that way, not in this. The House has shown repeatedly since this matter has been before it an utter indifference to the resolution. I have not antagonized it in any way except to require the presence of a quorum to vote upon it, and the difficulty of securing a quorum shows the indifference of the House. They may not want to directly antagonize it, or antagonize the gentlemen having it in charge, but there has always been a quorum present when the matter was up, though they have not been able to get one to vote upon it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman found the same difficulty when he called up the Utah bill the other day.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, that is true; but you could not get a quorum for this until I had to help you get it to-day.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MEYER. I yield now five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall occupy the time, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] has practically covered the ground I meant to take—that, in reading the report of the committee, I do not in the least dissent from what they say or what the Secretary of the Navy says in reference to the necessity for a reconstruction of the personnel of the Navy.

I believe that to be the case; and it was the case in 1854 when precisely the same complaints and difficulties, as I happen to know from personal knowledge, young as I was, were raised in the Navy at that time—exactly the same difficulties that we are told now exist. And I find by looking into the proceedings of the second session of the Thirty-third Congress that, this matter having been called to the attention of the Naval committees of the House and Senate by the Secretary of the Navy, Senator Mallory of Florida brought in a bill from the Senate Committee, and stated then "that the committees of the House and Senate," using the plural number, "had been unable to agree on a large part of the matters submitted to them by the Secretary, but had been able to draw up this bill," for the sole purpose the gentleman now alludes to, namely, to recognize the personnel of the Navy, striking down various naval officers from the rank they were unfitted to carry out and for the promotion of others.

Now, the committee in their report state, in a single sentence, that it is impossible that this matter should be carried out in the ordinary method of proceeding, by a report from the Naval Committee of one House, carrying the bill through one House and then passing it through the other.

I wish to see the personnel of the Navy reconstructed. I wish the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy carried out; but I have not understood yet from a single word, either in his report or the report of the committee, or in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], or of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER], why the ordinary proceedings of Congress should be departed from, and why this should not follow the strict precedents of the second session of the Thirty-third Congress by bringing in a bill from the Naval Committee, either of the House or the Senate.

If these gentlemen will show why it is impossible to do that in the ordinary way, and why we need a joint commission, then I will cheerfully vote for their recommendation. I earnestly hope that something will be done to remove what I recognize as existing defects in the personnel of the Navy, but I do not see why, after forty years, we should vary from the precedent of the Thirty-third Congress, established before the late unpleasantness.

Mr. COOMBS. Was not there a report made in the Thirty-third Congress that it was impossible for the two committees to agree?

Mr. EVERETT. They could not agree upon many of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary of the Navy, but on this particular point, of reconstructing the personnel of the Navy, they were enabled to introduce a bill from the Senate committee and have it carried.

Mr. CUMMINGS. If there had been a joint committee of investigation, would they not have agreed?

Mr. EVERETT. I am sure I do not know. I only know that there was not a joint committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Is it not more probable that they would have agreed if there had been a joint investigation?

Mr. EVERETT. I can not say as to that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now, the gentleman's argument is just this: He wants the Naval Committee of the House to enter into an investigation of this subject, and then he wants the Naval Committee of the Senate to go through a separate investigation of their own. This would give us two investigations and two separate reports, one in each House. The same object can be accomplished by an investigation by a joint committee of both the Senate and the House. It is proposed that this joint investigation shall not cost the Government one cent, and still the gentleman opposes it.

Mr. EVERETT. I yielded for a question and not for a speech. I beg to state that I have no doubt there are many cases in which a joint committee of the two Houses would carry through a matter much better than we do in the present way; but we have the present way, the regular course of legislation, which we adopt in all our proceedings, and which was adopted for this particular end in 1854; and I am unable to see any reason why we should vary from the regular course of legislation, even if it should be more expeditious.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MEYER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to state the result of the action in 1854, to which the gentleman refers us. It made a settlement which did not settle. Since that settlement the trouble between the line and staff of the Navy has occurred. It has rent the personnel of the Navy in twain. They did not settle the question. On the contrary, they split the thing wide open; and the reason why we ask for this joint committee to-day is to make an effort, after an investigation, to settle this difference between the line and staff of the Navy, and give us a navy that will be far more useful than our present Navy is to-day. The Secretary in his annual report says that such action is vitally material.

Mr. COOMBS. There is no use having ships without officers.

Mr. MEYER. I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the committee report the pending resolution to the House with a favorable recommendation?

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. I think we ought to have a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 96, noes 8.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, a quorum has not voted.

The Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MEYER and Mr. KILGORE.

The committee divided; and before tellers reported,

The CHAIRMAN said: The morning hour having expired, the committee will rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that that committee, having had under consideration concurrent resolution House Mis. Doc. 39, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADMISSION OF UTAH.

The SPEAKER. There is a special order.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill H. R. 352.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill H. R. 352.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if there be no objection, I move to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. TRACEY. I object.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the title of that bill was not understood.

Mr. TRACEY. Let us hear what the bill is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The title was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. TRACEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Do I understand that the gentleman from Alabama and I are to control the time?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I am willing to divide it with the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Alabama, and the Chair now understands the gentleman to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Yes, sir; and the time on the other side will be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. KILGORE. I do not want to put myself in the attitude of having to submit to any control about the time, as I am here——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Alabama yielded to the gentleman from Texas for one hour.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Yes, sir; or for such time as he may desire.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not understand that the gentleman from Alabama is to control the time in favor of the bill. As I understand——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Unless the gentleman from Texas will take control of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. The gentleman from Alabama made a minority report and I made the majority report. I do not want any disagreement——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It is true the gentleman from Alabama prepared a minority report upon certain provisions of the bill, but upon the general purpose of the bill we are together.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, sir; it is all right.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from Texas should control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama appears to be under the impression that he controls the entire time. Has there been any such agreement in the House?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS] will control the time against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any such agreement as that made in the House?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. There has not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then such an understanding would hardly be permissible in committee. The Chairman of the committee would have to recognize gentlemen as they rise.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I do not think it is important. The gentleman from Texas takes the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Then I shall go on with the discussion of the bill, and I shall not consume much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. For such a time as he desires, or to control the bill.

[Mr. KILGORE withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, if the bill now before the House admitting the Territory of Utah as a State in the Federal Union is to pass and become a law, I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the minority of the committee will be incorporated in it. I refer to the amendment in relation to polygamy, which is as follows:

The constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, except as to Indians not taxed, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide, by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State—

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship. But said constitution shall prohibit polygamy or dual marriage, and polygamy or dual marriage shall be declared by such a constitution to be felony and punishable by any of the courts of said State of competent jurisdiction by inflicting a fine of not less than $1,000 or more than $5,000, and confinement in the penitentiary for not less than one year or more than five years.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] has addressed this House for an hour, and that hour has been devoted to an attempt to establish the fact that the Mormons in the Territory of Utah have abandoned the practice of polygamy. He has quoted President Harrison as an authority upon that point. Let us see. I have a faint memory of a speech which President Harrison delivered at Salt Lake City in that magnificent tour of the country which he made in which he made a number and variety of addresses perhaps unequaled by any President since John Quincy Adams.

I say I have a faint memory that President Harrison on that tour made a speech at Salt Lake City, in which he said to the assembled Mormons that he believed "in one and only one uncrowned queen in every American home," and I am inclined to think that that remark had some application to the state of things existing in Utah at that time as seen by President Harrison.

I also desire to call attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] to the following significant remark in the report of the minority of the committee:

The Delegate from Utah was invited to be present, and amendments were made at his suggestion, and, as the committee understood, he was perfectly satisfied with all parts of the bill except that part which prohibited polygamy.

And I will refer to this subject later on.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to stand in my place and say that I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to admitting the Territory of Utah as a State in the Federal Union. I have a brother (a Gentile) who lived two years in Salt Lake City, and I think I have some inside information about Utah.

To be sure, it has the requisite wealth and population, but in my judgment, and from what I can learn, the character of the population and the character and practices of the Mormon Church, to which a majority of its citizens belong and to which they owe their first allegiance, unfits that Territory and its people to become members of the Federal Union.

The history of Mormonism from the time that Brigham Young made his pilgrimage and located, what he chose to style the Church of the Latter-Day Saints, on the shores of the Great Salt Lake down to a very recent time has been a history of superstition, licentiousness, murder, and crime that is a disgrace to civilization, and one of the foulest, blackest blots on the pages of history.

The Mountain Meadow massacre, the doctrine of "blood atonement," the damnable crimes of the "endowment house," the doctrine of plural marriages, the persecution and wholesale murder of apostates and Gentiles who resisted or denied the authority of the Mormon Church, the crimes of the "Danites" or "destroying angels," a band of bloodthirsty assassins employed to execute the will of the Mormon Church, are all mat-

ters of history and fresh in the memories of the living generation.

But, says the gentleman from Texas and say the supporters of this bill, the Mormon Church has changed, has abandoned polygamy. Well, if they have, I propose for one that they shall "do works meet for repentance" for a term of years longer, and until the Gentile Protestant Christian element in that Territory and the opponents of Mormonism, either by uniting with some other Territory or otherwise, shall become a majority, and be able to control the Legislature of the new State which is to be formed. Otherwise I am fearful that when the State shall be fairly inside the Union, the president of the Mormon Church, the successor of Joe Smith and Brigham Young, will have another revelation, reëstablishing the "destroying angels," the "blood atonement," the "endowment house," and polygamy.

Mr. Speaker, I have no confidence in either the honesty or the sincerity of the recent professed change of sentiment on the part of the Mormon leaders in regard to the subject of polygamy. Unless my information is faulty, the damnable crimes of the "endowment house" are still perpetrated in secret, polygamy has only been temporarily abandoned, and the persecution, ostracism, and bad treatment of Gentiles, especially of Christian teachers sent among them, continues.

Unfortunately, I left at my hotel a clipping which I have from the Salt Lake Tribune, and which I will ask permission to incorporate in my remarks, giving an account of the recent outrageous treatment of two female Protestant school teachers in the Mormon kingdom—outrageous and shameful treatment, I say, and apparently justified by the Mormon authorities. At least, the perpetrators of these outrages were never prosecuted.

Then, there is another serious objection to the admission of the Territory as a State. Probably there is not a Territory or State in the country so largely peopled by those who have absolutely no knowledge of our country, of its laws, of its institutions, and what should constitute a free State in the great Republic.

Not an inconsiderable part of the inhabitants of this Territory are the dregs of European governments, gathered in hordes by the Mormon missionaries in Europe and ticketed through from Liverpool, Berlin, Vienna, and Stockholm to what they are led to believe is the modern Zion, the New Jerusalem, and a land flowing with milk and honey.

And while other immigrants to this country become to some extent at least Americanized by their surroundings, no such happy change takes place among the foreign immigrants to this God-forsaken Mormon city.

The Republican party in its earliest conventions denounced the twin barbarisms, slavery and polygamy, and pledged itself to the overthrow of both. The first promise has been redeemed, at the expense of rivers of blood, thousands of lives, and billions of treasure. And, thank God, it is no longer a parody, as it was at the birth of the Republican party, to sing—

> The star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
> O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The twin relic of barbarism, polygamy, still lives. And while it does live and is in the ascendency I can never vote to admit Utah as a State of the Union.

Mr. COGSWELL. All the evidence is against you. The evidence is that it has been exterminated.

Mr. MORSE. What is that?

Mr. COGSWELL. All the record evidence is in favor of the extermination of polygamy in Utah.

Mr. MORSE. Well, Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, has got more faith in the Mormons and their promises than I have. He has some confidence in their promises, and I have none. I would not give a pinch of snuff for the promises of a whole regiment of Mormons, from my brother's experience for two years amongst the people of that Territory.

Mr. COGSWELL. But you preach repentance, and that it is at all times in order. Now, following your preaching, I believe that there are people who do repent and that there are times of repentance. There is every reason to believe that these people have repented.

Mr. MORSE. My colleague is exactly right on one point; I do believe in repentance. I believe in the good old hymn that says—

> While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

But I want evidence of that repentance. I want to know that this Mormon hierarchy has abandoned "blood atonement" for one thing; I want to know that they have abandoned the despicable crimes of the "endowment house," which have been committed by them in times past. I want to know and be sure of the fact that they have abandoned polygamy, and I am not prepared to take their statements unsupported by evidence. Therefore, as I said a little while ago, before I am willing to vote to admit them as a State into the Federal Union, I want these people, with their hands reeking with crime, with fingers red with the blood of the Mountain Meadow massacre, to bring forth fruit meet for repentance.

Mr. BRODERICK. They are all dead; that crowd.

Mr. MORSE. I wish they were. But they are not. The United States Government tried, convicted, and took one man back, John D. Lee, and shot him at the point where the crime was committed; and the only misfortune about the transaction is that they executed only the subaltern. They ought to have brought up his superior officers also, whose orders he obeyed, and executed them in the place where the foul crime was committed.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is a large Gentile element inhabiting the Territory of Utah, utterly opposed to the Mormon hierarchy, the Mormon Church, the endowment house, and to polygamy. And in their name and in their behalf I oppose the present admission of Utah as a State.

I predict that if this bill shall pass, and the government of that Territory shall pass from the United States to State and Mormon control, that legislation hostile to the missionaries and teachers and to the non-Mormon residents will be among the first acts of the Mormon Legislature.

Once admitted as a State, once let the Federal Government surrender its control and the power of the Federal Government to right the wrongs of the non-Mormon is lost and lost forever.

Mr. COGSWELL. That is in the bill. The bill provides that their constitution shall make provision that no discrimination shall be made. How can they in view of the enabling act?

Mr. MORSE. I see that in the bill; but my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts knows full well that we have certain amendments—the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth—to the Constitution, that apply especially to certain great sections of the country that are a dead letter, and civil and political rights are denied to millions of our countrymen. He knows that there are members of the House representing constituencies here elected by 1,500 votes when it took 30,000 votes to secure the election of my distinguished colleague. He knows full well how these Mormon people and a Mormon Legislature may paralyze these provisions of the bill, and especially so when the sentiment of a large majority of the people are against it.

Once admit them to statehood and these provisions can be made nugatory, null, and void. I repeat, sir, once admit them as a State, once let the Federal Government surrender the Territory and the power of the Federal Government to right the wrongs committed by the Mormons and protect its citizens in that Territory is lost and lost forever.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see the need for haste about this business. There is time enough in the future to admit Utah as a State. We have already admitted States to the Union for political purposes. And I confess, sir, with shame and mortification that my party is to blame for some of it. Yes, we have admitted States for political purposes, mere mining camps. We have admitted States whose population has decreased within the last decade. There is a State in this Union with two Senators and one Representative on this floor that has less than one-quarter of the population contained in my district alone. I say we have had enough of that business. There is no haste about admitting more States.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Is it not as big as Delaware?

Mr. MORSE. Not in population, I think.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I mean in representation. Delaware has but one Representative.

Mr. MORSE. What is the population of Delaware?

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. Well it has a population two or three times the size of the State I refer to.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. She was one of the original thirteen, however.

Mr. MORSE. Delaware has a right in the Union as a State; a mining camp has not. Rhode Island, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, has a right in this Union beyond that of a mining camp. Rhode Island and Delaware were in at the birth of the Union; they won their place in the great Federal Union by sacrifice of blood and treasure in the great cause of liberty in the war of the Revolution.

Mr. Chairman, Rhode Island and Delaware are both symbolized in the original stars of the flag that hangs over your head, whose folds, set with blue, signalize the starry firmament of God. I say Delaware and Rhode Island, which were among the original States that fought for the independence of this country, have rights that no mining camp can have.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. We did not have any chance to be in that fight. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Well, I am not finding fault with the gentleman from Washington because he was not born at that time.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The gentleman ought not to complain of States west of the Missouri River because we did not take any part in the revolutionary war.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. After all, is not the objection which the gentleman has to this bill caused by the fact that it allows another Western State in the Union a representation upon the floor of Congress? Is it not that instead of polygamy that he is objecting to?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from South Dakota does me an injustice. I do not really believe he means the insinuation which he makes by that remark.

Mr. PICKLER. Your late argument would indicate that.

Mr. MORSE. No, I beg your pardon. I think I am thoroughly honest and that if it were not for the moral conditions of Utah I would join with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] and every other man on this floor in admitting that State.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman pardon me for another interruption?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The gentleman has spoken very eloquently and feelingly with reference to Rhode Island and Delaware, and their services in behalf of American freedom. But is it not true that they came into the Union in much the same manner that McGregor took a seat at the table? Was it not with the understanding that the head of the table should be wherever McGregor sat, and that they would not consent to anything until they secured a certain amount of representation? Is it not a fact that they demanded two United States Senators for their little bailiwicks, and that they are now complaining of the representation that we have got in the West, and that they would not consent to the adoption of the Federal Constitution until they secured the representation which they now have? Is not that the history of it, or am I mistaken in regard to it?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I believe Rhode Island was one of the last States to consent to the adoption of the Federal Constitution. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WILSON] is correct.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. They were in at the beginning, and they secured the lion's share while they had the opportunity. We are coming in a little late, and are trying to secure a portion of what is left.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I have already given the reasons why I think Delaware and Rhode Island belong in the Union. There was great difficulty about the adoption of the Constitution, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WILSON] knows; and the gentleman well knows that George Washington, the father of his country, said in the Convention which framed the Federal Constitution, when there was great danger that the instrument would be rejected, that if this instrument were rejected he believed the next constitution would be drawn in blood.

I am not here to argue the question of representation in the other end of this Capitol. Our fathers wisely, as it seemed to them, gave to each State in the Union, without regard to its size, equal representation in the Senate of the United States. I believe the men who made the Constitution were as august, and honorable, and patriotic, and wise a body of men as ever assembled on God's green earth; but I do not think there is any justification in that fact for the admission of a State with 40,000 population, which has the same representation in the other end of this building as the great State of New York, or Pennsylvania, or Massachusetts.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Utah has 250,000 population.

Mr. MORSE. I am not making an argument against Utah on the ground of a lack of population.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. What evidence have you as to the moral condition there, as against the testimony from every source, Mormon or anti-Mormon, in the Territory or in the neighboring Territories?

Mr. MORSE. My argument is based upon my want of confidence in the honesty and integrity of the Mormons. I have no confidence in their professions, and I have already pointed out the danger of the Federal Government losing control of this Territory and turning the non-Mormons and Gentiles over to the tender mercies of that Mormon Legislature.

My information in regard to the affairs of Utah, and especially its past condition and practices, is derived from two sources: First, as already stated, I have a brother, who represented a coal-mining company and was a resident of that city for two years; but my second and fullest source of information is a book published by Eliza Young, "The Fifteenth Wife of Brigham Young," who apostatized from Mormonism, escaped from Salt Lake City, and, I think, lectured extensively upon Utah and Mormonism, and in the book to which I have referred gave an exhaustive and detailed account of the religion and practices of the Mormons and Mormon Church, with names, dates, and figures, none of which to my knowledge have ever been controverted or denied.

The statements of this book are believed to be veritable facts and veritable history.

The teaching and preaching of the Mormon bishops, apostles, and elders in the Mormon tabernacle are fully described, and some of this preaching is described as unfit for a pothouse, and so indecent as to make a stone image blush for shame. The crime of the Mountain Meadow massacre and the responsibility of the Mormon leaders for the same, is fully set forth and proven. The murderous assassinations, with dates and particulars, of those disobedient to the Mormon Church by a band of assassins, otherwise known as the "Danites" or "destroying angels," who invariably cut the throats of their victims, are also fully set forth. The doctrine of the blood atonement, by which numerous women had their throats cut by their husbands as a religious sacrifice, with names, dates, and particulars, is also fully described. The conduct and ceremony of the endowment house and the business of sealing plural wives, of which the writer claimed to be an eyewitness on repeated occasions, are also described. Undoubtedly most of the actors in these terrible scenes have answered for their crimes or superstitions at the court of last resort, which includes the father of this infamy, Brigham Young.

I do not charge the present residents of Utah to any extent with sanctioning or countenancing these crimes. While, as already stated, I have grave doubts as to whether or no the practice of polygamy has been wholly and in good faith abandoned, most undoubtedly a change for the better has taken place since the building of the Pacific Railroad and since the large influx of Gentiles to that Territory, and I am inclined to concede that no such crimes or superstitions could ever again obtain such a foothold among the inhabitants of that Territory as did prevail at the time to which I have referred; but that there is an immense amount of superstition remaining, that there is a blind obedience to the authorities of the church, no matter what commands they may give, I insist is still true, and I contend that it is not yet safe, wise, or politic to remove from that Territory the hand of the Federal Government and transer to a Mormon Legislature the making and enforcing of the laws which shall govern that people.

The claim is made here that there is no opposition in Utah to the Territory becoming a State. If that claim is true, there exists there now a very different state of things from what has existed when application has heretofore been made for statehood, when a protest loud and long has come up from the Gentile population against being turned over to the tender mercies of the Mormons, and against having the strong arm of the United States Government withdrawn.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman know that the non-Mormon people out there are a pretty robust set of fellows, and can take care of themselves?

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman from Washington knows there is a very large population south of here that is not able to take care of itself.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. That is a different condition.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. MORSE. They are not able to take care of themselves. That is the condition of those people.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives: I will not trespass upon the House further than to conclude with this remark: I stand in my place and say, in the name of civilization, in the name of virtue and morality and education and religion, in the name of American liberty, in the name of the good name and prosperity of the American Republic, I denounce the proposition to admit the Mormon Territory of Utah as a State in the Federal Union.

Mr. POWERS. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODNIGHT in the chair). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWERS. Is it in order to submit an amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order yet, as the bill is still under general discussion, and until general debate has expired amendments are not in order.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. Chairman, Congress, under the Constitution, may admit new States and shall guarantee to every State a republican form of government. It is not required to undertake for the intelligence, the morality, the sobriety, the peace, or good order, and much less the religion, of the people of a State. The framers of the Constitution absolved the Congress from any such

responsibility. The Territorial form of government is maintained largely at the national expense. In every case it is intended to be but temporary, and exist only until the Territory attains such population and such wealth that the people are able to conduct their own affairs and defray the expenses which are entailed in the administration of the State government.

The experience, since 1789, in the admission of new States indicates fairly well what population, what wealth, a Territory should possess in order to fit it for admission to the dignity of statehood. The actual, as distinguished from the potential, wealth and population have usually been disregarded. Anything like a religious test has been precluded as contrary to the Constitution and the genius of our institutions. So far Congress has not found it necessary to devise a method by which to measure the intelligence, morality, or generally the quality of the population knocking at the door for admission into the Union. Under some circumstances it may not be unreasonable to suppose that the forty-four States, embracing people who have good opinions of themselves, would display some taste as to the qualities and characteristics of the population whom they would be willing to admit into the select circle constituting the sisterhood of the Republic.

As for the people of Utah, I want to say that they shrink from no test not violative of the fundamental principles upon which our institutions rest, which even the most fastidious or exacting can see fit to apply. I propose to demonstrate in every respect the fitness of the Territory I represent for admission into the Union. In population, in wealth, in resources, in knowledge of our institutions, in standard of education, and in all the qualities that make intelligent and progressive citizens the people of Utah are fit for association with the proudest and best of the members of the Federal Union. And after having investigated the characteristics and quality of the people of Utah, and made comparisons of them with the people living in other States and Territories, aye, in the State of Massachusetts, I rise possessed of a knowledge which fills my heart with a just pride in the people whom I have the honor here to represent.

There have been, I believe, six applications made by the Territory of Utah for admission into the Union. The last of these applications was made in 1888. In every former instance those applying were members, generally, of the Mormon Church; and there came here, opposing the admission of the Territory, non-Mormons of Utah and the non-Mormons residing in the surrounding Territories or States. The objections which have been made in former times to the admission of Utah have not been on account of the lack of population or of wealth or resources.

Two questions have been made: First, the existence of a sentiment in the Territory which predominated, and which tolerated the practice of polygamy—a practice generally regarded as repugnant to the civilization and morality of the age; and second, the alleged interference of the Mormon Church in political and civil affairs; and on these two grounds and on these two grounds alone Congress has been reluctant and hesitated to admit the Territory into the Union. In 1888 the case was tried before the Committee on Territories in a very elaborate hearing. Majority and minority reports were presented. The majority in its report uses this language:

> From what has now been stated it is apparent that all the conditions exist in Utah, in a marked degree, necessary to entitle the people of that Territory to have a State government; and it is equally apparent that, by reason of her geographical position, her immense agricultural and mineral resources, her accumulated wealth, and the general intelligence and industrious and energetic character of her people, it is of national importance that Utah should have a State government.
>
> "The objections that are alleged against the admission are:
>
> First. The existence of polygamy.
> Second. The power and the teachings of the Mormon Church on that subject.

It was found in 1882 there were 2,225 adult male polygamists in the Territory of Utah. This report proceeds to say:

> It is not denied by the advocates of admission that polygamy is practiced in that Territory, but they claim that it is not obligatory upon the members of the Mormon Church, that it has been gradually dying out until now there are comparatively few who are living in polygamous relations, and that this few are generally past the meridian of life. They claim that polygamous marriages have ceased to be solemnized, that in the near future polygamy will have ceased to exist altogether, and is even now practically dead, and that it is unjust to deprive the many of political rights because the comparatively few are violating the law in this regard."

Mr. DINGLEY. Was that in 1882?

Mr. RAWLINS. This is the report made in 1888.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the statement based upon the number that were disqualified from voting?

Mr. RAWLINS. The act of Congress that disqualified polygamists to vote or hold office in Utah was passed in 1882. The Utah Commission was appointed, and they prescribed or recommended a test oath, under the operation of which all polygamists were excluded from voting. Female suffrage prevailed in the Territory at that time, and it was reported that about 10,000 males and females were disqualified from voting under the operation of the act of 1882. To be a polygamist a man must have two or more wives, and all the wives were disqualified under the act of 1882. These figures were ascertained by a calculation which showed that there were 2,225 adult males in the Territory of Utah who were polygamists in 1882.

The majority report of the committee in 1888 found that the practice of polygamy had been decreasing. It was claimed then by the representatives of the Mormon people that polygamy had been forbidden by the church, and they asserted that it was no longer in existence and would not revive. The majority gave some credit to that statement. The minority report (presented by Mr. Struble of Iowa) states the objections that were made at that time to the admission of the Territory, which were, the existence of polygamy and alleged church interference.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then, as I understand, the number of persons practicing polygamy at that time was determined solely by the number of persons who were disqualified from voting?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Those who declined to take the test oath?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. But by that method the whole number may not have been ascertained, because there may have been others who did not apply to vote.

Mr. RAWLINS. The gentleman from Maine will remember that it was made perjury to take the oath falsely, and that a man who had been a polygamist in years past and who had more than one wife and had had children born to him of such marriage, could not well conceal the fact. Polygamists were eliminated from the registration lists.

The relation was such that it could not be concealed. Acts of Congress had put the enforcement of the law in the hands of the United States marshal, and numerous deputies and United States commissioners existed throughout the Territory. All the means of ascertaining who were polygamists were at hand, including ample funds for the arrest, conviction, and punishment of offenders.

Mr. DINGLEY. Has my friend any means of ascertaining from any other statistical source within the Territory the number of polygamists in Utah at that time?

Mr. RAWLINS. Another test, I suppose, would be to ascertain the number arrested and convicted. There were some ten people arrested for polygamy during the years of the active enforcement of these laws. They were men who had married after 1882 and within three years next prior to the finding of the indictments. But the statute did not run as against persons who were guilty of unlawful cohabitation. Unlawful cohabitation consisted in this: Where a man, having previously married more than one wife, still held to the relation by associating with the unlawful wife and holding her out to the world as his wife even though there may have been no sexual intercourse.

Such was the definition of unlawful cohabitation given by the Supreme Court of the United States. Men who had married, years before, two wives, and had had children born to them of the polygamous marriage, would perhaps visit the household of the unlawful wife and family in order to provide them with the necessaries of life, and the proof would be made that the man had visited the woman, and that, being her husband, they had associated as husband and wife, and upon the submission of such proof to the jury the man would be convicted of unlawful cohabitation. If we apply as a test the number of people who were arrested and shown to be guilty of polygamy, then there were only ten such arrests and convictions, and, for unlawful cohabitation, less than five hundred. That was the result after years of prosecution and after the exertion of the utmost diligence and zeal in the arrest, condemnation, and punishment of offenders against those laws. The people who in 1888 said that polygamy was practically dead said the truth. We all know that it is the nature of man to be more willing to yield a fact than to concede an error.

The leaders of the Mormon people had for years said to them that this thing had been commanded by the Almighty, and that they would be protected if only they would conform to this tenet or doctrine of their faith. In spite of all the propagandism of polygamy that was brought to bear among the Mormon people from its establishment in 1853 down to the cessation of its teaching in 1887, it even having been urged that this practice was essential to the salvation of the members of the church, there was never but a small percentage of those people who practiced this doctrine, as is shown by official reports which have been made from time to time to the President or to the Secretary of the Interior.

I say that the former applications for the admission of Utah into the Union have been largely made on the part of the Mor-

mon people or the representatives of the Mormon people. I come not here as the representative of the Mormon Church or any other church. I come not here as an advocate of the practice of polygamy, for I believe it is vicious and ought to have been suppressed, as it has been. But I do come here, I am proud to say, as the representative of the people of Utah, irrespective of religion, creed, or politics, and if there is any opposition in that Territory now to the admission of Utah into the Union I have been unable to discover it.

In 1888, as shown by the minority report of the Committee on Territories, we found here advocating the admission of Utah into the Union Hon. John T. Caine, at that time Delegate from Utah, Mr. F. S. Richards, Hon. Mark A. Smith, Delegate from Arizona, and Mr. WILSON of Washington. Those who opposed admission were Governor West, of Utah, E. P. Perry, of Park City, Judges Baskin and McBride of Utah, Hon. FRED T. DUBOIS, Delegate from Idaho.

As it has been intimated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] that the present Delegate from Utah has some sinister motive in advocating the admission of Utah under the bill favorably reported by the committee, I would like to invite his attention to the fact that it is very cheap and easy to stand up and denounce a thing which all around you condemn, when you are in the popular current, when there is nobody opposed to what you say; but the highest evidence of sincerity is that when the current of popular sympathy is against you, you are outspoken in your convictions. I was born in the Territory of Utah; I have witnessed all the stages of its progress and development. And I did not wait until it became popular to say that polygamy ought to be discontinued and that the church ought to take its hand out of politics.

In 1885, at a public meeting in the theater in Salt Lake City, I said to the Mormon people themselves that polygamy must and should be given up, that it would be suppressed, and that they would save themselves much misfortune and suffering if they would acquiesce in the sentiment which so thoroughly prevailed in the nation that it would not be balked or thwarted. I said to those people then and there that the union of church and state in so far as it had existed must cease to exist. And in 1887, when I was invited to participate in the constitutional convention as the chairman of a Democratic club, I said that that club was in favor of the admission of Utah upon these conditions, that the sentiment of the people of the Territory should become predominant in favor of obedience to the law and the cessation of the practice of polygamy, and that the church cease its interference in political and civil matters. I stated that when I was convinced that this condition existed in the public sentiment of the Territory, I would gladly cooperate and do what I could to procure for the Territory admission into the Union.

Now, when those utterances were made they were made in sincerity. In 1885 many of those with whom I had been associated believed differently. I was subjected to some criticism. I recur to that occasion to make this allusion. When any gentleman intimates or hints to me that I have any covert purpose here in advocating the admission of the Territory of Utah in order that polygamy may be revived, I ask him to read the history on this subject. I will compare records with him or anyone.

Mr. MORSE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question right there?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not a fact that prior to the election of the gentleman, the Territory of Utah sent here as their Representative Mr. Cannon, a man who had six wives?

Mr. RAWLINS. No, sir.

Mr. MORSE. How many wives did he have?

Mr. RAWLINS. You mean George Q. Cannon?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. He was a polygamist, was he not?

Mr. RAWLINS. That is ancient history, my friend. Mr. Caine has represented Utah here; he was my predecessor as the Delegate from the Territory. He served here ten years. Mr. Caine is not a polygamist. In 1882 Mr. Cannon, the polygamist you speak of, was excluded from his seat in Congress on account of his polygamy.

Mr. MORSE. But he represented the sentiment of those people all the same, because they elected and sent him here.

Mr. RAWLINS. They elected him in years gone by. I am not denying, my dear friend, that in 1853 or 1860 or 1875 or 1880 polygamy was practiced in Utah. I am not denying that the people of that Territory elected polygamists to office in those old days. But the gentleman does not seem to know that the world does progress. [Applause.] There is nothing under the sun that is not changeable and subject to alteration. And that being so, the gentleman himself had better be careful.

Who was responsible for the education of the men who established polygamy in Utah? I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the men who are responsible for it originally were born, were bred, were educated under the system and civilization of New England. [Applause.]

I tell the gentleman now that the moral sentiment which led to its adoption in Utah, which led to that feature which is obnoxious, and, in my opinion, ought never to prevail, was the outgrowth of that puritanical sentiment which in some of its excrescences in the older days burnt witches, persecuted Quakers, drove out from the community Roger Williams, and later produced the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MORSE. I would like to say to the gentleman that when he says witches were burned in Massachusetts he falsifies history.

Mr. RAWLINS. But, Mr. Chairman, I shall proceed with my argument to state that all of these gentlemen whom I have named, and who were opposed to the admission of Utah as a State in 1888, every one of them now, so far I know, is in favor of its admission. Governor West in his report, which I have in my hand, one of the chief men who opposed it, perhaps more violently than any other, says:

> The practice of polygamy has been abandoned by the church and the people. Polygamous marriages are forbidden by the authorities of the Church. The people or church party has been dissolved, and the conditions existing in the Territory are now in nowise different from those in vogue in the States of the Union.

That is corroborated by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Baskin, who for years fought the church, and came here as a representative to oppose the admission of the Territory into the Union, and now is in accord with what has been stated by Governor West. He is now mayor of Salt Lake City, was elected on political lines, just as is done in other parts of the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, the surrounding States, the non-Mormons in the neighboring States, the people who have lived nearest to the Mormon people and are most familiar with the situation there, who constitute the best witnesses because they have a chance to see and know, and because they judge at their own peril when they so speak, say these people now are eligible to statehood, and that they are in favor of the admission of the Territory into the Union. At the time of the admission of the Territory of Idaho, under the law authorized by its constitution unfriendly to the Mormons—and there is a great body of them in that Territory—all these people were disfranchised and disabled to hold office.

At the last session of the Legislature of Idaho the disabilities imposed upon the Mormon people were, by unanimous vote of the members of the Legislature of both parties, all of them Gentiles, because no Mormon had a seat there, removed, and therefore they have expressed their opinion and belief—the people who will be most liable to be affected by it—that the Mormon people were fit to exercise and be intrusted with all the rights and duties of citizenship under State government. The people of Wyoming and the neighboring States are of the same opinion, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], dealing largely in ancient history, has asked permission to include a clipping from the Salt Lake Tribune, long published in Salt Lake City, of great circulation, which has been supposed to always give expression to the most violent and hostile sentiments against the Mormon people. I have some editorials here taken from the Salt Lake Tribune myself. When I paid a visit recently to the Territory of Utah I announced in an interview published in the Tribune, first, that I would encounter no opposition from home in reaching the immediate enactment of the statehood bill, and that I proposed to come back here and do what I could as speedily as possible to bring about the early enactment of that bill.

It was stated in this interview, as preliminary to it, that every editor in the Territory of Utah is in accord with my views on this subject. The Salt Lake Tribune, on November 19, 1893, published an editorial in which they said they approved of my conduct here and what I proposed to do. On November 17, in an editorial under the title "Let Statehood Come," the editor uses this language:

> On the statehood question, and in urging those in power to continue their their efforts and in promising them no opposition that we know of, we are entirely sincere.

Then there is no opposition to statehood from any quarter amongst those who are most interested—who are vitally interested in the question.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman give the name of the editor of the Salt Lake Tribune?

Mr. RAWLINS. Judge C. C. Goodwin.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Let me ask the gentleman if that paper is not also a Republican journal?

Mr. RAWLINS. It is a Republican paper, and has always been.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And is it not entirely Gentile, that is to say, anti-Mormon?

Mr. RAWLINS. It has always been regarded as a representative of the non-Mormon or Gentile element in the Territory and in the surrounding States and Territories.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman pardon me if I ask him a question?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Is there any reason now existing in the Territory of Utah why there should be an anti-Mormon paper?

Mr. RAWLINS. There is no anti-Mormon paper now. That paper has assumed to speak for the Gentiles of the Territory in the past.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. There is no distinction now in your Territory between Gentile and Mormon papers?

Mr. RAWLINS. There is no distinction The people of the Territory of Utah, in politics, in convictions, in sentiment, in purpose, are like the people of every other State and Territory in this Union.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Another question. Is not your Legislature Republican?

Mr. RAWLINS. I am sorry to say that at present the Legislature is Republican.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I am only assisting the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. I know, you are trying to convert your friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and you have a pretty hard task. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of Washington. No, sir; I deny the soft impeachment. You do me honor overmuch. I can not perform impossibilities. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. Now, if I may be permitted to proceed, the average of the population of the thirteen original States was 236,000. The average of the population of the States which have been admitted since, at the date of their admission down to the present time, is 113,000. Utah to-day has 240,000, all white people, with the exception of 2,000. Three-fourths of them are native-born citizens of the United States. All of them, with the exception of about 3 or 4 per cent, can read and write the English language. The standard of intelligence and education is far above the average of the American people. It is on a dead level with that of Connecticut.

Mr. COCKRELL. How about Massachusetts?

Mr. RAWLINS. Utah has a less percentage of foreign-born people than Massachusetts. One-third of the people of Massachusetts are foreign born. Three-fourths of the people of Utah are native born. We have a less percentage of foreign-born people than Massachusetts, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Washington, Idaho, Oregon, California, or Nevada. Do the foreign people come from the dregs? Why, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] would come to Utah and meet some of the men born, educated, and brought up there, he would feel that he had struck a country in which he was in reality a tenderfoot, and had something to learn. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I have seen some of these Morman immigrants on the wharf in New York and Boston.

Mr. RAWLINS. No; somebody fooled you. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. No, they did not.

Mr. BRETZ. That was not hard to do. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. I say the foreigners who are there come from England, Switzerland, and from Scandinavia. They are sturdy, independent, progressive, and obstinate, too. They are not a servile race. They are not easily dictated to or controlled. They have all the characteristics of the peoples from whom they come; and to transplant a man from one country to another does not change the blood which flows in his veins.

A large percentage of those people classed as Mormons have for years been at heart opposed to the practice of polygamy. They have not yielded to any ecclesiastical dictation because they liked it. Their solidity has been largely due to the situation and to the conditions in which they found themselves. In the enactment of needed legislation to suppress polygamy, in clothing the marshals with most extraordinary and unusual powers, in the zeal to suppress what was conceived to be an outrage upon civilization, the limitations of the law have not always been duly regarded, and jurors have been selected for the purpose of convicting upon the slightest evidence, which would be regarded elsewhere as but a pretense of evidence.

These things have led those people, many of whom were in favor of the discontinuance of the practice of polygamy, to believe that some of their friends were being persecuted; and so long as that condition existed they banded together to shield themselves and their friends from what they conceived to be injustice. The menace which has threatened what they conceived to be sacred to their consciences, and only a question between themselves and their God, led them to think perhaps that they were being persecuted. They are obstinate. Hence it has been that when any question of that kind arose they have stood together, as the people of the South have stood together, as the people of the North have stood together, as any people would stand together.

Now, when polygamy was yielded—as it was in fact yielded in 1887, when that question was eliminated—there was no reason any longer for the Mormon people to stand together.

Mr. BOATNER. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, he said that the people of the South had been standing together for a thing that was probably wrong. Was he referring to the late silver fight? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. I could not have been referring to that, because they did not stand together. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HARTMAN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes.

Mr. HARTMAN. Is it not a fact that the Mormon vote was divided up between yourself and your opponent at the last election, to a great extent?

Mr. RAWLINS. It was.

Mr. PENCE. If the gentleman will permit me, is it not a fact that your competitor for the seat you now hold was the Republican candidate, Mr. Frank Cannon; and is he not the son of the Cannon referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] here awhile ago.

Mr. RAWLINS. He is.

Mr. PENCE. The regular Republican candidate?

Mr. RAWLINS. He was.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman permit another question from the West? If Utah is admitted into the Union as a State, will it dispose of the Ute question and their removal from Colorado?

Mr. RAWLINS. I think we will take the whites and leave Colorado the Indians, if we can get into the Union. [Laughter.]

Now, I am entirely willing to talk over this matter, and I am desirous of answering any question that is pertinent to this issue, that will tend to make plain to the members of this House that Utah is fit to be admitted into the Union.

I was proceeding to state that the population and the education of the people of Utah was such as to entitle them to be admitted into the Union. I desire to say one thing further. Not only is the standard of education high—it is far above the average, as the returns upon that subject will show—but the people of Utah are entitled to more than ordinary credit for that condition, because during the forty years' existence of the Territory not an acre of land, not a dollar in money, has been made by any grant of the Federal Government available for the purposes of supporting education in that Territory.

The schoolhouses have been built, the expenses of maintaining the school system has been borne, wholly by taxes voluntarily imposed by the people upon themselves. For twenty years we have had a university maintained by funds granted by the Legislature out of the Territorial treasury and derived from taxation, under which opportunities were given to obtain the higher branches of learning. Some two thousand or three thousand young men and women have availed themselves of the opportunities afforded by that university, and they have gone out in the Territory and have disseminated the intelligence and knowledge they thus acquired. The man who supposes that there has been no progress in Utah during the last twenty or thirty years certainly does not understand or appreciate the situation. I am not going to defend some of the deeds that were committed in years gone by. Why, outrages have been committed in every community, in every state of civilization.

Mr. HARTMAN. And they did not advocate the burning of people for witchcraft?

Mr. RAWLINS. No. I do not defend the men who participated in the Mountain Meadow massacre. That was an atrocious and cruel butchery.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Which occurred before you were born.

Mr. RAWLINS. No, I was 7 years old then; but I did not participate in it. [Laughter.] Of course the gentleman from Massachusetts, being a Christian gentleman, I suppose, would visit the sins of the parents upon the children to the third and fourth generation. [Laughter.]

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Because he is not a Mormon.

Mr. RAWLINS. I want to say that those who were at the head of that crime were arraigned; some of them were executed; and they are all dead. Speak of any other outrage committed twenty, thirty, forty, or sixty years ago and who was responsible for it; will any gentleman point to any man in Utah who is amen-

able and responsible for any such outrage? As well say that the Senator from Wyoming is responsible for the massacre of Chinamen at Rock Springs; as well say that the people of Louisiana are responsible for the assault upon the Italians who were helpless and imprisoned; as well say that the people over here in Pennsylvania, at the time of the Carnegie trouble—those civilized and intelligent people of Pennsylvania, endowed with all the opportunities and privileges of citizenship of a State—as well say that they are responsible for the acts of the women there who in a moment were transformed into tigresses, gouging out the eyes of the prisoners as they were marched by; as well say that all the people of Pennsylvania are to be held responsible for that as to say that the people of this day and generation in Utah are responsible for any outrages that may have occurred there years ago.

There is less polygamy, as shown by the records in the last ten years, in Utah, made known and which has come to light in proportion to population than there has been in the same time in the State of Massachusetts. [Great laughter and applause.] Now, I know the gentleman will say this, as he did say, that these marriages are solemnized in secret, where nobody can see and nobody can hear.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. RAWLINS. Then how does the gentleman know it. [Great laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. How does the gentleman know that George Washington was the first President of the United States?

Mr. RAWLINS. But the gentleman said that these things took place in secret. As to what takes place in secret, if we should uncover all the misdeeds that are committed in Utah, in Washington, in Massachusetts, what would be disclosed in all its nakedness none but the all-seeing Eye can tell.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Washington State, or Washington city? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. Both. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, there is a presumption when a man is arraigned for crime that he is innocent because the rule is in favor of right conduct, of decency, and of morality. A man who charges to the contrary has the burden of proving it. And the rule is a just one. It has come down as a part of the common law and as an incident of our civilization. When an individual is charged with wrongdoing, the Constitution itself rears about him that bulwark which entitles him to be heard in his defense and presumes his innocence until the contrary is shown. When an entire people is arraigned by any gentleman he certainly ought to be prepared with some evidence to justify what he says. And when a gentleman rises upon this floor as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] did and makes the assertion with respect to the people of Utah, that they are murderers, polygamists, thieves, vagabonds, and is not able to produce one syllable of evidence to justify his statements—when a man who lives 3,000 miles away from them, who is unwilling to accept the testimony of reputable people who live right there among them, unwilling to accept the testimony of the people of Idaho, of Wyoming, unwilling to accept the testimony of decent people who have been in Utah—when a gentleman takes that attitude and has the effrontery to get up here and make such a speech as did the gentleman from Massachusetts awhile ago, he ought to hang his head in shame. [Applause.] He is not worthy to represent a civilized people. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have read the book entitled Brigham Young's Wife No. 15; and she ought to know. [Great laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. Oh, I suppose you have read some fictitious and fanciful tale.

Mr. MORSE. Not fictitious at all. It is the book of Brigham Young's wife No. 15, and it tells what took place in the endowment house. I guess she knows what was going on there. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. Where did you get "Wife No. 15?"

Mr. MORSE. It is a book which has had a circulation of 50,000 or 100,000 copies.

Mr. RAWLINS. Oh, my friend, I am not going back to discuss those questions with you. I am not going to deny that Brigham Young had ten wives, or thirteen wives, or fifteen wives.

Mr. MORSE. Then, do not accuse me of falsehood or tell me to hang my head in shame when my statements are truth and history. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. That is not the statement you made in your speech. The statement you made applied to the people living in Utah to-day. Brigham Young is dead; did you know that? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Did he have to go out of doors to die in the bosom of his family? [Laughter and confusion in the Hall.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I object to this proceeding. I raise a point of order upon it. Brigham Young was born in Vermont. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAWLINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to proceed, I would like to do so for a few moments without interruption. A case was tried in Idaho about 1886 in which a large number of witnesses were called who testified that polygamy in that Territory as early as 1884 had been forbidden by the church. Testimony was given in a case in the spring of 1888 that in Utah the Mormon authorities had in reality forbidden the practice of polygamy or the contraction of polygamous marriages as far back as 1886, and that after that time the practice had not existed. In 1888 the Legislature of the Territory of Utah passed what is entitled "An act regulating marriages." It will be found in 2 Compiled Laws of Utah of 1888, page 92. The second section of that act provides that marriage is prohibited and declared void where there is a husband or wife living from whom the person marrying has not been divorced.

That declares polygamous marriages unlawful. The act provides for the issuing of licenses by the clerk of the court to persons proposing to be married. Such licenses can only be issued to persons who are known; or, in case the persons are unknown, they are required to make affidavits that their status entitles them to marriage, and a false affidavit is made perjury, punishable as such.

The act designates the persons who shall be authorized to solemnize marriages, and then it provides that any such person who knowingly solemnizes a marriage under conditions not authorized by the act shall be punishable by imprisonment not to exceed three years, and by a fine.

That is a law which in effect renders polygamy unlawful, and provides for the punishment of any person who practices it or who participates in the solemnization of a polygamous marriage, and that, be it remembered, is an act passed by the representatives of the people of Utah at that time.

In 1892 a statute was passed, to be found in the session laws of Utah for that year, the first section of which provides as follows:

> Every person who has a husband or wife living, who hereafter marries another, whether married or single, and any man who hereafter simultaneously or the same day marries more than one woman, is guilty of polygamy, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 and by imprisonment for a term of not more than five years. But this section shall not extend to any person by reason of any former marriage whose husband or wife by such marriage shall have been absent for five successive years and is not known to such person to be living and is believed by such person to be dead, nor to any person by reason of any former marriage which shall have been dissolved by a valid decree of a competent court, or any person by reason of any former marriage which shall have been pronounced void by valid decree of a competent court on the ground of nullity of the marriage contract.

The next section provides the punishment for unlawful cohabitation of a man with any other than his lawful wife—makes it a misdemeanor. Those laws are to be continued in force under the provisions of the bill which is favorably reported by the Committee on Territories for the admission of Utah.

The final section provides that all laws in force in the Territory at the time of admission shall be continued in force under the State government.

I understand well enough that there is a sentiment among certain members of the House that there ought to be in the enabling act a provision that the constitution of the State shall make polygamy punishable as a crime. There is no substantial objection to that. In 1888 the people of the Territory of Utah proposed to insert such a provision in their constitution. The only objection that there is to it does not come from the Mormons or from the Mormon people. The Territory has enacted stringent laws for the suppression of polygamy. There are other provisions to which I might refer relating to the methods by which these laws shall be enforced.

Mr. POWERS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether he has any objection to the insertion in the enabling act of a clause prohibiting polygamy?

Mr. RAWLINS. None except what I shall state. I was proceeding to say——

Mr. POWERS. If you will assent to that, you can pass your bill before 5 o'clock this evening.

Mr. RAWLINS. I was going to make a suggestion on that subject. The provision which is proposed by the minority to be inserted in the constitution makes polygamy or dual marriage a felony and provides for its punishment; but it does not define the offense or make any exception. If that provision is inserted in the terms in which it is embodied in the minority report, it could not be in any manner changed or modified by the Territorial Legislature. It is not complete in its definition; it is inaccurate; it would work injustice; it would prevent the enactment of laws by the State which would tend more completely to suppress polygamy and to prevent its revival, if any such thing were supposed liable to happen.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRETZ. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] be allowed to continue his remarks until he has concluded.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAWLINS. I thank the gentleman and the House for their courtesy. I am sorry it has become necessary that I should occupy more than the time allowed under the rule.

(Mr. POWERS advanced to Mr. RAWLINS and showed him a proposed amendment.)

Mr. RAWLINS. I have no objection to that proposition. I was about to suggest that we might insert a clause providing that enactments of the Territorial Legislature for the punishment of polygamy and in relation to marriage should be continued in force: but I am entirely content with the proposition which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] suggests.

Several MEMBERS. Let it be read.

Mr. POWERS. The amendment which I propose is to add after the word "worship" in the nineteenth line, page 4 (which is the clause prohibiting certain things) the following words:

Provided that polygamous marriages shall be forever prohibited.

I understand that the gentleman from Utah assents that this amendment may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is not in order now.

Mr. POWERS. I have suggested this provision for the reason that it occurs to me the amendment proposed by the minority of the committee is altogether too cumbersome; there is too much machinery about it.

The CHAIRMAN. At the proper time the amendment can be submitted.

Mr. RAWLINS resumed the floor.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Utah this question: Is it not a fact that the provisions of this bill, if adopted, will carry into effect the Territorial laws until the Territory becomes a State, which will effectually suppress polygamy until the Legislature can meet?

Mr. RAWLINS. The present enabling act as proposed contains a provision which I was about to read. This provision of the enabling act, as proposed by the committee, is that—

All laws in force made by said Territory at the time of its admission into the Union shall be in force in said State, except as modified and changed by this act or by the constitution of the State.

Now, the laws to which I have referred, enacted by the Territorial Legislature, will by the operation of this provision of the enabling act be continued in force under the State government. It is true that the Legislature of the State might if it saw fit repeal or modify those statutes, but polygamy would be unlawful. Polygamous marriages would be invalid, by force of these Territorial statutes upon the passage of this enabling act, without any provision in the constitution or in the enabling act other than what I have read providing against polygamy.

The objection which I have, as I have already stated, to the definition of the offense of polygamy in the constitution is that if that provision be adopted by Congress it will leave the matter in an unsatisfactory condition, for the reason that it will repeal, for instance, the statutes that I have read enacted by the Legislature of the Territory; because the definition of "polygamy," as contained in the amendment of the minority, is inconsistent with these statutes. It rather tends, in my judgment, to prevent the exercise of the full authority on the part of the State of powers to prevent any revival of this obnoxious practice, and we do not intend—the people of Utah do not intend, in my belief—that it shall be revived.

There is, I think, nobody in the Territory at this time who has any desire whatever to revive it. The leaders of the Mormon Church have solemnly professed and pledged their faith and honor and the faith and honor of the people—the entire people of the Mormon Church—that they will not revive this practice. They did it in the petition for amnesty addressed to the President, and all the leading Federal officials in the Territory joined in a statement that they believed these men were sincere in asking the President to exercise his clemency in their behalf in accordance with the petition.

There have been no Mormon polygamous marriages in Utah, so far as known, within the last eight or ten years, with few exceptions, and the public declaration of the Mormon Church is that there has been a discontinuance of the practice. The Legislature has enacted every law required for the prevention of the revival of the practice, and in view of these facts no provision is necessary, in my judgment, although I am willing to consent that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Vermont, which has been read, may be adopted.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RAWLINS. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Does not the bill now before the House change the law as to the registration of voters; and if so, please state in what particulars?

Mr. RAWLINS. It only changes it to this extent: The same method of registration as now provided will prevail. Under the existing statute a man to be entitled to register or vote is required to take oath that he will not commit fornication, adultery, and various other crimes. It is an exceedingly obnoxious and offensive test to apply to any man.

It is an insult to any respectable citizen. Everybody, in fact, is now entitled to vote. If there are any polygamists there they are entitled to vote under the amnesty proclamation of the President; and to continue that obnoxious provision of the Edmunds-Tucker act would be of no use whatever to the people who desire to get rid of it, but would be a continuation of an offensive provision which they seek to have repealed. It is a sort of test oath of the most obnoxious character enacted by Congress to meet an extraordinary situation which has passed away, and we seek to eliminate it. That is the only effect of the change.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Do I understand the gentleman to state that its removal will actually make no difference in the registered vote of the population?

Mr. RAWLINS. Not at all.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RAWLINS. Certainly.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Suppose the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont is put into the bill: could it be enforced without legislation on the part of the Legislature? In other words, would the constitution itself be a penal statute, the violation of which could be punished, without an act of the Legislature?

Mr. RAWLINS. Certainly not.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Therefore, any prohibition of that kind would be dependent on the State Legislature and its action afterwards?

Mr. RAWLINS. After all, no matter what you require to be inserted in the constitution respecting polygamy, you have got to depend on the sentiment of the people of the Territory of Utah to prevent the revival of the practice.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Just the same as any other State.

Mr. BOEN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RAWLINS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BOEN. I have heard it stated that the opposition to polygamy is more prevalent amongst the women than the men in Utah. Is that true?

Mr. RAWLINS. I have nothing on that question that would be of service to the House.

Upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS], I would like to add this other answer, that his amendment would be irrevocable under the provisions of this enabling act without the consent of the United States and the people of said State.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. But is not the statement you made still true, that no matter what clause is put in the enabling act, in regard to the practice of polygamy, its enforcement must depend entirely upon the people in the end, upon the legislation enacted by the Legislature after the Territory shall become a State and the judges elected by the people of that State after it is a State? Is it not true that the enforcement of the law must depend entirely upon the judges and upon the sentiment of the people backing up the administration of the law?

Mr. RAWLINS. Oh, yes; it must depend upon the sentiment of the people.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And therefore this is unnecessary.

Mr. RAWLINS. My contention is that it is unnecessary. I am not going to admit the unfitness of the people I represent to be admitted into the Union by saying that it is necessary. If I believed that it were necessary, I am free to confess that I would not stand here advocating the admission of the Territory into the Union. It is not necessary. The sentiment out there contravenes it.

Now, the people of Utah have more at stake upon this question than gentlemen who represent other constituencies. I have traveled among those people, met them in every locality, discussed questions with them, civil and political. I know them as well as any man can know a people, because I have been with them all my life. I think I understand the sentiment which prevails among those who are uppermost in the councils of the political parties in the Territory, and who would likely dominate its affairs in case it be admitted as a State, and I am prepared to say upon my conscience that I believe those people can be safely

intrusted with the full measure of self-government which would be accorded under statehood.

The people of the East are misinformed as to the character, the education, and the intelligence of the people of Utah. I have in mind more than a hundred young men, born and educated in that Territory, who would grace the administration of any State in this Union on account of their ability, their learning, and their integrity. You will never have occasion to regret this act. By the admission of the Territory of Utah I believe her people—240,000 in number to-day, and probably in three or four years, with statehood, 500,000—will send to these halls men who will not only do credit to the people they represent, but who will be of service in the affairs of this great nation.

For forty-three years I have lived under a Territorial form of government. I have longed for the conditions to come when those people could be admitted within the Union of the States and be permitted to participate in the affairs of the nation.

Generations have passed away under the Territorial form of government. Men who do not live under that form of government little know the disadvantages under which the people labor. Men are sent to them to rule over them who owe them no responsibility, and who little understand their character or their situation; and, however bad may be the conduct of these rulers, it is indeed difficult to make men 3,000 miles away understand or appreciate the situation. How little of self-government is possessed to-day by the people of Utah is disclosed in a memorial, the statements of which, as they are drafted by myself, I know to be accurate. I call attention to some of the statements contained in this memorial:

The governor, the secretary, the members of the judiciary, except justices of the peace, the marshal, the public prosecutor and his assistants, the board of commissioners, who appoint all registration and election officers and control the elections, are selected by a distant appointing power, and are utterly unaccountable to the people for the manner in which they perform the duties of their offices.

The governor nominates the auditor of public accounts, the treasurer, the governing boards of all public institutions, such as the university, agricultural college, reform school, and insane asylum. Thus the people have no voice in the selection of persons to manage the public fund and institutions created and maintained at their expense.

The Territorial school commissioner is selected by the supreme court, and owes no responsibility to the people.

Clerks selected by the district judges and the probate judges appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, select the regular panels for jurors. The regular panel is supplemented by persons summoned at the discretion of the United States marshal. The determination of rights of life, liberty, and property rests with tribunals, no part of which owe any accountability to those most vitally concerned in the faithful performance of their duties. The marshal and his deputies are clothed with the most far-reaching authority, under which they may usurp the functions of all the local constabulary and police of the Territory. Even the justices of the peace are shorn of their limited jurisdiction by commissioners appointed by the supreme court, and whose jurisdiction is made coextensive with that of such justices.

And so we might go on enumerating the different officers concerned in the administration of the Territorial government, which would disclose the fact that the 240,000 people living in the Territory of Utah have scarcely a vestige of the rights of self government.

Now, I am not going to detain gentlemen longer upon this question. Both of the national conventions, in their platforms, have declared in favor of the admission of the Territory. Both the parties in the Territory of Utah have declared for the same thing. There is no opposition from that source. Everybody most familiar with the facts believe that the time has arrived when the people of the Territory of Utah should be admitted into the Union.

As I stated before, I believe there is absolutely no peril, so far as any apprehension entertained by anybody on the subject of polygamy, that that practice will ever under any circumstances be revived in that Territory.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I have canvassed this bill, and I see in it large appropriations of land, amounting to something like 1,400,000 acres. I desire to ask whether Congress has heretofore, when a new State has been admitted, granted any such donation of land as that disclosed in this bill?

Mr. RAWLINS. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question, because it enables me to state some facts upon that subject that will be of use to this House in voting upon this matter. There are, as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] in the opening argument upon this question, 52,000,000 acres of land in the Territory of Utah. The land office in that Territory was established in 1867. From 1867 down to the present time there has been disposed of 6,000,000 acres of land. The total area of the Territory which has been surveyed is about 12,000,000 acres. The total, covered by grants for railroads and other purposes, of the surveyed and unsurveyed lands which have been appropriated amount to less than 22,000,000 acres of land, leaving 31,000,000 acres of land wholly unappropriated and undisposed of.

These lands have during the past thirty or forty years been offered by the Government of the United States to anybody who was willing to go upon them and appropriate them and pay for them at the rate of $1.25 per acre. The people of this country have been clamoring for lands, but the fact is that these lands are mountain or desert lands. Some of them are lands which might be useful if they could be irrigated; but there is no water supply. In the Territory of Utah lands are wholly useless without water. These unappropriated lands would not to-day sell for 10 cents an acre. The 6,000,000 acres of land which have been entered under the land laws were settled upon prior to the extension of the public surveys over those lands. Under the law where the settlement is made prior to the extension of survey and the settlement happens to be made upon a school subdivision, when it comes to the selection of the school lands, which only takes place upon the admission of the Territory into the Union, other lands must be selected.

If we take the 6,000,000 acres, very little of these lands is available for school purposes. If we take the 12,000,000 acres the same is also true. My friend from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] states that there is granted one-ninth of the 52,000,000 acres, which is about 6,000,000 acres for school purposes under the provisions of this act. Now, that is not true. The grant for school purposes only takes effect as to the surveyed land or as the lands are surveyed. One-ninth of 12,000,000 would 1,570,000 acres of the surveyed lands. That is all that could be available at present, and much of these lands is excluded because settled before their survey.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do I understand you to say that if you take the relative values of the land proposed to be granted there to the lands granted to the other States, there is not much difference?

Mr. RAWLINS. It will give to Utah less in value than has been given to any State admitted into the Union of States. Objection has been made also that there is in this enabling act a grant of 10 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of lands through the land offices for school purposes of the Territory. There have been 6,000,000 acres, or about $1,400,000, derived for all the land disposed of during all of the past history of the Territory. If we get 10 per cent of all disposed of, that would only give $140,000. Under this act we get only 10 per cent of the lands that will be hereafter disposed of through the land offices: that is a mere bagatelle and can be stricken out of the bill with little or no detriment to Utah.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I see from the bill that sections No. 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township are to be appropriated to the State; how many townships are there in Utah containing public lands? In other words, how many acres will the State get under this provision?

Mr. RAWLINS. The gentleman can figure that out. I dislike to detain the committee any longer upon this question.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I simply desired to get at that as a business proposition.

Mr. RAWLINS. Well, there are 31,000,000 acres of land undisposed of, which have been offered by the Government of the United States for thirty years past at $1.25 an acre, but nobody would take them. They are not worth 10 cents an acre, and if the school lands are to be selected out of those, the total grant made to the Territory by this act will amount to very little.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I would like to know the amount.

Mr. RAWLINS. Well, one-ninth of 50,000,000 is somewhat less than 6,000,000 acres.

Mr. PICKLER. You are to have four sections out of every township. The new States recently admitted got the sixteenth and the thirty-sixth sections, two sections out of thirty-six, but you are to get four sections out of thirty-six?

Mr. RAWLINS. That is it. But if you look at the substance of the thing——

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, I think you ought to have it. That land is not worth anything to anybody else.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Can the gentleman tell us how many incorporated cities there are in Utah?

Mr. RAWLINS. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. Formerly, under the general preemption law of the United States, lands within the corporate limits of a city were not subject to private entry. The cities in Utah covered large areas of land under the original acts of incorporation.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. How many of them are there?

Mr. RAWLINS. I can not tell you; but that provision of the statute has been corrected, and, by an act of Congress passed in 1877, only so much land is now excluded from entry in any city as is actually settled upon and used for town purposes.

All the other lands within the old original corporate limits have been entered and the titles have passed to individuals. There is no monopoly of land in Utah. The average size of farms

there is 27 acres, according to the census returns. There are perhaps more people own their own homes in Utah than in any other State or Territory in the United States in proportion to population. You can not find a single individual there, as in California and elsewhere, holding thousands of acres of land. I do not know of a single man in Utah who holds to exceed 200 or 300 acres. There is no corporation or syndicate there controlling large blocks of land, except the Union Pacific Railroad, through the land grant made to it by the Congress of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that a change has taken place in Utah. How that change has been brought about may be interesting to gentlemen who are not familiar with its history. The making and the enforcement of laws by Congress has had something to do with it. There is no question about that. But there has also been developing for many years past in the Territory of Utah a sentiment among the people who have been born and brought up there, which has had a great deal to do with this change. The eradication or discontinuance of polygamy is perhaps due first to external pressure, but still more largely to the efforts of people within the Mormon Church itself to bring about the reform of the organization in that respect.

It should be borne in mind that but a very small proportion of the Mormon people have ever practiced polygamy. Those who did not practice it saw the evil consequences which flowed from its practice, the unhappiness which it caused in families, and that it rendered the people of Utah obnoxious to the prevailing sentiment of the age. Its practice disturbed the tranquillity, impeded the progress, retarded the growth, darkened the character, and destroyed the prosperity and happiness of the people.

Thousands of non-Mormons have come into Utah and made their homes there. Our schools are free; attendance is required; they are nonsectarian. Education has been freely disseminated. Under such conditions, polygamy having once been suppressed or extirpated, is not likely to be revived.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there has been any revelation on the subject of polygamy recently; or does the head of the church claim there has been?

Mr. RAWLINS. The Mormon people claim that their duty with reference to the practice of polygamy has been defined by a revelation. The present president of the Mormon Church on the 26th of September 1890, issued a manifesto in which he forbade the Mormon people from contracting marriages in violation of law. At a great conference of the Mormon people, ten or fifteen thousand being present, embracing all the various organizations of the church, it was moved that this declaration of the president of the church be regarded by the church as authoritative and binding; and that motion was unanimously adopted by the vote of that great congregation.

The elders of the Mormon Church got up and said that this came to the people with all the force of a revelation, and was binding upon them; and many of the Mormon people have testified in court when occasion has arisen when such testimony would be relevant; that they regard that as a revelation from Almighty God; that they no longer believe polygamy and its practice to be right; and in effect it is not only discontinued as a practice, but so far as the great mass of the Mormon people is concerned it is eradicated as a belief. But the people of Utah—I think I can speak for them on this question—mean, I believe, what they say. They are engaged in no scheme of fraud or treachery by which to deceive the nation. Having made this pledge and on this pledge asked this action by the American Congress, I think I can say for them that they will stand by it though the heavens fall.

Gentiles and Mormons associate so freely that you can not distinguish them. They act together in business transactions and in all the associations of life. You find them mingled in social circles, just as you find people intermingling elsewhere throughout the United States; and measuring man for man you can not tell one from the other. My friend from Tennessee, when he was recently out there, had an opportunity of meeting many of the people of all classes; they came to see him; and for the life of him he could not have pointed out which were Mormons and which Gentiles, although he might perhaps have been able to distinguish the Jews.

We have the most beautiful towns and cities upon the American continent; we have schools, school buildings, and school appliances; we have cultivated school teachers who would do credit to many of the old communities of this country. If there is any reason on earth why Utah should longer be kept out of the Union, I am unable to conceive it. I ask the vote of this House that Utah may be speedily admitted. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HARTER obtained the floor.

Several MEMBERS. Let us adjourn.

Mr. HARTER. If the House prefers to adjourn——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I wish to state that we are compelled to close this debate to-night, because we must finish the bill by half past 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. DINGLEY. The debate can not be closed to-night.

Mr. HARTER. If it is the pleasure of the House to adjourn, I shall certainly not stand in the way. [Cries of "Go on!"]

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I do not think we can get through the bill to-morrow if we adjourn now. If we do, several gentleman will lose their opportunity to speak.

Mr. DINGLEY. There will be no trouble about getting the bill through to-morrow.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly accommodate myself to the circumstances and to the humor of the House; and by making my remarks brief, I will leave ample opportunity for those to speak who choose to follow me.

I am very well aware that the temper of this House will finally show itself by a vote in favor of the admission of Utah into the Union. Nevertheless, I do not hesitate to ask a little of the time of the House in order that I may present briefly, and I hope with reasonable clearness, my objections to the measure. They are not based upon the grounds which have been so far urged here to-day against the bill.

I recognize, as every man on this floor must recognize, in the specimen that Utah has sent here as her representative, that her manhood is fully upon a parity with the manhood of the States already in the Union. If there were only enough such men as the gentleman who now sits at my right [Mr. RAWLINS] located on the 52,000,000 acres of land he speaks of, I should not only not object to their admission, but should be the earnest advocate of bringing Utah into statehood.

I believe also that the average population of Utah is of a more than ordinarily high grade; and I do not exclude from this characterization even those men who heretofore have been polygamists. As a rule that population is industrious, economical, thrifty, and sober. And therefore it seems to me, in proportion to numbers, there are possibly few of the older States which can claim for themselves a population of greater enterprise, of more general intelligence, or one more thrifty, more energetic, more industrious, and therefore better fitted for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship, than are the people of the Territory of Utah.

Nor, sir, do I object either to the peaceable condition of Utah. I believe life is just as safe within the borders of Utah as it is in the State of Ohio. I believe it is much safer than in many of the other States of the Union, and in many portions of the other States that have been in the Union ever since the Federal Constitution was adopted. Therefore, this is not the ground of my objection, for I believe also, there is less danger of anarchy or disorder in the State of Utah, if admitted, than in many of the larger States, and I doubt very much whether Utah would ever elect, if admitted as a State, a governor who would be as much in sympathy with anarchy and disorder as is the governor of one of the principal States of this Union. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POST. What State?

Mr. HARTER. I refer to the great State from which my esteemed colleague from Illinois comes. I am sure, sir, there will never be a governor of Utah elected who will propose to march to the Capital of the United States with the blood of those who disagree with him reaching to his bridle bits. I am not afraid of such a condition of things ever existing in Utah. Nor do I sympathize with the objection to her admission that some of the people there practice polygamy. I am not a polygamist myself [laughter] neither practically nor theoretically; but at the same time polygamy is not the objection or any part of the ground of my objection to the admission of Utah. I believe that there is no more polygamy practiced in Utah to a square mile than in Chicago, Boston, or Washington; and I say this, furthermore, that I do not believe in Utah there is one man who has ever had five wives contrary to the law where there are ten in Chicago who have had five or more contrary to the law of God. It does not become us to scandalize Utah or to object to its admission on this ground.

Far be it from me, Mr. Chairman, to object to the admission of Utah on such a ground as this, and if I came from Massachusetts I should be equally chary of objecting on this ground. [Laughter.] I will be very careful about objecting on any such grounds so long as Ohio and other States of the Union maintain on their statute books divorce laws which are an outrage on the men and women in the land and an insult to God himself; and since I come from a State disgraced by such laws I am not here on my feet to object to Utah coming into the Union because there are found people within her borders practicing polygamy. In fact, sir, if polygamy is to be practiced at all I prefer the com-

munity which practices it openly to one which practices it secretly and hypocritically. In other words, practically speaking, I would not draw much of a line of distinction between the polygamy of Utah and the monogamy of some of the older States. I repeat, therefore, that this is not the ground of my objection to the admission of Utah.

But, sir, on the other hand it seems to me that there are good grounds of objection. The admission of Utah as a State has objectionable features. This gentleman sitting on my right [Mr. RAWLINS] represents a Territory having 52,000,000 of acres of land and only 240,000 or 250,000 population, and he asks us to bring in this sparsely settled Territory as a State and plant it beside the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And Rhode Island and Delaware.

Mr. HARTER. Yes, Rhode Island and Delaware. But let me tell my friend they could not come into the Union now. They are entitled to wear the livery of States because they fought their way into the Union during the Revolutionary war.

I do not believe in bringing in any more States having a hopelessly insufficient population. It is not fair to the older States, nor does it give the people of the balance of the country a fair representation in the making of laws or in the election of their Chief Magistrate. I know it has been said that this is a party measure, that Utah will bring us two more Democratic United States Senators. [Laughter.] But this will not justify us, as Democrats, in voting for the admission of Utah. We have seen too much of that sort of partisan action on the part of the Republican party, and always condemned it.

Mr. RAWLINS. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HARTER. Yes.

Mr. RAWLINS. What was the population of Ohio at the time she was admitted?

Mr. HARTER. I am glad the gentleman has asked me the question, and hope the House has heard it. He asks me the population of Ohio when she was admitted into the Union. I can not give him the exact population at this time——

Mr. RAWLINS. I will tell you, then. It was 50,000. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HARTER. Well, gentlemen, as you applaud that sentiment I will wait with my remarks to give you a chance to do it again, because I want to use it for an exclamation point in my argument.

Mr. RAWLINS. What was the area?

Mr. HARTER. I do not remember accurately. I wish you would tell the House.

Mr. RAWLINS. Forty thousand square miles. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Forty thousand square miles. What was the population of the American Union at that time? The gentleman puts into my mouth the argument I wish to use, and he simply helps carry out the theme upon which I have entered. I say that the proportion of the population of Ohio, when it was admitted into the Union, as compared with the total population of the States then in the Union, was more than four times as great as that of Utah to-day. When the population of Utah doubles, if I am here in the House, I shall vote for the admission of Utah to the Union.

Mr. RAWLINS. I suppose you would not give us any room to increase? Now, during the last three years we have added to our population as many people as existed in Ohio at the time of her admission.

Mr. HARTER. That is just what I do not want to do. I am proposing to give you time to increase before you come in. Your admission now, I say, would be unfair, because in the most important affairs of this Government it gives to a sparsely settled population an unreasonable vote and corresponding influence. I appeal to you gentlemen on the Republican side of this House. We have heard you talk much of unfair representation. I know you have not proven it, but the burden of your speeches has been that the Democratic party has opposed fair representation; that one man in the South perhaps has had a vote equivalent to two men in the Northern States.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Four.

Mr. HARTER. See what will result in Utah if she is admitted. The people of that State will have two United States Senators, with just the same vote in the making of laws in the Senate of the United States as the State of New York. Yet New York has a population twenty times as great, and it is proposed to give to this population out there a representation equal to the State of New York. What does it mean? It simply means that by voting for the admission of Utah you vote to give to every citizen of Utah twenty times the power—in making the laws for the people of the United States, in passing upon some of the most important questions which ever came before the National Legislature—as you give to a citizen of the State of New York.

If this was the first case of this kind, the gravity of it would not be what it is to-day. But unfortunately it is not. Already you have in the Senate, at the other end of this Capitol, fourteen such votes; and you know how often they have been cast—I will not say maliciously—because far be it from me to impugn the motives of any Senator—but you know how often those votes have been cast in a way highly detrimental to the interests of the country at large.

Mr. KILGORE. According to your views.

Mr. HARTER. Yes; according to my views.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARTER. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to be interrupted without limit: but I do not know the temper of the House. I feel now that I am occupying more time than I should.

Mr. SIMPSON. The temper of the House is all right.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman from Kansas can ask his question.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in reasoning upon this basis of representation by population, he means to infer that in the system of government under which we are acting our Senate was organized on the idea that it should be representative of population, or do the Senators represent States? Do they not represent States instead of population?

Mr. HARTER. Has the gentleman finished his question?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. HARTER. Then I will say the gentleman is quite right.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman's argument falls.

Mr. HARTER. But the gentleman from Kansas ought to be familiar with the circumstances under which this unfair system of representation in the Senate was granted.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then it is the fault of the system of government, and not the fault of these people who live in Utah.

Mr. HARTER. I am willing to give the gentleman from Kansas all the time he wants.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman ought to remember the circumstances under which this very unfair principle was put into the Constitution of the United States. He ought to know that the States which demanded it stood in a very different position from Utah. They had rights which we of this day can not claim for Utah. The people of those States had shed their blood for the freedom of the country. They were then States capable of self-existence. As a matter of fact, they all had thoroughly organized governments, some of them so thoroughly organized that they were able to erect tariff walls high enough to prevent the productions of their sister States coming within their borders. They refused to come into the Union unless the rights which they then possessed were crystallized into the very unwise, unequal, and therefore unjust representation which we find in the Senate of the United States, where each State, large or small, has an equal voice.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I think they never had a tariff of more than 10 per cent, though.

Mr. HARTER. Excuse me from dipping into the tariff question. We will get enough of that I am sure in the course of a week or two.

Mr. LOUD. How did they stand on the silver question? [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. You asked me how they stood on silver. Some of them even discounted the wildest of your vagaries about silver, for they had money which was cheaper and meaner than even free silver would give us. I recommend you to read the history of Rhode Island in this connection.

My friend from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] interrupted me; and I am glad he did, because it reminds me of his own delectable State. [Laughter.] I feel that we have already gone as far into the experiment of admitting States sparsely settled and wholly unentitled to statehood as we should go. I say let us digest, if we can digest, if the stomach of the Union is strong enough to digest, the infantile States we have admitted into the Union. Let us digest our dinner of new States before we go to supper at the same table. Let us, for instance, get through with such enlightened States as Kansas! Let us have Kansas thoroughly civilized before we undertake any more. [Laughter and applause.]

We remember the action of the Legislature of Kansas during its last session. We recall how they broke the doors down, how they called in the police, and had to call for the militia of the State to keep men from each other's throats, a time when an outsider was not safe within a hundred miles of Topeka without two accident policies and double life insurance. Recalling this to the memory of my friend [Mr. SIMPSON] I say, Mr. Chairman, it is time that we should call a halt in this careless, indiscriminate, reckless, and I fear, in the end, very serious comedy of admitting States into the Union while they are wholly unfit for admission.

The fact that we have already admitted States into the Union

without being properly fitted for it is no argument that we should continue to do it. I know this is the argument used on this floor and by members in private conversation. They say that because we have taken in other Territories having an insufficient population that therefore we must admit every Territory upon whose vast and idle acres a small and scattered population lives. If, however, these gentlemen could but reverse the thing and bring us a proposition that we should take Utah into the Union and let Nevada go out, I think our vote would be nearly unanimous.

Mr. HARTMAN. How about Rhode Island?

Mr. HARTER. Rhode Island bought her place in the Union with her blood.

Mr. HARTMAN. And Delaware?

Mr. HARTER. And Delaware, too. Each fought for their places in the Union. No such appeal can be made for Utah.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Have you any statistics——

Mr. HARTER. You see my friend from Arizona expects his 6 by 7 Territory to come in next. [Laughter.] I am glad he has arisen as an object lesson. He shows that after the Mormon of Utah we are to have the Gila monsters of Arizona for fellow-citizens and lawmakers. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The gentleman will now submit to an interruption.

Mr. HARTER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I want to file this under the same principle of protest against the criticism made of the State of Illinois, by the gentleman for whom I have the greatest feeling of respect personally, when he comes here making an argument based on a naked assumption, based on the question of injury of people entitled to statehood. The whole is a protest against the Constitution of the United States. And then are we going to put it down that no State shall be admitted into the Union until it has as many people as the State of New York has? I ask you where are you going to put the line: and then I will ask you another question. You say Delaware and Rhode Island were admitted into the Union by virtue of the blood they shed for the country?

Mr. HARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Have you any statistics by which you can show that? If that is the question, have you any means by which you can state the number of soldiers furnished by Rhode Island in the Revolutionary war?

Mr. HARTER. No.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Have you any statistics of how many men Utah furnished in the Mexican war and which shed the most blood in that cause? Did you have any of those facts?

Mr. HARTER. I rise to admit that I do not have at my finger ends all the statistics that may exist in the public library; but if the gentleman desires to present these statistics I will move an adjournment of the House so that he may bring them in to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But do not you think it affects your protest against the Constitution?

Mr. HARTER. I am perfectly consistent. I will gladly vote for the admission of Utah to the sisterhood of States when her population comes half as near, in proportion, as the population of my own State did (at the time of its admission) to the population of the Union. Instead of asking more of Utah than the Union asked of Ohio, I am really asking only half as much, and the gentleman stands in a poor light and puts himself in an ungracious position, which is very contrary to his nature, as all know who know him will admit, when he makes such declarations on the floor of this House.

Mr. HARTMAN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HARTER. I am willing, but I do not wish to delay the House.

Mr. HARTMAN. A brief question. Are not the 260,000 people in the Territory of Utah entitled to as many rights as the 50,000 people in Ohio were entitled to when Ohio was admitted as a State?

Mr. HARTER. No, sir; not by any proper rule of proportion. Whenever the people of Utah are entitled to half as many rights, by any fair rule of arithmetical proportion, I shall be willing to grant them not half, but all the rights that the people of Ohio received.

Mr. SIMPSON. When did Ohio get a monopoly of rights in this country?

Mr. POWERS. On the 7th day of last November. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. My answer to the gentleman from Kansas is that Ohio never got, and to her honor she never desired, such a monopoly.

Mr. SIMPSON. It was generally understood that under the Republican national administrations she had a monopoly of the offices; she is the home of McKinley, who is the head and front of the tariff monopoly; and now, if she is going to take a monopoly of all the other rights, we may as well let her run the whole country. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. But if you do, the whole country will be well run, my good friend from——

Mr. SIMPSON. From Kansas.

Mr. HARTER. I was going to say my good friend from China, because I have discovered that the political views which my friend [Mr. SIMPSON] has so eloquently presented to this House from time to time are those which were entertained in China during the eleventh century. In fact, if the House will permit a little digression from the line of my argument, I will state that in reading the history of China with care I have discovered that the Populist idea of government pure and simple, as it is now held by a very intelligent and able fraction of the Representatives on the floor of this House, was understood and that it prevailed in China on two different occasions during the eleventh century; and it is further worthy of remark that upon both those occasions it brought China down to the verge of destruction, and, I may add, they have never tried a third dose of the same medicine. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I presume, if China——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. I yield to the gentleman from China. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I presume that if China had followed up that enlightened policy she would not now be lacking civilization. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, talking about civilization, we shall probably soon have an experiment in civilization not far from my friend's district, perhaps within the boundaries of the district which he represents, for I notice that the governor of his State has just invited all the tramps of America to make their home in Kansas. [Laughter.] Now, I am so liberal that if Utah would only invite the tramps of the country, and by that means would swell her population until it reached a respectable proportion to the population of the Union, I should then be willing to vote to bring her in as a State. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Under the new tariff law the population of Kansas will be pretty large if that invitation should be accepted. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I apprehend that no danger to Kansas will result from that circular if the Ohio people will stay away from us. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. I am sorry to have to admit that a very large proportion of the political population of Kansas did go from Ohio originally, but the errors into which they have wandered only show how easily men can depart from early and correct teachings when they get far away from a mother's knee and hearthstone.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that Kansas produced one man who is well known to the whole country, John Brown, who scared the whole Democratic party and freed the Democratic slaves.

Mr. HARTER. I do not know exactly what John Brown has to do with this question. However, as "his soul goes marching on," he may interfere possibly and potentially, too, in every question of public policy.

Mr. BOEN. What has China to do with it?

Mr. HARTER. I am entirely conscious that owing to frequent interruptions and to the fact that I rose rather unexpectedly to speak, I have not made a very connected argument on this question; and there are still two or three things I wish to state which are worthy of consideration.

It is claimed that the people of Utah will prosper more, will grow more rapidly under a State government than they have been doing under Territorial government. This is a proposition entitled to investigation. It ought to be fairly considered. If this handful of people in Utah will be very much blessed by admission—if we can create for their benefit a kind of paradise—if we can give them the millenium far in advance of the time they would be likely to get it otherwise, by admitting them into the Union and in doing so deprive the State of New York and other States of their proportionate representation, it is a matter which ought to be considered.

But the question is how much of an advantage it is going to be to the people of Utah if their Territory should become a State of the Union. Although they seem to think that they would grow more rapidly in population under a State government, I say that the facts in regard to the new States which have been recently admitted, will not sustain this assumption. I ask you gentlemen, when you go home, to look at your Tribune Almanac, or some other reliable almanac—the World Almanac, for instance, or the United States census, which is possibly not quite so reliable as either of them—and you will discover that the seven States which have been last admitted to the Union have

been growing in population more slowly since their admission than they did under a Territorial form of government.

I do not know why this is so unless possibly for the reason that government by the United States conduced more to their prosperity, gave them greater security and peace, than government by themselves. But whatever may be the reason, I say that the States to which I have referred, now represented at the other end of the Capitol by fourteen Senators—a representation out of all proportion to their population—have grown less rapidly since they came into the Union than they did while they were Territories. The population of these small States has not increased as much since their admission to statehood as the natural physical increase reasonably to be expected from those who live honorably in the married state.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The gentleman will recollect that they have been under Republican rule. That is the trouble.

Mr. LOUD. How can the census show what the gentleman says when a majority of these States have been admitted to the Union since the last census statistics were collected?

Mr. HARTER. Sometime ago—for a purpose which I can not distinctly recall at this moment, but something in connection with the interests of the silver States, compared with some of the older States of the Union—I carefully prepared a table intending to use it on the floor of the House; but not having occasion to do so I do not know where it is. That table, however, shows the facts as stated—I am familiar with these new States, but I was astonished beyond measure at the results that table revealed. Therefore, in admitting these people into the Union we are not conferring upon them any very great advantage; we are simply injuring ourselves beyond remedy without giving them any compensatory blessing.

I listened with interest to portions of the memorial which my friend from Utah read. I admit that the restrictions there recited upon the people of Utah are unreasonable. They show that the principle of "home rule" is not recognized as it ought to be with reference to this Territory. There is no reason why the governor of Utah should appoint those Territorial officers, or that the courts there, before which the citizens of Utah go for justice, should be constituted in the manner which the gentleman has shown. There is no reason now for such a state of things. But in undertaking to remedy this evil let us not bring about a greater one. The evil complained of can be easily removed. Let the gentleman draw up a bill, if he pleases, to correct the injustice, and we will pass it. He knows as well as I know the circumstances under which the unjust provisions found a place in the statutes. At that time Utah was a polygamous community, and such restrictions were deemed necessary.

Mr. PICKLER. Why, those provisions are applicable alike to all the Territories.

Mr. HARTER. No, sir; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PICKLER. I beg your pardon; that is the fact. Those provisions are simply the uniform law of all the Territories. I myself resided in a Territory for six or seven years, and I know that the people do not enjoy the right of governing themselves. I ask the gentleman in all candor whether he does not think it a hardship that an American citizen like the gentleman from Utah should live forty-three years in a Territory and be denied participation in government—be deprived of the ordinary rights of an American citizen?

Mr. HARTER. It has not been my privilege to live in a Territory forty-three years or forty-three days——

Mr. PICKLER. If you ever had lived there you would not be making this speech to-day.

Mr. HARTER. I think I would be making this very speech, but making it much stronger. But while I have not had the pleasure I would like to call his attention to the fact that there is no uniform law on this subject relating to the Territories.

Mr. PICKLER. Indeed there is. I make this as a statement of fact. By a law applicable to all the Territories the President appoints the governor and these other officers.

Mr. HARTER. If the gentleman will collect the facts and present them to the House, I will acknowledge the correctness of his statement.

Mr. PICKLER. I have correctly stated the law.

Mr. HARTER. I believe the gentleman is mistaken; I feel quite sure he is.

The gentleman asked me also whether I think it not too much of a hardship for a man to live in a Territory for awhile? I answer him no, I do not; and if that kind of life develops men like this gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. RAWLINS], I consider it a good argument for relegating many existing States to Territorial government. Another thing, the hardships of a Territorial life are not so very great. Here we live in the District of Columbia, which has a Territorial government.

And yet I find gentlemen very anxious to get here, crazy to break into the territory of the District of Columbia, and when they get here they are usually anxious to remain eternally. So that can not be much of an objection.

Mr. FLYNN. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. HARTER. I am always glad to hear from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. FLYNN. Out of the appointments made in Oklahoma, forty-two are carpetbaggers sent in from the outside. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. SIMPSON. From Ohio most of them, too, are they not?

Mr. FLYNN. No, sir; from Georgia. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman need not "shake his gory locks at me: thou canst not say that I did it." I tried to help give you a first-class governor; but the President occasionally makes a mistake, for which he should be readily excused, for we know that he is only human and not infallible. And I would say further to the gentleman that we should await the final returns from these "carpetbagger" appointments, as he calls them. They can not be worse, and they may be vastly better, than some of the incumbents that we have had in the past. After these carpetbaggers make a record, and it is as bad or worse than that of their predecessors, we will help him guillotine a few of them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio this question: How does he reconcile it with a common sense of justice that his State of Ohio, with the number of people she has representing that State on this floor, should undertake to keep out of the House of Representatives the 250,000 people in the Territory of Utah? I ask, how can you say that it is just? Should you not, in other words, reducing the argument to its proper conclusions, say that every State ought to have its representation reduced proportionately here; or else amend the Constitution and provide for a greater number of Senators, and according to population instead of by States? Is it fair to leave Utah unrepresented, while Ohio is so liberally provided for?

Mr. HARTER. That is a fair question, and I shall endeavor to answer it in the same fair spirit. I think I have already stated that it seemed to me the Constitution is entirely wrong on this question, and I think it is the concensus of American opinion as well as that of every expert student of a constitutional government, whether he lives in America or elsewhere, that this is an unfortunate feature in our Government. But I have already explained the origin of it, and under the circumstances the wisdom of the creation of this unjust principle in the Constitution I am not here to defend. At the same time the gentleman introduces into his question a suggestion about the State of Ohio; whether we are proposing to do as justly by Utah as we do by Ohio in the matter of representation.

I have used New York, as a matter of courtesy, for an illustration, holding Ohio back as a matter of humility, and because it is well enough occasionally for a man from Ohio to exhibit a becoming modesty about his great State. But if the gentleman forces me to bring Ohio in I will say that if we admit Utah to the performance of the most important legislation which will occupy the attention of the United States Senate for years and years to come; if we admit Utah now to the election of Presidents of the United States, who control the Executive Departments of the Government, who appoint all the judges and control our diplomatic relations with the balance of the world, then by this act we would give to any one man residing in the State of Utah fifteen times the amount of representation that the citizen of Ohio has.

Mr. HARTMAN. Would you object to admitting Utah if they would vote with you?

Mr. SIMPSON. That would be an inducement for them to remove from Ohio, would it not?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman how he makes that calculation—on what basis?

Mr. HARTER. Why, you would give the two Senators from the little State of Utah the same power that the great State of Ohio exercises in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But I understood the gentleman to refer to the Presidential election.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman is quite correct. When I applied the proportion of representation to the election of the Chief Magistrate it was erroneous, unless the election was thrown into the House. I am obliged to him for correcting me. I intended particularly to refer to the power of the State in the Senate and as applied to the making of laws which our Presidents must execute, and the proportion I stated is correct, as the gentleman will find if he takes the pencil I have given him and a piece of paper and figures it out. In Ohio we have a population of about 3,750,000.

In Utah they have a population which is claimed—and I believe it to be correct—of about 240,000. I am sure these gentlemen who knock at the door of the Union would not be guilty of misrepresentation. Giving them, therefore, all they claim, a man

residing in Utah would have about fifteen times as much power in making laws for the balance of the country as he would have if he lived in Ohio.

Now all this is unjust, it is all wrong, it is unnecessary; and looking forward some distance, you can see that it is also very dangerous.

Mr. BOEN. May I ask who is to be endangered by it?

Mr. HARTER. The whole country. Gentlemen of the extreme West, surely you now have a representation ample to the fullest extent. You have indeed a representation so far in excess of any other section of the country in the making of laws and in the election of the President, that it seems to me instead of asking more, you should, with proper modesty and with a reasonable respect for the rights of the people who are not fortunate enough to live in these far Western Territories, of your own accord say that you are content to wait for a more fitting time, and until you have gained larger proportions in population, proportions which will reasonably entitle you to membership in the sisterhood of States.

Mr. Chairman, I am much obliged to the House for the time accorded me.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. HAINES, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of the heirs of Casparus Coneyn, there being no adverse report thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. SMITH of Illinois, for this day, on account of sickness.

And then, on motion of Mr. WHEELER of Alabama (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2644) for the relief of Secor & Co., Perine, Secor & Co., and the executors of Zeno Secor—to the Committee on Claims.

The Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the following bills, and the same were referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 4559) granting a pension to Mary Collins.

A bill (H. R. 4582) for the relief of Jane Thomas.

A bill (H. R. 4561) granting a pension to Harriet T. Vosburgh.

A bill (H. R. 4560) restoring Julia L. Roberts, late Julia L. Doty, to the pension roll.

A bill (H. R. 4136) granting a pension to Ellen Connor, widow of Patrick Connor, deceased.

A bill (H. R. 4315) for the relief of George Thompson.

A bill (H. R. 3022) to place on the pension roll the name of Capt. James G. Saint.

A bill (H. R. 3009) granting a pension to Mrs. Eliza Fish.

A bill (H. R. 2564) to pension Mrs. Eliza T. Palmatier.

A bill (H. R. 2410) for the relief of Archibald P. Cooper.

A bill (H. R. 2403) for the relief of Lucy A. Branham.

A bill (H. R. 637) to pension Mrs. Nancy T. Eastman.

A bill (H. R. 636) granting a pension to Mary H. Howard.

A bill (H. R. 1889) to place the name of John T. Fruit upon the pension roll.

A bill (H. R. 647) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah Flanders.

A bill (H. R. 646) granting a pension to Sally G. Alley.

The Committee on Pensions was discharged also from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of Thomas Fitzgibbons, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the bill (H. R. 4658) granting a pension to Hiram R. Rhea (Report No. 196).

Also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the bill (H. R. 4659) to pension Elizabeth Portner (Report No. 197).

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 2148) for the relief of James A. Cook (Report No. 198).

Also, from the Committee on War Claims, a bill (H. R. 2314) for the relief of John N. Dorr, sr. (Report No. 199).

Also, from the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 2280) for the relief of William B. Ennis (Report No. 200).

Also, from the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 2253) for the relief of J. H. Bugg and others (Report No. 201).

Also, from the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 2194) for the relief of A. W. Pollard (Report No. 202).

Also, from the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Hugh F. McNairy, executor of A. C. Thomson, deceased (Report No. 203).

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: From the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 3553) for the relief of the estate of Lucy A. Barker, deceased (Report No. 204).

By Mr. ENLOE, from the Committee on War Claims, a bill (H. R. 766) for the relief of Randolph Wesson (Report No. 205).

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 4660) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River, at Glenwood, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4661) to authorize the sale of property situated in the city of Georgetown, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOEN: A bill (H. R. 4662) to advance causes on the calendar of the Supreme Court of the United States wherein States are parties—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 4663) to regulate the right of appeal in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 4664) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present ratio and upon equal terms—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HINES: A bill (H. R. 4665) to equalize bounty in certain cases of soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 4666) to regulate the jurisdiction of the United States district judges, and of the courts over which they preside, in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 4667) to provide for the opening of certain abandoned military reservations, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 4689) to direct and authorize the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of that branch of the Elizabeth River, Virginia, known as Deep Creek—to the Committees on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: A bill (H. R. 4692) for the erection of a monument to the late Edwin M. Stanton—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DUNPHY: A resolution to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to the widow of Thomas McKaig, late an employé of the House, a sum equal to his salary for six months; also expenses of his last illness and funeral expenses—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A resolution to carry out the finding of the Court of Claims for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Chouteau, Harrison & Valle—to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4668) for the relief of the estate of Daniel H. Avery, of Tuscaloosa, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLAIR: A bill (H. R. 4669) for the relief of Sarah J. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 4670) for the relief of Lewis H. Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 4671) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Joseph G. Utter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 4672) for the relief of John A. Haas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) for the relief of the Berks County Agricultural Society, of Berks County, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN: A bill (H. R. 4674) to increase the pension of David T. Stonebraker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) to increase the pension of Wells Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4676) for the relief of T. J. Wear—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) for the relief of Alexander L. Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) granting a pension to Thomas P. A. Leonard, of Sweetwater, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) for the relief of James Currier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) for the relief of Joseph Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 4682) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 4683) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 4684) for the relief of Flora A. Darling—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 4685) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer, late a captain Tenth United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. 4686) to correct the military record of Alexander P. Magaan, of Battery H, Fourth United States Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STORER: A bill (H. R. 4687) granting a pension to Mrs. Catherine Elliott—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4688) authorizing the removal of the charge of desertion from the record of Hugh F. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELLS: A bill (H. R. 4690) for the relief of Maurice Moriarty and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By. Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 4691) granting a pension to Thomas J. Reid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: Memorial of William H. Cayce, asking for the passage of a bill relieving him from unlawful treatment of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railway Company—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of Georgia (by request): Petition, papers, and summary report in the claim of John M. Boone, of Wilkinson County, Ga., against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of plate-glass workers of Charleroi, Pa., against change of duties on plate glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., relative to creation of artificial-freshet navigation in the upper Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial of the session of the Presbyterian Church of Arnesville, Ohio, favoring the repeal of the Geary law; second, to pass the Sabbath-rest bill; third, to pass a law respecting religion in the public schools; fourth, against the admission of Utah as a State; fifth, to pass a law creating a commission to investigate the liquor traffic; sixth, to pass a more stringent law prohibiting pauper and criminal immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of workingmen and other citizens of Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL (by request): Proposal and plan of John C. McGowan for relieving the sewers and for disposing of the sewage of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WISE: Certified copy of findings of fact and conclusions of law, Court of Claims, No. 15,607, William B. Isaacs *et al* against the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

M. C. BUTLER, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Mount Victory, South Ridgeville, Edinburg, Ross County, Ottawa County, and of J. C. Irwin Post, Grand Army of the Republic, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of such legislation as will secure the enforcement of laws passed to carry into effect Articles XIV and XV of the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the affidavit of Dr. H. W. Latham, of Latham, Mo., in support of Senate bill No. 255, granting a pension to John G. Hanna, private Company A, Forty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia. I move that the affidavit be referred to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany that bill

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 901) for the relief of the owners of the schooner Henry R. Tilton and of personal effects thereon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 223) for the relief of Isham T. Owen, of Missouri, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Joint Commission of Congress to Inquire into the Status of Laws Organizing the Executive Departments, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 1260) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is the same as House bill 4610, reported in the other House.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1051) for the relief of Jean Louis Legare, of the Dominion of Canada, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 444) making the surveyor of the District of Columbia a salaried officer, and to provide for more efficient service in the surveyor's office, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 326) for the relief of C. B. Bryan & Co., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 58) for the relief of William Clift, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1261) for the erection of a public building at Menominee, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. POWER introduced a bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Paul McCormick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 1263) to provide for the further distribution of reports of the Supreme Court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1264) to provide for the distribution of reports of the United States courts of appeals; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1265) for the relief of John Millen; which was read twice by its title, and with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1266) to extend and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and

Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, A. D. 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HUNTON introduced a bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1268) granting a pension to Calvin K. Bynum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1269) granting a pension to Christ Bueltemann; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1270) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Catlett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Pensions may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 249) for the restoration of Zerelda Cobbs to the pension roll, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed, as I desire to introduce a new bill on the subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Committee on Pensions will be discharged, and the bill indefinitely postponed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1271) for the relief of Zerelda Cobb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1272) granting a pension to Gabrilla P. Moody; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1273) for the relief of Bernard J. D. Irwin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1274) for the relief of Henry J. Hewitt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1275) for the relief of Michael Dittlinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1276) to refer the claim of David C. Allen to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1277) for the payment of arrears of interest on Chickasaw trust funds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1278) granting a pension to Isaac Gann; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 45) granting a medal to Bvt. First Lieut. A. Liebschutz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HUDSON RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives upon the Hudson River bridge bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey, further insisting on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GORMAN. I submit the conference report showing the disagreement. I move that the further conference requested by the House of Representatives be agreed to by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. VEST, Mr. GORMAN, and Mr. FRYE were appointed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills received yesterday from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home;

A bill (H. R. 213) to pay for alley condemned in square numbered 493, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (H. R. 3 29) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (H. R. 4015) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.;

A bill (H. R. 411) to require steam vessels of the United States, of 1,000 tons or more, to have one engineer and helper on watch in their engine rooms while under way, and to require all steam vessels of the United States, under steam for more than ten hours, to carry two licensed engineers; and

A bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bœuf River, in Louisiana.

The bill (H. R. 108) to fix the times and places for holding the Federal courts in the State and district of Nebraska was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (H. R. 894) for the relief of Robert Travila for loss of carbine in the late war was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 356) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from sale certain land in the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN HAWAII.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day, which will be read:

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 11th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if in his opinion it be not inconsistent with the public interest, whether any person whose name has not been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, and if so, what person, has been appointed since the 4th day of March, 1893, to represent the United States in the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whether such person has been accredited to the President of the Executive and Advisory Council of the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whether such person has been presented to the head of the Government of the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whether any, and if so what, authority has been given to such person touching the relations of this Government to the then existing or other government of the Hawaiian Islands and the protection of American citizens therein; and

Whether any discretion or power has been committed to such person to determine when the naval forces of the United States should be landed therein or withdrawn therefrom; and

Whether any authority has been committed to such person to use physical force in the territory of said Government, or to land an armed force there; and

Whether such person has been authorized to, or has in fact corresponded in regard to the public affairs of the Government of the Hawaiian Islands with any private person, newspaper, or other periodical; or has been authorized to, or has in fact undertaken to receive in said Hawaiian Islands the testimony of any private person, or has requested or received written communications from any private person in regard to the lawful and existing Government there, or the circumstances under which said existing Government was established; or any other matter relating to the public affairs thereof; and

If any such appointment or authority has been made or given, further to inform the Senate whether the same was made or given at a time when the Senate was in session, or has continued in force during any session of the Senate, or of Congress, or of any part thereof; and further

Whether such appointment or authority was communicated to the Senate during any session thereof; and further

Whether any person has accepted, or undertaken to accept, the office of a commissioner or public minister with the power aforesaid, or any of them, or has undertaken in any correspondence with the Government of Hawaii, or with any private person, to describe himself as commissioner of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. I do not see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] in his seat. As I understood from him yesterday, he is called away to-day by a social engagement of some importance and interest, and he then repeated his assent to an agreement that we had yesterday that this matter should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I understood that it had been referred yesterday, but I see that was not the case. I was not in the Chamber. But as that is the understanding, I move that the resolution be referred to that committee.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator will pardon me; it was postponed until this morning, because I desired to make a few remarks in relation to the resolution before it was referred to the committee.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator understood the general agreement?

Mr. FRYE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. I have no objection, of course, and I withhold the motion for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is debatable. The Senator can make it or withhold it.

Mr. GRAY. I withhold it for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I do not take the floor for the purpose of discussing the Hawaiian question. It seems to me that we are not in a proper preparation for such discussion; that for an intelligent one it is absolutely necessary there shall be a thorough and complete investigation of the facts and a report made to this body. I am hoping that the Committee on Foreign Relations will make such investigation, and that after that is done I shall have an opportunity to address myself to the Senate on the general subject.

In the discussion that took place day before yesterday the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] made use of the following language:

He—

Referring to Mr. Bayard—

He merely gives voice to what rises naturally in his patriotic heart, as it would rise naturally, I believe, in the patriotic heart of every American, that when the flag of the country has been used for the purposes of dishonor, and when the authority and power and prestige of the United States have been made to cover an act of piracy that the wrong should in some way at some time and some how be rectified.

I am informed (I did not hear it, because I have been necessarily absent through most of the discussion on Hawaiian matters, engaged on a committee of conference) that one or two other Senators have made somewhat similar statements.

Now, what is there to be inferred from the declaration of the Senator from Delaware? Nothing under the sun except that our former minister at Hawaii dishonored the flag of his country and undertook to commit an act of piracy. From what sources can any Senator derive any information which authorizes him, or which he thinks authorizes him, to make any such declaration? Merely from one only, from Mr. Blount's report, for before the Senators there is to-day nothing other than that.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FRYE. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I rose not to interrupt the Senator, except so far as it may be necessary to correct him as to the ground of the criticism I made upon the conduct of affairs in the Sandwich Islands last January. What I said was not founded wholly or in large part upon any alleged report of Mr. Blount, but it was founded largely upon the documents that were communicated to us by the President in February last, when a treaty of annexation was sent to us for our action. It was a part of the document accompanying the message of the President of the United States in February of last year, upon the letter of Capt. Wiltse, and upon the letter and correspondence of Mr. Stevens himself largely, that I made such criticism as I did upon that matter.

Mr. FRYE. I do not see how the Senator could have arrived at any such conclusion from the papers to which he refers. I notice that President Harrison said—it was brought to my attention by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]—on page 1 of Executive Document No. 76:

The overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government, but had its origin in what seems to have been a reactionary and revolutionary policy on the part of Queen Lilliuokalani, which put in serious peril not only the large and preponderating interests of the United States in the islands, but all foreign interests, and indeed the decent administration of civil affairs and the peace of the islands.

That was written, as a matter of course, after he had read all the messages and communications from Mr. Stevens.

Mr. GRAY. But if the Senator will allow me—I do not wish to interrupt him—I did not refer to the message of the President, but to the documents which accompanied the message; that was all. I do not wish to detain the Senate now by going over them. There are quite a number of them. I merely wish to make this general statement.

Mr. FRYE. But the message of the President was, of course, founded upon the documents to which the Senator refers.

Now, I do not know how far Blount's report is before the Senate. I do know it is before the country and before the House of Representatives in its entirety, and I do not see that there is or ought to be any delicacy about a reference to it.

I wish to say, in relation to that report, that in my judgment it is a most dangerous one on which any United States Senator can afford to make a serious attack upon the character of any private citizen of the United States. I affirm without hesitation that Mr. Blount in that report has not written one single unvarnished line of truth, nor given one unprejudiced opinion, nor rendered one impartial judgment.

Mr. President, I assume that this is an attack upon our former minister, Mr. Stevens, that he has dishonored the flag, that he has committed an act of piracy. Mr. Stevens was born in the State of Maine something over seventy years ago. For more than forty years he has been a prominent figure in our State. For more than forty years I have been intimately acquainted with him. For more than forty years the public eye of Maine has necessarily rested upon him. He has been during that period many times a member of both of our legislative bodies.

For many years he was the editor of the Kennebec Journal, our State paper, formerly edited for awhile by our late Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine. For more than thirteen years he has represented the United States Government as a minister abroad, at Paraguay and Uruguay, at Sweden, and in the Hawaiian Islands. He made international law a careful study, and for the understanding of it he was prepared by a thorough education in early life. He was familiar with all the usages and requirements of diplomacy. He was an antislavery Whig, and when the Republican party was born he necessarily united his fortunes to that party; and from that day to this he has been an earnest, zealous advocate of the principles of that party with his pen and on the stump. Indeed, I know of no man who has had more to do with the affairs of Maine publicly in the same length of time than Mr. Stevens. He is a man whose moral character is without a stain. He is slow to make up his judgments and zealous in maintaining them when made up. He is remarkable for his accuracy of statement, a characteristic, I suppose, acquired largely as an editor; and when Mr. Stevens makes a statement you can not make any one in Maine believe that it ought to be received with any grains of allowance whatever.

Such a man as this, who in his whole life up to this time and this hour never has had even a suspicion of wrong aroused against him, never has had an accusation made against him, is in the United States Senate, for some necessity or other, made the target of abuse and assailed as dishonoring the flag and as guilty of an act of piracy!

The President of the United States could and did, in spite of Constitution and law, make Mr. Blount paramount to Mr. Stevens in the Hawaiian Islands, but in intelligence, in education, in experience with affairs, in knowledge of international law, in familiarity with the usages and the requirements of diplomacy, in devotion to the interests and honor of his country, in fidelity to our Christian civilization, Mr. Stevens is paramount to Mr. Blount, and no President, not even Mr. Cleveland with all his power, can reverse that condition.

Mr. Stevens dishonor the flag! I propose to read what Mr. Stevens himself said to his neighbors, gathered around him at Augusta on his return from Hawaii, touching the dishonoring of the flag:

The raising of the United States flag over the Government buildings took place two weeks later—

That is, the 1st of February, two weeks after the revolution—

and on that transaction there is some misapprehension which it is proper for me to correct. You may be assured it was not hastily nor thoughtlessly done. It was done with all the serious sense of responsibility that the United States minister and Capt. Wiltse could command. And here I may pay a fitting tribute to Capt. Wiltse and drop a tear over his honored grave. He is no more on earth to speak for himself, and I can justly defend him against any implications on his intelligence or his honor. Forty years in the naval service, a brave officer in the war when shot and shell did their work of death among those who stood in defense of the nation's life, he loved the flag of his country with the devotion which the Christians of the early centuries had for the cross. In his breast beat as loyal a heart as ever throbbed with human life. At home he belonged to one of the two great political parties, and myself belonged to the other. But abroad we knew no party but our country—no duty but that of American representatives. Capt. Wiltse and the American minister were in complete accord in raising the flag, February 1. He knew the situation thoroughly. The Provisional Government made the request that it be done, and these were its reasons: It had been created only two weeks before. There were no trained troops on the islands available for its use. Many of the men in official places on the different islands, selected under the monarchy from palace favorites, had not been removed and their future conduct was uncertain.

Men from business circles and from stores, banks, offices, and workshops had been on guard day and night for two weeks. There had not been time to create an efficient police, nor to organize and drill a small military force. In a city of 24,000 people of various nationalities it was reasonable to suppose there might be some elements of disorder. On the plantations not far off and in the city itself were believed to be many Japanese who had served in their own army before they came to Hawaii. It was feared that the fallen

Queen and the lottery and opium ring around her would obtain the assistance of the Japanese and other foreigners to restore her to the throne, she compensating them by granting them the right of suffrage and other favors, which the Queen in her desperation readily would have promised to grant. Fear and panic began to gain headway in the city. A riot was feared. Millions of American property and life and order were in peril. In these circumstances the only sure hope of safety was in the American naval force at hand. Should the American representative run the risk of anarchy and bloodshed when it was certain he would be held rigidly responsible if catastrophe and calamity should come? It was this pressure of necessity which compelled the American representative to act with promptness and vigor.

These were the reasons which led the Provisional Government to ask our assistance, and these reasons are known to the American public. But there were other potential reasons which pressed upon me. For nearly half a century our Government had claimed rights and interests in the Hawaiian islands superior to any other foreign nations. Repeatedly there have been attempts to induce our Government to agree to dual or tripartite responsibilities at Honolulu. John M. Clayton, Secretary under President Taylor, repelled this forty-three years ago, and such has been our policy since. It was well known to me that this idea of joint action had not been given up, but was still insisted on by one, if not two foreign representatives at Honolulu. There was one Japanese war vessel in the harbor, and another powerful ironclad—larger than the Boston—had been telegraphed for. I knew the English war ship was soon expected. I had reason to think, and the Provisional Government had reason to fear, that these foreign representatives would insist on the same right to land their naval forces which we had exercised. We were five thousand miles from Washington, with no cable from Honolulu to San Francisco, and the long space between mail steamers would not permit communicating with our Government and our receiving an answer in less than three weeks.

We knew not then that Ashmead Bartlett, in the English House of Commons, had asked the Gladstone Ministry whas it had done or would do relative to English interests at Honolulu, and that Lord Grey in behalf of the English ministry had answered that it would trust the American Government to protect English life and property in Hawaii. We did know that the attitude of the English minister at Honolulu was quite otherwise from this—that he still wished to have joint responsibility with the American minister as to the landing of troops and the maintenance of public order at Honolulu. I was therefore compelled to decide whether I would risk the danger of a practical abandonment of the long-maintained American policy of nonjoint responsibility in Hawaiian affairs. To thus surrender in practice what we had long claimed I knew well would prove me unfit to be an American representative. Here were difficulties which could be effectively and conclusively overcome only in one way; that was by raising the flag over the Government building as a symbol of our superior right to protect the Hawaiian Government. This would not only prevent all the danger of riot and bloodshed, but would shut out the landing of any other naval force except our own. Capt. Wiltse saw this as soon and as clearly as I did. With an American heart loyal to the core, conscientious, firm, self-possessed fully aware of the grave responsibility of the act, he was prompt to do his duty. The officers under his command were as intelligent and loyal as their own veteran commander. The following are the words read by Lieut. Rush of the Boston, on the steps of the government building simultaneously with raising the flag, which was immediately published by posters and in the newspapers;

"TO THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.

"At the request of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands I hereby, in the name of the United States of America, assume protection of the Hawaiian Islands for the protection of life and property and occupation of public buildings and Hawaiian soil, so far as may be necessary for the purpose specified, but not interfering with the administration of public affairs by the Provisional Government.

"This action is taken pending and subject to negotiations at Washington.

"JOHN L. STEVENS,
"*Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States.*
"UNITED STATES LEGATION, *February 1, 1893.*
"Approved and executed by
"G. C. WILTSE,
"*Captain, United States Navy,*
"*Commanding the United States ship Boston.*"

It will be observed that the plain intent of this little document is noninterference with the sovereignty of Hawaii—that it claimed to establish only a qualified and limited protectorate, and instead of infringing on the sovereignty of the country, it was a response to the only government of the islands to aid in maintaining its own sovereignty. The salutary effect of thus raising the flag was immediate and remarkable. Quiet, confidence, perfect order at once took the place of panic, fear, and distrust. Language can not adequately express the joyful feelings of the large American colony and of all the better elements of the other nationalities. All save a few sympathizers with our national rivals looked on the American flag floating in those genial skies with profound respect. None more so than many of the native Hawaiians.

It has been said that President Harrison and Secretary Foster disapproved of our action. I have never so understood it. Secretary Foster after our action was taken did carefully define just how far the effect of our qualified protectorate and flag raising should go, and his definition and instruction on the subject was just what the Provisional Government and the American representative intended when the flag was raised, and just what the Provisional Government and the American representative thought and intended that our published document and official action expressed.

The one essential and effective step we took was to raise the flag—we only did that, and precisely that President Harrison and Secretary Foster never disapproved. It remained up seventy-five days. During that time all had been accomplished which had been promised and expected when it was raised. In that time two foreign war ships had arrived at Honolulu, but the American flag was up, and thus all danger of dual or tripartite arrangement as to Hawaiian affairs was avoided, and the just American predominance successfully maintained. They are dull statesmen and poorly equipped diplomatists who do not know the advantage which the party has who is in actual possession. I am but too glad to believe that the present Administration has no thought of giving up this vantage ground, to which the bold and vigorous dispatch of Secretary Bayard, approved by President Cleveland, to Minister Merrill, July 12, 1887, powerfully contributed.

The language of the dispatch, when an outbreak was feared in the summer of 1887, was the following:

"The interests of American citizens which have grown up under the extension of commerce between Hawaii and the United States and the guaranties of existing treaty must not be jeopardized by internal confusion in the government of these islands, and it is the duty of the United States to see that these interests are not imperiled or injured, and to do all things necessary for their just protection.

* * * * * * *

"While we abstain from interfering with the domestic affairs of Hawaii, in accordance with the policy and practice of this Government, yet obstruction to the channels of legitimate commerce under existing law must not be allowed, and American citizens in Hawaii must be protected in their persons and property by the representatives of their country's law and power, and no internal discord must be suffered to impair them."

These were the latest instructions to the United States minister at Honolulu, on file at the legation, for guidance in case of circumstances precisely like these which arose when the Hawaiian monarchy fell in January last. It was the language of this dispatch which Capt. Wiltse of the Boston had for his instruction.

The essential objects to be accomplished by raising the flag were gained during the seventy-five days its bright, starry folds were before the people of Hawaii. The Provisional Government had secured the necessary time to organize an efficient police and military force, to substitute reliable officials in place of the unreliable, and to consolidate the new Government, with the approval of the best and responsible men of all the islands. That country now has the best Government it has ever had, administered by men of intelligence, education, and character, and as thoroughly American in sympathy and in interest as we have at the head of any of our American States and Territories.

So much for the charge of dishonoring the flag. I thank Heaven that no citizen of Maine ordered it hauled down, and I compliment the admiral who did that in his dispatch he says:

I do it in obedience to the orders of Commissioner Blount.

I have no doubt that it may become necessary to drag Minister Stevens down. I have had reliable information since I came into the Senate this morning which says that—

The purpose of the Administration is to charge that Stevens was a party to corruption, employed to drag down the Queen's government and establish the revolutionary government.

That does not amaze me.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator read that again?

Mr. FRYE. It reads:

The purpose of the Administration is to charge that Stevens was a party to corruption, employed to drag down the Queen's government and establish the revolutionary government.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, does the Senator make that charge?

Mr. FRYE. I say I am informed upon what I regard as reliable authority that that is the purpose. That is what I said. I did not make the charge myself.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator give his authority, or is he not at liberty to do so?

Mr. FRYE. I am not at liberty to give the authority. I will say for myself that I am fully prepared to see any method resorted to to drag Mr. Stevens down. I will say that for myself.

Whether money was or was not expended by the revolutionists I do not know, but as to any charge that Mr. Stevens, our minister, had any participation in corrupt practices to remove one government and create another, I feel able to say I do know that there is not one word of truth in it, and it would require an immense amount of evidence infinitely better than any that has yet been sent from Hawaii to the Secretary of State, to convince the people of Maine that such a charge can be sustained.

As to the piracy, I wish to put in the RECORD in reference to that a statement of our late minister, Mr. Stevens, prepared with great care. I regard it as important that it shall be in the RECORD, so that in future discussions we may have his statements to which reference may be made. Mr. Stevens says:

A deep sense of obligation to my country and an American's duty to defend an insulted, threatened, and struggling American colony, planted as righteously and firmly on the North Pacific isles as our Pilgrim Fathers established themselves on Plymouth Rock, demand that I shall make an answer to the astounding misrepresentations and untruths of Commissioner Blount's report on Hawaiian affairs, a copy of which I first obtained, with difficulty, Saturday evening, November 25. It is proper for me to preface my answer by briefly alluding to the fact, that those familiar with international rules and proceedings, and have had diplomatic experience, must be astonished that Secretary Gresham and his commissioner should make, before the world, such a persistent effort to discredit the recent agents of the Department they now represent, and which was once represented by Thomas Jefferson, William L. Marcy, William H. Seward, and James G. Blaine. The general adoption of such a policy by our Department of foreign affairs could not fail to weaken greatly our influence with foreign countries in any future effort, and serve to make the American diplomatic service contemptible in the eyes of the world. Not only is the course of Gresham and Blount extremely un-American in its form and spirit, but it is also in direct opposition to the civilizing and Christianizing influence on the Hawaiian Islands, while it is playing into British hands, in direct opposition to the efforts of the American Board of Missions, and to the American Government, for more than sixty years, in all of which period there has been a uniform, continuous, and patriotic American policy.

I may also make a preliminary remark regarding the repeatedly asserted opinion of those who have assailed my official action, that I was prepared for and stimulated to it by the accomplished and thoroughly American statesman who occupied the Department of State most of the period of President Harrison's Administration. It is sufficient to say that this expressed surmise is utterly without foundation. What I know and state on this point accords with what ex-Secretary Tracey has recently asserted in that regard. Still more, I may properly add, that the lines of official duty as followed by myself and Capt. Wiltse, and the course of the Administration and of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in the critical Hawaiian days of January and February last, were exactly on the lines marked out by Secretary Marcy in 1854 and by Secretary Bayard in his dispatch to Minister Merrill July 12, 1887. Marcy's instructions and draft of treaty provided for annexation. Bayard's instructions of 1887 held the United States minister and naval commander at Honolulu responsible for the protection of American life and property and the "preservation of public order."

So much as a necessary introduction to my consideration of Blount's report. Not wishing to be severe on a neophyte in diplomacy, with little

knowledge of the world's affairs outside of his own country; sent on a very peculiar errand amid currents and islands entirely unknown to him, he has been partly the victim of [illegible]ces, having been caught in the meshes and snares adroitly prepared for him by the cunning advisers of the fallen Liliuokalani, and by the shrewd, sharp, long experienced British diplomatic agent, whose aims and hopes Blount has served so well, and without the least suspicion that he was aiding ultra-British interests, even more than he was helping the Hawaiian monarchists and the justly dethroned queen.

It is clear enough from Blount's manner on the day of his arrival at Honolulu, as well as by his letter to the Department of State written shortly after, that he designed, at whatever cost, to repudiate the views and action of the recently terminated Administration, and that in order to do so he must impugn the action of Minister Stevens and of the commander of the United States ship Boston. A total stranger, it was impossible for Mr. Blount to know how unfitting it was for him to take up his quarters where he was certain to be surrounded by royalists, and where the supporters of the Provisional Government would be reluctant to go.

The hotel was kept by one who had served as Kalakaua's chamberlain, who was one of the principal persons in a syndicate that had cheated the Hawaiian Government out of nearly $100,000, a transaction which Minister Merrill had officially reported to Secretary Bayard, and this man was the leading member of a firm that sought to do its chief business with England, a thoroughly unprincipled opponent of the Provisional Government and of American predominance in the islands. He employed as his active assistant in managing the hotel a highly educated Englishman, of disreputable character, who had written in the Hawaiian British newspaper, under anonymous signature, articles abusive of the United States and grossly falsifying our Government's treatment of the Indians. This man had had a most unsavory record while residing in the United States, and has been a bitter assailant of American officials in American newspapers—in the paid service of the fallen Queen he has written whatever she and her immoral favorite, Wilson, have asked him to write. Residing at that hotel, Mr. Blount was under the constant espionage of the palace adventurers.

As a precautionary safeguard against thus shutting out the Americans from ready access to Commissioner Blount, a wealthy and a highly respectable widow lady, of the American colony, was ready to grant the use of her house to Mr. and Mrs. Blount, the commissioner to pay the same amount it would cost him to live at the royalists' Hotel. This private house was situated near the United States Legation, in the quarter of the city where annexationists and royalists could have unobstructed access to the commissioner, and where he could conveniently avail himself of the legation records. This polite offer of an American residence to an American commissioner did not originate with the Provisional Government, nor did the Provisional Government have anything whatever to do with the proposed arrangement. A committee of three American citizens, born and educated in the United States, the superiors of Mr. Blount in education and manners, men who had not taken part in the revolutionary proceedings of the previous weeks, went on board the Rush when that vessel came into the harbor, while I was courteously meeting Mr. and Mrs. Blount on their arrival.

At the request of the three American gentlemen, I introduced them to Mr. Blount. His manner of receiving their visit repelled them, and they asked me to state the reasons why it would be pleasant to him, and better for all concerned, not to go to the royalists' hotel, but to take residence on neutral ground, where he would be master of his own surroundings. As delicately as I could do so, I stated the offer of the committee of his countrymen, pointing out to him that by accepting their proposition he would be near the archives of the legation, which he could conveniently use, which I would be pleased at once to place at his disposal. Brusquely, not to say insultingly, he refused the courteous and honestly intended offer of his countrymen, and at once placed himself amid royalists and ultra-British surroundings, the British legation being near this royalists' hotel, at which the British minister soon took residence and living.

The effort in his report to cast imputation on the Provisional Government and myself as to the offer of the American house to an American commissioner will be estimated at its true value by the American public. Commissioner Blount's manner toward me in the following weeks I would not allude to here were it not absolutely necessary to do so. It is well known to all who have knowledge of diplomatic rules and customs that when a new diplomatic agent arrives at the capital to whose government he is accredited, his predecessor and the occupant of the legation should receive him courteously, proffer his services to his successor, inform him of the existing state of affairs, and, as soon as convenient, give him access to the legation archives. This I did promptly, and had he availed himself of the kind offer of his countrymen as to residence, he could have occupied the room at the legation containing the official records, which I was ready to offer him. He coldly repelled my kindly intentioned offers, did not allow me to show to him the customary forms of introducing him to the foreign diplomatic officials and to the chief public men of Honolulu. How much of his singular course in these regards was due to want of knowledge, and how much to his already matured purpose to make out a case against the United States minister, the naval commander, and the Provisional Government, the American public must judge.

All insinuations and implications in Blount's report that I was averse to his access to the legation records is a shameless perversion of facts. To show the character of the men into whose environment he so quickly placed himself, I took to him the printed dispatches of Minister Merrill to Secretary Bayard, the printed records of the recently adjourned legislature, containing the recorded votes for and against the lottery gang, the recorded votes as to the recent changes of ministers, the official copy of the lottery charter, evidence of decisive value, if he had really come to Honolulu for any other purpose than to convict Harrison's Administration and the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee of hasty and ill-advised action in January and February last.

His manner while allowing me to leave these important documents in his room showed that he cared not to receive them, and the general drift of his report indicates that he did not even read them. Ignoring his inferiority of official rank, which, according to established rules the world over, was below that of minister resident, between a consul-general and chargé d'affaires, with the utmost effort of will controlling my outraged sensibilities, while suffering a terrible affliction at the recent sad drowning of a gifted and beloved daughter, I endured this insolent treatment, after thirteen years of service as United States minister, without a stain ever before attempted to be made on my official honor or my fidelity to American prestige and to American interests, never during my seventy-three years of life having lifted my voice, my hand, or my rifle against the flag of this American Republic. The charges, implications, and insinuations of Commissioner Blount against President Dole, Minister Thurston, and the other chief men of the Provisional Government are as baseless and unjust as those against myself and Capt. Wiltse, now sleeping in his honored grave.

But it is well for me to be more specific in meeting our opponent's recklessly partisan and *ex-parte* statements and arguments. Under the date of April 21, he says he disapproved of a request of the Provisional Government, that the American forces be landed for drill. I here affirm that the Provisional Government never made such a request. The Provisional Government followed the exact course followed under the monarchy. Whenever the naval commander desired to drill his men on shore, in accordance with naval regulations, he so signified to the United States minister, who made the request of the Hawaiian Government through the minister of foreign affairs. To my knowledge, at the period of which Blount speaks, the Provisional Government preferred that the American sailors and marines should not land for drill, because of possibilities of ill-feeling and broil between men of other naval vessels then in the harbor, but they granted these requests only as friendly and customary courtesy.

What Blount says about the Japanese man-of-war is equally *ex-parte* absurd, and egotistic. For weeks after his arrival in Honolulu he had not even met or spoken with the Japanese minister. He had neglected to call upon the Japanese official, and did not ask me to take him to the Japanese legation and introduce him to the Japanese representative.

Touching certain incidents of suspicion and alarm in Honolulu regarding some of the Japanese in the islands and the sudden appearance there of a powerful Japanese iron-clad, in addition to a smaller vessel there, in February and March, prior to Mr. Blount's arrival, I had taken the most prompt precautionary steps, and fully informed both Secretaries Foster and Gresham, who were at the head of the Department of State in those months. How much solid foundation there really was for the excitement and anxiety in Hawaii at that time in regard to the Japanese it was impossible positively to ascertain. But the circumstances were such that I would have been derelict as a minister of the United States, which has a large preponderance of interests and commercial rights in the islands, not to have been vigilant in the discharge of my duty. Several weeks before the fall of the monarchy I had been authoritatively informed that the newly arrived Japanese commissioner would press on the Hawaiian Government the demand that the Japanese in the islands should have the right of suffrage precisely as the American, European, and native-born Hawaiians enjoyed it under the constitution of 1887.

Not long after the Provisional Government had been established, prior to Blount's arrival, I received positive information, both from the Japanese minister and from the Hawaiian minister of foreign affairs, of the renewal of the demand of the right of suffrage of the Japanese residents, and there was known to be much ferment, if not an organized movement, among some of the Japanese in the same direction. I had positively learned that the Japanese commissioner had sent, by the steamer Claudine, which left Honolulu with the Hawaiian Washington commissioners, January 19, a cable dispatch to his Government at Tokio, requesting that a powerful iron-clad be immediately sent to Honolulu, though it was known that a smaller Japanese warship was about to arrive there from San Francisco. I do not intend to criticise the Japanese commissioner for thinking he needed another Japanese warship at Honolulu at that time. He was entitled to his own opinions, and was bound only by the instructions of his own Government. It certainly was not strange that in the peculiar circumstances of the Hawaiian situation, there should be anxiety among the Americans and the members of the Provisional Government, as to what might grow out of this agitation about Japanese suffrage and certain Japanese ambitions as to the future control of the islands.

Sir Edward Arnold's elaborate letter in the London Telegraph of January 24 had arrived there. Arnold's Japanese residence and sympathizers were believed to have some relation to much that had been said in Tokio by certain European antagonists of American interests and aims, and it was well known that individuals, both in Japan and Hawaii, had enriched themselves in the supply of Japanese contract labor. These persons were known to be bitterly averse to the passage of the islands under the American flag, in the just fear that in such an event their contract-labor profits would no more swell their bank accounts. The fallen Queen's unscrupulous and oily attorney was known to be one who had shared in this kind of gain, and was still the agent of this ring of speculators. It was feared by the supporters of the Provisional Government that the fallen Queen, the lottery ring, and palace gang would not hesitate to promise to grant to the Japanese the right of suffrage in the islands, provided they would aid in restoring Liliuokalani to the throne. Among the nearly twenty thousand Japanese on the islands, there were said to be many who had served in the Japanese army at home. The sudden appearance of the Japanese iron-clad in Honolulu harbor could not fail to create anxiety and misunderstanding.

It was in these peculiar circumstances that I felt it my imperative duty to have repeated interviews with my Japanese colleague. He did not attempt to conceal from me his wish that the suffrage right should be granted to the Japanese residents. He was frank and earnest on the subject. I was equally frank in informing him that I had no authority to speak on that subject, but that in the then existing circumstances and in the maintenance of our superior rights and interests in Hawaii, I expressed to him the opinion that the United States would resist any encroachment on the soil or sovereignty of Hawaii, and that I would maintain this position until otherwise instructed by my Government. These friendly interviews, in which the long-existing friendship and mutual interests of our respective countries were fully gone over, gave pacifying results to the well informed, though they did not at once put an end to public anxiety as to the suffrage agitation and as to what use the fallen Queen's supporters might make of it. Every step of my action was duly reported to the Department of State, prior to Blount having any knowledge on the subject. His claim to have put an end to Hawaiian anxiety about rumored Japanese encroachment is as purely assumptive as his expression to me at my house, that to him the Harrison Administration was indebted for the strong Democratic support which was given it in the threatened war with Chile, and that Senator MORGAN, now chairman of the Senate Committee of Foreign Affairs, could not aid much in the same direction, and is not a level-headed man.

In Blount's report, as given to the press, I find the following language:

"The two leading members of the committee, Messrs. Thurston and Smith, growing uneasy as to the safety of their persons, went to Minister Stevens to know if he would protect them in the event of their arrest, by the authorities, to which he gave his assent."

It is enough to say that there is not a semblance of truth in this assertion of Blount, made by him without his ever having hinted it to me or made any inquiry of me on the subject. He thus gives the signature of his indorsement to a charge which I never even heard of until I found it in Blount's printed report.

He says the response to the call of the committee of safety to land the men of the Boston "does not appear in the files of the legation." The meaning of this insinuation is obvious. Enough to say, there never was any such document. I received the invitation of the committee of safety for what it was worth, as I received other information on the same subject. I should have requested Capt. Wiltse to have landed his force, had not the committee of safety requested it. The critical circumstances existing, the fear of incendiarism, tumult, and robbery, and the danger of alarming panic in the night, more than justified our carrying out the standing instructions of the State and Navy Departments of July, 1887, which held the United States minister and naval commander responsible for the protection of American life and property, "and for the preservation of public order." The facts and the logic of the situation clearly indicated our duty.

It is well to state here that this landing of American forces in Honolulu had repeatedly taken place in a period running over many years. This happened in 1874, in 1887, in 1889, and was on the eve of being done on several other occasions. Several times prior to the events of January last I had been notified by the representatives of the Queen to be in readiness to receive a request to land our naval force. Repeatedly had our naval commanders during my official residence in Honolulu got everything in readiness to land, on information as to signs of danger which they and their officers had gathered by being in close touch with the then existing state of things.

The elements and forces of Hawaii in play in 1887, 1889, and in 1893 were and are essentially the same, the breadth and strength of the prevailing elements and forces in 1893 being more decisive than in the former periods. Those who assert to the contrary are not honest, else they do not understand what they have written about. To say that the overturn of the Hawaiian monarchy was bogus, a mere scare, is as absurd as would be the claim of those who might assert that the fall of Louis Phillipe in 1848 and of Louis Napoleon in 1871 was an illusion and a fraud.

Blount squarely asserts that I promised to aid the committee on safety by force. This is emphatically and categorically untrue. In reply to rival parties at different times, whether the representatives of the Queen or her opponents, my answer was always the same, that the force would not land until danger should be plainly imminent, and then only to protect American life and property, and to no one did I ever hint that I could, or would, recognize any but the *de facto* government, whether monarchical or republican, and as I said in my letter to Secretary Gresham, I here reaffirm that royalists and their opponents had equal access to the legation and to its official head. The best answer to the baseless charge that I promised to use force against the Queen is the order of Capt. Wiltse to his officers and his men, "To remain passive," and that no force was used, though the Queen, through her ministers, strongly requested it hours before the Provisional Government was recognized by me and all the other diplomatic representatives in Honolulu.

One of the most striking evidences of Blount's prejudiced, *ex parte*, and unwarranted statements is the following: "A meeting of the committee of safety held that night, January 16, at the house of Henry Waterhouse, next door to Minister Stevens's house, determined on the dethronement of the Queen, and selected officers."

The intent of the author of this language is obvious on its face. He wished it to be understood that this meeting was held near my residence for the purpose of easy access to, and in collusion with, the United States minister. What are the facts? Henry Waterhouse is an English merchant of wealth, of recognized character for integrity, intelligence, and of the most exemplary life. He has resided in the islands since early childhood, and is now a member of the Provisional Government. Though living so near me, he rarely talked Hawaiian political affairs with me, though he could but suppose that my private convictions must be in harmony with the prevailing views of all respectable Americans as to what had been going on in the islands for months. Of this meeting at the house of Henry Waterhouse, specified by Blount, I had no hint or knowledge at the time it was held, knew not of whom the meeting was composed, nor what was its action, and my first information as to the persons assembled at that meeting I obtained from Blount's report.

It is proper for me to say here that for three years prior to the Queen's *coup d'état* and fall, I had kept myself as thoroughly informed as possible as to the views, plans, and purposes of the several factions and parties that contended for control in Hawaiian political affairs. This was my imperative duty as a minister, and it was equally my duty to keep the State Department at Washington well informed as to all facts bearing on the actual situation. This necessarily compelled me to hold conversations with the best informed persons of the reform party, the Queen's party, and with the Wilcox and native Hawaiian party whose organized efforts for months was to induce or compel the Queen to break with her paramour, Marshal Wilson, whom they regarded a foreigner, who was born in Tahiti, of native mother and an English father, and who was very objectionable to the native Hawaiians, who believed Wilson stood between them and their sovereign, and who they well knew largely dictated at the palace. I was certainly as well informed of the views and plans of the royalists as I was of those of her opponents, generally carefully keeping my private opinions to myself.

Regarding the expectations and hopes of the Queen and her representatives in the exciting days from January 14 to January 17, and the views and hopes of her opponents, the following official documents speak for themselves.

Now, I read the document:

"The assurance conveyed by a royal proclamation by myself and ministers yesterday having been received by my native subjects and by them ratified at a mass meeting, was received in a different spirit by the meeting representing the foreign population and interests in my kingdom. It is now my desire to give to your excellency, as the diplomatic representative of the United States of America at my court, the solemn assurance that the present constitution will be upheld and maintained by me and ministers, and no changes will be made except by the method therein provided. I desire to express to your excellency this assurance in the spirit of that friendship which has ever existed between my kingdom and that of the Government of the United States of America, and which I trust will long continue.

LILIUOKALANI, *R.*

Samuel Parker, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Wm. H. Cornell, Minister of Finance; John F. Colburn, Minister of Interior; A. P. Peterson, Attorney-General.

Iolani Palace, Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

This earnestly pleading document from the fallen monarch and the terror-stricken lottery gang came to me more than twenty hours after the men of the Boston had landed. This plainly enough implies that the fallen Queen and her confidants then knew, as they could not have failed to know, that we had not taken part in her overthrow, which had already been accomplished. An hour later the fallen ministers came to the legation and urged on me the inquiry, if I could not use the United States force to sustain the Queen? My answer was what one can readily suppose it must have been—that the United States soldiers were on shore for a specific purpose, to protect American life and property, and could not take sides in aid of the fallen monarch nor with those who were then masters of the situation and were creating a new government.

It will throw light on this pleading message from the Queen more than forty-eight hours after her practical dethronement, to state that the landing of the United States forces in 1874 to put down a mob, which United States action resulted in securing Kalakaua on the throne, had had the effect of strongly fixing in the mind of Liliuokalani and her immediate supporters the idea that they had only to call on the United States minister whenever her power was in danger, and that the United States force would continue to adhere to an established policy in this regard. In this is the explanation that her fallen ministers came to me, with much assurance, to ask that I would use the United States forces to restore and support the fallen Liliuokalani. She and they could not see the very different case of her brother Kalakaua in 1874 and her own case January 17, 1893.

In a report to the Navy Department, dated January 16, Capt. Wiltse, after announcing the fact that the forces had been landed, says:

"While there has been no demonstration so far, there can be no doubt that the prompt landing of the battalion has saved life and property."

The request of Minister Stevens, upon which the captain acted, read as follows:

"UNITED STATES LEGATION, *January 16, 1893.*

"In view of the existing critical circumstances in Honolulu, indicating an inadequate legal force, I request you to land marines and sailors from the ship under your command for the protection of the United States legation and the United States consulate and to secure the safety of American life and property.

"JOHN L. STEVENS.

"To Capt. WILTSE, U. S. N."

The order of Capt. Wiltse to Lieut. Commander Swinburne, who commanded the naval battalion on shore, reads as follows, under the same date:

"You will take command of the battalion, and land in Honolulu for the purpose of protecting our legation and the lives and property of American citizens, and to assist in the preservation of public order. Great prudence must be exercised by both officers and men, and no action taken that is not fully warranted by the condition of affairs, and by the conduct of those who may be inimical to the treaty rights of American citizens. You will inform me at the earliest practicable moment of any change in the situation."

Mr. Blount's shamefully unfair attempt to cast suspicion on myself in the matter of the hall for the men of the Boston, on the first evening of their landing, I have answered in my letter to Secretary Gresham. I will repeat my language here.

After I had made my request to Capt. Wiltse to land his men as a precautionary safeguard to American life and property, he and his officers informed me that their men must have shelter for the night. Without special information in that regard, I had supposed that the ship's marines had tents of their own for their customary use in case of emergency on shore. I at once wrote a note and sent it by messenger to secure a large hall that was supposed to be available. The man in charge of the hall was several miles away. I had not known of the existence of the Arion Hall until that evening, when a messenger with my note was sent to the supposed agent of the Arion Hall, who was a royalist. He returned me a courteous answer, saying he would be pleased to let the hall for the specified purpose, but he had ceased to be the agent, informing me who had then charge of the hall. This required a third note and a third effort of the messenger, which proved successful. So much time had been thus consumed that the Boston's marines and sailors were obliged to stand weary hours in the streets before they were able to go to their night quarters. All of them would have been lodged at the legation and consulate but for want of room, where as many as possible were received, these localities being several streets and squares from the palace and Government building. For the occupation of Arion Hall by the men of the Boston the committee of public safety and supporters of the Provisional Government had no more responsibility than Secretary Gresham himself.

Now, let me say right here, there is elsewhere an intimation that the Arion Hall, occupied by the marines, was very close to the palace of the Queen, and that their guns were literally trained on the palace. In relation to that, I wish to say that the opera house is the house occupied in the former revolution by our troops, and that faces the palace, the palace being a considerable distance off; that at that time it was fired into, and consequently the owners would not allow the troops to be placed in that building at the recent revolution. The hall Arion is in the rear, some distance from the large opera house, and the palace is not in sight of the hall at all. The guns could not be trained from there on the palace by any possibility.

One of the chief objects in view by myself and Capt. Wiltse in landing the marines and sailors was to quiet the fear and panic in the city that incendiary fires might be set by irresponsible parties for sake of plunder. This fear was augmented by the fact that most of the buildings of the city are of wood. The request made of me by Capt. Wiltse and his officials when they came ashore was a hall for shelter, and maps of the city to enable them to act effectively if tumult and incendiarism should come, so that they would know how to act with rapidity and efficiency. To obtain the hall and secure the necessary maps occupied my time until late in the evening, there being only one map of the city in the legation, others being obtained by application at different private houses.

A copy of the call of the committee of safety, which Blount insinuates that I wished to conceal from him, had been promptly forwarded to Washington in January, and was in the printed pamphlet of the State Department documents ordered published by the Senate, a copy of which I supposed Blount must have brought with him when he came to the islands.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to copy here the following from Blount to Gresham, dated June 28, 1893:

"In my dispatch to the Department of April 26 I said: 'Mr. Paul Neumann is generally regarded here as a bright, plausible, and unscrupulous person.' I desire now to say that so far as the expression 'unscrupulous' is concerned a better knowledge of public opinion satisfies me that I was not justified in its use.

"JAMES H. BLOUNT,
"*Special Commissioner of the United States.*"

Why this remarkable change of opinion? So long as he supposed Neumann wished to make a trade with the United States or with the Provisional Government for a cash consideration of all Liliuokalani claims, Blount regarded Neumann a knave. As soon as this astute commissioner ascertained that Neumann was in full accord with Spreckels and Blount for Liliuokalani's restoration to the throne, at once Blount immediately learned that Neumann is "a right down" good fellow. So much for conclusive evidence that Spreckels, Neumann, and Blount were then, as now, rowing the same boat, and closely linked in the conspiracy to damage the action of Harrison's Administration, and of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on the question of annexation. To the same object Blount devoted much of his report to disapprove and repudiate the action of Secretary Marcy and the Democratic Administration of 1854, in authorizing our commissioners at Honolulu to negotiate a treaty of annexation on lines similar to those of President Harrison and the Senate committee of February last.

I wish to say right here that Paul Neumann made, I suppose, an official call on me when he was in Washington. He is a bright, smart fellow, undoubtedly. He called on me and informed me that he represented the deposed Queen. He had a two hours' interview. He never intimated to me in that interview that there was any complaint or any cause of complaint against the Ameri-

can minister or against the naval forces of the United States. He simply made an appeal to me that we should pay that Queen a sum of money for the Queen's lands, which we had taken from her, and then an annuity to support her. I never learned while Mr. Paul Neumann was here that he said anything as the Queen's agent except as to a money recompense for the wrongs to which she had been subjected.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say here, with the permission of the Senator, that perhaps others have had a similar experience. Mr. Neumann brought to me a letter of introduction from an old army friend of mine, and made about the same statement to me as that which the Senator has stated he made to him. I learned from him that his chief errand was to get a pecuniary allowance made for Queen Liliuokalani.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. Stevens proceeds:

This tilt of Blount, Spreckels, and Neumann against Marcy, Grant, Seward, Fish, Blaine, Harrison, and other leading American statesmen must amuse the American public as much as other recent transactions hostile to the American colony in Hawaii are exciting just public indignation.

So far as the affidavits of John F. Colburn and A. P. Peterson and Charles L. Hopkins, and the letter of W. H. Cornwell conflict with any writing or act of mine I will not multiply words. The first named is a notorious corruptionist with some amiable qualities, who aided in bribing the legislative members to vote out the Jones-Wilcox ministry and to pass the lottery bill, and he demanded and received as compensation for his infamous services a few hours of occupancy of the Hawaiian interior department, and Peterson is the man who aided in the distribution of the lottery stock for the purchase of legislative vote, and held the Queen's authority to constitute a lottery cabinet, and to aid the Queen to proclaim a reactionary constitution.

As to Samuel Parker, whose testimony is used to discredit my action, I would gladly say little. Mostly of native Hawaiian stock, he has a small fraction of Anglo-Saxon blood. Good-natured, free-hearted, ignorant, fond of luxuriant living, a notorious spendthrift, he has wasted a large fortune left him by his grandfather and uncle. His word and his note are of little value among the bankers and business men of Honolulu. For years trying to play politics and to be the Queen's minister, for which service he is without capacity, he has competed with Wilson for the control and the favors of the recent immoral occupant of the palace. He was a ready tool in the hands of Peterson and Cornwell in the palace conspiracy which precipitated the fall of the monarchy. It seems impossible that Blount should not have learned of the real character of the four fallen ministers whose words he cites.

Of the Dr. G. Trousseau who figures conspicuously among Blount's affidavits, whitewashing the notorious Wilson and Liliuokalani, and abusively reflecting on my official action, I need only say that he is an adventurous Frenchman with whose printed record in Paris and moral career in Honolulu I will not soil this paper. Of J. A. Cummins it is correct to remark that what is herein said of Samuel Parker in most respects applies to Cummins. A half-white, left valuable property by his English father, he has wasted it in extravagant living and shameful expenditures. For years Cummins has had two wives at the same time in his home. It is not strange that W. T. Seward unites in testimony with Cummins, for Seward is a kind of house clerk and steward of Cummins, occupying the same home, in which, it is well known in Honolulu, there is a great deal of unlawful freedom of life.

Throughout his ponderous document Blount ignores that the division between the Queen's supporters is not the ordinary division of parties in most countries. In Hawaii now and in recent years it is a division between bad men and good men, between men of moral character, property, and intelligence, and those of the opposite characteristics. The distinction is as broad as between the notorious Boss Tweed and his supporters, and the best citizens of New York, who overturned that powerful and corrupt ring.

Regarding the Governor Cleghorn, whose protest Blount speaks of relative to landing the men of the Boston, little need be said. Under the monarchy, prior to the adoption of the constitution of 1887, the Hawaiian Governor had some importance. The office was abolished by that constitution. The Legislature of 1890 restored the office as an honorary title, giving little power or duty. Cleghorn is a brother-in-law to the fallen Liliuokalani, is the reputed father of the so-called princess now residing in England, whose half-sister is married to the English minister's son. Cleghorn is completely under the influence and follows the advice of English Minister Wodehouse. His protest came to me after the landing of the Boston's marines.

Hopkins belonged to the same gang as Cornwell and Peterson. Cornwell has been one of the intimate palace associates of Kalakaua in his bestial, lecherous life and shameful transactions. He is of notoriously immoral habits. He has been a cheat on the race course, betting against his own horses. He was one of the most active in aiding Peterson and Colburn to bribe the legislature in forcing out the Jones-Wilcox ministry, whom all the responsible men of the islands wished to continue. He had been repeatedly voted out of the ministry after a very brief stay, by large majorities, all the honest members voting against him. Prior to Cornwell's two expulsions, Neumann had been voted out August 20, 1892, by a vote of 31 to 10. Reappointed by the Queen September 12, he was voted out October 17 by 31 to 15. He was a close confederate with Peterson and Cornwell. He was known to be of the contract labor ring which was bleeding the planters. With good reasons he was believed to be the author of the Queen's revolutionary despotic new constitution.

Losing caste in California as a political corruptionist, he had years before gone to Honolulu under the flattering auspices of Claus Spreckels. He had played poker with Kalakaua, to the depletion of the weak King's purse. He is the man whom the Queen sent to Washington to get her restored to the throne, or to sell out her claim to the crown in hard cash. He is the man by whom Blount absurdly hints I had sent dispatches to Washington, on an errand for which on no occasion had I ever employed anyone. Blount asserts he received this information from Spreckels. What a remarkable trio, Spreckels, Neuman, and Blount, two honest German Jews, and the astute, impartial, unprejudiced, newborn diplomatist, who had represented that he was the Democratic leader who had led his party to support Harrison in the threatened Chilean war, while he severely denounced Admiral Brown and Minister Egan. Spreckels, Neumann, and Blount! Who will decipher the enigma, explain the philosophy, and state the substantial considerations which bind this trio together?

The testimony of hundreds of such would not counterbalance the words of Minister Thurston, President Dole, and Henry Waterhouse, among honest men who know the respective parties. As to Wilson, the Queen's immoral favorite for many years, whom Blount attempts to whitewash, I will not soil these pages by giving even the notorious facts in this regard.

As to my recognition of the Provisional Government, I reaffirm what I said in my recent letter to Secretary Gresham.

Queen Liliuokalani inaugurated the revolution by attempting to destroy the constitution by revolutionary means. From Saturday afternoon, January 14, to January 16, there was no government in Honolulu, except in the united and self-possessed attitude of the citizens, who assembled in a great mass meeting on January 16, and consummated their efforts for law and order by the establishment of the Provisional Government on the 17th, which was promptly acknowledged by all the foreign representatives, who were familiar with the circumstances of its creation. It was nearly fifty hours after Liliuokalani and her favorites had destroyed her throne by a revolutionary outbreak when the men of the Boston landed. In the exciting hours preceding and following her fall, her representatives, as well as those who formed the Provisional Government, had equal access to the legation.

To all proper inquiries my answer was that the United States marines could not take sides, but whatever *de facto* government might exist would have to be recognized. When I did recognize it, late in the afternoon of the 17th, the Provisional Government was complete master of the situation, had full control of the city and of the government archives, the police station being surrounded and at the mercy of the Provisional Government. It was a small building in which the disorganized and powerless followers of the fallen Queen's paramour marshal took refuge, and they must surrender in a few hours by mere force of hunger. The Provisional Government knew its power to possess the station at once, but wished not to take a single life of its occupants. It deemed it wiser to await their surrender. Had the Queen's supporters dared to resist the organization of the new government, their only possible chance to do so was during Sunday and Monday of the 15th and 16th, while the citizens were attending their mass meeting, selecting their committees of public safety, and preparing to organize a government, as openly as public meetings are held in any American city. They did not dare to attempt to arrest or interfere with the aroused white citizens. It was a united and irresistible movement of the same men, with now increased numbers, that took away the despotic powers of King Kalakaua in 1887, and crushed the Wilcox revolt of 1889. They gathered at the armory with their rifles in hand, which were increased by other arms openly carried in a carriage from a gun store, with only three men in charge. The only government that existed, or could exist under those circumstances, was the Provisional Government.

I am fully aware that I have made this paper too lengthy. I regret to tax the public patience with words of mine. Against all just expectations I have been forced to expose the anomalous, the un-American, and most unfair course of Blount and associates against my official conduct, my honor, and all that a public man holds dear. This extraordinary assault on the American colony in Hawaii, antagonizing the American Christian civilization there established at the cost of the lives and labors of noble American men and women, this strange turning back on an American policy of more than half a century, this wanton disregard of the opportunity to assume jurisdiction and ownership of a territorial and maritime prize, with a clean title and without the cost of a single life, is justly causing profound indignation among the American people. These strange and unpatriotic proceedings in the presence of our national rivals is making a most shameful page of American history, which our future, if not our present, statesmen and generation will repudiate and blot out by wise and effective measures.

JOHN L. STEVENS.

AUGUSTA, ME., *November 29, 1893.*

So much for the act of piracy with which Minister Stevens is charged.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, but for the fact that I am on the eve of leaving the city and desire to avoid any appearance of evading responsibility in regard to this question I should not detain the Senate.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I do not speak as the advocate or special defender of the Administration. It would be a degradation of the issues involved in the question before the Senate for me to take any such position. I speak as an American Senator and an American citizen in regard to questions involving the honor and welfare of our common country.

It is greatly to be regretted that partisan malevolence has so distinctly shown itself in the debate on these great questions. With protestations that they desire no personal aspect to be given to this argument, and with the statement that in their judgment the real issue should not be discussed until the evidence is before the Senate, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] take occasion to assail everybody who differs with them in regard to the Hawaiian question, and undertake to place before the American people their side of this issue in order to take possession of public opinion in the United States. I do not choose by silence to be put in the attitude of acquiescing in the position taken by those Senators.

The Senator from Maine knows that I have the greatest personal regard for him; there is no Senator in this Chamber with whom my relations have been more pleasant; but I am compelled to say, with due respect, that when it comes to a political or partisan question, I would just as little trust that Senator as a hungry wolf when the bleat of a farmer's lamb is heard in his immediate vicinity. [Laughter.] With all his generous instincts, it is impossible for that Senator to be anything else but an intense New England Republican. [Laughter.] Like his friend, Mr. Stevens, his whole political action is governed by the great truth that "the earth belongs to the saints, and we are the saints." [Laughter.]

Mr. FRYE. I am greatly obliged to the Senator from Missouri for the compliment.

Mr. VEST. I have no doubt, and I mean it in the kindest and most fraternal spirit. That Senator knows that I would be incapable of saying anything disrespectful to him; but the truth of argument and logic requires that his correct position, as it is seen by others, should be placed before the country.

Mr. President, the Senator's friend, Mr. Stevens, defends his entire action in Hawaii in the concluding sentence of his re-

markable address by saying that he and his colleagues were there to Christianize the Hawaiian people. They have Christianized them out of their country; they have pursued the old New England fashion of taking possession in the name of God, and then dividing out under laws made by themselves. [Laughter.]

It is not a question between Mr. Blount and Mr. Stevens; it is minimizing the issue to bring here any such personal question. I do not know Mr. Stevens; he may be all his friend the Senator from Maine paints him to be, a godly, saintly, unexceptionable, Christian gentleman. I do not question it, nor do I care anything about it. I propose to treat him as I should any other witness who brought himself into court and demanded my vote upon his evidence.

I do know Mr. Blount. While I am not here to defend him—for I should treat him in the same way as Mr. Stevens—almost twenty years of intimate knowledge of James H. Blount authorizes me to state in the most public and emphatic manner that a purer man, publicly and privately, never has appeared upon the arena of American politics. For twenty years he was the honored representative of one of the great States of the South: the calcium light of public opinion and partisan malice shone upon him by day and night, and I defy any man living to bring here one shadow upon his character. He has his opinions, like every affirmative man and every man who is worthy of the name, but that anything he says is deliberately false, that anything in his career justifies the Senator from Maine to stand here and with his aggressive voice declare that there is not one word of truth in his report, I distinctly and emphatically deny.

He needs no defense from me. The American people, and especially the Southern people, know James H. Blount. If he had been a dishonest man, long ago would his reputation have been torn to tatters, for he has occupied the most prominent committee positions in the House of Representatives; again and again his people have returned him, and even the partisan press found no flaw in his record, and he left public life voluntarily, and not coerced into retirement.

My friend from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] suggests in that connection—and it is simply justice to Mr. Blount and his State—that in the article which the Senator from Maine was kind enough to read us from his friend Mr. Stevens he charges Mr. Blount with being a diplomatic neophyte, who knew nothing about the relations of this Government with foreign nations. Mr. Blount was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the popular branch of Congress, and discharged his duties, so far as I know, with the greatest acceptability to his constituents and to the country at large; and for this saintly gentleman from New England, who has been canonized here by the Senator from Maine, to denounce a Representative who for twenty years has served in the Congress of the United States as a neophyte in diplomacy is simply another specimen of that godly arrogance which we have always heard from that quarter of this country. [Laughter.]

Now, take the testimony of Mr. Stevens. From the beginning to the end of it you can see but one animus, and that is his determined effort to annex the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. Every line, every word, and every syllable is alive with that distinct idea. I have a right to dissect his testimony and see the motives which have actuated him. Take the beginning of his address:

> A deep sense of obligation to my country and an American's duty to defend an insulted, threatened, and struggling American colony, planted as righteously and firmly on the North Pacific isles as our Pilgrim fathers established themselves on Plymouth Rock, demand that I shall make an answer," etc.

In other words, plainly Mr. Stevens there states that there is no question about the legitimacy of the Provisional Government in Hawaii; that they are there by as righteous a title—and he uses the superlative—as that which our Pilgrim Fathers had to the soil upon which they landed when they came to Plymouth Rock. I shall not stop to discuss the legality of their title; let that go. My object now is to treat with the motive of this gentleman in all that he has said and all that he has done; and I take his own language in order to show it. But I come now specifically to discuss this matter, and I am sorry the Senator from Maine is not here in order that he might defend his distinguished friend from Maine.

In the newspaper report which Mr. Stevens was answering Mr. Blount stated that when he arrived at Honolulu there came off to the steamship in the harbor the American minister, Mr. John L. Stevens, with a committee of the Annexation Club, and that Mr. Stevens tendered to him a furnished house, with servants and a carriage, at any cost, "from nothing up." I quote the exact language. Mr. Blount opens his report with the statement that this minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary, Mr. Stevens, whose heart is lacerated and bleeding by the hauling down of the old flag, came in his diplomatic character with a committee of the Annexation Club, organized to annex those islands to the United States, with that distinct and only purpose, and tendered him, Mr. Blount, a furnished house, with servants and equipage, at any cost, from nothing up. That is the distinct charge, and I quote *in hæc verba*.

Mr. President, that was not only unseemly and undignified conduct, but outrageous conduct on the part of the minister of the United States. He says that he was neutral between these factions, that he simply represented the people of the United States and our national glory and honor. Was that consistent with the idea of his going out with a committee from the Annexation Club, the head of one of these factions, and attempting to take possession of the agent of the United States, the commissioner who came there upon this specific and identical business? What ordinary juror trying a case of *meum et tuum* in a circuit court would doubt the animus of a witness, even in a matter of dollars and cents, with this testimony before him?

But Mr. Stevens undertakes to answer that specifically, and I want to hold him now to his answer, not technically—for I am dealing with him in the most liberal and catholic spirit, giving him the benefit of every doubt. What is his answer? I will ask the Secretary to read it, and I will ask the Senate, as these words come from the desk, to recollect Mr. Blount's charge, and see what Mr. Stevens says to Mr. Blount's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). Without objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNDER ROYAL ESPIONAGE.

> A total stranger, it was impossible for Mr. Blount to know how unfitting it was for him to take up his quarters where he was certain to be surrounded by royalists, and where the supporters of the Provisional Government would be reluctant to go. The hotel was kept by one who had served as Kalakaua's chamberlain, who was one of the principal persons in a syndicate that had cheated the Hawaiian Government out of nearly $100,000, a transaction which Minister Merrill had officially reported to Secretary Bayard, and this man was the leading member of a firm that sought to do its chief business with England, a thoroughly unprincipled opponent of the Provisional Government and of American predominance in the islands. He employed as his active assistant in managing the hotel a highly educated Englishman, of disreputable character, who had written in the Hawaiian British newspaper, under anonymous signature, articles abusive of the United States and grossly falsifying our Government's treatment of the Indians.
>
> Residing at that hotel, Mr. Blount was under the constant espionage of the palace adventurers. As a precautionary safeguard against thus shutting out the Americans from ready access to Commissioner Blount, a wealthy and a highly respectable widow lady of the American colony was ready to grant the use of her house to Mr. and Mrs. Blount, the commissioner to pay the same amount it would cost him to live at the royalist hotel. This private house was situated near the United States legation, in the quarter of the city where annexationists and royalists could have unobstructed access to the commissioner, and he could conveniently avail himself of the legation records. This polite offer of an American resident to an American commissioner did not originate with the Provisional Government, nor did the Provisional Government have anything whatever to do with the proposed arrangement.
>
> The effort in his report to cast imputation on the Provisional Government and myself as to the offer of the American house to an American commissioner will be estimated at its true value by the American public.

Mr. VEST. Yes, Mr. President, it will be estimated at its true value. I undertake to say now that Mr. Stevens has not denied the statement of Mr. Blount, and he knows that he has not denied it. What is his answer to the specific allegation that he came with a committee of the annexation club and tendered this house and these servants and that equipage at any cost, from nothing up, as Mr. Blount graphically expresses it? His reply is that a very respectable American lady was willing to allow Mr. Blount and Mrs. Blount to occupy her house at the same board and rent for which he could secure apartments at the Royal Hotel. It is admitted by this Mr. Stevens that Blount has told the truth in regard to it. It is admitted that he met Mr. Blount, in connection with the committee of this Annexation Club, which made the extraordinary offer to him, and he evades the statement of Blount by an appeal to the American people to decide the issue between them.

Mr. President, it is extraordinary that Senators upon the other side who deprecate personalities should bring this foulmouthed and scurrilous witness here into court. Take the printed remarks which were read by the Senator from Maine, and who in the Hawaiian Islands opposed to Mr. Stevens in regard to annexation has escaped his billingsgate? He has taken up every man in those islands from the highest to the lowest ranks in life and disposed of them seriatim by personal charges, criminal some of them, and others so vulgar as to preclude me from criticising them further in this presence.

That is not all. This witness is insincere and contradicts himself. He says in the opening part of the speech made on his return to Maine that the Provisional Government was an absolute *de facto* government at the time he put those marines on shore; that it was firmly established; that there was no disorder. He makes good every statement that Blount has made in his report. Why did he take the military force of the United States and land it upon Hawaiian soil if that Government was already firmly

established and able to preserve order in the streets of Honolulu? He denies absolutely and emphatically that he ever had any agreement with the Provisional Government that he should use the marines in order to sustain that Government. Mr. President, I grant it. What intelligent man connected with that Government, knowing Mr. Stevens and knowing his opinion and knowing his determination to bring about annexation, wanted any promise from him? They might as well have exacted a promise from each other, because they knew what his intentions were without his putting them either in writing or giving them verbally.

The flag was torn down—"Old Glory desecrated," as some of the press of the Provisional Government denominate it. I should like to know from Senators upon the opposite side of this Chamber whether the flag was put there as an emblem of sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands? I beg them, when they give the elaborate arguments we are now promised, to tell me whether that flag of our country was put there to denote sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands, or was it put there simply to protect the property of citizens of the United States who were there for legitimate purposes, and not to attack the established Government?

Was there any use for the flag when there was perfect order, according to Mr. Stevens, and a *de facto* government supported by the entire population? Why keep the flag there uselessly as a threat to any portion of those people when the plea under which Mr. Stevens acted had been fully answered and there was complete order at Honolulu and throughout the entire islands?

But there is a part of the address of Mr. Stevens which the Senator from Maine did not read, that shows what sort of an impartial witness he is. There is one appeal always omnipotent with certain people in this country, and that is the late war. Beaten logically, beaten rhetorically, geographically, or ecclesiastically they fall back on the war. "Oh, you tried to tear down the Government; you were a rebel." That is the ultimate resort with these people.

Now, this man Stevens, this God-fearing, charitable, saintly old logician of Maine, understood that. Here is what he says. I ask the Secretary to read that part of the argument of Mr. Stevens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ignoring his inferiority of official rank, which, according to established rules the world over was below that of minister resident, between a consul-general and chargé d'affaires, with the utmost effort of will controlling my outraged sensibilities, while suffering a terrible affliction at the recent sad drowning of a gifted and beloved daughter, I endured this insolent treatment after thirteen years of service as United States minister, without a stain ever before attempted to be made on my official honor or my fidelity to American prestige and to American interests, never during my seventy-three years of life having lifted my voice, my hand, or my rifle against the flag of this American Republic.

Mr. VEST. Now, that was an argument against which nothing could prevail. I refer to that portion of it in which Mr. Stevens, not content with reciting his long and honorable career, appeals to the prejudices of the Northern people by saying that he never lifted his rifle against his Government. What did that have to do with the Hawaiian question? What did he mean by it except to array the prejudices of the loyal portion, so called, of the American people against Blount because he had been a Confederate soldier?

Why should Mr. Stevens have brought into this controversy regarding a great international question this statement that he had never lifted his rifle against the Government of the United States? I bring that out of his own mouth to show the animus which has incited and urged this man throughout the entire controversy, and by which he stands to-day. I take the conclusion of this gentleman's address, which I believe the Senator from Maine read. I ask the Secretary to read that again as a proper summing up to this remarkable testimony and recital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, if there be no objection.

Mr. FRYE. I suppose the Senator from Missouri does not think that for any special purpose I omitted to read that which he has just cited.

Mr. VEST. Oh, no; the Senator knows I do not think he suppresses anything. He is as frank and open an adversary as I ever met, and no doubt he has the same opinion of me politically that I have of him. Neither of us strikes below the belt. Now let the Secretary read what I have indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Against all just expectations, I have been forced to expose the anomalous, the un-American, and most unfair course of Blount and associates against my official conduct, my honor, and all that a public man holds dear. This extraordinary assault on the American colony in Hawaii, antagonizing the American Christian civilization there established at the cost of the lives and labors of noble American men and women; this strange turning back on an American policy of more than half a century; this wanton disregard of the opportunity to assume jurisdiction and ownership of a territorial and maritime prize with a clean title and without the cost of a single life, is justly causing profound indignation among the American people. These strange and unpatriotic proceedings in the presence of our national rivals is making a most shameful page of American history, which our future if not our present statesmen and generation will repudiate and blot out by wise and effective measures.

Mr. VEST. Now, Mr. President, there is the essence of this whole controversy. The crime committed by the President of the United States, for which he has been threatened with impeachment, is that he does not favor the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to this country. If that constitutes a crime I am a criminal, and in my judgment so are a large majority of the American people. Mr. Stevens, whatever else he be, understands the art of summing up his position, and that is in the concluding portion of his address. We have failed "to seize a marine prize." The Senator from Maine objects to the word piracy. That is very much like it. We have failed to seize a prize; we have failed to carry out American policy. I shall have something more to say about that directly; but there is the crime which the President of the United States has committed, in which, as I have already stated, in my judgment a large majority of the American people participate.

Mr. President, the plain issue is before us whether we are to quit now the traditional policy of this country established by Washington and carried out by Jefferson and concurred in by Madison and Jackson and Buchanan, and now by Cleveland, or are we to depart from that policy and now venture upon the great colonial system of the European powers. I assert it here now, and I want this made distinctly an issue, and as far as I am able I propose that the American people shall understand it: It is proposed now that instead of having a compact, continental republic, as our fathers intended, we are to have a great, expansive, territory-acquiring Government, extending even to the islands of the ocean and the uttermost parts of the earth.

Is it pretended, and will any Senator upon the other side of the Chamber undertake to say here now, that the Hawaiian Islands are to be held as colonies? Where is the warrant in the Constitution for holding any colonies? What is to be done with the Hawaiian Islands after we have taken possession of them and put the flag of the United States above them as an emblem of sovereignty? Are we to hold them as England holds India or Australia, as France has her island possessions in all the oceans of the world? What can we do with them except to bring them in as States? Here is the question, whether we are to add the Kanakas, the Japanese, Chinese, Indians, and characterless adventurers of Honolulu to the population of the United States already threatened in its moral integrity by undue immigration; and because the President of the United States dares to doubt that, he must be impeached or threatened with impeachment.

Mr. President, for one I shall hail with gladness the narrowing or defining this issue to the limits I have stated. The people of the United States want no colonies. We want the Government that our fathers made for us and that we intend to preserve for our children. We want a compact republic in which every citizen is represented; a compact republic with no islands out in the ocean around which we are to gather an enormous fleet and upon which we are to place expensive fortifications—a pawn to be seized in the event of war with a great power of Europe when an attack upon a single Kanaka would involve the honor and dignity of our whole country and require the expenditure of the last dollar and the last drop of blood to defend him.

We have heard a great deal from the Senator from Massachusetts about the unconstitutional action of the President in sending Blount as an agent or commissioner to Hawaii. I have no disposition to argue that question at length, but I want to refer that Senator to Miscellaneous Document No. 109 of the Senate and to the minority report signed by JOHN T. MORGAN, Eli Saulsbury, Joseph E. Brown, and H. B. Payne, in answer to that argument. I ask the Secretary to read now that portion of the minority report in regard to this same contention made by the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations in respect to the British treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

There is no fault in the manner of negotiating this treaty, and the President has not in any way exceeded his constitutional powers, or withheld any courtesy due to the Senate in respect of the agents selected by him to conduct the negotiation, or in the time or place of negotiating or concluding the treaty.

On the other question, as to the form in which the negotiation has been conducted and the authority of the two plenipotentiaries, Mr. Putnam and Mr. Angell, to act, without a confirmation by the Senate, we rely upon the precedents cited in the annexed brief of cases that seem to conclude any question on this point.

The table hereto appended, marked C, will furnish an easy reference to all the appointments of diplomatic agents to negotiate and conclude conventions, agreements, and treaties with foreign powers since 1792. The

whole number of persons appointed or recognized by the President, without the concurrence or advice of the Senate, or the express authority of Congress, as agents to conduct negotiations and conclude treaties, is 438. Three have been appointed by the Secretary of State and 32 have been appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It will be seen that an interval of 53 years, between 1827 and 1880, occurred during which the President did not ask the consent of the Senate to any such appointment.

The following important appointments and many others were made when the Senate was in session:

March 2, 1793.—David Humphries. By Washington. Commissioned plenipotentiary to treat with Algiers. Congress adjourned on that day.

January 26, 1832.—Edmund Roberts. By Jackson. Commissioner to treat with Cochin China and Siam. Congress in session.

May 3, 1838.—Nathaniel Niles. By Van Buren. Special agent to negotiate treaty with Sardinia. Congress in session.

March 28, 1846.—A. Dudley Mann. By Polk. Special agent to treat with sundry states of Germany. Congress in session.

The constitutional power of the President to select the agents through whom he will conduct such business is not affected by the fact that the Senate is or is not in session at the time of such appointment, or while the negotiation is being conducted; or the fact that he may prefer to withhold, even from the Senate, or from other countries, the fact that he is treating with a particular power, or on a special subject.

The secret-service fund that Congress votes to the Department of State annually is that from which such agents are usually paid. That is the most important reason for such appropriations.

The following is a summary of Appendix C:

Persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate:
1792. William Carmichael, William Shott, to treat with Spain.
1794. John Jay, to treat with Great Britain.
1794. Thomas Pinckney, to treat with Spain.
1796. Rufus King, to treat with Great Britain.
1797. John Q. Adams, to treat with Prussia.
1797. John Q. Adams, to treat with Sweden.
1797. C. C. Pinckney, John Marshall, Elbridge Gerry, to treat with France.
1798. John Q. Adams, to treat with Sweden.
1799. Rufus King, to treat with Russia.
1799. Oliver Ellsworth, Patrick Henry, and William Van Murray, to treat with France.
1799. W. R. Davis, vice Henry, as above.
1803. James Monroe and R. R. Livingston, to treat for Louisiana.
1803. Rufus King, to treat with Great Britain, northeast boundary.
1806. James Armstrong and James Bowdoin, to treat with Spain.
1814. J. Q. Adams, J. A. Bayard, Henry Clay, and Jonathan Russell, to treat with Great Britain.
1814. Albert Gallatin, to treat with Great Britain.
1826. R. C. Anderson and John Sergeant, to treat with the American nations.
1827. Joel R. Poinsett, vice Anderson, above.
1830. James B. Angell, John T. Swift, and W. H. Prescott, to treat with China.
Total number, 32.

Persons appointed by the Secretary of State:
1825. Christopher Hughes, to treat with Denmark.
1826. John James Appleton, to treat with Naples.
1886. George H. Bates, to treat with Tonga.
Total number, 3.

Persons appointed by the President:
Total number, 438.

Mr. VEST. I desire now to call attention to a tabulated statement of the number of officers appointed by Presidents of the United States while the Senate was in session and when it was not in session, and without the concurrence of that body. This statement is put as an appendix to the minority report of the committee. The very first appointment was made by President Washington, that of G. Morris, October 13, 1789, as a private agent, who held no other office at the time. In other words, the Father of his Country selected a private individual, who was not connected with the diplomatic portion of the Government, and made him his agent to go abroad and negotiate a treaty without consulting the Senate; and, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, the Father of his Country was treading upon very slippery ice, and very thin at that. I should like to know whether some distinguished Senator rose at that era in our Republic and threatened Washington with impeachment for having done what Cleveland has done to-day.

There are three hundred and eighty-odd appointments in this list made by Presidents without the consent of the Senate to negotiate treaties, to perform the most important diplomatic functions; and to-day it has been reserved to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to find that the Constitution was violated, and applause is elicited from the galleries by threatening the President of the United States with impeachment for having done what all his predecessors have done.

Immediately succeeding the appointment of Morris was the appointment of John Paul Jones. He is pretty well known to readers of American history. He was an admiral in the United States Navy at the time, and was appointed by the President without the knowledge of the Senate a commissioner to treat with Algiers for peace and friendship, and for the ransom of captive United States citizens.

Going on through the list we find the appointment of John James Appleton, May 12, 1825, appointed by the Secretary of State without the consent of the Senate, to arrange for the settlement of the claims of citizens of the United States against the Kingdom of Naples; and again January 26, 1822, Edmund Roberts, appointed commissioner by the President, without the knowledge of the Senate, to conclude treaties of navigation and commerce with Cochin China, Siam, and Muscat; and again Benjamin E. Green, June 13, 1849, appointed by the President as special agent in Haiti and the Dominican Republic, to conclude a treaty of commerce with Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour has expired.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. VEST. I desire to occupy only a few minutes more. I beg pardon of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. MORRILL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection. The Calendar will be considered as having been laid before the Senate, and the Senator from Missouri will proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. VEST. June 15, 1850, A. Dudley Mann was appointed special agent to the Swiss Confederation, to conclude with the Swiss Confederation a treaty "concerning all matters and subjects interesting to both nations." Mr. Mann, as well as these other gentlemen, let it be understood, occupied no diplomatic position, but were appointed by the President and Secretary of State from private life in order to perform these delicate functions.

Again, James B. Bowlin was appointed by the President, without the consent of the Senate, to conclude a treaty with New Granada with reference to a transit across the Isthmus of Panama.

I have read out of this list of over three hundred and eighty only those who at the time of their appointment held no diplomatic or official position whatever. I have not read the long list of those who were appointed by the President without the consent of the Senate and who were already in office, ministers plenipotentiary and resident at foreign courts, but I have read those who occupied no official position, in order to meet the contention that, as Mr. Stevens was minister plenipotentiary of the United States at Honolulu, no one else ought to have been sent there to perform diplomatic functions.

But we have heard a great deal about Paramount Blount. I read from the newspaper report of his instructions the following in regard to that much-quoted word. Mr. Gresham, in his instructions to Mr. Blount, says:

> You will investigate and fully report to the President all the facts you can learn respecting the condition of affairs in the Hawaiian Islands, the causes of the revolution by which the Queen's Government was overthrown, the sentiment of the people toward existing authority, and, in general, all that can fully enlighten the President touching the subjects of your mission.
>
> To enable you to fulfill this charge, your authority in all matters touching the relations of this Government to the existing or other government of the islands, and the protection of our citizens therein, is paramount, and in you alone, acting in coöperation with the commander of the naval forces, is vested full discretion and power to determine when such forces should be landed or withdrawn.

In other words, Mr. Blount is given power above Stevens, as the President had a right to do, as had been done in hundreds of other cases since the foundation of the Government when other agents had been appointed by this Government and given diplomatic functions above the ministers resident at foreign courts.

As a matter of course, this whole paper must be taken together; and what the President meant is evident from the subsequent portion of it:

> Should it be necessary to land an armed force upon Hawaiian territory on occasions of popular disturbance, when the local authority may be unable to give adequate protection to the life and property of citizens of the United States, the assent of such authority should first be obtained, if it can be done without prejudice to the interests involved. Your power in this regard should not, however, be claimed to the exclusion of similar measures by the representatives of other powers for the protection of the lives and property of their citizens or subjects residing in the islands.
>
> While the United States claim no right to interfere in the political or domestic affairs or in the internal conflicts of the Hawaiian Islands otherwise than as herein stated, or for the purpose of maintaining any treaty or other rights which they possess, this Government will adhere to its consistent and established policy in relation to them, and it will not acquiesce in domestic interference by other powers.

I affirm here now that taking this instrument altogether, it is simply a repetition and affirmation of the distinct, emphatic, and well-outlined policy of the United States from the foundation of the Government. Since the time when George Washington declared in his Farewell Address that this country should not interfere with foreign nations as to their domestic affairs, that we should enter into no entangling alliances, that we should maintain our own institutions and be satisfied with that, from the time when Washington and Jefferson refused to take part with France against England in the war of 1793, when Genet was given his letters of recall because he insisted upon embroiling this country in a foreign war, down through the terms of Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Buchanan, and now through the term of Cleveland, this has been the established policy of the people of this country. If it is proposed now to overturn it, let us know it and we are ready for the issue.

No demagogy about pulling down the old flag, no talk about

raising your rifle against the Government, no personal abuse of the President or anybody else will suffice on this issue. We intend to know whether you mean that the Government of the United States shall trample under foot its traditions, its history, the teachings of its greatest men, and go out upon diplomatic raids throughout the world for the purpose of interfering with the internal and domestic affairs of other people.

Mr. President, I deal with this matter in entire frankness, and I have no disposition to conceal my dissent from one expression which has been published in the press as coming from the Secretary of State in regard to the policy of this Government as to Liliuokalani.

As I understand the condition of affairs in Hawaii to-day, the Provisional Government is a *de facto* government. As I understand international law, a *de facto* government has all the rights, so far as other nations are concerned, of a *de jure* government. Whether that Government be established rightfully or wrongfully it is to day a *de facto* government, and any assault upon it by armed force on the part of the United States or any other country must be an act of war which can alone be brought about by the action of Congress.

I do not understand that Mr. Gresham, the Secretary of State, meant that armed force would be employed. He is an eminent jurist. He has just come from the bench.

After stating his profound conviction, in which I share, that the Provisional Government is the result of a mercenary conspiracy on the part of a few adventurers and that a majority of the people of the Hawaiian Islands do not participate in it, he simply puts a hypothetical question, whether under the plainest principles of equitable jurisdiction it would be our duty as a great people to redress the wrong, if it had been committed, and restore the *status quo*.

When the papers come in answer to the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts we shall know, I trust, what instructions were given to Mr. Willis. If it shall turn out that those instructions were to restore the Queen by armed force, no one will deprecate it and no one will resist the doctrine to any extremity more than myself.

I repeat that it would be an act of war; and it seems to me impossible that the Secretary of State and the President of the United States should have come to the conclusion that without the action of Congress they could do any such thing. But as I understand the position of the Administration now as given in the instructions to Mr. Blount, which I have read, it is simply a repetition and affirmation of the time-honored doctrine of our country in every Administration, that we should not interfere in the domestic affairs of other people, but content ourselves with the plain right of every nation to protect the property and persons of its citizens who are residing in a foreign country for legitimate ends.

Now, Mr. President, in conclusion, I do not think that under any possible circumstances, under any contingency, could I be induced to change my settled conviction that the people of the Hawaiian Islands have not been consulted in regard to this movement. I have no doubt that the presence of the United States marines in Honolulu is a sufficient military argument to bring about anything. I have no question that the large majority of the native population are helpless when the military power of the United States is known to be at hand in order to reënforce and protect the Provisional Government. When within forty-eight hours after the revolution was accomplished, to use Mr. Stevens's words, the commissioners started from the harbor of Honolulu for the United States to negotiate annexation, when from their own statements a petition with two hundred and odd names upon it was flung upon the deck of the steamship while it steamed out into the ocean, this hot haste, this premature action made every honest and intelligent man in the United States suspect the animus and the designs of the people engaged in it.

It was eight years before Texas was considered so firmly established as a republic *de facto* that the authorities of the United States thought it proper to treat with her as to annexation; and Gen. Jackson was denounced all over this country because he did not, upon the testimony then presented to him, declare that Texas was an independent republic and entitled to become a member of the United States. And here, because this Government does not in three days settle the whole question in favor of annexation, the President of the United States is to be denounced and threatened with impeachment in face of the American people!

I do not care to go into detail upon this question. I simply ask that the Secretary may read the opinion of Daniel Webster, and I take it his authority is good with the Senator from Massachusetts as to the policy of the Government of the United States on this question.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The United States have regarded the existing authorities in the Sandwich Islands as a Government suited to the condition of the people, and resting on their own choice; and the President is of opinion that the interests of all commercial nations require that that Government should not be interfered with by foreign powers. Of the vessels which visit the islands, it is known that the great majority belong to the United States. The United States, therefore, are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their Government than any other nation can be; and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government, or any exclusive privileges or preferences with it in matters of commerce. (Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, to Messrs. Haalilio and Richards, December 19, 1842; 6 Webster's Works, 478.)

Owing to their locality and to the course of the winds which prevail in this quarter of the world, the Sandwich Islands are the stopping place for almost all vessels passing from continent to continent across the Pacific Ocean. They are especially resorted to by the great numbers of vessels of the United States which are engaged in the whale fishery in those seas. The number of vessels of all sorts and the amount of property owned by citizens of the United States which are found in those islands in the course of a year are stated, probably with sufficient accuracy, in the letter of the agents.

"Just emerging from a state of barbarism, the Government of the islands is as yet feeble; but its dispositions appear to be just and pacific, and it seems anxious to improve the condition of its people by the introduction of knowledge, of religious and moral institutions, means of education, and the arts of civilized life."

Mr. HOAR. I have been absent on a private engagement during a great part of the Senator's speech, very much to my regret. As I came in I understood he was reading from what purported to be the instructions to Mr. Blount. May I ask him from what source he obtained the instructions?

Mr. VEST. As they were published in the newspapers and as Mr. Stevens replied to them.

Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me for a single minute I will give a summary for what it is worth, based upon a careful examination of the testimony, in so far as I could obtain it, in regard to the Hawaiian controversy. It is a summary of my conclusion, whether from a nonpartisan standpoint or not I shall leave others to determine. If I had the power I would withdraw every shadow of United States authority from the Hawaiian Islands, except in so far as it was necessary to protect under international law the property and persons of American citizens legitimately residing there. I would leave the opposing factions to settle the question of sovereignty for themselves.

There can be no solution of this question so absolute and determinate as that which would then be had between the adherents of Queen Liliuokalani and the Provisional Government. The doctrine of the United States through all our history has been that the people should determine their own government—not the educated people, not the titled people, not the opulent people, but, under God, the people, rich and poor, high and low. I would leave it to the people of those islands of all classes who are legitimate residents there and citizens to determine this question for themselves. For our Government now to put back this woman upon the throne if the Provisional Government be *de facto* is an act of war, and I will not believe that the President has contemplated it. For us to take part with the Provisional Government is to give proof that the military authority of this Government is to be used in a doubtful issue by turning the scales against an overwhelming popular majority of the people.

Either horn of that dilemma would destroy our prestige as a great Republic. Either course would strike down the doctrine of popular sovereignty upon which our Government is established and upon which it must stand. If the Queen have behind her enough of her people to put her back upon the throne then the Government of the United States should recognize that as the Government *de facto* and *de jure* of the Hawaiian Islands. If she has not that power then let her go down before the decree of the great tribunal to which all true Americans bow in this land, and for which the people pray throughout the world.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator let me say just one word?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. I simply wish to say that with the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Missouri, I am in hearty accord, and I believe that the people in the Hawaiian Islands are, too.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to make the same remark.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I rose this morning when the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts was read for the purpose of moving, pursuant to an understanding I had with the Senator from Massachusetts, that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I did not intend, in his absence or otherwise, to say anything except to refer to a single matter, which I thought ought to go into the RECORD as a matter of public information, without comment on my part, but which has been referred to by the Senator from Missouri, to wit, the in-

formation that was conveyed in the minority report of the Committee on Foreign Relations made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] in 1885 in regard to what was then called the fisheries treaty, and as to the negotiation of which the same objection was strenuously made that is made now—that the commissioners associated by President Cleveland with the Secretary of State to negotiate that treaty were appointed during the session of the Senate without its advice and consent.

The draftsman of that minority report, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, in referring to the contention of the majority of the committee that that was an unlawful and unconstitutional act, cited 438 precedents of the appointment of diplomatic agents to negotiate treaties, some of whom, most of whom, perhaps, were appointed during the recess of the Senate, many of whom were appointed during the session of the Senate, and some of those who were appointed during the recess of the Senate continued to exercise their powers long after a session of the Senate had occurred without any new appointment being sent in.

I wish merely to add to that list then reported to the Senate and contained in one of the Senate documents a list I have made of diplomatic agents for other purposes than for those of negotiating treaties appointed by the President without the advice and consent of the Senate. Some of these were appointed during the session. Some of them, as I said in regard to the other list, were appointed during the recess but continued to exercise their functions after the Senate met, no new appointment being sent in, their appointment not being treated as among those which under the Constitution, when made during the recess of the Senate, require a new appointment. I will refer now to the list, and that is all I wish to do, in order that it may go into the RECORD for the inspection of Senators who are interested in this matter. In 1790, August 11——

Mr. HOAR. I desire to say to the Senator from Delaware that if this matter is going into the RECORD I think I ought to take a minute or two at least, although I do not know how absolutely applicable it is to the subject of the resolution. However, I dislike very much to interfere with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware to postpone the conclusion of his remarks until the Senator from Vermont has spoken. Otherwise it will leave us in an awkward position.

Mr. MORRILL. Let the resolution go over until to-morrow.

Mr. GRAY. I wish to put this matter in the RECORD, because I think it is due to the Senate and due to the public that these precedents should go for what they are worth after the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts as a serious cause of criticism of the President.

Mr. HOAR. I want them to go for what they are worth.

Mr. GRAY. Very well; that is what I suppose they will go for. I think they will be scrutinized by intelligent people, and I think they are worth a great deal. I am not asking to add to them any emphasis of my own.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not wish to say anything that by any possibility can give rise to any difference of opinion between the Senator and myself. At this moment I wish to avoid anything of the kind. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the venerable Senator from Vermont gave notice last week that at 2 o'clock to-day he would address the Senate and he is here waiting.

Mr. GRAY. I will not detain him five minutes.

Mr. HOAR. And I can not reply to the Senator now if he puts in that matter.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator knows I have given way and have always a disposition to give way on every occasion when courtesy or consideration for so distinguished a Senator as the Senator from Vermont requires that I should do so; but I insist that I shall go on now for two or three minutes, which I told the Senator from Vermont I would take in giving the matters to which I have referred, and that I think is pertinent to the present issue.

In 1790, August 11, David Humphreys was appointed during the session of the Senate a diplomatic agent to establish relations with Portugal.

In 1836, June 23, Henry M. Morfit was appointed during the session of the Senate a diplomatic agent to obtain information relative to the civil, military, and political condition and character of the people of Texas.

In 1816, January 12, Joseph Devereaux was appointed special diplomatic agent to obtain information of the various occurrences in South America interesting in a political point of view to the United States of all military movements in that quarter and the disposition manifested toward the United States. I suppose that in order to obtain that information he had to communicate with informed persons in the communities in which he happened to be. That appointment was made during the session of the Senate.

In 1832, January 26, Edmund Roberts was appointed during the session of the Senate a special agent to Japan, Muscat, and Siam to negotiate concerning all matters relating to navigation and commerce.

In 1820, February 22, Charles S. Todd was appointed during the session of the Senate confidential agent to obtain information concerning the condition of affairs in Venezuela and New Granada and their relations with Spain. All these appointments were made of course without the advice and consent of the Senate. All the persons so appointed were agents to obtain information; and I need not say, of course, to any intelligent person that information is not usually obtained without communication with those capable of giving it.

In 1824, April 21, Thomas N. Mann was sent during the session of the Senate, without the advice and consent of the Senate, an agent to Guatemala, "to obtain information relative to the state and prospects of the country situated in South America which appears to have established the separate Government of Guatemala, whether they promise the establishment of its separate independent existence."

In 1812, April 10, D. B. Mitchell, who was then governor of Georgia, was an agent appointed by the President, without the advice and consent of the Senate, and during the session of the Senate, "to restore to Spain Amelia Island and other parts of East Florida taken by Gen. Matthews, contrary to the spirit of instructions, but to defeat any attempt of the British forces to enter said territory." I have not consulted the records of that time, and I do not know whether there was then any suggestion of the impeachment of President Madison for that appointment.

In 1818, February 7, William Taylor was appointed during the session of the Senate special agent to obtain redress for the confiscation of property of American citizens in Hayti.

In 1821, January 30, Edward Wyer was appointed, during the session of the Senate, diplomatic agent to obtain indemnity for all lawful claims against the Dominican Government.

In 1822, December 13, William McRee was appointed, during the session of the Senate, agent and commissary to Japan.

In 1811, January 26, George Matthews and John McKee were appointed commissioners under the act of January 15, 1811, to take temporary possession amicably, if possible, forcibly if any suspicion existed of armed interference by some other power, of East and West Florida.

I merely wish to add (and I shall not detain the Senator from Vermont longer in order to read them) there will be found in the list a number of appointments of special diplomatic agents made during the recess of the Senate, and as I said before their functions were continued after the Senate came in session, notably the appointment of Mr. N. P. Trist as a special agent of the President to go to Mexico, where he continued for more than one year under an appointment without the advice and consent of the Senate, continuing long after the Senate came in session, and his powers were paramount to those of Gen. Scott, he having power to make a treaty and order a withdrawal of troops and the cessation of hostilities.

That is all I wish to add now, because I can not detain the Senator from Vermont longer.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask that the resolution introduced by me Thursday last be read.

Mr. GORDON. Will the Senator from Vermont give me one moment to say a word in reference to a constituent of mine?

Mr. MORRILL. I wish the Senator would wait until I get through. I have been waiting here above an hour and expected to take the floor long ago.

Mr. GORDON. Certainly, Mr. President; I will wait.

PROPOSED FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution indicated by the Senator from Vermont will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MORRILL on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That all parts of the President's message relating to the tariff, internal revenue, and income tax, together with that relating to those who it is said, after a hard struggle for tariff reform, are solemnly pledged to it be, and hereby are, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, it might have been wiser to have allowed some remarks on the general subject of the tariff, made by me a dozen years ago, to stand as my completed record rather than to incumber it by further discussion. But some contribution from me to "the campaign of education" may be due, and, while I hope to make it not so lengthy or so ponderous as to seem the tired "wisdom of the ages," it may abridge my contributions hereafter to the literature of the tariff. It being a subject always of national importance and paramount to all political parties, my inclination in earlier days was to avoid all partisan reflections, and, if unable to do so now, it is because the Democratic party, forgetting the orbit which was early and long illuminated by their most illustrious representatives, has made it the foremost of party questions, by denouncing with tragic

vehemence the American doctrine of a protective tariff, as well as by ringing all their arguments against it on the same set of bells with those of free trade.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

During all the present generation modern Democracy has been prolific in queer tariff platforms, never right even by mistake, and each one dying unloved before the birth of its quadrennial successor. It gives me pleasure to rescue from oblivion, as a specimen, their platform of 1872, decorated with the champion of protection, Horace Greeley, as their Presidential candidate, which declared, on account of honest differences of opinion with regard to the systems of protection and free trade, that "we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts and the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from Executive interference or dictation." The tariff platform bantling of 1892, whether to be nursed or strangled by Executive interference, seems fated to become not less moribund and unsavory in 1896 than any other of the Democratic platforms now mouldering in the tomb of the Capulets.

Some radical change of the tariff is supposed to be imminent, not because the prosperity of the country demands it or can thus be promoted, but because the rhapsodies of "revenue reform" pads and inflates the Chicago Democratic platform. Ruskin once said of a sermon, "that it was either a human composition or a Divine message." Many obsequious partisans, fearful of being called heretics or of being excluded from the party patronage pasture, hastily accepted the platform without a why or a wherefore as "a Divine message," but the sundry juvenile earthly Democratic claimants of its authorship conclusively prove that the proposed "tariff for revenue only" was not only a square-toed synonym of British free trade, but wholly a "human composition," and put forth at a time when the gospel of the earliest Democratic inspiration was surrendered to the idols of the uncircumcised. No Democratic aspirants, however, for the Presidential succession have yet left their footprints on or claim relationship to this wonderfully and fearfully made platform. It is true there has been an unlocated suspicion that the audacity to carry out the platform would be found lacking and that it would have some deft and slippery modifications in order that the party might secure forgiveness for its wrongdoings through a deathbed repentance. But this will be discredited as obviously too late and a performance not clever enough to win absolution for a blunder worse than a crime.

The Democratic party, in its platform of 1892, denounced protection, with trombone epithets, as a "fraud and robbery," as well as "an atrocity," and, louder yet, as "unconstitutional;" and proposed to supersede and reform it by "a tariff for revenue only," or a tariff wholly based on the British example of free trade, with protection utterly emasculated. Such a measure will not be a leap in the dark from which any party can shirk its responsibilities. The example of a protective tariff in America for many years presents an indelible picture before the world of the great American industrial age, and in figures so large as to make it memorable forever. British free trade has also been on trial long enough to minimize the profits of agriculture in their whole United Kingdom. Their silk industries have also vanished; those of iron bend and groan under repeated antagonistic invasions from Germany and Belgium; and the free-trade cry for "Fair trade" exhibits the popular discontent with free trade.

FREE TRADE.

The practical merits of the respective systems of raising national revenue, therefore, invite critical examination by Congress, which must speedily determine whether or not the free-trade policy, directly imported from England, has such unimpeachable goodness as will justify our hurried acceptance, or the total abandonment of protection to all labor here employed, and to the great multitude of our fixed investments. These are some of the salient points to which I shall invite considerate attention.

It may be true that President Cleveland would like to be a little better than his party on the tariff, as well as on silver, and that he ought to abide by his early and solemn declaration that "we wage no exterminating war against any American interests;" but even those more anxious to speak well of the President than some highly valued members of his party are deplorably weak in the faith touching any revelation of an executive veto against tariff bills when tipped with "revenue reform" and triumphantly enacted by a Democratic Congress.

Those who are prolific in panegyrics on a "tariff for revenue only," the name now given to sweeten free trade, can not object to having the question of its excellence brought to the test of facts from the only place where such a tariff has been on trial, and which, as I believe, conclusively prove that the Democratic architects have built their platform on a sandy and most unsatisfactory foundation.

The economy of nations is studied by their statesmen as specialists, always seeking the higher dignity and greater prosperity of their own people; and whatever contributes to these ends they would, if possible, persuade mankind to believe equally advantageous to the world at large. Russia has no doubt that by wresting Constantinople from the Turks, the condition of the world would be largely bettered.

France, ambitious to cut as big a colonial figure as her neighbors, believes that civilization of Darkest Africa and India will be sadly retarded unless her tricolored flag, with sound of trumpet, is pushed to the front. Whether or not a great Republic will give a frail monarch a paramount boost is a blunt question in Hawaii. Canada insists that her natural products, agricultural and mineral, might enjoy free markets in the United States without injury to our people and with great benefit to Canadians. Italy is profoundly impressed that it is grotesque and absurd for any people to impose duties upon works of the fine arts. Greece thinks it quite wrong that her exports of dried currants should anywhere meet customs duties. Germany and Russia boldly seek to rival each other in the altitude of tariff walls on their frontier boundaries. Great Britain is sure that the general welfare of mankind and world-wide religion would be consummated if the United States would merely limit their enterprise to the production of wheat, cotton, and small potatoes, and allow the British, from their longer experience and free-trade scale of labor, to supply all American wants in manufactures and skilled industries. Free-trade condescension here creeps out with panther-like loveliness.

STATESMANSHIP OF LILLIPUT NOT APPLICABLE TO AMERICA.

These diversities and rivalries in the march of nations only serve to indicate that differences of climate, of locality, and of race, and possibly of patriotism, may require, with perhaps equal human wisdom, differences in their national economy, and that measures ever so proper in one country, if transferred to another involving changes of habit or of occupations, will always be maladroit and unstatesmanlike. Those who now have the honor to govern the Democratic party without the virility of originality appear eager to borrow and pet a foreign revenue measure, and learn by sore experience whether free trade shall first reach aristocratic or democratic "innocuous desuetude;" whether under Victoria or under Cleveland it shall meet its final death struggle.

Adam Smith's great free-trade work on the Wealth of Nations was first printed in 1776, and received more attention from its pure and felicitous use of the English language than for the economical principles promulgated. England continued to adhere to the most rigorous doctrine of protective tariffs for seventy years thereafter, and it was not until 1846, under the premiership of Sir Robert Peel, that even the corn laws were repealed. The Adam Smith theory of free trade was then applied to the changed conditions of one people—it then apparently suited the British—to whom it had become pertinent, perhaps a necessity, for the reason that their battle of life, from increasing population, was to obtain bread and meat for their people; but no other people accept or tolerate the isolated and forlorn British example. And yet it was admitted by some of its projectors that it would be a failure unless it should be adopted by other nations. It was a bait for silly foreign gudgeons, to which we are expected to give the first nibble.

The great contest of our American Republic, on the contrary, is to find consumers for its annual surplus of food products. Great Britain with its increased population must either export men or import their food, and generally does both. Our Republic, however, receives the surplus population of the world, but yet, as the new Egypt of Joseph, has enough and to spare, and, when famine appears among British subjects, sends them corn by the ship-load with money in the mouth of the sacks.

In the career of nations, England, unable from home-grown production to supply her people with wheat and flour for more than one week in four, is doomed to daily labor for daily bread; but, at great cost of indirect protection, as mistress of the ocean, and being the quondam leader of machine-made manufactures, she would still be able to maintain her power and increased population, provided there could be found free trade in foreign markets for her exportable manufactures. That is now her permanent and most perplexing want, which we, as their first and last hope, are called upon to furnish, and which the Democratic party appear most anxious to offer.

JEFFERSONIAN PROTECTION.

As colonies of Great Britain, according to the Declaration of Independence, "our trade with all parts of the world" was cut off, and taxes were imposed without our consent. We could sell or buy nothing anywhere but to or from Great Britain, and under taxes levied by the British Parliament. The final test was the demand for 3 pence per pound on tea. All British machin-

ery was forbidden to be exported, and, as then urged by Adam Smith, every measure that might define a tyrant was taken for our subjugation, as well as for the obstruction of infant manufactures. "The colonies have no right," one of their leaders declared, "to manufacture as much as a horseshoe nail." It was, therefore, no wonder that the foremost act of Congress signed by President Washington should have been for "the *encouragement* and *protection* of manufactures." All parties favored it: Jefferson as much as Hamilton. It is hardly too much to say that Jefferson remained one of the most pronounced protectionists we ever had, as his embargo act of 1808 sufficiently demonstrates.

After the war of 1812, had any American statesman opposed protective tariff he would have been regarded as a foe to his country. Mr. Calhoun, in 1816, as a friend of American tariff protection, hardly lagged behind Henry Clay; and Gen. Jackson, in 1824, was not less its champion than John Quincy Adams. There was then but little more than one party, and that was unanimously for "a tariff that would protect." Both Houses of Congress were Democratic in 1828, and among the eminent Senators who voted for the ultra-protective tariff of 1828, and who subsequently became Democratic Presidents, will be found the names of Martin Van Buren and James Buchanan. Such distinguished supporters of protection, I fear, would now be drummed out of the Democratic camp by some self-elected drum-majors. In 1860 the votes of Virginia and Tennessee were given to Bell and Everett, both of whom favored tariff protection. The tariff of 1861, undeniably blessed with the virtues of protection, was approved by a Democratic President, a veteran long in the highest services of his party.

TERRITORY.

England and Wales have a territory of only 58,186 square miles, or 948 square miles less than Florida, one of our smallest, yet very attractive States; and the total area of the United Kingdom, including Ireland, Scotland, and adjacent islands, is but 120,849 square miles, being less than half that of the State of Texas. I would not belittle the greatness of the English people because of the insignificance of the territory inhabited, but it must necessarily circumscribe their natural products and leave to trade and to their intercourse among nations little or nothing but their manufactures. Prior to the American Revolution we shared their glory and shame; and, it should be acknowledged without reluctance, there was more of the former than of the latter. Liberty and human rights were our heritage, but a heritage from our Creator, from which we refused to part, and though we refused allegiance to George III, our loyalty to Milton and Shakespeare, Burke and Pitt remains unbroken.

The territory of the United States is incomparably greater, and, including Alaska, covers 3,501,409 square miles, with a climate that invites all products, and with minerals, timber, agriculture, and manufactures somewhat commensurate with its vast extent. A policy, therefore, which might cover and blanket the small sea-girt territory of the so-called Great Britain, would be inadequate and most inappropriate patchwork if applied to a country so great as the United States, with all of its multifarious products and many millions more of men. The vain idea that the free-trade policy would open the doors to any new American advantages is untenable and preposterous, for the reason that it would be an unreciprocated surrender of our home markets, the greatest the world now affords, without any possible equivalents. Clip protection from our tariff, and Americans, like Samson, would be in the hands of the Philistines.

CONSTITUTION.

The Constitution of the United States is a written one, so perfect that it has been amended but twice in one hundred years; and the power of Congress to raise revenue "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare" remains untouched and unchanged.

The British form of government is unwritten and wholly within the power of Parliament, which is said to be omnipotent, except that it can not make a man a woman. From the reign of Elizabeth to the ninth year of Victoria, British protective tariffs were constitutional; and from that time to the present, British free trade has been constitutional. Formerly Great Britain fixed and limited the wages of laboring men by direct statute laws, and now unflinchingly does the same thing indirectly by free trade; that is to say, the British people must work for lower wages than we or others accept, or they could neither supplant us or anybody else in trade, nor obtain their regular daily supply of foreign food.

Free trade among the States of our Union is a horse of another color, being a legitimate and precious privilege, and by no means a privilege to be invaded by foreign states without let or hindrance, or without equivalents. It is enough that its use and free possession are and should be obtainable only by those who personally come within the domain of our light local taxation, and are proud to hold the valid title of an American citizen.

The free trade or "tariff-for-revenue-only" theory is without honor in America, save that of very equivocal value from having been brought forth by a Cæsarian operation upon the national Democratic party at Chicago in 1892. The history of anything like it here furnishes no basis of commendation, and it really would not seem to be the legitimate offspring of the Democracy, certainly not that of the blood of Madison, the father of our Constitution, nor of any Presidents from Virginia, but rather a come-by-chance cross with some high-stepping Mugwump of British origin. Though to stand here for one season only, the wonder is why the Democratic party should venture to copy the British example of stifling our manufactures to restore our colonial grievances of one hundred years ago.

Free trade will offer free raw materials without power to use them, which is no more than to give a man ruffles who wants a shirt.

HEAD AND TAIL OF THE BRITISH SYSTEM.

The revenue obtained by Great Britain from its free-trade tariff is less than one-fourth part of the annual amount there required, and consequently they are compelled to resort to many desperate schemes of taxation, which here under a republican form of government are odious and endurable only in an overmastering exigency of a great national war. Americans have an inherited hatred of such taxes as are most prominent in Great Britain for the collection of the chief part of their revenue, certified by stout swearing, increased at every revolt in India, Egypt, or South Africa, and ending by unfolding the veritable "tail which wags the dog" of free trade. It will, of course, be understood that these words point to the motley procession of British excise, license, and stamp taxes, for marriage, for lawyers, dogs, mortgages, and all of their kin, income, land, house, servant, carriage, and gun taxes, and finally taxes on the dead. This is the perennial banquet, and these are the grizzly measures for extorting revenue to which we are invited by the President, already looming up and which cohere to British free trade or a "tariff for revenue only." They are exotics, and whoever seeks to cultivate them on the American continent will find them plants of slow growth and bearing bitter fruit.

Hamilton stated that he would not have resorted to such taxes but for a threatened foreign war. Jefferson in 1798 wrote to Madison as follows:

> The excise law is an infernal one. The first error was to admit it by the Constitution; the second, to act on the admission.

As soon as Jefferson became President the "infernal" law was repealed. But in spite of the high prestige of Jefferson as a Democrat, it will soon be found that the Latter Day Saints will propose to replace all tariff reductions by the "infernal" excise system of the British.

The United States produces spirits and tobacco more abundantly and at cheaper prices than any other country, yet both are rigidly subjected by the British free-trade tariff to extraordinary duties amounting often to more than ten times their first cost. Nor is there any British constitutional scruple against protection when it can be made serviceable, and accordingly a higher protective duty is imposed upon manufactured tobacco than upon tobacco in the leaf. Unlike the British, who utter unceasing jeremiads against American tariffs, we neither growl at nor dispute the prerogative of Great Britain to make its own tariff, although made knowingly to apply to our country with greater severity than to any other.

They may be contented or not, but we have not outgrown some early repugnance to British tariffs, nor to such as may be advertised and adroitly prescribed for Americans by foreigners; and we brand as a blow below the belt financial contributions of British exporters and American consignees of British merchandise for partisan use here in a free-trade campaign urged to exterminate every vestige of tariff protection. Even the London "Punch," as an umpire, would hold this to be foul.

EMIGRANTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

Great Britain has many colonies, greater in extent than herself, where cheap and fertile land abounds, and where British trade with political and old-home affinities ordinarily would be so dominant as to monopolize the utmost output of British emigration; but from 1853—after the advent of free trade or "a tariff for revenue only"—to October, 1893, the number of British and Irish emigrants to the United States, not including those from Canada, amounted to 5,149,890.

This extraordinary exodus, largely of adult workingmen, from Great Britain to the United States, of more people than now dwell in the Canadian Dominion, or in Australia or in Ireland, can not be ascribed to anything else than either the home oppressions of free trade, or to the attractions emanating from a pro-

tective tariff; and the joy of determining which has been most potential in the movement may be left to the thick-and-thin philosophers of a "tariff for revenue only." It may help them to remember that no tracks of returning homesick emigrants from America have ever been discovered.

DECADENCE OF BRITISH AGRICULTURE.

The great deterioration of British agriculture, from the inherent friction of free trade, is not an idle tale, but its decadence is admitted and corroborated by incontestable facts. Their permanent acreage of pasture land in 1874 was 13,174,490 acres, but in 1892 had increased to 16,358,150 acres, showing an abandonment to cultivate 3,179,738 acres, with little increase of cattle or horses, and a positive decrease in the stock of sheep of over 2,000,000. The acreage of wheat in 1874 was 3,630,300 acres, and in 1892 only 2,219,889 acres, or a loss in their leading crop of 1,410,411 acres. The acreage of flax in 1874 was 9,394 acres, and in 1892 had dwindled to 1,421 acres. The acreage of permanent corn crops in 1874 was 9,431,490 acres, but in 1892 was only 7,808,031 acres, or less by 1,626,459 acres. These facts as to the decadence and deplorable condition of British agriculture, from which the attention of our farmers can not be diverted, are taken from their own records that have no word of comfort for this great industry.

The following extract from the London Spectator shows also the decrease in the number of males and females in England and Wales engaged in agriculture from 1871 to 1891:

It would appear from the third volume of the Census of England and Wales that the total number of both sexes employed on the land, which in 1871 was 1,153,544, and in 1881, 1,071,911, was in 1891 980,278, showing a decrease of 173,271 for the twenty years, in spite of the general increase of population. The total figures certainly confirm the impression that the people are receding from agriculture.

But, if the Spectator had looked back for thirty years instead of twenty, a more astounding decrease might have been exhibited, it being stated in the Statesman's Year Book that the number employed in agriculture in 1861 was 2,010,454, which would show a loss in thirty years of more than one-half of those so employed, notwithstanding an increase of over 8,000,000 of population.

The soil of England and Wales has been generously treated and is supposed to have lost nothing of its old time fertility. Guano, phosphates, and other modern fertilizers are abundant, and have been abundantly applied. What then is it that has blighted the vocation of more than one-half of those formerly employed in agriculture in England and Wales, and compelled them to flee from their homes to other countries, or to seek other occupations? If those left behind may answer, all, whether owners of the soil or laborers, with one accord would straightway declare that their sufferings have been imposed by a "tariff for revenue only." Among English farmers free trade has not a rag of reputation to cling to. Only a few persons own land in Great Britain, and these chiefly by primogeniture inheritance. The glory of America is that nearly all the land is held in fee simple by those who hold the plow.

On agriculture in England I will ask my friend, Senator FRYE, to read some very late testimony.

Mr. FRYE read as follows:

AGRICULTURE IN ENGLAND—A GLOOMY VIEW TAKEN BY THE EARL OF WINCHELSEA.

LONDON, *December 7.*

A congress opened in St. James Hall to-day under the auspices of the National Agricultural Union. The Earl of Winchelsea presided. Among those present were the Earl of Harrowby, the Earl of Denbigh, Lord North, and sixty members of the House of Commons.

The Earl of Winchelsea said that the resolutions that would be submitted to the congress embodied a large number of suggestions that had been received from representative agriculturists all over the world since the last congress was held. He was unable to congratulate the congress upon any material improvement in the agricultural situation. Landlords were losing their rents and tenants were being denuded of their profits. Thousands of laborers were without work and the towns were suffering from an influx of pauper laborers. The question was rapidly assuming the proportions of a national disaster. The nation was becoming more and more dependent upon food brought from foreign countries. The consensus of expert opinion was that the navy was inadequate to protect the food supply in the event of war.

One cause of the distress was the fall in prices due to foreign competition. England, the earl declared, was the only country in the world where the home producer was treated as a public enemy and was taxed, rated, and defrauded out of existence. It was necessary for the producers to combine and ask, not for protection, but for fair play.

PAUPERISM AND FREE TRADE.

Mr. MORRILL. The number of British paupers has been perhaps understated at 945,686. There are so many descriptions of their paupers—registered, dependents, vagrants, casual poor, able-bodied, indoor and outdoor—regulated by various laws, that it may be difficult for them to tabulate the total numbers; but, as thus stated, it is enormously greater than that of the United States, where a protective tariff has long prevailed. Beyond question British pauperism has been greatly promoted by the pinching conditions of free trade, which leave to their workingmen no annual surplus to deposit in savings bank, and bars them forever from the ownership of any homes, but with the dreadful certainty that their children will be left in destitution.

The paupers of the United States in 1890 numbered 66,578 white, and 6,467 colored. Of the white 27,646 were foreign born, of 10,608 one or both of the parents were foreign born, and there were also 24,220 outdoor paupers. Thus British pauperism, notwithstanding our nearly twice the population, is nine times greater than that of the United States. This is our modest contrast with the chronic pauperism of Great Britain, which has been graphically described by a member of Mr. Gladstone's cabinet as follows:

It is an awful fact—it is really not short of awful—that in this country, with all its wealth, all its resources, all its power, 40 per cent, that is to say, nearly one-half of the persons who reach the age of 60 are, or have been, paupers.

Is there any party here ambitious to follow this ill-starred track which marks the homes and highways of free trade?

British strikes often occur when reductions of wages are proposed to wage-receivers, who have no other answer save that wages are practically irreducible, as humanity can not live on less.

WEALTH.

One hundred years ago the United States were poor, few in numbers, with only stinted household manufactures, and no industries of any notable account save in agriculture. Great Britain, drawing well-relished nutrition from the breasts of her colonies, was then already conspicuous in its national power, its accumulated wealth, and its exportable manufactures. It had conquered India, and had been, with our help, victorious over France in Canada. After a century of commercial progress the wealth of Great Britain has been estimated at $20,000,000,000 less than that of the United States, which our census of 1890 states at $62,610,000,000. The inferiority of our public debt will be admitted, however, notwithstanding our enormous expenditure in the recent great war of the rebellion. The British national debt in 1892 was six times greater than at the commencement of the American Revolution, or, reckoning $5 to the pound sterling, $3,388,397,855, while the interest-bearing debt of the United States was only $585,029,330, or only about one-sixth of the British debt. Their annual interest per capita is $3.33, and ours 39 cents.

Do these facts indicate any economic blunder on our part that should suddenly teach us to reform our national revenue policy by an exchange for that of the country we have left so far behind in the national race?

PARTY SLOGAN.

Prior to our tariff revision of 1890, the great cry of tariff reformers appeared to be against a Treasury surplus, and for a reduction of the revenue annually collected. The surplus, however, promptly disappeared, during the Administration of President Harrison, in payment of the interest-bearing public debt, to the extent of $305,225,395, thereby reducing the annual interest charge of the Government to $26,771,604. Sixty million dollars of revenue were also cut off by enlarging the tariff free list and by reduction of rates on dutiable articles.

Neither the complaint of a surplus nor of too much revenue survive, but unfortunately the new Administration must have more revenue. Certainly, however, a free-trade tariff curtailment would not seem to be a safe and proper tonic to increase revenue, or to stimulate business enterprise, and could not fail to seriously augment the present financial discouragements. Nor will a Democratic Administration be likely to excite our admiration by any diminution of the public debt.

The familiar dictum, that we can not have exports unless they are balanced by an equal amount of imports, was prominent in 1899, and though constantly refuted by the trade of all nations, has found its quietus in the operation of our too-much slandered tariff of 1890, under which our exports for 1892 exceed those of 1890 by over $172,000,000, and our imports from Great Britain the first year were $38,422,381 less, and our exports $52,417,981 more than the year prior to the new tariff. The tariff of 1890, therefore, did no harm to our export trade, but considerably fortified the country against an unprecedented export of gold, which otherwise might have proved more dangerous and rampant.

The stale assertions are still repeated, though deprived for many years of any leg of truth to stand on, that "a reduction of our tariff will give our industries employment to more people, not a portion of the time but all the year," this being seriously suggested even by the President, "and though our manufacturers pay higher wages, they get more work for the same amount of money."

Obviously, by a reduction of the tariff, a larger importation of foreign merchandise is intended and must ensue, and thereby displace to an equal extent the products which otherwise would

have been made by the employment of our own people, but this is the legitimate effect of a "tariff for revenue only." Here the working day is curtailed by a less number of hours for a week's work, and here a less number of young children and women are employed at low wages than abroad. More work instead of less is, therefore, more likely to be demanded abroad for a day's wages than in America.

Any claim of superior stamina on the part of Americans, or of doing more work in a day than any other people, is a vainglorious assumption. The British are of the same stock, and bred in an equally healthy climate—though Southey thought it only fit to hibernate in during half the year—but their wage-earners grow old earlier from work and ruder fare. A Briton, so long as able to get full pay, without doubt, is about as athletic and physically as good as an American, and probably no better. We have wrestled with them and did not have the worst of it. It is enough in this respect that we claim to be their peers, and it is as ridiculous for us to claim general physical superiority to Europeans as it was anciently for one of the latter (so thoroughly refuted by Jefferson) to claim that Americans had physically degenerated.

Years ago it may be that we achieved some advantages in the priority of our inventions of labor-saving machines, but to-day all inventions are no sooner patented in one country than they go to many others, and machinery and the steam engine wherever utilized have made the whole world kin in manufactures and the mechanic arts. The silly claimants of physical superiority of Americans over all other people have been led into a fool's paradise, and ought to be led back for instruction to some charitable kindergarten.

BRITISH WAGE-EARNERS.

In Great Britain no wage-earner ever rises to be an employer of wage-earners. In the United States it is a common occurrence, and almost the rule, that the head, or business manager, of any industrial company has risen from the ranks of practical manual labor. The biographies of our captains of industry, when we look aloft in the history of the American people, shine forth as abundantly as the stars of the milky-way. Free trade, with only fine words to wage-earners, wears the air of aristocratic condescension, but protection helps with love like a brother.

It has been long roundly, perhaps ignorantly, claimed that the difference in wages here, compared with the lower British wages, is compensated by the lower cost of living; but this has no basis of truth, except that the lower scale of wages practically and brutally imposes upon British wage-earners a lower and far inferior scale of living. If their provisions and comforts of life were to be made equal to those of wage-earners in America, the British cost would be found excessive and insupportable.

The foundation of England's large wealth was laid by a century of stringent tariff protection—such as extending trade in woolens by making it unlawful to bury the dead in anything but woolens—and it may be admitted that the early results of free trade increased her foreign commerce: but that commerce is no longer greatly increasing, and British exports in nearly all directions are smaller than imports. Other nations have learned the magic of steam, of machinery, and of skilled workmen, and no longer welcome British merchandise to free-trade markets. Decrepit free trade, in fact, is slowly dying with the home discontent of Great Britain, and is already a *caput mortuum* everywhere else.

British wage-earners, as we all know, obtain on the average, under free trade, but little more than one-half as much reward for labor as Americans obtain under protection. How long free trade will be perpetuated even in Great Britain, in the face of suffrage extension, will be determined by the popular vote, and its funeral obsequies will not there be wet with the tears of wage-earners. True, its ghastly features may be briefly galvanized with the tender to all foreigners, by the Democratic party, of the home markets of the American continent: but that continent also wields a popular vote, and their sober second thought waits impatiently for utterance.

I do not suppose there can be any honorable members of Congress who bring with them protection as a commodity to barter for anything else. All are obedient to the doctrine, "buy the truth and sell it not." If there were any disobedients, I might remind them of the words of a preacher who, when dealing with the subject of the devil entering the herd of swine, proposed to handle it thus: "First, the devil will play at small game, rather than at none at all; second, they run fast when the devil drives; and thirdly, the devil brings his hogs to a fine market."

Permit me to say that no one should be asked to favor a protective tariff unless he believes it to be beneficial to the country and to his State. If in the latter there are not as many industries yet started by protection as there ought to be for the general welfare, as is the case in my own State, the greater is the necessity that more should be established, and that the great loss of producers in reaching far-off consumers in the transportation of their products should be speedily remedied. Those who are not for protection from the highest patriotic convictions, are likely to have a foot easily out of joint in every emergency.

That a free trade tariff might, could, or would be the order of the day, with protection wholly eliminated, was grimly proclaimed by the refusal of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee to allow the minority any participation or knowledge as to its construction, presumably for the reason that the minority of five would have outvoted the majority of twelve, or that contact with them in the committee room might introduce some dangerous germs of protection, now supposed to be unusually contagious, to which no Democrat should be pitilessly exposed. And yet the incubating majority, like other biddies that hide away while in labor, gave notice by loud cackling when they added an egg to the "revenue only" nest.

As their formulated blind-man's-buff work comes to light, a robust forgetfulness is exhibited by the exclusion of all the wise precedents of the past; but will they forget the resonant admonition of the 7th of November, reverberating from Iowa to Massachusetts? It is to be hoped, in the words of old Sam Johnson, "They will remember who kicked them last."

The advantages of a protective tariff are not claimed on account of its production and diffusion of wealth alone, but on account of its beneficence, its educational and civilizing influence, its distribution of the comforts of life among the men who work, and as the strongest arm of national independence.

The favored portion of our country with the longest summer days now wants protection on rice and sugar, and how long will it be before it may be wanted against Egyptian cotton? It has the option, through its control of the party now dominant, of maintaining the political economy of tariff protection and thereby of making progress in the front of all rivals, with the full industrial force of its entire population, or of accepting free-trade economics, faith without works, and thereby forever to lag in the rear by leaving the larger and superior half of its population excluded from many available and remunerative employments and the other untrained half, with no hope of anything better, segregated in precarious work fields by day and in hostile political camps at night.

The only potential lever that will ever lift up our magnificent States of the great West to the supreme mastery of their inland condition is a tariff with so much of protection as will encourage the introduction of manufactures and the use of the slumbering giant power now dormant in their abounding coal fields. Even the highest authority on free trade declared:

> Whatever besides tends to diminish in any country the number of artificers and manufacturers tends to diminish the home market, the most important of all markets, for the rude products of land, and thereby discourage agriculture.

The only regular foreign market for wheat is limited to two or three countries of Europe (England and Belgium), and the sharp competition of Russia, India, and Roumania, with their cheap lands and cheaper labor, has already made this market nearly worthless to American producers of wheat. The prices paid the present year will hardly cover the cost of production. The home market is really the only one that can ever be made larger or of any stable value. The market abroad will be good for wheat only when we have none to export, and good for nothing when we have.

There is scarcely more than one charge of extravagance loudly made against the history of the Republic for the past generation, and that is as to the large amount disbursed to pensioners of the four years' war for the preservation of the Union. Happily that charge effectually refutes the gray-haired aspersion that republics are always ungrateful. Even those who fought on the other side, in spite of this charge, now gladly return to their allegiance, and, "with sweet, reluctant, amorous delay," wear the honors and receive the pay of the Republic, whispering from the heart—

> With all thy faults, I love thee still,
> My country!

Free trade as an economic science, in the judgment of the world, is a dismal failure. Even in England, one of their most distinguished countrymen, in view of its total lack of sympathy for the welfare of laboring men declared that "the acceptance of the current doctrine of political economy is a standing disgrace to the human intellect." In America, also, the leaders of free trade, or of "a tariff for revenue only," care no more for the welfare of a laboring man than for that of "the man in the moon," and deride all protection as "paternalism," dismissing it with a sneer as the demand of an inferior and unworthy race.

One great difference between those who now favor a protective tariff and those who favor revenue reform appears to be that the protective party seeks to find work and good wages for the

many, while the reformers are struggling to find good wages without work for the many in the Executive Patronage Pasture, but that pasture, even with the *paramount* aid of Honolulu, is likely to be overstocked.

CONCLUSION

I have thus attempted to show that "a tariff for revenue only" is a royal relative of free trade, kissing at sight, and that free trade in its gloomy and only home is not without many serious drawbacks which in the United States would be unadulterated calamities, multiplied in number and aggravated in character, and that in comparison with a protective tariff it has no attribute which should find favor with anv American citizen.

I am loth to believe that our country will consent to have a thoroughly tested revenue system permanently superseded by an experimental change so revolutionary that even the convention-made index of its reckless character served to suspend or prostrate a fearful number of important American industries. Our farmers, who, next to wage-earners, are to bear the brunt of such a disastrous change, having their products on the free list as raw materials, and the consumers becoming producers, will not fail to learn that the swap of protection for free trade, in accord with the British pattern, is the surrender and shipwreck of the home market, twenty times more valuable, for the foreign without the remotest chance of any extension of the latter. Wage-earners also will not lag behind in the discovery that free trade with the alias of "a tariff for revenue only" is not a child's bogy, but a real juggernaut under whose wheels they will be the earliest victims called for sacrifice. Farmers and wage-earners with the large body of business men from every point of the compass, who know that the change proposed is a snare and a delusion, will right early assume the control of the high destiny of a people soon to number a round hundred million, and fully capable of protecting all the interests of a common country. The great question is, shall we have an English or an American tariff? President Grant used to insist that "the Democratic party always went wrong at the right time."

The policy of our Republic, when only in the gristle of its predestinated growth, as well as in later years, has been that of absolute independence, politically and industrially. Recently it was in peaceful and unexampled prosperity, and, in our dreams, the formost among the greater nations in wealth, business, and general intelligence of the people. But, with the advent of a new Administration and the pomp of power, our visions have been suddenly dimmed by the cloud of dire partisan measures which now sorely threaten the prosperity and general welfare of our people.

> A thousand years scarce serve to form a State;
> An hour may lay it in the dust.

The excellence and grandeur of the great American example of tariff protection now decorating many cities, towns, and thriving homes of industry, everywhere rewarding labor with the highest known wages, tendering a near market for all agricultural products, contributing largely to the wider educational character of our country and to the rapid extinction of the public debt, is fully comprehended, and our people do not want the further sinister evidence of its exalted national merits, which a contrast with "a tariff for revenue only" now portends, by a wretched exhibition of its present monuments in ruins.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. President, it is very late, but I ask the unanimous indulgence of the Senate for a moment that I may say a word in response to some remarks made by the honorable Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] in reference to a constituent of mine.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator allow me to give a notice in connection with the question on which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] has spoken?

Mr. GORDON. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont to allow his resolution to lie on the table until Friday or Monday next. I have given notice that I would submit some remarks on the resolution of the State Horticultural Society of Oregon favoring a retention of the duty on prunes, which resolution lies upon the table; but the resolution of the Senator from Vermont will be more appropriate for me to base my remarks upon, and if he will allow the resolution to lie upon the table I give notice that I shall call it up on Friday next, immediately after the morning business, should the Senate be in session on that day, and, if not, then I shall ask the Senate to indulge me on Monday, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, to submit some remarks upon the resolution of the Senator from Vermont under discussion.

I ask that the resolution of the Horticultural Society of Oregon be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That reference will be made if there be no objection.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN HAWAII.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. President, I have no idea of being drawn into this general discussion, certainly not at this late hour. It was my misfortune to be out of the Chamber to-day when the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] was making his speech.

It is impossible for me to conceive that a Senator, usually so fair-minded, so candid, so courageous, and courteous, could indulge in the criticism which I hold in my hand in reference to a former colleague of his in the other House of this Capitol, one with whom he has been familiar for years, and whose high reputation has never before been impeached in any Chamber or upon any occasion.

I have known Mr. Blount all his life. If there is one thing about him, which all know him concede, it is that he is a man of truth. His is an exceedingly well-rounded character, and the chiefest crown in that character is his love of fairness, of truth. This is the estimate placed upon him by those with whom he has served so long and so honorably in the other end of this Capitol. I will read what the honorable Senator is reported to have said in my absence to-day in his remarks.

> I affirm without hesitation that Mr. Blount in that report has not written one single unvarnished line of truth, nor given one unprejudiced opinion, nor rendered one impartial judgment.

Mr. President, my estimate of Mr. Blount might possibly be considered partial by those in this Chamber who have not known him so long as I have. I prefer, therefore, to submit in his defense the words uttered by those who have served with him for nearly a quarter of a century, among whom are those who differed with him in political faith.

On his retirement from the House, Mr. Blount received a testimonial from that great body of representative Americans such as has rarely been the fortune, indeed never the fortune, so far as my knowledge extends, of any American citizen. On both sides of that House, without reference to party, his colleagues testified to his lofty bearing, his patriotism, his fidelity to truth, and the universal acceptability of his service to that Chamber and to the country. Let me read a few words. I quote first from that old and honored Democrat of Indiana, Judge HOLMAN.

> I am certain I speak, then, the general sentiment of the House when I say that the retirement of Mr. Blount from the high position he has so long held as a legislator in the Congress of the United States takes from this body one of the most able, careful, laborious, and upright legislators known to our time, and one of the most conscientious and honorable gentlemen who have figured in the affairs of our Government during the past twenty years.

Lest this might be considered the testimony of a partial party associate, I beg to read what was said by members on the other side of that Chamber.

Mr. HITT of Illinois, a distinguished gentleman of high character, broad reputation, and long service, said of Mr. Blount:

> But I can not see the time approach when he is to leave our Hall without heartily joining, as one member of the House, with the honorable gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] in every word he has said in testimony of the personal worth, of the high character, of the industry, of the energy of the honorable gentleman from Georgia: and, I will mark most of all, that patriotism above party that inspired him in this House when, last year, leading a great committee charged to consider the affairs and interests, not of a party, but of a whole nation, embroiled in sharp dispute with a foreign power, he rose with the occasion and proved himself first and altogether a patriot—an American [applause]; so that a foreigner looking down from the gallery upon this Hall could never have told whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, but would have known that he was in every fiber an American. [Applause.]

Mr. President, I beg to close these quotations with the words of one who was known, I believe, as the father of the House, a Republican *par excellence*, a man without stain, whose testimony ought now at least to be received by every Senator on the floor. I allude to Mr. O'Neill of Pennsylvania, who has left these busy scenes and has, as we trust, been gathered to the home of the just and the truthful. Mr. O'Neill said of Mr. Blount:

> Mr. Chairman, I concur in all that has been said by those gentlemen who have expressed their opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Blount].
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> In the very prime of his usefulness in this House, a man so devoted to his duty, and so satisfactorily performing it upon all occasions here, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the country deserves more of his years and of his time than he has been willing to give to it.

I could add to this testimony almost indefinitely; but I wish simply to say in conclusion that I deplore beyond the power of expression that this debate or any other debate should make it necessary, for party reasons, or any other reasons, to involve the high reputation of a man whose whole life stands like a polished pillar without a blot or blemish upon it.

Sir, there is no occasion for arraigning men's honor or love of truth. Every man who has ever been in a court of justice and listened to testimony from the witness stand knows how men differ in their conceptions of scenes occurring immediately before their eyes, and especially when the testimony is gathered from hearsay, or of witnesses to scenes enacted long before.

Therefore, Mr. President, let it be understood once for all that

whatever differences of opinion there may be about this question, there is no reason and no excuse for assailing the reputation for truth of a man of Mr. Blount's record, and I challenge this Chamber and the country to produce one of superior whiteness or purity.

This much, sir, I felt bound to say in discharge of my duty to this honorable and honored citizen, and to the great State he has faithfully and ably and for so long a period represented.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia does not correctly estimate the language I used when he charges me with making an attack upon the integrity of Mr. Blount. I used the words "unvarnished truth," meaning purposely, and understanding that the language meant nothing more than that his report was a prejudiced report. I know Mr. Blount well and served with him in the other House. In my opinion he is a good man, in this matter appropriated to an exceedingly bad purpose, and in my judgment was acting under instructions. I intended nothing more by what I said than that his report was a prejudiced report.

The Senator has overlooked the only words in the remarks I made which might be conceived to be an attack on Mr. Blount. In drawing a parallel practically between Mr. Stevens and Mr. Blount, in which I intended to confine myself to mental qualities and not to moral, I accidentally inserted the words "integrity of character," and then asserted that Mr. Stevens was paramount to Mr. Blount in that respect. I will say to the Senator that a moment or two ago, when my speech was brought in to me, I struck that out, because I did not mean to attack the integrity of Mr. Blount, and the only comparison I purposed to make was between the mental qualifications of the two gentlemen.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. President, I am very glad to have heard these words from the distinguished Senator, and I had no doubt he would utter them. I said in the beginning of my remarks that I could not believe that the language as reported conveyed his meaning. I knew that he was acquainted with Mr. Blount and his high character. The words which the Senator has just quoted from his own speech were those which appeared to me least defensible of all the remarks which fell from him and which he has now, to his own honor and to my relief, stricken from the record.

Mr. BERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PASCO. I ask the Senator from Arkansas to withdraw his motion for the present?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Arkansas withdraw his motion?

Mr. BERRY. I do.

Mr. PASCO. I wish to inquire if the order has been made with reference to the pending resolution which was agreed upon, that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No order has been made in respect to the resolution.

Mr. PASCO. I ask now, if there be no objection, that that order be made, unless there is to be further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Florida asks that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] suggested that reference.

Mr. PASCO. I will state that the Senator from Delaware has been called out of the Chamber, and asked me to attend to the matter in his absence.

Mr. HOAR. I was about to say that the Senator from Delaware suggested to me a day or two ago that it might be as well to have the resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which I acceded on the ground that, while it calls for information which is not embraced in the previous resolution on the subject adopted by the Senate, still it is quite likely when the answer to that previous resolution comes in that it will contain, in connection with other matter, the information for which this resolution calls. So I acceded to that suggestion, but since that time there has been a considerable speech by the Senator from Delaware, a speech by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], and a speech by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. Therefore, I do not think this resolution ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations without my making one single observation, which I will make now if the Senate will permit, and that is that nearly all the precedents which those Senators have referred to—three or four hundred—as furnishing a precedent for the appointment of this gentleman to go to Hawaii, are precedents of persons appointed in the vacation and whose names were either sent into the Senate at the next session thereof, or whose function expired before the end of the next session. So they clearly came within the constitutional power conferred upon the President.

There are a few cases in regard to which the person employed by the Senator from Alabama had made a mistake in carelessly making the list. For instance, the joint high commission he specifies as an instance of persons appointed without the sending of the names to the Senate, when in fact those names were sent into the Senate and confirmed by the Senate. So, in the case of Mr. Trescott, if I heard the Senator correctly—I have just been shown the original document—his name was sent to the Senate immediately after his commission was made, he went out, and we confirmed him.

There are a few cases—I can not recall the number now, but I presume there may be twenty or thirty—to which this statement does not apply, but they are cases where the person had nothing to do but to ascertain and report the sense or willingness of the foreign government to the President or to the Secretary of State, the whole official action in regard to the entire subject being theirs. I conceive that the President might send his private secretary or his *valet de chambre* to inquire whether, if he were disposed to take a certain action, that action would be taken by another government, and the other government might through any instrumentality it chose send back another; but the action then is the action of the President.

There will not be found in all these precedents, I venture to affirm, a single case which gives the least countenance to this transaction, or which touches upon the class of powers which have been given to this gentleman here—powers to command the naval officers, which he did; powers to represent the purposes of this Government formally and officially to a foreign court, which he did; powers of a commissioner, who was enumerated a diplomatic commissioner—not a commissioner to make postal arrangements, but a diplomatic commissioner, a functionary expressly asserted in the act of Congress itself to be a diplomatic representative of the Government.

I expect hereafter, when the information comes from the President, to go fully into these questions and to answer the suggestions of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Delaware very fully indeed, but I shall not ask the Senate now to wait while I go into the discussion.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, will the Senate indulge me in one statement? As a matter of course, I do not pretend to be responsible for the accuracy of the table annexed to the minority report of the Commttee on Foreign Relations which I read this morning, but that table comes officially from the office of the Secretary of State. The executive document from which I read is in the hands of the Reporter, but I looked over it as carefully as I could. As a matter of course, the question is susceptible of accurate solution.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Missouri will pardon me. He was not here probably quite so long ago, but he knows very well the names of the high joint commissioners who made the treaty with Great Britain in 1871 were sent in to the Senate and confirmed, and there are five cases put down as if they were not sent in.

Mr. VEST. No; I came into the Senate in 1879.

Mr. HOAR. The case of Mr. Trescott I have just seen. The appointment was sent in to the Senate. He is put down as a person whosa name was not sent in.

Mr. VEST. I now recollect one instance particularly, from memory. It was the case of A. Dudley Mann, taken from private life and appointed by the President during the session of the Senate, with power to negotiate a treaty.

Mr. HOAR. Let me state a stronger one than that—Mr. Trist. That will help the Senator's argument, but it does not affect this case.

Mr. VEST. Yes, Mr. Trist. As a matter of course, the issue between the Senator from Massachusetts and myself as to the accuracy of the State Department table can be settled; and if that table is accurate, then unquestionably from the beginning of the Government it has been the custom of the President and of the Secretary of State to appoint persons not holding then any official position to negotiate treaties, and the treaties when made were sent to the Senate for its action.

Mr. HOAR. I think that will turn out to be true; but it does not affect this case.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Missouri leads me to take a moment (and I will take but a moment) to state that there certainly is a serious inaccuracy in the list of persons appointed by the President without the consent of the Senate to negotiate treaties. I refer to the statement on page 130 of Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 109, Fiftieth Congress, first session, the list which was alluded to by the Senator from Delaware this morning. On that page are given the names of the members of the high joint commission, Hamilton Fish, Robert C. Schenck, Samuel Nelson, Ebenezer R.

Hoar, and George H. Williams; Messrs. Hoar and Williams being put down as holding no other office at the same time.

The Senator from Missouri will please take notice that those names are given as those of appointments made by the President alone, and standing as appointments made by the President alone they certainly constitute a very strong argument in favor of several other acts that have been performed by President Cleveland. The trouble is that the statement is erroneous; that these high joint commissioners were not appointed by the President alone, but were confirmed by the Senate on the 10th day of February, 1871, as the records will show.

So the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts is strictly accurate, that the exceptions to the rule by which the President appoints only *ad interim* to fill vacancies, and by and with the consent of the Senate to important diplomatic functions, are insignificant; and there can not be found in the whole record of the diplomatic and consular appointments of the Government any case that corresponds with the appointment of Mr. Blount, as I shall take occasion to show if this subject is further discussed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the Senator from Florida deems himself possessed of the desire of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] in this respect.

Mr. PASCO. I will state that the Senator from Delaware told me there was some understanding with the Senator from Massachusetts in reference to this matter, and if there was no objection he would like to see it carried out this afternoon.

Mr. HOAR. There is no objection.

Mr. PASCO. It was in accordance with that request that I made the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1021) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes, so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 8,000 copies of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. J. Logan Chipman, late a Representative from the State of Michigan; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate and consider the entire subject of the rank, pay, and all other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BERRY. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 14, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1893.

POSTMASTER.

Michael J. O'Kane, to be postmaster at Wheeling, in the county of Ohio and State of West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEFICIENCIES IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in the appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Interior; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

TESTS OF MATERIALS AT WATERTOWN ARSENAL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the commanding officer of the Watertown Arsenal of tests of materials for industrial and other purposes made at said arsenal during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and ordered to be printed.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of contracts entered into by the War Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

REGULATIONS FOR THE SOLDIERS' HOME AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter, transmitting a draft of a bill, submitted by the Major-General Commanding the Army, relative to sections 4821, 4822, and 4823 of the Revised Statutes; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the cases of the following-named persons against the United States: Tenor Brabay, deceased; W. J. Bishop; T. O. Davis, deceased; Jno. Ferguson, deceased; E. A. Palmer, deceased; B. H. Thompson, deceased.

Also, in the case of Joshua Beck, deceased, against the United States; which were referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARTER, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3289) "to authorize the New York and New Jersey bridge companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. VEST, Mr. GORMAN, and Mr. FRYE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 31), for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota; when the Speaker signed the same.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE HON. J. LOGAN CHIPMAN.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. J. Logan Chipman, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, 8,000 copies, of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Michigan, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco to be delivered to the family of the deceased, and of the remaining 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said J. Logan Chipman to accompany the said eulogies.

The report (by Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee) was read, as follows:

The committee have considered the House concurrent resolution to print the eulogies in Congress on the Hon. J. Logan Chipman, late a Representa-

tive from the State of Michigan, and direct me to report the same with the recommendation that it do pass.

The estimated cost of same is $2,650.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH INDIAN AND OKLAHOMA TERRITORIES.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill S. 1021 off the Speaker's table and have it considered now.

The SPEAKER. Is such a bill on the Speaker's table?

Mr. HUDSON. There is a bill of that number on the Speaker's table. I may say, in explanation, this bill passed the Senate on the 2d day of November, and was reported to this House. It was examined by the Committee on Territories and approved by them. It was also examined by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], who at that time made objection to its passage. He has since carefully examined the bill and finds no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1021) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to consider this bill. The Clerk will read the bill, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the consideration of this bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Without waiving the right to object to the consideration of the bill, I would like to have an explanation of some of its main features.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. HUDSON. I desire to make an explanation, and I think the gentleman will then withdraw his ojection.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have no objection to the gentleman making a brief statement; but at this time the consideration of this bill ought not interfere with the other business before the House.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Senate on the 2d day of November, and was reported to the House on the 3d. It was brought up before the House for consideration and reported favorably by the Committee on Territories, but it was objected to at that time by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], and subsequently the gentleman from Indiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, examined the bill and is present to state the result of the examination. Now, I will say, further, that there are a number of parties employed to survey the line of railroad across the Territory this winter, and a large amount of money is being expended and heavy expense being incurred by the company, which ought not to be done if this bill is a proper one; and it ought to be passed upon now.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I will not object to the consideration of the bill, provided it does not occupy more than twenty minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the consideration of this bill sometime ago, simply for the purpose of looking into it for a moment. It is a Senate bill, granting a right of way through the Indian Territory, and it contains the usual safeguards. I think the measure ought to have gone to the Committee on Indian Affairs, but it went to the Committee on Territories. I have looked into it and I see no objection to its passage, unless my friend from Ohio knows of some.

The SPEAKER. This bill has not been referred at all yet. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understood that the original bill was sent to the Committee on Territories.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill? (A pause.) The Chair hears none, and the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HUDSON a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent Mr. SAYERS was granted leave of absence for the remainder of the day.

IRON ORE.

Mr. STEPHENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial of citizens of Bessemer, Gogebic County, Mich., adopted in mass meeting assembled, regardless of party, protesting against the proposed action of the Ways and Means Committee in classing iron ore as raw material and placing it upon the list of articles to be admitted free of duty.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I object.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PREMIUMS TO NAVAL CONTRACTORS.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas it appears that sums amounting to more than $1,000,000 have been paid out of the public Treasury to contractors building war ships for the United States on account of premiums; and

Whereas the said ships were constructed in accordance with designs, specifications, and calculations made by the Navy Department; and

Whereas it is alleged that the extraordinary and exorbitant sums paid and claimed as premiums could not have been allowed or could not accrue under the statutes and the terms of the contracts for building said ships, unless the speed requirements stipulated were intentionally named and fixed in the contract at a rate much less than the designs and the engine power would justify; and

Whereas it is alleged that the designs of the ships and the machinery were so made as to attain and secure a much higher speed than was required by the terms of the contract, thereby enabling and permitting the contractor easily and without risk to earn and claim extraordinary, exorbitant, and unjustifiable premiums; and

Whereas it is alleged that the contractors are permitted on the trial trips to resort to most extraordinary and unusual means to force the vessels up to speeds never attained in the service afterward, and, by straining the ship's machinery, to make a record for speed upon which to claim extraordinary premiums; and

Whereas it is alleged that such trials, so conducted, result in no benefit to the Government, but are wholly artificial and injurious to the vessels, and serve no purpose except to give exorbitant sums as premiums to the contractors: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is hereby instructed to take into consideration all matters pertaining to this subject, and make a thorough and complete investigation thereof, and report to the House, by bill or otherwise, and more especially whether the law and the terms of the contracts governing in these matters have been strictly complied with, whether any officer of the Government has through ignorance, or collusion, aided and abetted contractors to earn and secure payment of large premiums, by designing and powering ships for speeds much higher than was justified by the requirements of the contracts; and what extraordinary and unusual means have been resorted to and practiced by contractors on the trial trips to attain the excessively high speeds for premiums.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be directed to withhold further payments of any and all premiums for war ships until further direction of Congress, and that he inform the House in specific terms, in view of the fact that said vessels were to be constructed in exact conformity with the law, the terms of the several contracts, and the specifications prescribed by the Navy Department, upon what basis premiums have been paid, and also what amounts are now claimed to be due by contractors on account of such premiums and by whom such claim is made.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reserve the point of order upon that resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. Just a word. There has been over a million dollars already paid in premiums on these contracts for increased speed, and there is over a million dollars pending to be promptly adjusted. I am informed that the exact amount now claiming adjustment in the Treasury for increased speed of war ships under contracts heretofore made, including the Columbia, is the sum of $1,055,000. Inasmuch as these war ships are constructed under contracts which provide the exact details of construction in every particular it is obvious that this feature of "premium" on speed ought to command the attention of Congress.

It is alleged by leading newspapers of the country that there is no justification for this. It seems there is to be $50,000 paid under the contracts for an increase of speed to the extent of a quarter knot an hour above the speed specified. There is also provision for a corresponding reduction if the speed is less, but up to this time there has been no instance where a reduction has been made. In every instance there has been an increase of compensation to the constructors for the building of these ships, and as I have said, there are now pending claims of this character to the amount of more than a million dollars to be paid upon the Columbia and other vessels in excess of the contract price. It seems to me very proper that this subject should be inquired into, and if gentlemen wish to understand the basis on which this resolution is drawn I will ask that the papers which I hold in my hand may be read.

Mr. BINGHAM. What is the use of delaying the House? Let the resolutions be referred.

Mr. HOLMAN. No; I want the resolutions adopted. I do not think they ought to be referred; I think they ought to be adopted. Will my friend from Pennsylvania allow some editorials to be read from leading newspapers, especially the New York Tribune, which is friendly to the increase of the Navy, on this subject?

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman must be aware that the pre-

amble to this resolution contains a number of statements which are controverted. It seems to me that if there is to be any resolution upon this subject it ought to be a resolution directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate the subject, and it ought not to be prefaced with a preamble containing controverted statements. If the gentleman will withdraw his preamble and introduce one that simply directs the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate the matter there will be no objection to it on my part.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is stated in the preamble that these allegations are made, and I have the authority for that statement.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. The gentleman, as I understand, introduces his resolution for reference.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand that, but I do not care to have a stump speech put into a resolution for reference.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman from Maine consent that these papers shall be read?

Mr. LOUD. I object.

Mr. BINGHAM. I object. I have no objection to the Committee on Naval Affairs being directed to investigate this matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, I shall have to submit to a reference if the gentleman from Pennsylvania objects to the resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not object to the resolution. I am in favor of the investigation; but I object to your debating the matter now. I am perfectly willing to have the resolution referred.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, if this resolution was introduced for reference it should have been handed in at the desk, but if the gentleman from Indiana desires to have it considered now, of course that requires unanimous consent.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] think that it is proper at this stage of the proceeding to introduce and have go into the RECORD allegations taken from newspapers, when it is proposed to investigate this subject? Let us know what the facts are first, and discuss and judge of them afterwards. The gentleman proposes to have a verdict before the case is tried.

Mr. HOLMAN. Oh, this is done almost every day. The resolution does not declare that the facts are so; it simply states that these allegations are made.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman merely desires to have the subject investigated there is no objection; but if he wants to put into the RECORD a stump speech under the guise of a resolution and prejudge the case, there is objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will withdraw the preamble if gentlemen will consent that the resolution shall be considered now.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. The resolution ought to go to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland objects.

Mr. HOLMAN. Very well. Let the resolution go to the Committee on Naval Affairs. That committee, under the rules of the House, will of course promptly report.

The resolution was so referred.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that the first call of committees for the presentation of reports be dispensed with, and that members be permitted to hand in their reports at the Clerk's desk. We are very much pressed for time.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I object.

The committees were called, no reports being presented.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour for the consideration of bills called up by committees begins now at forty minutes after 12 o'clock.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the second morning hour.

Mr. MEYER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The call rests with the Committee on Naval Affairs, which has pending the resolution, the title of which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution in regard to the personnel of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to make a request. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD certain statements in regard to the subject of the preamble and resolution which I had the honor to submit a few moments ago. They are very brief.

Mr. LOUD. I object.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

Mr. MEYER. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution in regard to the personnel of the Navy.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 61, noes 5.

Mr. KILGORE. I make the point of "no quorum."

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. KILGORE and Mr. MEYER were appointed.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 18, not voting 113; as follows:

YEAS—222.

Adams,	Covert,	Hudson,	Powers,
Aitken,	Cox,	Hulick,	Price,
Alderson,	Crawford,	Hull,	Rayner,
Alexander,	Cummings,	Hunter,	Reed,
Allen,	Curtis, Kans.	Hutcheson,	Reilly,
Apsley,	Curtis, N. Y.	Ikirt,	Reyburn,
Arnold,	Dalzell,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richards, Ohio
Avery,	Daniels,	Johnson, Ohio	Richardson, Mich.
Babcock,	Davis,	Kiefer,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bailey,	De Armond,	Kribbs,	Robbins,
Baker, Kans.	Denson,	Kyle,	Robertson, La.
Barnes,	Dingley,	Latimer,	Robinson, Pa.
Bartholdt,	Dinsmore,	Lawson,	Russell, Conn.
Barwig,	Dockery,	Layton,	Russell, Ga.
Belden,	Dolliver,	Lefever,	Ryan,
Bell, Tex.	Doolittle,	Livingston,	Sayers,
Beltzhoover,	Draper,	Lockwood,	Settle,
Berry,	Dunphy,	Loud,	Shaw,
Bingham,	Edmunds,	Lucas,	Shell,
Black, Ga.	Ellis, Oregon	Lynch,	Sherman,
Blair,	Epes,	Maddox,	Sickles,
Blanchard,	Erdman,	Maguire,	Simpson,
Bland,	Everett,	Mallory,	Stallings,
Boatner,	Fitch,	Marsh,	Stephenson,
Boen,	Fletcher,	Marshall,	Stockdale,
Bowers, Cal.	Forman,	Martin, Ind.	Stone, W. A.
Branch,	Funk,	McAleer,	Stone, Ky.
Brawley,	Fyan,	McCulloch,	Strait,
Bretz,	Gardner,	McDearmon,	Strong,
Broderick,	Gear,	McGann,	Swanson,
Brookshire,	Gillet, N. Y.	McKaig,	Talbert, S. C.
Brosius,	Gorman,	McNagny,	Talbott, Md.
Brown,	Grady,	McRae,	Tate,
Burrows,	Griffin,	Meiklejohn,	Tawney,
Cadmus,	Grout,	Mercer,	Taylor, Ind.
Caldwell,	Hainer,	Meredith,	Terry,
Campbell,	Haines,	Meyer,	Tracey,
Cannon, Cal.	Hall, Minn.	Milliken,	Tucker,
Cannon, Ill.	Hall, Mo.	Montgomery,	Tyler,
Caruth,	Hammond,	Moon,	Updegraff,
Catchings,	Harmer,	Moran,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Causey,	Harris,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Chickering,	Hartman,	Murray,	Wanger,
Clancy,	Hatch,	Mutchler,	Washington,
Clark, Mo.	Hayes,	Newlands,	Waugh,
Clarke, Ala.	Heard,	Northway,	Weadock,
Cobb, Ala.	Heiner,	O'Ferrall,	Wells,
Cobb, Mo.	Henderson, N. C.	Outhwaite,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cockrell,	Hepburn,	Page,	Wilson, Ohio
Coffeen,	Hermann,	Paynter,	Wilson, Wash.
Cogswell,	Hilborn,	Pearson,	Wise,
Coombs,	Hines,	Pence,	Woodard,
Cooper, Fla.	Hitt,	Perkins,	Woomer,
Cooper, Ind.	Hooker, N. Y.	Phillips,	Wright, Mass.
Cooper, Wis.	Hopkins, Pa.	Pickler,	
Cousins,	Houk, Ohio	Pigott,	

NAYS—18.

Baker, N. H.	Capehart,	Jones,	Somers,
Baldwin,	Culberson,	Kilgore,	Turner,
Bankhead,	Hager,	Pendleton, Tex.	Williams, Ill.
Bryan,	Haugen,	Post,	
Cabaniss,	Holman,	Snodgrass,	

NOT VOTING—113.

Abbott,	English,	Lester,	Schermerhorn,
Aldrich,	Enloe,	Linton,	Scranton,
Bartlett,	Fellows,	Lisle,	Sibley,
Bell, Colo.	Fielder,	Loudenslager,	Sipe,
Black, Ill.	Fithian,	Magner,	Smith,
Boutelle,	Funston,	Mahon,	Sperry,
Bower, N. C.	Geary,	Marvin, N. Y.	Springer,
Brattan,	Geissenhainer,	McCall,	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Gillett, Mass.	McCleary, Minn.	Stone, C. W.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Goldzier,	McCreary, Ky.	Storer,
Brickner,	Goodnight,	McDannold,	Sweet,
Bundy,	Graham,	McDowell,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Gresham,	McEttrick,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burnes,	Grosvenor,	McKeighan,	Thomas,
Bynum,	Hare,	McLaurin,	Turpin,
Caminetti,	Harter,	McMillin,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Childs,	Henderson, Ill.	Money,	Walker,
Cockran,	Henderson, Iowa	Moses,	Warner,
Compton,	Hendrix,	Neill,	Wever,
Conn,	Hicks,	Oates,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cooper, Tex.	Hooker, Miss.	O'Neil,	White,
Cornish,	Hopkins, Ill.	Paschal,	Whiting,
Crain,	Houk, Tenn.	Patterson,	Williams, Miss.
Davey,	Johnson, Ind.	Payne,	Wilson, W. Va.
De Forest,	Joy,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wolverton,
Donovan,	Kem,	Randall,	Wright, Pa.
Dunn,	Lacey,	Ray,	
Durborow,	Lane,	Ritchie,	
Ellis, Ky.	Lapham,	Rusk,	

So the motion of Mr. MEYER was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RAY.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.
Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.
Mr. GEISSENHAINER with Mr. WRIGHT.
Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.
Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

For this day:
Mr. COMPTON with Mr. STORER.
Mr. MCGANN with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.
Mr. GRESHAM with Mr. LACEY.
Mr. SPERRY with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.
Mr. ENLOE with Mr. RANDALL.
Mr. BURNS with Mr. APSLEY.
Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.
Mr. MOSES with Mr. WHEELER of Illinois.
Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. WHITE.
Mr. MONEY with Mr. GROSVENOR.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The title of the pending resolution will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous Document No. 39; concurrent resolution relative to an inquiry regarding the personnel of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. When the morning hour expired on yesterday the committee was dividing on the motion to rise and report this resolution favorably to the House. The tellers, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER], will please take their places and resume the count.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 179, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration Miscellaneous Document No. 39, had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

The amendment reported by the Committee of the Whole was considered and agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MEYER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid upon the table.

ADMISSION OF UTAH.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to further consider the bill for the admission of Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to avail myself of the few moments accorded me to urge the passage of this bill for the admission of the Territory of Utah as a State in the Union.

I think I express the unanimous sentiment of the people of the mining region and of the Pacific coast generally when I urge upon this House the admission of that Territory as a State. No apprehension whatever is indulged in with reference to the question of polygamy. The feeling of all who live in that region and who are familiar by personal contact with Utah and its institutions is that polygamy is practically dead.

The leaven is working among the Mormons themselves. The old feeling that existed between the Mormons and the Gentiles is rapidly dying out, and I think the sentiment of that entire section is in favor of the admission of the Territory as a State without any condition or qualification other than that which is attached to the admission of every other State into the Union.

There is one question, however, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to direct the attention of the committee, and to which I desire especially to address myself, and that is the land-grant question. Two bills are presented here, one by the majority and the other by the minority of the Committee on Territories, differing, I believe, materially or solely in this particular: The majority bill proposes to give the Territory double the land grant that has been conceded to other States on their admission. The minority bill gives the usual quantum of land, but adds a condition that if the lands selected are arid that then two acres shall be given for every acre to which the Territory would be entitled. There is no reason for any such condition as that. We all know that Utah belongs to the arid region: that it is impossible to cultivate anything there without the aid of irrigation, and I object to leaving the determination of the character of the lands to bureau officers here in Washington, who as a rule know nothing whatever of the conditions in the arid region.

Few who have not lived there can realize how entirely dependent that region of country is on artificial irrigation. Almost all of the States which have been the objects of the benefaction of the Government heretofore in this regard have been in regions in which the lands have been watered by the rains from the heavens, but in that intermountain country agriculture can not rely upon the chance supply from the heavens. The moisture there is stored in the snows falling on the mountain ranges, which melt during the spring and summer and feed the streams which flow into the lakes and sinks of the desert.

In Utah I am told that every stream of any importance, with one single exception, empties into Salt Lake, and that the creeks relied on for irrigation empty into the streams that in turn flow into Salt Lake. It is necessary there not only to divert these waters from the streams over the land by canals and ditches, but also to provide for artificial reservoirs in the mountains and cañons in which the water may be stored, so that it can be let down upon the lands during the period of drought, when the natural flow of the streams is scanty and attenuated.

It is kept there in a measure on tap, responsive to the demands of man. It is therefore utterly impossible to inaugurate a system of settlement in that region similar to that which has existed in the Mississippi and other valleys. Individual settlement and individual reclamation can not obtain generally. It is true that the first settlers upon the banks of these rivers can, by inexpensive ditches and canals, divert the waters over their lands, and thus establish a crude system of irrigation; but they in time—and I have no doubt that is the case now in Utah—absolutely absorb the natural flow of the rivers during the period of drought, and it becomes necessary there, in order to bring larger areas of land within cultivation, to resort to this system of storage, of establishing artificial reservoirs to which I have alluded, and of constructing canals and ditches at great expense, covering large areas of land by a comprehensive plan.

This work can therefore only be inaugurated by the use of capital, by aggregating men together into some organization, corporate or otherwise, by employing capital in building dams, constructing reservoirs and ditches to bring a large area of land under their control, and then dividing that area of land up into small farms of twenty or forty acres, and selling to settlers. Here I may say that a farm of twenty or forty acres, irrigated throughout the year, dependent upon such sytem of supply, will yield more than a farm of one hundred and sixty or two hundred acres in the Mississippi Valley. It will amply support a family.

I state these facts in order to show that it is essential that something in the way of organized effort should be accomplished with reference to these arid lands; that either the United States Government, as the proprietor of these lands, should seek their highest development by the construction of reservoirs and irrigation ditches, and then sell the completely irrigated lands to the settler, or that the Government should transfer these lands to the various States constituting a part of that arid region, and allow them to enter upon a comprehensive system of irrigation. That system can be conducted by the State itself, if it so chooses, or can be intrusted, under proper conditions and limitations, to private capital; but capital is absolutely essential, whether it be the capital of the General Government or the capital of a State, or the capital of private corporations and individuals; and unless capital is employed in the way of organized effort it will be impossible to bring those States up to their highest development.

The majority have presented a bill in which they wisely, though only partially, recognize this condition of things, and hence grant to that State twice as much of these arid lands as they do to the other States of agricultural lands. They should have granted to the State of Utah all the arid lands within its domain; for it seems to be a recognized fact now that the General Government, as proprietor of these lands, will not enter upon the scheme of their reclamation. If it does not, if it is not willing to discharge the duties which belong to it as proprietor of the lands, then let it transfer those lands to someone who will, either the State or some organization acting under the authority of the State. It is utterly impossible to rely upon individual effort. The field of individual effort throughout the arid region is already exhausted by the reclamation and irrigation of the lands immediately adjoining the streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has expired.

Mr. REED. I ask that the gentleman may have more time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I only ask for three minutes.

There being no objection, Mr. NEWLANDS' time was extended.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am afraid of trespassing upon the time of other members who wish to be heard upon the subject, and I will simply add one word on another subject.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] yesterday, in opposing the measures for the admission of Utah to the Union, declared that if we had only some means of turning out Nevada whilst we let in Utah he might be in favor of it. I do not see the gentleman on the floor, and I am at a loss to know why Nevada should be the special object of animadversion whenever this question of the creation of a new State is brought up. Do the people of that State forget that when this country was in the throes of rebellion the little State of Nevada poured into the lap of the nation $600,000,000? Do they forget that President Lincoln, shortly before his death, viewing with gratification the increased output of silver in that and the adjoining States, asked Speaker Colfax to bear to that people a special message of congratulation on the fact that "the increasing production of silver in that region will aid the country in the restoration of specie payments and solve perplexing financial questions"?

Little did that man of sorrow and of anxiety realize that within eight years after his death the utility of silver in the restoration of specie payments would be destroyed; that this country by legislation would deny itself the special benefaction which nature had given it, and that a great and controlling industry in that region would be suppressed.

Why is Nevada prostrate to-day? Because the legislation of the nation has been leveled against her. You have suppressed her silver-mining. She has recently been paying attention to the wool industry, and you propose to suppress that. Borax and soda are her only remaining minerals on which she can rely. She has for years been engaged in the process of developing vast fields of soda and borax, and you propose to put them upon the free list. This tariff is to be framed in such a way that New England shall have everything free that she does not produce and everything protected that she does.

Mr. REED. Do not charge New England with having a hand in that. New England is as adverse to this tariff bill as you are, and will show it by her votes.

Mr. BOWERS of California (to Mr. NEWLANDS). Be a little careful about telling the truth about that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know how or by what queer process this unnatural alliance has been brought about between the South and New England, but it seems that it has been accomplished, both on the tariff and on financial questions, and the West has been left out.

Now, I say that Nevada has been prostrated by legislation, and by legislation alone. The protection given to industries in other sections of the country has been withdrawn; silver, the acknowledged money metal of the world, has been stricken down; her miners have been denied the right which has existed through the centuries of taking their silver to the mints and there having put on it the stamp of the realm and made coin. Every industry upon which she has relied has been or is being attacked; and yet the very men who aimed the fatal blow now deride her because she is prostrate.

Gentlemen, Nevada deserves nothing like contempt or derision. She is small in population, but she is great in the vigor and intellect of her people. I approached a small-minded man who happened to hold a position under the late Administration with reference to an appointment from that State and he said to me, "Don't you think little Nevada has had enough?" I said, "Yes; if you consider the sparseness of her population; but no, if you consider the brains of her men." [Applause.] I point you to the long line of distinguished statesmen who have represented that State upon the floors of Congress. It is taunted with being a "rotten borough" and the home of millionaires; the place from which millionaires are returned to Congress.

Point me a millionaire who has ever represented that State who has not had brains. In that State the mere possession of wealth is not a disqualification for office. The men who have represented that State in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States have been men who have won success there by the exercise of robust qualities of mind and body. They have not won their wealth by the process of money-lending or in the devious ways of Wall street, but by wrestling with nature in her very strongholds; and the people of that country have recognized their merit and sent them here.

I point you to a JONES, who in the last Brussels Conference was recognized as superior to any man there on all questions relating to political economy and monetary science, and whose speeches constitute the reservoir from which most of the learning upon the silver and bimetallic question has come. I point you to the restless and resistless agitator, STEWART, an object of derision in the East, but loved in the West, whose advanced ideas upon all subjects relating to legislation are impressed upon the statute books of the country. These men and men like these have worthily represented that State, and ever since her admission into the Union her people and her statesmen have held an advanced position in all matters relating to the prosperity and growth of the country, have contributed much to the general good, and without partisanship, sectionalism, or prejudice have stood by policies which had in view only the general interest. She deserves no slurs and shall accept none without resentment.

I fear I have already indulged myself at the expense of others who wish to speak, and I shall now close my remarks with thanks for your kind extension and indulgence. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House but a few minutes. As a member of the Committee on Territories, I would like to say a few words upon the admission of Utah. I did not sign the report, because I was absent. Had I been present I certainly would have signed the report for the admission of Utah as a State into this Union. The Constitution of the United States guarantees, or should guarantee, to every State a republican form of government; therefore I am in favor, Mr. Chairman, of the majority report of this committee. I believe that the people of Utah, and it has been proven on this floor, are made up of the best citizens of this country; that she has to-day sufficient population and sufficient wealth to entitle her to statehood and self-government. I think that has been proven beyond dispute.

The opposition to the admission of this Territory as a State is confined to comparatively few members of this House, and I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, that the opposition comes from a narrow prejudice and a sentiment that believes that if this Territory is admitted as a State there will be two more Senators and two Congressmen who will probably vote against their financial ideas. I do not believe that there is any opposition in this House except that. How do they know that when this State is admitted into the Union that those views will be held by the people? They may, as a matter of fact, by that time believe in the theory advocated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], who spoke in opposition to this bill. They may, if they read the circulars that he has put into circulation throughout the country, believe that the financial system of the country and the money of the country should be based upon bank credits, checks, and drafts, which is his theory about furnishing the financial policy of this country.

But I am willing to trust to the intelligence of the people of Utah to settle that question for themselves. They are certainly wise enough not to adopt any financial policy that will not be for the interest of that community. I am willing to trust to the intelligence of the West to settle the questions that involve their interests. It has been clearly proved that since the building of railroads, the opening up of commerce, and the flow of population from the East to Utah, the effect has been to remove all possibility of the reëstablishment of polygamy in that Territory. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], in his remarks last evening—I am sorry he is not present now—went out of his way, as it seemed to me, to say that he objected to the admission of Utah as a State because it would give her two Senators, a representation too large for her population.

Mr. Chairman, I think that objection comes with a very poor grace from the gentleman from Ohio, who professes to be a good Democrat. The Constitution of the United States provides that every State shall have two Senators, upon the principle that the Senators are the representatives of the States, and not directly of the people; and the Democrats of this country have always been great sticklers for carrying out the provisions of the Constitution. Now, I should like to know how the gentleman from Ohio, as a Democrat, can consistently make an objection of that kind to the admission of Utah as a State. Another thing, the gentleman went out of his way also to attack nearly every State in the West and Northwest and their governors. [Laughter.] He attacked the great State of Kansas and her governor.

Now, sir, I do not wish to say anything against the State of Ohio. She is as good a State as there is in the Union, and her people are as good and intelligent as the people of any other State in the Union. The sons of Ohio have contributed largely to make Kansas what she is to-day. But the gentleman from Ohio went out of his way to attack the governor of my State in connection with a recent circular that he has issued, proposing to stand between the poor and those who would oppress them, proposing to help the people of this country who are out of employment, in consequence, as I believe, of vicious legislation brought about by men who advocate the financial principles of which the gentleman from Ohio himself is one of the prominent champions. The demonetization of silver and the return to a single gold

standard in this country is, I believe, one of the causes that have brought us to the condition in which we are to-day.

The governor of my State, a humane man, has issued a circular suggesting that these poor people ought not to be treated as criminals until they have committed some overt act, some offense against the law; that they ought not to be arrested and treated as vagrants or criminals until they have committed some crime. Mr. Chairman, it is the laws of your country that have made those people tramps. The Democrats say that the present condition results from the high protective tariff, building up monopolies and denying to labor proper access to opportunities for the production of wealth. The Republicans say that this condition is brought about by the threat to abolish the protective tariff system and to establish free trade in this country; while the Populists declare that it is largely owing to the financial system which, since 1873, has deprived the nation of a sufficient amount of money with which to do business, and thereby has paralyzed business.

Mr. Chairman, whether the present condition is due to one of these causes or to another makes no difference in this discussion. The facts are that we are in this condition, and that multitudes of our people are unable to find employment, and the People's party, although they may not have discovered any great panacea that will cure all the evils with which society is afflicted, certainly do stand to-day as the friends of those poor people and are engaged in an earnest effort to better their condition. The governor of my State has simply attempted to put into practice the teachings of the Christian religion, the doctrine that all men are brothers in this world, the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and as soon as he attempts to carry into effect the teachings of Christ, men call him a crank, and all the little two by seven newspapers and all the little two by nine politicians in the country jump onto him for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. ARNOLD. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that this debate has given opportunity for the discussion of past records. It has also demonstrated the fact, as was shown upon yesterday, that such is not at all times a pleasant undertaking. Therefore I shall not now go into any history whatsoever of Utah or of its institutions in the past. I am here to say that I am no apologist for polygamy. I believe it to be the putrid excrescence of a sensuous mind. The light of civilization has been turned upon it and the eyes of the people of the United States to-day look upon it only in loathing and in horror. But, sirs, while all this may be true, and while the stain of polygamy may cling to the past record of that Territory, yet if to day it has forsaken the infamous practice and stands upon an equal footing with the balance of the sisterhood of States, then I take it that we will not look to such record, but simply to the present attitude of the people of Utah, and will act upon the principle that the only question for consideration is the present good standing of that Territory.

Now, sir, I do not want to refer to the records of the Mormon Church. I care nothing about going back to the manifesto of 1890. I care nothing about the great conference that was held a few days thereafter, in which that manifesto was unanimously indorsed. I care nothing about all these things. I simply refer to the fact that since the issue of that manifesto polygamy has practically ceased and been abandoned in the Territory of Utah. More than that, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of this committee to the fact that, outside of ecclesiastical proceedings, outside of the fact that the Legislature of the Territory of Utah has passed laws stringent in their character prohibiting the practice of polygamy in that Territory—that in addition to all this, the question of the admission of Utah has been thoroughly investigated by a committee of this House.

Gentlemen of prominence, gentlemen of standing in that Territory, in February, 1892, came before the Committee on Territories and gave their statements, which are upon record and which can be seen by every member of the House. They speak in no uncertain terms. They tell you the facts as they exist there to-day. And having viewed that testimony impartially from beginning to end, but one conclusion can be drawn therefrom, and that is the conclusion which I announced in the beginning of my remarks—that that infamy no longer exists in the Territory of Utah.

Who were those witnesses? Two of them were men who have sat upon the supreme bench of the Territory. One of them, a United States marshal appointed by Mr. Harrison, who had been brought in contact with the people of the Territory and who had, therefore, peculiar and paramount opportunities of observing and noting the trend of thought in this regard. And these gentlemen having submitted their statements to you, having given their testimony, all cumulative upon that point, even so far back as February, 1892, in what impartial mind can there rest to-day a solitary doubt as to the existence or nonexistence of polygamy in the Territory of Utah?

Moreover, the witnesses who appeared on that occasion in opposition to the admission or to the "home rule" principle in Utah—those witnesses, when driven to the wall, as you will see by examining their statements, admitted that polygamy was dead in that Territory, and that it was not an obstacle to its admission into the Union. If that be true, there is no longer any ground of objection to admission.

But we had some illustrations here yesterday that seemed to me unique in their character. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], rather looking upon polygamy, I believe, as no very great crime, inasmuch as according to his view it is practiced all over the United States, could see no objection to the admission of Utah upon that ground; but ransacking his ingenuity he discovered that this Territory had not so large a population as the State of Ohio, and therefore he determined it is not entitled to come into the Union with the same rights and privileges as are accorded to all of the States. And when his attention was called to the fact that here were Rhode Island and Delaware in the Union, enjoying these rights and privileges, he replied that by some mysterious dispensation of Providence the "blood of the Revolution" had given those States special and honored privileges over and above the balance of the people of the United States.

I do not pretend to go into any argument of that sort. I have no time to discuss the mistakes of the fathers. I simply say that to-day Utah possesses under the Constitution and laws of the United States the requisite population for admission into the Union.

One matter more and I am done, because I do not want to occupy the attention of this Committee of the Whole more than a short time. If my position is correct, that polygamy has practically ceased and been abandoned in the Territory of Utah, I desire to know whether it would not be putting a stigma upon her to admit her under an act embracing the amendment proposed by the minority report of this committee. Is it not equivalent to saying to that Territory or its people, "We doubt your sincerity; we know that you have performed all that you have undertaken; we know that you have complied with every jot and tittle of every promise you have made to us; we know that to-day, so far as we can see, you stand upon an equal footing with the people of these United States, yet nevertheless we propose to doubt you; we propose to say by this bill that if we give you statehood we are fearful that you may relapse into your former condition." Now, gentlemen, if you believe that, then do not admit this Territory at all. If she is to come in with leading strings of this sort, then in Heaven's name let her remain out of the Union longer. We want no States but those which are sovereign and equal in all respects; and I shall therefore vote against the minority report upon that ground.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here comes a Territory knocking at the doors of the Union for admission. She comes full panoplied with wealth, intelligence, population. You need not doubt her. She can not recede. Why, sir, you might as well expect the days of religious bigotry to overspread the State of Massachusetts; you might as well expect to stem the tide of irresistible progress as to expect that Utah, having bathed in the splendors of Anglo Saxon civilization, will return to the darkness and the degradation of her former condition.

Why, sir, the very decrees of fate forbid. The planets themselves move not more surely in their courses than does the eternal march of right and morality. Let us, then, admit this Territory upon an equal footing with the other States of the sisterhood; let us say by our vote that we have faith in local self-government, and thus be able to add a new star that shall move in harmony and beauty in our great American constellation. [Applause.]

[Mr. WASHINGTON withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. OATES. Mr. Chairman, I have long since been satisfied that polygamy as it existed in the Territory of Utah was crushed out and destroyed by the enforcement of the Edmunds-Tucker law. Thus believing, I was in favor of the admission of Utah into the Union as a State at least four years ago. I knew then that they had the requisite population, intelligence, and wealth, and that the Territory was sufficiently large; and I believed then, as I do now, that it was refused admission for political and partisan reasons. Since that time, observing that the State of Nevada, which adjoins it, continued to lose its population, it occurred to me that there was quite a question for the consideration of Congress as to what would become of that State if this thing continued.

Now, I do not controvert the statement of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] of the intelligence and worthiness of the inhabitants of that State; but it is a fact which stares all of

us in the face that it continues to lose its population. Three years ago, when the census was taken, it had but about 40,000; and I saw in a California paper since that time that the population of the State now does not exceed 33,000. If their mining industries continue to be less and less profitable, what may the population in that State be reduced to within a few years longer? Down to 20,000, and possibly 10,000 people. Would not it be an anomaly for a State of the Union, with an equal vote with the great State of New York in the Senate and with a Representative here, to continue a State in the Union with but a handful in population? The expense of maintaining a State government by such a small population is very heavy.

Now, I do not agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] that it is wrong in principle that a small State shall have an equal vote in the Senate with a large State. But for the adoption of that principle the Union would never have been formed, for the small States would not have gone into it; but it seems to me that when a State is growing less and less all the time there ought to be some remedy for it. It is the province of Congress to admit new States into the Union under this clause of the Constitution:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.

Then again, I think Congress has absolute power to dispose of this Territory under the following clause of the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, etc.

It is clear that Congress has not the power to destroy or disestablish a State; but it occurred to me as a good solution of this difficulty, without interfering with the rights of the State of Nevada, and also giving the people of Utah a position in the Union to which they are entitled, during the last session, the extra session of Congress, I introduced a bill, which was referred to this same committee, to add the Territory of Utah to the State of Nevada. The only question there is about that, or the power of Congress to do it, is as to the consent of the State of Nevada.

The power in Congress to absolutely dispose of the Territory rests in its own discretion. I have received information—I do not know how true it is—that this would be perfectly satisfactory to the State of Nevada. If so, it certainly ought to be done. It is no advantage to multiply the number of States we have in the Union; but the people of the Territory of Utah ought to be admitted into the Union either as an independent State or incorporated with another State; and I think the wisest way to put it in the Union would be as a part of the State of Nevada, because then it would be a good State in territory, population, and in every way entitled to the fullest recognition. It ought to be very desirable to the people of Nevada.

But, sir, if nothing is presented here which enables me to record my vote for that result, I shall vote for the admission of Utah into the Union as a State, believing that the people thereof are entitled to that consideration.

Having expressed my views upon the subject, Mr. Chairman, as the time is growing short, I will not consume it any further, but will yield the floor that the bill may be further considered.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now read by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the bill be now read by sections for amendments. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. That all male citizens of the United States over the age of 21 years, who have resided in said Territory for one year next prior to such election, are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory. Such delegates shall possess the qualifications of such electors; and the aforesaid convention shall consist of one hundred and seven delegates, apportioned among the several counties within the limits of the proposed State as follows: Beaver County, two delegates; Box Elder County, four delegates; Cache County, eight delegates; Davis County, three delegates; Emery County, three delegates; Garfield County, one delegate; Grand County, one delegate; Iron County, one delegate; Juab County, three delegates; Kane County, one delegate; Millard County, two delegates; Morgan County, one delegate; Piute County, one delegate; Rich County, one delegate; Salt Lake County, twenty-nine delegates, thus apportioned, to wit: Salt Lake City, first precinct, four delegates; second precinct, six delegates; third precinct, five delegates; fourth precinct, three delegates; fifth precinct, three delegates; all other precincts in said county, outside of Salt Lake City, eight delegates; San Juan County, one delegate; San Pete County, seven delegates; Sevier County, three delegates; Summit County, four delegates; Tooele County, two delegates; Uintah County, one delegate; Utah County, twelve delegates; Wasatch County, two delegates; Washington County, two delegates; Wayne County, one delegate, and Weber County, eleven delegates; and the governor of said Territory shall, within twenty days after the passage of this act, by proclamation order an election of the delegates aforesaid in said Territory, to be held on such day as he may in such proclamation designate, not less than sixty nor more than ninety days after the issuing thereof. The board of commissioners known as the Utah Commission is hereby authorized and required to cause a new and complete registration of voters of said Territory to be made under the provisions of the laws of the United States and said Territory, except that the oath required for registration under said laws shall be so modified as to test the qualifications of the electors as prescribed in this act; such new registration to be made as nearly conformable with the provisions of such laws as may be; and such election for delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the result ascertained, and the certificate of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of said Territory regulating elections therein of members of the Legislature. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegates under this act shall be entitled to vote on the ratification or rejection of the constitution, under such rules or regulations as said convention may prescribe, not in conflict with this act.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

> Strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and the first six words of line 5, in section 2, and substitute the following:
> "SEC. 2. That all persons who are qualified by the laws of said Territory to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly thereof are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory; and the qualifications for delegates to such convention shall be such as by the laws of said Territory persons are required to possess to be eligible to the Legislative Assembly thereof."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, occupying as I do the position of chairman of the Committee on Territories, I had intended closing the general debate, but yielded my time to gentlemen who desired to express their views.

I will therefore be pardoned for taking this opportunity to explain the features of the amendments which will be offered during the consideration of the bill by sections.

The question as to the necessity of a clause in the constitution of the proposed State prohibiting polygamy, engaged the attention of the committee, and upon that point alone was there any material division of opinion. A portion contended that any such requirement was not necessary, while others were of the opinion that the condition was of a character which called for provisions which are not usual in laws enacted by Congress for the admission of Territories into the sisterhood of States.

The people of Utah fully appreciated the force of this conclusion, and in the constitution framed by them in 1887 they engrafted such a provision in that instrument.

Section 12 of the constitution adopted by the people of Utah was in these words:

> SEC. 12. Bigamy and polygamy being considered incompatible with "a republican form of government," each of them is hereby forbidden and declared a misdemeanor.
> Any person who shall violate this section shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 and imprisonment for a term not less than six months nor more than three years, in the discretion of the court. This section shall be construed as operative without the aid of legislation, and the offenses prohibited by this section shall not be barred by any statute of limitation within three years after the commission of the offense; nor shall the power of pardon extend thereto until such pardon shall be approved by the President of the United States.

By another section of that constitution the foregoing provision was made irrevocable.

Section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States says:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

It will be observed that the people of Utah recognized that section 12, which I have read, and which they incorporated in their proposed constitution regarding polygamy, was essential in order to comply with the above provision, and to place that State upon an equality with other States of the Union.

The distinguished gentleman who represents Utah upon this floor states that the insertion of such a provision would be a stigma upon the Territory. My purpose is to have this great Territory with its population of 250,000 admitted as a State, and I regard the insertion of an antipolygamy clause as essential to accomplish that purpose. I want to see the distinguished gentleman [Mr. RAWLINS], who spoke so eloquently yesterday, come to Washington not as a Representative, but to adorn the Hall at the other end of this Capitol. He states that there has been no precedent for action of this character.

The gentleman forgets the laws of Congress enacted less than a quarter of a century ago. He forgets the law by which the great State of Virginia became again a State of this Union—that great State, with a galaxy of statesmen and heroes greater than any that ever came from any other land: the State which gave us the eloquence of Patrick Henry, that stirred the people's courage and fortitude to win their liberties: the State that gave the sword to Washington to fight and win the battles of our forefathers; the State that gave us the pen of Jefferson to write the Declaration of Independence—the same Jefferson whose

statesmanship and wisdom founded the great Democratic party, which has done so much to make our land great, free, and prosperous [applause]; the State that gave us a Marshall to frame the judicial system of which we are so proud, and, I may be pardoned for saying, the State which in later years gave to the world two great heroes, whose characters in ages to come will be pointed at as the exemplifications of the highest type of moral manhood—soldiers, the sheen of whose swords will illumine the pages of history for thousands of ages to come, and the courage and fortitude of Virginia soldiers led by such superb commanders as these will furnish themes for poetry and romance as long as civilization shall exist—the State that produced these men was only restored to statehood by adopting a constitution which overturned their most cherished traditions, destroyed the property which was the accumulation of a century, deprived substantially every intelligent and educated man of the right of suffrage, and placed that glorious State under the control of ignorant negroes, who but a few months before were the slaves of the men who made Virginia a great and prosperous Commonwealth.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the reconstruction acts which I have before me controvert with great emphasis the assertion that there is no precedent for legislation by Congress for the proposed provision.

The amendment prepared by myself is in these words:

The constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color except as to Indians not taxed, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide, by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State—

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiments shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship. But said constitution shall prohibit polygamy or dual marriage, and polygamy or dual marriage shall be declared by such constitution to be felony and punishable by any of the courts of said State of competent jurisdiction by inflicting a fine of not less than $1,000 or more than $5,000, and confinement in the penitentiary for not less than one year or more than five years.

Any provision, however, which meets the objectionable evil will be gladly accepted as a substitute. If the people are sincere in their determination to prevent the recurrence of the practice of polygamy, such a provision in the constitution will certainly aid them in carrying out that laudable purpose.

That the population of Utah is very largely composed of members of the Mormon Church is shown by the last census.

The following table gives the total population by the censuses of 1880 and 1890, and also the population of each county:

Population of Utah, 1880 and 1890, and increase during the decade.

Counties.	Population.		Increase.	
	1890.	1880.	Number.	Per cent.
Beaver	3,340	3,918	578	14.75
Boxelder	7,642	6,761	881	13.03
Cache	15,509	12,562	2,947	23.46
Davis	6,751	5,279	1,472	27.88
Emery	5,076	556	4,520	812.95
Garfield	2,457	----------	2,457	----------
Grand	541	----------	541	----------
Iron	2,683	4,013	1,330	33.14
Juab	5,582	3,474	2,108	60.68
Kane	1,685	3,085	1,400	45.38
Millard	4,033	3,727	306	8.21
Morgan	1,780	1,783	3	0.17
Piute	2,842	1,651	1,191	72.14
Rich	1,527	1,263	264	20.90
Salt Lake	58,457	31,977	26,480	82.81
San Juan	365	204	161	78.92
Sanpete	13,146	11,557	1,589	13.75
Sevier	6,199	4,457	1,742	39.08
Summit	7,733	4,921	2,812	57.14
Tooele	3,700	4,497	797	17.72
Uinta	2,762	799	1,963	245.68
Utah	23,768	17,973	5,795	32.24
Wasatch	3,565	2,927	638	22.82
Washington	4,009	4,235	226	5.34
Weber	22,723	12,344	10,379	84.08
Total	207,905	143,963	63,942	44.42

I have also prepared a table from the Census Reports showing the strength of the Mormon Church, designated by its adherents as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

By this table we see that every county in Utah has several organized churches of this persuasion, that the communicants of these churches exceed in number one-half of the population, and that the seating capacity of the churches and halls used as churches is nearly one-half of the population, and it must be remembered that this strong condition of the church is shown by the census of 1890, which was taken after thousands of Mormons had left Utah and settled in Old Mexico.

The table is as follows:

Table showing the condition and strength of the Mormon Church of Latter-Day Saints in Utah.

Counties.	Number of organizations.	Church edifices.	Seating capacity.	Halls, etc.	Seating capacity.	Value of church property.	Communicants or members.
Beaver	6	5	1,395	1	----------	25,100	1,342
Boxelder	17	8	2,550	11	1,470	24,000	4,776
Cache	23	21	7,920	2	300	87,000	6,902
Davis	10	9	4,700	1	100	36,500	4,686
Emery	11	3	525	8	2,375	13,475	2,243
Garfield	6	6	1,450	----------	----------	10,900	1,460
Iron	5	5	1,950	----------	----------	17,700	2,251
Juab	6	5	1,800	1	65	19,661	3,190
Kane	8	1	300	7	885	1,300	2,161
Millard	8	3	1,325	5	1,350	11,000	2,815
Morgan	9	3	950	7	780	3,200	1,479
Piute	8	4	850	5	810	3,800	1,609
Rich	5	3	610	2	150	5,350	1,118
Salt Lake	43	38	13,015	7½	2,185	222,691	23,428
San Juan	1	1	250	----------	----------	1,500	180
Sanpete	16	14½	7,760	2	500	56,980	12,713
Sevier	13	6½	2,300	6	1,230	16,715	3,943
Summit	13	7½	4,550	3	350	20,250	2,383
Tooele	7	6	1,575	1	----------	13,561	1,974
Uinta	6	1	500	5	1,047	800	1,588
Utah	27	18	7,050	14	3,038	69,450	12,240
Wasatch	5	4	2,600	2	300	7,200	3,057
Washington	19	8	1,650	12	1,925	4,150	2,680
Weber	21	10	4,800	12	2,005	61,125	10,351
Total	293	190½	72,375	114½	20,865	733,216	117,629

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to add a few words.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, there is one other amendment which has been suggested. It is to provide that the amount of land given to the State of Utah shall be the same as has been given to the other Territories recently admitted as States. But to meet the contention that these lands are arid, I add a proviso that in case any of the lands shall be found to be of that character, then the State shall receive two acres for one.

With regard to the soil of Utah I read the following from the American Cyclopædia, volume 16, page 233, viz:

Much of the soil of Utah possesses the elements of fertility and when irrigated produces good crops. In narrow belts around the lakes and rivers, and along the streams, the moisture is sometimes sufficient without irrigation, but the plains in their natural state are, for the most part, hard, dry, and barren, frequently covered with a saline incrustation, and producing only sagebrush and occasional tufts of sand grass and buffalo or gama grass.

Notwithstanding this we learn from the Census Reports that up to this time comparatively little land has been brought into cultivation. It has been considered that it was necessary to irrigate to make farming profitable, but owing to the difficulties and uncertainties in obtaining a supply of water many farmers in northern counties have adopted what is called dry farming.

I read from the Census Report upon Irrigation in Utah:

Owing to the difficulties and uncertainties concerning the supply and distribution of water, many farmers in the northern counties have gone to the extreme of declaring that dry farming is preferable wherever it is possible, and that in many localities, by carefully preparing the land by summer fallowing and planting at a proper season, cereals can be raised to a greater profit than by irrigation, although the yield per acre is far less. Alfalfa, or, as it is usually termed, lucern, is raised in many counties without water, one cutting of the plant being made, and then, no water being applied, a crop of seed is raised.

With regard to the difficulty of procuring water, the same report from the census says:

With the present unregulated water supply the success of farming depends largely upon the amount of snowfall in the mountains and the time of year in which this occurs. If the snow falls early in the winter, it usually becomes hard, and does not melt until the heat of summer has become intense and the needs of the crops are greatest. On the other hand, if the snow falls late in the winter, it does not have time to become compact, but melts in the early spring, and runs to waste long before the farmers have the greatest necessity for it.

A number of attempts have been made in various parts of the Territory to regulate the supply, and storage works have been built on a small scale, some of which are successful. These, when placed in suitable localities out of the reach of floods, not in the course of a river or the drainage from a large area of barren rocks, have justified the plans of their builders, and have rendered possible the cultivation of numerous tracts of valuable lands.

In reading this report I find evidence that in localities where

the supply of water is ample the labor and expense of applying water to irrigation is comparatively small. The report says:

Whenever the irrigator has an ample supply of water allotted to his field, and his irrigating stream is as large as he can control, the labor of applying the water to the land is comparatively small, for it penetrates to all parts of the land, advancing rapidly over the dry soil. On the other hand, however, when his irrigating stream is very small, he must spend a far longer time in carefully conducting it to each spot where water is needed, and the dry soil seems to drink up the little rill as it slowly creeps along, and demands from the farmer great patience and skill. Many irrigators are successful as long as water is in abundance, but when the time comes to economize they can not accommodate themselves to the new circumstances, and their crops suffer in consequence.

In another part of the report I find a statement that up to 1890 dry farming was only about 10 per cent of the land cultivated. The report reads:

In Utah crops were raised by irrigation in the census year ended June 30, 1890, on 253,473 acres, or 411.68 square miles, a trifle over five-tenths of 1 per cent of the entire area of the Territory. The aggregate number of farms was 10,757, and of these 9,734, or about nine-tenths, depended upon irrigation, the remaining tenth being either stock ranches or farms in the northern end of the Territory, where the climate is less arid, or situated so high in the mountains that crops can be raised by what is known as "dry farming."

The bill as reported makes a direct appropriation and donation of 1,350,000 acres of land, including all saline lands, and in addition thereto, for school purposes, four sections in each township, amounting to 6,042,311 acres, thus making a total donation of 7,392,311 acres. The grants heretofore made to States on their admission, for school purposes, have been as follows:

State.	Total area.	State.	Total area.
SECTION 16.	*Acres.*	SECTIONS 16 AND 36.	*Acres.*
Ohio	704,488	California	6,719,324
Indiana	650,317	Minnesota	2,969,990
Illinois	985,066	Oregon	3,329,706
Missouri	1,199,139	Kansas	2,801,306
Alabama	902,744	Nevada	3,985,428
Mississippi	837,584	Nebraska	2,702,044
Louisiana	786,044	Colorado	3,715,555
Michigan	1,037,397	Washington	2,488,675
Arkansas	886,460	The two Dakotas	5,366,451
Florida	908,503	Montana	5,112,035
Iowa	906,144	Idaho	3,068,231
Wisconsin	968,649	Wyoming	3,480,281

In view of this fact, the Senate has twice declined to make reports upon bills which give this exceptionally large donation of land to Utah, and a portion of the House Committee on Territories thought it best to amend the bill so as to more nearly conform to the views so emphatically expressed by the Senate. Should the amendment proposed by them be adopted, the bill would still make a direct and unconditional donation to the State of 920,000 acres of land, including 3,000 acres of saline lands. The proposed amendment also donates to the State of Utah, when admitted, for school purposes, 3,021,156 acres, making a total donation of 3,751,156 acres. In order to meet the contention that much of the land proposed to be donated is arid land, the amendment also provides that in all cases where such lands are included in the lands granted by the bill the donations shall be doubled in quantity; that is to say, that in case any land received is arid land the State of Utah, when admitted, shall receive two acres for every one which is donated by this bill.

The contention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] that the Territory did not have sufficient population to justify admission is not justified by facts. Not only is the population amply sufficient, but the intelligence and character of the people of that section is all that can be asked.

The census of 1890 places the population of Utah at 207,905, which is 15,041 more than the combined population of the States of Montana and Wyoming, and 17,054 in excess of the entire population of the adjoining States, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming, and 34,004 more than required under the census of 1890 for a Representative in Congress.

The population has greatly increased since the census was taken. The governor of the Territory in his report to the Secretary of the Interior, dated October 1, 1892, estimates the population at 223,930, being an increase of 16,025 over the Census Report. This is deemed a very conservative estimate, and the population to-day may be safely placed at 240,000, and many estimate its present population as high as 250,000.

Of the 207,905 inhabitants given by the census report there were:

Males	110,463
Females	97,442
Excess of males	13,021

The population of the Territory has a steady growth by immigration from other States and foreign countries, but more especially by births. The Census Reports give the following facts:

Between the ages of 5 and 17 years	67,465
Native born	62,463
Foreign born	5,002
Between the ages of 18 and 20 years	12,472
Native born	10,519
Foreign born	1,953
Males between ages of 5 and 20 years	40,498
Females between ages of 5 and 20 years	39,439
Total	79,937
Total males of voting age	54,471

The idea often expressed by persons ignorant of the facts, that the people of Utah are mostly foreigners, is most successfully refuted by the Census Reports, which make the following showing:

Total American born	154,841
Total foreign born	53,064

The proportion of foreign born to American born in Utah is less than in the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, California, Massachusetts, South Dakota, New York, Michigan, Washington, and the Territory of Arizona.

Only in three States and one Territory has the foreign population decreased more than in Utah during the census decade.

The percentage of aliens who speak the English language is greater in Utah than in thirty-two States and two Territories.

The population of Utah consists largely of the white element, there being of colored persons, embracing civilized Indians, Chinese, Japanese, and Hawaiians, as well as negroes, only 2,006 in the entire Territory, less in proportion to the whites than in any of the Pacific States and Territories.

I have, with some trouble, prepared a table showing the population of every State admitted into the Union as shown by the census taken next preceding the date of admission, and also the population as shown by the census next following the date of admission.

The table is as follows:

Table showing date of admission of each State, the representative ratio at date of admission, the population by the census taken next preceding the admission, the population by the census next following the admission, and the ratio of increase during decade of admission.

State.	Date of admission.	Representative ratio on previous census.	Population by census next previous to admission.			Population by following census.			Per cent of increase.
			White.	Colored.*	Total.	White.	Colored.*	Total.	
Vermont	Mar. 4, 1791	33,000	85,154	271	85,425	153,908	557	154,465	80
Kentucky	June 1, 1792	33,000	61,133	12,544	73,667	179,872	41,082	220,955	200
Tennessee	June 1, 1796	33,000	31,913	3,778	35,691	91,709	13,893	105,602	195
Ohio	Nov. 29, 1802	31,000	45,028	337	45,365	228,861	1,899	230,760	408
Louisiana	Apr. 30, 1812	35,000	34,311	42,245	76,556	73,383	79,540	152,923	100
Indiana	Dec. 11, 1816	35,000	23,890	630	24,520	145,738	1,420	147,178	500
Mississippi	Dec. 10, 1817	35,000	16,602	14,704	31,306	42,176	33,272	75,448	140
Alabama	Dec. 14, 1819	35,000	6,422	2,624	9,046	85,451	42,450	127,901	1,312
Illinois	Dec. 3, 1818	35,000	11,501	781	12,282	53,788	1,374	55,162	350
Maine	Mar. 15, 1820	35,000	227,736	969	228,705	297,340	1,192	298,532	33
Missouri	Aug. 10, 1821	40,000	55,988	10,569	66,557	114,795	25,650	140,455	111
Arkansas	June 15, 1836	47,700	25,671	4,717	30,388	77,174	20,400	97,574	221
Michigan	Jan. 26, 1837	47,700	31,346	233	31,639	211,560	707	212,267	570
Florida	Mar. 3, 1845	70,680	27,943	26,534	54,477	47,203	40,242	87,445	60
Texas	Dec. 29, 1845	70,680				154,034	58,558	212,592	
Iowa	Dec. 28, 1846	70,680	42,924	188	43,112	191,881	333	192,214	345
Wisconsin	May 29, 1848	70,680	30,748	196	30,945	304,756	635	305,391	886
California	Sept. 9, 1850	93,423	91,635	962	101,597	323,177	4,086	327,263	316
Minnesota	May 11, 1858	93,423	6,038	39	6,077	169,395	259	169,654	2,730
Oregon	Feb. 14, 1859	93,423	13,087	207	13,294	52,160	128	52,288	294
Kansas	Jan. 29, 1861	127,381	106,390	627	107,017	346,377	17,108	363,485	240
W. Virginia	June 19, 1863	127,381				424,033	17,980	442,013	
Nevada	Oct. 31, 1864	127,381	6,812	45	6,857	38,959	357	39,316	520
Nebraska	Mar. 1, 1867	127,381	28,696	82	28,778	122,117	789	122,906	328
Colorado	Aug. 1, 1876	131,425	33,221	456	33,677	191,126	3,201	193,561	388
N. Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	131,425	36,094	†815	36,909	182,123	373	182,496	20
S. Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	131,425	97,053	†1,215	98,268	327,290	1,518	328,808	30
Washington	Nov. 11, 1889	131,425	67,199	7,917	75,116	349,513	8,877	349,390	466
Idaho	July 3, 1890	151,912	29,013	3,597	32,610	82,018	2,267	84,219	162
Wyoming	July 11, 1890	151,912	19,437	1,352	20,789	59,275	1,425	60,700	31

*Including all except whites. †Estimated.

By this table we see that the population of Utah in 1890 was thirty-four times as great as the population of Minnesota by the census next preceding its date of admission. We also see that it had thirty times the population of Nevada by the census taken four years before it was admitted. We see that Utah, in 1890, had a population seventeen times greater than the population of Illinois, as shown by the census taken next preceding the admis-

sion of the State, and the proportion regarding Oregon is almost as great. We think these figures fully refute the argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Will the gentleman state whether his amendment is intended to allow women to vote in Utah?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. No, sir; it is not.

The question then being taken upon the amendment of Mr. WHEELER, it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the third Monday after their election, and, after organization, shall declare on behalf of the people of said proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States; whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State. The constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, except as to Indians not taxed, and not to be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide, by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State—

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That the people inhabiting said proposed State do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof, and to all lands lying within said limits owned or held by any Indian or Indian tribes; and that until the title thereto shall have been extinguished by the United States the same shall be and remain subject to the disposition of the United States, and said Indian lands shall remain under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the Congress of the United States; that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States residing without the said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands belonging to the residents thereof; that no taxes shall be imposed by the State on lands or property therein belonging to, or which may hereafter be purchased by the United States or reserved for its use: but nothing herein, or in the ordinance herein provided for, shall preclude the said State from taxing, as other lands are taxed, any lands owned or held by any Indian who has severed his tribal relations, and has obtained from the United States or from any person a title thereto by patent or other grant, save or except such lands as have been or may be granted to any Indian or Indians under any act of Congress containing a provision exempting the lands thus granted from taxation: but said ordinance shall provide that all such lands shall be exempt from taxation by said State so long and to such extent as such act of Congress may prescribe.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory shall be assumed and paid by such State.

Fourth. That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

The committee recommended an amendment to the third paragraph of section 3, line 47, so as to make it read:

That the debts and liabilities of said Territory, under authority of the Legislative Assembly thereof, shall be assumed and paid by said State.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add the following after the word "State," at end of line 15, section 3:

Provided, That the United States hereby reserves the right to prohibit and punish polygamy within said State, and that all laws of the United States now in force or hereafter to be enacted by the Congress of the United States prohibiting polygamy and providing for the arrest, trial, and punishment of persons practicing the same shall have full force and effect within said State, and the United States courts shall have full and complete jurisdiction to enforce said laws within said State against all persons violating any of the provisions of said laws now enacted or hereafter to be enacted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the speeches of the gentlemen who are in favor of the admission of this Territory as a State. As to the people, the land, the territory, I have no controversy with them. Nevertheless this fact stands out prominently in the case, that a large proportion of the voting population of Utah belong to the Mormon Church and are under the control and influence of the officers of that organization. So late as the year 1890, under the signatures of the officers of that church, a petition was sent to the President of the United States in which it was admitted that they were not only practicing polygamy at that time, but that such was the religious faith of the Mormon Church. That petition is quoted in the report of the committee, on page 3. I read a paragraph from it:

We, the first presidency and apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, beg respectfully to represent to your excellency the following facts:

We formerly taught to our people that polygamy, or celestial marriage, as commanded by God through Joseph Smith, was right; that it was a necessity to man's highest exaltation in the life to come.

That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our president, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago, and was steadily taught and impressed upon the Latter-Day Saints up to a short time before September, 1890. Our people are devout and sincere, and they accepted the doctrine, and many personally embraced and practiced polygamy.

When the Government sought to stamp the practice out our people almost without exception remained firm, for they, while having no desire to oppose the Government in anything, still felt that their lives and their honor as men were pledged to a vindication of their faith; and that their duty toward those whose lives were a part of their own was a paramount one, to fulfill which they had no right to count anything, not even their own lives, as standing in the way. Following this conviction, hundreds endured arrest, trial, fine, and imprisonment, and the immeasurable suffering borne by the faithful people no language can describe. That suffering, in abated form, still continues.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KILGORE. I yield now to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Clerk read again the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON'S amendment was again read.

Mr. POWERS. On yesterday I submitted an amendment, which was read at the Clerk's desk, but which was not intended to come in at the point at which the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to be inserted. I desire to offer my amendment as a substitute for his, to come at the end of line 19 instead of at the end of line 15. If it would be in order, I would move as substitute for his amendment the one which I send to the Clerk's desk; but if that can not be done, I will ask the committee to vote down the gentleman's amendment and I will then offer mine in place of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont could move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. POWERS. But the two amendments do not apply to the same part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the most expeditious way of reaching the object would be to vote upon the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and if that is rejected the vote can then be taken upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. POWERS. Then I will ask the House to vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I will submit mine at the proper time. I ask that it be read now.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 3, on page 4 of the printed bill, insert after the word "worship" in line 19 the words: "*Provided*, That polygamous or plural marriages shall be forever prohibited."

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire obtained the floor and said: I yield my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not differ with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] as to the object sought to be accomplished. But in this act of admission I want to reserve to the Government of the United States the power specified in my amendment. We can bring in a State upon any condition that we deem proper, just as we brought back into the Union the late seceding States. My amendment proposes to reserve to the Government of the United States the right to punish polygamy if there should be an attempt to practice it in this new State. If polygamy has ceased to exist in Utah to-day, it is because of the Tucker-Edmunds act, because of the terror which that law inspired among those people—not by reason of any revelation that they may claim to have had from Heaven.

Some gentlemen say, why not simply require an antipolygamy cause in the constitution of the new State? I reply that if only this were done, a convention which might be controlled by these Mormon people might strike out that provision of the State constitution; and then the Gentile citizens of that Territory would be under the absolute control of the Mormon population. I propose to go farther than that and to reserve to the United States Government in this enabling act such power that if those people undertake to practice polygamy, the United States courts, acting under the laws of Congress now in force or which may be enacted, may try and punish such offenders.

A provision of this kind can do no harm. If those people are honest in this business, if they really concur in good faith in the effort to wipe away this crime from our civilization, then the Congress of the United States in years to come can repeal this clause of the enabling act. I want to vote for this bill, I want this Territory to come into the Union as a State, but I want it to do so in such a way that this damnable curse and blot which has disgraced the country shall be under the control of the Government of the United States—not merely of the Mormons of Utah. [Applause.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MAHON, it was rejected.

Mr. POWERS obtained the floor.

Mr. BRODERICK. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. POWERS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

After the word "worship," in line 19, section 3, page 4 of the printed bill, insert the words, "*Provided*, That polygamous or plural marriages shall be forever prohibited."

Mr. BRODERICK. I desire to offer a substitute for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has the floor now; the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] later to offer his amendment.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no question that every member on the floor of this House desires sincerely and honestly to put an end to polygamous marriages in the Territory of Utah. Such being the case, it seems to me that there should be incorporated in the organic act by which the Territory is brought into the Union as a State some provision which shall assure the public mind that this institution which gentlemen tell us has already seen its best days shall never again raise its head in Utah. I think a misapprehension exists in the minds of some members as to the scope of the amendment which I offer. If the House will indulge me a moment, I desire to point out how the language which I propose to insert harmonizes with the preceding language already in the bill. The bill now provides:

And said convention—

Referring to the convention which is to be held to adopt a state constitution—

shall provide, by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State—

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

This language, if my amendment be adopted, will be immediately followed by these words:

Provided, That polygamous or plural marriages shall be forever prohibited.

Thus, if this enabling act be passed with my amendment, the convention of the State will be required to provide by ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of the State, that polygamous marriages shall be forever prohibited within the new State.

But some gentlemen say that it will depend upon an act of the Legislature to carry this provision into effect. That may be; but who ever heard of Congress undertaking in the admission of a new State to adopt a law to govern the internal affairs of that State, when it provided for admission with a constitution adopted by the people. The two things are incongruous; one is a constitution, the other a legislative act. It will be the duty of the Legislature of the State of Utah to adopt all legislation needed to carry out the provisions of the organic law.

Why, Mr. Chairman, suppose we were called upon to admit a new State that had sanctioned slavery; that had allowed it to be carried on within her borders. Would we undertake to provide penalties to be inflicted upon any man who might hold a slave? Not at all. We would do just what our predecessors did a few years ago when they admitted the reconstructed States back into the Union; we would provide by some general enactment that slavery and involuntary servitude should be forever excluded from the new State, and we would leave it to the State itself to adopt such legislation as it might deem proper to carry out that act.

But supposing that they should adopt such legislation. Suppose, Mr. Chairman, that it is left to stand as the organic law of the State when admitted, is it not a well-known fact that wherever a right is given, or a wrong done, there is always some way to find a remedy? Most assuredly.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. I ask consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, if we are to admit the Territory of Utah as a State at all into the Union let us admit her just as we admitted the other States. Let us prescribe, as well as we may, against the practice of polygamous marriages; but let us do it in an orderly way, and not undertake to incorporate a legislative provision into the body of the enabling act.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. If Utah be admitted as a State, and your amendment should be adopted to the enabling act, would it not make an inequality between the States? Would not, in other words, the State of Utah be subject to restrictions and regulations which do not belong to the other States of the Union?

Mr. POWERS. I regret to say, in answer to my friend from Alabama, that it would; but we were compelled once to do that same thing by my friend's own State when they came back a few years ago.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. But you had a constitutional provision in regard to that.

Mr. POWERS. Congress required your State to adopt a constitution having a specific change from the original act.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. But the point I am raising is this: If your amendment is adopted, that is, the provision you wish to insert, you attempt to make and do make a difference in the conduct of the United States Government toward this Territory, when admitted as a State, from that which was pursued with reference to any of the other States, a difference which Congress can not exercise over the other States. Is it not an inequality?

Mr. POWERS. I do not admit that Congress can not exercise it over the other States. I say that the power of Congress is plenary. We may attach such provisions as we see fit. It was not applied to the other States because this is an exceptional case. This is a case calling for the exercise of exceptional powers on the part of the General Government, and to satisfy the great public mind of the country that this evil has been wiped out, has been eradicated in the most effective manner possible, it seems to me that we should make the exception provided for in this amendment.

It can devolve no hardship upon the people of the Territory if this practice has been abandoned, as we are told, and further, in answer, the Delegate from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS], having such supreme confidence that this institution is actually dead, has given his assent to the adoption of the amendment and its incorporation into the bill. [Cries of "Vote! Vote!"]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, in common with nearly everybody else on this side of the House, I am in favor of this measure and shall not interpose any objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS]. In fact I understand that it has been accepted by the Delegate from the Territory of Utah [Mr. RAWLINS].

The Republican party has always been in favor of the admission of the Territories into the Union. We have already, largely under the auspices of the Republican party, admitted nearly the whole of the vast territory of our Northwest, so that there remains outside of the Union only four Territories. It would be a gross violation of our duty to refuse to admit a State on the ground that a faithful representation of the State would interfere with Eastern notions of economy and finance.

The people of Utah for many years have been asking from Congress the right of statehood. If there has been any objection to the admission of Utah that has had force with the public mind it has been the existence of the anomalous institution of polygamy in that Territory. I say candidly to the House that I would not vote for the admission of the Territory except upon the assurance that the institution of polygamy is dead. We have that assurance not only from the officials representing the United States Government in the Territory, but from the Gentile population there as well. Public opinion there, with no visible distinction of creed or party, is now substantially united in favor of the admission of the new State. In voting for its admission, now that the objectionable feature of its social system has yielded to the influence of time, I think I speak for the great mass of the Republican party in welcoming that population, long since entitled on the ground of numbers to the advantages that belong to an American commonwealth, to the growth and progress to which the enterprise of the frontier has given them an honest title. [Applause.]

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I desire to offer to the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4 strike out all from line 16 to line 19, inclusive, and insert:

"First. The free exercise of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall be secured forever to all mankind; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinion on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience so secured shall not be so construed as to excuse or justify practices inconsistent with the good order and safety of the State."

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to make any opposition to this bill. I believe that Utah is entitled to be admitted into the Union as a State. Her population, her natural resources, the wealth and intelligence of her people entitle Utah to become a State in the Union.

There has since its organization been a question as to polygamy in this Territory. That it once existed there in the most objectionable form no one can deny. Congress has been legislating and the Territory has been legislating for the last twenty years against polygamy. The laws are now enforced, and polygamy is renounced by the Mormon people. I believe it was done in good faith. Now, I do not apprehend that polygamy in that Territory can ever be restored, whether it becomes a State or not. I have some personal knowledge of the people of that Territory.

I have no doubt that there are old people there who believed that polygamy was a divine revelation, and who believe it now; but I know that the young people, regardless of sex and regardless of religious creed, are almost unanimously opposed to this infamy. With these young people coming to the front in the Territory, with the Gentiles coming in from every State in the Union, with their common-school system that has been adopted and put in operation there, with the political parties divided as they are now in the Territory, it would be impossible for any organization to restore polygamy in that country. The condi-

tions there are entirely different from a few years ago, so different that this offense against society will never again be tolerated.

The proposition that I have offered is substantially the constitutional provision that has existed in the State of New York for more than forty years. There is but a slight modification of that provision. I simply desire to substitute it for the paragraph and for the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS]. This provision has existed in New York for about forty-eight years, and is in the present constitution of that State. It has been construed by the Supreme Court, and I believe it is safer to substitute this provision, which has been construed and is understood in one of the States of the Union, than it is to adopt a new provision. I therefore hope that the substitute will be adopted.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that the pending amendments are, first, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS], and then a substitute offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK], endeavoring to cover the same question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to suggest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] has offered a substitute, and therefore the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] to amend the text of the bill must be voted upon before it is in order to vote upon the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK], because his amendment strikes out a part of the text of the bill, as well as the words which the gentleman from Vermont proposes to add.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I hope the proposition offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] will be adopted, because it covers the entire question.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] made a very remarkable speech yesterday, in which he not only attacked Utah, but the seven States of the Northwest lately admitted, and delivered a lecture to the former Congresses which admitted them. Among other things the gentleman made the following assertion: He said the appointment of the list of officers that the Delegate from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] had read as being appointed by the Federal authorities was a hardship, and that while he was opposed to the admission of Utah, he would be glad to vote for a law that would assist the people there to have their own government.

When I arose and interrupted the gentleman to assert that this was the law of all the Territories, and that the officers appointed in the Territory of Utah were merely the same officers that were appointed in all the Territories, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], who sets himself up as an authority in this House upon finance, upon law, and upon Chinese history, very vehemently denied my assertion. He said that I was absolutely mistaken, and persisted in that statement. For his benefit, and for the benefit of gentlemen who may not have lately examined the statute, I simply desire to call attention to the Revised Statutes of the United States, Title XXIII, chapter 1:

Provisions common to all Territories.

Section 1841 reads as follows:

SEC. 1841. The executive power of each Territory shall be vested in a governor, who shall hold his office for four years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed by the President. He shall reside in the Territory for which he is appointed, and shall be commander-in-chief of the militia thereof. He may grant pardons and reprieves, and remit fines and forfeitures, for offenses against the laws of the Territory for which he is appointed, and respites for offenses against the laws of the United States, till the decision of the President can be made known thereon. He shall commission all officers who are appointed under the laws of such Territory, and shall take care that the laws thereof be faithfully executed.

You will perceive that the governor appoints all appointive officers, contrary to the assertion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

So section 1843 of the same chapter provides for the appointment of a secretary of the Territory by the President.

Section 1864 provides for the appointment of a supreme court, of one chief justice and two associate justices, by the President.

Section 1875 provides for the appointment of a United States attorney by the President, and section 1876 for the appointment of a United States marshal.

And the governor of the Territory appoints the clerks of the county in the different counties and the trustees of the public institutions.

This is the fate of the people of all the Territories. They have little control of their own government.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] was wholly mistaken in his claim that a greater hardship had been imposed upon the people of Utah, as far as the appointment of officers is concerned, than has been imposed upon other Territories.

Mr. Speaker, having lived for several years in a Territory, and knowing how unsatisfactory and distasteful such government is to the American citizen, I shall vote at any time to admit the remaining Territories as States in the Union.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I regard the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont as absolutely useless. There is nothing in the provision of his amendment that will in the slightest degree interfere with polygamy. It is simply an advisory statement to the Legislature to legislate on the subject. That is all. He says that he has faith that the Legislature will suppress and prohibit polygamy. If it will, it can do it quite as well without this amendment as it can with it. Speaking for myself, I prefer that this amendment should be voted down. Let us put into the Constitution, if we are to do anything on the subject, something which executes itself, forever prohibiting polygamy in that State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont, which the Clerk will now report.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I rise to offer an amendment to the amendment. I desire to insert the word "are" instead of "is" in my amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend the amendment of Mr. POWERS, by striking out the words "shall be" and inserting the word "is."

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Make it "are."

The purpose of that is, that the Constitution, when adopted, shall execute itself. For instance, in the State of Ohio we have a provision which prohibits licensing the liquor trade. That provision executes itself. No law of the Legislature is necessary. If that provision goes into the Constitution of the State of Utah it executes itself without any act of the Legislature.

The question was taken upon the amendment to the amendment, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Division.

Mr. POWERS. I think gentlemen are laboring under a misapprehension as to the purpose of the amendment to the amendment. The gentleman is entirely right on the question of grammar. You want this constitution exactly right grammatically as well as legally. [Laughter.]

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 99, noes 42; so the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] has submitted a substitute for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Vermont as amended by the gentleman from Ohio and the text of the bill.

Mr. BRODERICK. I desire to have it reported again.

The substitute was again reported.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That upon the admission of said State into the Union, sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36 in every township of said proposed State, and where such sections or any parts thereof have been sold or otherwise disposed of by or under the authority of any act of Congress other lands equivalent thereto, in legal subdivisions of not less than one quarter section and as contiguous as may be to the section in lieu of which the same is taken, are hereby granted to said State for the support of common schools, such indemnity lands to be selected within said State in such manner as the Legislature may provide, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the second, sixteenth, thirty-second, and thirty-sixth sections embraced in permanent reservations for national purposes shall not, at any time, be subject to the grants nor to the indemnity provisions of this act, nor shall any lands embraced in Indian, military, or other reservations of any character be subject to the grants or to the indemnity provisions of this act until the reservation shall have been extinguished and such lands be restored to and become a part of the public domain.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I offer an amendment to that section, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2, section 6, strike out the words "two" and "thirty-two."
In line 12, section 6, strike out the word "second," and in line 13 strike out the word "thirty-second."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That lands to the extent of two townships in quantity, authorized by the third section of the act of February 21, 1855, to be reserved for the establishment of the University of Utah, are hereby granted to the State of Utah for university purposes, to be held and used in accordance with the provisions of this section; and any portions of said lands that may not have been selected by said Territory may be selected by said State. That in addition to the above, 200,000 acres of land, to be selected and located as provided in the foregoing section of this act, and including all saline lands in said State, are hereby granted to said State, for the use of the said university and an agricultural college which shall be connected therewith. That the proceeds of the sale of said lands, or any portion thereof, shall constitute a permanent fund to be safely invested and held by said State; and the income thereof to be used exclusively for the purposes of such university and agricultural college.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments recommended by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, section 8, strike out "two" and insert "one;" and after the word "hundred" insert "and ten." In line 13, after the word "and," insert "90,000 acres for the use of," and after the word "college" strike out the words "which shall be connected therewith" and insert the word "therein." In line 16 strike out the word "a," and after the word "permanent" strike out the word "fund" and insert the word "funds;" and add the word "respectively" at the close of the section.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 13, page 8, strike out "ninety" and insert "two hundred;" so as to read "200,000 acres."

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the committee have recommended the appropriation of large increases of acreage and have not reported an increase for the agricultural college, as they have for the purpose of erecting public buildings at the State capital and various other purposes, but have only adopted the amount appropriated to the various other States admitted into the Union some years ago, to wit, 90,000 acres; now if it be true that a large body of this land is arid land, unfit for cultivation and almost worthless, it seems to me that we ought to increase the amount for the agricultural college.

Mr. PENCE. How much does your amendment increase the amount?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. One hundred and ten thousand acres. We have increased the amount of land donated all along the line for other purposes; and as the agricultural college is one of the most important institutions that the Government can create in that Territory I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BOEN. Division.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The purpose of the amendment does not seem to be understood by the gentleman from Minnesota. It only increases the amount of land for the agricultural college. As an increase has been made all along the line for other purposes, why should we not make an increase in this respect?

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 124; noes 6. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That 10 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State, to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of the common schools within said State.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that section.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 1, section 9, strike out "ten" and insert "five," so as to make the provision read, "that 5 per cent of the sales of public lands," etc.

Mr. McRAE. I am in favor of admitting the Territory of Utah as a State, but I think that she ought not to have more than 5 per cent of the sales of the public lands. I do not know whether there is much public land in that Territory to be sold, or under what law it would be most likely to be disposed of, but I have here a compilation from the statutes making these grants to the other public land States admitted into the Union, beginning with Ohio and ending with Wyoming, and I find that none of those States received over 5 per cent of the proceeds of the public lands. Each of them received 5 per cent except California, which did not receive any. Now, in order that there may be uniformity in this matter, I think my amendment ought to be adopted. I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the amendment, these quotations from the different acts applying to other States in relation to this matter.

There was no objection.

The following is the compilation referred to by Mr. McRAE:

Memoranda of the grants of the 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of the public lands made by Congress to each and every one of the several public-land States (except California), as contained either in the acts of Congress admitting such new States, or acts passed soon after their respective admission into the Union.

OHIO.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 7. Third. That one-twentieth of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said State, sold by Congress, from and after the 30th day of June next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be applied to the laying out and making public roads leading from the navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic, to the Ohio, to the said State, and through the same, such roads to be laid out under the authority of Congress, with the consent of the several States through which the road shall pass: *Provided always*, That the three foregoing propositions herein offered are on the conditions that the convention of the said State shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by Congress, from and after the 30th day of June next, shall be and remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under authority of the State, whether for State, county, township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the day of sale. (U. S. Statutes, volume 2, page 175.)

LOUISIANA.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sales of the lands of the United States, after the 1st day of January, shall be applied to laying out and constructing public roads and levees in said State, as the Legislature thereof may direct.

SEC. 6. * * * *And provided also*, That the said convention shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the people inhabiting the said Territory do agree and declare, that they forever disclaim all right or title to the waste or unappropriated lands, lying within the said Territory; and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States; and, moreover, that each and every tract of land sold by Congress shall be and remain exempt from any tax, laid by the order or under the authority of the State, whether for the State, county, township, parish or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the respective days of the sales thereof; and that the lands, belonging to citizens of the United States, residing without the said State shall never be taxed higher than the lands belonging to persons residing therein; and that no taxes shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that the River Mississippi and the navigable rivers and waters leading into the same or into the Gulf of Mexico, shall be common highways and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said State as to other citizens of the United States, without any tax, duty, impost or toll therefor, imposed by the said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 2, page 641).

INDIANA.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 6. Third. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said Territory, and which shall be sold by Congress from and after the 1st day of December next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads and canals, of which three-fifths shall be applied to those objects within the said State, under the direction of the Legislature thereof, and two-fifths to the making of a road or roads leading to the said State under the direction of Congress.

Fifth. * * * *And provided always*, That the five foregoing provisions, herein offered, are on the conditions that the convention of the said State shall provide by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by the United States, from and after the 1st day of December next, shall be and remain exempt from any tax, laid by order or under any authority of the State, whether for any State, county, or township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years, from and after the day of sale. (U. S. Statutes, volume 3, page 290.)

MISSISSIPPI.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said Territory, and which shall be sold by Congress from and after the 1st day of December next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads and canals; of which three-fifths shall be applied to those objects within the said State, under the direction of the Legislature thereof, and two-fifths to the making of a road or roads leading to the said State, under the direction of Congress.

SEC. 4. * * * *And provided also*, That the said convention shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the people inhabiting the said Territory do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right or title to the waste or unappropriated lands lying within the said Territory, and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States; and, moreover, that each and every tract of land by Congress shall be and remain exempt from any tax laid by the order or under the authority of the State, whether for State, county, township, parish, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the respective days of the sales thereof, and that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States residing without the said State shall be taxed higher than the lands belonging to persons residing therein; and that no taxes shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that the river Mississippi, and the navigable rivers and waters flowing into the same or into the Gulf of Mexico, shall be common highways, and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said State as to other citizens of the United States, without any tax, impost, or toll therefor imposed by the said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 3, page 349.)

ILLINOIS.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 6. Third. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the lands lying within such State, and which shall be sold by Congress from and after the 1st day of January, 1819, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for the purposes following, viz: Two-fifths to be disbursed under the direction of Congress, making roads leading to the State, the residue to be appropriated by the Legislature of the State for the encouragement of learning, of which one-sixth part shall be exclusively bestowed on a college or university.

Fourth. * * * *Provided always*, That the four foregoing propositions herein offered are on the condition that the convention of the said State shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by the United States, from and after the 1st day of January, 1819, shall remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under any authority of the State, whether for State, county, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the sale; and further, that the bounty lands granted, or hereafter to be granted, for military services during the late war, shall, while they continue to be held by the patentees or their heirs, remain exempt, as aforesaid, from all taxes for the term of three years from and after the date of the patents, respectively; and that all the lands belonging to the citizens of the United States residing without the said State shall never be taxed higher than lands belonging to persons residing therein. (United States Statutes, volume 3, page 430.)

ALABAMA.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 6. Third. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said Territory, and which shall be sold by Congress from and after the 1st day of September, in the year 1819, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads, canals, and improving the navigation of rivers, of which three-fifths shall be applied to those objects within the said State, under the direction of the Legislature thereof, and two-fifths to the making of a road or roads leading to the said State, under the direction of Congress.

Fourth. * * * *And provided always*, That the said convention shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the people inhabiting the said Territory do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the waste or unappropriated lands lying within the said Territory; and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States; and, moreover that each and every tract of land sold by the United States after the 1st day of September, in the year 1819, shall be and remain exempt from any tax laid by the order or under the authority of the State, whether for State, county, township, parish, or any other purpose, for the term of five years from and after the respective days of the sales thereof; and that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed higher than the lands belonging to persons residing therein; and that no tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that all navigable waters within said State shall forever remain public highways, free to the citizens of the said State and of the United States, without any tax, duty, impost, or toll therefor imposed by the said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 3, page 489.)

MISSOURI.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 6. Third. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sale of lands lying within the said Territory or State, and which shall be sold by Congress, from and after the 1st day of January next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads and canals, of which three-fifths shall be applied to those objects within the State, under the direction of the Legislature thereof; and the other two-fifths in defraying, under the direction of Congress, the expenses to be incurred in making of a road or roads, canal or canals leading to the said State.

Fifth. * * * *Provided*, That the five foregoing propositions herein offered, are on condition that the said State shall provide, by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by the United States from and after the 1st day of January next, shall remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under the authority of the State, whether for State, county, or township, or any other purpose whatever for the term of five years from and after the day of sale. And further, that the bounty lands granted, or hereafter to be granted, for military services during the late war, shall, while they continue to be held by the patentees, or their heirs, remain exempt as aforesaid from taxation for the term of three years from and after the date of the patents respectively. (U. S. Statutes, volume 3, page 545.)

ARKANSAS.

(Five per cent.)

Third. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sale of lands lying within said State, and which shall be sold by Congress, from and after the 1st day of July next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads and canals within the said State, under the direction of the General Assembly thereof.

Fifth. * * * : *Provided*, That the five foregoing propositions herein offered are on the same condition that the General Assembly or Legislature of the said State, by virtue of the powers conferred upon it by the convention which framed the constitution of said State, shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the said General Assembly of said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, nor with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title of such soil to the bona fide purchasers thereof; and that no tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that in no case shall nonresident proprietors be taxed higher than residents; and that the bounty lands granted or to be hereafter granted, for military services during the late war shall, whilst they continue to be held by the patentees or their heirs, remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under the authority of the State, whether for State, county, township, or any other purposes, for the term of three years from and after the date of the patents respectively. (U. S. Statutes, volume 5, page 58.)

MICHIGAN.

(Five per cent).

Fifth. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sales of all public lands lying within the said State which have been or shall be sold by Congress, from and after the 1st day of July, 1836, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be appropriated for making public roads and canals within the said State, as the Legislature may direct: *Provided*, That the five foregoing propositions herein offered are on the condition that the Legislature of the said State, by virtue of the powers conferred upon it by the convention which framed the constitution of the said State, shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, nor with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in such soil to the bona fide purchasers thereof. And that no tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that in no case shall nonresident proprietors be taxed higher than residents; and that the bounty lands granted, or hereafter to be granted, for military services during the late war shall, whilst they continue to be held by the patentees or their heirs, remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under the authority of the State whether for State, county, township, or any other purpose, for the term of three years from and after the date of the patents, respectively. (U. S. Statutes, volume 5, page 59.)

IOWA AND FLORIDA.

(Five per cent.)

Fifth. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of sales of all public lands lying within the said State, which have been or shall be sold by Congress, from and after the admission of said State, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be appropriated for making public roads and canals within the said State, as the Legislature may direct: *Provided*, That the five foregoing propositions herein offered are on the condition that the Legislature of the said State, by virtue of the powers conferred upon it by the convention which framed the constitution of said State, shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that the said State shall never interfere with the soil within the same by the United States, nor with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in such soil to the bona fide purchasers thereof; and that no tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that in no case shall nonresident proprietors be taxed higher than residents; and that the bounty lands granted, or hereafter to be granted, for military services during the late war, shall, while they continue to be held by the patentees of their heirs, remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under the authority of the State, whether for State, county, township, or any other purpose, for the term of three years from and after the date of the patents, respectively. (U. S. Statutes, volume 5, page 799.)

WISCONSIN.

(Five per cent.)

Fifth. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of sales of all public lands lying within the said State, which have been or shall be sold by Congress, from and after the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State, for the purpose of making public roads and canals in the same, as the Legislature shall direct: *Provided*, That the foregoing propositions herein offered are on the condition that the said convention which shall form the constitution of said State shall provide, by a clause in said constitution, or an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, nor with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in such soil to bona fide purchasers thereof; and that no tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that in no case shall nonresident proprietors be taxed higher than residents. (U. S. Statutes, volume 9, page 58.)

MINNESOTA.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 5. Fifth. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sales of all public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by Congress after the admission of the said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the State, for the purpose of making public roads and internal improvements, as the Legislature shall direct: *Provided*, The foregoing propositions herein offered are on the condition that the said convention which shall form the constitution of said State shall provide, by a clause in said constitution, or an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, or with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in said soil to bona fide purchasers thereof; and that no tax shall be imposed on lands belonging to the United States, and that in no case shall nonresident proprietors be taxed higher than residents. (U. S. Statutes, volume 11, page 167.)

OREGON.

(Five per cent).

SEC. 4. Fifth. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of sales of all public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by Congress after the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to same, shall be paid to said State for the purpose of making public roads and internal improvements, as the Legislature shall direct: *Provided*, That the foregoing propositions, hereinbefore offered, are on the condition that the people of Oregon shall provide an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, or with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in said soil to bona fide purchasers thereof; and that in no case shall nonresident proprietors be taxed higher than residents.

Sixth. And that the said State shall never tax the lands or the property of the United States in said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 11, page 384.)

KANSAS.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 3. Fifth. That 5 per cent of the net proceeds of sales of all public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by Congress after the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to said State for the purpose of making public roads and internal improvements, or for other purposes, as the Legislature shall direct: *Provided*, That the foregoing propositions hereinbefore offered are on the condition that the people of Kansas shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, or with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in said soil to bona fide purchasers thereof.

Sixth. And that the said State shall never tax the lands or the property of the United States in said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 12, page 127).

NEVADA.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 10. * * * That 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of all public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State for the purpose of making and improving public roads, constructing ditches or canals, to effect a general system of irrigation of the agricultural land in the State, as the Legislature shall direct.

SEC. 4. Third. That the people inhabiting said Territory do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the said Territory, and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States; and that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States, residing without the said State, shall never be taxed higher than the land belonging to the residents thereof; and that no taxes shall be imposed by said State on lands or property therein belonging to, or which may hereafter be purchased by the United States. (U. S. Statutes, volume 13, page 30.)

NEBRASKA.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 12. * * * That 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of all public lands lying within said State, which have been or shall be sold by the United States prior or subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State for the support of common schools.

SEC. 4. Third. That the people inhabiting said Territory do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within said Territory, and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States, and that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States residing without the said State shall never be taxed higher than the land belonging to residents thereof; and that no taxes shall be imposed by said State on lands or property therein belonging to or which may hereafter be purchased by the United States. (U. S. Statutes, volume 13, page 47.)

COLORADO.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 10. * * * That 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of all public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State, for the purpose of making and improving public roads, constructing ditches or canals, to effect a general system of irrigation of the agricultural land in the State as the Legislature shall direct.

SEC. 4. Third. That the people inhabiting said Territory do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within said Territory, and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States, and that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States residing without the said State shall never be taxed higher than the land belonging to residents thereof; and that no taxes shall be imposed by said State on lands or property therein belonging to, or which may hereafter be purchased by, the United States. (U. S. Satutes, volume 13, page 34.)

CALIFORNIA.

Be it enacted, etc., * * * That the State of California shall be one, and is hereby declared to be, one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever.

SEC. 3. * * * That the said State of California is admitted into the Union upon the express condition that the people of said State, through their Legislature or otherwise, shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the public lands within its limits, and shall pass no law and do no act whereby the title of the United States to, and right to dispose of, the same shall be impaired or questioned; and that shall never lay any tax or assessment of any description whatsoever upon the public domain of the United States, and in no case shall nonresident proprietors, who are citizens of the United States, be taxed higher than residents; and that all the navigable waters within the said State shall be common highways, and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of said State as to the citizens of the United States without any tax, impost, or duty therefor. (U. S. Statutes, volume 9, page 452.)

NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, MONTANA, AND WASHINGTON.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 13. That 5 per centum of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said States which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said States into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said States, to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of common schools within said States respectively. (U. S. Statutes, volume 25, page 676.)

IDAHO.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 7. That 5 per centum of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State, to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of the common schools within said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 26, page 215.)

WYOMING.

(Five per cent.)

SEC. 7. That 5 per centum of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of the common schools within said State. (U. S. Statutes, volume 26, page 222).

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. MCRAE, and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MCRAE. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 119, noes 29; so the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk proceeded to read section 10.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, as the committee have not reported any amendments to the part still to be read, and I do not understand that any amendments are desired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall desire to submit an amendment to a later portion of the bill, which I think will not be objected to.

Mr. RAWLINS. I withdraw my request.

The Clerk, continuing the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 19. That the constitutional convention may by ordinance provide for the election of officers for a full State government, including members of the Legislature and Representatives in the Fifty-third Congress at the time for the election for the ratification or rejection of the constitution; but the said State government shall remain in abeyance until the State shall be admitted into the Union as proposed by this act. In case the constitution of said State shall be ratified by the people, but not otherwise, the Legislature thereof may assemble, organize, and elect two Senators of the United States in the manner now prescribed by the laws of the United States; and the governor and secretary of state of the proposed State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and when such State is admitted into the Union as provided in this act, the Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress, and to all rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States; and the State government formed in pursuance of said constitution, as provided by the constitutional convention, shall proceed to exercise all the functions of State officers; and all laws in force made by said Territory at the time of its admission into the Union shall be in force in said State, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State; and the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

Mr. POWERS. I move to amend, in line 26, section 19, by striking out the words "not locally inapplicable." I think these words were inartificially inserted in this place. The clause as it now reads is as follows: "And the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States." I propose to strike out the words "not locally inapplicable," so that the provision will read: "And the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I think everybody will agree to that.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill and amendments to the House with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 352) "to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass, with sundry amendments.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments and on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered. If a separate vote is not demanded upon any amendment the Chair will submit the question on agreeing to the amendments in gross.

The amendments were adopted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read a third time, and passed.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

HAWAII.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report back the resolution requesting the President to send to the House copies of instructions given to our minister to Hawaii and other correspondence, with the recommendation that the resolution pass with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read first the original resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to this House, if not inconsistent with the public interest, copies of the instructions given to the representative of the United States now in the Hawaiian Islands in regard to the protection of the lives and property of American citizens there, or any contemplated change in the form of government.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the report of the committee.

The report of the committee was read, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution requesting the President to communicate to the House of Representatives copies of the instructions given to the representative of the United States now in the Hawaiian Islands in regard to the protection of the lives and property of American citizens there, or any contemplated change in the form of government, having carefully considered the same, report the resolution and recommend its adoption with an amendment as follows: Add to the resolution these words: "And all correspondence since the 4th day of March, 1889, in regard to Hawaii, not before transmitted to Congress."

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT]. The Committee on Foreign Affairs directed me to report the resolution to the House with an amendment. The resolution is enlarged by the amendment so as to request all correspondence in regard to Hawaii since March 4, 1889, not already transmitted to Congress. I do not know whether it is the wish of the House that there should be any general debate before the correspondence is sent in; but if the gentleman from Illinois, who is the author of the resolution, desires five or ten minutes I will yield to him.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the opportunity to say one word for the purpose of urging the immediate action of the House upon this resolution, which is a resolution of inquiry merely, seeking to give us light—more light. A week ago—making to-day the extremest time under which, in accordance with our rules, a resolution of inquiry can be delayed—this resolution was introduced. It called for a paper to which all minds in the whole country, not alone in this House, were turned, not in idle curiosity, but in grave anxiety. The committee have

widened the resolution to embrace many documents. I shall be glad to see them; and, at my suggestion, only one modification was put on the amendment—not to reprint documents hitherto sent. I desire now not to anticipate the debate which will probably occur in this House when full information shall have been received from the Executive in response to this resolution, but merely to express the earnest hope that the resolution will receive in its support every vote in the House, sending it forth in the most emphatic form, and that it may be completely, promptly answered.

The newspapers of this morning tell us of thousands of men in alarm in a distant country erecting breastworks, gathering in arms, preparing to die, if necessary, before they will be conquered or disturbed by anything else than American arms. When men have such an impression upon their minds in another country, under an independent government, thousands of miles away, caused by official utterances believed to be repeated in the language of the instructions which is called for in this resolution and which is to all of us unknown, it is urgent upon all, it is urgent upon this House that we make known our wish for this information.

I make no reflection; I give no intimation of what I may believe as to the course of the Executive. I offer no criticism whatever. That will come, if any gentleman should entertain and desire to express opinions favorable or unfavorable to the Executive, in the debate which we shall have when the information arrives and we know Minister Willis's instructions. But now is the time when we should express, I think emphatically and promptly and at the same time respectfully, our desire to have this information from our Executive, with the hope and trust, which I cordially join all others on this floor in expressing, that when received it may prove that our Executive has been like his predecessors, patriotic and American from first to last. [Applause.]

I do not desire to discuss the resolution or to say anything upon the merits of the question implied in it, further than to impress upon the House the single point of the urgency for its immediate adoption.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I have not yielded the floor. I desire to say that I agree with the gentleman from Illinois in what he has said in regard to the importance of the resolution which has been reported. The original resolution was offered by the gentleman from Illinois only one week ago. It was acted on by the Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday—only one day ago. I desire the fullest and the most exhaustive investigation of the subject referred to by the gentleman in his speech. I concur with him on that point, and I am satisfied that questions relating to Hawaii should be thoroughly examined. And I can state here that when everything is made known to Congress and the country the present President will be believed by the people and by Congress to have shown as much patriotism, as much justice, and as much fairness—yea, more—than the Executive that went out when Mr. Cleveland came in. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe the information sought by this resolution will be promptly sent to Congress. But the time has not arrived for the general debate. Therefore I move the previous question on the pending resolution and amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The question having been put,

The SPEAKER. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call for a division.

The question being again taken; there were—ayes 138, noes 60.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The question having been put,

The SPEAKER. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, there was a misunderstanding in regard to the last vote, which was, it now appears, on ordering the previous question. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] desired to speak. I voted under a misapprehension, supposing the question was upon the passage of the resolution; and now we have the vote announced upon the adoption of the amendment. Can there not be an opportunity for the gentleman to speak at this time if he desires to do so?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered upon the resolution and amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

On motion of Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DOCKERY. By direction of the Joint Commission appointed to Investigate the Executive Departments, I desire to make a report at this time, and ask that it be printed, retaining its privileged character, so that I may call it up at any time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], from the Joint Committee to Investigate the Executive Departments of the Government, submits a report, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the privilege which this matter now has be retained, so that it may be called up at a later period with the same rights as at present; the object being to have the bill and report printed, so that members may examine them before the matter is brought up for consideration.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. HOUK of Tennessee to withdraw papers in the case of Champion Duncan, there being no adverse report.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague, Mr. DAVEY, be granted leave of absence for three days, in consequence of sickness.

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen who spoke on the Utah bill may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURROWS. That applies only to those who addressed the House?

The SPEAKER. That is the request of the gentleman from Alabama. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

And then, on motion of Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky (at 4 o'clock p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CADMUS: A bill (H. R. 4693) for the promotion of anatomical science and to prevent the desecration of graves in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BALDWIN: A bill (H. R. 4694) to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 4695) providing for the pensioning of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the United States, and for a rerating of certain pensions heretofore granted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4696) to revive the grade of lieutenant-general in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 4697) to authorize the establishment and maintenance of post lights on the York River, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4698) to authorize the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4699) to readjust the salary and allowances of the postmasters at Guthrie, Oklahoma City, and Kingfisher, in Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4700) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase portrait of Henry Clay—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4701) to incorporate the Supreme Lodge of Knights of Pythias—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMAN: A resolution instructing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inquire into and to report by bill or otherwise the payment to contractors of premiums paid to the builders of war ships—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: A concurrent resolution of the State of Washington, indorsing the Nicaragua Canal construction—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the proposed annexation of the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 4702) for the relief of John C. Heazlitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOWERS of California: A bill (H. R. 4703) for the relief of Capt. George A. Johnson, of San Diego, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4704) for the relief of Basil Moreland—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4705) for the relief of A. P. H. Stewart—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4706) to relieve John Davis of the charge of desertion and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4707) for the relief of W. H. Ketchum, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4708) for the relief of the estate of I. Du Bose, Marengo County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 4709) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. McFarland, late of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4710) for the relief of the heirs of James Bridger, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4711) granting a pension to John A. Link—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4712) granting a pension to Almira Johnson, widow of Horace H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE FOREST: A bill (H. R. 4713) granting a pension to W. H. Ohl, late private in Company D, Eighty-third New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4714) providing for the issuance of a patent to lands occupied by the Sacred Heart Mission, in accordance with agreement made by the United States with the Citizens' band of Pottawatomie Indians, of Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 4715) to place the name of Thomas E. Rochester on roll as a soldier of the Mexican War—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNAGNY: A bill (H. R. 4716) to pension Squire Bower at the rate of $30 a month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4717) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against George Alcott on rolls of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 4718) for the relief of Lincoln W. Tibbetts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana (by request): A bill (H. R. 4719) to pension Mary C. Banks, widow of Hiram G. Banks, a member of Company K, Fourth Regiment Indiana Legion Ohio Home Guards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4720) to pension Lucy Brown, dependent foster mother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) to reimburse Frank D. Bolton for losses sustained by burglary while postmaster at New Harmony, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4722) for the relief of Capt. Plesant M. Williams and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4723) for the relief of John S. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4724) for the relief of Edward Chastain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4725) for the relief of M. B. Ryan, administrator *de bonis non*, son and only heir at law of John S. Ryan, deceased, late of Charleston, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Protest of citizens and cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia against any change in the duty on imported cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CADMUS: Petition of J. C. A. Donnelly and others against any change in the tariff as set forth in Schedule J of Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of California: Protest of the Pacific Pine Lumber Company against a reduction of the present tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition to place the name of Thomas E. Rochester on the pension roll as a soldier in the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of importers, dealers, and manufacturers of tin plate, Chicago, Ill., for the maintenance of specific duty on tin plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 123 citizens and oil producers of Bolivar, Allegany County, N. Y., against the placing of petroleum, crude or refined, on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of petroleum oil producers of Olean, N. Y., against placing petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Papers to accompany House bill 3752—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Petition of merchants of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the tax on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Resolution of New Bedford (Mass.) Typographical Union favoring Government ownership of a telegraphic system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. REED: Petition of officers and employés of the Unicorn and the Wahnetah Silk Company of Catasauqua against the reduction of duties on silk plushes and velvets—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial of citizens of Bessemer, Gogebic County, Mich., adopted in mass meeting assembled, regardless of party, protesting against the proposed action of the Ways and Means Committee in classing iron ore as raw material and placing it upon the list of articles to be admitted free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Memorial of citizens of Allegheny City, Pa., against the passage of the tariff bill known as the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of carpet workers of Worcester, Mass., protesting against reduction of tariff on carpet—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: Petition of 46 citizens of Washington (State) relative to the act of Congress of September 29, 1890, for an extension of time for payment of said lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of Spokane Camp, No. 99, Woodman of the World, relative to the purchase of the Northern Pacific Railroad—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The VICE-PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

ZEBULON B. VANCE, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The VICE-PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; which had previously received the signature of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHIPMAN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. J. Logan Chipman, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, 8,000 copies, of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Michigan, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco to be delivered to the family of the deceased, and of those remaining, 3,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said J. Logan Chipman to accompany the said eulogies.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following

concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Whereas there are constantly before Congress numerous bills dealing with the question of rank and pay in the Navy, and other matters concerning the personnel of the same: and

Whereas the present laws relating to this subject are in many instances imperfect, inconsistent, unjust, and the result of piecemeal legislation: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a special joint committee, consisting of three members of the House and three members of the Senate, be appointed respectively by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to fully investigate and consider the entire subject of the rank, pay, and all other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy; to have power to send for persons and papers, sit during the recess, if any, and during the sitting of both Houses; and to report at any time after it convenes, as may be convenient, what legislation, if any, is necessary in the premises. Any bill so reported by them shall simplify, codify, and revise existing laws relating to the personnel of the Navy, so far as may be found possible.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes, so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of citizens of Boston, Mass., representing both political parties, manufacturers of wool shoddy and wool extracts, remonstrating against the reduction in the tariff proposed in the Wilson bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS presented resolutions adopted at a regular meeting of the Nashville (Tenn.) Union No. 20, Coopers' International Union of North America, favoring the ownership and control by the Government of the telegraph system; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. TURPIE. I present the memorial of E. F. Claypool, of Indianapolis, Ind., setting forth a scheme of banking under an act of Congress without an issue of bonds. It is very carefully prepared by one of the most successful and skillful financiers in our State. It is not long. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN presented resolutions adopted by the Cincinnati (Ohio) Subordinate Association of the National Lithographic Artists and Engravers' Association, favoring specific instead of ad valorem duties on lithographic work and an increase of duty on lithographic plates; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying that an appropriation of $10,000 be made to provide for an official investigation as to the feasibility of artificial freshet navigation of the Upper Ohio River in times of low water; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented two petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of New Madison and Lincoln, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of the Journeymen Tailors' Union of West Superior, Wis., praying that a Government telegraph system be added to the postal service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against any change in the present duty upon imported cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for examinations, surveys, and reports of certain Atlantic coast ship canals, especially as to the connection between New York Bay and Delaware River and between Delaware Bay and Elk River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WASHBURN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 3188) providing for the punishment of train-wrecking; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Press Feeders' Union, No. 9, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of the bill (S. 1136) to establish a postal telegraph system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill, and remonstrating against the division of the St. Paul customs district as proposed by a measure now pending before Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 42, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying that all labor employed upon the new Government Printing Office shall be by day's work, under the control of the Supervising Architect; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 408) for the relief of William H. Atkins, formerly commissary sergeant, United States Army;

A bill (S. 474) for the relief of Wells C. McCool;

A bill (S. 506) granting an honorable discharge to William Pierce;

A bill (S. 142) to remove the charge of desertion from William H. H. Cook;

A bill (S. 910) for the relief of Eunice Tripler, widow of Charles S. Tripler;

A bill (S. 470) for the relief of George H. Jewett, of Arlington, Washington County, Nebr.;

A bill (S. 467) for the relief of Brig. Gen. John R. Brooke, United States Army;

A bill (S. 469) for the relief of Adolph von Haake; and

A bill (S. 468) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John W. Wacker.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally, without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 179) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas H. Carpenter, late captain Seventeenth United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers;

A bill (S. 144) to correct the military record of John W. Taylor;

A bill (S. 104) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana; and

A bill (S. 743) for the relief of the citizens of the States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington who served with the United States troops in the war against the Nez Perces and Bannock and Shoshone Indians, and for the relief of the heirs of those killed in such service, and for other purposes.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 190) for the benefit of sundry persons residing in the vicinity of Jefferson Barracks, Mo., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 891) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept payment without interest of certain special assessments, and for other purposes, heretofore reported by him.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. BRICE, December 12, 1893, providing for the appointment of twelve additional Capitol policemen, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 898) for the creation of a "reserved list" of the Army of the United States submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 407) making an appropriation for the improvement of the road to the national cemetery near Pensacola, Fla., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

SUFFERERS IN FORD'S THEATER DISASTER.

Mr. WALTHALL. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments, to report it without amendment, and to submit a written report thereon. I am also directed to ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. I suggest to my colleague on the committee, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the advisability of either having read at the desk or printed in the RECORD the letter from the chief of the Bureau.

Mr. WALTHALL. I will let the report be read.

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes; let the report be read. It shows the advisability of this action.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments, have considered the same and report as follows:

The Secretary of War in his annual report for the year 1893, referring to the clerks in the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater calamity on the 9th of June last, says:

"The Department has extended to the employés who were injured the most liberal consideration which the law permits, but under the recent opinion of the Attorney-General sick leaves with pay can not be granted for a longer period than sixty days in any one year.

"It is recommended that Congress authorize payment to them of the full amount of their salaries during such periods as they may be unable, by reason of their injuries, to return to duty, unless it shall in the meantime make specific provision for them by direct appropriation. The payment of their salaries during the period of their enforced absence would require no additional appropriation, the full amount of such salaries for the current year having already been appropriated by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act."

The law which has been construed to forbid the granting of sick leave with pay for a longer period than sixty days with pay in any one year is contained in a proviso in the act of March 2, 1893, mentioned in the joint resolution, and is as follows:

"*And provided further*, That the head of any Department may grant thirty days' annual and thirty days' sick leave, with pay, in any one year to each clerk or employé, the sick leave to be allowed in cases of personal illness only, or where some member of the immediate family is afflicted with a contagious disease and requires the care and attendance of such employé, or where his or her presence in the Department would jeopardize the health of fellow-clerks: *And be it further provided*, That in exceptional and meritorious cases, where to limit such sick leave would work peculiar hardship, it may be extended, in the discretion of the head of the Department, with pay not exceeding sixty days in any one case or in any one calendar year." (27 Stats., 715.)

In the absence of some such specific provision for the employés referred to as that to which the Secretary alludes, it is manifestly just that they should be exempted from the law above quoted, and your committee therefore recommend the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. VANCE, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal the statutes relating to supervisors of elections and for special deputy marshals and other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted the following report; which was read:

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred House bill No. 2331, being an act to repeal the statutes relating to supervisors of elections and for special deputy marshals and other purposes, have considered the same and beg leave to report it back to the Senate with the recommendation that it be passed without amendment, and for a further report thereon the committee adopts the report of the Committee on Election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress, of the House of Representatives, on the same bill and makes it its own.

Mr. CHANDLER. The report upon this bill was not unanimous, and I desire an order of the Senate for leave to the minority to file the views of the minority adverse to the passage of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to state the names of the dissenting Senators.

Mr. CHANDLER. The dissenting Senators are the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS], and myself, in whose behalf the minority report will be submitted.

SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

Mr. VILAS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, to report it favorably with amendments, and to ask for the present consideration of the bill on account of the needs of the court in that Territory.

By unanmimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was to add at the end of section 1 the words "reversing a judgment or other determination of the district court;" so as to make the section read:

That hereafter the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma shall consist of a chief justice and four associate justices, any three of whom shall constitute a quorum; but three judges must concur to render an opinion reversing a judgment or other determination of the district court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after the word "President" in the first line of section 2, the words "to nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," so as to read:

That it shall be the duty of the President to nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint two additional associate justices of said supreme court, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, line 2, after the word "trial" to insert "or hearing," so as to make the section read:

That no justice of the supreme court of said Territory shall sit as a member of said court in the trial or hearing of any case decided by him in the district court, or wherein he has any interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I am opposed to so much of the bill as provides that a judge who has sat at the trial whose ruling there is excepted to shall not sit at the appellate hearing. I think the interests of justice to parties require that the judge who tried the case below should be present; that it is quite essential, and that any person fit for the judicial function may be trusted to sit where his rulings are reconsidered. But the Senate has so often expressed its judgment the other way that I shall not make any question upon the bill at this time. I wish merely to record my own dissent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I concur entirely with the view expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts, and for the same reason, that the Senate has made a rule, which, as I regard it, it will not now depart from, I acquiesce in the passage of the bill as it now stands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole will be concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VILAS. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. VILAS, Mr. LINDSAY, and Mr. PLATT were appointed.

REPRINT OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO HAWAII.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a resolution, and to submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed and bound in cloth in one volume, for the use of the Senate, 1,200 copies each of Senate Executive Document No. 45, "Relative to the draft of an uncompleted treaty with Hawaii;" Senate Executive Document No. 57, "Correspondence between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain relative to the Sandwich Islands;" Senate Executive Document No. 76, "A treaty of annexation concluded on the 14th day of February, 1838, between the United States and the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands," and Senate Executive Document No. 77, "Correspondence respecting relations between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands from September, 1820, to January, 1893," all of the second session, Fifty-second Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. As I understand the reading of the resolution, it includes all the documents which have been submitted to Congress up to the 4th of March, 1893.

Mr. GORMAN. I was informed by the superintendent of the Document Room——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the same.

Mr. DOLPH. I do not understand that the resolution includes all previous communications, but simply the communications made during the second session of the last Congress.

Mr. GORMAN. So I understand.

Mr. DOLPH. I was on the point of making a suggestion, but I thought I would let it go. It was that previous communications which have been made public or might be made public concerning this matter be included in the volume, which would be very convenient and valuable publication.

Mr. GORMAN. The documents specified will make a very large volume. I have introduced the resolution in this form to cover all the documents, the copies of which have been exhausted, and to keep the cost within the limit of $500.

Mr. DOLPH. Very well.

The resolution was agreed to.

SENATE ELECTION CASES.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back the concurrent resolution providing for printing a new edition of the Senate Election Cases, and to submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (submitted by Mr. HOAR August 14, 1893) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,000 copies, in cloth, of the first volume of the new edition of the Senate Election Cases; 1,500 copies to be for the use of members of the Senate and 2,500 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, the same to be printed on the back as follows:

Senate Privileges and Elections.
Volume I.
Election Cases.
Taft.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask my colleague on the committee whether the resolution is so worded as to include the second volume, the Precedents.

Mr. GORMAN. I think it covers the edition up to date. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] introduced the resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the resolution may be read again. I think perhaps it does not include the second volume.

Mr. HOAR. It is a concurrent resolution, and must go to the other House.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think in addition to the first volume there should be included the document known as Precedents Relating to the Privileges of the Senate, which was compiled by Mr. Furber, clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think it will not make a bulky volume to include them both in one volume. Perhaps the resolution had better be passed over until it can be looked at to see whether it includes that volume.

Mr. HOAR. The new volume which was laid on our tables within a day or two was not here when I offered the resolution, and perhaps the Senator from Maryland would like to include a provision for printing it, as the resolution has to go to the other House.

Mr. MANDERSON. Let it go over.

Mr. GORMAN. Very well; let the resolution lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. COCKRELL. Referring to the resolution, I should like to ask what is the second volume referred to by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MANDERSON. It is known as Precedents Relating to the Privileges of the Senate, compiled by Mr. Furber, who was clerk to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. COCKRELL. Miscellaneous Document No. 68?

Mr. MANDERSON. Miscellaneous Document No. 68, and it is supplemental to the book known as Senate Election Cases.

Mr. COCKRELL. Ought it not to be printed with it?

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it should, and for that reason we have let the joint resolution go over for a few moments until it can be looked at.

Mr. GORMAN. It has gone over for that purpose.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1279) granting a pension to Norris Barber; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 1280) for the promotion of anatomical science and to prevent the desecration of graves in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MORRILL. A similar bill has once or twice passed the Senate and it seems not only proper but very necessary. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 1281) to amend section 7 of "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1282) to amend an act approved May 2, 1890, entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Oklahoma," etc.: which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1283) granting a pension to William J. Ford; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1284) providing for the coinage of silver dollars, the retirement of small denominations of gold and paper money, and for other purposes; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. STEWART. I ask that the bill be read at length.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the seigniorage or profit fund which has resulted from the coinage of silver bullion under the acts of February 28, 1878, and July 14, 1890, or which would result from the coinage of such bullion, shall be coined into silver dollars of standard weight and fineness, with full legal-tender quality, at the rate of not less than $2,000,000 per month, and such dollars shall be covered into the Treasury.

SEC. 2. That when all the seigniorage or profit-fund bullion specified in the first section of this act have been coined as therein directed, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase each month silver bullion at the market value in quantities sufficient to coin not less than $2,000,000 each and every month; and he is hereby directed to coin the said bullion monthly, as fast as purchased, into standard silver dollars; and a sum sufficient to carry into effect the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 3. That when any paper circulating notes or certificates of whatsoever character, of denominations less than $10, issued under authority of the United States, except national-bank notes or certificates redeemable only in silver dollars, shall be received at the Treasury or any subtreasury, they shall not be reissued, but shall be assorted, counted, and recorded, and immediately destroyed, in accordance with the existing provisions of law; and as rapidly as said notes or certificates are destroyed, they shall be replaced by an equal amount of like notes or certificates, of denominations not less than $10.

SEC. 4. That hereafter no national-bank note shall be issued of a less denomination than $10; and all such national-bank notes, when received at the Treasury or any subtreasury, shall be destroyed in accordance with law; and the national banking associations whose notes are destroyed under the provisions of this section shall be respectively required to substitute notes of denominations not less than $10 in lieu of those destroyed.

SEC. 5. That from and after the passage of this act the coinage of the two-and-one-half-dollar gold piece and the five-dollar gold piece is hereby prohibited; and the coins above named shall not be struck or issued by the Mint of the United States; and such coins, when received at the Treasury or any subtreasury, shall be withdrawn from circulation and recoined into eagles and double-eagles, in accordance with law.

SEC. 6. The President of the United States is hereby authorized to appoint five commissioners to an international conference, to be held at a place to be hereafter designated, with a view to secure, internationally, a fixity of relative value between gold and silver, as money, by means of a common ratio between these metals, with free mintage at such ratio, and for compensation of said commissioners, and for all reasonable expenses connected therewith, to be approved by the Secretary of State, including the proportion to be paid by the United States of the joint expenses of such conference, $80,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. POWER introduced a bill (S. 1285) authorizing the State of Montana to make selections upon certain public lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 1286) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle the mutual account between the United States and the State of Florida heretofore examined and stated by said Secretary under the authority of the Congress, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1287) for the relief of Augustus Boyd; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1288) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of William B. Isaacs & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HUNTON introduced a bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Sophia Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1290) granting the right of way through the Arlington reservation for electric railway purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1291) for the relief of Rosa A. Jordan, on account of the death of her husband, David C. Jordan, by the collapse of the old Ford's Theater, on the 9th day of June, 1893, while in the performance of his duty as a clerk in the Record and Pension Office of the War Department, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Ford's Theater Disaster (Select).

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1292) to amend section 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to fermented liquors; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF TEXTILE FABRICS.

Mr. CAMERON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to report to the Senate the value of the textile fabrics purchased for the Army, the Navy, the Indian Bureau, and the Marine Hospital Service, for the fiscal year 1893.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that when the Senate adjourn today it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose like most Senators I am getting letters frequently from my constituents for copies of the President's message. I understand that the ordinary resolution to print extra copies of the President's message has been suspended by the debate. I hope that the Senate will by unanimous consent make the usual order for printing extra copies of the President's message, because it is now called for by our constituents and we ought to have it. It is, I am told, in type ready to be printed at any moment. I therefore move, and I hope it will be done by unanimous consent, that the ordinary extra number of the President's message be printed—just the message itself with-

out any of the documents. There is no objection to the order, I understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF FORD'S THEATER DISASTER.

Mr. HARRIS. If there be no concurrent or other resolutions, I will ask the Senate to consider at this time a resolution which I offered on the 7th day of October last, which stands upon the Calendar as No. 20 of matters upon the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business has closed.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I ask the Secretary to report the resolution to which I refer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Chair to investigate the Ford Theater disaster and report to the Senate whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate the sufferers of that disaster for the injuries sustained by them, and if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the committee will investigate each individual case and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case.

Be it further resolved, That the committee may employ a clerk who is a stenographer and who shall do the stenographic work of the committee as clerk, and that the committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, and the chairman of the committee, or of any subcommittee, may administer oaths.

Be it further resolved, That the expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Resolved further, That said committee may act jointly with a similar committee of the House of Representatives if the House shall appoint such committee, and that the committee may report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. HALE. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he conceives that there is any necessity for the raising of a new and special committee for this investigation? It occurs to me that there are several of the committees of this body, who very naturally might take up the subject and investigate it and report as the Senator desires. We have a great number of committees. The work is divided and given to them, and members of those committees are in the habit of working together. I think the creation of additional special committees or the creation of special commissions is rather an abuse. A measure came from the House of Representatives this morning providing for a joint committee in the nature of a commission, to deal with certain matters touching the Navy, which are precisely the subjects for which we have a Naval Committee.

In this case here was a public building in the District of Columbia, occupied by one of the Departments of the Government, and there is great interest in the mournful and melancholy circumstances attending the great destruction of life when that building or portions of it fell; but I can see no reason why the Committee on the District of Columbia, where the building is situate, which has jurisdiction generally over the District and over the conditions of health or disease, and whatever touches human life here, and of which the Senator from Tennessee himself is chairman, should not take charge of the matter, or the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which deals directly with these buildings. Therefore I hope the Senator will modify his resolution so that it will direct either one or the other of those standing committees to make the proposed investigation.

It can not be said that they are overburdened with work, because the Calendar, which I hold before me, does not show that there is any burdensome overplus of work for the committees. I hope the Senator will modify his resolution, unless he can give some better reason than is suggested to my mind for it.

Mr. HARRIS. If I had not supposed the raising of a select committee to investigate this matter was necessary, I am sure I should not have introduced the resolution which I now ask the Senate to consider. There are several bills already introduced for the relief of different persons who were injured in that disaster, one of which has been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; one or more, I understand, to the Committee on the Judiciary; but the bills have been scattered amongst different committees.

There are a large number of persons who were injured in that disaster, and they are petitioning for relief. There is certainly no propriety in the Committee on the District of Columbia taking jurisdiction of this subject-matter, for it is one with which the District of Columbia has nothing whatever to do. The Committee on the District of Columbia deals with the business affairs of the District of Columbia, with the general government of the people of the District; but if there be a liability, either legally or in equity and justice, growing out of the Ford's Theater disaster, it is the liability of the Government of the United States and not of the people of the District. They have no interest whatever in it, no responsibility whatever with regard to it.

My own judgment would be if those claims should go to any one of the standing committees the Committee on Claims would be the most appropriate. I have consulted with members of that committee, with its chairman and others, and they quite agree with me in the fact that, overburdened as that committee has always been, is now, and must be for some time to come, it would be practically, if not utterly, impossible for that committee to give the investigation necessary in these cases if Congress shall decide that compensation is to be made at all.

The report of the Secretary of War shows that there were 22 persons killed outright and a large number of persons more or less seriously injured in this disaster, and the War Department recommends that a measure of compensation shall be rendered to the injured parties.

My own idea was that a committee of five could take this matter up. It involves no expense whatever, except the simple salary of one clerk; no additional expense is involved, except that single item. If such committee be created, my idea would be to ask the Executive Departments to organize a board of surgeons from the surgeons of the Army and the surgeons of the Navy and the Marine Hospital Corps, before which every one of the injured parties should go and be examined, and the committee would take the report of that board of official employés, official surgeons of the Government, as to the extent, the durability, and the character of the injury of the persons. The first step, however, would be to determine the question, will the Government make compensation at all? That question decided in the affirmative, then each individual case may be taken up and examined by itself, and carefully examined, to see the extent and character of the injuries of each one of the victims of that disaster.

I think it is wise, necessary, and proper that the committee suggested should be raised; but I am certainly content to allow the Senate to take any course that it shall deem wisest and best in the premises.

Mr. MANDERSON. I quite agree with the suggestions of the Senator from Tennessee, and I do not know that it is necessary that I should add anything to that which he has suggested in this regard.

The whole country stood appalled in the presence of this dreadful disaster. Weeks and months have rolled by and nothing has been done to indicate whether the Government has a responsibility to make these losses whole, so far as they can be made whole by pecuniary compensation to those who have suffered.

This is not an investigation, it seems to me, a service on which would be sought by anybody, and I take it that none of the regular committees of the body would be very anxious to participate in it. It is an investigation which means an immense amount of labor: it means that the committee having it in charge shall personally investigate the case of every one injured and the condition of the family of every person killed.

Mr. HOAR. How many were killed and wounded?

Mr. MANDERSON. Twenty-two were killed and a very much larger number were injured. The Senator from Tennessee has shadowed forth somewhat the nature of the duties of this proposed committee or commission, that there must be a medical examination by some proper surgeon. Those belonging to the Army or the Navy perhaps would be better fitted for this part of the work. There should also be such presentation of the facts in each case as will appeal to that equity which exists in Congress to make these losses good so far as we can.

The natural committee, and the only committee perhaps of the regular committees of the body, that would take hold of this matter, would be the Committee on Claims. Most of the members of this body in some stage of their career have served upon that committee. We all know how it is overburdened with labor, that it impossible for it within the time which is allotted to committee work to dispose at any session of the bills which are presented for its consideration. No member of this body has been appealed to by those who have suffered, or the relatives of those who have been killed, who has not been at a loss to know to which of the regular committees of this body the claims should be sent.

I know that I deliberated some time myself, and under the deliberation, in the presence of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, did not present such bills, because I was at a loss to know whether they had better be referred to the Committee on Claims, the Committee on the District of Columbia, or the Committee on Military Affairs. All of those committees are overburdened with work. I think a small committee, such as is proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, would perhaps during the holiday recess take this matter in charge and at an early day report to Congress; first, as to whether there is a proper liability or responsibility on the part of the Government, and the facts in each case, recommending what amount shall be paid to each one who has been injured.

Mr. HALE. I am not very particular as to how this work shall be done; but I can see, from what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] has said, that substantially the work which it is said these overburdened committees can not do is to be done by persons outside of any committee. If this is to be looked into by a board or an association or a selected list of surgeons or doctors, the Committee on Claims or the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any other regular committee of the Senate can invoke that assistance as well as a new committee. There is no difficulty in that.

The work will be done when it is embarked in by a clerk and these outside professional gentlemen. That will be the upshot of it.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] says that all these committees are overworked. Then you gain nothing, Mr. President, by raising a special committee and selecting individuals from overworked committees: because, if the committees are all overworked, the individual members are overworked, and an overworked member of a committee has no more time for a new committee than he has for his old committee.

I shall not further oppose the resolution, because the Senator from Tennessee has evidently looked into it very carefully and he is a very conservative Senator; but I do wish again to call attention to what I think is not a good practice, that is of raising special committees and commissions and organizations outside of the regular committees of this body, who I think are amply competent to do its work.

Mr. DOLPH. I am not particular as to whether the work proposed by the resolution shall be committed to a special committee or to one of the standing committees of the Senate. Certainly the Committee on Claims would be an appropriate committee to be authorized to carry out the purpose proposed by the resolution. The Committee on the Judiciary would be a very appropriate committee to determine as to whether there is a legal or equitable liability on the part of the Government. The Committee on the District of Columbia, I think, would not be an inappropriate committee to deal with the question. The Committee on Military Affairs might claim jurisdiction on account of the accident having happened to a building occupied by employés under the War Department.

I desire, however, to call attention to this resolution and to this matter generally, and I do it reluctantly, because it is a very disagreeable thing to me, and may be considered ungracious.

I served on the Committee of Claims for a number of years, and I was disposed on that committee to confine relief to persons entitled to relief under the laws of the United States, or who came within some clear precedent which had been established. I therefore found that I was under the necessity of frequently opposing the action of the committee, and in several cases made a minority report. In one case, where a marshal of the United States had sold imperishable property and had appropriated the money and the litigant had lost it, the majority of the committee determined to pay for it. A bill was reported and passed the Senate, at least, and probably both Houses of Congress, paying the litigant for his property, notwithstanding the marshal was required to give a bond for the faithful performance of his duty. The United States had done its duty in that regard, and had taken a proper bond. I thought that case established a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was that a Colorado case?

Mr. DOLPH. It was a Western case. I forget the State from which it came.

Mr. COCKRELL. Colorado, I think.

Mr. DOLPH. I thought it would be a dangerous precedent to say that the United States was going to respond in money to compensate every litigant in the courts of the United States for money lost through the dishonesty of the clerk of a court or of the marshal, or, I might say, through error or dishonesty of the judge.

Then there has been another class of cases, cases where superintendents of public buildings and other public works, after the plans had been prepared by the Supervising Architect and adopted by the Treasury Department, and changes had been ordered and people had furnished supplies, or a contractor had performed additional work. The Committee on Claims have been in the habit of paying those claims, and that enables a superintendent of a public building or other public work to determine what the appropriation for a work or building shall be, and how much it shall cost.

We have been in the habit of indorsing and ratifying the unauthorized and illegal acts of the agents of the Government in that respect.

There arose in that committee the case of a Mr. Williams, who visited some building in San Francisco in course of erection in the hands of the contractor, and went to an upper story in the building in an elevator, which was merely there for the purpose of carrying material, and he was injured. That is a case similar to this. I think the majority of the Committee on Claims reported in favor of the Williams claim. I could not agree to it, because I thought it was an entering-wedge, a dangerous precedent to establish, that the United States should be liable in money for all injuries resulting not only from the negligence of all its officers, but even of contractors, where the building was a public building.

It must be borne in mind that we have, I think, about one hundred thousand officers in the Army and the Navy and on the civil list, and the question ought to be determined just where the liability of the Government commences and where it ends. We ought to determine for just what acts the Government is going to be responsible. For instance, we ought to know if the driver of a mail wagon on the streets of Washington, who drives his wagon carelessly and runs into a carriage and frightens the horses, and the occupant of the carriage is thrown out in the street and killed or injured, whether the United States is going to respond in damages for the negligence of the driver of a mail wagon; and that illustration will answer for any act of negligence or want of care by any other officer of the Government.

Shortly after I came into the Senate, when I saw how many claims went before the Committee on Claims and how little the committee was bound by precedent and how it would reject what I thought was a meritorious claim one day and the next day it would report in favor of one no more meritorious, applying a rule one day to which it did not adhere the next, I discussed in the Senate several times the necessity of adopting some general law which would define and limit the responsibility of the Government and send these cases, if possible, to the courts.

That brings me down to what I wish to say about the pending resolution. The resolution provides that the committee shall first ascertain substantially whether there is a legal or equitable liability of the Government in this case. I need not say this is a case which has aroused the sympathies of the public, and a case in which my sympathies are enlisted for those who suffered. It was a great disaster; but, as I say, this committee is directed to inquire, first, whether there is a legal or an equitable liability on the part of the Government; and, then, without reporting to the Senate, if they, a committee of five Senators, determine that important question, they are to go on and ascertain substantially what amount of money shall be appropriated by the Government for the relief of every one of these persons.

I should be better satisfied if that question could be first determined by the Senate in some way before we set this precedent, if the committee—whether it be a standing committee of the Senate or a special committee—were required to report upon that question, and when the Senate has decided that relief should be given, then investigate the question as to how much damages each should receive.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator will allow me to suggest to him the question as to whether compensation should be made at all in this case or not lies at the threshold, and would necessarily be the first question investigated. My own opinion would be that the judgment of the Senate should be invoked upon that question before the committee proceed to investigate each individual case.

Mr. HOAR. Then, would not the Senator consent to have all of his resolution after the word "them," in line 5, stricken out for the time being, and leave that for subsequent action?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection.

Mr. DOLPH. I shall not continue the discussion. All I rose to suggest was what the Senator from Tennessee now says should be done. I do that, not because I care for the paltry amount which would be awarded to the sufferers in this case under any circumstances, but I think before we enter upon this business of compensating persons for the negligence or supposed negligence of inferior officers of the Government we ought to carefully consider it, and set the precedent so that we shall be willing to be bound by it.

Mr. PALMER. I inquire of the Senator what preliminary method he would suggest as settling the question of liability?

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to see the resolution referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with the request that they make a speedy report as to the question of liability, and then a special committee could carry it out. That might be done without changing the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Tennessee whether the recommendation of the Committee on Contingent Expenses had not better be adopted, that the resolution be first referred to some appropriate committee?

It seems to me that the resolution is liable to several pretty serious criticisms. In the first place, it is liable to the criticism made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH], that it does not

provide that the Senate shall determine the question of legal liability before the individual injuries are to be investigated and ascertained.

Here were sixty-two persons, I understand; some twenty-two killed, I believe, and forty injured; but the Senator from Tennessee knows better about the number than I do. A Senator informed me just now that that was the number as he understood it.

Mr. HARRIS. I am not sure as to the number, but I think it will exceed forty.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. It would be cruel to call those persons, to raise their expectations, and have them prove the amount and character of their injuries, which would involve ascertaining the physical condition, the prospect of cure, and all the questions which come up, with which every Senator who is a lawyer is familiar, in cases of personal actions, and then have the whole thing brushed away without doing anything about it, because Senators thought it was a sound public principle that in such a case compensation ought not to be made.

I understand the Senator from Tennessee to agree that the committee's opinion as to whether there is a liability on the part of the Government, legal or equitable, ought not to be acted upon in such a way that they will go on and ascertain the injury until the Senate has decided the question of liability, and therefore it seems to me that it would be better to stop this resolution with the word "them," in line 5, and then if the committee report favorably, of course they will provide a proper means of ascertaining the injury.

In the next place, in my judgment, with due deference to the great experience of the Senator from Tennessee, it is better that the amount of the personal injuries be ascertained in some other way than by a committee of the Senate. The duty of investigating sixty cases of individual injury, to hear each party, to hear each party's doctor and nurse, to ascertain the items of cost of the sickness and the chances of recovery, how the persons were hurt, and to what extent they ought to be paid, should be devolved upon some public officer of the Government and not on a Senate committee.

Then, the resolution provides for a joint committee with the House of Representatives if committee see fit and the House shall so desire. That is a great invasion and reversal of the policy of the legislation of this Government from the beginning. We go on the ground that these two separate bodies are to make up separate judgments, and we make exceptions only in cases of elections and some very special and peculiar cases where a joint committee is raised, or to do acts which the two bodies are to do jointly. In relation to those we have a Committee on Printing from the necessity of the case, and a Committee on the Library from the necessity of the case, which are joint committees, and indeed they are so made by statute.

The question whether we are to enter upon the policy of acting by joint committees, which we do not do in any other class of claims, is to be left to this particular committee so far as it is concerned, and then the resolve provides that, even if there be a joint committee of both Houses, still the expense is to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. Therefore, it seems to me, with great deference to the Senator from Tennessee, that his object, as he has just explained it, would be accomplished by passing the first five lines of the resolution and letting the rest be provided for hereafter.

Mr. HARRIS. The suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts is in no sense objectionable to me, because in practical operation the results of the passage of the resolution, modified as he suggests, will be precisely the same as they would have been if the resolution should pass without modification.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me. The committee which should be then appointed, if they thought the claims ought to be paid, would then report a scheme for ascertaining the amount of the injuries.

Mr. HARRIS. It would certainly be unwise in such committee to take up sixty, more or less, individual cases, and undertake to develop the exact facts in respect of each case, unless it had been previously decided, under all the circumstances, whether strictly legal or not, a measure of compensation ought to be allowed. Then comes the question, in the light of all the facts of the case, what would be a reasonable measure under the circumstances?

I have no objection to modifying the resolution as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution be read as modified.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Chair to investigate the Ford Theater disaster and report to the Senate whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate the sufferers of that disaster for the injuries sustained by them.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am sorry that my friend from Tennessee yielded to that suggestion. The public feeling, and I think the feeling of every Senator, is that the Government of the United States should render a generous and liberal allowance to those persons in its employ who, by the negligence or fault, perhaps, of officers of the Government, and perhaps of others, in a public building of the United States were hurried to death, injury, and pain. I do not think it is necessary to inquire into the legal liability of the Government for such injuries. The equitable liability is clear and unquestionable. Therefore it seems to me that the only object and the only purpose of appointing a committee of this kind is to ascertain what would be, under all the circumstances, a reasonable provision.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suppose it is perfectly clear, if the Senator will allow me, that there is no legal liability on the part of the Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. I admit that. The only question is what, in justice between man and man, or rather between the Government of the United States and its employés in a case of this kind, where death and injury and loss have fallen upon a large number of its employés, ought to be paid.

It seems to me, therefore, that that question, so far as the inquiry would be limited, is already settled in the minds, I think, of three-fourths of the Senators here present.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Ohio will allow me to suggest to him that I think his object and mine are precisely the same.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, if the resolution passes as modified, the committee will investigate the general facts and circumstances applicable to that disaster and the injuries resulting from it; but, unless the Senate shall decide that compensation shall be made to the injured parties, there can be no necessity, it seems to me, for the committee in advance to go on to develop the facts in respect to each individual case. When, however, the Senate shall have decided that compensation shall be made, then the committee will be authorized to go on and investigate each individual case, develop every fact material to each individual case, and present each individual case for such compensation as, in the opinion of the committee, the party is entitled to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does not the Senator from Tennessee know that the Senate have already decided the moral and equitable liability which the Government of the United States ought at once to assume without question and without a reference to a committee? I can speak for the Senate of the United States now, without the slightest doubt, that by an overwhelming majority the opinion of Senators would be that some reasonable and proper redress should be given to those servants of the United States who, without fault of theirs, were hurried to death or suffered injury. That question is solved. I think there is no use in having a committee appointed for the purpose of settling it. If the Senator, however, is willing to take the resolution, shorn of its important and best features, I am perfectly willing. I do not wish to stand in the way; but I think the proposed remedy ought to be given immediately. I happen to know some of those who were very severely injured and also one who was killed, and I think there can be no doubt in the mind of every Senator, if all the circumstances were known, that they would be ready and prompt to give some reasonable and fair relief.

I think it unnecessary to divide up this resolution and appoint a committee to ascertain a fact which I believe is already ascertained in the minds of a great majority of the Senate—a mere question of equity and right, a sense of what is due to our employés. I think it would be better to have the original resolution stand, but if the Senator desires to have that preliminary finding I have no objection. I think, however, it will only delay the relief, which ought to be granted promptly.

Mr. PASCO. I hope the resolution will pass in the shape in which it was originally proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]. I do not see the necessity for dividing up this work.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that, regardless of the question as to whether these people could obtain a remedy by law if suit were brought against the United States, there ought to be some remedy and relief; and I think that ample and entire power should be given the proposed committee to deal with the whole subject when it is committed to them.

I did not intend to participate in this debate, but as reference has been made to the Committee on Claims, of which I am chairman, I stated to the Senator from Tennessee, who consulted with me in reference to this matter, that so far as the Committee on Claims is concerned, that committee is entirely willing that this subject shall go to a special committee.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to suggest to him that if he really prefers the resolution as originally in-

troduced, he will have to move to amend by reinserting the matter stricken out. At the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who is not now in the Chamber, I consented to modify the resolution. Therefore, if the matter stricken out is to be reinserted, certainly in the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts it must be done by vote of the Senate.

Mr. PASCO. I shall make that motion before taking my seat in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee.

I will state that the Committee on Claims have a large amount of work before it. Fully one-third of the bills which are introduced into this body go to the Committee on Claims, and with all diligence it is impossible for that committee at any session or at any Congress to dispose of all the work which is referred to it. Still, if it had been the will of the Senate to commit this matter to our committee, we should have endeavored to have considered it as industriously as possible. But the reasons for referring the resolution to a special committee are, in my judgment, ample, and I hope that the committee will have entire jurisdiction of the whole subject as contemplated by the original resolution offered by the Senator from Tennessee. Therefore I move that the matter which the Senator from Tennessee has consented shall be stricken out, be reinserted, and that the resolution be passed in that shape.

Mr. DOLPH. As I said when I was on my feet before, I sympathize as deeply with the persons who suffered by the Ford Theater accident as any Senator, and I shall undoubtedly, when the Senate comes to act upon it and after full consideration makes a precedent, vote for relieving those persons; but I do not think we can assume, because the public have been convinced that recompense ought to be made, or because it is supposed that the majority of Senators are in favor of granting relief, that we necessarily need intrust to a committee the question as to whether we shall do it. We had better, if we are going to do that, strike out the first part of the resolution and assume that we are going to make recompense in this case, and not put the burden on the committee of determining whether we shall do it, but simply let them ascertain how much shall be paid to each one of these individuals.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me, I think the important thing to find out is how much we ought to pay to each of these persons. As we are talking about setting an example or making a precedent, if the Senator will call to mind other things which the Senate and House of Representatives have done—I do not mean in this particular Congress—he will find that this is about as good a thing to do as a thousand things which we have done in the past.

Mr. DOLPH. Yes, Mr. President, a better thing to do than ten thousand things we have done since I have been in the Senate. I have been here ten years, and we have done a thousand things each year since I have been here which were less meritorious than this.

There are—I was going to say a hundred thousand—but there are thousands of claimants who have had claims before this Government, some of them for the last fifty years, whose claims are just as legal and just as equitable against the Government as the claims of these persons, and yet who can not get a hearing. They come here year after year and present their bills, which are referred to the Committee on Claims. The Committee on Claims reports a small percentage of them. A smaller percentage gets through the Senate and a much smaller percentage gets through the House of Representatives. If you will take the statutes at the end of a Congress, you will find that the least meritorious claims have been worked through, and worked through by the persistence of the men who are hired to represent them, and who can be paid liberally, because the claims are the least meritorious.

So these meritorious men go on from year to year until they disappear and die, and a great majority of their claims are now being pressed by their heirs and by their personal representatives. It is because I should like to see some uniformity of action on the part of the Senate, because I should like to see, when we establish a precedent, that we establish one by which we will abide, and that we shall not to-day say we will pay these sufferers, who ought to be paid by this great Government, on account of the negligence or misconduct of an officer of the Army, and next week we will reject a claim for damages for the death of some person or for the injury of some person by some other officer of this Government.

If we are going to enter upon this business, let it be understood that the Government is going to stand as the representative of its employés; and no matter whether it is by the collapse of a building, by the explosion of a naval vessel, by the wreck of a vessel, or by the burning of a building, or the fall of an elevator, or the running away of a mail wagon driven by an agent of the Government, or by whatever accident or casualty death is caused or injury inflicted, that the United States is going to acknowledge its legal or equitable obligation to pay claims. That is all I am suggesting.

I have grown sick of the way in which the United States responds to its equitable obligations, and not only equitable obligations, but actual legal obligations. As I say, only a small percentage of the claims presented to Congress ever get through Congress, and those the least meritorious. The consideration and payment of the great mass of them is neglected. I know of people in my State who have good claims against this Government, who are in absolute want. I know of others who have died in poverty for the want of that which the Government owed them, just as much as the Government will owe me my salary for the month of December on the 3d of next month.

That is what I was suggesting to the Senate. I said it would be probably considered an ungracious matter to make a suggestion which would seem like obstructing this resolution. It is an unpleasant matter, and I thought for a time that I would not mention it at all; but I should like, when we establish this precedent, that the Senate establish it so that we may know that the Senate is going to enter upon this work, and, when we understand that, the proposed committee can investigate and determine how much each one of these claimants shall receive.

If it is true that we know that we are going to pay these claims, that we are going to enter upon this policy; if it is true that three-fourths of the Senators are in favor of paying these claims, let us strike out the first part of the resolution and not ask the committee to determine whether we shall pay these persons anything. That is my suggestion.

I want the Senate to decide that question instead of the committee, and sooner than trust it to a committee and let them act upon their own conclusions, I would strike out that part of the resolution and refer to the committee to determine how much each person shall be paid. I would make that decision of the Senate the precedent, and rather than pass this resolution as a whole I would sooner strike out the first part of it and let the Senate say we will pay these claims and instruct this committee to ascertain how much shall be paid.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate except to say a word. I desire to say that if I have an opportunity of voting for the payment of the representatives of the people who have been killed by the fall of that building, occupied by the Government and undermined by the Government, and falling down on account of it, I intend to so vote.

So far as the Senator from Oregon has charged that we have paid ten thousand claims that we ought not to have done——

Mr. DOLPH. I have not charged that.

Mr. CULLOM. That is a matter about which he can satisfy himself, but I know that we have made appropriations here which were not nearly so meritorious as the action which is sought to be taken in reference to these claims. The very idea that the Government of the United States will not consider and allow what ought to be allowed in such cases, especially where they occur right here under the shadow of the Capitol, in a building for which we are paying rent, which fell as a result of the action of our own officials——

Mr. COCKRELL. We are not paying rent for the building.

Mr. HARRIS. We own the building.

Mr. CULLOM. If we own the building that makes the case much worse. The idea that we shall refuse to pay these unfortunate people, or their representatives, what is a fair and reasonable remuneration, seems to me abhorrent. I do not know how it is as to others, but I am surprised at the Senator from Oregon in making an assault at this time upon the action of Congress. Whatever course the Senate pleases to take as to the reference of the resolution, whether under a cold, technical construction of the Constitution or not, we are going to pay these people whatever is fair and right, in my judgment. I shall vote to do it at least, whether anybody else does or not. When we are considering it, let us take into account what we have appropriated for the suffering people on the Mississippi River, for instance, on account of the floods and other cases of that kind.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from Illinois has no authority or right for insinuating that I made an assault on the resolution. I did not say we had made ten thousand appropriations which were wrong. I said that we had made probably ten thousand appropriations since I have been here which were less meritorious than the one now proposed. I said this is a meritorious claim, and that I should vote for the payment of these people; but the Senator assumes that I can not criticise the form of the resolution, that I can not help to put this proposition in shape, without being antagonistic to the purpose of the resolution.

Sir, there is nothing in what I have said to warrant such an assumption. I have said all the way through that what I had said I said reluctantly, that I was in favor of paying these people, that I wanted the Senate to act intelligently upon this subject, and that I wanted the Senate to make a precedent by which

we could stand hereafter. What I objected to was referring the question as to whether we are under any equitable liability to make compensation to five Senators, instead of the Senate itself saying whether we are or not.

The Senator from Massachusetts proposes to strike out the latter part of the resolution and refer the question of liability to five Senators. I would not object to that, because their report would come back to the Senate and we would get the final action of the Senate, saying substantially that we would pay the claims, and then we could proceed to investigate them. If the Senate wants to act upon that question now it can act upon it as intelligently as it can after the five Senators have investigated it. If the Senate wants to say now that we will pay the claims, let us strike out the first part of the resolution, requiring the committee to ascertain whether there is any equitable or legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay them, and simply direct them to ascertain how much shall be paid. I would support the resolution in that form: but because I seek to put the resolution in shape so that it will be a precedent for the future, and propose to have the Senate determine whether we are under any liability to pay these people instead of five Senators, it is wrong to assume that I am making an assault upon the resolution and that I am acting such an ungracious part as to place objections in the way of the Government doing what is just and equitable towards these people. Sir, I disclaim any such intention.

Mr. CULLOM. I will withdraw any suggestion that the Senator is opposing the resolution, if he is not doing so. The vehemence with which he talked led me to believe that he is inclined to vote against the whole measure; but I withdraw all that I said on that point, and I am prepared now to vote for the resolution as originally introduced by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DOLPH. As I said, I served four years upon the Committee on Claims. I am aware that we have never been governed by precedents, but owing to one reason or another we select the people who shall be favored and who shall be paid for just claims against the Government, and we leave the great mass of them to present their claims, Congress after Congress. I am desirous that what we do shall be put upon a proper basis: that we shall do it intelligently, after discussion and understanding; and that when we have established a precedent in a case like this we shall abide by it. That is all I am suggesting.

Then, further, I suggest that we have something now that will indicate the intention of the Senate in this matter and make the precedent before we go to all the trouble of calling witnesses and surgeons to ascertain the amount of injury that each one of the claimants has received and the amount of compensation that should be given to each. I move now to restore that portion of the resolution that was stricken out by the consent of the Senator from Tennessee, and to strike out the first part.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Oregon that the motion indicated by him is now the pending motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the question be taken on the motion of the Senator from Florida, and then I will move to strike out the first portion, and Senators will see whether I am inimical to this measure.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the motion to strike out the first part of the resolution prevails, it will be more far-reaching than Senators suppose. I understand it is now to be assumed as the judgment of the Senate that the principle is correct, that the United States are to be made liable out of the public Treasury for any damage which may occur to any human being whatever arising from the neglect or the willful fault of any agent of the United States. If we are to establish that principle we are assuming a liability that no government yet has ever assumed. So I desire to say that before we take that kind of a step, fixing so large a contingent liability upon the taxpayers of this country, we had better examine our ground carefully. Let a committee examine it, and let the Senate pass upon it, and do not let us, out of mere sympathy for distress, without examination, fix upon the Treasury of the United States so large a liability.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator suppose that I said the United States is liable? I did not state that. On the contrary, upon the suggestion made to me I do not think, using the word "liable" in its legal sense, that the United States is liable for damages under these circumstances. The United States could not be hung even if it were guilty of the willful act of destroying these lives, nor is it liable for damages in any legal sense; but it is liable before a court of justice higher than the courts of the United States. It is liable under the rule to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Congress in passing laws, a thousand times at every session, grants compensation to claimants on the ground of equity, justice, right between man and man, without regard to liability. Congress pays claims of that kind every day. This is the kind of liability I believe the Government of the United States is now under, not before a court of law, but in the tribunal of the Congress of the United States, at the bar of justice. That is the kind of liability I speak of.

I think this is as strong a case as I ever knew. Perhaps I feel a little more interest in it because I happened to be here at the time. I was called upon and went down and saw the distressing scenes, and they are pictured on my mind at this moment. It seems to me that all Senators should appreciate the nature of that scene, which was undoubtedly brought about by the fault of officers of the Government or others. That is the reason why I feel that it is not a question which ought to be decided by the mere fixed rules of liability.

Mr. GEORGE. If I had not been interrupted by the Senator from Ohio I would have stated, what I now proceed to state, that whilst I think this is a very grave question and deserves calm and judicial consideration on the part of the committee and on the part of the Senate itself, I do not mean to anticipate by anything I say what ought finally to be the judgment of the Senate; but I do say it is an innovation upon the rules of law and it does open the way by precedent to establishing very large liabilities against the Government. For this reason I insist that the Senator from Oregon in his first remarks upon the subject was correct, and we ought calmly, in a judicial and fair temper, first to decide what liability we should assume, and then there will be time enough, if we reach the conclusion that we should assume a liability, to determine the amount of it.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Mr. President, I served upon the Committee on Claims for a brief time. During the time I was on that committee a vast number of bills came to the committee, all of them involving the question of the liability of the Government for an act of commission or omission of an officer of the Government, and the standing rule of the committee was to report those bills adversely.

Whatever may be the equities in this case, and I am not denying those equities, I think the ground taken by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] is preëminently proper. I can not see how we are to shut the flood gates to the vast amount of bills which go into that committee, claiming liabilities against this Government of every kind and nature in the world, resulting from some claimed act of omission or commission on the part of an officer of the Government if, *a priori*, without any investigation here, we determine the liability and leave only the question of amount to be fixed. If we do that, then we have done an injustice in the Senate year after year, because the unanimous action of that committee during my incumbency on the committee was to report unfavorably every bill involving that question, on the ground that there was no legal liability on the Government for any act of commission or omission on the part of the officer; that he was an agent with a delegated and limited authority, and that any act of his which brought wrong to anybody was beyond the scope of his agency and entailed no liability upon the principal.

I understand that to have been the rule existing in that committee from its very organization. If it is a hardship, it is a hardship that has come home to hundreds of people having claims quite as just against the Government as the claims of the unfortunate people stricken by the fall of this building.

I think the position of the Senator from Mississippi is preeminently a wise and safe one. Let us send the question of this disaster to the committee properly charged with the duty of determining the legal liability of the Government. Then, when we get a report fixing what the legal rights are, this body can determine to do something as a matter of equity beyond any legal liability, if the legal liability does not exist. We can much better determine what we should do as a matter of equity when we have fixed our legal rights than we can by putting our legal rights aside and determining in advance that there is a legal liability on us to pay anything whatever.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, the resolution proposed by the Senator from Tennessee gives to the special committee ample and complete power to dispose of the entire matter, and to give consideration to all the questions suggested by the Senator from Louisiana. It is evident, of course, to every Senator that as a matter of strict legal right there can be no recovery, and if this case went to the Committee on Claims in the ordinary way no doubt that would be the fate of the whole measure. It would be brought back to the Senate with a report that there was no legal liability upon the part of the Government, and that there could be no recovery.

But I understood that the resolution of the Senator from Tennessee was brought in upon a different principle. It is to cover a very remarkable case, a case that has never before occurred in the history of the Government. I was in the city at the time the disaster occurred. I was near the scene very soon after the accident. I know the deep feeling there was in the city at the

time, and I know how it spread over the entire country. We all know that whatever the legal liability of the Government may be, there is a disposition on the part of Senators to give some relief to the sufferers from this terrible calamity, and there is a disposition upon the part of the people to support any such action which may be taken by the two Houses of Congress.

The resolution offered by the Senator from Tennessee covers the entire ground. It gives ample scope to determine the whole matter. There is an advantage in having the case considered by a special committee that would not exist if it went to the Committee on Claims. As I said before, we might be governed by the precedents, which are narrow, and which have been referred to by the Senator from Louisiana; but if it is taken up as an exceptional case and referred to a special committee, and the generosity of the Government is extended to these suffering people and the survivors of those who have died, it can not then be quoted as a proper precedent to be applied in every case where injury is done through carelessness, negligence, or accident on the part of officers of the Government. There is an advantage in sending it to the special committee as an exceptional case, and it should be sent there with full power to the committee, so that it may dispose of the whole matter, and without applying the strict and rigid rule of the law it should give to those people such relief as the equitable and peculiar circumstances of the case would seem to justify.

I hope that the resolution will be restored to its shape as originally presented by the Senator from Tennessee, and that the entire control of the whole subject will be given to the special committee proposed; and when the matter comes again before the Senate we shall have all the facts before us, with the recommendation of the special committee as to the course that should be pursued.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PASCO. Certainly

Mr. DOLPH. Does the Senator prefer that five Senators shall determine the question of liability rather than that it shall be determined by the Senate?

Mr. PASCO. I am indifferent about that matter. It will come to the Senate at last for final action.

Mr. DOLPH. After the committee has gone to all the labor of investigation. If you are going to pay the claims, why not strike out the first part of the resolution and let the committee go on and ascertain how much shall be paid?

Mr. PASCO. If the committee desire to get the views of their fellow Senators and the views of the Senate upon this question, after extending its investigations to that length and having prepared a report of its proceedings up to that point, it will have abundant power under the resolution to submit a partial report to the Senate and ascertain whether it meets with the approval of the Senate or not. It can come in with a partial report and submit it to the Senate if it sees fit, or go on and bring the whole matter in.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Florida will allow me, the Senator from Oregon does not mean to say that under the resolution the select committee would decide the question?

Mr. DOLPH. That is the language of the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. The select committee will report all the facts pertinent to the case with its recommendation, but the Senate will sit in judgment upon the report of that committee and will decide for itself whether the conclusions of the committee are right or wrong.

Mr. PASCO. I understand the point of the Senator from Oregon to be that there should be a preliminary finding before the committee extends its labors to ascertain all the circumstances and the amount that should be allowed to the different sufferers. But the committee can make a preliminary report, if it sees fit to do so, under the power given to it by the Senate in the resolution.

Mr. DOLPH. There is no direction to the committee to make a preliminary report.

Mr. HARRIS. It is authorized to report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. DOLPH. There is no suggestion that it shall make a preliminary report. There is nothing in the resolution to indicate that it shall take the sense of the Senate as to whether it is correct in its judgment that there is a liability on the part of the Government, either legal or equitable. Of course, before any of the sufferers can receive money the Senate and Congress must act on the report, and that will necessarily involve the question whether there is any liability, whether any relief should be granted or not, as well as the question as to how much shall be granted.

I think the resolution is very peculiar and extraordinary in its effect. It is usual to ascertain the question of liability before we lay the foundation for paying a claim, and that is all I am suggesting. I am willing the Senate shall be committed to that matter by striking out that portion of the resolution which requires the committee to examine and report whether there is any legal or equitable obligation on the part of the Government and simply direct the committee to ascertain how much each individual shall receive.

That is my suggestion; but your committee is required to go on and act upon its finding and determination as to the legal or equitable obligation of the Government in this case before that question has been determined by the Senate. If that is necessary, why not let the Senate determine it now? Why not let the Senate assume that there is an obligation and simply direct the committee to go on and ascertain how much shall be paid, not whether anything shall be paid? If the latter part of the resolution is restored, I shall endeavor to carry out my view of the matter by moving to strike out that portion of the resolution which requires the committee to inquire whether there is any legal or equitable obligation, and simply direct it to examine the case of each sufferer from the Ford's Theater disaster and to report how much shall be paid in each case.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is closed, and the Calendar is in order under Rule IX.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the consent of the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the resolution

Mr. DOLPH. Let it be proceeded with by unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida will proceed.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the adoption of the resolution as introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, but I wish to say that for myself I do not need the report of any committee to decide that when an officer or person in the employment of the United States is required to perform a public duty in a particular place under the entire control of the United States, he has no discretion except to perform that duty in that place, and if by reason of the obligation to perform the public service there he shall lose his life or becomes disabled it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to make compensation for it. Nor do I see that such an allowance involves responsibility for any other case than precisely that case where the public official sacrifices his life, or becomes disabled, in the performance of a specific duty imposed upon him by law. It would seem to me, as the Senator from Ohio has said, that that is a question which would need no reference and no consideration.

We speak of liability on the part of the United States, but there is no liability except that which is created by law. Governments are not to be conducted upon the basis of individual responsibilities and obligations. They are to be treated upon a larger field of consideration than those which are created by statute and prevail between one individual and another. But it may be said that the spirit of this age goes farther, and that in the case of an employer possessed of large means, or a great corporation, where employés lose their lives or become disabled in the performance of duty, the general equity which is pervading the whole public opinion of the world is in favor of giving compensation in such cases.

Therefore, so far as that is concerned, I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] is right in saying we might well by a resolution of this body, without a reference to a committee to inquire into the status of the law between individuals, declare that these people are entitled to compensation according to the degree of disability and injury which they have received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATT in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] to amend the resolution. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida, the effect of which is to restore the resolution to its original form.

The SECRETARY. Add to the resolution, after the word "them," in line 5, the following:

And if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the committee will investigate each individual case, and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case.

Resolved further, That the committee may employ a clerk who is stenographer, and who shall do the stenographic work of the committee as clerk, and that the committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, and the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee may administer oaths.

Resolved further, That the expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Resolved further, That said committee may act jointly with a similar committee of the House of Representatives, if the House shall appoint such committee, and that the committee may report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. HOAR. Is that the language which has once been stricken out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee modified his resolution by leaving off the part which it is now

proposed to add as an amendment by the Senator from Florida. The question is, Shall the amendment be agreed to?

Mr. HOAR. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Florida, may I inquire, to establish the practice of joint committees between the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. PASCO. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts, who was out of the Chamber while the discussion was going on, that a very general feeling has been expressed throughout the Senate—the first expression of it came from the Senator from Ohio—that the committee should have entire jurisdiction over this whole matter and that it should not be left simply to find out what the legal rights of the parties are. In order to carry out that purpose, my motion is to restore the resolution to its original shape, and I made the motion with the consent of the Senator from Tennessee, who felt embarrassed by the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me to make a suggestion, that particular part of the last resolution which provides for acting in conjunction with a similar committee of the other House, if the House shall appoint such a committee, might be stricken out. There can be no objection that I can see to striking that part of the resolution out and leaving in the last declaration, that the committee may report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. PASCO. I am perfectly willing to modify my amendment to that extent. My desire is to give the committee entire jurisdiction over the whole subject-matter, so that these people may not be delayed.

Mr. HARRIS. Then let the Senator modify his amendment so as to reinstate all of the matter except that provision.

Mr. PASCO. I will so modify it, at the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then that portion of the matter proposed to be inserted will be stricken out.

Mr. HOAR. That will obviate the principal objection I made, though I still think that unless the Senate is very strongly of opinion that the claim should be allowed it would be better to have the matter come back to the Senate first. I think in any case it would be better to have the amounts ascertained in some other way than by a committee of the Senate. If we put upon a committee of the Senate the duty of investigating nearly seventy individual cases of personal injury, hearing the doctors and nurses, and all the evidence that is necessary to ascertain the extent of injury to the person, one of two things will follow.

In order to do the work properly the Senate committee ought not to take less than a solid month of hard work or they will shirk that work and the report will be made without due and proper investigation. I think it is much better to have them ascertain and report the liability, and then provide that if there be a liability the amount shall be ascertained by the Secretary of War or by some other Department officer who can employ the necessary instrumentalities for it.

Mr. COCKRELL. The committee will use all those instrumentalities fully in ascertaining the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. Now, to carry out the views of the Senator from Ohio and my own views about the matter, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It simply imposes on the committee the duty of ascertaining how much should be paid these people, and now by inference there will be action by the Senate as to whether they shall be paid or the whole question will be left to the Senate after the report comes in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 2, after the word "investigate," to strike out down to and including the word "case," in line 7, in the following words:

> the Ford Theater disaster and report to the Senate, whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate the sufferers of that disaster, for the injuries sustained by them, and if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the committee will investigate each individual case.

And insert:

> the case of each individual sufferer by the Ford's Theater disaster.

So as to read:

> *Resolved*, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Chair to investigate the case of each individual sufferer by the Ford's Theater disaster and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from Maine suggests to me what may be an omission in the original resolution, whether it covers the case of the representatives of deceased persons. The original resolution says "the sufferers," and I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee whether there ought not to be some additional words inserted to cover the representatives of deceased persons.

Mr. HARRIS. If there can be a doubt as to the power of the committee to report in respect to persons who suffered to the extent of death, then I am ready to accept any suggestion that will cover and include it; but I do not think that there can be such a doubt.

Mr. DOLPH. It assumes that the wife or other dependent relatives would be sufferers by the disaster, which I think is within the limits of competent construction.

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not think the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should be adopted if those who vote for the resolution are really in favor of ultimate relief to these sufferers. I think the strongest position it could be placed in before the Senate (as a bill would have to pass both Houses) would be a report from a committee on either the legal or the equitable liability resting upon the Government in this particular case. If the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted that inquiry is entirely eliminated from the consideration of the committee, and the only question then is as to fixing the liability in the individual cases. So I think it is to the interest of those who are seeking to have some action taken, not only by the Senate, but by both branches of Congress, that this inquiry should be gone into fully and exhaustively, and a proper report upon the legal or equitable liability made to this body.

Mr. HOAR. This whole question can be avoided by striking out, what I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will consent to, the words "sufferers of" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons injured or killed by."

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection to that modification.

Mr. HOAR. That will cover the whole point.

Mr. HARRIS. It makes the clause unquestionably clear as I think it is clear without it, but I have no objection to the modification.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose my amendment will come first, because it perfects the clause proposed to be stricken out. I move to strike out the words "sufferers of" and insert "persons injured or killed by."

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Tennessee accepts that.

Mr. HARRIS. I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts is accepted by the Senator from Tennessee. It will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, strike out the words "sufferers of" and insert "persons injured or killed by;" so as to read:

> Whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate the persons injured or killed by that disaster.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it read "The persons injured or the representatives of persons killed."

Mr. HOAR. I was about to suggest that the words, "or their representatives" be inserted.

Mr. PASCO. I was going to ask how Congress can compensate a man who was killed.

Mr. HOAR. I move to insert after the word "disaster" the words "or their representatives," and then to strike out the words "for the injuries sustained by them." It is now complete without the latter clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "disaster," in line 5, insert the words "or their representatives," and in the same line, after the amendment just adopted, strike out the words "for the injuries sustained by them."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection the resolution will be so modified. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator from Oregon through the Chair whether he does not think the necessary effect of his amendment is to determine here now the question of liability?

Mr. DOLPH. That is my purpose. I prefer to determine the question of liability here now rather than to let five Senators determine it. I propose that we shall determine it before they go to all the expense of the investigation. My objection is to the operation of the resolution. If these five Senators determine there is no legal or equitable liability and they report back by resolution, that ends the whole business unless the Senate reverses their report; but if they determine for themselves and not for the Senate that there is liability on the part of the Government, then they go on and incur all the expense and then it comes back to the Senate to determine the question at last.

We can not please all. I find I can not please the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia at the same time. I can not please those Senators who say we will not make this a precedent; that it is an unusual case; that we will give something

just because these people were great sufferers and because the public think it ought to be done and Senators sympathize with them, but we will not make any precedent. But here comes the Senator from West Virginia and he wants an elaborate report in which the legal or equitable obligation of the Government shall be so ascertained that it will carry a bill through both Houses and make a precedent for all time. So I can not please all.

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. FAULKNER. I wish to say to the Senator that his motion to amend is essentially antagonistic to the resolution. I ask him frankly how can any Senator who does not know anything in reference to the facts of the disaster vote in favor of his amendment? If he should succeed in accomplishing his purpose and have the amendment adopted, I, for one, should be compelled to vote against the resolution, because I should then be compelled to vote to pay these parties according to their disability without knowing whether there is any legal or equitable obligation whatever resting upon the Government. Therefore I say that his amendment is entirely antagonistic to the purposes the mover of the resolution necessarily had in view.

Mr. DOLPH. I think not. Here comes the Senator from Ohio and says that the public have made up their minds about this matter; that the public have determined that these people should be paid and that justice should be done them, and four-fifths or three-fourths of the Senate have determined that question. I do not suppose that we shall know absolutely any more about the facts of the case when we get through with it than we know now. We may have it in the shape of a report; we may have it placed on our files; but we shall know no more about the merits of the case than we know to-day; that is to say, whether the money should be paid.

Mr. FAULKNER. What is the use of a report, then?

Mr. DOLPH. The only question to be determined by the committee is as to the liability of the Government for the negligent or wrongful act of a subordinate officer of the Government. That is a simple question; it is a question which any lawyer can determine in his own mind in ten minutes.

Mr. FAULKNER. But I ask the Senator whether that question does not depend upon the facts in a particular case, and if I am not cognizant of those facts how can I pass upon the legal question?

Mr. DOLPH. I say the facts of this case are not in dispute.

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not know them. Does the Senator?

Mr. DOLPH. Does not the Senator know about the liability belonging to the Government; about the improvements which were going on; about the foundations which were being undermined? Does anybody doubt those facts? Are those in issue? Can there be any controversy about them? Certainly not. Now, then, the Government was conducting that work, whether it was through the Secretary of War, or Col. Ainsworth, or some subordinate under him whose duty it was to see that the work was properly and safely conducted. There was negligence; and according to the theory of the people who press these claims, the liability of the Government is just the same whether the Secretary of War was responsible, or Col. Ainsworth, or some subordinate officer under him.

So I say that there can be and there is no dispute as to the real facts in this case, and the only legal question is whether the Government is equitably liable to these people, and ought the Government to assume to be responsible for the wrong or the negligence of every officer of the Government charged with a duty.

That is all the legal question there is, and I submit that is a question we can determine on a vote this morning just as well as we can determine it hereafter. I think the mind of the Senator from West Virginia is made up on that proposition, but if we are not to determine it this morning I think it would be more orderly, and would save expense, and save great trouble and labor to the committee if we should determine it in advance of the investigation.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate must finally determine whether it will pay this damage, and how much it will pay, and therefore must adopt the full report of the committee, but what I have been complaining about is making five Senators the judges, in the first instance, as to whether there is any liability. So I am willing myself to vote for my amendment and let the Senate this morning determine that we will pay these people, and let the committee determine how much we shall pay them.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be voted down, now that he has declared its purpose. Unquestionably under the general rule of law under which I understand the Committee on Claims has proceeded from its foundation, prima facie there would be no legal liability on the part of the Government; but there are classes of cases which have come before that committee (one of them was called to my attention this morning connected with an elevator run in this building) where growing out of peculiar and exceptional conditions surrounding the employment, compensation was made and the legal rule not violated, because there was a line of demarcation drawn between the general principle and the particular case to which the appropriation applied.

All that the remarks I made a while ago were intended to apply to was to safeguard against any opening of the flood gates here to a violation of the general principle to which I referred. If this case comes under an exceptional condition, if this case is accompanied by facts which take it out of the general rule, then it seems to me it is a great deal safer for this body to have the report of a committee stating those exceptional grounds and make up a record so as to prevent the application of the precedent in the future.

There was the case of a vessel before the Committee on Claims at the last session of the last Congress. It was elaborately and carefully argued. The conclusion reached was that, growing out of the peculiar authority exercised by the master of the vessel and the application of the laws of commerce to that vessel, the damage caused in that particular instance was an exceptional case, and there was a liability.

Now, there may be something in the facts of this case which would bring it in the grasp of that exception, and it might be so stated as to enable every gentleman to vote for it and accomplish what he considered an equitable obligation without any violation of the legal principle. Therefore, I think it very important that the committee should have power to look into the whole matter, study all the circumstances, and evolve the application of the legal principles which apply, so that we may vote discriminatingly when we come to vote on the report.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this is a question of very grave importance, and it may lead to bringing about very numerous and very large claims against the Government. I beg to suggest that it would be better to refer the resolution to a committee before it is acted upon. It seems to me it would be best to refer the resolution to the Judiciary Committee. It has been decided over and over again that the Government of the United States is not liable in such cases; and we have had the principle before Congress and before committees in a great variety of cases. In cases of loss by the mails, for instance, it has never been held that the Government was liable for mail matter, not even when the letter is registered. It does not occupy the relation to the citizen that a private person does whose relations are those of contract or social duty. If we shall hold that the Government is liable we shall reverse a principle of common law, the practice of the Government from its foundation, and it would probably give rise to many claims resting on that doctrine.

It seems to me, sir, the best disposition of this question would be to allow each person to make his own case before the Government, and then if the Government should choose, on account of the peculiar hardship, to give a gratuity to the person who has suffered, let the question appear in that light and let it be done upon that ground. As at present advised, I shall vote against the resolution. I think it best to let each individual case stand on its own merits and be discussed according to its peculiar circumstances.

Mr. BATE. I see the object of those who have discussed this question seems to be to get at the legal liability of the Government and that the committee may make a report upon the legality of the obligation of the Government in law as well as in equity and justice. By reference to the resolution I find the language to be—

That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Chair to investigate the Ford Theater disaster, and report to the Senate whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate, etc.

Leaving out the word "law" altogether, the inquiry merely being whether it is equitable and just. As we want to cover the whole case and get a complete report, I wish to move at the proper time to insert the word "law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order now to move to perfect the text of the resolution.

Mr. BATE. I move, then, under the decision of the Chair, that the word "law" be inserted just preceding the word "equity," so that we may get from the committee a report as to the law as well as to the equity and the justice of compensating the sufferers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, after the word "in," insert "law;" so as to read—

whether in law, equity, and justice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

Mr. DANIEL. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. In line 2, after the word "investigate," strike out the following words:

the Ford Theater disaster and report to the Senate, whether in law, equity, and justice, the Government should compensate the persons injured or killed by that disaster, or their representatives, and if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the committee will investigate each individual case—

And insert:

the case of each individual sufferer by the Ford Theater disaster.

So as to read:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Chair to investigate the case of each individual sufferer by the Ford Theater disaster and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as it has been amended.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution as amended will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Chair to investigate the Ford Theater disaster, and report to the Senate whether in law, equity, and justice the Government should compensate the persons injured or killed by that disaster, or their representatives; and if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the committee will investigate each individual case, and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case.

Resolved further, That the committee may employ a clerk who is a stenographer and who shall do the stenographic work of the committee as clerk, and that the committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, and the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee may administer oaths.

Resolved further, That the expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Resolved further, That the committee may report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. DOLPH. I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee whether the word "and" in line 3, after the word "equity," should not be stricken out and "or" inserted. I suppose the object is to determine whether legally or equitably compensation should be allowed.

Mr. HARRIS. The word "and" should be stricken out and "or" inserted.

Mr. DOLPH. The word "and" would couple all together and probably require a legal as well as an equitable obligation before we could give any relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3 it is proposed to strike out "and" and insert "or," so as to read "whether in law, equity, or justice the Government should compensate," etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be so modified.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have not been able to listen to the whole debate and I do not quite apprehend the force of the words in the resolution "if it shall be decided." Do those words refer to a decision by the committee, or a decision by the Senate, or a decision by Congress? "If it shall be decided" that there is such a liability, then the details shall be investigated. Is it the intention of Senators to commit to the committee the final decision of the question whether the United States ought in law, equity, or justice to pay these amounts so that it will be binding upon the Senate in case a favorable report is made?

Mr. HARRIS. The intention of the resolution is to raise a committee to investigate and develop the facts and report them to the Senate, with such recommendation as the committee may make, and invoke the judgment of the Senate upon the merit of that report.

Mr. CHANDLER. Upon the whole question, the question of justice as well as law?

Mr. HARRIS. Every question involved will be submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT subsequently announced as the special committee under the resolution, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FAULKNER, Mr. WHITE of California, Mr. MANDERSON, and Mr. MCMILLAN.

ACCOUNTS OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent to call up for consideration House bill 4340. Yesterday that bill was reported to the House of Representatives by the joint commission to inquire into the status of the laws regulating the Departments and was passed there. I I now submit a report on the part of the Senate members of the commission recommending the passage of an exactly similar bill. I submit the report in support of the House bill and ask that the House bill may be taken up and passed. It will only take a few moments and it is of some importance to the Post-Office Department that the bill should be passed now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). If there be no objection, the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom the bill was formally referred this morning, will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. The House bill is on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. CALL. Before consent is given for the consideration of the bill I wish to say that I think there are some questions connected with the manner in which it comes before this body, whatever may be the merits of the bill, that deserve consideration, and very careful consideration. I do not know that it is important, and I will not object to the present consideration of the bill; but I merely wish to say that I think some attention will have to be given to the manner in which the bill comes before the Senate.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The Joint Commission of Congress to Inquire into the status of Laws Organizing the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes, having considered the same, report it back herewith and recommend that it do pass, with the title amended so as to read as follows:

"A bill to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department."

Section 407 of the Revised Statutes now requires that the certificates of deposits by postmasters shall be sent by the depositories, through the office making the deposit, to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, and from that office to the Auditor.

The accompanying bill changes the law so as to require the certificate to be sent directly to the Auditor's Office, obviating the delay now experienced, which is to no purpose, since the work in the Third Assistant's office is that of merely entering the amount of the certificates of deposit in books arranged by quarters to accord with the alphabetical arrangement of offices making deposits, but which are neither balanced, proved, nor checked against anything else, and which necessarily afford an imperfect guide to the status of any account, being, as will be seen, credits for money only, and does not include credits from other sources or any of the debits.

The certificates are needed to make a complete and final check by the Auditor; and to avoid delay in the adjustment of postal accounts should go direct to that office.

The proposed change will facilitate the settlement of postmasters' accounts by at least one month.

F. M. COCKRELL,
JAMES K. JONES,
S. M. CULLOM,
Members on the part of the Senate.
ALEXANDER M. DOCKERY,
JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
NELSON DINGLEY, JR.
Members on the part of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COCKRELL. In connection with the report of the joint commission, I desire to read the following letter from the Postmaster-General, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 13:

Hon. A. M. DOCKERY,
Chairman Joint Commission of Congress, etc., Washington, D. C.:

SIR: I have examined the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require certificates of deposits by postmasters to be sent direct to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, and desire to say that its passage will greatly facilitate the settlement of accounts of postmasters, and I therefore earnestly recommend its passage by Congress.

Very respectfully,

W. S. BISSELL,
Postmaster-General.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I understand this is a House bill which was reported in regular form in the other House, and as it now stands on its passage here has not been referred to any committee of this body. It is recommended by the Senators upon what is called a joint commission, composed of members of the Senate and House of Representatives. What place in the proceedings of this body, and under the rules of this body, a joint commission has is a question for consideration. If it be a committee of this body it must have been created by this body and not by any outside authority.

The Constitution gives to this Senate, not to a preceding Senate, the right to designate the members of this body who shall constitute its committees. This commission, not a committee of this body, was not created by the Senate. It was created by the President of the United States and by the two Houses of the last Congress. Senators and Members of the present House

were designated by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the last House, whose authority and official life expired with that body, to perform duties in this body and in the other House.

If it was competent by virtue of an enactment in the appropriation bill agreed upon in conference, and disapproved by the vote of the Senate when the bill was considered in the Senate, for a statute of the United States to confer authority upon the President of the expired Senate to select members of this body to perform legislative duties in it, then this commission has some existence, and its report can be officially recognized; but if it be contrary to the power vested in this body, which exclusively has the right to designate the members of the body to perform legislative duties, then it can have no existence and no recognition here.

Is it important that this body shall confine itself to the constitutional power conferred upon it, or shall we recognize the authority of the President of the United States and the two Houses of the last Congress of the United States to change by a statute the constitutional power of this body over its own members and its rules of proceeding and the designation of its official duties?

More than that, the provision in the appropriation act which creates this commission, called a joint commission, provides that the joint commission shall have authority to sit at its own discretion without limitation of time, in determination, final and absolute upon its own expenses, and to issue its warrants upon the Treasury of the United States without limitation for any amount of money it may see fit to decide is proper and legitimate for the conduct of its business.

Mr. President, a committee of this body is recognized and known in its constituent qualities. It is a portion of this body designated by the official authority of the Senate to perform legislative duty. If it is a committee it can only possess authority and derive it from this existing Senate and not from a statute of the United States passed by a House and a Senate which have no longer existence and which never had authority to declare what members of this body should be assigned to the performance of a particular duty. If it be not a legislative body and its duties are not legislative they are either executive or judicial. If they be legislative this commission has no existence, because it is not created by each House, by the Senate whose term commenced not as Senators but as a Congress on the 4th of last March, and it can derive no authority whatever from the act of the House and the Senate in the last Congress of the United States, whose committees have been formed since the passage of the act and their legislative duties devolved upon them by the action of the present Senate.

Is it executive? Can an executive duty be created by the Senate and the House of the last Congress of the United States to be performed by members of this body? This is the legislative department. It therefore can not be an executive body, or an executive duty, or belong to the executive department. Neither can it be a judicial body nor within the domain of the judicial department.

Then what is it? This body created a joint commission of Senators and Members of the House by the last expired Congress to perform legislative duties in this body here, and with power to sit and to report bills to this body. If it was competent to give authority to the last Congress to designate the Senators who are to perform these duties as a committee, it was competent to do it for all time.

But manifestly this commission has no legal or valid existence. It is not a committee of this body, because committees of this body can only be created by the Senate under the power to determine the rules of its proceedings. Members of a committee can not be designated by the last House of Representatives, which expired on the 4th of March last, nor by the last Senate, which terminated with that Congressional term, but by this present body here sworn in and constituting the Senate since the 4th of March, and by the present House, because in the term "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings" is involved and declared the power of the House and the Senate existing at the time when the rule of proceeding is determined upon.

Since the passage of that act, if the commission ever had any existence, this body has by resolution assigned to its different members the performance of the duty here reported by this joint commission under this statute, or by Senators who are performing it in violation of the very assignment and designation of Senators to whom this subject had been committed—the members of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

So I say that this is a dangerous innovation upon the power of the Senate, the existing Senate, to establish its own rules of procedure, and that therefore this bill, whatever may be its merits, has no proper place here upon the recommendation of a body which has no legal existence, and can not be recognized under the rules of this body or under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that this bill has been very well considered by the joint commission created by a provision in the legislative appropriation bill of a year ago, and that it probably will result in great reforms in the management of the financial accounts of the Post-Office Department; but I did not understand by the act creating that commission that a bill would come before the two Houses of Congress for consideration without reference to the proper standing committees of the bodies.

I only heard part of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], but I think I agree with him in that portion of his remarks as to the propriety of also having the regular standing committees of the body consider these matters. I know how careful the members of the special commission are, especially the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], in looking into all these reforms. I have no doubt they have accomplished a great work of reform, but I think we should have a little more time for the consideration of these bills. I believe it has been only in the last twenty-four or thirty-six hours that the attention of the Senate has been called to this matter. This is the third bill before this body during this Congress from that commiss on. One of the bills we have already passed, a bill providing for the printing of bills in place of the ordinary engrossment by handwriting. Another bill, which is on the Calendar, I know is a mistake as far as the provision relating to the Government Printing Office is concerned, to which I have called the personal attention of the members of the commission.

I am as heartily in favor of these reforms as any Senator can be. I have, as I stated before, great faith in the commission. I have no doubt they will do what probably no committee would undertake to do, but at the same time I think it wise that we should have a little more deliberation before passing these bills and putting them upon the statute books.

I suggest to the Senator from Missouri to at all events let this bill go over a day or two, until we can further examine it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has not even read the report in this case. If there was any occassion for delay in this matter, I should be the last Senator to press it, but this is merely to change the method of the transaction of the business of the Post-Office Department, which has been approved by the Postmaster-General and by everyone connected with the Department. It simply changes the notification of the deposits of public moneys and requires, instead of their being sent around about through the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, that they be sent directly to the Sixth Auditor.

There are bills which the joint commission will report which will require deliberation, which make important changes. For example, one is the bill reported yesterday and placed on the Calendar. The bill to which the Senator from Maryland refers also been placed upon the Calendar. If a bill requires consideration and investigation, I have always recommended that it should go to the Calendar; but I did not suppose that anybody would object to a bill which simply made a change of this kind and which the Postmaster-General says is absolutely essential in order to facilitate the transaction of business in the Post-Office Department.

If Senators after this explanation think that they ought to have more time to digest and come to a conclusion on this little proposition, I will consent that the bill may go over, but I am certain that no Senator will ask it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether, under the present system, when the Postmaster-General gets a notice of a deposit, he does anything with it except to send it to the Auditor?

Mr. COCKRELL. Nothing is done except to delay the information being communicated to the Auditor, thus wasting the time of three or four clerks in doing nothing, except in handling the notice and entering it. It is the most farcical performance that has ever been had in administration.

Mr. CHANDLER. The proposed change is to have the notices sent directly to the Auditor?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; having designated the depositary of the Government funds, to send the receipt directly to the Sixth Auditor, where it has to go after running around Robin Hood's barn.

Mr. CHANDLER. What possible objection can there be to the proposed change?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Postmaster-General has said that he earnestly recommends the passage of the bill. The matter has been before the Postmaster-General and all the officers of the Department. They discussed it for two nights in the presence of the experts, and they have investigated the entire question. The persons who have been in the habit of receiving these notices have been heard. The bill simply proposes a change. If there were anything in it which required consideration or

deliberation, I should not ask the Senator from Maryland or any other Senator to pass upon it; but it did seem to me that this was such a simple proposition that we might pass it and be done with it.

Mr. CULLOM. I only wish to say a word in addition to what has already been said by the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the committee.

This subject was very thoroughly and for quite a length of time investigated by the commission, not only in the Capitol, but with the Postmaster-General and the Secretary of the Treasury, so as to be sure that we were not making a mistake in this proposed change in the administration of the Post-Office Department. I think there can be no doubt that the bill ought to pass, because it is in the interest of economy and dispatch of business in that Department.

Mr. GORMAN. I am so accustomed, as is the Senate, to accept whatever the Senator from Missouri may say is right in this body, that it was, of course, with a great deal of temerity that I ventured to suggest delay for a day of the consideration of a bill which I have not read, and which I have not had any opportunity to consider until it came up in the Senate. The members of the commission, I trust, will bear with me in simply insisting on having a sufficient time to ascertain what they have thought right to present to the Senate.

I stated a moment ago that I thought the commission would probably bring about a great many reforms in the departments, but that it was a novel thing for Congress to appoint such a commission. It was done in the expiring hours of the last Administration on an appropriation bill. I expressed my opinion at that time that it was an extraordinary thing to do. I did not believe then, and I had not the impression until within the last few days, that the recommendations of the commission would be reported to the two Houses of Congress and passed through without consideration by the proper standing committees.

Mr. President, everything that is a change is not a reform. I may be a little slow in this matter and I am somewhat of an old fogy in these changes of the method of doing business. I do not believe that anything will be lost by fair consideration and deliberation.

I did not know until the Senator explained them what the provisions of the bill were, but now that he has done so, I think probably this will be a great reform. But I submit to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], and also to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], who is a member of the commission, that the present method has been going on for a long time, and a few days of grace to enable us to read the reports can not work injury. The Government can stand it, and the loss will not be very great in the meantime.

As I said a moment ago, I am not here to criticise the work of the commission. I have no objection to it, but I think I have discovered in one of the bills pending in the body, which the commission considered very thoroughly during the summer, that it would result in anything but good so far as one branch of the Government is concerned. The other bill which has passed and is in operation is a novel thing. It has resulted probably in the improvement in the appearance of bills but there has been no improvement as to expense or economy. There is no economy in it. I submit to our friends on the commission that it is an extraordinary body, of which they are members, and at all events we should have reasonable time to examine their work. That is all I ask.

Mr. COCKRELL. If my good friend from Maryland will just say that he thinks, with the report of the commission and the letter of the Postmaster-General which have been read, that the bill requires further consideration, I shall have not another word to say. I am just as anxious as he is that every Senator on this floor shall understand everything which is done. I have no disposition to conceal anything in any shape, manner, or form; but when this bill was called up and the report was read, with the recommendation of the Postmaster-General, when it only covers one item, and when the commission has asked for all the other bills to be placed upon the Calendar, we do not think that the criticism is just that we are trying to force an important measure through here without deliberation. If the Senator will say that he wants more time to deliberate on this little bill, I shall ask that it go upon the Calendar.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I think, as a rule, it is a wise thing for the Senate to have time for proper consideration. I believe in deliberation in this body in all these matters. On the other hand, if the Senator from Missouri will say to me that the interests of the Government will suffer between now and Monday if this bill should not be passed, and that any great damage will occur, I shall agree to withdraw my objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. The only difference is simply that the Post-Office Department may commence the preparation of carrying out this system of work, and the passage of the bill will give them time to do so by the first of the month.

Mr. GORMAN. I have great respect for the heads of Departments, but I have seen a great many heads of Departments come and go; I have seen a great many men who have come into power, suddenly raised to high station, who want to introduce all sorts of reforms, which amount to nothing, and end in no good. I believe it would be safer, in the interest of the Government, in the interest of the people, and in the interest of the administration of these Departments, if some of them would move a little more slowly than they have been moving, and learn a little better the duties, and ascertain the troubles and what needs to be corrected in the Departments, before expressing such opinions as have been expressed.

Under the circumstances, unless the Senator from Missouri will tell me and the Senate that there is a great and urgent necessity for the passage of this bill, and that he knows from his personal examination that the bill is correct, I trust he will let it go over until Monday.

Mr. CULLOM. So far as the Postmaster-General and his Department are concerned, the bill did not originate with that Department. The Senator knows that what we call the joint commission appointed by the last Congress—whatever may be the propriety or constitutionality of that action by Congress—is not now before the Senate, as I understand, for discussion. The commission was appointed and charged with special duties. The commission went to work according to the prescription of the act itself, and provided experts, as it was required to do. The experts have gone on and have shown wherein this unnecessary work, if you please, existed in the different Departments.

This bill originally came from the commission in conjunction with the experts, and it was presented to the heads of Departments. The bureau officers were called in, and discussions took place in the presence of the commission. All the matters involved in the question were discussed and turned over and over again. Finally the Post-Office Department—all the officials, I think, at last concurring—agreed that this bill was in the interest of the public and of economy.

I make these remarks to the Senator from Maryland to show that the Department itself is not rushing in for reform simply for the name of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. On the other hand, the trouble was to convince the officers of the Department of the necessity for these changes.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; the trouble with the commission was to convince the Department that there might be a different mode of doing business in the Department which would be in the interest of the public and work economy as well.

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois how much saving is involved in the passage of this bill?

Mr. CULLOM. I understand it to be anywhere from $75,000 to $100,000 a year.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is not by this bill, but by the other bill.

Mr. CULLOM. That is so. It is by the other bill. I can not answer the Senator exactly as to the saving which will be accomplished by this bill, but by another bill proposed by the commission it will be about $100,000 a year.

Mr. GORMAN. On what is the bill based? Does it dispense with sundry officers, or how is the saving, or what is the reform?

Mr. CULLOM. Of course it will dispense with unnecessary employés, and in that way it will be in the interest of economy, but while it will be doing that it will be in the interest as well of simplicity in doing business.

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Senator will permit me, the postmaster in Laurel sends his money to Baltimore to be deposited there. The designated depository gives two receipts, sends one to the Postmaster-General, and instead of sending the other to the auditing officer of the Treasury Department, who has to pass upon it, he sends it to a division in the Third Assistant Postmaster-General's office. That division keeps it there until an examination and a record is made of it. They do not do anything with it which amounts to anything. There is no responsibility as to it at all. After they are through with it, then it goes over to the Sixth Auditor's Office. The time of the clerks in the Third Assistant Postmaster-General's Office in handling this matter is simply a waste.

I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that the joint commission employed three as fine business men as can be found in the United States, who are experts in business. The president of the commission has made his way from a clerkship in a railway office to the presidency of the largest railroad combination which exists to-day in the United States, and has gone through all the departments.

These experts went to the Sixth Auditor's Office, and found out how this business came into the Sixth Auditor's Office. Then they went into the Postmaster-General's Office, and they examined the whole process there. They discussed these methods with every one of the present employés, and many of them have been long in the service.

After they had gone through there, they said "this is the proper way to do this work upon business principles." Then they had the Postmaster-General, the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, the Superintendent of the Money Order Division, and all the officials to meet together, laid before them their plans and recommendations, and heard all the objections and criticisms of these officers of the different departments until the last vestige of objection was removed, and all the officers said "this is the best way to do the business."

This matter has been thoroughly examined. There can be no trouble so far as it is concerned. We have a bill, which I reported yesterday, which changes the fees in regard to money orders, abolishes the postal notes, and relates to a number of other things. I did not ask to have the bill taken up and passed at once, because I wanted it to go upon the Calendar. I want Senators to see it. We think it is a wonderful reform. The most remarkable thing in it is that nearly every solitary person in the Department at first opposed the plan which these experts had devised, but they got together, and those who were the bitterest opponents of the plan are to-day its warmest advocates, because they became convinced that the present system and method was not the best in a business point of view, and therefore they became willing to accept the change.

This is one of those simple things which I thought ought to be passed so as to change the method in the Post-Office Department in order that the Department might make arrangements accordingly and send out their notices as to how the receipts for deposits should be made out and the plan be inaugurated.

As to all the other items, where there is any material change as a matter of course the commission will not ask for their consideration until after the bills have been printed just as we have done in other cases, so that Senators may have full opportunity for their examination and discussion.

Mr. CALL. If no one else does, I for one shall insist upon a vote by yeas and nays being had upon this bill before it passes.

The merits of the bill are not a question of any importance compared with the question whether or not three Senators may be designated and three members-elect, not sworn into office, not members of Congress—whether a power by statute can be created in the President of a Senate about to expire and a Speaker of the House, whose functions are about to end, to designate the members of the two Houses who are to perform legislative duties. That is the question.

Here in this act, rejected by the Senate, three Senators are required to be nominated by the President of the last Senate to perform legislative duties in the coming Congress and three members-elect of the House of Representatives, not sworn in, when the organic law gives to each House of the Congress which commenced on the 4th of March the sole power to designate the members, according to the rules of its proceedings, who are to perform duties. They have designated them, and yet a commission—what?

A legislative body, an executive body, a judicial body, created by a President of the Senate whose power is about to expire, and had expired long before the performance of these duties, and a Speaker of the House of Representatives, who was *functus officio* when this body came into existence, assigned the members of the two Houses who are to perform this duty. If it is a legislative duty, then the sole power to designate the members who should constitute this commission was in this body; if it was an executive duty, then this body had no right either separately or in conjunction with the House of Representatives without the approval and action of the President of the United States, or the head of a Department, in nominating the persons who are to do it. So if it were a judicial duty.

But it is said to be a legislative duty which this commission has performed in reporting a bill, recommending its passage, and asking the Senate, instead of relying upon the Senators designated by itself to perform these duties, accept their recommendations and their work.

It matters not what may be the merits of the bill or what may be its importance, if it be true that the Senate and House of Representatives of an existing Congress have alone the power to designate the members of the two bodies who shall be charged with official duties, then that power ought to be preserved, and no other authority recognized.

Here is a statute of the United States, passed by an expired Congress, designating the members of this body who are to perform duties in this Congress, and giving to them what? Power to sit perpetually, power to draw their warrant upon the Treasury of the United States for $100,000,000 in their discretion, without limit, to employ experts, and to employ noted employés of the great railroad corporations, with unlimited discretion, and to supervise the entire departmental system of the United States, and since that period of time under the action of the Senate other Senators have been designated to perform the same duties.

If we are to reason about this, of what character is this commission? Is it a legislative one? If so, it is a committee of this body, and that only. Is it an executive one? If so, then that Congress had no power to create outside of the Constitution, without the nomination of the President or vesting the power in the head of a Department. If it is a judicial body, then the same remark applies.

Here, then, we have an important bill, represented to be necessary to the public service, reported here by Senators who have not been designated by this body to perform this duty, and with extensive powers vested in them, unconstitutional powers, the power of drawing their warrant as a committee upon the Treasury of the United States. Suppose we adopt that system and thus allow, by some arrangement, a President of the Senate who is about to leave his office, who has no further responsibility, who becomes *functus officio*, and a Speaker of the House, whose public functions are about to end, to vest in members of a coming Congress, in a commission or a committee, call it what you please, of the two Houses, extensive powers, to draw their warrant upon the Treasury of the United States and require it to be paid, what is to become of this Government?

Mr. President, I insist that it is an unconstitutional body and a dangerous precedent for the honest and fair and just administration of this Government. It has no warrant as a legislative body. The statutes of the United States can not create committees of coming Congresses nor designate the Senators who are to perform duties in either of these bodies. That is the character of this most remarkable provision, which was disapproved in the Senate, and came upon an appropriation bill, unobserved by any one, as the result of a conference.

I shall insist on a vote by yeas and nays upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I have not had time, I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri, who has charge of the pending bill, to look into it. I take it for granted the reforms proposed are all right; but it seems to me there will be no harm in letting the bill go over until Monday. I should like an opportunity to examine the report.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly, I have no objection to the bill going over if any Senator desires it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

SENATE ELECTION CASES.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the concurrent resolution, which was passed over this morning at my request, in regard to the printing of the new edition of the Senate Election Cases may be taken up. I think it will occupy but a moment.

By unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution reported this morning from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have some amendments which I desire to offer to the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Nebraska.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,000 copies in cloth, in one volume of the new edition of the Senate Election Cases and of precedents relating to the privileges of the Senate: 1,500 copies to be for the use of the members of the Senate, and 2,500 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, the same to be printed on the back, as follows:

SENATE PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.
ELECTION CASES.
TAFT.
PRECEDENTS
AS TO
PRIVILEGES.
FURBER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that the resolution which was reported this morning?

Mr. MANDERSON. That is the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not catch the reading of it. Will the Senator inform us what it includes?

Mr. MANDERSON. I can tell exactly what it includes. It proposes to issue in one volume form the late edition of Senate Election Cases and add to it Document No. 68, which contains the precedents as to privileges of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do I understand, then, that it will include the volume we already have of precedents of the Senate?

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes; and of contested election cases. It is the document which was laid on the desk this morning.

Mr. COCKRELL. There was no volume on contested election cases laid on my desk this morning.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am not referring to that. I am referring to the volume called Precedents Relating to the Privileges of the Senate, which was laid on the desk this morning.

Mr. COCKRELL. It has been on our desks for a week; at least it has been on mine.

Mr. MANDERSON. I only saw it this morning.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that it is to be added to the volume on contested elections.

Mr. MANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will that volume of contested elections include those of the present session?

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not know of any contested election cases during the present session.

Mr. STEWART. There were three during the extraordinary session.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not know whether it includes those cases or not. It is brought up to a very late day. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] can inform the Senators as to that.

Mr. COCKRELL. The volume certainly ought to bring the cases up to a certain time. There were, I believe, three cases of contest decided at the last session, the first session of this Congress. It seems to me that if we are going to publish a new work it should include all the cases up to date. We have already one bound volume of contested election cases.

Mr. MANDERSON. Not in extra numbers, but only the usual numbers of the last edition.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have the usual number of that edition. I should like, if we are going to print another volume, to have it include all the cases to date. I suppose all the precedents to date have been compiled.

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. If they are not brought up to date, they should at least be brought up to the 4th of last March.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not suppose the volume of Taft referred to includes the three contested election cases disposed of at the last extraordinary session of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does it include those up to the 4th of last March?

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. GORMAN. Up to the end of the last Congress.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is as late as the contested-election cases have been prepared for the Printer. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. COCKRELL. The volume ought to contain all the cases to the end of the Congress.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It ought to include all cases until the end of the first session of the present Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. That would take some time to prepare.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It is well known to the Senate that we had under consideration three very important contests at the extraordinary session, which, after very lengthy debate, were passed upon by the Senate.

Mr. MANDERSON. The trouble is that those contested-election cases, I apprehend, have not been prepared for the Printer, and they certainly have never been printed in the usual number. There will be no difficulty in Mr. Taft, or his successor in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, preparing and adding the late cases.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Does the Senator from Nebraska understand to what date those cases are now brought down?

Mr. MANDERSON. The volume is complete as far as the matter of the privileges of the Senate is concerned.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The volume undertakes to deal with the subject of contests, and for that reason, it seems to me, it ought to include all the contests up to the present time.

Mr. MANDERSON. That can be included in the proposed volume.

Mr. PASCO. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it is intended to put the cases which have been decided during the present Congress in the proposed volume—I mean the Montana and other cases?

Mr. MANDERSON. They will be placed in the volume, provided the clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections will prepare them for the Printer. The Committee on Printing can not prepare them.

Mr. PASCO. Can not the publication be withheld for a week or ten days for that purpose?

Mr. MANDERSON. I have no doubt it can be withheld for that purpose.

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that he allow the resolution to go over.

Mr. MANDERSON. All right; I am willing that the resolution shall go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

RAILROAD OVER HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 4243.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BERRY. I move that Senate bill 420, which refers to the same subject, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOSING OF SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask the indulgence of the Senate for the present consideration of the resolution submitted by me some time since, to rescind the order closing the Senate Chamber to visitors.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution referred to by the Senator from Kansas will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PEFFER December 11, 1893:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to rescind an order recently issued requiring that the Senate Chamber be closed to visitors.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MANDERSON. I shall feel bound to object, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that I understand the purpose of the Senator from Kansas to be to submit a very few remarks, and then to allow the resolution to be referred to the Committee on Rules, to which I think the committee will have no objection.

Mr. MANDERSON. Do I understand that final action on the resolution is not now desired?

Mr. PEFFER. I intended to ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules when I have submitted a very few remarks on the subject-matter.

Mr. MANDERSON and Mr. SHERMAN. There is no objection to that.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, for some days past there has been a great deal of criticism in the newspapers on the action of the Committee on Rules, or of some of the officers of this body, in closing the Senate Chamber to visitors. There has also been a good deal of criticism by letter and by word of mouth from individuals concerning the same fact; and it is by reason of that criticism that I have thought it proper to call the attention of the Senate to the subject. In doing so, I have not been unmindful of the delicacy of the situation and of the proprieties concerning it, and for some time hesitated as to the best manner of approaching the subject; but the more I reflected upon it, the more appropriate it seemed that attention should be called to the matter in this public way.

The subject itself is of sufficient importance to justify public action on the part of the Senate. We all know that the people are becoming very sensitive about everything of this character, more especially since what transpired during the last extraordinary session. It has become common in many parts of the country to designate this body as the American House of Lords. In view of that fact, and of many others of like character, I thought it was well now that the resolution should be taken up and that some public action be taken in relation to it.

In calling attention to the matter, I wish to say for my own part that it is not my purpose, in any manner or to any extent, to criticise either the committee or any officer of the body. I have no doubt that what has been done was done from the very best motives. I do not know, indeed, what was the cause of the order; I only know the fact; but it seems to me that it is due to the public that some official statement should be made concerning the cause of the order, if such a one has been made.

Mr. SHERMAN. What was the order?

Mr. PEFFER. The Senator from Ohio asks me what has been the order. I do not know what order has been issued, but the matter about which I am speaking is the closing of the Senate Chamber to visitors. It is commonly remarked in the newspapers, and I find it to be understood by the people who come here, that from the hour of 9 o'clock in the morning until the meeting of the Senate, this Chamber is closed, which is practically shutting the people out of this place.

As I have said, it is not my purpose in any respect nor to any extent to criticise unfavorably the action of the officers of this body. Our Sergeant-at-Arms is a most efficient officer, courteous in every respect, careful, obliging, and earnest in his efforts to preserve the public comfort; but while doing that, it seems to me the order, or whatever it may be called, ought to be rescinded.

My intention is not, I repeat, to criticise the action of the Committee on Rules or of the officers specially charged with the care of the Senate Chamber, for it is to be presumed that they have done what they regarded as a thing proper to be done. The purpose of the resolution is to take the sense of the Senate on the question whether the room in which this body sits shall be closed to persons visiting the Capitol.

This building does not belong to the Senate nor to Senators. It was erected by authority of the people, at their expense, and for the convenience and comfort of the persons chosen to transact the public business here. It belongs to the people of the United States; their money paid for every atom of its many parts. We are its custodians only. It is our duty to take good care of it, and we have chosen a small army of men to assist us in that respect. At every entrance to the Senate Chamber we have stationed two doorkeepers; every door of the galleries has its guard; every committee room has its messenger, and some of them two clerks. There is not a nook or corner of the great building that is not within the jurisdiction of someone always on duty.

Besides this corps of officers there is on duty constantly a large body of trained policemen, who move about the corridors to preserve order. In this Chamber we have officers charged specially with its care, men of keen sight and alert movement, always faithful and ready for emergencies.

With all this able-bodied force, it is submitted that there is little ground for apprehension that any serious loss will occur by reason of the ill behavior of relic-hunters.

This Chamber has in its history and associations much to interest our people. A visit to the city of Washington by a stranger is not complete without a personal inspection of the room where the Senate holds its sessions and a stroll over its historic floors.

To my mind, Mr. President, it is cruel to close these doors in the faces of the people. It is proper to keep out disorderly persons, and to protect the property in our keeping against vandalism; but it is not proper to say to the people who own the building, the people who sent us here and whose servants we are, "You shall not enter here."

I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be so referred.

Mr. MANDERSON. Before this matter passes away, I think it no more than right to say that no member of the Committee on Rules knows of any order of the character specified by the Senator from Kansas. I have just had a hurried conversation with the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, who says that the rule or order under which he is acting has been among the rules of the Senate for a great many years, that it fell into disuse about ten years ago, and that he has simply acted under a rule which has existed a very great length of time.

Mr. CULLOM. What is that rule?

Mr. MANDERSON. I was searching for it when the Senator from Kansas yielded the floor. I shall try to obtain it.

The reason for the exclusion of the public during the hours when the Senate force is busy and the pages are at work preparing the files and distributing the documents which are daily distributed upon the desks here, is because the Senate Chamber and the adjacent rooms have been subject to the misconduct of those who seem to take a delight in injuring, destroying, and stealing public property. One of the doorkeepers of the Senate, who has charge of this floor and who has charge of the pages, has told me that within the last few weeks—since the Senate commenced its session. I think, was his statement—there have been stolen from the desks of the Senators during the morning hours four or five inkstands filled with ink and eight or ten of the sand-receptacles on the desks of Senators, and so the Sergeant-at-Arms has thought it well to protect public property by the enforcement of this old rule.

There has been no action by the Committee on Rules. The action taken, whatever it may have been, has been by the efficient Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate in the performance of what he thought it his duty to do under the circumstances.

Mr. PEFFER. It is that rule which I ask to have rescinded.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it is no more than justice to say this much in behalf of the officer of this body who has particular charge of this Chamber. He says further that no reputable person, no one who can be conceived to have business upon the Senate floor, or who was here from a proper curiosity, has been excluded during these hours, but that the effort has been to keep away from here some people who should be entirely excluded from the Capitol and not permitted in any part of it.

Mr. PEFFER. If the taking of a few inkstands away from the desks of Senators is the only occasion of this rule, I submit that it is high time that the rule should be rescinded. I discovered one day that my own inkstand, or the inkstand from the desk which I occupy, had been removed, but I supposed that some friend had come along, and knowing that I was from Kansas, took it to be dynamite, and removed it for the safety of the public property. But I know of nothing else that has been done.

Seriously, Mr. President, this matter ought to be dealt with not in a light way; it ought not to be disposed of rudely nor harshly, but with due deliberation and with due respect to the rights of the people.

I submit that it is cruel to keep well-behaved, sane, healthy persons out of this Chamber. A person who would be under the common law admitted to a public inn ought to be admitted into this Chamber at all times, under proper regulations, of course, when it is not in use by the Senate. That has been the rule, as I understand. I did not know until recently that there was ever any occasion for closing the doors against the public.

I did not know that such a rule as that to which the Senator refers had ever been adopted; but I did know that the Chamber was not closed in the face of the people, for I have been through the Chamber myself before I was a member of this body, and I have seen many other persons go through it. Indeed, I did not know that there was any intention to exclude anybody until recently; and in speaking of the matter, I repeat, I do it with the kindest feeling toward everyone, not to criticise anybody, but I think it is due to the public that some action of the Senate should be taken immediately.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I have seen a statement printed in the press throughout the country that recently a change had taken place here, so that persons visiting the Capitol could not, when the Senate was not actually in session, pass through this Chamber. The custom has always been since I have been here, when the Senate was not actually sitting, that visitors were permitted to go through this Chamber, inspect the seats, and look over the surroundings. That was a custom which, so far as I am concerned, I think was entirely proper. What change has now been made or by whom ordered I do not know.

It is also alleged in the newspapers that recently an order has been made that the elevator shall be for the exclusive use of Senators. I do not know whether that statement is true or not. If true, I do not know by whom it has been ordered, but I think it is not well, unless there is a strong reason for it, to change the usages which have existed for a long period of time, and to which the people have been accustomed.

I do think, unless injury is resulting to the public property; unless business is going on here with which their presence would interfere; that all persons coming to the Capitol, who conduct themselves as ladies and gentlemen, should have a right to pass through this Chamber and pass up and down in the elevator in the building, when it does not interfere with the business of the Senate.

That is my opinion about this question. I do not know who has it in charge, but I hope the committee which does have it in charge will examine the matter and see if there is an overwhelming reason why the custom which has so long prevailed here shall be changed.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I want the Senate to act advisedly upon this resolution. Whilst the Committee on Rules has made no order I probably am the only member of that committee who is responsible for the order the Sergeant-at-Arms has made and I mean here and now to assert that it was entirely proper that he should have both the orders of which complaint has been made here.

As to the right of the public to come into this Chamber up to within a few moments of the hour designated by the rules of the Senate for the Senate to convene, I take it that every Senator sees the propriety of and indorses the action that official of this Chamber took. I do not know where to fasten the responsibility, but acts of theft, petty larceny subject to indictment were so frequent in this Chamber that the Sergeant-at-Arms found it necessary, or thought it was necessary, to shut those people out.

As to cutting off one of the two elevators in the Senate wing, I am sure that the Sergeant-at-Arms, like myself, is more than willing to submit that question to the judgment of the Senate. There are two elevators in this wing of the Capitol. It may be the fault of Senators or it may be their misforture, but very often the electric bells sound calling a vote or announcing a roll call upon an important matter, and every Senator here knows, as I know, and they can bear testimony as I do bear testimony to the fact that we would go to either elevator and find crowds of people—tourists, curiosity-hunters, whoever they might be—who would deprive us of the chance to get to this Chamber in order to answer to our names on the call.

Now, it was deemed fair not to reserve the right to the Senate exclusively, but to the Senators and to everybody who had business with the Senate, to use one elevator and to turn the other over the public generally. That order was made. The

Committee on Rules was not responsible for that order, but I, as a member of that committee, assumed the responsibility by saying to the Sergeant-at-Arms, as I say here, that I thought it was proper and right that it should be done.

This building was not designed or erected for sight-seers. It was established here for the purposes of legislation, and to debar a member of the Senate who in the discharge of his duty may be in his committee room transacting business the Senate has imposed upon him, whilst every excursionist of the land uses the elevators to his exclusion, was a thing indefensible to me. Whilst I disclaim for the Committee on Rules any responsibility, I desire to avow my own responsibility and to assert that the Sergeant-at-Arms may hold me responsible. I thought it was enough if we should turn over one of the two elevators of this wing of the Capitol to the general public and reserve the other one, not to Senators alone, but to those who under the rules are entitled to transact business with the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. Including members of the press.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes; I thank the Senator from Maryland for the suggestion. That order included the members of the press, and they have the same rights there that Senators have.

One thing more, Mr. President. The room of the Committee on Appropriations is the objective point of all the organized lobbies that infest or beset the Capitol. Its door is on the same floor with this Chamber, Its door opens right adjoining the elevator which has been reserved. Its members (I have a right to speak for them for I am one of its members) find it difficult to leave this Chamber and get to that committee room on a call of its honored chairman, or to get back from that committee room to this Chamber, without being beset by every paid lobbyist who was ever sent here to aid in pressing every nefarious scheme of legislation that comes before Congress. The closing of that elevator protected and sheltered that committee room. It did more. It sheltered the approach to the President's room, reserved for him, and it sheltered the approach to the Marble room, reserved for those visitors whom Senators are willing to have admitted.

This action was not without precedent. If I may be permitted to refer to the other House of Congress, I would suggest that it was exactly in line with the policy pursued there, which experience demonstrated to be necessary.

I know, Mr. President, it is charged through the public prints, and I at least am advised by private mail, that the Senate is seeking to make itself an exclusive body, and the very regulations which are now under consideration have been suggested and paraded as proof. The facts are fairly stated. The Sergeant-at-Arms adopted the rules without authority from the Committee on Rules, but with my sanction, for I believed that they were necessary to the decent and orderly conduct of this body. It is meet and proper that the attention of the Senate should be called to the matter, and I have no regret that the attention of the Senate has been called to it. I am entirely content to have not the Committee on Rules but the Senate itself pass upon it and to determine whether we are to protect ourselves or not.

I do not know that anyone ever complained that the other House undertook to protect its members in their right to get to its roll calls and its votes; but it seems that we are to be denied that privilege, and that if an excursion party of a thousand people come here to infest the Capitol your electric bells may ring and a Senator can not get from his committee room to his place in the Chamber until the traveling public has been accommodated.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BLACKBURN. With great pleasure.

Mr. BERRY. Is it now the rule of the other House that no one is permitted to go on the floor of the House in the morning prior to the session of that body?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not know that such a rule or regulation prevails.

Mr. BERRY. I understood the Senator to say it did.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I did not mean to be understood as asserting that. What I meant to say was that the House wing of the Capitol has two elevators, just as the Senate wing of the Capitol has two, and that the House has found it necessary to close one of them against the general public just as the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate closed one of these. I did not mean to say that the public were excluded from the other House before the meeting of that body; but I did mean to say, and I mean now to repeat, that in my judgment the Sergeant-at-Arms acted wisely when he closed this Chamber against the incursions that you and every one of us have witnessed here every day, if indeed we were fortunate enough to come before the hour of our meeting.

I am perfectly content to have the Senate pass upon the action of the Sergeant-at-Arms on both these propositions. I simply meant to have the Senate understand that while the Committee on Rules had taken no action, I, as a member of that committee and its chairman, had cordially indorsed the action of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate.

Mr. President, may I add just one word? There are committee rooms that have been added, located in what is known as the terrace of this building. That improvement or extension of the Capitol was completed probably two years ago. Those rooms are there. On the report of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate Congress purchased a piece of property known as the Maltby Building situated 300 yards from the Capitol. The necessities of this body in the nature of committee rooms forced the assignment of Senators both to the terrace and the Maltby Building.

Now, let your electric bell ring announcing a call of the Senate or a vote by yeas and nays, and you will agree with me that if a Senator's committee room is in the terrace or in the Maltby Building, where my friend, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], has his quarters, from neither could he answer to roll call or to vote if he found an elevator blocked and himself refused the right of transmission to this floor. It is simply a question of the personal convenience of Senators. I can stand it as well as others. I am glad the question is brought up. I am glad to have it settled without the authority of the Committee on Rules to support the action of the Sergeant-at-Arms; but I venture nothing in the assertion that his action in both these particulars is indorsed by every member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the Sergeant-at-Arms has evidently done nothing but his duty in obeying the orders of the Senate, or the orders of those to whom he looks as representative of the Senate; but I do not receive quite happily all the expressions of the Senator from Kentucky. I hear him speaking of thousands of excursionists coming here to "infest" the Capitol.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the Senator will permit me, I did not mean to criticise anybody who was brought here, either by curiosity or interest, to see the Capitol of the country. Upon the contrary, I wish that every man, woman, and child in this land was required to come at least once and see the Capitol, in order to appreciate the greatness of the country that it represents.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator has qualified the expression very much, and I am glad I gave him the opportunity, for the expression was, "Suppose a thousand excursionists should come here to infest the Capitol."

But I think it ought also to be said that the Senator somewhat exaggerates the number of bad people, the mischievous people, the thieves, or the disreputable lobbyists who come about here. I have been here only about thirteen years, but I have never been seriously troubled by any of those classes. All or nearly all of the large committee are in a sense claims committeess. Take, for example, the Military Committee, on which I have served for many years, which is down on the floor below. We have never found any difficulty there in protecting our doors by our messengers. I am aware that sometimes the crowd gathers a little at the elevator near the Appropriation Committee room door; but in going there to go down the elevator I never have any difficulty, I am sure.

I join with the Senator now, as he expresses himself, in congratulating the country upon the number of people who come here. It always gives me profound pleasure to see a thousand excursionists come here, and I have frequent occasion—I had it to-day—to express my delight at meeting friends here who never had been in the Capitol before. I devoted two hours of this afternoon to endeavoring to entertain them and guide them about this building. I wish it were in some proper way made compulsory for every adult citizen of the United States to come here once before he was 40 years old, for we know what they say after they have been here. Indeed, they have not been in this town half an hour before they are praising it and expressing their delight with it, and you can not make any one of them say that one extra dollar has been expended in beautifying it, whether upon its public buildings or otherwise.

Now, I think we can get along with this with a little patience. I should like to have people allowed to come through this Chamber. It is a recollection for a lifetime for the young people who walk through here and sit for a moment in these chairs, even the Vice-President's chair, that they will remember always. One or two or three persons watching over, if it was necessary to take extra persons, would cost comparatively little.

As to the use of the elevator, if upon the ringing of the Senate bells the men who run the elevators understand that they are to close those machines absolutely against any persons but Senators for just a few minutes, the object will be gained; we can get there and get up; but nine-tenths of us ordinarily when we are in a hurry to answer a call get up the steps quicker than we get up the elevator anyhow. As to the Maltby Building, or-

dinarily no man gets here from there in time to answer to his name. Unless there be some explanation, or a failure to have a quorum, or something of the kind, indeed he can not get here anyway; that is out of the question.

I hope this matter will be liberally managed, and if necessary the number of sharp, active, attentive guards may be increased: but I am not willing, except as to one small regulation in regard to the elevator to make any serious change in the old rules.

Mr. BLACKBURN and Mr. HARRIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. I was going to inquire if a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules is pending?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose for the purpose of making that motion. I think the resolution ought to go to the committee. Let the committee take up the whole subject-matter, and thoroughly and quietly consider it and determine exactly what, in the opinion of that committee, should be done, and submit its report to the Senate for future action.

Mr. BERRY. I agree about that.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I asked recognition just as my friend from Tennessee took the floor to make the very same suggestion and to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the resolution, as I understand it, proposes to instruct the Committee on Rules to rescind a rule which the committee never made. The committee has never made any rule nor read nor heard of such a rule as the resolution proposes to rescind. I had simply risen to ask that the matter might be referred to the Committee on Rules, in order that it might have a chance to submit its views on both these questions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have the resolution read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to rescind an order recently issued requiring that the Senate Chamber be closed to visitors.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, as I tried to state very clearly in the beginning, I did not know when or where the rule had originated, and I hesitated for some time to know just how I ought to proceed. I finally concluded that this would be the best way in order that even in this clumsy manner the subject might be brought to the attention of the Senate and to the committee, and that the committee charged with the subject-matter might examine the question carefully and make such report to the Senate as in the judgment of the committee ought to be made. That is my view of the matter now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] to refer the pending resolution to the Committee on Rules.

The motion was agreed to.

NONRESIDENT PENSIONERS.

Mr. PALMER. I beg the unanimous consent of the Senate to take up and consider the bill (S. 1138) to repeal so much of a proviso of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," and approved March 1, 1893, as relates to the payment of pensions to nonresidents who are not citizens of the United States.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PALMER. I ask that the Secretary may read from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions that which I point out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

A clause of chapter 137 of the public acts of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress provides:

"That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to a nonresident, who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service."

I respectfully ask your attention to this clause, in the hope that you may recommend its repeal. It causes great trouble and annoyance to the excepted classes, who constitute the great bulk of nonresident pensioners, in compelling them to make proof that they belong to these excepted classes. And the final result is that payments under it are withheld from but few save widows and dependent mothers, who have little else for their maintenance. The saving is too little to offset the suffering inflicted in individual cases. If all nonresidents were refused payments of pension, some plausible argument might be made in support of such policy; but none can be urged in favor of this law, which, while giving annoyance to all, strikes only the most helpless.

I should not feel warranted in asking attention to this law but for the fact that it entails much work on this Bureau in answering communications, and seems to yield little practical results except annoyance and apparent cruelty. I recognize to the fullest extent that my sole duty is to execute and administer the laws as they are enacted—fairly and honestly interpreted.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner*.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 18, 1893, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1893.

CONSUL.

Marcellus L. Davis, of Arkansas, to be consul of the United States at Merida, Mexico.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

William P. Wooten, of Russellville, Ark., to be register of the land office at Dardanelle, Ark.

Jesse Ross, of Arkadelphia, Ark., to be register of the land office at Camden, Ark.

John P. Clendenin, of Gassville, Ark., to be register of the land office at Harrison, Ark.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John A. Bunch, of Kingston, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Harrison, Ark.

David Dixon, of Magnolia, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Camden, Ark.

Benjamin H. Crowley, of Paragould, Ark., to be receiver of public moneys at Little Rock, Ark.

POSTMASTER.

William F. Cass, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14, 1893.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Charles W. Dabney, jr., of Tennessee, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

John R. Procter, of Kentucky, to be Civil Service Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION.

Eugene T. Chamberlain, of New York, to be Commissioner of Navigation.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE CUTTER SERVICE.

Carl M. Green, of New York, to be Second Assistant Engineer in the Revenue Cutter Service.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

Commodore Francis M. Ramsay, to be chief of the Bureau of Navigation in the Department of the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Paymaster Albert D. Bache, to be a pay inspector.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Arthur Peterson, to be a paymaster.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Ambrose K. Michler, to be a paymaster.

Passed Assistant Paymaster William W. Galt, to be a paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster Samuel L. Heap, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster John Q. Lovell, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster James S. Phillips, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Passed Assistant Engineer William S. Moore, to be a chief engineer.

Passed Assistant Engineer George Cowie, to be a chief engineer.

Passed Assistant Engineer Charles P. Howell, to be a chief engineer.

Assistant Engineer William Strother Smith, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Assistant Engineer Gustav Kaemmerling, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Assistant Engineer Kenneth McAlpine, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Assistant Engineer Clarence H. Mathews, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Assistant Engineer DeWitt C. Redgrave, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Assistant Engineer William W. White, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Assistant Engineer Bias C. Sampson, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Lieutenant (junior grade) John G. Quinby, to be a lieutenant.

Ensign John A. Hoogewerff, to be a lieutenant, junior grade.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Albert E. Amsbary, of Delta, Colo., to be register of the land office at Montrose, Colo.

Andrew F. Snelling, of North Yakima, Wash., to be register of the land office at North Yakima, Wash.

POSTMASTERS.

James W. Forbis, to be postmaster at Greensboro, in the county of Guilford and State of North Carolina.

Amos K. Bradley, to be postmaster at Madisonville, in the county of Hopkins and State of Kentucky.

Joseph E. Grobmyer, to be postmaster at Carrollton, in the county of Carroll and State of Kentucky.

Green A. Denham, to be postmaster at Williamsburg, in the county of Whitley and State of Kentucky.

Charles C. Collings, to be postmaster at Gloucester City, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey.

Philip E. Tufts, to be postmaster at Rahway, in the county of Union and State of New Jersey.

Maggie M. Moore, to be postmaster at Yorkville, in the county of York and State of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, MILITARY ACADEMY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the buildings and grounds of the Military Academy, submitted by the Secretary of War; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate submitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the restoration of certain unexpended balances; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FINDINGS COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House communications from the Court of Claims, transmitting copy of findings in the cases of the following parties *vs.* The United States, namely, W. H. Woodward, Phil Davis, W. C. Grisson, S. M. Golden, A. T. Blick, and J. R. Ferrill; which were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING, POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up for consideration at this time the bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this bill, reported from the Joint Commission, is subject to be called up at any time, that right having been granted by the House. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act approved January 3, 1887, modifying certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and entitled "An act to modify the postal money-order system, and for other purposes," and the first section and such provisions of the second section as are applicable to postal notes of the act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to modify the postal money-order system, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, repealed, but nothing herein contained shall prevent the payment, after July 1, 1894, in the manner provided by existing law, of postal notes issued prior to that date, and any such postal notes, if presented for payment more than one year from the last day of the month of their issue, may be paid by warrant, as provided by section 4 of this act in the case of money orders.

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the said act of March 3, 1883, as amended by the act of June 29, 1886, entitled "An act to reduce the fee on domestic money orders for sums not exceeding $5," be amended to read as follows:

"That a money order shall not be issued for more than $100, and that fees for domestic money orders shall be as follows; to wit:

"For orders not exceeding $2.50, 3 cents.

"For orders exceeding $2.50 and not exceeding $5, 5 cents.

"For orders exceeding $5 and not exceeding $10, 8 cents.

"For orders exceeding $10 and not exceeding $20, 10 cents.

"For orders exceeding $20 and not exceeding $30, 12 cents.

"For orders exceeding $30 and not exceeding $40, 15 cents.

"For orders exceeding $40 and not exceeding $50, 18 cents.

"For orders exceeding $50 and not exceeding $60, 20 cents.

"For orders exceeding $60 and not exceeding $75, 25 cents.

"For orders exceeding $75 and not exceeding $100, 30 cents."

SEC. 3. That section 4 of said act of March 3, 1883, as amended by the act of June 29, 1886, entitled, "An act to make the allowances for clerk hire to postmasters of the first and second class post-offices cover the cost of clerical labor in the money-order business, and for other purposes," be amended to read as follows:

"That postmasters at money-order post-offices of the first and second classes may be allowed by the Postmaster-General to employ such number of clerks in the transaction of their money-order business, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as he may deem expedient.

"The allowances for clerk hire made to postmasters of the first and second class post-offices by the Postmaster-General, out of the annual appropriation for clerks in post-offices, shall cover the cost of clerical services of all kinds in such post-offices, including the cost of clerical labor in the money-order business.

"And at all other money-order post-offices the compensation for the clerical labor in the money-order business shall be paid out of the fees received for the issue of money orders, and shall be 3 cents for each domestic or international money order issued:

"*Provided*, That the Postmaster-General may allow to the postmaster at each international exchange office such additional amount in each case, out of the annual appropriation for clerks in post-offices, as he may deem expedient to enable these postmasters to obtain the clerical labor necessary for the performance of such special duties as are imposed upon them by the operations of the money-order system and are not required of other postmasters:

"*And provided further*, That the salaries of postmasters, as fixed by law, shall be deemed and taken to be full compensation for the responsibility and risk incurred and for the personal services rendered by them as custodians of the money-order and other funds of the Post-Office Department."

SEC. 4. That section 5 of said act of March 3, 1883, be amended to read as follows:

"That the auditor of the treasury for the Post-Office Department shall, immediately after the close of the present fiscal year, transmit to the Postmaster-General a statement of the aggregate amount of domestic money orders and postal notes which shall have remained unpaid for a period of one year or more from the last day of the month of their issue.

It shall be the duty of the postmasters at all money-order offices to render to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department a monthly statement, beginning at the end of the first month of the next fiscal year, of all domestic money orders payable at their respective offices, as evidenced by advice, remaining unpaid for one year from the last day of the month of issue, such statement to be accompanied by the advice, and not to include any money orders issued at a date prior to June 30, 1893; and the amount of money represented by the Auditor's statement, and by the monthly statements of the postmasters, as certified to the Postmaster-General by the Auditor, shall be turned into the Treasury by the Postmaster-General for account of the Post-Office Department to be used as current revenues. And thereafter domestic money orders shall not be paid at the offices upon which they are drawn, or at the offices of issue after one year from the last day of the month of issue of such money orders; but such money orders shall be sent to the Post-Office Department, and shall be paid by a warrant of the Postmaster-General countersigned by the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the Post-Office Department, to the extent of the moneys paid in on this account, the payments so made to be charged to an appropriation account hereby created to be denominated "Unpaid money orders more than one year old."

SEC. 5. That section 4036 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be repealed.

SEC. 6. That section 4039 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by adding the following:

"That it shall be the duty of the postmasters to attach to their accounts rendered to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department the letters of advice, or if lost evidence of that fact, recalled from the post-office to which originally sent for all repayments of domestic money orders provided for in this section and in section 4038 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

SEC. 7. That section 4033 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster-General shall supply such money-order offices, as he may deem expedient, with blank forms of applications for money orders, in such form as he may direct."

SEC. 8. That section 4044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1893, approved July 16, 1892, be amended so as to read as follows:

"It shall be the duty of postmasters at post-offices authorized to issue money orders to render to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department monthly, semimonthly, weekly, semiweekly, or daily accounts of all money orders issued and paid, of all fees received for issuing them, of all transfers and payments made from money-order funds, and of all money received to be used for the payment of money orders or on account of money-order business."

SEC. 9. That section 4034 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended so as to read as follows:

"The Postmaster-General shall furnish money-order offices with printed or engraved forms for domestic money orders in such form as will provide for coupons that, by the separation from the money orders, will designate the amounts for which the money orders are drawn, and no money order shall be valid unless drawn upon such form. And it shall be the duty of postmasters to forward to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department said coupons with their money-order accounts."

SEC. 10. That the Postmaster-General may authorize postmasters at post-offices other than those designated as money-order offices to issue money orders in the same form as provided for in the preceding section of this act, excepting that such money orders shall be in such form as to prevent their being drawn for a sum in excess of $5; the rates for such money orders to be the same as those provided for in section 2 of this act, and post-offices so authorized shall be designated "limited money-order offices."

SEC. 11. That section 4040 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended so as to read as follows:

"Whenever a money order has been lost within one year from the last day of the month of issue the Postmaster-General, upon the application of the remitter or payee of such order, may cause a duplicate thereof to be issued, without charge, providing the person losing the original shall furnish a certificate from the postmaster by whom it was payable that it has not been, and will not thereafter be, paid; and a similar certificate from the postmaster by whom it was issued that it has not been, and will not thereafter be, repaid.

"Whenever a money order which has not been paid within one year from the last day of the month of issue has been lost, the Postmaster-General, upon the application of the remitter or payee of such order, shall issue a warrant for the payment thereof, as provided for in section 4 of this act, without charge, on the certificate of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, or upon such other proof satisfactory to the Postmaster-General, that the order has not been paid."

SEC. 12. That the Postmaster-General is hereby invested with power to make all needful regulations for the enforcement of this act, and is hereby authorized to designate any officer of the Post-Office Department above the grade of fourth-class clerk to sign all warrants authorized by this act in his stead, and such warrants when so signed shall be of the same validity as if they had been signed by the Postmaster-General.

SEC. 13. That this act shall take effect from and after the 1st day of July, 1894; and all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. DOCKERY. In view of the fact that this is the unanimous report of the joint commission, I ask consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOCKERY. I now submit the report of the joint commission, and will ask the attention of members to its reading, as it sets forth the reasons in detail for the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The report (by Mr. DOCKERY) was read, as follows:

The Joint Commission of Congress to Inquire into the Status of Laws Organizing the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4010) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report it back herewith and recommend its passage.

The bill has been carefully examined, and is approved by the Postmaster-General.

Section 1 of the bill abolishes the postal note. The advisability of this is generally conceded. The postal note was intended to afford an opportunity to send an odd amount of change through the mails. It affords no security, and if lost no duplicate by law is allowed to be issued. It causes great inconvenience and annoyance to newspapers and large institutions that receive money through the mail, as, when the inclosure is not in the letter, correspondence is necessary, and the individual who sends the postal note is frequently not aware that in buying a postal note he has no security whatever.

The fee that is charged for a postal note is 3 cents up to and including amounts for which they can be issued, viz, $4.99. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, the average amount for which postal notes were issued was $1.68, so it is evident that a large proportion of them were issued for amounts less than $2.50. By the change proposed in fees by section 2 of the bill, a money order can be issued for an amount as great as $2.50 for 3 cents. This would supply the facilities now afforded by the postal note. Any one who desires to send money must be aware to whom he wishes to send it, and if it is sent to a party who is not convenient to a money-order post-office, he simply has to indorse the money order over to some one who is convenient to a money-order post-office, or indorse it in blank and send it to some one who will collect it for him, who may fill in the name for proper identification and obtain the money on the order, or send it to the bank.

Section 2 of the proposed act reduces the fees charged for money orders and brings them to the same basis as is now charged by the various express companies. The reduction takes place in the fees charged for orders exceeding 15 cents, as per the following schedule:

	Cents.
For orders not exceeding $2.50	3
For orders exceeding—	
$2.50 and not exceeding $5	5
$5 and not exceeding $10	8
$10 and not exceeding $20	10
$20 and not exceeding $30	12
$30 and not exceeding $40	15
$40 and not exceeding $50	18
$50 and not exceeding $60	20
$60 and not exceeding $75	25
$75 and not exceeding $100	30

The present rates for the issue of money orders are as follows:

	Cents.
For orders not exceeding $5	5
For orders exceeding—	
$5 and not exceeding $10	8
$10 and not exceeding $15	10
$15 and not exceeding $30	15
$30 and not exceeding $40	20
$40 and not exceeding $50	25
$50 and not exceeding $60	30
$60 and not exceeding $70	35
$70 and not exceeding $80	40
$80 and not exceeding $100	45

The reduction in the rates for the larger orders will give the Government more business in those orders for the reason that the express companies have been obtaining that business, charging less fees than the Government, while the Government has been doing a larger business in the smaller orders, which must necessarily be done at a loss.

These rates were recommended by the Superintendent of the Money-Order System in his reports for the year ending June 30, 1892, and June 30, 1893, excepting that in neither case did he recommend the 3-cent rate for orders up to $2.50. The rate for small orders is made to take the place of the rate now charged for postal notes, without which there would be cause for complaint.

There has been no estimate made of the probable increase of business under these new rates; indeed, there is no basis upon which to make such an estimate, yet it is confidently believed that the increase will be very considerable when the reduced rates go into effect.

The money-order business grew gradually from its organization in 1864, showing an increase both in the amount and number of orders issued and of the fees received therefor, until the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, when the amount of fees was $1,102,839; since which time they have never been so great until the year just closed, when the amount of fees exceeded by only a little over $17,000 that of 1883.

The postal-note business began in 1884, the year following the one just referred to with respect to the large money-order business, and grew in five years, say, in 1888, to the largest amount ever realized for the sale of postal notes until the last fiscal year. The revenue in fees from that source have increased but little since 1888, when there was $200,341 received for fees, and in the year just closed but $233,000. Thus it will appear that there has been no growth in the revenue from the money-order business in the past ten years, and but little in the postal-note business for the past five years; so that while the postal-note business for the first five years of its existence might account for the failure of the money-order business to increase, it has not continued to account therefor since, and the money-order and postal-note business taken together could at best only show an increase in the issue of orders for less than $5, all of which are known to be at a loss to the Government. Thus the necessity is apparent for a schedule that will produce an increase in the business of the larger orders and yield some profit to the Government, whilst at the same time affording cheap facilities to the public for the transmission of money.

The history of the growth of the postal service, and in fact all other features of the Government's business, is too well known to need discussion here; but it affords proof of the fact that the volume of the money-order and postal-note business has not grown as it should have.

Section 3 proposes to reduce the fee paid to postmasters for the issuing of money orders to 3 cents. This applies to third and fourth class postmasters, as first and second class postmasters at present—and no change is made as to this provision—receive an allowance for clerk hire requisite for the work that is done in the money-order business.

Third and fourth class postmasters now receive 3½ cents for each money order issued and the same for each money order paid or repaid, and 1 cent for each postal note issued and three-fourths of a cent for each postal note paid or repaid. The proposed change, to a commission only for orders issued, will not be as disadvantageous to the postmasters as the difference in the commissions now allowed would seem to indicate, as the smaller offices, third and fourth class, do not pay many money orders or postal notes, their work being principally the issuing of orders and postal notes which are paid at the larger offices.

The abolition of the postal note and the authorization of money orders to be issued at the same rate now charged for postal notes up to $2.50, will give the postmasters 3 cents each for the issuing of money orders in the place of the postal notes, for which they now receive a commission of only 1 cent. This would very materially increase their compensation for the issue of smaller orders.

As a general proposition it is manifestly unbusinesslike and improvident to pay a larger fee for the issuing of money orders than the Government receives for the same, that is, 3 cents; likewise to give a commission for the payment of an order, as the Government does not receive any fee for such payment. It is no more equitable to pay a postmaster for the payment of the money order than it would be to make him an allowance of salary based upon the mail which he distributes. His compensation is now based upon the cancellation or sale of stamps.

The apparent reduction in commissions to third and fourth class offices, under the proposed rates, based upon the report of the superintendent of the money-order system for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, is about $50,000. This will principally fall upon the third-class postmasters, for the reason that there is a larger proportion of orders, issued to orders paid in the fourth-class offices than in the third class; and further, by the increase of the commission on orders which take the place of the postal notes, the large number of fourth-class offices which are authorized to issue postal notes and not money orders, which offices by the proposed act will be authorized to issue money orders up to $5, will receive a commission of 3 cents, while under the present law they receive a commission of but 1 cent; and all other fourth-class offices which issue postal notes will receive a commission of 3 cents under the proposed act for money orders which they will issue in lieu of the postal notes now issued.

It is evident, therefore, that the fourth-class offices will not suffer by the proposed change, but will be benefited, and the loss, if any, will fall upon the third-class offices. If this loss should be equal to the amount estimated, $50,000, it will mean an average loss to third-class postmasters of not to exceed $20 each per annum. This possible loss, however, to postmasters will not be actual, as the reduction in the rates of fees charged for money orders, notably the rates for the small money orders to 3 cents, will necessarily increase the volume of business and largely add to the commissions of the postmasters.

By the fourth section of the act of March 3, 1883, the second, third and fourth class postmasters received a commission for the payment and issuing of money orders and postal notes. Second-class postmasters were deprived of this compensation by the act of June 29, 1886, as it was deemed at that time that the compensation of second-class postmasters was sufficient on their salary allowance.

It is claimed by the Post-Office Department that the salary of the third-class postmasters is greater in proportion than that of fourth-class postmasters, and that the fourth-class postmasters are too poorly paid. The reduction of fees proposed will increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters by the increased sale of small orders at their offices, and by increased commissions on the orders which will take the place of postal notes, and it will not take from the third class offices all the commission that they receive from the money-order business, as was done from the second-class offices by the act of June 29, 1886, but will allow them a commission of 3 cents for the issuing of orders. The salary of third-class postmasters ranges from $1,000 to $1,900 per annum. In addition to this they will receive the 3-cent commission for the issuing of orders.

Section four provides for turning into the Treasury, for the account of the Post-Office Department, the funds that are now held by the latter on account of the numerous unpaid domestic money orders and postal notes accumultaed since the organization of the money-order system together with an accurate accounting for the amount involved. The Government has gone on receiving money for issuing these orders and notes and paid it out as they have been presented, and left to chance or guesswork the question of the balance remaining unpaid. Obviously such a plan is very defective.

It is proposed by this section to check out by the reports from the postmasters and the orders received that have been paid, against the report of the office issuing the orders those that have been paid, and determine exactly those remaining unpaid and transfer the amount so ascertained into the Treasury, and from time to time as these old unpaid orders are presented to pay them on the warrant of the Postmaster-General out of the Treasury.

The act further provides that the postmasters shall, by a system of reporting the orders issued upon their offices and not presented for payment within one year from the date of their issue, afford the Auditor's Office a convenient and systematic method of keeping a record of and a check upon the outstanding orders more than one year old from and after the date on which the Auditor's Office will have determined the aggregate balance from the commencement of the money-order system, so that from time to time the record will be complete and accurate of all orders outstanding unpaid.

There can be no question of the propriety of having the money represented by these unpaid orders covered into the Treasury. The work of getting the money out by reason of the Postmaster-General's warrant will be no greater than is now done by the issuance of a duplicate order.

The act of March 3, 1883, provided that this account of unpaid orders should be made up to within seven years after the date of their issue. Ten clerks have for more than ten years been appropriated for annually for the purpose of making up this account. Only a part of it, however, was done. That por-

tion may be utilized in the work that is contemplated now. The accumulations of these orders to date is estimated to amount to something like $3,000,000, on account of which there was recently tranferred to the Treasury, to the credit of the Post-Office Department, $1,250,000. The purpose is to proceed on the same lines and make the operation complete and exact.

Section 5 repeals the section of the statutes which now provides for the payment of a money order more than one year old by issuing a new order in lieu of the old one by the Postmaster-General. It is necessary to repeal this section to avoid any conflict between it and the provisions of the next preceding section of the bill.

Section 6 amends by adding to an existing section of the statutes the requirement that postmasters shall attach to their reports, to the Auditor, of money orders repaid at their offices, the advice sent to the office upon which the order was drawn, which, as a matter of course, must be recalled for the purpose of preventing the office to which the advice was sent reporting the same to the Auditor as unpaid, after it will have been in his hands more than a year. Otherwise, the office upon which the order was drawn will have reported it to the Auditor as unpaid. The Auditor would in due time discover and rectify the error of such postmaster, but it is preferable to reduce such errors to the minimum by affording every facility to prevent them, which this does. The repayment of an order is not in the sense of a separate accounting therefor, but merely to designate it as the liquidation of an order at the office at which it was issued; in other words, to distinguish it from the orders drawn upon that office.

Section 7 of the bill so amends as to abolish the present form of application for money orders, and empowers the Postmaster-General to issue a form requiring less writing, and at only such offices as there appears to be need of having such form. At the smaller offices, where nearly if not quite all of the applicants for money orders are known to the postmaster, there can be no question but that the application form is an unnecessary burden upon the applicant, and naturally makes him seek money orders from the express companies, where the application form is not required. It seems that some form is desirable at the larger offices where, to facilitate the work of the clerks in the post-office, some memorandum of what is desired by the applicant could be made. A blank not unlike those usually found on the outside counters of banks would be sufficient for this purpose.

Section 8 changes an existing statute so that reports from money-order offices will go direct to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department instead of going through the Office of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System. It appears that the work done upon these reports in the Office of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System is of a superficial character; that nothing is proved or checked, and of necessity considerable delay occurs in getting the reports to the Auditor, where the complete check is made and discrepancies are detected.

It is proposed to have these reports go direct to the Auditor, so that he will give immediate attention to all of the features contained within the report, and if there are omissions and discrepancies that indicate the necessity for action on the part of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System with a view to having an inspection of the office, or otherwise, the Auditor will report the same to the superintendent at once and afford every facility for the much-needed supervision over irregularities that are discovered, and this, too, much earlier than is possible under the present system.

It is hardly necessary to point out that everything contained in these reports is essentially of an accounting character, and, like postal accounts, is subject to the direct and immediate supervision of the accounting officer until some irregularity is discovered which requires the supervision of the administrative department, in which event again, like the postal account, the accounting officer would prepare the case for the attention of the Post-Office Department.

The statutes make provision for the Auditor's supervision of these accounts, and to perform the function in a business-like way it is necessary that the reports should reach his office without delay, and thus afford opportunity for prompt action.

Section 9 amends an existing statute which provides for the Postmaster-Generals' issuing to postmasters blank money orders on such printed or engraved forms by adding that the form shall include a coupon, which, when detached from the order, will designate the amount that the order was drawn for. It also provides that the coupon shall be forwarded to the Auditor's Office with the postmaster's report of money orders sold. The distinctive feature of the form, called a "margin check," is not unlike devices now in use for similar and other purposes, and which in this connection will accomplish a very important result; that is, it will enable the Auditor to make a definite check of the postmaster's money-order accounts immediately upon their receipt.

The present system involves delay until the orders issued have been paid, received at the Department, and checked against the report of the office issuing before the debit of that office is fully determined. It will be noticed under such a plan, even if all orders were presented for payment, that it would be several months before the debit of the issuing office could be determined; but the facts are that many orders never have been and probably never will be presented for payment. Thus a definite clearance of the account with the postmaster making sales of such orders is impossible.

It is proposed that these orders shall be prepared in such a small and neat form as to give them an attractive appearance and make them easy to handle and not more cumbersome to the files, the coupon check included, than is the case with the present money-order form.

Section 10 extends the facilities of the proposed money-order system as an office of issue only to small offices that are now enjoying the use of the postal note and that are not regularly designated as money-order offices. There are about seven hundred of these offices, and the provision will afford facilities for transmitting money without which there would be some inconvenience.

Section 11 provides for a means of paying for lost money orders which are covered now by a section of the Revised Statutes, but which need some modification to adapt them to the changed conditions resulting from covering into the Treasury the amount of outstanding unpaid orders more than a year old.

Section 12 is the usual provision for having the preceding sections of the act carried into effect by the proper head of the Department, and makes provision for delegating the work of signing warrants to a substitute in the same language as that in the statutes now in force.

Section 13 fixes a date that appears to be a convenient time for having the provisions of the act take effect, namely, July 1, 1894.

DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS.

For the information of Congress the joint commission submit as an appendix to this report the report of the experts made to the commission under date of September 18 last, which report covers substantially the reforms proposed in the accompanying bill, together with certain modifications of existing regulations for and methods of doing business in the Office of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department and in certain offices of the Post-Office Department; which modification of regulations and methods have been carefully considered by the commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Postmaster-General, and have been approved.

These recommendations will simplify the manner of keeping and auditing accounts in the office of the Auditor and the methods of business in the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General.

There is a great deal of duplication and unnecessary work now done in the Auditor's office; and the changes proposed will effect a more direct and expeditious settlement of accounts, as well as a large saving of clerk hire.

The accounts of the Presidential post-offices have heretofore passed through four divisions of the Sixth Auditor's Office, and it can readily be seen what an unnecessary expense this involved in the simple handling of the accounts. The divisions through which they pass are the examining division, the review division, the bookkeeping division, and the collecting division. In all of these four divisions more or less of examining work is done upon the accounts.

It is now proposed that the accounts of postmasters shall go to one division, where they shall be settled finally, except in cases where the Auditor's clerk finds a difference, when the account will be reviewed by a proposed second division.

By the present system of passing an account through to many divisions the responsibility is divided, and careful and accurate work is not obtained, as is proved by an examination of the work in the Sixth Auditor's office. The larger part of the postal revenues come from post-offices at which there are auditors, and those accounts are very carefully prepared; and upon their receipt in the Auditor's office, by the proposed plan, it is intended that the accounts shall be taken up at once, certain clerks to examine the allowance for railway mail clerks and letter-carriers, other clerks to examine the accounts for certificates of deposit, etc., and the account to be finally disposed of, correspondence written and passed over to the proposed correspondence and files division, where errors will be reviewed and proper entries made for the filing of the accounts.

In addition to the safeguard of this complete and consistent audit of the accounts, it is proposed that a change shall be made in the stamp accounts, by which the postmaster renders to the Third Assistant Posmaster-General a statement of the stamps which he has received during the quarter, the amount that he has sold or returned to the Department, and the balance he has on hand. The Third Assistant Postmaster-General is to check this account by the stamp ledgers which he has in his office, and is to certify the statement and send to the Auditor with the receipts for the stamps.

This will give the Auditor a complete check of the stamp account of the postmaster, which is the basis for his account; and the system will comply with the law (United States Revised Statutes, section 405), which requires that the Postmaster-General shall certify to the Auditor that which in any way affects the accounts. This law is not now complied with as regards postage stamps. By this statement of the stamp account, coming through the Third Assistant Postmaster-General's Office, another check is obtained upon the account, which is a more important and valuable check than any check that could take its place in the Sixth Auditor's Office. The system of checking postage stamp accounts now is very unsatisfactory and unreliable.

At present clerks of the Sixth Auditor's Office, at such times as it is convenient, copy into ledgers the items of stamps that have been charged to the postmasters by the ledgers of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General's Office. This is informal and irregular, and applies to the Presidential offices.

For the fourth-class postmasters' accounts the only evidence that the Auditor now has as to the stamps sent is the receipts which have been forwarded to him from the Third Assistant Postmaster-General's Office. If by chance any of these receipts have gone astray and the postmaster should fail to charge himself with the stamps, the error might not be discovered.

The clerical force of the Auditor's Office as now organized is as follows:

Division.	No. of clerks.	Amount of salaries.
Examining division	20	$30,200
Pay division	25	39,000
Review division	11	17,200
Foreign division	13	17,400
Bookkeeping divisions	77	95,240
Collecting divisions	52	65,960
Inspecting division	57	63,800
Recording division	70	87,200
Assorting division	48	46,960
Checking division	36	37,120
Total	409	500,140

On the basis of the present clerical force and work done, it is proposed to reorganize the office and reduce the divisions from ten to seven, as follows:

	No. of clerks.	Amount of salaries.
Presidential and fourth-class offices and general accounts division	84	$105,840
Correspondence and files division	26	32,980
Pay division	26	40,800
Money-order examining division	71	81,000
Money-order bookkeeping division	84	80,540
Money-order assorting and checking division	91	71,600
Money-order foreign division	12	15,000
Total	374	428,360

Making a saving to the Government of 35 clerks and $71,780.

This reduction of annual expenditures is not only to obtain, as a result of the new system, but the settlement of postmasters' accounts will be greatly expedited and a more thorough supervision thereof will be secured.

The preceding exhibit relating to the present organization and the expense of the Auditor's Office does not represent all of the expenses, since, in addition to the 409 clerks, at an expense of $500,140, there are the Auditor, Deputy Auditor, chief clerk, and their clerks, messengers, assistant messengers, laborers, charwomen, etc. The numbers and amounts treated of have reference only to the clerks engaged directly in the divisions in which changes are recommended.

In addition to the foregoing estimated reduction of annual expenditures there will probably be a further retrenchment in the Office of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System, by the discontinuance, in the examining division, of the inspection of money-order accounts, whereby the work of about five clerks at, say, $6,000 per annum, may be dispensed with.

ALEX. M. DOCKERY,
JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
NELSON DINGLEY, Jr.,
Members on the part of the House of Representatives.
F. M. COCKRELL,
JAMES K. JONES,
S. M. CULLOM,
Members on the part of the Senate.

APPENDIX.

OFFICE OF THE EXPERTS UNDER THE COMMISSION TO EXAMINE THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,

Washington, D. C., September 18, 1893.

DEAR SIR: Your experts have given close attention to and careful consideration of the investigations and examinations intrusted to them. Fully appreciative of the magnitude of the work to be accomplished and of the results to be obtained, they have deemed it proper that the full scope of the operations of the various Departments of the Government, with their ramifications into accounting and other methods, should be carefully and thoroughly studied before making any reports to your commission suggesting changes of any kind, in order that when such a report was made its recommendations would relate to and become a part of a general system covering all. It will be understood by your committee that when each subject is treated in a report from time to time it will have been dealt with by your experts in conjunction with the general system, so that when all subjects are covered and the general system completed, there will be no conflict in the proposed changes.

Consistent with the policy indicated above, we beg to render you herein a report upon the office of the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury Department, and such recommendations as are made herein are classified and relate to the subjects as follows:

A. Organization and system of accounts.
B. Postage-stamp account.
C. Money-order system and compensation of postmasters relating to same.
D. Approximation of saving to obtain.

The accounts adjusted in the office of the Sixth Auditor are those of post-offices and transportation of mails, divided into two general sections, one for settling postal accounts, paying transportation and contingent expenses, the other for settling money-order and postal-note accounts.

The present divisions of the office, the number, class, and annual compensation of clerks employed therein, and an outline of their duties in each division are:

POSTAL AND TRANSPORTATION AND CONTINGENT EXPENSES ACCOUNTS.

First. Examining division.

1 chief		
3 class 4		$1,800
9 class 3		1,600
3 class 2		1,400
1 class 1		1,200
3 class E		1,000
20	Total	30,200

Checks quarterly accounts of first, second, and third class (Presidential) post-offices.

Second. Pay division.

1 chief.		
4 class 4		$1,800
12 class 3		1,600
6 class 2		1,400
1 class 1		1,200
1 class E		1,000
25	Total	39,000

States various accounts for domestic and foreign transportation and supplies; also records accounts consecutively for the files.

Third. Review division.

1 chief.		
2 class 4		$1,800
4 class 3		1,600
2 class 2		1,400
2 class 1		1,200
11	Total	17,200

Checks quarterly accounts of first, second, and third class (Presidential) post-offices and accounts for domestic transportation and supplies.

Fourth. Foreign division.

1 chief.		
1 class 4		$1,800
1 class 3		1,600
5 class 2		1,400
1 class 1		1,200
2 class E		1,000
2 class D		900
13	Total	17,400

Checks accounts for foreign transportation. States accounts for international postal settlements, and checks accounts (received from other nations) for international money-order settlements.

Fifth. Bookkeeping division.

1 chief.		
3 class 4		$1,800
12 class 3		1,600
16 class 2		1,400
18 class 1		1,200
11 class E		1,000
4 class D	(average)	950
4 class D		900
4 class C		840
4 class B		720
77	Total	95,240

Checks quarterly accounts of first, second, third, and fourth class postmasters and enters them in ledgers, which are recapitulated for quarterly and annual statements. Keeps appropriation ledgers; also records of warrants and all accounts of a general character relating to the mails.

Sixth. Collecting division.

1 chief.		
2 class 4		$1,800
9 class 3		1,600
12 class 2		1,400
13 class 1		1,200
6 class E		1,000
4 class D		900
3 class C		840
2 class B		720
52	Total	65,960

Checks accounts of fourth-class offices; of first, second, and third-class offices when errors are reported therein from review or bookkeeping divisions. Makes and sends to postmasters correction sheets and letters respecting accounts; keeps record in jacket form of quarterly balances, and record of numbers for files of all postmasters' accounts.

MONEY-ORDER AND POSTAL-NOTE ACCOUNTS.

Seventh. Inspecting division.

1 chief.		
5 class 3		$1,600
7 class 2		1,400
16 class 1		1,200
8 class E		1,000
8 class D		900
8 class C		840
4 class B		720
57	Total	63,800

Checks domestic and international money-order and postal-note accounts, the paid orders and notes being checked against the credits claimed therefor.

Eighth. Recording division.

1 chief.		
10 class 3		$1,600
20 class 2		1,400
18 class 1		1,200
13 class E		1,000
1 class D		900
6 class C		840
1 class B		720
70	Total	87,260

Enters in ledgers all money-order and postal-note accounts, makes book record of money transfers, against which the accounts of the postmasters are checked.

Ninth. Assorting division.

1 chief.		
3 class 2		$1,400
5 class 1		1,200
14 class E		1,000
12 class D		900
5 class C		840
8 class B		720
48	Total	46,960

Arranges money orders and postal notes in the order of issue, that is, according to offices and numerically.

Tenth. Checking division.

1 chief.		
1 class 2		$1,400
8 class 1		1,200
15 class E		1,000
4 class D		900
4 class C		840
3 class B		720
36	Total	37,120

Checks paid money orders and postal notes against the reports of the issuing office.

In approximating the compensation for the foregoing divisions the chief clerks are rated at $2,000 per annum, and nothing is allowed for messengers and laborers.

A general subdivision of the accounts, and the divisions through which they pass, are as follows:

Quarterly accounts, first, second, and third class post-offices: Examining division; review division; bookkeeping division; collecting division.

Quarterly accounts, fourth-class post-offices: Bookkeeping division; collecting division.

Domestic transportation and supplies: Pay division; review division.

Foreign transportation: Pay division; foreign division.

International postal accounts: Foreign division.

Domestic and international money-order and postal-note accounts: Inspecting division; recording division; assorting division; checking division.

Foreign money-order accounts: Foreign division.

International orders paid and coupons of those issued: Inspecting division; foreign division.

Appropriations, warrants, miscellaneous journal entry, etc.: Bookkeeping division.

Pay warrants: Pay division; bookkeeping division.

Your experts recommend that the divisions, with an outline of the work to be performed in each, shall be as follows:

A. ORGANIZATION AND SYSTEM OF ACCOUNTS.

First:

First section.—Presidential offices and general accounts division: Quarterly accounts from the first, second, and third-class offices; complete check and entries in ledgers; one set of books only, with such auxiliary records as may be necessary to properly check authorities for disbursements. Ledgers for appropriations, warrants, and miscellaneous general accounts; and prepares quarterly and annual statements.

Second section.—Fourth-class offices division: Quarterly accounts from fourth-class offices; complete check and entry in ledgers. One set of books only, with such auxiliary records as may be necessary to properly check authorities for disbursements.

Second. Correspondence and files division: Receives all post-office accounts. When errors are found in first and second divisions, reviews and makes statements to postmasters. Jackets as a convenience for filing, but shows on the jacket only name of post-office, name of postmaster, date of appointment and date of accounts; jackets to contain four years, more or less, but there should be a new one for a change of postmasters. Numbers, indexes, and files the jackets containing accounts.

Third. Pay division: States accounts for domestic and foreign transportation and for supplies (including Universal Postal Union accounts).

Fourth. Money-order examining division: Checks all reports of money-order offices. Keeps a record of unpaid orders outstanding one year or more. With reports there will be received a coupon of orders issued.

Fifth. Money-order bookkeeping division: Keeps ledgers for all money-order accounts and prepares quarterly and yearly statements.

Sixth. Money-order assorting and checking division: Arranges orders numerically according to issuing office, and checks orders paid against reports of issuing office.

Seventh. Money-order foreign division: Adjustment of foreign money-order accounts.

In connection with the foregoing rearrangement of the divisions the following changes should be made:

FIRST. FOR MATTERS WHICH REQUIRE DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS ONLY.

That such record shall be kept in each division as will effect a complete check of the account which, as designated, will be examined in that division. As an illustration: So much of the data now kept on the jackets in the postal collecting division as is essential to the adjustment of the postal account shall hereafter be kept on the ledgers or upon auxiliary books as will best facilitate the work in the first and second divisions.

That only one check of an account shall be made, except in cases where errors in the postal accounts are found in the first and second divisions, in which event the corrected figures are to be reviewed by the third division. There appears to be no good reason for having an account examined by two different persons for the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy thereof. It is assumed that the work on an account, if done by one person, will be of an efficient character, so that when a balance is determined it will be accurate. If inefficiency in auditing prevails at all, it is reasonable to expect that it might prevail with two persons examining the same account; then the second examination is no better than the first. Where two persons are passing the same account, one of them to a greater or lesser degree depends upon the other; thus the possibility of obtaining accuracy is not increased. Furthermore, nearly if not quite all of the accounts passed in the Sixth Auditor's Office have previously been passed upon by some other representative of the Government, therefore the work of the Auditor's Office is in the nature of a review. One such review would appear to be all that any sound business proposition would require.

That the reproduction of figures on accounts that are found to be correct should be discontinued. The column in the postmaster's reports for use of the Auditor's office involves the rewriting of many figures which are already known to be correct, and it is to no purpose, since the figures transcribed to the books are the same as those found on the postmaster's account.

That the book record of transfers of money from one account to another and from one post-office to another should be discontinued. This has special reference to the deposits of money-order funds and of the transfers from postal account to money-order account or vice versa. The essential feature when money is so transferred is to determine that the credit claimed by the office making the remittance corresponds with the debit taken up by the office receiving the same. That is, sums can as well be checked by reference to the report as if the amounts were transcribed to books for that purpose. The proof of this is found in the manner of checking the certificates of deposit for postal funds, in which case there are no entries in books to check the amounts.

That certificates of deposit for postal account, now sent to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, finance division, should be sent direct to the Auditor. The work in the finance division should be dispensed with, since it affords an imperfect guide as to the status of any account, the record being that of deposits (credits for money remitted) but does not include the credits from other sources of any of the debits. The accounts should be fully treated in the Auditor's office, embracing the supervision of deposits in accordance with Revised Statutes, section 292.

That as far as practicable the appointment of new postmasters be made to take effect at the beginning of the quarter. This would expedite the work in the Auditor's office, by avoiding the rendering of two accounts for the same quarter from the same office.

That the allowance for "rent, light, and fuel," and other expenses should be fixed to apply by quarters to meet the requirements of the period.

Such an arrangement would be more equitable to the postmaster, and less troublesome to the Auditor's office in settling the accounts than is now the case with an annual allowance.

B. POSTAGE-STAMP ACCOUNT.

That the post-offices shall render to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General a separate account for stamps, in different colored paper for Presidential and fourth-class offices, showing balance on hand first of quarter, received, sold, returned (to Department), and balance on hand at close of the quarter.

The statement is to be checked in the stamp division, certified (the initials of a clerk would suffice for the certificate) and forwarded to the Auditor to be checked with respect to the balance carried from one quarter to another. The Auditor's office shall also check the amount of stamps sold against the postal account, which would form the basis for the principal debit item thereon. Eliminate from the present postal account that portion known as the stamp account, but instead file with the postal account the certified account of stamps received from the Third Assistant Postmaster-General and the receipts for the stamps issued. The receipts, with the ledger balance from the previous quarter, would afford the Auditor a complete check of the stamp account.

That the requisitions from post-offices for stamps, received in the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, should be assorted by States, and alphabetically by offices therein. Those received after a given day, say the 20th of the last month in each quarter, should be treated for account of the subsequent quarter, the object being to reduce to the minimum charges for stamps in one quarter that are not received by the post-office until in the subsequent quarter. The date (suggested above as the 20th) should be fixed by the Deparment in accordance with what past experience would seem to be the best to serve the purpose.

That the Third Assistant Postmaster-General (stamp division) should keep the stamp ledgers, according to States, and offices alphabetically therein, and balance each account quarterly.

This system of postage-stamp accounts will comply with the law (Revised Statutes, section 405) which requires that the Postmaster-General shall certify to the Auditor that which in any manner affects the accounts. This law is not now complied with as regards postage stamps.

C. MONEY-ORDER SYSTEM.

That a form of money order be used substantially as submitted herewith. It embraces a feature—a margin check—which, by the separation of the money order from the coupon, designates the amount that the order is drawn for, thus affording a check thereof by the Department, in that the coupon will show the figures next higher than those for which the order is drawn. There are patents issued on similar devices, viz:

No. 268788, in favor of M. F. Berry, called "Check or other paper representing value," dated December 12, 1882.

No. 471106, in favor of M. A. Drew, for "Safety bank check," dated March 22, 1892.

The principle of the two patents and the proposed margin check of money order is the same, but the form of each differs from the other.

The use of the proposed money order will enable the Auditor to adjust a postmaster's account on its receipt, the coupons for money orders sold determining the debits at once, without waiting for the checking of paid orders against the issuing office. At present it requires about a year and a half to settle the account of a retiring postmaster.

That the separate accounting of money orders repaid should be discontinued. The percentage of such transactions to the whole number paid, in both dollars and the number of orders repaid, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, was about three-fourths of 1 per cent of the number regularly paid. It would appear to be of no value for statistical purposes and absolutely none for practical purposes in the adjustment of accounts. There was formerly a repaid account for postal notes, discontinued some years ago.

SECOND. FOR THOSE MATTERS WHICH REQUIRE STATUTORY PROVISIONS.

That reports of money-order offices should be sent direct to the money-order checking division of the Auditor's office, in which there should be facilities for opening and sorting such reports, instead of being sent, as now, to the office of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System, thus dispensing with the preliminary examination given the reports in the superintendent's office. The Auditor's office should have supervision of, and give attention to, the cash transfers and balances. The matter contained within these reports is of an accounting character and should, like postal accounts, go direct to the accounting officer.

Revised Statutes, section 4044, should be amended to cover, this provision.

That there should be but one form of domestic money order, which should combine the purposes of both the present postal note as well as the regular money order. The new order should be issued in the name of the party to whom it is to be paid. The present postal note has no security, since it is payable to bearer and has no advantage over remitting currency except that it affords a convenient form for mailing an odd amount of change. Postal notes are payable at any office. The Government does not issue duplicates, thus resulting, in case of the loss of a postal note, in a confiscation of the purchaser's money, which is unjust.

Repeal chapter 13, January 13, 1887, Supplement to Revised Statutes, page 517, relating to postal notes.

That a new schedule of Government fees for the issue of money orders be made as follows:

Up to—	Cents.	Up to—	Cents.
$2.50	3	$40.00	15
5.00	5	50.00	18
10.00	8	60.00	20
20.00	10	75.00	25
30.00	12	100.00	30

These rates are in accordance with a recommendation made by the Superintendent of the Money-Order System in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and are about the same as those charged by the express companies (the latter being limited, however, to $50), excepting that for sums up to $2.50 the rate is to be 3 cents. The reason for making the rates as low as those charged by the express companies coming in competition with the Government in this business is obvious. The rate of 3 cents on sums up to $2.50 is made with a view of continuing the facilities to the public for small sums at the present rate charged for postal notes.

While it is true the present postal note provides for the issue of $5 for 3 cents, it is noticed that the average is very much less than half of the maximum. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, the first year after the introduction of the system, the average issue was for $2.01, and has gradually decreased until the year ending June 30, 1892, when the average issue was for $1.68; so that, based upon past experience, a large percentage of the postal-note purchases will hereafter be provided for at the 3-cent rate. The security of the order proposed should compensate for the increased rate over that heretofore charged for postal notes on issues for $2.50 to $5.

Supplement to Revised Statutes, chapter 123, page 406.

That the form of application now made at the post-offices for money orders be discontinued. Necessity for filling out a form of this character is more or less of a burden upon the purchaser, and naturally drives him to the express offices competing for this business, where a written application is not required. The written application is of no possible advantage to the Government, and certainly affords nothing in the way of protection in the accounting. Assuming that due diligence is exercised in the post-offices issuing money orders the Government incurs no risk by discontinuing the application.

Revised Statutes, section 4043.

That money orders shall not be paid at the offices upon which they are drawn or at the office of issue after one year from date thereof, but that orders more than one year old shall be sent to the Post-Office Department and paid by warrant of the Postmaster-General countersigned by the Sixth Auditor; and in this connection postmasters shall render a monthly statement of all outstanding unpaid orders payable at their respective offices, as evidenced by advice, up to one year from date. The amount of such statement should be deposited in the Treasury for account of the Post-Office Department, and certificate of deposit therefor sent to the Sixth Auditor.

If to determine the amount of money orders and postal notes now outstanding in detail, as provided for in respect to money orders by the act of March 3, 1883, section 5, Supplement to Revised Statutes, page 407, is too expensive, then a dividing date could be made, creating a new money-order account. The money orders of old account should be paid out of funds to the credit of that account, and money orders of the new account should be paid out of funds to the credit of the new account.

The balance of funds on hand to the credit of the old account one year after the dividing date should be turned into the Treasury as unpaid orders more than one year old, in accordance with above provision. The postmaster, to obtain credit for the repayment of money orders, must attach to said orders the advice which he shall recall from the office to which originally sent.

Revised Statutes, section 4036, and also refer to the act of March 3, 1883, section 5, chapter 123, Supplement to Revised Statutes, page 407, which provides for turning back into the Treasury unpaid money orders over seven years old, which act has not been complied with.

That the rate of commission to postmasters for the issue of money orders shall be 3 cents per order, which is the minimum fee proposed to be charged for them; and no commission shall be allowed for the payment of orders, as the Government receives no fee for their payment. At the first and second class post-offices, where clerks are necessary to conduct the money-order business, the allowance for such clerk hire should be made in accordance with the requirements of the offices without respect to the commissions paid at third and fourth class offices.

Supplement to Revised Statutes, section 4, page 406.

That the commission of 3½ cents each for certificates of deposit for money-order money transferred from one office to another be discontinued. These certificates are principally issued at either first or second class offices, where the allowance for clerk hire should be in accordance with the requirements.

Supplement to Revised Statutes, section 4, page 406.

D. APPROXIMATION OF SAVING TO OBTAIN.

The following is a recapitulation of the present cost of and number of clerks in the various divisions of the Sixth Auditor's Office, approximately:

Division.	Amount.	Number.
First	$30,200	20
Second	39,000	25
Third	17,200	11
Fourth	17,400	13
Fifth	95,240	77
Sixth	65,960	52
Seventh	63,800	57
Eighth	87,200	70
Ninth	46,960	48
Tenth	37,120	36
Total	500,140	409

On the basis of the present clerical force and work done, it is estimated that the proposed eight divisions would stand thus:

Division.	Clerical force.	Compensation.	Clerks.
First	Present bookkeeping division	$95,240	77
	To aid on Presidential accounts	10,000	7
Second	One-half of the present collecting division	32,980	26
Third	All of the present pay division	30,000	25
	*One from the foreign division	1,800	1
Fourth	All of the present inspecting division	63,800	57
	For additional force to aid in increased work in checking stub orders issued and for keeping record of unpaid orders.	17,200	14
Fifth	Record division, excepting say, five clerks at $6,000, now engaged on books recording money transfers.	80,540	64
Sixth	Presenting assorting and checking division	71,600	91
	Excepting change in class, viz:		
	1 chief $2,000		
	10 clerks 12,000		
	80 clerks 57,600		
Seventh	Present foreign division, less one clerk *(transferred to fourth division to adjust Universal Postal Union accounts).	15,600	12
	Total	428,360	374
	Making a reduction, approximately, of	71,780	35

In addition to which there would be a saving in the office of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System, by the discontinuance, in the examining division, of the inspection of money-order accounts, whereby the work of about five clerks at, say, $5,000 per annum, would be dispensed with.

There will also be a saving, in the finance division, Third Assistant Postmaster-General's office, for discontinuing the handling and entering of certificates of deposit of, say, five clerks at $6,000.

The money orders and postal notes issued, paid, and repaid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, were reported as follows:

Domestic: 12,069,442 issued, 11,951,648 paid, 85,612 repaid; total, 24,106,702.
International: 983,476 issued, 287,412 paid, 3,266 repaid; total, 1,274,154.
Postal notes: 7,050,040 issued, 7,011,490 paid.

The commission on above at legal rates would be as follows:

Domestic, 24,106,702, at 3½ cents each	$843,734.57
International, 1,274,154, at 3½ cents each	44,595.39
Postal notes:	
Issued, 7,050,040, at 1 cent each	70,500.40
Paid, 7,011,490, at ½ cent each	52,586.17
Or a total of commissions	1,011,416.53

The foregoing figures represent what would have been paid if each office received a commission on the exact number of orders handled. Settlement is not, however, so made. Third and fourth class offices only receive commissions, while the first and second class offices are given an allowance for clerk hire based upon a sum within the amount of commissions.

The actual payments were:

For commissions, third and fourth class offices:		
Domestic orders	$362,593.51	
Postal notes	54,767.65	
International	4,667.66	
		$422,028.82
For allowance for clerk hire first and second class offices		584,915.41
Making a total of		1,006,944.23

There are other expenditures in the same fiscal year on account of the money-order business, as shown by the Superintendent's report, for the expenses of the Superintendent's office, clerks in the Auditor's Office, etc., making an expenditure of $16,707.69 in excess of the total receipts from fees for the sale of orders, which amounted to $1,435,254.53.

In the proposal to make the rate of commission 3 cents on orders issued only, it is not intended to disturb the allowance for clerk hire in first and second class offices in so far as such allowances may be necessary.

There are no statistics to show the number of money orders issued and paid at the different classes of post-offices. It is known in a general way that the percentage of orders issued in third and fourth-class offices is considerably in excess of those paid in such offices, the tendency of the movement of money orders being from the smaller offices of the classes just named to the larger first and second class offices.

Assuming that at third and fourth class offices three-fourths of the commissions are for orders issued, and one-fourth for orders paid, the account (on the basis of 3 cents for orders issued and no commissions for payments) would show as follows:

Domestic money orders	$233,100.11
Postal notes	133,496.13
International money orders	2,917.29
	369,513.53
Total commissions paid, per report	422,028.82
Saving to Government by proposed change	52,515.29

The loss on money-order business, as per the Superintendent's report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, was $16,707.69. This is after realizing a profit of $102,412.79 on exchange. It does not appear that this profit can always be depended upon, so that, in order to make the money-order business self-supporting, as it undoubtedly should be, a saving on the present system would seem necessary.

TOTAL SAVING, APPROXIMATELY, BY THE ADOPTION OF ABOVE RECOMMENDATION.

Clerks, Auditor's Office	$71,780
Clerks, Superintendent's Office	6,000
Clerks, third assistant, finance division	6,000
Commissions	52,515
	135,295

In addition to which the proposed change in commissions, and the abolishing of postal notes, and dispensing with separate reports of orders repaid would simplify the accounting.

In these recommendations your experts have been guided by the conviction that the Government should not be run for profit, but at the same time it should incur no loss in the transaction of its affairs. The reduction recommended herein in the money-order commission paid will accrue to the benefit of the people by the proposed reduction in fees.

The matters contained herein which relate to the Post-Office Department are only such as were considered in connection with matters found in the investigation of the Sixth Auditor's Office, and this report is not intended to cover the Post-Office Department proper.

Respectfully submitted.

J. W. REINHART,
C. W. HASKINS,
E. W. SELLS,
Experts.

Hon. A. M. DOCKERY,
Chairman, Joint Commission, etc., Washington, D.C.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK,
Washington, D. C., October 21, 1893.

SIR: I am directed by the Postmaster-General to inclose herewith a copy of a letter from the Attorney-General of the United States with regard to the proposed form of a money order devised by the experts employed by the joint commission of Congress, his opinion having been requested as to whether or not the proposed form would be an infringement on any patents which have been granted by the United States Government for the form of a money order.

Very respectfully,

GEO. A. HOWARD,
Chief Clerk.

HON. ALEX. M. DOCKERY, M. C.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, D. C., October 21, 1893.*

SIR: I have given careful consideration to the question propounded in your letter of October 6 as to the proposed form of money order devised by the experts employed by the joint commission of Congress, and have consulted the law department of the Patent Office upon the matter. It is not, of course, a question upon which I am authorized to give an official opinion, as it involves questions of fact as well as of law. It is a question which can not be decided without an investigation of records, which it is not within the province of this Department to make. A careful search has been made of the records by an experienced law clerk in the Patent Office and he has transmitted to me copies of the specifications and drawings of these patents which are, in his opinion, nearest the form submitted by the commission. It is his opinion that your proposed form of money order would not be an infringement of any of these patents, and in that opinion this Department would coincide.

Very respectfully,

RICHARD OLNEY,
Attorney-General.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit in this connection a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and also one from the Postmaster-General bearing upon this question and ask to have them read at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington D. C., December 12, 1893.

SIR: I have to inform you that the reports of the Sixth Auditor and your experts, in the matter of the conduct of the official business assigned to the office of the Sixth Auditor, have been carefully read and considered, and to state that I have no objection to a trial of the methods suggested by the experts and will make the necessary orders to carry the same into effect, provided such conduct of the service is officially approved by your commission.

Respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

Hon. A. M. DOCKERY,
Chairman Joint Commission for Investigating the Status of the Executive Departments.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1893.

SIR: I have carefully examined House bill No. 4510 to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes. I approve of the provisions thereof, and trust that it may be speedily enacted by Congress.

I have also carefully considered the proposed modifications of certain regulations and methods of doing business in the Post-Office Department, and with reference to the settlement of accounts of postmasters by the Sixth

Auditor, which are fully referred to in the report which the joint commission submit, accompanying the said bill, and have substantially recommended the adoption of the same.

Very respectfully,

W. T. BISSELL, *Postmaster-General.*

Hon. A. M. DOCKERY,
Chairman Joint Commission of Congress, etc.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. DOCKERY. I now ask that general debate be considered as closed and that the consideration of the bill be proceeded with by sections under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill by sections. Section 4 was read.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to section 4, on page 5 of the bill, in order to make clear what is meant by the term "next fiscal year."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 13, section 4, of the bill by striking out the words "next fiscal year" and inserting "fiscal year commencing July 1, 1894."

Mr. DOCKERY. That is right.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The previous question was ordered; under the operation of which the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DOCKERY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Rules.

The report was read, as follows:

Resolved, That this day, after the second morning hour, and each day thereafter until both such bills shall have been fully disposed of, be assigned to the consideration of H. R. 4393 and H. R. 353.

Mr. REED. What are those bills?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Those are the bills relating to the admission of Arizona and New Mexico to the Union. I demand the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports.

SELECTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS, MONTANA.

Mr. LATIMER, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill (H. R. 83) authorizing the State of Montana to make selections from certain public lands; which was read a first and second time, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. HAUGEN. I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAUGEN. I find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning remarks by Hon. J. W. TALBERT, of South Carolina, made before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do not know whether leave was granted to the gentleman to print these remarks in the RECORD; but I want to find out whether that is so, and if so, how far this leave extends.

I believe this is the second time that the gentleman has published remarks in the RECORD made before the Committee on Banking and Currency. If it is generally understood that arguments made before the committees can be published in the RECORD, we want to know it. The remarks of the gentleman begin on page 7 of the Appendix. I do not rise for the purpose of finding any fault with the gentleman, but I want to know how far this leave extends.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. You want to know how those remarks got into the RECORD?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. By unanimous consent, which was granted on the day before yesterday.

Mr. HAUGEN. Nobody on this side seems to have been aware of it.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I asked unanimous consent to print in the RECORD remarks made by myself before the Committee on Banking and Currency upon the bill (H. R. 384) to enlarge the currency and distribute the same, and no objection was made. Therefore those remarks appear in the RECORD this morning, and I will state, Mr. Speaker, that my reason for asking that leave was simply this——

The SPEAKER. The House granted to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] leave to print remarks upon the bill (H. R. 384). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAUGEN] will find that consent on page 171 of the RECORD.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to know how the remarks came to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I would like to explain for the satisfaction of the gentleman——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order. There is no question before the House.

DONATION OF CANNON TO ALLEGHENY AND PITTSBURG, PA.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution donating two old cast-iron cannon to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be reported, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 97) donating two obsolete cannon to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa.

Resolved, etc., That two of the old cast-iron cannon now at the United States Arsenal at Pittsburg, Pa., and there before the late war, be donated to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa.: *Provided*, That, in the judgment of the Secretary of War they can be spared for the purpose without detriment to the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] for the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not understand the object of this donation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. These are two old cannon that have no value whatever, and it is simply desired to put them in the public park there, because of their local historical interest. That is all.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at five minutes past 1. The call rests on the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. This is the call of committees for the consideration of measures.

ASSIGNMENT OF LAND SCRIP.

Mr. McRAE (when the Committee on Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill H. R. 73.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

Supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled "An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives."

Mr. McRAE. I yield the floor to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for the Commissioner of the General Land Office to cause patents to be issued, as evidence of title, for all valid locations made with land scrip issued pursuant to decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States, which valid locations were made prior to the approval of the aforesaid act in the same manner that patents are now issued under the provisions of section 3 of said act of January 28, 1879.

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole to consider the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The title was again reported.

Mr. SOMERS. I move that the bill be reported back to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the report on that bill.

The report (by Mr. SOMERS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 73) "supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled 'An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives,'" have had the same under consideration, and report it back with the recommendation that it pass.

The committee presents as a part of this report the accompanying communication from the honorable Secretary of the Interior, in which he recommends the passage of the bill, and shows the necessity for it.

Certain scrip was issued by the Commissioner of the General Land Office pursuant to a decision of the United States Supreme Court, under the act of June 2d, 1860, and supplemental legislation, for 624,269,230 acres. (See Public Domain, page 1276.)

There were about 1,900 locations made prior to the date of the approval of the act of January 28, 1879 (20 Stat., 274). The bill does not seek to validate any title that is now valid, but only to authorize the issue of patents in all valid locations of such scrip. It is unnecessary, except to furnish the owner of the lands with the evidence of his title, as in the case of locations made since June 28, 1879.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, October 20, 1893.

SIR: I transmit herewith report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office on House bill 73, entitled "A bill supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled 'An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives,'" with inclosures therein referred to. I see no objection to the passage of the bill.

Very respectfully,

HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

Hon. THOMAS C. MCRAE,
Chairman Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1892.

SIR: I have the honor to receive by reference of March 28, 1892, from the Hon. George Chandler, First Assistant Secretary, H. R. bill No. 5111, entitled "A bill supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled 'An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives,'" which was submitted to the Department by the Hon. T. C. MCRAE, chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, and referred to me as above for report in duplicate and return of papers.

In reply, I have to state that the act of January 28, 1879, referred to in the title of this bill has been construed as providing in its third section for the issue of patents or locations made with land scrip issued pursuant to decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States under certain statutes therein named, when the locations were made subsequent to the approval of said act, and as not providing for the issue of patents on locations made prior to the approval thereof.

The object of H. R. bill No. 5111 is to provide for the issue of patents on such locations made prior to the approval of said act.

I see no objection to the passage of said bill, which I herewith return.

Very respectfully,

THOS. H. CARTER, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The motion of Mr. SOMERS was then agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 73, had directed him to report the same back with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SOMERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LIMITATION FOR COMPLETION OF TITLE OF LANDS UNDER DONATION ACT.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill H. R. 69.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under the act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "Donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants on said lands.

Mr. MCRAE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The bill is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MCRAE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole to consider the bill which the Clerk will now report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases where persons under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to create the office of surveyor-general of the public lands in Oregon, and to provide for the survey and to make donations to settlers of the said public lands," approved September 27, 1850, or the various acts amendatory and supplemental thereto, have made proof of settlement on tracts of land in either of the late Territories of Oregon or Washington, and given notice, as required by law, that they claimed such lands as donations, but have failed to execute and file in the proper land offices proof of their continued residence on and cultivation of the lands so settled upon and claimed, so as to entitle them to grants of the lands and patents therefor, such claimants shall have, and they are hereby given until the 1st day of January, 1893, the right to make and file their final proofs and fully establish their rights to donations of land under the aforesaid act of Congress, and no longer; and all claimants who shall fail to make and file final proof and perfect their claims to lands, as donations under the acts aforesaid, before the said 1st day of January, 1893, shall thereafter be held to have abandoned their claims to the lands embraced in their notices; and the Land Department of the Government and the courts shall thereafter refuse to accept any further evidence in support of such donations.

SEC. 2. That in all cases where claims to lands as donations, as aforesaid, are not perfected by making and filing final proof as hereinbefore required, the tracts involved shall be, and the same are hereby, declared subject to homestead entry and other forms of disposal under the laws governing the sale and disposition of the public lands, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office is hereby authorized to dispose of and issue patents for the lands embraced in such abandoned and incomplete claims, in the manner prescribed by existing laws and regulations: *Provided*, That where such abandoned tracts of land are claimed by purchase in good faith from the original claimant, or are at the date of this act and for twenty years prior thereto, actually occupied and in the undisturbed quiet and adverse possession of some person or persons, themselves or asignees, and whose improvements thereon are of the value of $100 or more, or where heretofore, in the absence of such conditions, said tracts of lands to the extent of 160 acres may be settled upon by any person under an erroneous claim of right and may be used as and for a bona fide residence, and the said occupant having previously exhausted his or her right of homestead under the general land laws, then in such cases said occupants and claimants shall have a preference right of purchase in the order herein named: *Provided*, That they shall within ninety days from the 1st day of January, 1893, file with the register of the land office of the district within which the lands are situated their affidavit and the affidavits of at least two disinterested witnesses establishing the facts of their purchase and occupancy, and improvement or bona fide settlement, as the case may be, of said lands, as herein required, and shall pay to the receiver of the proper land office $1.25 for each acre contained in the abandoned tract, the area thereof to be determined by the official plats of survey of the public lands.

SEC. 3. That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to deprive the Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the regulations governing contests in land cases, of his right to allow or direct hearings to be instituted to show that a donation claimant has abandoned the lands described in his notice, or prevent the Commissioner, when it is proven that such a claim is invalid or abandoned, from cancelling the same upon the official records and thereafter disposing of the lands as a part of the public domain: *Provided*, That where hearings are allowed contestants shall pay the expenses incident thereto in the same manner that costs are paid in other contested land entries; and this act shall not be construed to affect any case now pending before the Land Department in which final proof has been furnished.

SEC. 4. That the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall issue the necessary rules and regulations to give full force and effect to the provisions of this act.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee is brief and will give a full account of this bill, I ask that it be read.

The report (by Mr. LACEY) was read, as follows:

Under the act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, known as the "donation act," a considerable area of the public land in Oregon was claimed by persons who, from various causes, have since failed to occupy or obtain title to the same. Under the act of 1850 their heirs at law or devisees may in case of death make the necessary proof and obtain title to the land.

Many of the claims taken under this "donation act" have been abandoned for many years. New settlers are desirous of occupying and improving the same, but can not obtain title because of the filings already made. In order to obtain title to these lands at present it is necessary to institute proceedings in the nature of a contest against the claimants, or, in case of death, against the unknown heirs or devisees of claimants. This method is expensive, complicated, and unsatisfactory.

After so long a lapse of time a brief statute of limitations ought to be enacted giving a reasonable opportunity for claimants to appear, and in case of failure to appear and assert their rights their claims should be barred.

In the opinion of the committee an extension until January 1, 1895, would be a sufficiently long time to enable all bona fide claimants to appear and assert their rights, and we recommend to that end the following amendments to the bill:

In line 18, section 1, strike out the word "three" and insert "five;" and in line 24, in said section, strike out the word "three" and insert "five;" and in line 25 of section 2 strike out the word "three" and write "five," making the date of limitation January 1, 1895.

Under the original act of 1850 the rights of a claimant go on his decease to his heirs at law or devisees, and it is better that the language of this bill should conform to that of the act of 1850. So we recommend that the word "assignees," in line 15 of section 2, be stricken out, and the words "heirs at law or devisees" be inserted in lieu thereof.

With these amendments we recommend the passage of the bill. The proposed bill preserves and protects the interests of occupying claimants by giving them a preferential right of purchase. We deem it also proper to say that the propriety of the passage of such a bill as the one proposed has been submitted at various times to the Interior Department, and that on February 18, 1890, Hon. L. A. Groff, Commissioner of the Land Office, recommended the passage of the bill.

In January, 1893, Hon. W. M. Stone, Commissioner, made a like recommendation. On October 10, 1893, Hon. L. W. Lamoreaux, Commissioner, also recommended the passage of the present bill with amendments as now proposed by the committee, and Hon. Hoke Smith, Secretary of the Interior, on October 20, 1893, concurred in the opinion of Commissioner Lamoreaux.

Mr. LACEY. I move that the amendments reported by the committee be agreed to.

Mr. TRACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. This bill, as I understand it, is to make a change in the existing laws so that the parties who had not availed themselves of the privileges of the act of 1850 might now be allowed to file their claims.

Mr. LACEY. No, sir; the situation is this. Under the donation act of 1850 a large number of claims were taken that were subsequently abandoned in fact, although no record of abandonment was made. The lands are now subject to entry; but at the same time, in order to enter them, it becomes necessary that a contest should be instituted against the parties who have laid claims, or against their heirs, most of whom are dead or unknown. The main object is to establish a short limitation, ending January 1, 1895, requiring all claims to be proved within that time or they will be barred. The real object is to restore the land to the public domain and open it to entry. The gentle-

man from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN] is probably more familiar than I with the details of the bill, and I will yield for him to explain the bill.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, just in a moment I desire to say that these lands are within my State and the present State of Washington. Under the act of September 28, 1850, certain donations or grants of lands were made to those who should settle within those two Territories. They were required to file what are termed notifications or filings. Those filings have been decided by the Interior Department to be in the nature of entries; and, although the land may have been abandoned and may be lying as open common, still the Department insists that, being considered to be entries of land, they take the land from the public domain and from settlement and entry, and hence it is necessary for the party who desires to make settlement and acquire title to enter into a formal contest by filing regular affidavits alleging the abandonment of the land, and following that up by notice of hearing, by advertisements, and then by evidence before the register and receiver to regularly establish the abandonment of the land. That evidence then goes before the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and if approved, cancellation follows and the land is thrown open for settlement.

Now, I desire to say to my friend from New York that there are not many of these claims in existence in my State, and there are fewer, I think, in the State of Washington. Some of them have been settled upon under bona fide conveyances from the individual who claimed to be the original settler under the donation act, who had filed his notification. Then there are others who have slept upon their rights, as it were, many of them assuming that the original claimant had a title; that he had made final proof in the local land office, but who discovers that he has no title, and is in the situation of a person who can not acquire title, the original claimant being dead, or the witnesses being dead or not being available.

Now, this act furnishes a remedy even as to those parties, providing that where an assignee, in good faith of an original settler, can show by proper evidence that he is, for value paid, an assignee of an original claimant, his right shall be respected upon payment of $1.25 per acre.

Mr. PICKLER. I understood that the recommendation of the Secretary was that the word "assignee" should be stricken out, leaving only the words "devisee or heirs."

Mr. LACEY. That is so. That change is recommended in order to make the language of this conform to the language of the original act of 1850.

Mr. HERMANN. There appears to be some misunderstanding between my friend from Iowa and myself. The bill provides that those who are assignees shall not be entitled to the benefits of the original act; that is, that they can not come in and acquire title by making proof before the expiration of the limitation; it confines that privilege to devisees and heirs. That makes the amendment consistent with the original act. But, as to those who shall be entitled, by reason of their equities, to commute upon payment of $1.25 per acre, the provision is that those who are assignees of original locators may, by the payment of $1.25 per acre, even after this particular period, establish their equities and obtain title.

Secondly, there is another class, those who have lived upon those lands for twenty years, who are allowed to come in and obtain title by purchase upon paying $1.25 an acre. The purpose and the substance of these provisions is to remove the cloud which now rests upon quite a number of these old donation claims, so that the lands may be thrown open to settlement without the necessity of making contests and incurring the expenses which that would involve.

Mr. SAYERS. Can the gentleman tell us how many of these claims are in Washington?

Mr. HERMANN. I presume that there are not more than one hundred, possibly not more than fifty; there are not to exceed one hundred, or possibly one hundred and twenty-five in Oregon. Many of these claims were abandoned because the people could not make a living upon them, the lands being worthless; others were abandoned because the people were not able to furnish testimony of four years' residence. For these and other reasons the abandonments took place.

Mr. PICKLER. Does this bill provide that lands upon which proof is not made before January, 1895, shall afterwards be open to settlement under the homestead law?

Mr. HERMANN. Yes, under the homestead law only. The rights of actual settlers are preserved.

Mr. TRACEY. Has the gentleman got the letter of the Secretary of the Interior in relation to this subject? If so, I would like to have it read.

Mr. HERMANN. The report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office has been read.

I will state further, Mr. Chairman, for I know that the gentleman from New York is sincere in his desire to have this bill passed provided it is just, that I have personally consulted the Commissioner of the Land Office, not only at this session but in previous sessions (for the bill has been pending a long time), and that the Commissioner, recognizing from his records the embarrassments which exist in the States named as to making proof of abandonment, etc., has urgently recommended the passage of this bill. The bill meets with his full concurrence.

Mr. TRACEY. The present Commissioner?

Mr. HERMANN. Yes, the present Commissioner as well as the former Commissioner. The bill has been considered by the Land Office under two different Administrations. The Secretary of the Interior has also recommended the passage of this bill.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, such bills as this often make trouble. Somebody wants to get the land of somebody else, and tries to make Congress the agency by which to attain that result. Somebody comes here to get a bill passed providing that some claimant's claim shall expire at a certain time, the real reason being that some other claimant wants to get the land. I do not know much about this particular bill, but I have seen a good deal of the results of this sort of legislation. We had the Des Moines River Lands question before Congress more than twenty-five years. In that case there were thousands of settlers claiming that an act of Congress passed in 1861 was void, and could not take away their title to their land. Now, there must be some private interest at the bottom of this bill. The public interest does not demand that people who have pre'mpted lands shall have their claims cut off. Some private person, or probably some corporation, is behind this bill; otherwise it would not be here. That is how it strikes me.

Mr. LACEY. I take for granted that the gentleman desires to get at the facts.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. This land was taken forty-three years ago, and evidently the persons who are claiming it have not been very active in pressing their claims, as they have waited so many years. The land has lain idle all this time, and, whilst these parties have an apparent claim upon the record, as a matter of fact they assert no claim. The land is simply lying idle, and the people of Oregon and of Washington desire to have it utilized as against claimants who are asserting rights theoretically, but not occupying the land.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any reason why, if a man owns a farm, he may not own it for forty years or fifty years or longer. I do not see how he loses his title by lapse of time, and I have not yet heard any answer to the suggestion that there is something behind this bill in the nature of a private interest, some parties trying to get the lands of other people by paying merely the Government price.

Mr. HERMANN. I desire to say that there is no more relation between this matter and the Des Moines land title bill than there is between day and night. And I submit to the gentleman from New York that the facts before the Department—and I presume the Department is better authority on this question than he is—go to show that no proof whatever was made in the first notification on these claims; and that although forty-three years have elapsed in which these parties desiring to make proof might have done so, it is proposed to allow them two years additional in which to make this proof. Owing to their laches or negligence this legislative cancellation might justly take effect to-day, or as soon as the act can be approved by the President; but in order to give to parties who may possibly have been led astray as to the law, and under a misconception of their rights have been living on these lands forty-three years, an opportunity to come in and make final proof, it is proposed to give them two years further time in which to do this.

I ask the gentleman what consideration he has for bona fide settlers who are residing on those lands, if he shall refuse people who went there as home seekers, selecting these lands as their dwelling places for the balance of their days and who stand to-day confronted and overshadowed by this conflicting title which can not be removed except by going into the land offices and instituting a costly and sometimes very prolonged contest? I ask the gentleman whether he is not willing to do justice to this class of men, and whether it is not just to compel the parties who have brought clouds upon the title to these lands to come in within two years or be forever debarred of their rights to prove title, if they ever had any? It seems to me that those who are bona fide settlers on those lands are entitled to this much in justice and equity.

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. There is one thing which I would like my colleague to explain. At what time did these lands cease to be taken up under this donation act, and how long a time did

parties have under that act before they were required to make proof? The gentleman's answer to this question will probably enlighten the House.

Mr. HERMANN. As a matter of fact, under the act of 1853, supplemental to the act of September 27, 1850, those parties had four years thereafter. That was the last extension. They were required to come in and make proof within that time of their residence. They did not do this, and they have failed to do so since that time.

I submit to my friend from New York that we who are representatives of that State, who are constantly mingling with its people and who are conversant with the situation of affairs there, know personally the situation of these lands. We find many of them waste pl.ces; and in other locations we find honest, law-abiding, home-seeking settlers on those lands, who have not the means nor the desire to enter into a long and costly contest to perfect their titles; and I submit it is our duty to do this for their benefit.

If the gentleman objects to applying a statute of limitations in this case he might as well extend his objection to all statutes of limitation. Certainly all such statutes might as well be wiped out if there can not be a provision of that sort in this case after a lapse of forty-three years.

Mr. HARTMAN. As a matter of fact do not these so-called claims to these lands operate merely as a cloud upon the title?

Mr. HERMANN. They do.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is a very easy and plain way for the United States Government to protect its rights. If any man asserts a claim to land for which he has not paid, all the Government has to do is to foreclose its claim, making him a party and giving him a chance to have his day in court. Then, as soon as judgment is obtained, he can be cleaned out. That is the honest way to do in these cases.

You can not pass the title to land by an act of Congress. A great many people think that you can; but in fact Congress has no power to pass a law by which the title which one man has or claims to a piece of land, will be transferred to another man. This legislation, it seems to me, is in that direction. It is in the line of driving out a body of people who do not know that we are passing this bill, who have no notice of this proceeding, who are allowed no day in court, no chance to defend themselves.

The fact as disclosed here seems to be that a body of settlers on these lands want to get them away from the real owners. My friend has just conceded that fact. I think we had better let this matter alone, or if we do anything, ask the Attorney-General to foreclose the interest of the United States in these lands and have them sold. In that way we would allow each party claiming title to come forward and defend his rights.

My friend says that these claimants have had a chance to pay up and perfect their titles. So did the parties in the Des Moines River case. The parties in possession of those lands advertised to the world that everybody having claim to the lands might make that claim effectual if he would pay $1.25 per acre; and it was claimed that because parties having title did not rush up in a body and make this payment they lost their rights; but there are to-day six thousand claim nts for those lands who are demanding that their rights shall be preserved and protected, notwithstanding the act of Congress and notwithstanding the fact that they did not "walk up to the captain's office" and pay $1.25 per acre when these other parties who wanted the lands gave them the opportunity to do so.

These men will never hear of the opportunity which is given them, to come up and save their lands, by complying with this provision of this law. They never would know anything about it, until too late, when the opportunity is gone and all their rights have been lost. That is the reason I object to it.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I will do justice to the gentleman from New York by stating that I do not think he comprehends the real scope of this measure.

In the first place these parties, if there be any, have their day in court. They have two years in which to establish their rights, if they have any. They have had in addition to that forty-three years to establish their claim, and, as I said before, in accordance with strict justice, there should be a legislative cancellation, this day, or at least as soon as this act could reach the President for his approval.

Secondly, I desire to say to the gentleman that I venture the assertion that of the few claimants benefited under this act possibly not one of the original settlers is laying claim to-day to this land.

Third, as to establishing any rights or conferring any title, this bill does nothing of the kind, except towards the original settlers provided they establish their rights within the two years fixed by the law. It merely provides that those who have been on the land twenty years, and those who purchased land from the original settlers, believing that they had a title, shall have the equity of purchase. It does not convey any title. It gives them only a preference right to go to any land office, pay their $1.25 an acre, and the law recognizes their present occupancy and possession.

I submit, therefore, that the gentleman from New York, generous and gallant as he is, is the last man to deny his fellow-citizens any right to which they are entitled.

I ask that a vote be taken on the bill.

The amendments recommended by the committee were adopted.

Mr. LACEY. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly arose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration House bill No. 69, had directed him to report the same to the House with certain amendments, and that as so amended it do pass.

The amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM M'GARRAHAN.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Private Land Claims I call up the bill (H. R. 415) to submit to the Court of Private Land Claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman propose to call this important bill up in the morning hour?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

The question being taken on a division demanded by Mr. SAYERS, there were—yeas 62, nays 0.

Mr. SAYERS. No quorum.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. SAYERS and Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia as tellers.

The House proceeded to divide.

Before the result of the division was announced,

Mr. SAYERS said: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour has expired.

MILEAGE OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1893.

SIR: I beg to call your attention to the fact that there are no funds available to pay the mileage of Members of Congress and Delegates for the first regular session of the present Congress, and that an appropriation will be necessary to provide for the deficiency.

I submit herewith correspondence with the First Comptroller of the Treasury on this subject.

Respectfully submitted.

H. W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. This communication will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SALARY OF HOUSE AND SENATE EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move, under the special order, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill (H. R. 4393) for the admission of Arizona.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask unanimous consent to consider the joint resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 98) authorizing payment of the December salary of employés of the House and Senate on the 21st day of said month.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to pay

the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid upon the table.

ADMISSION OF ARIZONA.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the title of the bill indicated a moment ago by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HOOKER of New York) there were—ayes 79, noes 4.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 11, not voting 184; as follows:

YEAS—158.

Alderson,	Coffeen,	Hermann,	Pickler,
Alexander,	Conn,	Hilborn,	Reilly,
Allen,	Coombs,	Holman,	Richardson, Mich.
Arnold,	Cooper, Fla.	Hunter,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bailey,	Cooper, Tex.	Hutcheson,	Robbins,
Baker, Kans.	Cornish,	Ikirt,	Russell, Ga.
Bankhead,	Cousins,	Johnson, Ohio	Ryan,
Barnes,	Covert,	Joy,	Sayers,
Barwig,	Crawford,	Kilgore,	Sibley,
Bell, Colo.	Culberson,	Kribbs,	Simpson,
Bell, Tex.	Curtis, Kans.	Kyle,	Sipe,
Beltzhoover,	Davis,	Lane,	Snodgrass,
Berry,	De Armond,	Lawson,	Stone, Ky.
Black, Ga.	Denson,	Layton,	Strait,
Blair,	Dinsmore,	Lockwood,	Swanson,
Blanchard,	Dockery,	Lynch,	Sweet,
Bland,	Donovan,	Maddox,	Talbert, S. C.
Boen,	Dunn,	Maguire,	Talbott, Md.
Bowers, Cal.	Dunphy,	Mallory,	Tarsney,
Branch,	Edmunds,	Marshall,	Tate,
Brawley,	English,	McAleer,	Taylor, Ind.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Enloe,	McCreary, Ky.	Terry,
Bretz,	Epes,	McCulloch,	Tracey,
Broderick,	Erdman,	McDannold,	Tucker,
Brookshire,	Forman,	McDearmon,	Turner,
Bryan,	Fyan,	McEttrick,	Turpin,
Bunn,	Geissenhainer,	McMillin,	Tyler,
Bynum,	Goodnight,	McNagny,	Weadock,
Cabaniss,	Gorman,	McRae,	Wells,
Cadmus,	Grady,	Montgomery,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cannon, Cal.	Griffin,	Morgan,	Wheeler, Ill.
Capehart,	Hager,	Mutchler,	Williams, Ill.
Caruth,	Hall, Minn.	Oates,	Williams, Miss.
Catchings,	Hall, Mo.	O'Ferrall,	Wilson, Wash.
Causey,	Hammond,	Outhwaite,	Wise,
Clancy,	Hare,	Page,	Woodard,
Clark, Mo.	Harris,	Paschal,	Wright, Mass.
Clarke, Ala.	Hartman,	Pearson,	Wright, Pa.
Cobb, Ala.	Heard,	Pence,	
Cockrell,	Henderson, N. C.	Pendleton, W. Va.	

NAYS—11.

Aldrich,	Haines,	Pigott,	Wadsworth,
Bundy,	Hepburn,	Randall,	Warner.
Chickering,	Lacey,	Sherman,	

NOT VOTING—184.

Abbott,	Compton,	Goldzier,	Kiefer
Adams,	Cooper, Ind.	Graham,	Lapham,
Aitken,	Cooper, Wis.	Gresham,	Latimer,
Apsley,	Cox,	Grosvenor,	Lefever,
Avery,	Crain,	Grout,	Lester,
Babcock,	Cummings,	Hainer,	Linton
Baker, N. H.	Curtis, N. Y.	Harmer,	Lisle,
Baldwin,	Dalzell,	Harter,	Livingston,
Bartholdt,	Daniels,	Hatch,	Loud,
Bartlett,	Davey,	Haugen,	Loudenslager,
Belden,	De Forest,	Hayes,	Lucas,
Bingham,	Dingley,	Heiner,	Magner,
Black, Ill.	Dolliver,	Henderson, Ill.	Mahon,
Boatner,	Doolittle,	Henderson, Iowa	Marsh,
Boutelle,	Draper,	Hendrix,	Martin, Ind.
Bower, N. C.	Durborow,	Hicks,	Marvin, N. Y.
Brattan,	Ellis, Ky.	Hines,	McCall,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Ellis, Oregon	Hitt,	McCleary, Minn.
Brickner,	Everett,	Hooker, Miss.	McDowell,
Brosius,	Fellows,	Hooker, N. Y.	McGann,
Brown,	Fielder,	Hopkins, Ill.	McKaig,
Burnes,	Fitch,	Hopkins, Pa.	McKeighan,
Burrows,	Fithian,	Houk, Ohio	McLaurin,
Caldwell,	Fletcher,	Houk, Tenn.	Meiklejohn,
Caminetti,	Funk,	Hudson,	Mercer,
Campbell,	Funston,	Hulick,	Meredith,
Cannon, Ill.	Gardner,	Hull,	Meyer,
Childs,	Gear,	Johnson, Ind.	Milliken,
Cobb, Mo.	Geary,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Money,
Cockran,	Gillet, N. Y.	Jones,	Moon,
Cogswell,	Gillett, Mass.	Kem,	Morse,
Moses,	Ray,	Sickles,	Thomas,
Murray,	Rayner,	Smith,	Updegraff,
Neill,	Reed,	Somers,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Newlands,	Reyburn,	Sperry,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Northway,	Richards, Ohio	Springer,	Walker,
O'Neil,	Ritchie,	Stallings,	Wanger,
Patterson,	Robertson, La.	Stephenson,	Washington,
Payne,	Robinson, Pa.	Stevens,	Waugh,
Paynter,	Rusk,	Stockdale,	Wever,
Pendleton, Tex.	Russell, Conn.	Stone, C. W.	White,
Perkins,	Schermerhorn,	Stone, W. A.	Whiting,
Phillips,	Scranton,	Storer,	Wilson, Ohio
Post,	Settle,	Strong,	Wilson, W. Va.
Powers,	Shaw,	Tawney,	Wolverton,
Price,	Shell,	Taylor, Tenn.	Woomer.

No quorum voting.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. MONEY with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

For this day:

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. PAYNTER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. EVERETT with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. RICHARDS with Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITCHIE with Mr. DOLLIVER.

Mr. STOCKDALE with Mr. APSLEY.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move a call of the House.

The call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll; when the following members failed to answer to their names:

Abbott,	Dolliver,	Jones,	Paynter,
Aldrich,	Donovan,	Kem,	Ray,
Babcock,	Durborow,	Lapham,	Rayner,
Bankhead,	Ellis, Ky.	Latimer,	Reyburn,
Bartholdt,	Everett,	Linton,	Richards, Ohio
Bartlett,	Fellows,	Lisle,	Ritchie,
Beltzhoover,	Fielder,	Livingston,	Russell, Conn.
Blanchard,	Fitch,	Magner,	Schermerhorn,
Brattan,	Fithian,	McCleary, Minn.	Scranton,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fletcher,	McDowell,	Settle,
Brickner,	Geary,	McGann,	Sickles,
Brown,	Goldzier,	McKaig,	Sipe,
Bryan,	Graham,	McKeighan,	Somers,
Burnes,	Gresham,	Mercer,	Springer,
Caminetti,	Grosvenor,	Meredith,	Stallings,
Compton,	Grout,	Meyer,	Stevens,
Coombs,	Haines,	Milliken,	Stockdale,
Cooper, Ind.	Harter,	Money,	Washington,
Cox,	Henderson, Ill.	Montgomery,	Wever,
Crain,	Henderson, Iowa	Morgan,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cummings,	Hendrix,	Moses,	White,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hines,	Murray,	Whiting,
Davey,	Hopkins, Ill.	Neill,	Wilson, W. Va.
De Forest,	Houk, Ohio	Newlands,	Wolverton.
Dingley,	Houk, Tenn.	Patterson,	

The SPEAKER. The doors will now be closed; the Clerk will call the absentees, and on this call excuses will be in order.

The roll was again called.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. JONES] is detained by illness in his family.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fifty-five members have answered to their names. The gentleman from Alabama moves to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill the title of which has been read; and on this the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 3, not voting 181; as follows:

YEAS—169.

Alderson,	Branch,	Causey,	Davis,
Alexander,	Brawley,	Clancy,	De Armond,
Allen,	Breckinridge, Ky.	Clark, Mo.	Denson,
Arnold,	Bretz,	Clarke, Ala.	Dinsmore,
Bailey,	Broderick,	Cobb, Ala.	Dockery,
Baker, Kans.	Brookshire,	Cockran,	Doolittle,
Baldwin,	Brown,	Cockrell,	Dunn,
Barwig,	Bryan,	Coffeen,	Dunphy,
Bell, Colo.	Bunn,	Conn,	Edmunds,
Bell, Tex.	Bynum,	Cooper, Fla.	Ellis, Oregon
Berry,	Cabaniss,	Cooper, Ind.	Enloe,
Black, Ga.	Cadmus,	Cooper, Tex.	Epes,
Black, Ill.	Campbell,	Cornish,	Erdman,
Bland,	Cannon, Cal.	Covert,	Fielder,
Boatner,	Capehart,	Crawford,	Forman,
Boen,	Caruth,	Culberson,	Fyan,
Bowers, Cal.	Catchings,	Curtis, Kans.	Geissenhainer,

Gorman,	Lawson,	O'Neil,	Strait,
Grady,	Layton,	Outhwaite,	Swanson,
Griffin,	Lester,	Page,	Sweet,
Hager,	Lockwood,	Paschal,	Talbert, S. C.
Hall, Minn.	Lynch,	Pearson,	Talbott, Md.
Hall, Mo.	Maddox,	Pence,	Tarsney,
Hammond,	Maguire,	Pendleton, Tex.	Tate,
Hare,	Mallory,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Taylor, Ind.
Harris,	Marshall,	Pickler,	Terry,
Hartman,	Martin, Ind.	Price,	Tracey,
Hatch,	McAleer,	Reilly,	Tucker,
Hayes,	McCreary, Ky.	Richards, Ohio	Turner,
Heard,	McCulloch,	Richardson, Mich.	Turpin,
Henderson, N. C.	McDannold,	Richardson, Tenn.	Tyler,
Hermann,	McDearmon,	Robbins,	Wadsworth,
Hilborn,	McEttrick,	Robertson, La.	Weadock,
Holman,	McLaurin,	Rusk,	Wells,
Hooker, Miss.	McMillin,	Russell, Ga.	Wheeler, Ala.
Hunter,	McNagny,	Ryan,	Williams, Ill.
Hutcheson,	McRae,	Sayers,	Williams, Miss.
Kirt,	Meredith,	Shell,	Wise,
Kilgore,	Morgan,	Sibley,	Woodard,
Kribbs,	Mutchler,	Simpson,	Wright, Pa.
Kyle,	Newlands,	Snodgrass,	
Lane,	Oates,	Springer,	
Latimer,	O'Ferrall,	Stone, Ky.	

NAYS—3.

Bundy,	Randall,	Warner.

NOT VOTING—181.

Abbott,	Donovan,	Johnson, Ohio	Reed,
Adams,	Draper,	Jones,	Reyburn,
Aitken,	Durborow,	Joy,	Ritchie,
Aldrich,	Ellis, Ky.	Kem,	Robinson, Pa.
Apsley,	English,	Kiefer,	Russell, Conn.
Avery,	Everett,	Lacey,	Schermerhorn,
Babcock,	Fellows,	Lapham,	Scranton,
Baker, N. H.	Fitch,	Lefever,	Settle,
Bankhead,	Fithian,	Linton,	Shaw,
Barnes,	Fletcher,	Lisle,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Funk,	Livingston,	Sickles,
Bartlett,	Funston,	Loud,	Sipe,
Belden,	Gardner,	Loudenslager	Smith,
Beltzhoover,	Gear,	Lucas,	Somers,
Bingham,	Geary,	Magner,	Sperry,
Blair,	Gillet, N. Y.	Mahon,	Stallings,
Blanchard,	Gillett, Mass.	Marsh,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Goldzier,	Marvin, N. Y.	Stevens,
Bower, N. C.	Goodnight,	McCall,	Stockdale,
Brattan,	Graham,	McCleary, Minn.	Stone, C. W.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Gresham,	McDowell,	Stone, W. A.
Brickner,	Grosvenor,	McGann,	Storer,
Brosius,	Grout,	McKaig,	Strong,
Burnes,	Hainer,	McKeighan,	Tawney,
Burrows,	Haines,	Meiklejohn,	Taylor, Tenn.
Caldwell,	Harmer,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Caminetti,	Harter,	Meyer,	Updegraff,
Cannon, Ill.	Haugen,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Chickering,	Heiner,	Money,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Childs,	Henderson, Ill.	Montgomery,	Walker,
Cobb, Mo.	Henderson, Iowa	Moon,	Wanger,
Cogswell,	Hendrix,	Morse,	Washington,
Compton,	Hepburn,	Moses,	Waugh,
Coombs,	Hicks,	Murray,	Wever,
Cooper, Wis.	Hines,	Neill,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cousins,	Hitt,	Northway,	White,
Cox,	Hooker, N. Y.	Patterson,	Whiting,
Crain,	Hopkins, Ill.	Payne,	Wilson, Ohio
Cummings,	Hopkins, Pa.	Paynter,	Wilson, Wash.
Curtis, N. Y.	Houk, Ohio	Perkins,	Wilson, W. Va.
Dalzell,	Houk, Tenn.	Phillips,	Wolverton,
Daniels,	Hudson,	Pigott,	Woomer,
Davey,	Hulick,	Post,	Wright, Mass.
De Forest,	Hull,	Powers,	
Dingley,	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	
Dolliver,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Rayner,	

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the names be recapitulated.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have just come into the House, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, where I had been on the matters relative to legislation. When my name was called I was not present, but I would like to have my name recorded, if it is in accordance with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain the request.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I refrained from voting because I am paired, but would like to vote to make a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House and failed to hear his name called?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I went out because I thought I had no right to vote. I was absent, and under the apprehension that I had not the right to vote.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the Chair can not entertain the request.

The names were recapitulated.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 169; the nays 3. No quorum has voted.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Republicans are filibustering against the admission of States, and therefore I move that the House adjourn.

[Cries of "Regular order!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I tried to vote, and I am a Republican.

Mr. REED. Then, of course, as the gentleman is moving to adjourn, he withdraws his remarks.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. LAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary: A bill (H. R. 1141) to remove the political disabilities of Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, in the State of Georgia. (Report No. 212.)

By Mr. MOON, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Henry James, residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas. (Report No. 213.)

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH: A bill (H. R. 4726) for the relief of citizens who have entered lands under an act to provide for the sale of timber lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 4727) to appoint a district judge for the southern district of Mississippi—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill H. R. 4728) for a public building at the city of Altoona, Pa., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALDERSON: A bill (H. R. 4729) to create the southern district of West Virginia, and to change the present judicial district of West Virginia, and fixing times and places for holding courts in said districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4730) supplemental to an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 4731) setting apart a portion of the Fort Keogh military reservation in the State of Montana for the purpose of an industrial school for Indian children, for the establishment of such school, for an appropriation for its establishment and maintenance, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4732) to amend section 3893 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McLAURIN: A bill (H. R. 4733) to repeal the duties on manufactured cotton goods, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4734) to authorize the Secretary of State to accept for the United States of America a painting by G. F. Watts, Royal Academician, entitled "Love and Life"—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 4735) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of certain corporations within the District of Columbia, approved October 1, 1890—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOWERS of California: A bill (H. R. 4736) to establish a postal savings bank department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4737) to create the office of foreman of pressework in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (by request): A bill (H. R. 4738) to amend section 738, chapter 22, of an act of Congress for the District of Columbia, passed June 19, 1860, specifying the grounds for divorce—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 4739) for the relief of heirs of Philip B. Shell, late of Bollinger County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4740) to increase the pension of Mrs. Helen G. Heiner, widow of the late Capt. Robert

G. Heiner, Company A, United States Infantry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4741) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Coffman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 4742) for the relief of the estate of Stephen Kulp, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COCKRAN: A bill (H. R. 4743) to appoint Warren C. Beach a captain in the Army, and to place him on the retired list, in addition to the number now authorized—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FUNK: A bill (H. R. 4744) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Larison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4745) for the relief of Andrew Shoenfelt, a citizen of Blair County, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4746) for the relief of the Society of the United Brethren in Christ, of Tyrone, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4747) for the relief of James Bookhamer, of Blair County, Pa.—to the Committe on Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4748) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 4749) granting a pension to W. A. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4750) to grant an honorable discharge to George Pennington, alias James Smiley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4751) for the relief of Charles P. Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 4752) for the relief of Elisha Lowry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4753) for the relief of Josef Stiner—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 4754) for the relief of Susan McCluskey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4755) to remove the charge of desertion against Elijah T. Holloway—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 4756) to grant a pension to Martha Custis Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A bill (H. R. 4757) for the relief of Benjamin F. Fox—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 4758) for the relief of Michael F. Newell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHELL: A bill (H. R. 4759) providing an appropriation for continued improvement of the Congaree River, in South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 4760) for the relief of George M. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4761) granting an honorable discharge to John Benson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4762) for the relief of Elizabeth Looney—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of all the employés of the Howard Plate-Glass Company, of Duquesne, Pa., against change in the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition from laborers on public works, providing for payments due from contractors on Government works—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of C. S. Businga, of Franklin Grove, Ill., for 1-cent postage law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of S. H. Caldwell, of Webb City, Mo., for compensation for loss of horses while with Company C of the Seventh Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, actively engaged in the United States service—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: Memorial of 224 employés of the Burlington Woolen Mills, of Winooski, protesting against any reduction of duties on woolen and knit goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STORER: Petition of the Cincinnati Subordinate Association of the National Lithographers, Artists, and Engravers' Association, for substitution of specific for ad valorem duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, for improvement of the Upper Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the Little Rock Printing Pressmen's Union, asking that there should be created the office of foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: Petition signed by 24 members of Cass Post, No. 415, Grand Army of the Republic, of Dresden, Ohio, praying for a thorough investigation of the present administration of the Pension Office—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: Protest of employés of Norristown Steel Company, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

T. W. DAVIS AND MICHAEL KNIGHT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House communications from the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings of the court in the cases of T. W. Davis *vs.* The United States and Michael Knight, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims.

KITCHEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, calling attention to the condition of the kitchen of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. This communication will be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and, if there be no objection, that committee will be directed to investigate the condition of the kitchen, and to report to the House at any time.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HITT, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Sarah M. Cadwell, Fifty-first Congress, there being no adverse report thereon.

THE LATE SENATOR STANFORD.

Mr. LOUD offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That Saturday, the 20th day of January, 1894, beginning at 2 o'clock p. m., be set apart for appropriate eulogies to the memory of Hon. Leland Stanford, late a Senator from the State of California.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, for prior years, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I am instructed by the committee to call up this bill after the reading of the Journal to-morrow.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege relating to the proceedings of the House. I ask that the communication which I send to the Clerk's desk be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A RAILWAY ADVERTISEMENT IN A GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 3.*

One of the most remarkable innovations essayed in a Government publication appears in an executive document just printed by order of the House Committee on Military Affairs. It is a glaring advertisement of a Western railroad which runs from Chicago to Oklahoma. The advertisement appears on an official map, which is inserted in the printed testimony in relation to the opening of the Cherokee Strip. The map shows the sectional and township lines of the lands within the Strip, and also the location of the town sites, the courses of the streams, and the railroad right of way. That much, of course, is taken from the Government survey and is legitimate, but on the margin of the map, in bold letters, is a "double-column" advertisement of one of the two railroads that cross the Strip. The entire official directory of the railroad company is given, together with a table showing the various towns on the line, their respective population, and the railroad fare to each of them from Wichita, Kans. Above all is a stirring appeal to the public to patronize the road as the "best one in all respects to travel on," and the "only original World's Fair line."

How this railroad advertisement crept into a Congressional publication nobody in authority seems to know. The probabilities are that the enterprising clerk who edited the copy of the testimony for the Public Printer secured the necessary map from the railroad company as the most convenient source, and then neglected to strike out the advertisement. It is quite probable that the publication will have an alarming effect upon some of the antimonopoly members of Congress as soon as the details of the new publication shall greet their eyes.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I should not pay any attention to a publication of that kind, because I know that members of Congress, or other intelligent persons, would be very unlikely to put an evil construction upon the matter therein referred to, but since the subject was brought to my attention the local Republican paper of my city has very kindly insinuated that the advertisement was edited by the clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs with a view to a possible free ride over this railroad, or that the committee itself was expecting to have the privilege sometime of free transportation over the road. [Laughter.] This publication relates to Executive Document No. 27, a letter from the Secretary of War in relation to the opening of the Cherokee Strip.

After the resolution was adopted directing an investigation of that matter an officer of the Army of considerable standing, Col. Heyl, of the Inspector-General's Office, was notified by telegraph to proceed to Oklahoma and make the investigation. He made the investigation, and finding occasion for a map to be used in connection with his report, he purchased one at the most convenient point, and did not observe that it contained this advertisement. He used the map for reference and sent it to the War Department as a part of his report. That report passed through the hands of the chief clerk of the Adjutant-General's Office.

Of course, reports of this kind are not all investigated by the Secretary of War personally; that would be utterly impossible; and the Secretary transmitted the report and accompanying papers to the House, as is customary, without having given them critical examination. By order of the House it passed from the Speaker's table into the hands of the Public Printer. The Committee on Military Affairs never saw it until it was in printed form. The clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs never saw it until he saw it in printed form. It was no part of their duty to scrutinize these papers. Every gentleman present is aware that communications of that kind pass immediately from the House into the hands of the Public Printer. I have here a letter from the Adjutant-General, which I will ask to have read in this connection.

The letter was read, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 14, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to our conversation on Tuesday last in the matter then brought to attention by you, of the incorporation of a Western railroad map in the official report of Col. E. M. Heyl, Inspector-General, of an investigation by him of certain affairs in Oklahoma Territory, and its subsequent publication in an executive document, I have the honor to inform you that Col. Heyl, having been called upon by telegraph for a statement of the circumstances in the case, reports that the map was used by him simply to illustrate the text of his report; that it was purchased by him from his private funds, and was not donated by the railroad concerned or by anyone; that he took advantage of it as the means immediately at hand of showing location of new towns, school lands, and troops; that it was purchased without regard to where or by whom it was published, and that the fact of its publication by the railroad company did not attract his notice. He disclaims all intention of using it to advertise any corporation whatever, and holds that criticism to such effect is unjust.

On the 28th of September, 1893, he was furnished with a copy of a telegram communicating House resolution of the same date, calling for report "as to what part the Army of the United States had in the opening of the Cherokee Strip on September 16, 1893, and under what orders it acted; and whether said orders were violated; and whether any outrages were committed by the troops upon any civilians entering said Strip." He had already, by telegram, been charged with investigation of the circumstances of the case.

Under the requirements of the resolution of the House, the report, with accompanying papers, was transmitted to the House of Representatives on the 1st of November, 1893, and was printed under its order of November 2, 1893.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
GEO. D. RUGGLES, *Adjutant-General.*

Hon. JOSEPH H. OUTHWAITE, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, no political significance ought to have been given to this matter, nor does the oversight of the officer from whom the report came nor of those through whose hands it passed reflect in any wise on the honor or integrity of the officers concerned in making this report. I will say, however, in this connection that I am informed that the officer who made the report and also the chief clerk through whose hands it passed, both old in the service, are neither of them politically in sympathy with the present Administration.

Mr. SIMPSON. Can the gentleman tell us whether he has any information showing why they happened to purchase this particular map, or whether it was given to them by the railroad corporation.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Col. Heyl states distinctly that having need of a map to refer to in connection with points of interest involved in his report, he sent out and purchased this one with his own funds and used it. In using the map, of course his attention was directed particularly to the matters that he wished to bring to the knowledge of the Secretary of War and of the Congress. He simply omitted to run a blue pencil mark through that advertisement. I can not conceive that Col. Heyl could have had any motive to present such an advertisement as that as a part of his report.

Mr. SIMPSON. I do not suppose anyone would impute to him such a motive; but it leaves that impression upon the people that this map has been given to the Department by a railroad corporation for the purpose of getting an advertisement.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But my friend from Kansas will observe that in the report of Col. Heyl, who is now in Chicago, and whose absence from the city has been one cause of my delay in bringing this matter to the attention of Congress, it is stated that he purchased this map himself; it was not given to him by anyone.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to suggest that, in order to expunge this advertisement, it would have been necessary to do something more than draw a blue pencil through it; the advertisement could not have been struck out without making a new plate.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Oh, yes, it could. The plate did not come with the map. This map delineates other railroads in regard to which it was necessary to have information as a part of the geography of the country.

Mr. MORSE. But this advertisement is part and parcel of the plate or electrotype; and it could not have been struck out.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But a new plate of the map has been made at the Government Printing Office. Had there been no advertisement on the map sent over, none would have been made by the printing office.

Mr. LACEY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio whether he does not think that this advertisement which is now going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be a little more valuable than the one which went into this executive document?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. LACEY. I want to know whether the advertisement of this great Rock Island route, which is now going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will not be more valuable than the advertisement which has already gone into the miscellaneous document?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am not responsible for the advertisement. The name of the company has not been mentioned until mentioned by the gentleman himself. He is doing the advertising. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say.

IMPROVEMENT OF CONGAREE RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. SHELL, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, requested to furnish the House of Representatives at the earliest day practicable such information as he may have regarding the necessity for providing deeper draft over the two miles of the Congaree River just below Columbia, S. C., that is contemplated in the present approved project for that river; and that he be requested further to submit a plan and estimate of the cost of securing a depth in this two miles of river equal to that already provided for the rest of the stream.

RECIPROCITY.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby respectfully requested to furnish to this House information as to the number of reciprocal commercial agreements or treaties this Government has made under the provisions of the tariff act approved October 1, 1890; the names of the several foreign countries with which such agreements or treaties were negotiated; the length they are severally to continue in force; the classes of manufactured articles or agricultural products produced in the United States, on which a reduction of the duty on the importation of such products to such foreign countries was thus obtained, and the amount of such reduction; also the kind, amount, and value of all products of the United States exported to each of said foreign countries, separately, during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1890, June 30, 1892, June 30, 1893; and also the kind, amount, and value of all products imported into the United States from each of said foreign countries separately during each of the fiscal years named.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, has this matter been considered by any committee of the House?

The SPEAKER. It has not. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I have no objection to the subject being considered; but I think it is of sufficient importance to justify the reference of the resolution. I hope the gentleman will consent to this course. I do not object to the consideration of the subject.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then let the resolution be referred.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The Committee on Ways and Means to which, I suggest, the resolution be referred, will give the subject due consideration.

Mr. REED. Is not that committee rather slow in these matters?

Mr. MCMILLIN. We will be fast enough for the gentleman.

REVIVAL OF SUITS AGAINST UNITED STATES OFFICERS.

The committees being called for reports,

Mr. WOLVERTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4312) to provide for the

revival of suits by mandamus against officers of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

No further reports being presented,

The SPEAKER. The morning hour for the consideration of business called up by committees begins now at twenty-five minutes after 12 o'clock. The call rests with the Committee on Private Land Claims.

WILLIAM M'GARRAHAN.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. On behalf of the Committee on Private Land Claims, I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 415) to submit to the Court of Private Land Claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill.

The question having been put,

The SPEAKER. They ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SAYERS. I call for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 50, noes 5.

Mr. SAYERS. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia and Mr. SAYERS were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 169, noes 11.

So the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. MCRAE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 415) to submit to the Court of Private Land Claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, that can not be done at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the gentleman's motion?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. That the committee rise and report the bill favorably.

Mr. DINGLEY. But there has been no general debate. Until general debate is closed that motion is not in order. The bill must be considered by paragraphs for amendment.

Mr. SAYERS. That motion is not in order at this time. We have had no general debate at all. I demand the reading of the report. I desire to say right here to the gentleman that he can not pass this bill through in such shape as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has the floor if he desires to occupy the time.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I do not wish to occupy the time in debate if it can be avoided.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to use the time he can be recognized for that purpose, otherwise the Chair will recognize some gentleman in opposition.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. How much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes of the hour. Does the gentleman desire to occupy it?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I do not desire to take any time in debating this bill. The bill has been before this House in different shapes for more than a quarter of a century; and I think that nearly every member is thoroughly conversant with it. If I take time now in debating the matters contained in the bill it will simply consume the remainder of the hour, and I will have no opportunity within the hour to get a vote upon the motion to report it favorably.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Is this the same bill that was vetoed by President Harrison?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. No, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. In what respect does it differ from that bill?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. The bill to which the gentleman refers passed both Houses in the Fifty-second Congress. The President vetoed it for two reasons, as he assigned in the veto message: one that the bill failed to require proof of McGarrahan that he was the legal assignee of the claim, and the other that the bill as drawn confirmed the title in the New Idria Mining Company to certain property. This bill is drawn to fit both conditions then raised.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Does this bill make the Government liable upon any conditions?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. It provides that the claim to this property shall be referred to the Court of Private Land Claims. If they find that the claimant has any title to it, it shall report the value of any materials to Congress that may in the time past have been taken from the land; so far and no further. That is the bill. Congress has already passed upon the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Does it require the court to consider in evidence certain papers now lost or said to be lost?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. No sir; not to consider lost papers, only papers that are in existence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Those papers that were in existence?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Yes sir.

Mr. MILLIKEN. It merely gives a standing in court to this claimant as I understand it.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. That is all.

Mr. DINGLEY. And with the right of an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, the gentleman will find, further.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? If this bill is referred to the Court of Private Land Claims will it not require Congress to prolong the life of that court, which is now nearly about to expire?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I did not know that the court was about to expire.

Mr. SAYERS. There are other questions that I would like to ask the gentleman.

Mr. DINGLEY. There are many questions that arise.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas. How long do you want? I will yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. SAYERS. Well, I won't take a moment. I want to show just the character of this bill which the committee has called up to be passed in this manner.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I will give you two minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman can occupy his own time, and I will take the floor in my own right afterwards. I wish to present the character of this bill to the committee.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. How much time do you want?

Mr. DINGLEY. There is no time to-day to get this bill through.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Only seven minutes of the hour remain.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I am willing to yield the gentleman half of that.

Mr. SAYERS. I do not intend to permit a bill which may involve the Government in an expenditure of millions of dollars to pass through the House under the whip and spur of the morning hour without resistance.

Mr. LOUD. It may involve thirty millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What is the amount of money behind this claim?

Mr. SAYERS. Nobody can tell.

Mr. LOUD. Thirty millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It is more than the balance in the Treasury, isn't it?

Mr. SAYERS. Yes.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. How much time does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] want?

Mr. SAYERS. I desire an hour.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. There is not an hour remaining. There are only five minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. PENDLETON] is running.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I see that it is perfectly apparent there is no intention on the part of the opponents to this bill to allow me to reach a vote within the next five minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. Of course not.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Under the circumstances, I think I will take the time myself. I want to give some slight explanation of this claim.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman read the fourth section of the bill?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virignia. No; I shall not read any section, as there is not time. I do not desire to be inter-

rupted. In the year 1868, some twenty-five years ago, I first heard of this claim, and I have followed it in Congress and out of Congress, until I have found myself called upon to consider it, as chairman of the Committee on Private Land Claims.

It is, I believe, the most remarkable claim which has ever been presented before Congress; and it has been more vigorously, thoroughly, and honestly pursued than any other claim which has ever been presented before Congress; and the reason that I want to call the attention of you gentlemen to it just now is not in the hope of obtaining the passage of the bill to-day, but because I expect in a few days to try to obtain a special day for the consideration of the bill, and I want to arouse the interest of this House in this claim, so that a sufficient number will attend to give me a quorum and consider the bill on its merits.

Mr. McGarrahan is an old gentleman, nearly 75 years of age. For twenty-five years this claim has been his life. He has been pursuing it year after year, month after month, day after day. Four Houses of Representatives of the United States have passed this bill. Two Senates of the United States have passed this bill. President Harrison only vetoed it on two grounds, which have been obviated in the present measure; and I hope that when I obtain a day for it there will be a sufficient number of members of the House of Representatives who desire to see justice done to the honest claim of an honest old man with one foot in the grave—I hope a sufficient number of members of this House will be here to stand by me and help me get a vote upon it, regardless of the corporations in the West that may choose to fight it; and I believe that my friend [Mr. SAYERS] will stand by the bill and stand by old man McGarrahan, and stand by the cause of justice. [Applause.]

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman yield a minute to me?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the character of this bill in the brief time that is allowed me. In the first place, if the members of the committee will read the second section, a provision will be found which makes every *ex parte* statement made before any committee of Congress, every character of testimony that has been taken in behalf of the claimant, competent testimony, which makes pretended copies of originals that have been lost evidence; so that if all the testimony so authorized is admitted, should the bill became a law, the Government would be absolutely powerless to defend itself against the claim.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Is it not the same evidence that has been presented in the court heretofore?

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to call the attention of the committee to another clause in this bill, which provides that the Court of Private Land Claims shall be taken by the witnesses of Mr. McGarrahan beneath the surface of the earth, to inquire into the supposed value of all the minerals there, and assess a judgment therefor, which Congress will be called upon to pay.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Is there anything said about any such judgment in this bill?

Mr. SAYERS. There is not a man who has ever had any connection with the matter who can tell this committee the amount of the finding which may be rendered under this bill if it should become a law, and for that reason I am opposed to it. I have said to the gentleman that if instead of trying to crowd this measure, which is of so great importance, which is so far-reaching in its consequences, through the morning hours, he would allow us to debate it for a reasonable time so that the House may be thoroughly informed as to the character of the measure upon which it may be called upon to vote, then, so far as I am concerned, I will not object to the taking of the sense of the House upon the question. I can not agree to the passage of the bill, as desired by the gentleman from West Virginia, without even reading the report of the committee.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Will the gentleman help us to get a day for the consideration of this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The morning hour has expired.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MCRAE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 415) to submit to the Court of Private Land Claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (S. 1021) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. VILAS, Mr. LINDSAY, and Mr. PLATT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1138) to repeal so much of a proviso of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," and approved March 1, 1893, as relates to the payment of pensions to nonresidents who are not citizens of the United States; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments.

VACATION OF ORDER FOR EVENING SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the Friday night session be vacated for this evening.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with the special order, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill (H. R. 4393) for the admission of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the day set apart under the rules for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar. I desire to make a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering business on the Private Calendar.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I make the point of order——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that while this is the day set apart under the rules for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar, on yesterday an order was adopted by the House, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That this day, after the second morning hour, and each day thereafter until both of such bills shall have been fully disposed of, be assigned to the consideration of H. R. 4393 (for the admission of Arizona) and H. R. 353 (for the admission of New Mexico).

The SPEAKER. This order, adopted by the House on a report made by the Committee on Rules yesterday, provides that that day and each day thereafter, after the second morning hour, be devoted to the consideration of these bills. The Chair thinks that would deprive the House of the right of going on with the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. ENLOE. That is a continuing order until it is finally disposed of?

The SPEAKER. It is, until disposed of. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 130, nays none.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point that no quorum has voted.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 5, not voting 166; as follows:

YEAS—182.

Alderson,	Coombs,	Hines,	Rayner,
Alexander,	Cooper, Ind.	Houk, Ohio	Reilly,
Allen,	Cooper, Tex.	Hudson,	Richards, Ohio.
Arnold,	Cox,	Hunter,	Richardson, Mich.
Bailey,	Crain,	Hutcheson,	Richardson, Tenn.
Baker, Kans.	Crawford,	Johnson, Ohio	Robertson, La.
Baker, N. H.	Culberson,	Kilgore,	Rusk,
Baldwin,	Cummings,	Lane,	Russell, Ga.
Bankhead,	Curtis, Kans.	Latimer,	Ryan,
Barnes,	Daniels,	Lawson,	Sayers,
Barwig,	Davey,	Lester,	Sibley,
Bell, Colo.	Davis,	Lisle,	Sickles,
Bell, Tex.	De Armond,	Livingston,	Simpson,
Beltzhoover,	De Forest,	Lucas,	Snodgrass,
Berry,	Dinsmore,	Lynch,	Somers,
Black, Ga.	Dockery,	Maddox,	Springer,
Blanchard,	Donovan,	Maguire,	Stallings,
Bland,	Doolittle,	Mallory,	Stevens,
Boatner,	Dunn,	Marshall,	Stockdale,
Bower, N. C.	Dunphy,	Martin, Ind.	Stone, Ky.
Brawley,	Ellis, Oregon	McAleer,	Strait,
Breckinridge, Ark.	English,	McCreary, Ky.	Swanson,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Enloe,	McDannold,	Sweet,
Bretz,	Erdman,	McDearmon,	Talbert, S. C.
Brickner,	Fielder,	McEttrick,	Talbott, Md.
Broderick,	Forman,	McKaig,	Tarsney,
Brookshire,	Fyan,	McLaurin,	Tate,
Brown,	Geary,	McMillin,	Taylor, Ind.
Bryan,	Geissenhainer,	McNagny,	Terry,
Bunn,	Goodnight,	McRae,	Tracey,
Bynum,	Gorman,	Meredith,	Tucker,
Cabaniss,	Grady,	Meyer,	Turner,
Cadmus,	Griffin,	Montgomery,	Turpin,
Campbell,	Hager,	Morgan,	Tyler,
Cannon, Cal.	Hall, Minn.	Mutchler,	Washington,
Caruth,	Hall, Mo.	O'Neil,	Weadock,
Catchings,	Hammond,	Outhwaite,	Wells,
Clancy,	Hare,	Page,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clark, Mo.	Harris,	Paschal,	Williams, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Hartman,	Paynter,	Williams, Miss.
Cobb, Ala.	Hatch,	Pearson,	Wilson, Wash.
Cobb, Mo.	Haugen,	Pence,	Wise,
Cockran,	Hayes,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wolverton,
Cockrell,	Henderson, N. C.	Pendleton, W. Va.	Woodard.
Coffeen,	Hermann,	Pickler,	
Conn,	Hilborn,	Price,	

NAYS—5.

Haines,	Powers,	Randall,	Warner.
Pigott,			

NOT VOTING—166.

Abbott,	Durborow,	Jones,	Ray,
Adams,	Edmunds,	Joy,	Reed,
Aitken,	Ellis, Ky.	Kem,	Reyburn,
Aldrich,	Epes,	Kiefer,	Ritchie,
Apsley,	Everett,	Kribbs,	Robbins,
Avery,	Fellows,	Kyle,	Robinson, Pa.
Babcock,	Fitch,	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.
Bartholdt,	Fithian,	Lapham,	Schermerhorn,
Bartlett,	Fletcher,	Layton,	Scranton,
Belden,	Funk,	Lefever,	Settle,
Bingham,	Funston,	Linton,	Shaw,
Black, Ill.	Gardner,	Lockwood,	Shell,
Blair,	Gear,	Loud,	Sherman,
Boen,	Gillet, N. Y.	Loudenslager,	Sipe,
Boutelle,	Gillett, Mass.	Magner	Smith,
Bowers, Cal.	Goldzier,	Mahon,	Sperry,
Branch,	Graham,	Marsh,	Stephenson,
Brattan,	Gresham,	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, C. W.
Brosius,	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Stone, W. A.
Bundy,	Grout,	McCleary, Minn.	Storer,
Burnes,	Hainer,	McCulloch,	Strong,
Burrows,	Harmer,	McDowell,	Tawney,
Caldwell,	Harter,	McGann,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannetti,	Heard,	McKeighan,	Thomas,
Cannon, Ill.	Heiner,	Melklejohn,	Updegraff,
Capehart,	Henderson, Ill.	Mercer,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Causey,	Henderson, Iowa	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Chickering,	Hendrix,	Money,	Wadsworth,
Childs,	Hepburn,	Moon,	Walker,
Cogswell,	Hicks,	Morse,	Wanger,
Compton,	Hitt,	Moses,	Waugh,
Cooper, Fla.	Holman,	Murray,	Wever,
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker, Miss.	Neill,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cornish	Hooker, N. Y.	Newlands,	White,
Cousins,	Hopkins, Ill.	Northway,	Whiting,
Covert,	Hopkins, Pa.	Oates,	Wilson, Ohio
Curtis, N. Y.	Houk, Tenn.	O'Ferrall,	Wilson, W. Va.
Dalzell,	Hulick,	Patterson,	Woomer,
Denson,	Hull,	Payne,	Wright, Mass.
Dingley,	Ikirt,	Perkins,	Wright, Pa.
Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Phillips,	
Draper,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Post,	

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, in behalf of my colleague (Mr. MCCULLOCH), that yesterday evening he complained of having fever. I am satisfied he is sick this morning or he would be present. If present he would vote "yea."

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. MONEY with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

For this day:

Mr. GRESHAM with Mr. RAY.

Mr. MOSES with Mr. HARMER.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. WHITING with Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair.

ARIZONA.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. It is almost verbatim the bill which passed the last House on June 6, 1892, by almost a unanimous vote. The vote was 173 ayes and 13 nays.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. I think the bill ought to be read, Mr. Chairman.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Arizona is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and that the constitution which the people of Arizona have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 2. That the said State shall consist of all the Territory included within the present boundaries of Arizona, to wit: Commencing at the southwest corner of the State of Colorado, the same being the northwest corner of the Territory of New Mexico as established by act of Congress February 24, 1863; thence west with the thirty-seventh parallel of north latitude to its intersection with the east boundary line of the State of Nevada; thence south with that boundary line to its intersection with the center of the Colorado River; thence following down the center of said river to a point on the boundary line established by treaty between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, dated December 30, 1853; thence easterly, following said treaty line to its intersection with 109° 2' 59.25" of longitude west of Greenwich; thence north with that degree to the place of beginning.

SEC. 3. That until the next general census, or until otherwise provided by law, said State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the election of the Representative to the Fifty-fourth Congress and the Representative to the Fifty-fifth Congress shall take place at the time and be conducted and certified in the same manner as is provided in the constitution of the State for the election of State, district, and other officers.

SEC. 4. That sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36 in every township of said proposed State, and where such sections, or any parts thereof, have been sold or otherwise disposed of by or under the authority of any act of Congress, other lands equivalent thereto, in legal subdivisions of not less than one quarter section, and as contiguous as may be to the section in lieu of which the same is taken, are hereby granted to said State for the support of common schools, such indemnity lands to be selected within said State in such manner as the Legislature may provide, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. That all lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be disposed of only at public sale, the proceeds to constitute a permanent school fund, the interest of which only shall be expended in the support of said schools. But said lands may, under such regulations as the Legislature shall prescribe, be leased for periods of not more than five years, and such land shall not be subject to preemption, homestead entry, or any other entry under the land laws of the United States, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, but shall be reserved for school purposes only.

SEC. 6. That 100 sections of the unappropriated public lands within said State, to be selected and located in legal subdivisions as provided in section 4 of this act, shall be, and are hereby, granted to said State for the purpose of erecting public buildings at the capital of said State.

SEC. 7. That 10 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to the same, shall be paid to the said State, to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of the common schools within said State.

SEC. 8. That the lands granted to the Territory of Arizona by the act of February 18, 1881, entitled "An act to grant lands to Dakota, Montana, Arizona, Idaho, and Wyoming for university purposes," are hereby vested in the State of Arizona to the extent of the full quantity of 75 sections to said State, and any portion of said lands that may not have been selected by said Territory of Arizona may be selected by the said State: but said act of February 18, 1881, is hereby so amended as to provide that none of said lands shall be sold for less than $5 per acre, and the proceeds shall constitute a permanent fund, to be safely invested and held by said State, and the income thereof be used exclusively for university purposes. The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

SEC. 9. That 100,000 acres or land, to be selected and located as provided in section 4 of this act, are hereby granted to said State for the use and support of an agricultural college in said State as provided in the acts of Congress making donations of lands for such purpose.

SEC. 10. That in lieu of the grant of land for purposes of internal improvement made to new States by the eighth section of the act of September 4, 1841, which section is hereby repealed as to the State of Arizona, and in lieu of any claim or demand by the said State under the act of September 28, 1850, and section 2479 of the Revised Statutes, making a grant of swamp and overflowed lands to certain States, which grant it is hereby declared is not ex-

tended to the State of Arizona, and in lieu of any grant of saline lands to said State, the following grants of land are hereby made, to wit:

To the State of Arizona: For the establishment and maintenance and support in the said State of the insane asylum, 50,000 acres; for the penitentiary, 50,000 acres; for the deaf, dumb, and blind asylum to be established, 30,000 acres; for a miners' hospital for disabled miners, 30,000; for normal schools, 100,000 acres; for State charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions, 250,000 acres; for county hospitals, 100,000 acres.

SEC. 11. That the State of Arizona shall not be entitled to any further or other grants of land for any purpose than as expressly provided in this act; and the lands granted by the foregoing section shall be held, appropriated, and disposed of exclusively for the purposes herein mentioned, in such manner as the Legislature of the State may provide: *Provided, however*, That none of the lands granted for normal schools shall be disposed of otherwise than as provided in section 5 of this act.

SEC. 12. That all mineral lands shall be exempted from the grants made by this act; but if sections 2, 16, 32, and 36, or any subdivision or portion of any smallest subdivision thereof in any township shall be found by the Department of the Interior to be mineral lands, said State is hereby authorized and empowered to select, in legal subdivisions, an equal quantity of other unappropriated lands in said State in lieu thereof, for the use and the benefit of the common schools of said State.

SEC. 13. That all lands granted in quantity or as indemnity by this act shall be selected, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, from the unreserved and unappropriated public lands of the United States within the limits of the State entitled thereto; and there shall be deducted from the number of acres of land donated by this act for specific objects to said State the number of acres that may have heretofore been donated by Congress to said Territory for similar objects.

SEC. 14. That the sum of $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Territory for defraying the expenses of the said convention and for the payment of the members thereof, under the same rules and regulations and at the same rates as are now provided by law for the payment of the Territorial Legislatures, and for the elections held therefor and thereunder. Any money hereby appropriated not necessary for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 15. That the said State, when admitted as aforesaid, shall constitute a judicial district, the name thereof to be the same as the name of the State; and the circuit and district courts therefor shall be held at the capital of the State for the time being, and the said district shall, for judicial purposes, until otherwise provided, be attached to the ninth judicial circuit. There shall be appointed for said district one district judge, one United States attorney, and one United States marshal. The judge of said district shall receive a yearly salary of $5,000, payable as provided for by law, and shall reside in the district. There shall be appointed clerks of said courts, who shall keep their offices at the capital of said State. The regular terms of said courts shall be held in said district at the place aforesaid on the first Monday in April and the first Monday in November of each year, and only one grand jury and one petit jury shall be summoned in both said circuit and district courts. The circuit and district courts for said district, and the judges thereof, respectively, shall possess the same powers and jurisdiction and perform the same duties required to be performed by the other circuit and district courts and judges of the United States, and shall be governed by the same laws and regulations. The marshal, district attorney, and clerks of the circuit and district courts of said district, and all other officers and persons performing duties in the administration of justice therein, shall severally possess the powers and perform the duties lawfully possessed and required to be performed by similar officers in other districts of the United States; and shall, for the services they may perform, receive the fees and compensation allowed by law to other similar officers and persons performing similar duties in the State of California.

SEC. 16. That all cases of appeal or writ of error heretofore prosecuted and now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States upon any record from the supreme court of said Territory, or that may hereafter lawfully be prosecuted upon any record from said courts, may be heard and determined by said Supreme Court of the United States. And the mandate of execution or of further proceedings shall be directed by the Supreme Court of the United States to the circuit or district court hereby established within the said State from or to the supreme court of such State, as the nature of the case may require. And the circuit, district, and State courts herein named shall, respectively, be the successor of the supreme court of the Territory, as to all such cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein; and that from all judgments and decrees of the supreme court of the Territory mentioned in this act, in any case arising within the limits of the proposed State prior to admission, the parties to such judgment shall have the same right to prosecute appeals and writs of error to the Supreme Court of the United States as they shall have had by law prior to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 17. That in respect to all cases, proceedings, and matters now pending in the supreme or district courts of the said Territory at the time of the admission into the Union of the State of Arizona and arising within the limits of such State, whereof the circuit or district courts by this act established might have had jurisdiction under the laws of the United States had such courts existed at the time of the commencement of such cases, the said circuit and district courts, respectively, shall be the successors of said supreme and district courts of said Territory; and in respect to all other cases, proceedings, and matters pending in the supreme or district courts of the said Territory at the time of admission of such Territory into the Union, arising within the limits of said State, the courts established by such State shall, respectively, be the successors of said supreme and district Territorial courts; and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such circuit, district, and State courts, respectively, and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law; but no writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding now pending, or that prior to the admission of the State shall be pending, in any Territorial court in said Territory shall abate by the admission of such State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred and proceeded with in the proper United States circuit, district, or State court, as the case may be: *Provided, however*, That in all civil actions, causes, and proceedings in which the United States is not a party transfers shall not be made to the circuit and district courts of the United States except upon cause shown by written request of one of the parties to such action or proceeding filed in the proper court; and in the absence of such request such cases shall be proceeded with in the proper State courts.

SEC. 18. That the Legislature of the said State may elect two Senators of the United States as is provided by the constitution of said State, and the Senators and Representative of said State shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 19. That until the State officers are elected and qualified under the provisions of the constitution of said State the officers of the Territory of Arizona shall discharge the duties of their respective offices under the constitution of the State in the manner and form as therein provided.

SEC. 20. That from and after the admission of said State into the Union, in pursuance of this act, the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States; and all laws in force made by said Territory at the time of its admission into the Union, until amended or repealed, shall be in force in said State, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State, and all acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by a Legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 21. That this act shall take effect on the 1st day of July, 1894.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as this bill passed the House last year by a vote of 173 to 13, and the House fully understands its provisions, I trust that no one will seek to delay its passage. I have made inquiry and I can not learn that there is any desire on the part of the House for any extended debate upon this measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for about ten minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] have ten minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I do not think that Arizona has sufficient population, wealth, or commercial importance to entitle that Territory to become a member of the Federal Union as a State.

The time will come, undoubtedly, when I will be in favor of such a bill. I am confident that that Territory will suffer no hardship under a Territorial government for some years to come.

The Territory of Arizona has a population of 60,000, or, to be exact, 59,620, one-quarter of the population required to represent a district in Congress from Massachusetts. To continue to admit such small States, with such unequal representation in the Senate, is a great injustice to the great, prosperous commercial and empire States of the Union, as was so strikingly shown in the three months of the silver contest in the Senate, when the majority were deaf to the demand of a great majority of the people of the country. Deaf, I say, to the universal demand of the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Ohio, because mining camps like Nevada had the same representation in the Senate of the United States as the great empire States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. This bill, like the bill to admit Utah and New Mexico, is going to pass this Democratic House and six Democratic and free-silver Senators added to the Senate of the United States; but I denounce it as impolitic, unwise partisanship, and not statesmanship. I denounce it as unjust to the great Commonwealth which I in part represent.

Having said so much about the pending bill, I desire to revert to the former debate for a moment, upon the admission of Utah as a State.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday last, when the House was in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, the delegate from Utah, Mr. RAWLINS, saw fit to make a bitter personal attack on me. The time for debate was so limited and so many other gentlemen desired to speak, that I made no attempt to reply; and I would now be silent but for a very unjust and untruthful charge which the gentleman made against the Commonwealth which I have the honor in part to represent.

The gentleman charged in his reply to my speech on that occasion: First, that polygamy was established in Utah by natives of New England, that it was a legitimate outgrowth of Puritanism; and, second, he further charged that the colony of Massachusetts had executed persons convicted of witchcraft by burning.

Where did the gentleman from Utah get that? Perhaps he read it in the Mormon bible. I recommend to the gentleman from Utah that he get and read a reliable history of Massachusetts and New England, and I would suggest for a starter a kindergarten edition.

That Mormonism is a legitimate outgrowth of the stern virtues of the men who settled New England, of the men who crossed a trackless ocean and who there dared the dangers of the wild beasts and hostile Indians to establish a place where they might worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, men and women who knew no fear but the fear of God—I say such a charge against the early settlers of New England is the foulest slander that ever was uttered, and he is the one who should hang his head in shame.

Now, in reply to the gentleman's charge that Massachusetts burned witches, I have to say that a lie well stuck to is not as good as the truth; and I affirm, and challenge contradiction, when I say that no witch was ever burned in the colony or Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the matter of the witchcraft delusion the people of Massachusetts colony shared the delusion that extended over the civilized world at that date; at that time thousands were executed in every European country for witchcraft, and the letters which

came to the colonies from their friends in the mother country were filled with accounts of these trials and executions, and it is no wonder that the delusion should have affected them.

To the honor of Massachusetts be it said that she was one of the first civilized countries to repudiate and denounce the delusion and to confess in sorrow and repent of her mistakes of the past.

And, Mr. Chairman, it does not lie in the mouth of any man calling himself a Mormon (though I concede his claim that he is an antipolygamist), I say it does not become any Mormon born in Utah to call in question or make invidious reflections upon any man upon this floor on account of New England ancestry and education, or to accuse any Massachusetts man of bigotry or superstition.

The gentlemen who heard my speech, as well as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will bear witness to the fact that the charges which I made against the inhabitants of Utah were largely and principally directed to the vile deeds of the past, and I incline to and did allow that a change had come over the sentiment of the people, but I still distrusted the Mormon heirarchy in command of the so-called Mormon Church, and I pleaded for delay in the admission of Utah in order that the leaven which is said to be working in that dark and benighted Territory might have its full effect before it should be admitted as a State.

That is all the ground there was for the bitter personal attack made upon me by the Delegate from Utah.

It seems that the House did not agree with me, and I bowed to the will of the majority.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to read the bill by sections.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, before that is done I wish to occupy two or three minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont be recognized for five minutes. I have no disposition to oppose any obstacle to a full and free debate.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. POWERS. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge, and of the Delegate from Arizona who is interested in it, to the fact that the preamble of the bill recites that the people of Arizona "on the 30th day of September, 1889, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose," adopted a constitution. That constitution is nowhere set forth in the bill, so that we are called upon to pass this enabling act without knowing what the constitution is.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The report of the committee sets out the constitution in full. The gentleman will find it printed on pages 11 to 30 of the report.

Mr. POWERS. I turn to the report, and I find that the constitution there set forth, instead of having been adopted on the 30th of September, 1889, was adopted on the 2d day of October, 1891.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The report states the correct date.

Mr. POWERS. So that there is an incongruity between the bill and the report.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The preamble is erroneous. I was present and a member of the constitutional convention, and I know that the date set forth in the report is the proper one. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for having called attention to the error in the preamble, and I shall move to have it corrected.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed and that the bill be read by sections.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the people of Arizona did, on the 30th day of September, 1889, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution, which constitution was ratified and adopted by the people of said Territory, at the election held therefor on the first Tuesday in December, 1891, which constitution is republican in form and is in conformity with the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas said convention and the people of the said Territory have asked the admission of said Territory into the union of States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever: Therefore——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the suggestion made by my friend from Vermont [Mr. POWERS], I move to correct the error in the preamble. In the first and second lines I move to strike out the words "on the 30th day of September, 1889," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "on the 2d day of October, 1891."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, no objection has been urged to this bill or to the admission of Arizona as a State. I am heartily in favor of it and will gladly cast my vote for the passage of this measure. But, sir, there are other important questions which should engage some portion of the time and attention of this body, and I ask the indulgence of the House while I occupy a few minutes in directing attention to some of them.

From the people whom I represent, and from all their fair land, comes the cry of hard times, attributable in part, as I have said, to the discrimination against them in our tariff legislation.

But there are other causes for this condition that are being continued by the present Administration, the prompt removal of which causes depends upon the courage and the patriotism of the dominant party in these Halls. Among these evils—for they are evils—is the disproportionate distribution of Government official favors.

For thirty years the Government has been maintaining a vast army of employés—how many I can not certainly say, but their number may safely be estimated at 200,000. Of these, 100,000 have been selected, or might have been selected, from the people generally without reference to the place of residence. They include employés in the various Departments at Washington, in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and other cities, and those having headquarters at these places, such as employés of the Coast and Geodetic Surveys, Pension and Post-Office examiners, special agents of the land and Indian offices, as well as others doing the general work of the Government. Of that 100,000 I should say 75,000 are residents of the North and East, 20,000 of the West, and 5,000 of the South. Estimating the average salary paid them at $1,250 per annum, we thus pay to the North and East a yearly sum of $100,000,000 out of the taxes drawn from all the people. When to this we add $150,000,000 annually paid to residents of the Northern and Eastern sections in pensions, we have given an appreciable reason for their wealth as well as our poverty.

When we substract from the product of Southern industry the $50,000,000 paid by it for pensions, we can understand not only the comparative poverty of the South, but appreciate the fact that she is discriminated against in the sum of about $300,000,000 annually.

Without regard to the pensions paid by the South—and paid cheerfully to honest pensioners—what would have been, and what would be the effect of transposing the conditions of things as to holding office merely? That $100,000,000 apportioned among the fifteen Southern and Southwestern States would give to each nearly $7,000,000 a year. Divide my figures in two, and the $3,500,000 she would receive for each of even ten years would construct their highways, set wheels of new and profitable industries to making music on the banks of many a rapid stream, build shops and furnaces at the foot of many a mountain swelling with mineral treasures, and make every valley smile with the cultivation of its native fertility. [Applause.]

As it has been, and as it is, all this awaits in a large measure the coming of Northern or foreign capital, slow in coming, but as welcome as it is slow, but a capital, as far as regards being derived from this country, based very materially upon a Government's beneficent patronage and upon partisan, unjust, and outrageous legislation by the Republican party, which has always been as sectional as it has been partisan.

How much better, how much more just to distribute these favors with impartial hands, and what more fitting time than now, when more than half the dominant party comes from a section most favored by nature in possibilities for the general advancement of the country and most disregarded by the Government that was intended for all the people!

But in the face of such facts and amid such surroundings, what are the conditions that confront us?

We have a President whose personal and political fortunes the South has almost solidly espoused. But when haughtily presented with the alternative of accepting the resignations of two Republican Civil Service Commissioners or dismissing an honest, manly Southern Democrat; with Republican Commissioners who, following a partisan Republican President, suspended the operation of the civil-service law in the South long enough to dismiss Democrats in the railway mail service, and extended its operation in Washington to include Republican carpenters and day laborers in the Departments, the plan continues under this Democratic Administration, which has retained more than a year since the election that made it in some of the most important places in the Departments, having immense partonage, and actually reappointing Republican officials having no interest to contribute to the success of the Administration, and who can justly claim no greater ability than thousands of other citizens in sympathy with the purposes and policies of the Democratic party; an Administration one of whose chief advisers, not content with retaining Republicans in office and in power, actually has an alien, a British subject, on the pay rolls of the Government. It is enough to justify the interrogatory, What would become of us if one of these "indispensables" should die?

It is no dismissal of the question to cry that the people are after the spoils of office. No Democratic President can with good grace cry back "spoils" to those who seek positions which generally call for a hundred cents' worth of work for every dollar of salary.

The civil service, originally wrong, has been so abused for partisan purposes that it has become the bane of the country. It grants life tenure to office. It has fastened old and incompetent men and women upon the Government; for there are hundreds of this kind in the Departments. If the law can not be repealed, it should be so amended as to put a limit within reason on the period of service, say six or eight years.

Why, we already hear it advocated that after certain service, or upon the death of these persons, they should be pensioned, thus creating a sentiment for pensions to civilians for clerical service, and thus fostering in a most dangerous fashion the continuation and enlargement of class legislation, run to riotous excess, and culminating, as it must, in absolute paternalism. It is notorious that in my section of the State of Tennessee, with hundreds of capable, upright, and deserving Democrats, eligible on the list under the civil service law, these Republican Commissioners have in nine cases out of ten selected Republicans instead of Democrats; and this, too, in spite of the fact, equally notorious, that the downfall of the Republican party in the South was not only the result of the ignorance and corruption of its officeholders, but also because there were not enough Republicans to be found in the ranks of its party to fill the offices who were either competent or decently reputable.

Is there a true Democrat in this House who has not been subjected to humiliation on account of this condition of things? Do we forget that we have filed charges against men who hold Government positions for flagrant violations of the very law that gives them their positions, and that the Departments continue to pay and harbor Republicans who are incompetent, instead of removing them for Democrats who are competent? We have seen strange bedfellows under the civil service law. We saw on the night of the last election Republican officeholders under a Democratic Administration shouting with exultation and derision in the faces of Democrats who had come to this city duly accredited by their party and people, with every right of competency and popular indorsement, to hold these same offices.

We may differ with the Executive on this, as we have on other questions, which we claim as a free representative of a free, brave, and intelligent constituency we have the right to do, but we rejoice we still agree with the sentiment of that grand patriot, Andrew Jackson, in that he said long ago, "To the victor belongs the spoils." That was the rallying slogan of victory announced by an American who was always the implacable enemy of monopoly in all its forms and guises. He believed, and we believe, that when the Democratic party is chargeable with the administration of the Government, then the Democratic party ought to be credited with whatever good it accomplishes, and, on the other hand, take the discredit of failure to fulfill its trust. Andrew Jackson believed, and so do we believe, that a divided party responsibility can but result in confusion and the final destruction not only of parties themselves, but in the ruinous and ignominious defeat of every patriotic purpose for which it was founded and for which its organization was to be kept intact.

Mr. Chairman, I have hundreds of men in my district honest, capable, and patriotic men and Democrats, knocking at the doors of these Departments, asking only the most modest recognition of valuable services, but kept coldly on the outside and loftily ignored for the retention of Republicans who contribute money to defeat Democrats. It is a sad commentary on the plight of our great party, when we have to realize that of the offices that belong to that party, if they belong to any party, to be held in trust for it by a Democratic Administration, at least two-thirds of them should still be in the hands of Republicans, who daily entertain themselves by deriding the Administration and the impotency of a party that may and does not control every branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you and to every fellow-Democrat on this floor that this is nothing short of outrage. It is a cruel imposition upon the masses of Democratic voters that ratified the ticket nominated at Chicago, and therefore I say it is a betrayal of party trust. It can not escape the justice of that accusation by any sublimation of political philosophy. It is not a theory of Government, of what any Mugwump may deem the most beautiful form of administration, that confronts us merely, but it is the condition in which we see ourselves denied our own by the very individuals with whom we have every right to share the pleasures as well as the responsibilty of publicly serving our people, and at the same time we must look upon all these benefits bestowed upon a party which, when it does not have offices with which to reward its favorites when in power, simply goes to work and creates offices for them.

How long shall we continue the laughingstock of our enemies? They have no right to any place in our strongholds. It is worse than folly to allow them to sit within hearing of our councils of war. Their Trojan horses have been allowed too long to remain within our citadels that were won by the efforts and the sacrifices of the Democratic party.

Let us drive out the enemy and all his spies, and let us place the Administration where it rightfully belongs, with undivided and undiminished and unfeared responsibility in the hands of Democrats, and Democrats only. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That until the next general census, or until otherwise provided by law, said State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the election of the Representative to the Fifty-fourth Congress and the Representative to the Fifty-fifth Congress shall take place at the time and be conducted and certified in the same manner as is provided in the constitution of the State for the election of State, district, and other officers.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "fourth," at the end of line 4, and inserting "third;" and by striking out the word "fifth," before the word "Congress," and inserting "fourth."

The amendments were severally agreed to.

Sections 6 and 7 were read.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I move to amend by striking out in the first line of section 7 the word "ten" and inserting "five," so that only 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of public lands shall go to the school fund. This amendment will make this bill correspond precisely with the provisions of the bill for the admission of Utah, which we passed the other day.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. As it seems proper that a general rule should be observed in this matter, I do not oppose the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Section 8 was read.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to make an inquiry of the Delegate from Arizona. In this section we provide that none of this university land shall be sold for less than $5 an acre. But section 6 of article 9 of the constitution of this new State provides:

No land shall be leased for a period longer than ten years, nor any lands be sold for less than the appraised value, and in no case for less than $10 per acre, unless otherwise provided in the enabling act.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In view of the provision in our constitution, it seems to me we should be left free to dispose of these lands at less than $10 an acre when it is found absolutely impossible to sell them at that price. The constitutional convention undertook to put these lands, beyond peradventure, in a safe situation, so that the largest possible amount should be obtained for educational purposes. In view of our constitutional provision it seems to me there is no necessity for a limitation in this act.

Mr. FUNK. I move to strike out in section 8 these words, beginning in line 9:

But said act of February 18, 1881, is hereby so amended as to provide that none of said lands shall be sold for less than $5 per acre.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. There is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. This amendment ought to be adopted. The constitution of the proposed State provides ample protection in this matter.

Mr. FUNK. If this amendment be adopted the officers in charge in this new State, and who will of course know the value of the lands, will be authorized to dispose of them at such price as they deem proper. These officers should not be so restricted that they can not sell at less than $5 an acre, because there may be a great deal of land worth only two or three dollars an acre, which can be disposed of at that figure, but which could not be disposed of at all if the provisions which my amendment proposes to strike out were retained. I think the officers in charge should be allowed to fix the value of these lands, and sell them at such a price as they may be able to get.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Section 9 was read, as follows:

SEC. 9. That 100,000 acres of land, to be selected and located as provided in section 4 of this act, are hereby granted to said State for the use and support of an agricultural college in said State as provided in the acts of Congress making donations of lands for such purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, in our action the day before yesterday in Committee of the Whole upon the bill for the admission of Utah, it was decided upon an amendment offered by my friend from Washington [Mr. WILSON], adopted in Committee of the Whole, and subsequently adopted by the House, that 200,000 acres of land, in view of the condition of the land, much of it being absolutely desert land, ought to be given for educational purposes.

In view of the fact that the State we now propose to create has about the same area, and the lands are substantially similar, except that possibly some of our school lands are worse than those in Utah, we ought to be as liberal with the new State of Arizona as we were with Utah. I hope, therefore, there will be no objection to the amendment which I now propose, to strike out in the first line of this section the word "one" and insert "two;" so as to provide that 200,000 acres shall be granted for the support of an agricultural college in the State.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I hope there will be no objection to this amendment; it ought to be adopted. The land is not valuable, and I do not think it possible to apply it to better purposes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I wish to ask the prospective Senator from Arizona [referring to Mr. SMITH] where he desires this amendment to come in? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In section 9.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment ought not to prevail. I think it would be wise for the House to consider for a moment what we are doing here with the public lands. One section of this act proposes that the second, sixteenth, thirty-second, and thirty-sixth sections—one-ninth of the whole surface of the Territory—shall be given to this new State.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The gentleman should say to the schools of the State.

Mr. HEPBURN. There is a ninth part of 73,000,000 acres given away. Not content with this, another section proposes to give the proceeds of a tenth part of the remainder. Then there is another provision proposing to give 100 sections to another specific purpose—64,000 acres——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Where does the gentleman find that provision?

Mr. HEPBURN. More than an acre for every individual within the limits of the Territory when the last census was taken. The amendment of the gentleman from Arizona proposes now to give 200,000 acres for another purpose. So we go on, making it unnecessary, it seems to me, that we should have the eleventh section, which blandly provides (after all these extraordinary grants giving away nearly all the lands which are disposable) that no other land shall be given to the State.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. How much did your State get?

Mr. HEPBURN. Nothing like this.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Well, how much?

Mr. HEPBURN. Not half of it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, yes, you did.

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir; nothing like this.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HEPBURN. No, not mistaken. We did not get one-fifth of it, to be more explicit.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Well, was not one acre of the land that you got worth more than a hundred of some of these lands?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Of course the lands donated to the State of the gentleman from Iowa were valuable lands, and these, at least most of them, are arid. The million acres of land donated to Iowa are much more valuable than all the land proposed to be donated to Arizona by this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. My State has a population of 2,000,000 people, and these grants were to it for a population of that size, while all of these millions of acres proposed to be donated here are given to a population of but 60,000 or less.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. This will provide for more people from your State who will come and live with us. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, people leave my State to go there! You do not know what you are talking about. [Laughter and applause.] Why, I once crossed that Territory myself, and I did not see a green thing, without it wore breeches, from one border of the State to the other. [Laughter.] It is a waste and desert; and the idea of admitting such a population to statehood is to my mind an outrage and an indecency, a crime against the balance of the people.

Years ago, Mr. Chairman, twenty-five years ago, we did a similar thing to this by admitting to statehood Nevada; but we did that without experience, and we did it without knowledge of what it would result in. We did it in the hope and in the belief that when statehood was conferred upon the Territory population would flow in there. Why, we have been experimenting in this Territory for twenty-five years, with ample railroad facilities, with immense mineral wealth, the report says, with the capacity to produce all the fruits of the tropics, and yet in all of these twenty-five years but 60,000 people are found domiciled within the limits of the Territory. I say that you gentlemen of the majority who are now intent on political power are committing a crime against the people. You have no right to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the gentleman in one or two respects.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Don't get up a discussion here and injure my bill.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I will not do you any harm.

Several MEMBERS. Let us have order.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I will not occupy but a few moments.

The gentleman from Iowa has been telling us something about Arizona. He said he went across Arizona and during the whole journey he did not see a green thing except that wearing breeches. Why, the gentleman could not even have looked out through the car window. If he had been with me I could have shown him green spots all along. There are plenty of places there where he could have seen more cattle grazing on a 40-acre lot, and getting fat, than he could find on any 400 acres in his State at any time. [Laughter and applause.] He could have seen more cattle on fewer acres, more green places in the winter or summer months, in December there, when his State is covered with snow from one end to the other, and there are no grazing cattle to be found anywhere.

Why, don't you know that there are valleys more than two hundred miles long and from twenty to forty miles wide in Arizona that are more fertile than the famous plains of the valley that are watered by the river Nile? These lands are capable of producing more than the lands on the river Nile.

The gentleman says that for twenty-five years they have been undertaking to make something out of this Territory, and they have not succeeded in doing anything in the way of population. What can a minor do? Make them full grown; declare them of age; give them an opportunity to do something, and in five years you will see plenty of people there, and a rich, growing, prosperous State where now population is sparse.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, the population is American, and that is what I like about Arizona. You admitted Utah the other day after a long fight over your question of polygamy. But Arizona has as its population mainly Americans—enterprising, industrious, thrifty, and energetic—the people to make a great American State out of.

The political question has been brought in here, too. Now, these people have a right to be Democrats, and a right to be silver men, under the Constitution of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] I think in one of these respects they are right and in one they are wrong. It is, of course, an error in judgment that they are Democrats, but they will get over that; I trust they will. [Laughter and applause.] I believe they will in time, because I know that a State that is going to be as enterprising, as rich, and populous as Arizona is bound to be, is going to become Republican in time, and you can not stop it. [Laughter.]

I tell you that you are mistaken when you say that Arizona is all an arid country. It has better facilities for irrigation than any other Territory in the United States, more possibilities of wealth than any Territory that you have admitted this Congress or will admit.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the committee long, nor to enter into any extensive argument upon this question, because I believe the points on each side are well understood by all the members of the House.

It seems to me that it would be a pity if it were supposed that all those who sit on this side of the House, and who regularly expect to help constitute the majority, should be set down as voting for this bill without any opportunity to record their opinion, or have it understood on which side they voted. I presume the bill will pass. I presume it will pass by a large majority. I have no wish to offer any factious opposition, but I must say that I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], that it has been a mistake in the past, and it will be a mistake in the future, to admit new States whose population falls so far short of the ratio which we ascertain in constituting the regular membership of the House.

I believe, sir, it has proved a mistake, whatever party may have acted in admitting them, and I think it ought not to be considered as a party question. If these Territorities deserve to be admitted as States, by all means let them be admitted, whichever party they are to vote with now, whichever party they are to vote with hereafter; or if they decide they will vote with neither of the great parties, but for some third party that they consider responds more clearly to their local demands. If they are entitled to statehood, I will vote for giving it to them, even if I know they are going to vote against what I believe to be the general welfare of the United States. If they have not the proper qualifications for being admitted to statehood, I shall vote against them, even though I know I am throwing away votes that would be on my side.

It does not seem to me that the population of Arizona is sufficient to admit it to statehood now, and that it has not shown

that its rate of increase is sufficient to lead us to infer that it will have the requisite population in a short time. I may be mistaken. I shall be glad if I prove wrong. I presume Arizona will be admitted, and if my predictions are falsified, if Arizona grows and gains and becomes the great and wealthy and populous State that its friends promise, no one will be more glad to be proved mistaken than I shall; but with my existing lights I do not feel that I am willing to have my vote or my voice recorded in favor of its admission.

I have said these words without the slightest wish to provoke any unkind feeling on the subject from the friends of Arizona, and those who wish to admit her. She will be admitted late, if not soon. I hope she will grow. I hope she will succeed. I believe that ultimately she will grow and will succeed, as all the great Western States have done and are doing, with one possible exception I hope it will prove that the $10,000,000 which we paid for her in 1855 were well spent: but with my existing lights I feel that I prefer to record my vote, as far as possible, against admission.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman think it is fair to hit a man when he is down?

Mr. EVERETT. I thought Arizona was up.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. The gentleman will admit at least that silver is disabled?

Mr. EVERETT. You can disable a man or a nation, but I do not believe you can disable a thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLIKEN. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. EVERETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask that gentlemen allow us to go on with the reading of the bill. A general desire has been expressed that the bill be passed this evening. Of course, I will not insist upon this if any gentleman desires to further address the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, owing to the somewhat exaggerated remarks of the enthusiastic gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS], I wish to call attention to the statement made by the committee. They give as the total number of cattle that are roaming the 73,000,000 acres of this Territory as 720,940, worth an average of $8.28 apiece. So much for that.

Mr. Chairman, the entire taxable wealth of this Territory is given by the committee as $28,270,466.28, less than one-fourth of the taxable wealth of the city of Washington. Yet you propose to give these 60,000 people, representing $28,000,000 of wealth, people scattered over this vast Territory, the same power in the United States Senate as the State of New York has.

What has become of the diatribes we used to hear from the other side of the House about the "rotten borough" of Nevada? How many times have we heard you gentlemen inveigh against the wickedness of the Republican party in admitting to and permitting statehood where 60,000 people constituted the entirety of the population; yet you are now about to do the same thing, and you are about to do it with your eyes open; you are about to do it with a knowledge that this State can not be populated. Here we have more than one thousand miles of railway. At the time that Nevada was admitted into the Union great difficulties were experienced in reaching that distant point. No railroads touched it; and yet there was 60,000 or a little less population there.

You opposed its admission then. Yet here is a proposed State with only 60,000 population, with facilities of travel which would enable men to reach it if they desired to reach it. If there was a possibility of rapid growth; if it was within the limits of human possibility that extensive growth and development should occur, they would be there now; but there is no such possibility. It has, in all human probability, reached its maximum in population. The 60,000 that you see there to-day will be the population, I fear, twenty-five years hence.

Gentlemen, you ought not, in the hope that you may have an addition of two Democratic Senators from that State, commit this crime against the balance of the nation. It is unjust——

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield to me for a simple question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, if it is a simple one, I will.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. It is a very short one. Is it any greater crime to admit Arizona than it was to admit Wyoming and Idaho?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am not discussing the relative qualities of crimes. It is a crime; and if you can save your conscience by comparing your action with that of some other man who admitted that he has committed a crime, do it; I do not want to do so. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. Chairman, being somewhat familiar with the country under discussion and believing that this Territory should be admitted to the sisterhood of States, I am sorry that the question of politics has been brought into the discussion and that silver has become prominent in the minds of some of the gentlemen.

This is not a question of politics, or of silver or no silver, but purely a question as to the qualifications of the Territory, in point of population, wealth, and resources, to assume statehood and share the honors in common with other States, with full representation on this floor and in the other end of the Capitol. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that he has but little conception of the value of the Territory when he asserts that he once "crossed that Territory and did not see a green thing, without it wore breeches, from one border of the State to the other."

I can assure the gentleman that no finer valleys are found on this continent than those in Arizona. Many of these valleys are of vast extent, and with the waters from the melting snows, which annually fall in the mountain region, once stored away in reservoirs sufficient to tide over the dry season, the water to be utilized in irrigating these valleys, no estimate can be formed as to the productive capacity without a real test.

Give all these arid lands to the State instead of the 200,000 acres proposed and now under consideration, to aid her in constructing these reservoirs, and you will find that her population and wealth will increase, and there will be homes for many thousands of industrious and prosperous citizens where there is now but seeming arid deserts. I am sorry the bill does not contain a provision giving all the land to the State.

Anyone not familiar with the character of the country can have no conception of the future value of these vast valleys (referred to by the gentleman from California) when capital and enterprise shall join hand in hand to construct these reservoirs and shall utilize the water from the melting snow in the mountain region of that State, to tide the farmer over the dry season. After these valleys have once been put into a proper system of irrigation, the resources can scarcely be estimated; nearly everything there, when irrigated, grows to perfection. These valleys properly irrigated will support a population equal to that of any other area the same size in the known world. Untrammel this and other States in the arid region by giving them their lands, to aid men of enterprise in their development and you will open up an avenue for many homeless people.

I can now point to places in New Mexico and West Texas, where large reservoirs are being constructed to irrigate the arid lands along the Pecos River. Roswell, N. Mex., near the head of the Pecos River, has started a system of irrigation within the last few years, and is now a real oasis in a desert land—fine orchards and farms, as fine fruit trees as you will find in any country and bearing the best of fruit. Roswell is 4,000 feet above the level of the sea, and since the discovery of the real value of the land it has risen from $1.25 per acre to $5, $10, $20, $30, and in some favored localities the land brings as much as $100. Give Arizona statehood, put her on equal footing with the other States, and you do but justice to a deserving people who have vast possibilities within their reach.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That in lieu of the grant of land for purposes of internal improvement made to new States by the eighth section of the act of September 4, 1841, which section is hereby repealed as to the State of Arizona, and in lieu of any claim or demand by the said State under the act of September 28, 1850, and section 2479 of the Revised Statutes, making a grant of swamp and overflowed lands to certain States, which grant it is hereby declared is not extended to the State of Arizona and in lieu of any grant of saline lands to said State, the following grants of land are hereby made, to wit:

To the State of Arizona: For the establishment and maintenance and support in the said State of the insane asylum, 50 000 acres; for the penitentiary, 50,000 acres; for the deaf, dumb, and blind asylum to be established, 30,000 acres; for miners' hospital for disabled miners, 30,000 acres; for normal schools, 100,000 acres; for State charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions, 250,000 acres; for county hospitals, 100,000 acres.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for some changes in this section, but I would rather forego them than delay the bill by precipitating debate upon the subject. I would like to ask for two or three amendments to conform the amounts of the land grants made in the bill to the exact figures contained in the Utah bill passed the other day. I am free to say that I want this change largely for the purpose of showing that I was not indifferent on this occasion to the requirements of the situation nor forgetful of the sense of the House as expressed in the bill for the admission of Utah. Trusting that no debate will be insisted upon, I ask consent to the adoption of the following amendments:

In line 15, section 10, after the word "asylum," strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred," so as to make the amount 100,000 acres.

In the same line, after the word "penitentiary," strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred," so as to make the amount 100,000 acres.

In line 17, before the word "thousand," strike out "thirty" and insert "fifty," and in line 18, before the word "thousand," strike out "thirty" and insert "fifty."

The amendments were severally agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 14. That the sum of $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Territory for defraying the expenses of the said convention and for the payment of the members thereof, under the same rules and regulations and at the same rates as are now provided by law for the payment of the Territorial Legislatures, and for the elections held therefor and thereunder. Any money hereby appropriated not necessary for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Section 14, line 4, strike out the word "said," before the word "convention," and after the word "convention" insert the words "which adopted the constitution on the 2d day of October, 1891."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That ought to be adopted, Mr. Chairman. It simply designates more exactly the fund to which the money shall go.

Mr. POWERS. The clause as it stands reads, "the said convention." There has been no convention referred to in the earlier part of the bill, but it is obvious that the draftsman intended to refer here to the convention which adopted the constitution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. That the said State, when admitted as aforesaid, shall constitute a judicial district, the name thereof to be the same as the name of the State; and the circuit and district courts therefor shall be held at the capital of the State for the time being, and the said district shall, for judicial purposes, until otherwise provided, be attached to the ninth judicial circuit. There shall be appointed for said district one district judge, one United States attorney, and one United States marshal. The judge of said district shall receive a yearly salary of $5,000, payable as provided for by law, and shall reside in the district. There shall be appointed clerks of said courts, who shall keep their offices at the capital of said State. The regular terms of said courts shall be held in said district at the place aforesaid on the first Monday in April and the first Monday in November of each year, and only one grand jury and one petit jury shall be summoned in both said circuit and district courts. The circuit and district courts for said district, and the judges thereof, respectively, shall possess the same powers and jurisdiction and perform the same duties required to be performed by the other circuit and district courts and judges of the United States, and shall be governed by the same laws and regulations. The marshal, district attorney, and clerks of the circuit and district courts of said district, and all other officers and persons performing duties in the administration of justice therein, shall severally possess the powers and perform the duties lawfully possessed and required to be performed by similar officers in other districts of the United States; and shall, for the services they may perform, receive the fees and compensation allowed by law to other similar officers and persons performing similar duties in the State of California.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this section provides that the marshal and other Federal officers of Arizona shall receive the same fees and compensation that are allowed by law to similar officers performing similar duties in the State of California. I believe it is a fact that there are two Federal districts in California, the northern and the southern, and that in the northern districts the officials receive much higher compensation than they receive in the southern district. There is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary a fee bill, intending to regulate the fees of these clerks and other officials throughout the whole country, and it strikes me that it would be unwise in this enabling act to fix the fees for these officers in Arizona, and that it had better be left until a general fee bill, properly guarded, has been adopted for the whole country.

I therefore move to amend by striking out the balance of that section after the word "law," in line 31, so that it will provide that these officials shall receive the fees and compensation allowed by law.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this section.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Line 10, section 15, before the word "thousand," strike out "five" and insert "four."

Mr. HUNTER. That relates to the salary of the judge.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I trust that my friend will not insist upon that amendment. That would make a distinction between the compensation of the judge of this district and the judges in other districts where the expenses are not so high. I recognize and appreciate the gentleman's motive, but I do not like to have a discrimination of this kind made against the judge in my district, and I trust that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. In view of the explanation made by the gentleman from Arizona, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to strike out this entire section and insert in lieu thereof this provision:

The State of Arizona shall be attached to the State of Utah for judicial purposes.

Here is a population of 60,000, not equal to the population of many counties in very many States. The duties of the Federal judiciary in Utah will not be very burdensome; it will be easy for the judges to dispose of all judicial matters that may pertain to this sparse population. Therefore I submit this amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Section 16 was read:

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, in the haste of passing this bill we are liable to commit some clerical blunders. In this section, providing for the return of the mandate of execution from the United States Supreme Court, the draftsman of the bill evidently intended that the mandate should be directed by the Supreme Court of the United States to the circuit or district court of the State of Arizona, if it should be proper so to return it, or if not, that it should be returned to the supreme court of the Territory. Some of these mandates may obviously get back to Arizona before the organization of the State is completed. If the word "from," in line 9 of this section, be struck out all difficulties of construction in this matter will, I apprehend, be removed. I offer that amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

Sections 17, 18, 19, and 20 were read.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire obtained the floor.

Mr. POWERS. I move to amend by striking out the words "not locally inapplicable"——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] was recognized.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I rose for the purpose of making precisely the same motion which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] has suggested. I move to amend by striking out, in line 3 of section 20, the words "not locally inapplicable."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. That is all right; the amendment ought to be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Section 21 was read.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. It will be observed that this bill is entirely different from the bill providing for the admission of Utah. This bill declares the State admitted and accepts and adopts the constitution presented by a convention which has already met in Arizona; whereas in the case of Utah the convention was yet to be held, and it was provided that in case the constitution adopted by the convention should be found conformable to the Constitution of the United States and not repugnant to the provisions of the enabling act, the President should by proclamation declare the Territory admitted as a State. But the bill before us admits Arizona absolutely upon the constitution presented. That constitution has not been examined by this House.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It has been examined by all gentlemen who have done their duty. This constitution has been printed in a House document for nearly two years. It was printed in the Fifty-second Congress and was reprinted in this Congress.

Mr. GROUT. It has not been examined, I say, by this House. Not one gentleman in ten on this floor has read that constitution. I undertake to say that not a gentleman outside the committee reporting the bill has read that constitution completely. I have looked into it somewhat, and I find in it things which to my mind are objectionable. For instance, I call attention to the tenth section of the bill of rights, which it is proposed we shall adopt by our vote, together with the other provisions of this voluminous constitution of two hundred and thirty-one sections concerning which we know nothing. Section 10 provides that—

In suits at common law and in the trial of crimes not felonies the Legislature may provide that a verdict be by concurrence of three-fourths of the jury.

Now, that is new to most of the States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. My friend will pardon me; it is very old in many States.

Mr. GROUT. It is un-American. Will any gentleman tell me what States have such a provision.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Iowa for one.

Mr. BOWERS of California. And California.

Mr. GROUT. I understand that in some few of the States such a provision exists, but it is not the prevailing law. It is the civil or French mode of obtaining justice, but not the common law or Anglo-Saxon method of procedure.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Six or seven of the Western States have provisions of that kind.

Mr. GROUT. I call attention to that matter, and pass to section 13, in which it is provided—

The writ of habeas corpus is a writ of right, and shall never be suspended.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is right, I should think.

Mr. GROUT. That provision contravenes the Constitution of the United States, because the President is empowered by the

Constitution of the United States to suspend the writ of habeas corpus in certain cases. This provision says that the writ shall never be suspended.

Mr. COFFEEN. It applies only to State jurisdiction.

Mr. GROUT. But it contravenes the Constitution of the United States. It declares broadly, not that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended by State authority, but that it shall never be suspended.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Of course it can not contravene the Constitution of the United States. Nothing of that sort was intended or could be intended.

Mr. GROUT. Of course not. But before I approve a constitution for a new State, I wish to know that it is in harmony with the Constitution of the United States. It clearly contravenes the Constitution of the United States; and suppose some fine day Arizona stands upon the doctrine of State rights, and refuses, under its constitution, to respect the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, and with the approval of this constitution by Congress—which we shall do if we pass this bill——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Did not my friend vote for the admission of Wyoming and Idaho? The clause which he has read is an exact copy of the provision contained in the constitutions of those two States.

Mr. GROUT. I have not had time to look into that matter, and so will not controvert his statement; but if it is in those constitutions that does not make it right. I wish to call attention to one or two points further.

Section 17 of the bill of rights provides that:

No person shall ever be imprisoned for debt except in case of fraud.

Now, what will you do with the man who has simply committed a breach of trust, in which the element of fraud does not enter in the ordinary acceptation of the term? When an attorney, for instance, collects money and fails to turn it over or account for it? It is a debt. This provision of the constitution provides that he shall never be imprisoned for such an offense as that.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Do you not call that a fraud?

Mr. GROUT. In the legal acceptation, the ordinary acceptation of the term, it is not.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Then what is it if it is not a fraud?

Mr. GROUT. It is a breach of trust, a breach of confidence. Matters involving a breach of trust do not involve necessarily a fraud, as I say, in the ordinary acceptaiton of the term.

Mr. HAGER. But it would be an embezzlement.

Mr. GROUT. Not hardly an embezzlement. But it is a debt, and would not necessarily constitute what is technically known as a fraud. It is the receipt of money by the attorney for the benefit of his client which he fails to turn over. It could be recovered under the count for money had and received. In most of the States, in my own at least, the creditor may have a close-jail execution for the misappropriation of trust funds. I think this a wholesome law, but under this section in this bill of rights Arizona can not punish such breach of trust by imprisonment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. GROUT. I ask to be permitted to continue for a minute more.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROUT. I wish to call the attention of the committee to section 31 of this bill of rights.

Mr. BAILEY. Before the gentleman proceeds I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman says that the provision to which he refers is against the Constitution of the United States. I desire to ask if he does not know——

A MEMBER. What provision?

Mr. BAILEY. He has referred to the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. I wish to ask if the gentleman does not know that all of the courts have decided that this is a limitation on the power of the Federal Government, and not on the power of the States?

Mr. GROUT. We all understand, of course, that the President of the United States can suspend the writ of habeas corpus under certain conditions; but this says that it shall never be done in Arizona.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. GROUT. And to that extent it contravenes the Constitution of the United States. I do not say that it overrides the Constitution, but it comes in conflict with that provision of it, and I think it objectionable; the constitution of every State should be brought into harmony with the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land.

Mr. BAILEY. The provision of the Federal Constitution which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] quotes is a limitation upon the power of the Federal Government alone. The provision in the constitution of Arizona is a limitation upon the power of that State alone. Each is a valid limitation within its own sphere, and neither conflicts with the other, because they apply to different sovereignties.

Mr. GROUT. Very true; but the two should be in harmony—all will agree to that. Again, section 31 provides:

No person shall be imprisoned for the purpose of securing his testimony longer than may be necessary to take his deposition, and then only when he fails to give bail to attend the taking of said deposition.

This is a very dangerous provision. What are you going to do with the man who utterly refuses to testify at all? You can not imprison him under that provision. I ask for the reading of the new constitution section by section, so that the House may understand it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I raise the question of order that that is not before the House.

Mr. GROUT. We ought not be asked—to use the language of the bill—to "accept, ratify, and confirm" this constitution till we know what it is. It has not been read yet, and for one I can not "confirm" it till I know what it is.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STOCKDALE. I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Is it competent in this proceeding to move to amend this constitution?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. No; the people of Arizona made their own constitution, and this bill proposes to admit the Territory as a State under that constitution.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I have submitted the question to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Then I desire to be heard briefly on one or two points. I find in this constitution a provision that I am informed appears in some State constitutions, four States, perhaps. It occurs to me that it should not be in any of them. Page 12, section 7, provides:

SEC. 7. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, or by information based upon an affidavit as may be prescribed by law, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall anyone be subject, for the same offense, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

I do not believe any man should be tried for his life upon information. It is an innovation wherever it does exist on the common law and upon our system of jurisprudence. Whatever State may have it they adopted their own constitution. That is all right. But that is no inducement to the Congress of the United States to adopt or ratify a constitution with that provision in it.

Mr. COFFEEN. It is generally found in the new State constitutions.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That may be true; but the general disposition in this country to-day is to more and more disregard the rights of citizens. No man who has kept up with the history of the country will deny that if such a proposition had been stated twenty years ago—even ten years ago—it would be cried down by the country, that an officer or anybody else, by affidavit, can take a man up and try him for his life upon information. It is an outrage and ought not to be permitted.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the people of Arizona formed this constitution, and they knew what they were doing and what they needed, and also to state further that this constitution has been before the House for more than a year—for nearly two years.

Objection has been made to the bill on the ground that the population of Arizona is not sufficient for statehood. At the last census Arizona is reported to have had about 60,000 inhabitants, exclusive of Indians. This was far below the actual number of white people then living in the Territory, and it is now estimated that there are at least 100,000 people living in Arizona. They assemble there from nearly all the States in the Union, and are enterprising, progressive, and good citizens. This compares very favorably with the population of other States which have been admitted.

I have, with some trouble, prepared a table showing the population of every State admitted into the Union as shown by the census taken next preceding the date of admission, and also the population as shown by the census next following the date of admission.

The table is as follows:

Table showing date of admission of each State, the representative ratio at date of admission, the population by the census taken next preceding the admission, the population by the census next following the admission, and the ratio of increase during decade of admission.

State.	Date of admission.	Representative ratio on previous census.	Population by census next previous to admission.			Population by following census.			Per cent of increase.
			White.	Colored.*	Total.	White.	Colored.*	Total.	
Vermont	Mar. 4, 1791	33,000	85,154	271	85,425	153,908	557	154,465	80
Kentucky	June 1, 1792	33,000	61,133	12,544	73,657	179,873	41,082	220,955	200
Tennessee	June 1, 1796	33,000	31,913	3,778	35,691	91,709	13,893	105,602	195
Ohio	Nov. 29, 1802	31,000	45,028	337	45,365	228,861	1,809	230,760	408
Louisiana	Apr. 30, 1812	35,000	34,311	42,245	76,556	73,383	79,540	152,923	100
Indiana	Dec. 11, 1816	35,000	23,890	630	24,520	145,758	1,420	147,178	500
Mississippi	Dec. 10, 1817	35,000	16,602	14,704	31,306	42,176	33,272	75,448	140
Alabama	Dec. 14, 1819	35,000	9,422	2,634	9,046	85,451	42,450	127,901	1,312
Illinois	Dec. 3, 1818	35,000	11,501	781	12,292	53,788	1,374	55,162	350
Maine	Mar. 15, 1820	35,000	227,736	969	228,705	297,340	1,192	298,532	33
Missouri	Aug. 10, 1821	40,000	55,968	10,569	66,557	114,795	25,660	140,455	111
Arkansas	June 15, 1836	47,700	25,671	4,717	30,388	77,174	20,400	97,574	221
Michigan	Jan. 26, 1837	47,700	31,346	293	31,679	211,560	707	212,267	570
Florida	Mar. 3, 1845	70,680	27,943	26,534	54,477	47,203	40,242	87,445	60
Texas	Dec. 29, 1845	70,680				154,034	58,558	212,592	
Iowa	Dec. 28, 1846	70,680	42,931	188	43,112	191,881	333	192,214	345
Wisconsin	May 29, 1848	70,680	30,749	196	30,945	304,756	635	305,391	886
California	Sept. 9, 1850	93,423	91,635	962	101,597	323,177	4,086	327,263	310
Minnesota	May 11, 1858	93,423	6,038	29	6,077	162,395	259	169,654	2,730
Oregon	Feb. 14, 1859	93,423	13,087	207	13,294	52,160	128	52,288	294
Kansas	Jan. 29, 1861	127,381	106,390	627	107,017	346,377	17,108	363,485	240
W. Virginia	June 19, 1863	127,381				424,033	17,980	442,013	
Nevada	Oct. 31, 1864	127,381	6,812	45	6,857	38,269	357	39,316	520
Nebraska	Mar. 1, 1867	127,381	28,696	82	28,778	122,117	762	122,906	322
Colorado	Aug. 1, 1876	131,425	39,221	456	39,677	191,126	2,435	193,561	388
N. Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	131,425	36,094	†815	36,909	182,123	373	182,496	20
S. Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	131,425	97,053	†1,215	98,268	327,290	1,518	328,808	30
Washington	Nov. 11, 1889	131,425	67,199	7,917	75,116	340,513	8,677	349,190	405
Idaho	July 3, 1890	151,912	29,013	3,597	32,610	82,018	2,357	84,219	182
Wyoming	July 11, 1890	151,912	19,437	1,352	20,789	59,275	1,425	60,700	31

*Including all except whites. †Estimated.

By this table we see that the population of Arizona is some sixteen times larger than the population of Minnesota by the census next preceding its date of admission, and we also see that it is fifteen times greater than the population of Nevada by the census taken next preceding its date of admission.

The taxable property in Arizona in 1891 was $28,270,466.28 and the actual value was estimated at about $70,000,000.

The following railroads are now being operated in the Territory:

	Miles.
Southern Pacific of Arizona	383
Atlantic and Pacific	393
New Mexico and Arizona	87
Prescott and Arizona Central	73
Arizona and New Mexico	41
Arizona and Southeastern	36
Central Arizona	35
Maricopa and Phœnix	34
Total	1,082

Arizona possesses some of the finest and most valuable forests in the world. I call especial attention to the famous Mogollon forest, which covers an area of 10,000 square miles, or 6,400,000 acres, being, with probably one or two exceptions, the most extensive body of timber in the known world, and it has never yet felt the stroke of an ax. The timber belt of Northern Arizona alone covers an area of 20,000 square miles, or 12,800,000 acres. In 1886 ties were sawed at Flagstaff for 1,500 miles of railroad in Old Mexico, and from this point great quantities of sawed lumber are yearly shipped into California and New Mexico, yet the fringe of this forest's mantle has not been torn. The pine grows to the height of 150 feet, with a diameter of 5, 6, and 8 feet. It grows as straight as a die, and the first branches are from 50 to 75 feet above the ground. The ash, black walnut, and scrub oak are found in the lower valleys and ravines. Besides these are the cottonwood, alder, cedar, manzanita, maple, mesquite, wild cherry, and ironwood, the last a tree peculiar to Arizona and Sonora. It is hard and brittle and takes a beautiful polish. When dry it can scarcely be cut with an ax, and has a specific gravity greater than water. It creates a furnace heat equal, it is said, to the best coke.

The acting governor of Arizona, in the report heretofore referred to, says:

The principal kinds of timber used for fuel are pine, oak, juniper, and mesquite, and the supply is usually bountiful in all populated parts of the Territory. The principal shipping point for lumber is Flagstaff, on the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad, in Northern Arizona. In this connection I submit the following communication from Hon. D. M. Riordan, president of the Arizona Lumber Company at Flagstaff, whose information and reliability on this subject can not be questioned:

"In response to yours of the 17th, which is just at hand, I beg leave to say (without having before me all the data necessary to complete accuracy), my belief is that the pine-timber resources of this Territory will be quite sufficient for any population we will have, near or remote, even with wasteful and improvident methods, for at least one hundred and fifty years, but if properly conserved they can be made to furnish all the timber needed for wise use by all the people this Territory can support for all time to come.

I base this upon my knowledge of the timber to this particular forest. The increase by growth is to-day vastly in excess of the quantity being removed.

Conservative judges and estimators of timber who have had greater experience than I, place the quantity of timber on the Colorado plateau at about 8,000,000,000 feet. This includes the Coconino forest, but does not include the forests of the White Mountains nor the timber in the Santa Catalinas, Santa Ritas, nor in any other of the timber-covered regions of the Territory.

The report upon the timber lands of Arizona is a wonderful exhibit of wealth. The Mogollon forests contain beyond question the most valuable timber that is attainable. In 1887 the governor made a report stating this forest to be equal in extent to the combined areas of New Jersey and Delaware, larger than Massachusetts, and double the size of Connecticut.

In concluding this subject it is enough to say that her timber alone will produce wealth enough to support a prosperous State.

Agriculture is rapidly becoming the principal industry of Arizona. It can be profitably maintained only by irrigation in the southern counties. Maricopa County has on the Salt River about 185 miles of canals, reclaiming a quarter million acres of the most fertile land in the world. On the Gila River, in the same county, there are some 90 miles of irrigating canals, reclaiming 50,000 acres. When the water shall be economically used and the canals extended, these rivers will give 1,000,000 acres to the productive area of the State.

Yuma County has 125 miles of canals, reclaiming 90,000 acres, and has in course of construction one of the largest irrigating canals in the Territory. There is a proposition on foot to take out an immense canal from the Colorado, south of Yuma, to reclaim vast bodies of fine lemon, orange, and fig lands.

Pinal County, from the Gila and San Pedro Rivers, has over 125 miles of irrigating ditches. A storage reservoir has been constructed south of Florence with a capacity of 8,000,000,000 gallons.

Graham County has fully 80 miles of irrigating ditches, Cochise 50, and Pinal probably as much. The two last-named counties, however, are chiefly devoted to mining and stock-raising. When we consider that these vast canals have been constructed and great deserts reclaimed within the last few years, we can, perhaps, form an appreciable idea of what the State of Arizona is destined to be. As to the agricultural products, reference is made to the annual reports of the governors of Arizona.

Stock-raising has been remarkably developed. It is estimated that Arizona now contains about 20,000 horses, 150,000 sheep, and 250,000 cattle.

Arizona is one of the richest mineral sections in America. Not a mountain range yet prospected that does not contain veins of the precious metals. Ore is found everywhere. Gold, silver, and copper mining is successfully pursued.

The report of the yield of gold and silver the last year was put at $5,771,555, and this is far below the actual product.

In addition to this is the great copper output, which, as far back as 1888, amounted to over 30,000,000 pounds a year. There is no limit to Arizona's power to produce copper. The gold and silver output for the year 1891 has been estimated as high as $8,000,000, and no estimates have fallen below $7,000,000.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I think I am justified in saying that the condition in which we find Arizona shows that this Territory has every possible requirement for statehood.

I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with favorable recommendation with the amendments adopted by the committee.

Mr. GROUT. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized, and moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments and with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OUTHWAITE, chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move the previous question upon the bill and amendments to engrossment and third reading and the final passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments. If a separate vote is not demanded, the vote will be taken on the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. EVERETT. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 187, nays 62, not voting 104; as follows:

YEAS—187.

Aitken,	Cooper, Tex.	Houk, Ohio	Powers,
Alderson,	Covert,	Hudson,	Price,
Alexander,	Cox,	Hunter,	Reilly,
Allen,	Crain,	Ikirt,	Richards, Ohio
Arnold,	Crawford,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richardson, Mich.
Bailey,	Culberson,	Johnson, Ohio	Richardson, Tenn.
Baker, Kans.	Cummings,	Kilgore,	Robbins,
Baker, N. H.	Curtis, Kans.	Kribbs,	Robertson, La.
Bankhead,	Davey,	Kyle,	Russell, Ga.
Barwig,	Davis,	Lane,	Sayers,
Bell, Colo.	De Armond,	Lawson,	Shaw,
Bell, Tex.	De Forest,	Lester,	Shell,
Berry,	Dinsmore,	Linton,	Sibley,
Black, Ga.	Dockery,	Lisle,	Simpson,
Blair,	Dolliver,	Livingston,	Smith,
Bland,	Donovan,	Lucas,	Snodgrass,
Boatner,	Doolittle,	Lynch,	Somers,
Boen,	Dunn,	Maddox,	Springer,
Bower, N. C.	Dunphy,	Maguire,	Stallings,
Bowers, Cal.	Edmunds,	Mallory,	Stockdale,
Branch,	Ellis, Oregon	Marshall,	Stone, Ky.
Breta,	English,	Martin, Ind.	Strait,
Brickner,	Enloe,	McAleer,	Swanson,
Broderick,	Epes,	McCreary, Ky.	Sweet,
Brookshire,	Erdman,	McDannold,	Talbert, S. C.
Brown,	Forman,	McDearmon,	Talbott, Md.
Bryan,	Funk,	McEttrick,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Fyan,	McKaig,	Tate,
Bynum,	Geary,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Ind.
Cabaniss,	Geissenhainer,	McMillin,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cadmus,	Goodnight,	McNagny,	Terry,
Campbell,	Gorman,	McRae,	Tracey,
Cannon, Cal.	Grady,	Meredith,	Tucker,
Capehart,	Griffin,	Moon,	Turner,
Caruth,	Hager,	Mutchler,	Tyler,
Catchings,	Hall, Mo.	O'Ferrall,	Washington,
Causey,	Hammond,	O'Neil,	Weadock,
Clancy,	Hare,	Outhwaite,	Wells,
Clark, Mo.	Hartman,	Page,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clarke, Ala.	Hatch,	Paschal,	White,
Cobb, Ala.	Haugen,	Paynter,	Williams, Ill.
Cobb, Mo.	Hayes,	Pearson,	Williams, Miss.
Cockrell,	Heard,	Pence,	Wilson, Wash.
Coffeen,	Henderson, N. C.	Pendleton, Tex.	Wise,
Conn.	Hermann,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wolverton,
Coombs,	Holman,	Pickler,	Woodard.
Cooper, Fla.	Hooker, Miss.	Post,	

NAYS—62.

Adams,	Fletcher,	Lacey,	Reed,
Aldrich,	Gear,	Lefever,	Ryan,
Avery,	Gillet, N. Y.	Loud,	Stephenson,
Babcock,	Gillett, Mass.	Marsh,	Stone, W. A.
Barnes,	Grout,	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Barthold,	Hainer,	McCall,	Tawney,
Bingham,	Haines,	McCleary, Minn.	Thomas,
Boutelle,	Hall, Minn.	Meiklejohn,	Updegraff,
Broslus,	Heiner,	Mercer,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Bundy,	Hepburn,	Milliken,	Wadsworth,
Cannon, Ill.	Hicks,	Morse,	Walker,
Cogswell,	Hitt,	Northway,	Warner,
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker, N. Y.	Payne,	Wilson, Ohio
Cousins,	Hulick,	Perkins,	Wright, Mass.
Dalzell,	Hull,	Phillips,	
Everett,	Kiefer,	Randall,	

NOT VOTING—104.

Abbott,	Draper,	Jones	Rayner,
Apsley,	Durborow,	Joy,	Reyburn,
Baldwin,	Ellis, Ky.	Kem,	Ritchie,
Bartlett,	Fellows,	Lapham,	Robinson, Pa.
Belden,	Fielder,	Latimer,	Rusk,
Belthoover,	Fitch,	Layton,	Russell, Conn.
Black, Ill.	Fithian,	Lockwood,	Schermerhorn,
Blanchard,	Funston,	Loudenslager,	Scranton,
Brattan,	Gardner,	Magner,	Settle,
Brawley,	Goldzier,	Mahon,	Sherman,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Graham,	McCulloch,	Sickles,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gresham,	McDowell,	Sipe,
Burnes,	Grosvenor,	McGann,	Sperry,
Burrows,	Harmer,	McKeighan,	Stevens,
Caldwell,	Harris,	Meyer,	Stone, C. W.
Caminetti,	Harter,	Money,	Storer,
Chickering,	Henderson, Ill.	Montgomery,	Turpin,
Childs,	Henderson, Iowa	Morgan,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Cockran,	Hendrix,	Moses,	Wanger,
Compton,	Hilborn,	Murray,	Waugh,
Cooper, Ind.	Hines,	Neill,	Wever,
Cornish,	Hopkins, Ill.	Newlands,	Wheeler, Ill.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Oates,	Whiting,
Daniels,	Houk, Tenn.	Patterson,	Wilson, W. Va.
Denson,	Hutcheson,	Pigott,	Woomer,
Dingley,	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	Wright, Pa.

Accordingly the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:

On this question:

Mr. FIELDER with Mr. PIGOTT.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 353) for the admission of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 353) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire if that bill has been reported by any committee of the House?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It has been reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. REED. By a vote in open committee?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. By a vote in open committee. It was first reported by a majority of the gentlemen of the committee signing a paper authorizing a report, and afterwards in open committee that action was ratified and confirmed, and the committee unanimously voted to report the bill favorably.

Mr. REED. When was that done?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. On the 2d or 3d day of November.

Mr. REED. Which transaction took place on the 3d day of November?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. It is impossible to hear what is being said by either of the gentlemen who are now addressing each other.

Mr. REED. I have not sought this private interview. This is the work of the chairman of the committee Mr. WHEELER of Alabama]. The chairman of the committee came over here to tell me about it, but I assure the House I did not seek any private information.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Out of respect for the distinguished gentleman from Maine I approached his side of the House when I observed that his remarks were addressed to me.

Mr. REED. I wish he would do it every time. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which has been read.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 353) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, with Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, is there any report on the Calendar for Oklahoma?

Mr. PAYNE. How about Alaska? [Laughter].

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, as this bill is almost an exact copy of the language of the bill passed in the last Congress, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. LOUD. Let us preserve at least a show of decency.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Let us occupy a little time in admitting States into the Union, at least by reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently there is objection to this request. The bill will be read.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In section 2, line 21, after the word "delegates," insert the words "Guadalupe County, two delegates." In line 23, after the word "county," strike out the word "twelve" and insert the word "ten."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask that the bill be reported by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will give his attention for a moment. General debate has not been dispensed with, and the bill must be read by sections.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I do not understand that there will be a desire for any extended general debate. I ask that the general debate be considered as closed, unless some gentleman desires to address the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. I desire to make a few remarks.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I hope the gentleman will be recognized then.

[Mr. BINGHAM withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, however trying the temptation to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], I shall not at this time be a party to any discussion that would divert this House from the consideration of the question that is before it. It would be an easy task indeed for anyone to dispose of such trivial objections as have just been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I personally am amazed that a gentleman who a few days ago, upon another and more solemn occasion, charmed the House while instructing it, should now, upon a measure which deals with matters of life and not of death; with things to come, not things that are past; with the treatment of questions concerning those who are to live and not merely the virtues of those who are dead and gone—I say I am amazed that the same gentleman should be so weak on this occasion who the other day was so strong; because this question is one that should have inspired his strongest thoughts and utterances.

Mr. Chairman, it matters not what view I may have taken upon this floor in August last as to the political divisions upon the silver question. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COCKRELL] in his utterance to-day, that it is a pity that the silver question should have been dragged in here by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER]. It is a pity that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] should have dragged in political considerations. If New Mexico, which has been standing knocking for admission to the Union ever since before the State from which I come, the proud Centennial State of the Union, was admitted, has been all the while and is to-day qualified as to her wealth and as to her citizenship for membership in the Union, then, sir, no such trivial objections as those which have been urged against her admission should be considered for a moment.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not entirely satisfied as to the status of affairs. I have voted for the admission of Utah. I have voted for the admission of Arizona. I stand here ready to vote for the admission of New Mexico. But I am bound, not only by my own wish but otherwise. There are other members who are bound as I am, and, if I may be permitted a moment of time, I can explain more particularly what I mean. Last April there was held in the city of Ogden, in Utah, a convention of delegates from the transmississippi country. There were represented there twenty-two different States. I was honored with a position on the committee on resolutions. That committee reported resolutions in favor of the admission of Utah, of Arizona, of New Mexico, and of Oklahoma. At that time we did not consider the political differences that seemed to have marked the course of the voters of those four Territories.

Here within the last twenty-four hours, Mr. Chairman, I have found, as others have, that upon this side of the Chamber there are many members willing to admit Arizona and New Mexico if Oklahoma is to be admitted. We find upon this floor that Utah is represented by a Delegate elected as a Democrat; Arizona by a Delegate elected as a Democrat; New Mexico by a Delegate elected as a Democrat; Oklahoma by a Delegate elected as a Republican; and so far as I am informed the party to which I belong, the People's party, casts no considerable vote in any one of those Territories. Republican members hesitate to-day upon this question because of the fear that when we have acted upon the measures now pending, when by the action of the House Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico have been added to the list of States, a balk will be made, and there will be some hesitation and delay upon the side of the majority here.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I should not repeat the substance or effect of private conversation; but I feel at liberty to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], the chairman of the Committee on Territories, has within an hour assured a number of us that he and his committee stand as ready to report favorably upon the admission of Oklahoma, represented on this floor by a Republican Delegate, as the committee has been to report the bills on which we have acted.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. PENCE. I trust that is true, and I have no doubt of it myself; but it seems to me it would answer a good purpose—I trust the suggestion may not be considered unbecoming on my part—if the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, would speak to this House and give us some assurance as to what we may expect from him and his committee upon the Oklahoma bill. Personally I am favorable to the admission of all these Territories; but all of them means four: it does not mean three, one being left out. Personally I would like to hear from the committee, and be assured that a favorable report upon the Oklahoma bill is to follow, regardless of political considerations.

Mr. BRODERICK. I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order now; the general debate has not closed.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I will make a statement in answer to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. PENCE]. I presume he is aware that under our treaties with the five Indian tribes it would be impossible now to pass a bill for the admission of Oklahoma. There has been but one bill introduced for that purpose, and it came to the committee but a short time ago. It is a proposition to admit the entire Indian Territory, including the country occupied by the five tribes, and until the treaties with those tribes are modified and the consent of their council obtained, we can not pass a law in Congress for the admission of the Territory in that shape.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. When we acquired the title to Oklahoma did we not extinguish the Indian title?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. But the bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma includes all the five tribes. The boundary of the proposed State is found in the second section of Mr. FLYNN'S bill. It is as follows:

SEC. 2. That the State of Oklahoma shall be bounded as follows: On the north by the States of Colorado and Kansas, on the east by the States of Missouri and Arkansas, on the south by the State of Texas, and on the west by the State of Texas and the Territory of New Mexico.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Why can not the gentleman's committee report that bill back with the five tribes left out? What have we to do with them?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. We always like, in the Committee on Territories, to consider the wishes of the delegate who introduces the bill; therefore, in conformity to his wishes, we are endeavoring to obtain the necessary authority which would enable us to report the bill in the form introduced by him; and we also desire to inform ourselves as to the wishes——

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Is the delegate from New Mexico here?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The delegate from New Mexico is not here.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Then you are not considering his wishes at all in reference to the present bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. We are using our best endeavors to conform to the wishes of the distinguished gentleman who represents New Mexico on this floor.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. How do you know what his wishes are if he is not here?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabarma. We do know what they are; we have taken pains to ascetain his wishes. We have been in constant consultation with the gentleman who has charge of Mr. JOSEPH'S affairs during his temporary absence, and he assures us that Mr. JOSEPH desires the bill to be pressed to its final passage at as early a day as possible. In addition we have been in telegraphic communiention with him. The delegate from New Mexico deserves great credit. He prepared the report and secured the passage of the bill a year and a half ago. He reintroduced the bill at the beginning of the first session of this Congress. He was a constant attendant at the meetings of the Committee on Territories. He prepared the able and valuable report upon the bill which I hold in my hand, and secured a favorable report upon his bill in the language in which it was introduced.

He is now sick; and we are now simply standing in his place to ask the passage of this bill in conformity with his wishes.

We all hope to see him returned as a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

Mr. WASHINGTON. He is a member of the committee, and reported this bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Yes, and he reported the bill now being considered.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Are you not holding back the bill for the admission of Oklahoma in order that it may include the Indian Territory in its entirety?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The committee are not holding back the Oklahoma bill, and I feel justified in saying that the members of the Committee on Territories are unanimous in their desire to clothe Oklahoma with statehood at an early day as practicable. When first appointed chairman of the Committee on Territories I commenced a careful examination of the laws affecting this Territory. I found by the fifth article of the treaty of December 29, 1835, that the United States agreed that the lands ceded to the Cherokees by that treaty should, in no future time, without their consent, be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory. I read from the United States Statutes at Large, volume 7, page 481:

The United States hereby covenant and agree that the lands ceded to the Cherokee Nation in the foregoing article shall, in no future time without their consent, be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory.

I also read in the same volume, page 368:

Article XIV. The Creek country west of the Mississippi shall be solemnly guaranteed to the Creek Indians, nor shall any State or Territory ever have a right to pass laws for the government of such Indians.

I read from the fourth article of the treaty of August 7, 1856, United States Statutes, volume 11, page 700:

The United States do hereby solemnly agree and bind themselves, that no State or Territory shall ever pass laws for the government of the Creek or Seminole tribes of Indians, and that no portion of either of the tracts of country defined in the first and second articles of this agreement shall ever be embraced or included within, or annexed to, any Territory or State, nor shall either, or any part of either, ever be erected into a Territory without the full and free consent of the legislative authority of the tribe owning the same.

During the last Congress a law was enacted looking to negotiations with the five civilized tribes for the purpose of the extinguishment of the national or tribal title to their lands, either by cession of all or a part thereof to the United States, or by the allotment of the same in severalty to the Indians thereof, or by such other method as may be agreed upon, with a view to the ultimate creation of a State or States of the Union which shall embrace said lands.

The law upon this subject, which may be found in the Indian appropriation act approved March 3, 1893 (section 16), reads as follows:

SEC. 16. The President shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint three commissioners to enter into negotiations with the Cherokee Nation, the Choctaw Nation, the Chickasaw Nation, the Muscogee, or Creek, Nation, the Seminole Nation, for the purpose of the extinguishment of the national or tribal title to any lands within that Territory now held by any and all such nations or tribes, either by cession of the same or some part thereof to the United States, or by the allotment and division of the same in severalty among the Indians of such nations or tribes, respectively, as may be entitled to the same, or by such other method as may be agreed upon between the several nations and tribes aforesaid, or each of them, with the United States, with a view to such an adjustment, upon the basis of justice and equity, as may, with the consent of such nations or tribes of Indians, so far as may be necessary, be requisite and suitable to enable the ultimate creation of a State or States of the Union which shall embrace the lands within said Indian Territory.

The commissioners so appointed shall each receive a salary, to be paid during such time as they may be actually employed, under direction of the President, in the duties enjoined by this act, at the rate of $5,000 per annum, and shall also be paid their reasonable and proper expenses incurred in prosecution of the objects of this act, upon accounts therefor to be rendered to and allowed by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time. That such commissioners shall have power to employ a secretary, a stenographer, and such interpreter or interpreters as may be found necessary to the performance of their duties, and by order to fix their compensation, which shall be paid, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, from time to time, with their reasonable and necessary expenses, upon accounts to be rendered as aforesaid; and may also employ, in like manner and with the like approval, a surveyor or other assistant or agent, which they shall certify in writing to be necessary to the performance of any part of their duties.

Such commissioners shall, under such regulations and directions as shall be prescribed by the President, through the Secretary of the Interior, enter upon negotiation with the several nations of Indians as aforesaid in the Indian Territory, and shall endeavor to procure, first, such allotment of lands in severalty to the Indians belonging to each such nation, tribe, or band, respectively, as may be agreed upon as just and proper to provide for each such Indian a sufficient quantity of land for his or her needs, in such equal distribution and apportionment as may be found just and suited to the circumstances; for which purpose, after the terms of such an agreement shall have been arrived at, the said commissioners shall cause the lands of any nation or tribe or band to be surveyed and the proper allotment to be designated; and, secondly, to procure the cession, for such price and upon such terms as shall be agreed upon, of any lands not found necessary to be so allotted or divided, to the United States; and to make proper agreements for the investment or holding by the United States of such moneys as may be paid or agreed to be paid to such nation or tribes or bands, or to any of the Indians thereof, for the extinguishment of their claims therein.

But said commissioners shall, however, have power to negotiate any and all such agreements as, in view of all the circumstances affecting the subject, shall be found requisite and suitable to such an arrangement of the rights and interests and affairs of such nations, tribes, bands, or Indians, or any of them, to enable the ultimate creation of a Territory of the United States with a view to the admission of the same as a State in the Union.

The commissioners shall at any time, or from time to time, report to the Secretary of the Interior their transactions and the progress of their negotiations, and shall at any time, or from time to time, if separate agreements shall be made by them with any nation, tribe, or band, in pursuance of the authority hereby conferred, report the same to the Secretary of the Interior for submission to Congress for its consideration and ratification.

For the purposes aforesaid there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States, the sum of $50,000, to be immediately available.

Neither the provisions of this section nor the negotiations or agreements which may be had or made thereunder shall be held in any way to waive or impair any right of sovereignty which the Government of the United States has over or respecting said Indian Territory or the people thereof, or any other right of the Government relating to said Territory, its lands, or the people thereof.

Approved March 3, 1893.

The House is well aware that the President has appointed these three commissioners and that they are now negotiating with the five nations. Mr. FLYNN did not introduce his bill until October 14, 1893, and I do not think it reached the committee until about October 20—less than two weeks prior to adjournment.

The committee were at that time very busily occupied in considering other bills, and I do not recollect that anyone ever appeared before the committee with regard to the bill. I presumed Mr. FLYNN desired the bill to pass in the form that it was introduced, and I devoted myself to examining the matter and doing all I could to forward the wishes of those people and admit them into the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is it not a fact that there is sufficient population in Oklahoma outside of those Indian tribes to entitle that Territory to statehood?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I think so, undoubtedly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, what is the objection to admitting that part which is ready to come in?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. My colleague on the committee [Mr. SIMPSON]—and I am glad he is a member of our committee—will concede that the committee in all its actions has sought to consider the wishes of the Delegate and the people he represents with regard to the admission of the respective Territories.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the chairman of the committee know that that matter was up before the committee in the last Congress and that there is no possibility of getting the consent of those Indians to the admission of Oklahoma as a State? So that, if we postpone admission till the consent of the Indian tribes is obtained, this step will probably be postponed for twenty years to come.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The gentleman knows that within the last three weeks commissioners have been appointed by the President and sent out there, trying to negotiate with the Indians on this very subject. I do not think the gentleman is justified in his intimation that there is no possibility of success in this mission.

Mr. REED. What sort of authority did this commissioner possess?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It was not a single commissioner. There are three commissioners, and they have the authority which was conferred upon them by a Congress of which the gentleman himself was a member. I think the RECORD will show that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] voted for the bill which created the commission and conferred the authority for the proposed negotiation. The act has been read to the House. I now ask that the bill be read by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] has been recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to protest against the line of argument which has been pursued in the last few minutes, as well as to the questioning put by the gentleman from Colorado to the member of the Committee on the Territories who has charge of this bill, as to the probable future action of that committee. I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado and to the Committee of the Whole of this House, that with a clear and distinct Democratic majority on this side of the House, the precedents and the acts of the Fifty-first Congress will not be repeated by the Fifty-third Congress of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No Territory will be admitted into the Union as a State because of its political complexion.

Mr. MILLIKEN. We doubt it, seriously doubt it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. We will not shut out Oklahoma from a fair, honorable, and honest consideration of her claims to sisterhood because she has a Republican representative on this floor. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. But will you admit it; that is the serious question?

Mr. HATCH. You are asking a question now that you know is absolutely impertinent to this issue and unfair until we reach the consideration of the case and have all of the facts before us.

Mr. MILLIKEN. It seems to me to be a very pertinent question.

Mr. HATCH. Not at all. You have no right to ask me or any other member on this floor how he will vote on the consideration of a proposition for the admission of Oklahoma; certainly not until her claim to sisterhood has been presented by a report of the committee made to the House and the facts laid before us in that way.

Mr. MILLIKEN. If my friend will allow a word just there. I will say that I would not have asked the question if the gentleman had not himself, in the opening of his speech, predicated the grounds on which he would vote.

Mr. HATCH. No; the gentleman is mistaken. I did not lay any such predicate as that, or state how I would vote, except to say that we would sustain the long and honorable record of the Democratic party.

What I meant was that this House of Representatives, with its Democratic majority, would not settle and conclude this question from the standpoint of the Republican party and the action taken by them always whenever they have been in power. We know that during the Fiftieth Congress, when the two Dakotas, Washington, and Montana were admitted into the Union, an appeal was made to this House to include the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, not because of their political

complexion, but because they presented as fair a case for admission as any State ever admitted into the Union since the original thirteen; and I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not now undertake, in his answer to the gentleman from Colorado, to state in advance or make any pledge that will be supposed to bind the consciences or the judgment of the majority in this House.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I would like to state that what I referred to was the feeling of the committee with reference to the matter as being favorable to the admission of Oklahoma. I do not undertake to bind anybody. I simply stated it was my opinion that the members of the committee were favorable to the admission of Oklahoma. That was, I think, the substance of my remark.

Mr. HATCH. Do I understand from the remark made by the gentleman from Alabama that the committee has already passed on that question?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The committee have not passed on it; but the gentleman knows that in the committee room, as a general thing, members discuss these matters amongst themselves, and the impression conveyed is that they are favorable to the admission.

Mr. HATCH. But I take it the committee, in their conversations, will not undertake to bind themselves or this House when they come to a vote upon the proposition. I simply want it understood, and clearly understood, that whatever is done in that regard is not to be considered as binding upon this House. We can not act until the facts are laid before us.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The remark I made in reply to the question was, in the presence of most if not all the members of the committee, and all apparently assented to it, and I think I am correct. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Is not Oklahoma "all right?"

Mr. HATCH. I do not know whether Oklahoma is all right or not. I have not any report from the committee, and no evidence by which I can form an opinion or cast a vote as to whether she is ready, and ought to be admitted, or not. What I protest against is the assumption that this shall be made a lobby, and that one of these Territories shall be tacked on to another. There is no lobbying about it.

This Territory, New Mexico, has been, by all of the testimony that has been presented to this House for the past eight years, in full possession of all of the qualifications requisite for admission into the Union, and it has been excluded heretofore simply because the Republicans have voted against it from a political standpoint. I do not intend that the gentleman from Alabama, or the gentleman from Colorado, for both of whom I have a high personal regard, shall bind me by any pledge in advance as to how I shall vote on that Oklahoma question. [Applause.]

I favor, Mr. Chairman, the admission of New Mexico because she ought to have been admitted years ago to statehood. When the Oklahoma case comes before the House, I will make up my judgment and vote according to the information furnished by the committee in its report; and in that action shall be guided by my best judgment as to all of the facts in the case, and not by any question as to the political complexion of the Delegate from that Territory on this floor. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMPSON Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Committee on Territories in the last Congress. We had a number of delegations before that committee from what is now Oklahoma Territory, asking for statehood, and it was demonstrated beyond a doubt that there was no possibility of getting the consent of the Indian Nation to come in as a State; and the only way you will get Oklahoma admitted as a State is to admit her without the five civilized Indian tribes. At least that is my belief.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Why did not you introduce a bill, then?

Mr. SIMPSON. My belief is that such a course will meet with the approbation of the people of Oklahoma. She has sufficient population and wealth to-day, and I want the Democrats in this House to prove their assertions are correct, that they have not advocated the admission of Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico on political grounds, but that they show that broad statesmanship which will admit the Territory of Oklahoma also, regardless of how her citizens will vote.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] a question.

Mr. SIMPSON. Very well.

Mr. BLAND. I understand that the gentleman has referred to the Cherokee Strip. Is the Cherokee Strip included in Oklahoma?

Mr. SIMPSON. It is now a part of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Mr. BLAND. Why not admit them both?

Mr. SIMPSON. It is a part of the Territory of Oklahoma, which should be admitted as a State.

Mr. BLAND. If you would introduce a bill for that, there would be a good many of us who would vote for it.

Mr. SIMPSON. The bill will be introduced if the chairman of the Committee on Territories [Mr. WHEELER of Alabama] will pledge himself to-day to report it. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Is it usual to ask the chairman of the committee for such a pledge?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is what we want. We want a guaranty from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Ask for a guaranty on the tariff, or something else.

Mr. BOWERS of California. This bill can wait until you report the Oklahoma bill. I am in favor of admitting the Territories, but I want them admitted on equal terms.

Mr. SIMPSON. We want an understanding that the Territory of Oklahoma will be admitted as a State. That is what we want, and that is what we have got to have.

In my mind, the Democrats should show that broader statesmanship that lifts the party out of partisanship and shows that they are more desirous of making laws for the benefit of the people than to secure party advantages. Besides, even if they should choose to move along the lines which apparently give the most advantage to the party, it will not avail them to give statehood to New Mexico, which is populated by a race speaking an alien language, and deny statehood to Oklahoma, which is peopled by the best blood of the American continent. Nor will it do for Republicans to raise objections to the admission of this Territory of New Mexico because they fear they might not vote the Republican ticket, nor will it do either to raise objections that they have not sufficient population or wealth. This is certainly a new doctrine, that the possession of wealth should be the only claim for self-government.

This is certainly a new doctrine in this Republic. That is not the doctrine taught by the men whose blood and muscle made this a republic. I do not believe this doctrine reflects the sentiment of the people of New England to-day any more than it did in 1776. But let me say to those timid souls who can see no value in any proposition without it has the clink of coin and the accumulation of wealth behind it, let me say to them to have no fear on that score; there will be in the near future both wealth and population in this Territory. The forces that are at work will furnish both. The same causes that have driven man from the place where he first saw the light of the world are yet at work, and will push him on to the end.

It is said by scientists that ages and ages ago there was a tropical climate in the northern regions, and that man, along with animals that only live and thrive in the temperate and tropical climate, lived and inhabited that part of the earth. But there comes a change. Suddenly down from the northern regions came the biting blasts of Arctic winter, and the air, so to speak, was frozen into ice. Glaciers formed and moved over the earth to the south. Before this irresistible force man was driven to leave his former home and haunts, to find new opportunities to supply his wants. From central and western Europe, Scotland, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and France they were driven forth to seek new habitations. But though the heat of the sun has long since melted the ice, and the grass is green and the harvests ripen where once was nothing but eternal winter, there is yet a powerful force that is ever pushing the human race onward to find new and unoccupied countries; not, however, on the same lines, but along the temperate zone, from east to west, they are being driven by another resistless power.

Since prehistoric times populations have moved steadily westward, as De Tocqueville said, "as if driven by the hand of God." But it was customary in times gone by to lay all the blame on God for the misfortune of man; but a higher civilization has taught us that nearly all the ills he suffers are attributable to his own ignorance of the laws of God.

This force, that makes him, like the "Wandering Jew," ever to be condemned to move onward, is generated by himself. It is the outgrowth of a bad system of land tenure, which allows one human being to hold such portions of the earth out of use and deny his fellow-man access to this great storehouse of wealth.

Land monopoly, that has resulted in depriving man of the right to live upon land, his only home, has had the effect to push him from one end of the globe to the other, and in his flight he has been pushed forward with a steady and resistless force, as did the glaciers push him from north to south, and his course has been marked by changes upon the earth's surface almost as great as was that marked by the course of the mountains of ice.

From India, Persia, Greece, Italy, Germany, France, Spain, Great Britain, and then to this great West, on from Plymouth Rock and Jamestown to the Golden Gate, like the star in the east which guided the three kings with their treasures westward until at length it stood still over the cradle of the young

Christ, so the star of empire, rising in the East, has ever moved onward, until at last it has rested over what, to my mind, is the treasure-house of the world. I will insert as part of my remarks an extract from a little book entitled "Our Country," by Josiah Strong, D. D., which sets forth the resources of the great West. He says:

Of the twenty-two States and Territories west of the Mississippi only three are as small as all New England. Montana would stretch from Boston on the east to Cleveland on the west, and extend far enough south to include Richmond, Va. Idaho, if laid down in the East, would touch Toronto, Canada, on the north and Raleigh, N. C., on the south, while its southern boundary line is long enough to stretch from Washington City to Columbus, Ohio; and California, if on our Atlantic seaboard, would extend from the southern line of Massachusetts to the lower part of South Carolina; or, in Europe, it would extend from London across France and well into Spain. New Mexico is larger than the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The great measurement of Texas is nearly equal to the distance from New Orleans to Chicago, or from Chicago to Boston.

Lay Texas on the face of Europe, and this giant, with his head resting on the mountains of Norway (directly east of the Orkney Islands), with one palm covering London, the other Warsaw, would stretch himself down across the kingdom of Denmark, across the empires of Germany and Austria, across Northern Italy, and lave his feet in the Mediterranean.

Dakota might be carved into a half dozen kingdoms of Greece; or, if it were divided into twenty-six equal countries we might lay down the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel in each.

Place the 50,000,000 inhabitants of the United States in 1880 all in Texas, and the population would not be as dense as that of Germany. Put them in Dakota, and the population would not be as dense as that of England and Wales. Place them in New Mexico, and the density of population would not be as great as that of Belgium. Those 50,000,000 might all be comfortably sustained in Texas. After allowing say 50,000 square miles for "desert," Texas could have produced all our food crops in 1879, grown, as we have seen, on 164,216 square miles of land; could have raised the world's supply of cotton, 12,000,000 bales, at one bale to the acre, on 19,000 square miles, and then have had remaining for a cattle range a territory larger than the State of New York.

Accounting all of Minnesota and Louisiana west of the Mississippi, for convenience, we have, according to the census of 1880, 2,115,135 square miles in the West and 854,865 in the East. That is, for every acre east of the Mississippi we have nearly two and half west of it. But what of the "Great American Desert," which occupied so much space on the map a generation ago? It is nomadic and elusive; it recedes before advancing civilization like the Indian and buffalo which once roamed it. There are extensive regions, which, because of rocks or lava beds or alkali, or altitude, or lack of rain, are unfit for the plow, but they afford much of the finest grazing country in the world, much valuable timber, and mineral wealth which is enormous. Useless land, though much in the aggregate, is far less than is commonly supposed and in comparison with wealth-producing lands is almost insignificant.

The vast region east of the Rocky Mountains, though once the home of the "Great American Desert," really contains very little useless land. We have all heard of the "Bad Lands" of Dakota; but they comprise only about 75,000 acres out of 94,528,000 in the territory, and even these lands are an excellent stock range.

Mr. E. V. Smalley says:

"Cattle come out of the Bad Lands in the spring as fat as though they had been stall-fed all winter."

The United States surveyor-general says:

"The proportion of waste land in the Territory (Dakota), owing to the absence of swamps, mountain ranges, overflowed and sandy tracts, is less than in any other State or Territory in the Union."

There are 20,000 square miles of "bad lands" in Northwestern Nebraska rich in wonderful fossils but economically worthless. It is often said that the Kansas lands near the Colorado border are alkaline; but Prof. Mudge, State geologist, says that, in fifteen years of exploration, he has found but two springs containing alkalies, and has never seen 10 acres of land in one place which has been injured by it. There is probably a little waste land in Kansas as in Illinois. The "Staked Plain" of Texas is sometimes spoken of as a desert; but a Texan writer, who has lived there for years, says of it: "While it is true that this vast territory which we are describing is mainly a grazing country, it is also true that it abounds in fertile valleys and rich locations of large extent, which are as well watered and as fertile as any in the nation." That portion of the "Staked Plain" which is mountainous is rich in minerals.

Driven from the plain east of the Rocky Mountains the "Great American Desert" seems to have become a fugitive and vagabond on the face of the earth. It was located for a time by the map-makers in Utah, but being persecuted there, it fled to Arizona and Nevada. I do not mean to imply that there are no waste lands in Utah. Portions of the Territory are as worthless as some of its people. There are some deserts, one west of the Great Salt Lake, which contains several thousand square miles; but the surveyor-general of the Territory says:

"Notwithstanding the opinion of many who deem our lands 'arid, desert, and worthless,' these same lands under proper tillage produce 40 to 50 bushels of wheat, 70 to 80 bushels of oats and barley, from 200 to 400 bushels of potatoes to the acre, and fruits and vegetables equal to any other State or Territory in quantity and quality."

There are vast tracts which can not be irrigated, but it has been discovered that by deep plowing these same lands, without artificial moisture, can be made to produce bountifully. The culture of these high lands was, the past year, thoroughly successful. Arizona has been considered a waste, and undoubtedly much land there is arid; but, on the other hand, there is much also which is wealth producing. Gen. J. C. Fremont, who as governor of the Territory for several years, had exceptional facilities for gaining information, in his official report in 1878, said: "So far as my present knowledge goes, the grazing and farming lands comprehend an area equal to that of the State of New York." And a writer in Harper's Magazine for March, 1882, says: "It is estimated by competent authority that, with irrigation, 37 per cent can be redeemed for agriculture, and 60 per cent for pasturage." Certain it is that when the Spaniards first visited the territory in 1526, they found ruins of cities and irrigating canals, which indicated that it was once densely populated by a civilized race which subsisted by agriculture.

There is more barren land in Nevada than in any other State or Territory of the West. The wealth of the State is not agricultural or pastoral but mineral. Nevertheless the surveyor-general of the State says: "In our sage-brush lands, alfalfa, the cereals and all vegetables flourish in profusion where water can be obtained, and the State is speedily becoming one of the great stock-raising States of the Union." A good authority estimates that eventually one-half of the State can be made valuable.

The area in which occur, here and there, most of the worthless lands of the West, is pyramidal in shape, the base extending along the Mexican line in Texas, and the apex being found in the northern part of Idaho. That is, the proportion of useless lands decreases as you go north, until it seems to disappear entirely before reaching the Northern Pacific Railway.

Mr. E. V. Smalley, who, in the summer of 1882, traveled the line of that road before its completion, writes:

"The whole country traversed through the northern tier of Territories, from Eastern Dakota to Washington, is a habitable region. For the entire distance every square mile of the country is valuable either for farming, stock-raising, or timber-cutting. There is absolutely no waste land between the well-settled region of Dakota and the new wheat region of Washington Territory. Even on the tops of the Rocky Mountains there is good pasturage; and the vast timber belt enveloping Clarks Fork and Lake Pend d'Oreille and the ranges of the Cabinet and Cœur d'Alene Mountains is more valuable than an equal extent of arable land."

Comparatively little of the Rocky Mountain region has been surveyed. In the absence of exact knowledge, therefore, we must rely on the estimates of surveyor-generals, governors, and others who have had opportunities to form intelligent opinions concerning the available lands of the West. In some cases official reports of surveys have afforded accurate information; but in most it has been necessary to rely on estimates which pretend to be only approximately correct. I believe they are temperate, and will prove to be rather under than over the truth. According to these estimates the region west of the Mississippi embraces 785,000 square miles of arable lands, 645,000 square miles which are useless, except so far as they are mineral lands. In weighing these figures several considerations should be borne in mind.

1. Generally speaking, those best acquainted with the West make the largest estimates of its resources and have the most faith in its future.

2. Land often appears worthless which experiment proves to be fertile. For instance, the "Great Columbia Plains" of Eastern Washington. The soil, which varies from 1 foot to 20 feet in depth, is, except in the bottom lands, a very light colored loam, containing an unusually large percentage of alkalies and fixed acids. A few years ago, sowing wheat on that soil would have been deemed throwing it away; but the experiment resulted in a revelation, viz, that these 14,000,000 acres of peculiar soil are probably the best wheat fields in all the world. Other illustrations equally striking might be given. Rev. A. Blanchard, home missionary superintendent for East Wyoming and Colorado, writes: "Nothing is more surprising than the material for supporting a population which continues to be developed in all this region of mountain and plain; a region which, twenty years ago, was considered an inhospitable desert, capable of supporting nothing but Indians."

3. Barren islands are often rendered fruitful. Water is all that is needed to make most of our western "deserts" blossom as the rose. In 1882 twelve artesian wells were sunk in Tulare County, Cal., with astonishing results. They were found to flow from 2,000,000 to 15,000,000 gallons daily; and where once were barren plains the fields are a succession of vineyards, orchards, and wheat fields. Since then many of these wells have been sunk in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Colorado. Moreover, the rainfall seems to be increasing with the cultivation of the soil. It is also worthy of note that what rain there is usually falls in those months when it is most needed, and that there is little or none during harvest.

Oftentimes all that a sterile soil needs is treatment with some mineral which nature has deposited near by.

4. The arable lands in the Rocky Mountains are mainly in valleys which, like basins, have gathered detritus of the mountains for ages. The soil is therefore very deep and strong, yielding much more than the same area in the East; and in the Southwest two crops a year from the same soil are very common, so that this land is equal to twice or three times the same area in the East.

5. The above estimate of arable lands in the West does not include the timber lands, a large proportion of which is of the finest quality. Of the 260,000 square miles of timber, 45,000 are in Texas, 26,000 in Arkansas, and 25,000 in Minnesota. Nearly one-half of the whole is in the Mississippi Valley, and a good deal of the remainder is on fine soil, so that it is reasonable to infer that 1,000,000 square miles or more of this timber land would be arable if cleared. Moreover, much of the 645,000 square miles of grazing land will prove to be arable. We may therefore expect the arable lands of the West ultimately to reach 900,000 square miles and perhaps 1,000,000.

6. A considerable portion of the 854,865 square miles east of the Mississippi is not arable. In New England, New York, and Pennsylvania there are 94,500 square miles of unimproved lands.

It is a fair inference that in the old States, where land has long been in demand, so much would not remain unimproved unless generally incapable of improvement. Throughout the many mountain ranges of the entire Appalachian system there is much waste land and more that is not arable. In the absence of any exact data it would seem from the facts just given that there must be not less than 50,000 or 60,000 square miles of waste land east of the Mississippi, and twice as much that is not fit for the plow.

This reduces the arable lands of the East to about 700,000 square miles as against 785,000 in the West, with the probable eventual addition to the latter of 100,000 or 200,000 more. For every acre in the East, bad as well as good, there is another in the West capable of producing food; and in addition, a timber area as vast as all New England, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana. And this, be it remembered, does not include the magnificent timber lands of Alaska, which William H. Seward said would one day make that Territory the ship-yard of the world. And in addition to all this, the West has grazing lands 50,000 square miles broader than the total area of all the States east of the Mississippi, not above enumerated. In 1880 there were in the West 61,211,000 head of live stock; and those vast plains are capable of sustaining several times that number. The West, therefore, has 1,690,000 square miles of useful lands against 800,000 in the East—more than twice as much.

Nor have we finished our inventory of western wealth. Its mineral resources are simply inexhaustible. The precious metals have been found in most of the States and Territories of our Western Empire. From the discovery of gold to June 30, 1881, California has produced $1,170,000,000 of that metal. The annual product is now from eighteen to twenty-five millions. From 1863 to 1880 Idaho produced $60,000,000 of gold and silver, and Montana from 1861 to 1879 not less than $162,000,000. In twenty years Nevada produced $448,545,000 of the precious metals. The production of Colorado during the twenty-four years preceding 1883 was $167,000,000. Her output for 1882 was $27,000,000. In wealth-producing power a single rich mine represents a great area of arable land. For instance the Comstock Lode, in 1887, produced $37,662,252.

Those twelve insignificant holes in the side of the mountain yielded more wealth that year than 3,890,000 acres planted to corn the same year. That is, those few square rods on the surface in Nevada were as large as all the cornfields of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota collectively. Rocky Mountain wealth, penetrating thousands of feet into the earth, compensates for large areas of barren surface. The agricultural resources of a country do not now as formerly determine its possible population. To-day easy transportation makes regions populous and wealthy which once were uninhabitable. Even if a blade of grass could not be made to grow in all the Rocky Mountain States, that region could sustain 100,000,000 souls, provided it has sufficient mineral wealth to exchange for the produce of the Mississippi Valley. Quartz mines have been known

in the Rockies for years, which could not be worked without heavy machinery.

The inner chambers of God's great granite safes, where the silver and gold have been stored for ages to enrich this generation, are fastened with time locks set for the advent of the railway. The projection of railway systems into the mountains will rapidly develop these mines. For the year ending May 31, 1880, the United States produced 55 tons 724 pounds (avoirdupois) of gold, and 1,090 tons 398 pounds of silver. These huge figures may be better grasped, perhaps, by considering that the gold represents five ordinary carloads, while a train of one hundred and nine freight cars of the usual capacity would be required to transport the silver.

But the precious metals constitute only a small part of the mineral wealth of the West. "An eminent metallurgist and scientist has recently estimated the entire mineral production of the region west of the Mississippi, for the year 1880, as worth $1,000,000,000, and has given the items on which his estimate is based." This sum is equal to the value of five-elevenths of all our agricultural products of the same year. The West has upwards of 200,000 square miles of coal measure, thirty-eight times the area of all the coal fields of Great Britain. Excepting Minnesota, coal has been found in every State and Territory west of the Mississippi. And not one is without iron. California has superior ores. The iron of Oregon is equal to the very best Swedish and Russian metal. Wyoming has immense deposits.

The supply of Utah is enormous. It is found in some form in every county of Missouri. Iron Mountain and Pilot Knob are estimated to contain 500,000,000 tons of the finest ore. There are great masses of iron in Texas, probably equal in quantity and quality to any deposits in the world. Lead is found in all the States and Territories of the West, except Minnesota, Nebraska, and the Indian Territory. In many of them the ores are rich and abundant. The lead-producing area in Missouri is over 5,000 square miles. The product of that State in 1887 was over 63,000,000 pounds. Nebraska and Kansas alone are without copper. Rich ores and native metal abound in what seem inexhaustible quantities. The deposits of salt are without computation. Besides salt springs and lakes which yield great quantities, there are beds of unknown depth covering thousands of acres. Sulphur also is exceedingly abundant.

In Idaho there is a mountain which is 85 per cent pure sulphur. A deposit in Louisiana, equally pure, is 112 feet thick. Nevada has borax enough to supply mankind. In Wyoming there are lakes in which the deposits of sulphate of soda are from 10 to 15 feet in thickness, and almost chemically pure. Gypsum abounds. Texas has the largest deposits known in the world; "enough to supply the universe for centuries." The Colorado River of Texas cuts its way through mountains of solid marble. In many parts of the Rocky Mountains there are the finest building stones, granite, sandstone, and marble, of all possible colors and shades, without end. It would be tiresome simply to enumerate the valuable minerals which swell the undeveloped wealth of the West.

If recent reports are correct, it is not denied even tin, the world's supply of which has hitherto been so limited. Inconsiderable deposits have been found in several States and Territories; but Prof. Bailey, United States Geologist for Montana, states that in the region of Harneys Peak, he has found tin-bearing rock that can be quarried from the surface, that there are veins measuring more than 50 feet in width, which will average much better than those in Cornwall. He declares that there is enough to supply the world, and says that it is impossible to imagine this great body of ore ever being exhausted. If these statements are correct, the discovery is one of the most important of the century.

The unrivaled resources of the West, together with the unequaled enterprise of her citizens are a sure prophecy of superior wealth. Already have some of these young States outstripped older States of the East, as is seen by the following statement of wealth per caput according to the assessed valuation of property in 1880:

South Carolina	$110	Kansas	$161
Illinois	255	Minnesota	330
Vermont	259	Colorado	331
Indiana	368	Montana	475
New York	538	California	674

The West is destined to surpass in agriculture, stock-raising, mining, and, eventually, in manufacturing. Already appears the superiority of her climate, which Montesquieu declares "is the most powerful of all empires, and gives guaranty alone of future development."

Every advantage seems to be hers save only greater proximity to Europe, and if the East commands European commerce, the Golden Gate opens upon Asia, as yet to receive—

"The Wealth of Ormus and of Ind,"

and send her argosies to all the ports of the broad Pacific. Beyond a peradventure, the West is to dominate the East. With more than twice the room and resources of the East, the West will have probably twice the population and wealth of the East, together with the superior power and influence which, under proper government, accompany them. The West will elect the Executive and control legislation. When the center of population crosses the Mississippi, the West will have a majority in the Lower House, and sooner or later the partition of her great Territories, and probably some of the States, will give to the West the control of the Senate. When Texas is as densely peopled as New England, it is hardly to be supposed her millions will be content to see the 62,000 square miles east of the Hudson send twelve Senators to the seat of Government, while her territory of 262,000 sends only two.

The West will direct the policy of the Government, and by virtue of her preponderating population and influence will determine our national character, and therefore destiny.

That we are to have another movement of the masses out to the unoccupied land is as certain as the rising and ebbing of the tide. For more than fifteen years there has been a steady flow of population to the cities. Land monopoly, which is the parent of all other monopoly, has robbed the people of the wealth and concentrated it in the hands of the few.

They have built cities, railroads, canals, all the magnificent palaces, yet they find themselves homeless and in a condition to perish, amidst plenty and abundance. They starve in the shadow of the storehouses bursting with plenty, and so it follows that the tide that flows to the cities until the population is out of all proportion as distributing points for the agricultural community, it must again flow out to the rural districts. Man naturally likes the society of his fellow-man, and it is only under the strongest pressure of poverty that he is driven out into the new country.

Let me here insert one of the speeches made in Chicago recently before the Trade Assembly Convention in that city. Listen to the outcry of the poor of Chicago, which is but a type of every large city in the country:

We would wish to bid you welcome to a prosperous city, but the truth will not justify the assertion. Things are here as they are, but not as they should be. We bid you welcome in the name of a hundred monopolists and of fifty thousand tramps; here, where Mammon holds high carnival in palaces, while mothers are heartbroken, children are starving, and men are looking in vain for work. We bid you welcome in the name of a hundred thousand idle men; in the name of those edifices dedicated to the glory of God, but whose doors are closed at night to the starving and the poor; in the name of the ministers who fatten from the vineyards of God, forgetting that God's children are hungry and have no place to lay their heads; in the name of the pillars of the sweating system, of the millionaires and deacons whose souls are endangered by their appetite for gold; in the name of the wage-workers who sweat blood which is coined into golden ducats; in the names of the insane asylums and poorhouses packed by people crazed by care in this land of plenty.

We will show you exhibits of Chicago that were not shown at the Fair grounds, of her greatness and her weakness. To-night we will show you hundreds of men lying on the rough stone in the corridors of this very building—no home, no food—men able and willing to work, but for whom there is none. It is time for alarm—alarm for the continuation of a Government whose sovereign States are delivered to railway magnates, coal barons, and speculators; alarm for the continuation of a Federal Government whose financial policies are manufactured in Wall street at the dictation of the money barons of Europe. We expect you to take measures to utilize the franchise and to hurl from power the unfaithful servants of the people who are responsible for existing conditions.

Now, one of the most potent causes of these conditions is explained in the following extract clipped from a Chicago paper:

The present site of Chicago was sold by the Indians for 3 cents an acre. Taking the most valuable corner lot in the business part of the city as a criterion, the value has increased 130,000,000 per cent. In 1830, when there were 50 people scattered around Fort Dearborn, a quarter of an acre of land in what is known as the "heart of Chicago" could have been purchased for $20. In the past sixty-three years there were only two years in which the city did not show an increase in population over the previous year. But there were thirteen years during that time when this quarter of an acre of land showed a decrease in value, according to the real-estate appraisement. The greatest increase per cent recorded was in 1835, when it rose in value 400 per cent over the value of the previous year. With our latest knowledge of real-estate "booms" it is easy to picture the vision the owner must have had of the future glory of Chicago when he raised the price of his corner lot from $200 in 1834 to $5,000 in 1835. To-day the lot is assessed at $1,200,000.—*Real Estate Record.*

The only outlet, the only open road to safety, lies through immigration to those new Territories where they can find unoccupied land, and let us hope that they will be the happy homes of millions of people; and let us also hope that, like the heat and light of the sun that melted the frozen ice in the glaciers, the sunlight of reason and brotherly love will so soften and civilize man that he will not then deprive his fellow-man of the right to live upon the land, and that the earth belongs to the children of men and should be held for their use. And as the means to secure this end, let us give them the right to govern themselves, through their admission as States into the Federal Union; and then under the glorious old flag, with its forty-eight stars, we will march forward and make a permanent and abiding home for mankind.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask whether the members of the committee are to barter away the rights of the people in one section, as a benefit to those of another? I want to know what we are discussing. I understood we were discussing the question of the admission of New Mexico into the sisterhood of States. I find that a portion of the members of this House on my right want to drive a bargain, to find out whether we will do something else in consideration of their performing a duty presented to them to act upon. I say now, with the highest estimate of the character and ability of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], that he had no right to ask the question which he asked of the chairman of the Committee on Territories [Mr. WHEELER of Alabama], and the chairman of that committee had no right to answer it, if I know anything about parliamentary law. It looks in the direction of a bargain: "If you will do something for me I will do something for you."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I would like to state to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DUNN] that this bill for the admission of New Mexico passed the House at the last session by a vote of 177 to 3, and I expect the bill to pass again by nearly the same vote. Everything said upon this subject has been in the presence of the gentleman. No bargain has been proposed, and the facts certainly show that no bargain is necessary to insure the passage of this bill; and if it was, I can assure the gentleman that I would not be a party to any such bargain.

Mr. DUNN. I have the highest regard for the gentleman. I know something about his record in the late troublesome times through which this country passed. His courage is undoubted. His wisdom may be assailed in matters of this kind. Neither he nor any other man has a right to pledge a bargain that his committee or any other committee will admit a State into the Union in consideration of votes given for the admission of New Mexico. I say we are right in asking for admission of New Mexico, or we are wrong. If we are wrong let gentlemen vote against that ad

mission, but do not let them force a bargain that "we will do wrong for you if you will do wrong for us."

What is the condition of Oklahoma Territory? We do not know anything more about it than the man in the moon. It is in a chaotic condition. It is represented here on this floor, it is true, but it is composed of a mixed population, who do not know each other yet, nor where they came from, nor to whom they belong. An effort is being made here to force a bargain that before we admit a settled Territory which has long had an organized government, which has been for years knocking for admission, that "before that Territory is admitted as a State, a bargain must be made with us, the small end of nothing whittled down sharp, the wind instrument of the politics of this country, that you must guarantee us that you will admit Oklahoma."

I am sorry that I have had to say this much. I have said it after I have seen a chaotic mass gathering before the House, and bargaining away, as it were, the rights of the people. I hope we will proceed with the discussion of the admission of New Mexico; and there are enough Democrats here, all honest, and Democrats ought all to be honest if they are not, to deal with that question and leave out these people who are trying to make a bargain with us. [Applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the committee for a very few minutes, to explain the condition of New Mexico and her right of admission into the Union at this time.

I desire to state, at the beginning, that the Delegate from New Mexico [Mr. JOSEPH], is detained from attending by reason of severe illness. He has been diligent for many years in serving her people on this floor, in urging the admission of New Mexico into the Union; and no man has ever served his constituents more faithfully in that respect than has the Delegate from New Mexico. I have received a telegram from him stating his inability, on account of sickness, to be here; and in his behalf I ask this committee to consider this bill now and do justice to New Mexico and her people.

In the Forty-third Congress, which was Republican in both branches, a bill passed both Houses, by large majorities, admitting New Mexico and Colorado into the Union; but the same bill did not pass both Houses. In the House of Representatives, in the closing hours of the Forty-third Congress, there was a general agreement among the members, upon both sides of the question of politics, that both these Territories should then be admitted into the Union. A motion to suspend the rules and admit Colorado into the Union was carried by three or four more than the two-third vote required to suspend the rules. A similar motion was immediately made in regard to New Mexico: and, notwithstanding that House was nearly two-thirds Republican, that motion only failed by two or three votes of the necessary two-thirds to give recognition to New Mexico at that time.

It was then believed by everybody, or nearly everybody in Congress, that those two States should come into the Union together in 1876; and Congress at that time, although both branches were Republican, had done everything it seemed possible to further the admission of New Mexico, the bill having passed both Houses by a large majority, and nearly every Republican on that side of the House at that time voting in favor of New Mexico coming into the Union. But owing to the necessities of the closing hours of the session, when it required a two-thirds vote to pass it under a suspension of the rules, it failed.

In the Fiftieth Congress a bill was passed by a large majority in favor of the admission of New Mexico into the Union. The Senate rejected New Mexico. A conference committee was called, and that conference committee was instructed by a vote of this House, on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], to eliminate New Mexico from the bill and although but few Democrats voted for the measure all the Republicans at that time voted to eliminate New Mexico from that bill. We believed then that New Mexico was entitled to be admitted into the Union, and after the House had instructed the conference committee, the committee promptly obeyed the instruction and brought in a bill admitting the two Dakotas, Washington, and Montana, and that Democratic House passed the bill in the closing hours of the session, and it was signed by Mr. Cleveland before the expiration of his term.

The Fifty-first Congress, which was Republican in both branches, admitted the States of Wyoming and Idaho into the Union, neither of which States has one-half of the population that New Mexico has to-day and had at that time. On this side we voted against the admission of those two States, for the reason that we believed that Arizona and New Mexico were equally entitled to admission, and desired that the four should be admitted instead of the two.

Mr. REED. That was making a bargain—that was proposing a bargain——

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir.

Mr. REED. That has been reprobated by the gentleman in the rear.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was not a bargain. We offered no bargain, but we plead for justice; and justice was denied those two Territories.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, we plead again for justice; we plead for justice which has long been delayed New Mexico. We have already admitted Arizona, and we ask that that justice be done New Mexico before the House adjourns. Let us admit New Mexico now into the Union, and do that which we should have done twenty years ago. [Applause.] [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DUNN], I can not see how the granting of the demand of New Mexico for admission to the Union should depend on what the Committee on the Territories may promise to do for Oklahoma. This certainly is not the time to discuss the claims of Oklahoma to statehood. In the last Congress it was clearly developed, and it has been still more clearly developed in this Congress by those acquainted with the condition of affairs in Oklahoma, that that Territory is not yet ready for statehood. The question does not depend on whether her people may vote the Republican or may vote the Democratic ticket. We really have no idea how they will vote, as they have had no opportunity to express themselves at the ballot box. Since the opening of the Cherokee Outlet and the large increase of population the Territory of Oklahoma is to-day practically unformed.

There is no telling as yet what new additions may be made to her Territory. I let no man surpass me in my admiration of the pluck and energy of the brave men who have taken possession of Oklahoma. They are a fine type of the manhood of nearly all the Southern and Western States, and when they and their Territory are ready for admission I will fight their battle with all my might. We must or should settle the question as to whether the Indian Territory is to become a part of Oklahoma before we consider the question of admission. To do that intelligently will require an alteration of the existing treaties with the five civilized tribes. I think that the Indian Territory and Oklahoma ought to be combined and brought into the Union as one State. Taken together they will make one of the richest, most fertile, and desirable of all the Southwestern States. Indeed, taken separately, either in time will make a good State. We can not, as matters now stand, compel the five tribes to abandon their tribal relations, take their lands in severalty, and accept citizenship in the United States. I believe all that will be accomplished, however, in a reasonable time. I am willing to grant that, if reports be true, there is a sufficient population in Oklahoma to constitute a State and to be entitled to a Representative on this floor at the present ratio. Something else besides population is necessary for statehood. You must have sufficient taxable property to support the burden of State government.

There is not, I venture to say, one farm in five in Oklahoma to-day to which the occupant has a valid title that would subject his holding to taxation. There is nothing on which to base a State government as yet except the people who have gone there. There is no taxable property except town lots, railroads, and some personalty, so that they would be unable to bear the burden of statehood were you to put it upon them.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. What is the amount of taxable property of New Mexico?

Mr. WASHINGTON. It is over $60,000,000.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The report says forty-five millions.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. BRETZ. Sixty millions.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The gentleman from Indiana says sixty millions. My impression was that it was about a hundred millions. As to population, New Mexico had by the last census nearly a hundred and sixty thousand people. She was considered ripe for admission as far back as 1876, and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated, a bill was passed by this House admitting her, and a bill admitting her should have been considered in the Fifty-first Congress, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and myself stood up in the Committee on Territories and fought in season and out of season in favor of her admission. With a population of over a hundred and fifty thousand at that time she was set aside, while Idaho and Wyoming, with not more than half the population and wealth, were brought in and "railroaded" through this House because it was thought that they would give the Republicans four more Senators and two Representatives on this floor.

The Committee on Territories of the Fifty-first Congress positively refused to consider the bills for the admission of Arizona

and New Mexico, and the only reason was the political one, that Arizona and New Mexico then had Democratic Delegates on this floor. Now, to-day, I say as a Democrat, that we will do justice by every Territory that is fit and ready for admission.

Another reason that is urged in some quarters against the admission of New Mexico is that her population is a Catholic population, some are pleased to call it a foreign population, because many of the people are of Spanish descent and still speak that language. I ask in the name of high Heaven, how many years is a man required to be a resident of this country before he can acquire citizenship? The people of New Mexico who are of Spanish or Mexican origin are just as much citizens of the United States to-day as are the people of Kansas, or of Iowa, or of Nebraska, who have come to those States within the last eight or ten years from various countries in Europe; nay, they are more so, because practically all the people of New Mexico of Mexican or Spanish descent were born in that Territory. All of them under 40 years of age were born citizens of the United States, all who were residents at the time the Territory was acquired were guaranteed citizenship by the treaty itself.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman whether there has been any insinuation or charge made that New Mexico should be rejected from statehood, except in the report of the Republican majority of the Committee on Territories in the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. WASHINGTON. In the Fifty-first Congress the Republican majority made no report on New Mexico. They refused to consider the bill in committee even. If my memory serves me correctly, the Republican minority of the Committee on the Territories made a report in the Fiftieth Congress against the admission of New Mexico. I think Mr. Warner, from the gentleman's own State of Missouri, made that adverse report.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. They refused to admit those people on the ground of their "worshiping crosses and idols."

Mr. WASHINGTON. In the Fifty-first Congress I know that in the committee such reasons were urged against the admission of New Mexico. And now, Mr. Chairman, as we have had so much said on the question of the peculiar faith or mode of worship or belief of the people of Utah who are called Mormons, and as so much has been said at other times in regard to the faith and religious practices of the people of New Mexico who belong to the Roman Catholic Church, I want to know whether a man's religion is to be made a test of his fitness for citizenship in this Union? If so, let it be stated here and now, and let it go forth to the world. If religion is to be also a party test, let it be so declared here and now. With her delightful climate, her immense and as yet almost undeveloped mineral resources, with her fertile agricultural lands—sufficient in area and productive capacity to maintain a population of more than 2,000,000 people—New Mexico only awaits the coming of statehood to put her in the front rank in the sisterhood of younger States. She is not lacking in schools and colleges. Her people are intelligent, industrious, and thrifty, and before the steady stream of immigration pouring into her borders the last vestige of the picturesque civilization of the dons and senoritas will soon disappear.

There is every reason why New Mexico should be admitted, and not one why she should not be. She has wealth sufficient to sustain a State government. She has an intelligent, educated population, competent to maintain a State government, and numerous enough to entitle her to a Representative on this floor under the present apportionment. In the treaty with Old Mexico by which we acquired that Territory the faith and honor of this great Government was pledged that as soon as the Territory and its people should reach the point where they were entitled to citizenship and statehood, statehood should be granted to them. Now, I ask you in the name of justice and honor to redeem the solemn pledges of the Government given in the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, and allow the people of New Mexico to enjoy all their rights as the citizens of a State of the American Union. [Applause.]

Mr CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I voted with a great deal of pleasure to admit Utah into the Union; I voted with a great deal of pleasure to admit Arizona; I am going to vote with a great deal of pleasure to admit New Mexico. New Mexico ought to have been admitted ten years ago. It is a great outrage that she has been kept out so long. [Applause.] Having said this, I wish to make another remark or two. Some gentlemen here do not seem to know anything about Oklahoma; and the less they know the more they have to say. [Laughter.] Better act on the principle of "Be sure you're right, then go ahead." That country is as fine a country as God Almighty in His infinite wisdom ever made. In the Indian language Oklahoma means "Beautiful Country," and it comes fully up to the definition. If you will admit what is now the Territory of Oklahoma and the remainder of the land which belongs to the Indians down there as one State, it will make as good a State as Iowa, as good a State as Illinois, as good a State as any other State except Missouri, which is the great imperial State of the Mississippi Valley. [Laughter and applause.] Oklahoma is a land delightful to look upon—bountifully watered—abundantly wooded.

One gentleman here—I forget who—talks about the population of Oklahoma Territory being "inchoate;" that they do not know one another. Let me tell you that they are American citizens, all; they are the adventurous spirits of all that Western country—Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Arkansas, and Texas. They are the same sort of men that laid the foundations of free government in all the Louisiana Purchase, in California, Oregon, and Texas. They belong to the class of men such as old Sam Houston, who fought for liberty at San Jacinto, and such as Davy Crockett, Travis and the brave men who died at the Alamo in defense of American freedom. [Applause.] An "inchoate" population, is it? Why, sir, take one hundred and fifty thousand Anglo-Saxon American citizens, place them in the middle of the great African desert to-morrow, and in less than a week they will have a constitution and laws and be living in peace and order under them. [Applause.] That is the distinguishing characteristic of the race from which we sprang. [Applause.] These Oklahoma people are flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I feel friendly to the people of Oklahoma. I have tasted of their salt, eaten of their bread, and drank at their springs. I do not know whether that Territory is ready to be admitted or not; I am not passing on that question. But I want to tell you Eastern gentlemen something about that Territory. In 1890 I ran for Congress and was beaten [laughter] by a scratch.

A MEMBER. You ought not to call him that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not say I was beaten by "the Old Scratch," but by a scratch. [Laughter.] Well, a fellow in that condition, just after he has been beaten—you have all been there and know how it is [applause]—feels that he would like to go off for recreation and recuperation—hunting, fishing, and so forth. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. And a good deal of the "so forth." [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. More of the "so forth" sometimes than anything else. [Applause.] Well, I went down to Oklahoma and spent three weeks in that Territory; three of the happiest weeks of my life. Why, Mr. Chairman, the land down there is so rich that if they had it up in New Jersey, Maine, New Hampshire, or Vermont, they would sell it by the peck for seed [laughter] or use it as a fertilizer. [Laughter and applause.]

One gentleman says there is nothing out there but people, and that therefore you must not admit Oklahoma. [Applause.] That is beautiful logic. [Applause.] Nothing but people! [Applause.]

> What constitutes a State?
> Not high-raised battlement or labored mound,
> Thick wall or moated gate;
> Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
> Not bays or broad-armed ports,
> Where laughing at the storm rich navies ride;
> Not starred and spangled courts,
> Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride;—
> No: men, high-minded men;
> Men who their duties know;
> But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain;
> These constitute a State.

[Applause.]

And of such is the citizenship of Oklahoma. They say there is nobody out there but the "people;" that may be true: there is not much out there except the people and the land. But the land is rich; the people are brave. [Applause.] I slept one night out there in a dugout. I got lost.

A MEMBER. That was a part of the "so forth."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, it is not a part of the "so forth." I want to tell you what kind of people live in dugouts out there. As I was saying, we got lost. It is the easiest thing in the world to get lost in a prairie country.

A MEMBER. When you are fishing! [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, when you are fishing! [Laughter.] I made this kind of a proposition to the men who were with me—that the first place we came to that had two rooms we would call for accommodations to stay all night. The first habitation we met thus equipped was a tent and a dugout. Well, I had an idea, such as some of you gentlemen have, that they were tough citizens out there. We drove up and made our request to stay all night, and they told us we could do so. We sat down to supper. They did not have very much to eat, but it was nicely cooked; it was well served, and they had napkins on the table. [Great laughter.]

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait till I finish this sentence. I decline to yield until I have done so.

The fact that there were napkins on the table led me into conversation with the lady and gentleman who lived there. The man had served his country in the Army and wore upon his breast a medal for heroic conduct, and the woman was as intelligent and refined a lady as any that live in the city of Washington with all its palaces. [Applause.] Such are the people who live in dugouts in Oklahoma. They are an honor to any country. They are fit to have been the fathers and mothers of the Gracchi. [Applause.]

Now I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for his question.

Mr. DUNN. Are you in favor of admitting a State where they have nothing to eat? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly you are not going to judge of a man's character by what he eats. A man may have very little to eat and still be a good citizen. [Applause.] Good citizenship does not necessarily mean great riches and clipping coupons and eating terrapin and canvasback ducks, though some people seem to think so. [Applause.] And remember that they have had two harvests since then, and a harvest out there means something. They raise 30, 40, or 50 bushels of wheat to the acre. They raise more stuff on one acre than can be raised on forty in New Jersey. Talk about it being a poor country! Why, it is a country that raises the finest cotton that is produced in the United States. They took the premium at the World's Fair for cotton. [Applause.]

A MEMBER. Arkansas got it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I do not know about that. I do not want to say anything against Arkansas; but if she got it I think she must have hooked the cotton from Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Now, these folks go out there and subject themselves to great hardships in order to establish homes, because we are a home-loving and home-making people. They have schoolhouses, churches, and the beginnings of charitable institutions. [Applause.] They take their rifles with them as a part of their accouterment. I undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that if our country were in peril, if we were engaged in a general foreign war with all of the nations of the earth, there would be more volunteer soldiers from Oklahoma, in proportion to the population, than from any other State in the Union, and they would be made up one-half of the old Union soldiers and the other half of the old rebel soldiers, and they would vie with each other to see who would fight the hardest for the American flag. [Applause.] Let no man, I do not care where he comes from, assail the hardy pioneers that go out into that wild country and conquer the wilderness, making it blossom like the rose. [Applause.] God bless them! They are State-makers. After awhile your children will go there; it may be a good while, but finally after these hardy pioneers have smoothed the pathway your children will be proud to be citizens of the great State of Oklahama that is to be. [Applause.]

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, and then I will conclude. I say I do not know whether I shall vote for the admission of Oklahoma or not. As far as I am individually concerned I would rather see the whole thing come in together. But of one thing you may be as sure as that you live, and that is I am not going to lose an opportunity to so vote as to increase in this House, and in the other end of the Capitol, the power of the Trans-Mississippi country. [Applause.] That is the seat of empire in the near future, and that is my platform. [Applause.]

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, the discussion to which we have just listened in the last ten or fifteen minutes only illustrates more forcibly the wisdom of the question with which I begun a short time since. We have been told, sir, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that this Territory has been ready for admission for many years.

Mr. HATCH. Will the gentleman yield to a motion that the committee rise?

Mr. PENCE. If it is agreeable to the committee.

Mr. HATCH. If the gentleman yields I will make a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield, being a friend entirely to the admission of New Mexico and Oklahoma, unless the gentleman from Alabama [Gen. WHEELER] suggests that it is the proper thing to do.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I think it is well that the debate should run on for a while yet. We are all interested in these speeches.

Mr. PENCE. Then I will continue. My own inclination of course would be to yield to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri. But every word that has been uttered within the last half hour shows the necessity of some kind of a sensible understanding—a reasonable understanding—as to the individual promises that have been made by members to each other on this floor.

But I was proceeding to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] told us that New Mexico should have been admitted twenty years ago, and that her admission has been postponed from time to time. That in itself is enough to fortify me in the determination that so far as I am concerned nothing shall happen to postpone for twenty years, or for ten years, the admission of Oklahoma, if it is entitled to admission. I have no controversy with anything that has been suggested here, and I have no regret for having raised the question with the chairman of the Committee on Territories, as to what was to be the action of that committee in these cases. I trust that every member of the House will agree that I intended no impropriety whatever; but I do believe that the inquiry has answered my purpose.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be considered as closed.

Several members objected.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a single word as to the absence of the Delegate from Oklahoma——

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OUTHWAITE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 353, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the progress of the debate to-day some little criticism was passed as to the absence of the Delegate from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN]. I desire to say he was here during a portion of the day, but was called home by the very serious illness of his child, and that is the reason he is not present.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen who have spoken on the bill for the admission of Arizona and the bill for the admission of New Mexico may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] asks unanimous consent that gentlemen who have spoken upon the bills for the admission of Arizona and New Mexico may extend their remarks in the RECORD. This applies to gentlemen who have addressed the House. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

And then, on motion of Mr. WHEELER of Alabama (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 16, 1893, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (H. R. 4416) for the relief of Bvt. Maj. Gen. George S. Greene. (Report No. 216.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) for the relief of Eugene Wells, late captain Twelfth Infantry and second lieutenant First Artillery, United States Army. (Report No. 217.)

By Mr. SICKLES, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 1580) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana. (Report No. 218.)

By Mr. GORMAN, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 4172) for the relief of William R. Steinmetz. (Report No. 219.)

By Mr. BOWERS, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 1133) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John W. Wacker. (Report No. 220.)

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: A bill (H. R. 3840) to pension Joel A. Walters. (Report No. 221).

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4754) for the relief of Susan McCluskey—the Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4709) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. McFarland, late of the United States Navy—the Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4764) to authorize additions to

and improvements in public building at Davenport, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4765) to authorize the St. Louis River Bridge Company and the Duluth Transfer Railway Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the St. Louis River from a point at or near Grassy Point, in the village of West Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to the most available point opposite, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4766) to ascertain the number of Chickasaw freedmen—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4767) to repeal section 16 of the act making appropriations for the Army, approved July 15, 1870, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 4768) to provide for the stamping of unstamped instruments, documents, or papers—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McALEER: A bill (H. R. 4769) to amend sections 4756 and 4757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by substituting the words "appointed persons" for the words "appointed petty officers"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4770) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 99) for printing the history of colored troops in war—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CRAIN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 100) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to levy a direct tax in proportion to the assessed valuation of all property subject to taxation in the several States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McRAE: A resolution to amend clause 51 of Rule XI—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TARSNEY: A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House certain information respecting reciprocal commercial treaties or agreements made pursuant to the tariff act approved October 1, 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH (by request): A bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of Mrs. Maria McMurdie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4772) for the relief of Bernard J. D. Irwin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 4773) to place retired Commander Frederick R. Smith on the retired list as captain, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 4774) for the relief of Samuel L. Moore and Sons Company, of Elizabeth, N. J.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 4775) granting a pension to David Levy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) to reimburse the Millert Foundry and Machine Company for money retained by the United States for failure to complete a contract within a specified time—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 4777) for the relief of William Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4778) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 4779) for the relief of Catherine Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) for the relief of Thankful Robbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 4781) to relieve Clifton McCallister from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) to pension Mathias Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4783) granting right of way through Government reservation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McALEER: A bill (H. R. 4784) for the relief of Bernard Brennen, alias Berney O'Brine, removing the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) for the relief of John Scanlin from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE (by request): A bill (H. R. 4786) for the relief of Asa Townsend—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) to pension Alexander Mackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4788) for relief of William H. Crook—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A bill (H. R. 4789) granting an honorable discharge to Edward Drake—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHELL: A bill (H. R. 4790) to permit Agnes A. Niver to bring a suit against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4791) for the relief of J. M. Flanary—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4792) granting a pension to Eunice Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4793) granting a pension to George W. Park—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Pittsburg Petroleum and Metal Exchange, of Pittsburg, Pa., against taking the duty off oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, of Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the so-called Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, of Pittsburg, Pa., in favor of legislation to impose penalties for unlawful interference with railroads—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of J. McCracken & Co., of Oregon, protesting against any reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN (by request): Petition of lithograph artists, engravers, and printers, for increase of tariff on lithographic work—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Detroit subordinate association of National Artists and Engravers' Association, on same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the American Philosophical Society, in favor of an appropriation by Congress for the examination and survey of the Atlantic coast ship canal, between New York Bay, Delaware Bay, and other points—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of citizens and workingmen of Frankford and vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: Memorial of Oregon lumbermen, against repeal of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Resolution of the Thurman Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the putting of sugar, coal, wool, and iron ore on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Remonstrance of 125 workingmen and citizens of New Castle, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Southington, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of manufacturers of tin and terne plates in the city of Chicago, protesting against the change from specific to ad valorem duty as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Protest and petition of the McCullough Iron Country and a number of citizens of North-east Cecil County, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: Petition of John W. Benson, for removal of the charge of desertion, to accompany House bill for relief of John Benson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of 111 workingmen of the Cleveland Hardware Company, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 16, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ELEVENTH CENSUS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the Eleventh Census, submitted by the Secretary of the Interior; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SALARIES OF COURT EMPLOYÉS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting additional estimates of appropriations for salaries of employés of the court-house, District of Columbia, submitted by the Attorney-General; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

OCCUPATION OF PUBLIC LANDS, FORT MONROE, VA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, referring to House Executive Document No. 5, second session, Fifty-third Congress, and transmitting, for information, a copy of a report prepared in obedience to orders of his Department upon the occupation of the public lands at Fort Monroe, Va.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL JUSTICES, SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have examined the Senate amendments to that bill. They relate entirely to the phraseology of it, and I think they greatly improve the bill. I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

The motion of Mr. CULBERSON to concur in the Senate amendments was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CULBERSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate bills; which were severally read a first and second time, referred to the committees named below, and ordered to be printed:

Joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments—to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. R. 1138) to repeal so much of a proviso of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," and approved March 1, 1893, as relates to the payments of pensions to nonresidents, who are not citizens of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PAGE, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, for this day, on account of important business.

To Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. TUCKER), indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. BOATNER, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

FURTHER URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the further urgent deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HATCH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will now read.

The title was again reported.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be taken up under the five-minute rule. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I ask if the gentlemen on the other side can agree upon a time for debate?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am inclined to think that possibly time might be saved if general debate should proceed a little while without agreement. So far as I am concerned, I think I can certainly get through in less than an hour, but there are other members of the Committee on Appropriations and possibly other gentlemen who may desire a little time. There is no disposition upon this side to delay the speedy passage of the bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I have no doubt the gentleman is frank about that; but can not we agree upon two hours on a side?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am afraid I would be subject to criticism of my colleagues upon the side of the minority if I were to agree to that; but a little later on I think it will be indicated how much time we desire. I will cooperate with the gentleman in the speedy passage of the bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Illinois now take the floor, then, and commence the debate?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I thought the gentleman from Kentucky would commence the debate.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to make a suggestion, why not consider the bill up to the point on which there is to be discussion and then let it be discussed as long as both sides desire?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have no objection to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas, that the bill be considered now under the five-minute rule, except as to the item for special examiners; and when that is reached consider it, or when the bill is otherwise completed except that item.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman is mistaken as to the proposition. It only includes so much as is prior to that particular provision; that when we come to that provision, then general debate may be had.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Where does that come in the bill?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is about the fourth page.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It seems to me that the whole bill might be disposed of except the item under the head of Pension Office, on page 4, and then to have it considered by general debate and by consideration under the five-minute rule, as the House determines.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I prefer to not let the agreement go any further than up to that point.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not concede that there is any point in that. Many members will insist on amendments, and the reason I thought of assenting to the proposition was, there are to be some amendments in connection with the House that I would be glad to then have out of the way.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I would rather not take the bill up in this way, because I can say very frankly it may leave the House without a quorum. I prefer to have these things left open, in the hope thereby of preserving a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. We had better go on in the ordinary way.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Very well.

Mr. REED. That is satisfactory. I simply want to make the suggestion, as a member of the House, that it is impossible in matters of this kind to tell how much time ought to be taken in debate when we do not know what scope it may take.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, there is so much confusion we can not hear what the gentleman is saying.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appeal to gentlemen on the floor to preserve order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. This bill carries in the aggregate $1,651,000. None of the items involve party divisions or ought to cause contention, and I suppose none will be seriously antagonized except the one about special examiners of the Pension Office.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? Would it not be a good idea to have a recess until we can get some light?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the committee that he is informed by the proper officer that the order has been given and that the light will be turned on in a moment. There is something out of order about it, but it will be remedied in a minute.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, there is no item in it which may not be taken up by the committee under the five-minute rule and thoroughly explained in the five-minute debate. The only question which will be debated is the provision in the bill which appropriates $200,000 for special examiners in the Pension Bureau. I do not desire to anticipate that debate. The question is merely one of administration. The Bureau is now expending about $160,000,000 a year. The chief of that Bureau believes that it is to the interest of the Government, of the taxpayers from whom this money comes, of the claimants to whom payments hereafter have to be made if certificates shall be granted, that this examination in the field shall continue, and if so, this sum is absolutely necessary.

It is a smaller sum than that which the Commissioner asks, but is sufficient, in the judgment of the committee to accomplish the purposes which he desires to accomplish, and as this is a question of administration concerning so large an expenditure, and as the amount in itself is comparatively so small, I presume that when the debate is over there will be no opposition to that provision of the bill. The gentlemen of the minority desire to make it the reason—I will not say the excuse—for a debate upon the general conduct of the Pension Bureau, possibly upon the general subject of pensions, and, so far as I am concerned, I reserve the remainder of my time to close the debate, and yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who represents the minority on the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has occupied five minutes and has fifty-five minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would have been gratified if the beginning of the consideration of this bill could have gone over until Monday, but as the holiday recess is almost upon us, the gentleman in charge of the bill very properly desires it to be disposed of as early as possible.

I do not know that there is any item of appropriation contained in this urgent deficiency bill about which the gentleman from Kentucky and I disagree, so far as recommending the enactment thereof is concerned; and yet as a member of the House of Representatives of the United States—that great body which originates appropriation bills for the public service under the Constitution and the precedents, it seems to me that we do well to inquire a little touching the expenditure of the public money for the public service as it is covered by some of the items in this bill.

I believe in inquiry upon the part of the House of Representatives touching the action of the Executive in the administration of the law and the expenditure of appropriations from the public Treasury, and especially I have felt it to be proper to make such inquiry in connection with one of the items recommended in this bill in view of the following sentence from the President s message:

> Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners.

This sentence occurs in the message of the President to Congress submitted at the commencement of this session, and, as one of the items of appropriation in this bill runs to the administration of the pension laws, I believe it to be apt and proper that we should make some inquiry to ascertain how this money is being expended, what is proposed to be done with it, and whether with the appropriation of the sum here recommended should go additional sums, under additional safeguards, to remedy an evil which the President alleges to exist. And that naturally brings us to inquire as to whether the President is mistaken in the statement which I have quoted from his annual message.

The Committee on Appropriations, through its proper subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] being chairman of it, and I representing the minority, have with our limited knowledge, been as vigilant as was practicable for two or three days in making this inquiry. We called before us the Commissioner of Pensions, and various chiefs of divisions. We asked many questions touching the administration of the law in connection with the Pension Bureau and the expenditure of money for the adjudication of pension claims, and gentlemen will find the answers of the Commissioner, in the shape of tables and documents, as well as statements upon examination and cross-examination, set forth in full in the report of the committee accompanying this bill. Mr. Chairman. I undertake to say here and now that when the President of the United States submitted that statement in his annual message he was mistaken, and mistaken, as it seems to me, under circumstances that should have prevented the Chief Executive of the United States, with all the means that he has to obtain knowledge, from falling into such an error.

There are in the Pension Office, in round numbers, about two thousand employés. Counting the examining surgeons and other incidental employés there are, in round numbers, about five thousand persons engaged in administering the law covering the adjudication of pensions. At the beginning of the examination of the Commissioner of Pensions there was much of loose allegation of fraud or alleged fraud connected with pension claims, but it did not materialize on cross-examination. There are two hundred and thirty-five special examiners that have been engaged in examining into the merits of pension claims in the field, and, as I recollect, about a dozen of them were stated by the Commissioner to be engaged specially upon the investigation of alleged fraudulent certificates already granted and supposed fraudulent claims that were pending. The Commissioner of Pensions, with his chief of this division, stated, as will be seen in the report, that the saving to the Government from these investigations since the 1st of May last was something over a million dollars.

On cross-examination it appears that substantially all of that million dollars was counted as a saving because certain claims that never had been allowed, and never would have been allowed as the evidence fairly shows if they had not been specially examined, were specially examined and rejected. And because they were specially examined and rejected, although they never had been allowed and in all probability never would have been allowed, these gentlemen come in and proclaim that they have actually saved the Treasury of the United States on account of these rejected claims over a million dollars. Upon close examination it appears that the exact amount that was saved within the period indicated was, in round numbers, $31,000!

Mr. DINGLEY. My colleague will pardon me if I call his attention to the fact that even that aggregate of $31,000 includes the reductions as well as those cases in which there were frauds.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Now, we began to open our eyes when we turned on the white light of investigation and cross-examination. The Commissioner of Pensions came before us, and the hearings show this remarkable fact—he stated in substance that there are no more frauds in this great Bureau which administers the payment of $150,000,000 to $160,000,000 a year to over a million of people than there are in the ordinary adjudications of cases in the courts throughout the country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the gentleman quote that as the anguage of the Commissioner?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not; but I give the substance of his language. I was glad that he stated it, and I have no doubt from the examination I have given in former years and this year to the administration of the law in connection with that great Bureau that it is absolutely true. Whom did the President consult, where did he gather his information, when he made that astounding statement in his message? His Commissioner of Pensions does not say so: an examination of the records of the Pension Bureau does not show it.

In this connection I desire, however, to speak of a class of cases that legitimately came under inquiry in our investigation. In 1890 we enacted a general pension law under which nearly 400,000 names are now upon the pension rolls, the pensioners drawing pensions at an average, as I recollect it, of $113.75 a year. That legislation was enacted because the Congress of the United States believed that the time had come to recognize a great army of ex-soldiers who could not receive recognition under the law as it was prior to that time. It was just to provide for giving pensions to multiplied and multiplied thousands of men who were entitled to such pensions for injuries received in the service—remember, in the service—but who could not make the technical proof required.

Members understand how these claims were established. Each soldier has an official history; and if he was in a hospital he has a medical history. A large proportion of the soldiers of the late war had no medical history, were never in the hospital, but in fact received injuries in the wear and tear of the service that, as age came upon them, did entitle them to relief under the law as it was prior to 1890, but they could not make the technical proof required.

Then there was another class who had received injuries that were telling upon them from weakened nervous forces arising in fact from army service, since the close of the war. So Congress passed the act of 1890, under which nearly one-half in numbers of all the pensioners on the rolls to-day are drawing pensions at from $6 to $12 per month.

Congress enacted the law, but its construction and administration under our system of government is with the President of the United States.

An unfriendly construction and administration of the law would not have met the intention of Congress or done justice to the soldiers. A liberal, patriotic, friendly construction and administration of the law was what Congress intended, the country desired, and justice to the soldier required. Fortunately, Benjamin Harrison was President of the United States. His whole Administration was in harmony with the legislation. His Commissioner of Pensions, Gen. Raum, issued Order No. 164, which provided for the rating of the pensions, and which I now read:

The following is a copy of Order No. 164:

In regard to fixing rates of pensions under act of June 27, 1890.

That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above $6 and less than $12, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin; and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above $12 per month, shall be rated at $12 per month.

GREEN B. RAUM, *Commissioner.*

Approved October 15, 1890.
CYRUS BUSSEY, *Assistant Secretary.*

For a quarter of a century, under laws in force prior to that time, there had grown up a system of rating of pensionable disabilities equivalent to the inability of the claimant to perform manual labor. These ratings were a growth tested by the observation and experience of the Pension Office for a generation, and these were the ratings that Gen. Raum adopted in issuing Order 164, subject only to the restrictions of the law of 1890, that no rating could be below $6 or over $12 per month.

To illustrate, a soldier afflicted with hernia or double inguinal hernia which requires the constant wearing of a truss was rated, if of service origin, say at from $18 to $30 per month. Order 164, construing the act of 1890, gave the claimant the maximum, or $12 per month.

And these ratings and this construction of the law were known to all men. The construction of the law was a humane, it was a natural, a proper construction. If it erred at all, it erred in favor of the men who had served the country in the ranks for three years and over; because, as gentlemen understand, of the enlistments in the late war over 2,000,000 were for three years or longer.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows who changed the construction of that law?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENLOE. Who did?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The present Commissioner of Pensions, with the approval of Secretary Smith, changed the construction of the law.

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I know exactly what the gentleman is after, and I will come to it in a moment.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, I ask the gentleman whether the construction was not first made by Assistant Secretary Bussey before the beginning of this Administration?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, I will show the gentleman that it was.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I understand the case the gentleman refers to; and I understand the claim that President Cleveland, as an afterthought, seized upon to take a part of the curse off of his Administration in the minds of the people. I understand that thoroughly, and I come to speak of it now.

This construction, given in October, 1890, wrote upon the pension roll 400,000 names—names on the average as worthy as the average of other names on the pension roll.

This construction of the law under President Harrison was known by all men. Congress time and time again approved it. The Fifty-first Congress, of which I had the honor to be a member, and which passed the law, approved this construction by appropriating all the money necessary to pay the pensions granted under it in both sessions thereof. Ay, more. The Fifty-second Congress, with a Democratic majority of 140 in the House in both the first and second sessions thereof, approved this construction of the law by appropriating all the money necessary to enforce it and pay pensions granted under it.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. I have here upon my desk the appropriation bill known as the pension appropriation bill, reported last January to the then Democratic House, in which I find various amendments proposed changing the provisions of the law, and one amendment in substance revoking Order 164. The Democratic House of Representatives last winter would not even consider the proposition that its Committee on Appropriations recommended, and that, along with other amendments, went out of the bill.

So here is a construction given to a law running through a period of time between three and four years, acquiesced in by Congress; its reversal was attempted before the last Congress, showing the knowledge that Congress had derived upon the subject, carrying first and last under this construction in round numbers seventy or eighty millions of dollars a year, and yet in the year of our Lord, 1893, in May last, with Grover Cleveland President, Mr. Smith Secretary of the Interior, and Mr. Lochren Commissioner of Pensions, we find that they made haste to reverse the construction of the act of 1890, made by Harrison's Administration and nullify Order 164, notwithstanding the rights of all these men, almost four hundred thousand in number.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, such action of President Cleveland was an official mistake akin to a crime. But the gentleman from Tennessee says, by way of a question, if I did not know in the Weike case, so called, that Gen. Bussey, acting for the Secretary of the Interior, last winter overruled and reversed this Order 164. No, sir, he did not, I answer the gentleman. I have read that case closely, and inquired fully about it. My time will not allow me to read it to the House. It is held in that case in substance that "schedule or nominal rates" will not, under the act of 1890, be added together to make up a rate under said act, except as they may singly or combined affect the claimant's capacity for manual labor.

To illustrate, suppose a claimant is receiving $8 a month for rheumatism or other disability and applies for increase to $12 under the law of 1890 on account of partial loss of the little finger at $2 per month, and some other similar disability for $2, the application would be rejected for increase under the decision in the Weike case.

It is perhaps well enough that I should give the facts in the Weike case.

Weike drew a pension under the old law of $8 per month, granted before the enactment of the law of 1890 for rheumatism. After the act of 1890 he filed an application under it for urinary trouble as well as rheumatism, hoping to get an increase over $8 per month. The urinary trouble was not of sufficient severity to affect his ability for manual labor, and Commissioner Raum rejected his application. Weike appealed to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary affirmed the decision of the Commissioner of Pensions and dismissed the appeal.

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I prefer to finish this talk first.

Mr. ENLOE. It is just on that point.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. For the gentleman knows if you are broken in on you can not do justice to yourself or to anybody else. In all probability a minute later I will touch on the very point the gentleman refers to.

Mr. ENLOE. If the gentleman will allow me when he has finished that talk, I should like to call his attention to some inaccuracies in his statement.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

I have stated, Mr. Chairman, the Weike case as well as I could. I do not pretend to be a very good lawyer, but I think I have stated the case fairly, I have read it carefully, and think I have given a fair synopsis of it. Do you want further proof of it? With that refusal to cumulate nominal schedule ratings, the administration of the Pension Office went right along from January to May until the present Commissioner came in under order 164 just as it always had done——

Mr. ENLOE. Right there——

Mr. LACEY. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that in the Bennett case no reference whatever was made to the Weike case as a precedent.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, yes, I will come to the Bennett case in a minute.

Mr. ENLOE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the language of the decision which he is referring to.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now if my friend will take his own time and read that in his own time, he will add more light to this discussion than he otherwise would and for this reason: There is no decision ever made by a court but what somebody, somewhere, can pick out a sentence, as it is disassociated with the other sentences and the facts of the case, and give an apparently different meaning than the tenor of the whole case gives.

Mr. ENLOE. If the gentleman will allow me right there, I do not desire to pervert the meaning of this decision, or to take the gentleman's time unnecessarily. He is quoting from the decision of the late Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Bussey, in which Mr. Bussey distinctly overrides order number 164, and issues a new order to the Commissioner of Pensions, direct-

ing him not to add together these minor disabilities under the act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Precisely.

Mr. ENLOE. That is the decision.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Precisely, just as I have stated it; but it does not revoke order 164; and my friend will bear me out in saying that he fails to state one very important point, namely, that the Weike case was rejected by the Commissioner of Pensions in the ordinary administration of that office; that Weike and not the Government took an appeal, and that Secretary Bussey sustained the Commissioner of Pensions in rejecting the Weike claim. That claim was rejected, according to the ordinary practice of the Bureau, under order 164, and the decision was that you could not cumulate these nominal disabilities, like a little finger off and similar disabilities, adding them together for a rating under the act of 1890.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, will the gentleman allow me? I desire to ask if he does not know that that was exactly the decision made by Assistant Secretary Reynolds in the Bennett case?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Not so.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, then, the gentleman does not understand the English language as I do.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have read the case known as the Bennett case, containing the decision made by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Reynolds, and I will speak of it in a few minutes.

Mr. ENLOE. Does he not decide the same principle exactly?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I believe we will both make greater headway if my friend will allow me to go on in an orderly way.

Mr. ENLOE. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, Mr. Chairman, this was the condition in May last, when Mr. Lochren became Commissioner of Pensions. What happened then? A case known as the Bennett case, the claimant living in Indiana, went by appeal to the Secretary of the Interior. Gentlemen will find both the Bennett and the Weike cases in the appendix to the report of the Secretary of the Interior.

What was the Bennett case? In substance, as the Secretary rules upon it, a slight defect in the hearing of both ears, so he could not hear the tick of a watch an inch or two from the ears. In 1890 Mr. Bennett was rated under the law of 1890 at $12 a month, for the reason that prior to the act of 1890 slight deafness of both ears was rated at $15 a month, and $12 was the maximum under the act of 1890. Now, with great fervor Secretary Reynolds, on appeal, turns Mr. Bennett down and refuses him any rating whatever, and in turning him down he takes occasion to quote the law of 1890, to quote order 164: he reverses and nullifies order 164 as to all the 400,000 adjudicated cases under it and issues an order to carry out the reversal.

Mr. AITKEN. Did he not refer to the Weike case?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not think he did; but I am not clear on that point. Now, the Bennett case has been quoted from one end of the country to the other. I have stated what it is, as it appears from the record.

Mr. ENLOE. And misrepresented it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not think I have misrepresented it. I have not intentionally done so. My reputation in the House does not subject me to that imputation.

Mr. ENLOE. I do not mean that the gentleman himself has misrepresented it; but I say in being quoted from one end of the country to the other, it has been misrepresented in the newspaper press as a new decision, when in fact it was only an affirmation of Secretary Bussey's decision.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, my friend, if this infamous ruling, made under this Administration, had been made under the former one, after it had been in force for three years and ratified by Congress, with 400,000 men pensioned under it, I would attack it with just as much vigor, whether Mr. Raum or Mr. Bussey made it, as I now attack it when Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Lochren made it.

Mr. ENLOE. That is right. Go for Raum and Bussey. Bussey did it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not go for them, because in this respect they are not guilty; your Administration is guilty. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Now, what else? Bennett is lost sight of. Poor devil; no, not poor devil: poor man, humble and weak, away out in Sullivan County, Ind. I hold a copy of the records from the files in the Bennett case; and under the testimony of his neighbors, who are reported as unimpeached and unimpeachable, under the testimony of his family physician, under the examination as given by the medical board last spring in his neighborhood, Bennett is entitled, I have no doubt, to a pension under the act of 1890. Humble man; that is true. Denied: that is true.

I can not dwell upon the discussion of one case, except as it illustrates the position of all the rest, substantially. By the way, Mr. Bennett is 70 years old; served his country well in the late war; sunstroke; hard of hearing. The last medical report, made this last spring, says: "Almost blind in one eye and the other defective from age;" trembly; affected with nervous prostration, especially in the summer time. Seventy years old, and he is taken down first, last, and all the time refused any rating whatever. I asked the Commissioner's views about it, and I hope gentlemen will give me their attention.

The Commissioner of Pensions (Mr. Lochren) thought Order 164 was made in the teeth of the law of 1890. He had not heard anybody condemning its repeal, and was absolutely surprised when I modestly told him I did not agree with the change of construction of that law. In asking him about the Bennett case (I had not the record at that time) I suggested that I had heard that Bennett was 78 years old. Quick as lightning, he came back and said his attention had not been called to it: he had never read the papers in the case. "But," says he, "in the practice in my Bureau, whenever it is shown that a man is 75 years old, I stop right there and put his name upon the pension roll, under the act of 1890, at the highest rate, $12 a month, without any proof whatever as to his inability to labor." I commend the present practice of the Commissioner of Pensions (Mr. Lochren) to the honest consideration of the gentleman from Tennessee, that when applicants are 75 years old, he puts them on the pension roll under the act of 1890, whether they are disabled in any degree for manual labor.

Mr. ENLOE. Does the gentleman want me to make any reply now?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, the gentleman in his own time can do so. I only wanted to call his pure mind to that point. But here Order 164 is overthrown by this Administration and the adjudicated rights of 400,000 people, many of whom have been on the pension rolls for three years, are placed in jeopardy, many of them suspended, and others dropped. And yet the very Commissioner of Pensions that overthrew these rights, comes in in the next breath and tells us that his practice is, whenever any man who has a claim is shown to be 75 years of age, he does not ask any other question as to his disability for manual labor or otherwise, but puts him on, not at $8, not at $6, but at $12 a month, the maximum under the law.

Mr. ENLOE. Was not this man asking for $15 for deafness?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, no.

Mr. ENLOE. That was Bennett.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Bennett was rated at $12 a month in 1890. At that time the schedule rating for slight deafness for both ears under the old law was $15 a month, made by my colleague from Illinois [Gen. BLACK] while he was Commissioner of Pensions. Since that time, and before this Administration came into power, when the Bennett case was pending, Gen. BLACK'S rating at $15 a month, under the old law, had been reduced to $6.

Mr. ENLOE. Who did that?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Why, the Pension Office, under President Harrison did it. It may have been right or it may have been wrong; I am speaking of it as a fact. But if the Pension Office, as now administered, in my judgment, appeared half as anxious to do justice to a poor man who defended the flag with his little all during the war as it is to posture in the newspapers and hunt up some excuse to talk about illegal pensions and to enable the President of the United States to denounce fraud upon that roll in thousands of neighborhoods that can not be found with a search-warrant, they would have done better justice and met with better approval of the people, North and South.

Mr. ENLOE. Does the gentleman object to the President denouncing the frauds on the pension rolls?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, no. I believe in denouncing frauds.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is what you are doing now.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But I object to the President of the United States, or to the gentleman from Tennessee, or to the newspaper press of the country, or any portion of it; picking out of a million cases one case, or one hundred cases, or one thousand cases, where they find fraud or mistake, and making that a ground for damning the whole pension roll in the minds of the public as fraudulent. [Applause on the Republican side.] And in objecting to that I am in the right, for even Commissioner Lochren, who is now administering the Pension Office, says, before the Committee on Appropriations, that the adjudications of pension claims are as honest as the transaction of important matters in the ordinary affairs of human life, and says, in substance, as I stated awhile ago, that the transaction of the busi-

ness of that office is as honest as the transaction of business in the average courts of the country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is misrepresenting Mr. Lochren.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No; I do not misrepresent anybody.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I refer you to page 18 of the report.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly. I asked him the question. I understand all about it, and the whole examination shows that I am correct.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, please give the Commissioner's answer in his own words.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have no objection to his answer. I am willing to put it in my remarks, but it would take three or four minutes to read it now.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will read for you.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is all right. Read it. So, Mr. Chairman, we now have Order 164 reëstablished by Commissioner Lochren, provided the pensioner is 75 years old.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that that may be the rule, but it is not the practice, for I have the case of a man 84 years old who has been suspended.

Mr. ENLOE. Probably he never was entitled to a pension at all.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am speaking now of what Commissioner Lochren states to be his practice, and I commend that practice. Whenever it appears that a claimant under the act of 1890 is 75 years old, I believe that, without further inquiry or controversy, his name ought to be put on the pension roll under the act of 1890. Why? Because ninety-nine out of every one hundred men, 75 years of age, that have gone through the late war, are physically weak, and, as a rule, the mind sympathizes with the body. That rule does justice in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred. So, too, Order 164 construing the act of 1890, revoked by this administration did justice in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred.

Commissioner Lochren does not stop to ask whether the man who is 75 years old is wholly unable to work. Oh, no. He presumes the disability to perform manual labor from the man's age; just as Gen. Raum presumed that the man who had a hernia and wore a truss was disabled to the extent of $12 a month, the rating under the law prior to 1890 being $18. And Commissioner Raum did justice in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, as Commissioner Lochren does justice in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred provided the applicants are 75 years of age. But, says somebody, "Do you mean that every man 75 years old is unable to work?" No.

There is my honored colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BUNDY. I want you to look at him. He is 76 years old. I want you to put your hand upon his arm and feel the size and structure of the muscles; I want you to let him get his grip upon your hand. I am 57, but I can not compete, nor can the average man of 57 compete in physical strength, or mental strength either, with the gentleman from Ohio, although he is 76. Take the case of Gen. PALMER, the Senator from my own State of Illinois. He served in the late war and he is now past 75 years of age. He could be pensioned under the act of 1890 to-day, without reference to whether he is able to perform manual labor or not. There would be no question asked him under the ruling of Commissioner Lochren. And yet Tray, Blanche, and Sweetheart, the whole pack, are opening upon the late Administration because it applied to all these cases a general rule in principle like that which Commissioner Lochren applies to one class of cases. Now I will drop that subject right here, for there are other matters that I want to talk about.

I have in my hand a report of the Commissioner of Pensions. Let me read an extract from it which will be found on page 7:

> Precedence is no longer given to cases under the act of June 27, 1890, but claims for pensions under the prior laws for disabilities of service origin are now adjudicated in their order where the evidence is complete. So far from holding back this class of claims, I think they should have precedence as being older and more meritorious.

Now, what does that mean? No sane man can read it without reading between the lines an attack upon his predecessor for making claims under the act of 1890 unduly prominent and for not disposing of claims under the older law.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question at this point?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to know whether the gentleman thinks that as a matter of justice and right the soldier who is making a claim under the act of June 27, 1890, should be given preference over the soldier whose present disability had its origin in the service. The one case is that of an old soldier who is asking a pension for disability incurred in the service; the other may be a ninety-day man who never heard a gun fired, who never incurred any disability in the service.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his interruption, and when I get through with my answer I think he will know more than he does now.

Mr. ENLOE. I hope so.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The claimant under the old law is entitled to have his claim allowed when it is ready for disposition, and the case is the same with cthe laimant under the law of 1890. The law knows no difference between these two classes of worthy men.

Mr. ENLOE. Was not the gentleman insisting that the Commissioner was wrong because he did not preserve a distinction between them?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman could contain himself till I finish a brief statement on any subject he would save my time and himself from discomfiture.

Mr. ENLOE. I will save the gentleman's patience by not interrupting him.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I meant to be courteous to the gentleman.

The force in the Pension Office is now what it was twelve months ago. Mr. Lochren came in the 1st of May. He has had charge of that force, five thousand in number, for seven months. After several day's effort I did get a statement of how many claims under all the laws Mr. Lochren had adjudicated in his seven months from May 1 to December 1, as compared with the number of claims under all the laws, adjudicated during a corresponding period of last year. Now I hope I have the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ENLOE. I did not know the gentleman wanted my attention. I thought I had been giving him too much attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be allowed to continue until he finishes his remarks, without regard to time.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am nearly through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois may be extended indefinitely. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have here a table of claims passed and claims rejected for seven months under each Administration, which I will insert at the close of my remarks, one in 1892 and one in 1893, with substantially the same force. This table shows that Commissioner Raum issued 144,000 certificates in the seven months in 1892, while Commissioner Lochren issued 44,000. Do you catch on. [Laughter.] Mr. Raum did three and one-half times more work than Lochren has done.

Mr. ENLOE. The gentleman invited my attention a few moments ago. Will he now allow me to say something?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman will allow me to conclude this statement, then I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he is aware of the fact that when the act of June 27, 1890, was passed and the adjudication of those cases was begun, there was an arrangement between the office of the Commissioner of Pensions and the War Records Office, by which nothing was necessary in most of these cases except to furnish the military record of the soldier, the papers being on file; so that cases could be adjudicated five times as rapidly then as they can now.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now behold how plain a tale shall put that down I am taking seven months of 1892 and comparing the work done with that done in seven months of 1893. I have the tables here and I will put them in my remarks.

Mr. ENLOE rose.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Hold on a minute. This rapid disposition of claims continued through March and largely through April last until Mr. Lochren came in and your party obtained full possession; and then it dropped off. But that is not all.

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman allow me a remark right there?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly, if it is on this point.

Mr. ENLOE. I presume the gentleman wants, as I do, to get at the facts.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is what I desire.

Mr. ENLOE. I understand the gentleman is criticising the present Commissioner for not adjudicating cases rapidly enough. I have called his attention to the fact that the facilities for adjudicating those cases were much greater under the former administration than under the present; and the gentleman has

cited a ruling of the Commissioner which shows why that is so. The present Commissioner of Pensions takes up every case in its order, without regard to whether it is a claim under the old law or a claim under the new law. Therefore he must send many of these cases to the field, and their adjudication must be delayed. The cases under the act of June 27, 1890, had principally been disposed of under the former administration.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Not at all. The gentleman is swift in his defense, but he had better get his facts. Commissioner Lochren substantially stated before our committee that under the law of 1890 he did not send cases to the field, and did not propose to do so; it was the old cases under the law prior to that time.

Now, that is not all. How many cases were rejected during the seven months of Mr. Raum's administration, and how many during the seven months of Mr. Lochren's administration? I have got it right here, the table, showing 88,000 rejections under Raum and 84,000 under Lochren. Lochren kept up pretty well on the rejections, but Raum beat him 3 to 1 on the admissions to the rolls.

Mr. ENLOE. That is very much to the credit of Lochren.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, the gentleman is entitled to his opinion; but, appealing to the American people, I say it is not to his credit, and by that tribunal, the people of this country, before whom this Administration and all of us must appear and answer, I think he will find a different verdict will be rendered.

But that is not all. Lochren claims he desires to dispose of these badly neglected claims under the old law. How many of them did Commissioner Raum dispose of in seven months of 1892? He disposed of 11,000 of these claims under the old law; that is to say, 11,000 Army and Navy old-law claims in the aggregate, while Commissioner Lochren disposed of 6,000.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would like to suggest to my colleague, in justice to himself, that if he will look into the matter closely he will find that they skipped about here and there, taking up those cases which were easiest to adjudicate and settle.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. How do you know that?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I have referred gentlemen to the facts, that is all.

Mr. GROUT. Is there anything in the examination which would justify that conclusion?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No; I deny that it is a fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what have we? A pension force to adjudicate claims—and I will put it in the RECORD—in round numbers of 5,000 people, experts all, who have worked for the office for years, and yet they are doing but a little over one-fourth of the work that was done when somebody was in charge of the office that wanted to do justice to the soldiers and dispose of these cases.

Now, I want to say one other word. In making my talk this afternoon I make it here just before the Christmas holidays rather than afterwards, and for a purpose.

I want the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions on the other side of the House. When order No. 164 was repealed at one stroke of the pen, they marked off—suspended—12,000 cases. Now, mind you, 12,000 men who were drawing pensions were suspended from the rolls by virtue of the order, and to suspend that 12,000 men they examined between 30,000 and 40,000 cases of out 400,000. Well, men began to kick all over the country. Democrats and Republicans; Democratic pensioners and Republican pensioners, the good people everywhere said that is not fair, and they kept on kicking, and they kicked day after day and week after week until the 26th of August came around, and then a new light broke on Cleveland's Administration.

There had been too much kicking. [Laughter.] So they turned about and modified Secretary's Smith's order issued on the 26th day of May, and said: "In the future we will examine the cases, and where on the face of the claim the man is entitled to any rating at all, whether he has got too much or not, we will not suspend him until the case has been investigated," and then with a stroke of the pen they restored 9,000 men to the rolls. I tell you I believe in kicking. [Laughter]. I want in this discussion, setting down naught in malice, I want on each side of this House that the American Representatives shall kick and kick and kick at the policy of this Administration in this Pension Bureau until again a new light shall come upon them, and they shall do justice with vigilance to the men that have been entitled to it for all of these long years.

Now, somebody may ask whether I intend to attack the Pension Office or not. No, I do not. But I do intend to attack and I do attack the atmosphere in that office. I attack it in the interest of honest claimants; it is 20° below zero there. [Laughter.] There is a force that has been built up for a quarter of a century, a force that is so well trained that Commissioner Lochren told us on this examination that he never kept but fifty of them on the 1890 suspended cases, and expected to have less; that they were so well trained that each one could dispose of fifty cases a day, of the suspended cases, under the law of 1890—I mean cases that come up under the revoking of order 164. And yet you see how insignificant their work has been in comparison to what it was under the former administration.

Mr. Chairman, there are over 700,000 claims pending in the Pension Office, awaiting disposition. There are, in round numbers, 400,000 allowed claims under the act of 1890, adjudicated under a construction of that law approved by Congress and the country, which are placed in jeopardy by the wrongful and unfriendly action of the present administration. The Commissioner of Pensions has all the force necessary to carry on speedily and vigilantly his great work, doing justice to both claimant and Government.

Let this Congress and let the country thunder about the ears of this Administration until new light shall dawn upon it, until it shall prosecute the exceptional fraudulent pensioner and cease using the cry of fraud as a cover under which it knifes honest claimants and casts suspicion upon a million pensioners to whom the country in great part owes its existence, and who are in truth and fact only receiving a part of that recognition which a grateful country is glad to accord them.

I thank the committee for its attention. [Applause.]

This is a statement made by the Commissioner of Pensions before the House Appropriations Committee of the business done in adjudicating pension claims in the Pension Office for seven months, in 1892, under Harrison's Administration. The object of its insertion being for comparison with the table which follows it, showing the like work done in the same period under Cleveland's Administration:

Report of certificates issued, by months, classes, and laws, from May 1 to November 30, 1892.

Months.	Original.																Increase.	Additional, act of June 27, 1890.	Reissue.	Restoration.	Under acts of—				Supplemental.	Duplicates.	Accrued.	Total.
	Army.		Navy.		Act of June 27, 1890.				War of 1812.		Old wars.		Mexican war.		Indian wars.						August 4, 1886.	June 7, 1888 (arrears).	March 4, 1890.	July 14, 1892.				
	Invalids.	Widows, etc.	Invalids.	Widows, etc.	Army invalids.	Army widows, etc.	Navy invalids.	Navy widows, etc.	Survivors.	Widows.	Invalids.	Widows.	Survivors.	Widows.	Survivors.	Widows.	Army nurses.											
1892.																												
May	1,214	414	8	9	13,228	2,100	504	191	----	1	----	2	22	80	----	----	----	2,879	3,237	677	128	----	1	4	----	41	112	648	35,674
June	1,311	424	7	6	12,677	2,176	267	83	1	3	1	1	16	17	----	----	----	2,821	4,489	624	103	7	----	----	----	53	42	420	25,539
July	1,260	434	5	7	10,575	2,258	137	111	----	1	1	----	5	26	----	----	----	2,116	2,817	487	89	2	----	2	----	22	69	715	21,110
August	910	597	12	9	5,851	2,872	229	123	----	5	1	----	3	17	----	----	----	1,774	4,139	643	110	1	1	1	----	29	11	712	18,046
September	598	549	21	6	4,251	2,180	141	57	1	----	13	8	33	52	----	----	----	1,496	3,244	497	113	----	----	1	----	45	89	654	14,969
October	939	706	12	7	5,746	3,547	437	77	----	6	3	3	5	23	----	3	----	1,636	5,753	783	128	2	1	3	9	44	99	702	20,286
November	1,022	751	24	17	6,946	3,765	341	62	----	1	2	1	27	65	3	----	3	1,101	3,547	703	92	----	2	3	13	36	177	661	18,265
Total	7,274	3,967	89	61	59,274	18,918	2,037	704	2	13	26	14	112	266	3	----	6	13,823	27,216	4,414	763	12	5	19	22	280	599	4,509	144,426

5. Report of certificates issued from May 1 to November 30, 1893, for seven months under Cleveland's Administration.

Months.	Original.														Army nurses.	Increase.	Additional, act of June 27, 1890.	Reissue.	Restoration.	Under acts of—				Supplemental.	Duplicates.	Accrued.	Total.
	Army.		Navy.		Act of June 27, 1890.				War of 1812.		Old wars.		Mexican war.		Indian wars.													
	Invalids.	Widows, etc.	Invalids.	Widows, etc.	Army invalids.	Army widows, etc.	Navy invalids.	Navy widows, etc.	Survivors.	Widows.	Invalids.	Widows.	Survivors.	Widows.	Survivors.	Widows.				August 4, 1886.	June 7, 1888 (arrears).	March 4, 1890.	July 14, 1892.				
May	503	522	7	4	229	2,841	8	71	....	3	....	....	14	23	161	248	52	1,221	634	629	82	2	....	....	36	63	151	1,148	8,742
June	474	419	9	5	383	2,066	19	110	....	....	1	1	6	19	147	203	55	539	217	363	48	....	1	....	14	27	116	1,086	6,331
July	515	309	10	8	264	1,221	7	30	....	1	....	2	4	9	32	48	7	559	77	211	28	1	4	....	10	10	184	743	4,330
August	522	320	8	....	276	994	2	11	....	10	....	....	10	40	52	120	14	1,304	98	273	68	....	1	....	22	5	372	661	5,173
September	477	245	19	6	421	1,206	3	16	....	....	....	1	11	55	126	174	11	2,407	132	533	124	....	....	....	28	15	140	580	6,730
October	552	319	22	9	749	1,379	9	16	....	....	1	....	24	65	111	299	11	1,492	251	534	111	....	1	1	22	56	330	673	7,054
November	418	284	22	14	536	1,230	16	25	....	3	2	2	25	96	147	277	14	1,122	377	483	88	....	1	4	17	44	206	724	6,137
Total	3,554	2,428	97	46	2,858	10,927	64	279	....	17	4	5	94	307	776	1,369	164	8,664	1,686	3,026	569	3	8	5	149	220	1,559	5,615	44,497

This is a statement of pension claims rejected in seven months in 1892, under Harrison's Administration, for comparison with the number of claims rejected in like period under Cleveland's Administration in the next table:

Summary of report of cases rejected from May, 1892, to November, 1892, inclusive, under Cleveland's Administration.

Old wars:		
Original invalid	299	
Original widow	200	
Total		499
Indian wars:		
Original invalid		
Original widow		
Total		
Service since March 4, 1861:		
Original invalid	24,068	
Original widow	6,531	
Total		30,599
Act of June 27, 1890:		
Original invalid	18,781	
Original widow	3,961	
Total		22,742
Additional to prior applications on file under former acts:		
Pending original invalid	5,614	
Rejected original invalid	274	
Certified invalid pending	1,860	
Certified invalid not pending	751	
Pending, widows	241	
Rejected, widows	72	
Certified widows, not pending	67	
Total		8,879
Increase		24,656
Increase and accrued, widows		13
Increase, act of June 27, 1890		675
Nurses		9
Total		88,072

Summary of report of cases rejected from May, 1893, to November, 1893, inclusive.

Old wars:		
Original invalid		324
Original widow		211
Total		535
Indian wars:		
Original invalid		188
Original widow		177
Total		365
Service since March 4, 1861:		
Original invalid		7,494
Original widow		4,923
Total		12,417
Act of June 27, 1890:		
Original invalid		26,481
Original widow		2,339
Total		28,820
Additional to prior applications on file under former acts:		
Pending, original invalid		5,195
Rejected, original invalid		1,337
Certified invalid, pending		2,552
Certified invalid, not pending		2,141
Pending, widows		641
Rejected, widows		108
Certified widows, not pending		340
Total		12,314
Increase		28,563
Increase and accrued, widows		1,106
Nurses		36
Total		84,156

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this discussion grows out of a clause in the bill that is now pending before the committee which appropriates $200,000 to the Bureau of Pensions for the purpose of keeping in the field what is known as field examiners.

The gentleman who has taken his seat, my colleague on the committee [Mr. CANNON of Illinois], has not for one moment challenged the propriety or the justice of this appropriation. He has simply endeavored to occupy the time allotted to him by the committee in casting a shadow over the administration of the Pension Bureau, as well as the President of the United States, and in attacking Secretary Smith and Judge Lochren for the revocation of Order No. 164. He begins by saying the President declares, "thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds." He appears to be dumfounded to find such an expression in the message of the President. Indeed, he appears to be astonished that either the President or anybody else should assert that this whole business is honeycombed with fraud. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the members of the committee will turn to the Commissioner's report, on page 14, they will find these statements there:

Money illegally withheld, recovered on instructions from criminal section and turned over to pensioners, $809.

Money illegally obtained, recovered as the property of the United States, and covered into the Treasury, $18,808.62.

There is a total of $19,807.62 in that item.

Of which, recovered by judgments for the United States in civil suits instituted through criminal section, $4,861.67.

Cases submitted for criminal prosecution during the fiscal year, 115. Persons arrested and bound over, 109; indicted, 145; convicted, 73; sentenced, 60. Persons acquitted, 40. Cases nol prossed, 1.

Then if the gentleman will take the balance of that page and the following page 15 of that report, he will find one single instance in the State of Virginia, where they have unearthed a lot of frauds in which they absolutely saved—not as the gentleman from Illinois intimated on the other line, by not granting pensions, but by the revocation of fraudulent pensions that had been granted and were being paid—$55,000 in one instance. If you will go further and take up the instance in New Mexico, the instance in Buffalo, New York, and many other cases, the gentleman will ascertain and this House can ascertain at once where Mr. Cleveland got his authority for making that assertion.

There is no reflection in that assertion upon the honest soldier getting his pension. No man can construe the language of the President as a reflection upon the honest soldier who is entitled to his pension and is receiving it. It is remarkably strange that for twenty-five years and more some of these fraudulent pensioners have been on the rolls, and up to this day claim agents are daily adding to the roll fraudulent pensioners, and not until now has there been any extraordinary effort made to reach them or develop the existing frauds, so abundant as proclaimed by the President in his message.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Do you not know that in 1883 a list of all the pensioners was published in the newspapers of the country, in every neighborhood, to find out whether there were any frauds?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What has that to do with this proposition?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You say no effort has ever been made to find them out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What kind of an effort was that? I am asking about the Bureau. What has the Republican Administrations, from 1865 down until now, done?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. They caused that publication.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Was it not a Republican Administration that did that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Did what?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Published the entire pension list, to see if anybody knew of any frauds or could discover any.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, the Democratic Administration is doing more.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Yes; you are doing more by suspending lawful pensions.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We are not publishing lists in the newspapers, that the farmers of the country do not read and that nobody else reads. We are sending examiners down into every neighborhood, and we are appointing men who understand their business, and we send them into every soldier's neighborhood, and if he has a just claim, he comes before the examiner and submits such proof of his claim as can be scrutinized then and there by the examiner. This is done with his neighbors and friends present, and not in some secluded office with a claim agent, who is by contract largely interested in his claim. The action alluded to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS], by a Republican Administration in publishing the names of all pension applicants was entirely abortive, and necessarily so, for the reason that it required, to be effective, one neighbor to become an informant against another. Information necessary to set up a fraudulent pension can not be obtained in that way.

Ma. VAN VOORHIS of New York. But we sent the names of every man, woman, and child all over the country, so that if there were any frauds they could know it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You did that in a wholesale way, and the gentleman must remember that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. The gentleman from Illinois——

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman allow me for a moment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not know how much time the gentleman desires.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I only desire to ask a question. Are you not entirely aware that under every Republican Administration these men have been in the field searching for frauds and examining cases, just exactly as the service is to-day?

Mr. PICKLER. And that as many convictions were had as you have now?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. To some extent that is true, but no special effort had ever been made to develop frauds.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then there have been some?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes. The gentleman from Illinois put the question to Judge Lochren as to whether there were more dishonesty or fraud in the Pension Office than in the courts. Let me read the question and the answer:

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In connection with this Bureau, considering that the amount involved is $150,000,000 to $160,000,000 a year, is it not true, in your judgment, that honesty averages quite as well in that Bureau as it does in the ordinary adjudications throughout the country or the world?

Here is the answer:

Mr. LOCHREN. I think the old soldier is as honest as other men—quite as much so.

You can see that he did not answer the question as propounded by Mr. CANNON, and he did not intend to answer it as propounded, for his short service in the Bureau did not authorize an answer direct. "The old soldier is as honest as other men." Yet the fraudulent claim agents and pensioners are admitted to exist in his answers to other direct questions touching this matter. Mr. CANNON said:

Once in a while dishonesty creeps into the courts and into all human affairs.

Mr. LOCHREN. In all transactions which are human.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And yet, in the main, human transactions are honest.

Mr. LOCHREN. That is true, I think.

The general proposition and the general answer, and that is all there is in it.

The great fault found with the Administration, Mr. Chairman, is that they have changed Order 164. Order 164 was based upon the act of 1890. I desire to call attention of the committee to the language of the act.

SEC. 2. That all persons who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $12 per month, and not less than $6 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

Proportioned how? Now, here comes the whole gist of the question under debate:

Proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

That is the exact language of the act of 1890. What was Mr. Raum's ruling? It was to fix the pension in proportion to the accumulated causes of inability. Let me illustrate. If a man had lost a part of a little finger, that is no cause of inability to earn a support by manual labor. If he had lost one eye, that is no cause; but if he had half a dozen of these difficulties and of these wounds and losses, he added them all up together and brought them under the act of 1890, and put him to the highest point the law allowed as to service origin under the old law, thus ignoring the act of June 27, 1890. That was his practice.

Now, I do not believe there is a lawyer on the floor of this House on either side of the House that will take and read the act of 1890 and say that Mr. Raum's practice was in harmony with it. The purpose of the act of June 27, 1890, was not to pension soldiers or their widows for actual service, but in the many instances where ex-Union soldiers had become unable to earn a support by manual labor growing out of service rendered. This is evident from the language used in the act. The act analyzed is this. A soldier must have served ninety days or more, been honorably discharged therefrom, his disability permanent, and not the result of his vicious habits, which incapacitates him from earning a support by manual labor, to be pensioned proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

Here is the Order 164 which contravenes this:

IN REGARD TO FIXING RATES OF PENSIONS UNDER ACT OF JUNE 27, 1890.

That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above $6 and less than $12, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin; and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above $12 per month, shall be rated at $12 per month.

Approved:

GREEN B. RAUM, *Commissioner.*

CYRUS BUSSEY, *Assistant Secretary.*

Judge Lochren, in answer to a question propounded by myself, says:

Order No. 164 was a palpable violation of both the spirit and the letter of the act of 1890

And, notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asserted to the contrary, the same decision as to that order was made under President Harrison's Administration by Mr. Bussey, the Assistant Secretary. In the Weike case Mr. Bussey declared and ruled emphatically that Order 164 was against the law. I have here his whole decision, to which I refer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The Bennet case shows how these cases were made up under the act of 1890 by Commissioner Raum. I read from the statement of the medical referee, Thomas D. Ingraham. He says:

The inability of the applicant to perform manual labor was not taken into consideration at all.

The gentleman from Illinois says that Mr. Cleveland, Secretary Smith, and Commissioner Lochren made a mistake akin to a crime. Mr. Chairman, I know how hard it is for a Southern man, or for a Democrat, whether from the North or the South to touch this pension business in any shape, form, or manner without being criticised and suspected.

The Secretary is a Southern man, yet an honorable man, with no intention to wrong Union soldiers or their widows. He was not, however, a rebel soldier. He was a boy at the time of the war between the States, and his only purpose was to execute the law of the land. The Commissioner of Pensions was, I understand, a Union soldier, and a very true and worthy one, and can have no incentive to rob or hinder a Union soldier in his efforts for a pension. Mr. Cleveland is a Northern Democrat, from education and association bound to do justice to ex-Union soldiers, and yet these three men, the gentleman from Illinois asserts—by what authority he conceals—have made "a mistake akin to a crime" in undoing Order 164. Why make such an insinuation when the Republican Administration under President Harrison did the same thing? About a year ago some of my friends on the other side of the House, having often declared in my hearing that there was no fraudulent pensioner on the roll, that all the pensions granted were legitimate, I then, upon this floor, gave them some examples of fraudulent pensions; and the process of investigation that has gone on since the Cleveland Administration came into power has developed, as I mentioned a moment ago, an immense amount of pension frauds in Virginia, in Buffalo, in New Mexico, and in other localities.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. PICKLER. With all the pensioners that there are upon the rolls, and all this mass of fraud that you talk about and that are mentioned in the extracts from the Commissioner's report which you have given us, you succeeded in getting just sixty convictions last year. That is the amount of this "honeycomb of fraud" that you have been talking about.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes. The gentleman must remember that this examination has just begun, and before this Administration ends he will be surprised at the number of convictions. Many cases are still on the docket, and the courts are now sitting to try them. Only yesterday we got news of a case where one person was convicted and sent to the penitentiary, and if the gentleman will wait a few weeks, a few months, or a few years, we will give him many hundreds of convictions.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes; you roll every little case that you find as a sweet morsel under your tongue. When you do succeed in running down some fellow you make the most of it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the point. The gentleman from Illinois makes the declaration that if this Administration had been half as anxious to do justice to the poor soldier as they were to give themselves newspaper notoriety these troubles would not have arisen. Mr. Chairman, the simple fact that Mr. Cleveland has referred to this matter of pension frauds in his message and the fact that the Commissioner of Pensions asserts and specifies, and gives the names and numbers of fraudulent pensions, seems to have provoked this uncalled for thrust at the present administration of the Pension Bureau. I do not believe that there is a Democrat upon this floor, nor a Democrat in office under Mr. Cleveland who has ever had an idea (nor do I believe that Mr. Cleveland himself has) of obstructing a Union soldier or his widow in getting a pension who is legally entitled to it.

I know this, that these special examiners, who are sent into the field, and for the continuance of whose work this appropriation of $200,000 is proposed in this bill, are engaged in a work which is not in the pecuniary interest of the Government, but is almost totally in the interest of the pensioner. A great majority of the pensioners are not able to make out their papers and present them in such a form as to conform to the requirements of the law and the rules and regulations of the office. There are three classes of cases which come to the office. The first is the class which embraces cases made out clearly, distinctly, and fully in compliance with the law and the rules and regulations. Then there is a much larger class of claimants who only know that they are entitled to some rating without having any definite knowledge as to what that rating should be. All these cases are determined by the examiners.

Mr. DINGLEY. The ratings are determined by the surgeons.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, but they are based upon the evidence gathered by the examiners and by the evidence furnished to the Department.

Mr. DINGLEY. They are based upon a physical examination of the applicants.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] complains because the present Commissioner is keeping in abeyance applications under the act of 1890, and largely giving his attention to claims arising under the old law prior to 1890.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. My friend misstates me entirely.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I so understood your remarks.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What I claim is, that in the name of paying special attention to old-law cases, he is not paying attention to either class.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I understood the gentleman differently; he is entitled, of course, to his correction.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. My remarks will show that is what I said.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But I desire to say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois that there are now pending under the old law 18,000 cases of soldiers claiming pension on account of disabilities of service origin; and I want to say in my place that prior to the administration of Mr. Lochren preference had been given to applications under the act of 1890.

Let me state why this was done. It was for this reason, that under the act of 1890 there could be an increased rating. A man drawing pension for partial disability might obtain pension for total disability under the act of 1890, so that instead of drawing a pension of $12 or $15 a month he might draw $70 a month. I do not blame the soldiers for making application in that way; nobody blames them. They took advantage of the act of 1890 to obtain an increase of their pensions; and they flooded the Department in Washington with their applications on that line. They brought their pressure to bear on Mr. Raum; he gave his attention to their claims—perhaps properly; I am not going to question that at all. But at the same time it is true that back behind those are 18,000 claims that have never been attended to—claims under the law for pensions of service origin. Mr. Lochren takes this view—and we believe the House will sustain him—that those men who actually received wounds or disabilities in the service, and who when twenty-seven years have rolled away are still without pension, ought to be heard first.

The gentleman says that Mr. Lochren disposes of these pension claims only about one-third as fast as Mr. Raum did. Well, I want to say to him, with all due deference to Mr. Raum and the administration of the office under him, that if the gentleman will visit the Pension Bureau now and acquaint himself thoroughly with the system of doing business there and contrast it with the method of hurry and flurry under Mr. Raum he will find that there is a great deal more care in the examination of pensions now than there was prior to Mr. Lochren's administration. Investigations are made now that were not made then. And as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] said a moment ago, Mr. Raum had facilities for hurrying these matters through that Mr. Lochren has not.

The gentleman from Illinois says that under the revocation of order 164 there were 12,000 suspensions, and "that when people began to kick (both Democrats and Republicans) the order was changed, and changing the order put 9,000 pensioners back on the list." Now, the whole matter was simply this: Under order 164 these people had been pensioned. If the order went down, the pension necessarily went down with it. Whose fault was it? Was it the Government's fault or was it the soldier's? It was in my opinion purely a matter of grace that the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior modified that order so that the pensions should run where there was evidence of any rating whatever, instead of being suspended entirely. But there certainly was nothing wrong in the suspension of these pensions. It is just what would have happened in a court of justice. It is just what would have happened under a Republican Administration as well as a Democratic one. If this order had gone down the pensions under it would have gone down with it.

The gentleman from Illinois says he does not attack the Bureau, but he attacks the atmosphere of the Bureau; the atmosphere of the Pension Bureau, it seems, is twenty degrees colder under this administration than under the former one. I wish to suggest to the gentleman that hot atmosphere is not always pure; and I invite his attention to this proposition, that if the atmosphere there is twenty degrees colder it is forty degrees purer.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it has gone abroad that Mr. Cleveland and the Secretary of the Interior and Judge Lochren and the Democratic party are all at war with the old soldier. I wish to say here and now that I think our Republican friends who make that assertion know better when they make it. I do not believe [addressing the Republican side] that you believe it. You may have a kind of a lingering thought that we on this side have not as much sympathy for the Union soldier as you have. You may have an idea that those of us who were on the other side in the war would be perfectly willing that these pensioners should be dropped, whether entitled to pensions or not, if we could make our consciences clear of the result.

But in my humble opinion there are very few intelligent Republicans in this country, much less on the floor of this House, who believe that President Cleveland, Secretary Smith, or Judge Lochren have acted illegally or in any manner endeavored to defraud or hinder the granting of pensions to those legally entitled. I do not believe it; and I do not believe the country believes it. It is true, however, that Mr. Cleveland stands distinctly against the payment of fraudulent pensions; he is on record on that line since his first Administration, and was so regarded by those who voted the Democratic ticket in the last campaign. Mr. Smith being under him and Mr. Lochren being a subordinate also, there is no question in my mind that the President has said to them in some way or another, "These frauds ought to appear, and must appear if they exist." And, in my humble opinion, that is as far as the President has ever gone or ever authorized anybody else to go.

The atmosphere of the Bureau may be colder, as the gentleman from Illinois has suggested. It may be rendered colder by the fact solely that proper investigations have developed a wonderful amount of fraudulent processes and fraudulent pensions beneath. And this, I understand from the testimony of the Commissioner, is not chargeable in many cases to the soldier. It is chargeable to a class of pension agents—men who have gone over the country looking up every possible claim, whether just or unjust, righteous or unrighteous, and inducing thousands of people to make claims. All these fraudulent claims from Virginia came through one of these attorneys.

It is the same thing in Buffalo; it is the same thing in New Mexico; and now why should our Republican friends hesitate to hold up the hands of the present Administration and endeavor to unearth these frauds that are being perpetrated throughout

the country by these pension claim agents or attorneys? Is it not to the honor of the old soldier that he should have his pension uncontaminated by such associations?

Mr. BLAIR. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, with his consent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not think it is right, let me suggest, to charge the Republican party with any opposition to the effort to unearth frauds. The Republican party will vote unlimited appropriations to assist in making these efforts more efficacious, honest, and earnest to unearth fraud. But what the Republican party does object to is, under the pretense of unearthing other frauds, by preconceived, preconcerted, continuous efforts withholding the pensions of honest claimants who are deprived of them without the shadow of right. That is what we believe.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman from New Hampshire, in response to his interrogatory, how can you develop or unearth a fraud without in some way or manner injuring those really entitled under the law to their pensions? How can it be done?

Mr. BLAIR. Simply by putting another force on that specific duty. We should not object to the investigation of such claims in the administration of universal justice, or thwart them in any way, if it were not that the idea, apparently, is to prevent the allowance of any just claims by a pretense of unearthing frauds that do not exist.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The appropriation before the committee is for that very specific purpose—to send out examiners to investigate these cases and unearth the frauds.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow an inquiry?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. BINGHAM. Only a question. You are making a broad declaration of fraud. Your Department have asked you, a committee from this House, for $300,000 for that purpose. You have cut it down to $200,000——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, do not make a speech in my time. Please ask your question?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am coming to it. I say they have asked you for $300,000 and you cut it down to $200,000. You declare that fraud exists. You claim that you want a thorough investigation. The gentleman says we are opposing an investigation. Does not the gentleman know that during Cleveland's first Administration we gave $500,000 annually for this purpose? and now the gentleman says the Republican party do not want an investigation of these frauds!

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania had asked his question I could have answered it and gone along with my remarks; but I will answer him anyhow. They asked for $300,000 and we gave them $200,000 with a distinct understanding that these men were to be kept in the field. Now since we have only four or four and one-half months between the two sessions of Congress we can supplement the remainder when it may be necessary, and the gentleman knows it just as well as I do, for he is on the committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. That does well enough in a question of fortifications or matter of that kind; but we are not doing that kind of work unearthing fraud.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, it will do for unearthing fraud too. That appropriation will be sufficient to be used in that time. That was the understanding between the Commissioner and the subcommittee that made the investigation, that he could get the money he wants through a Democratic House whenever necessary and all that is necessary to develop the frauds. But what I complain of is that when we come to do honor and tribute to your soldiers who fought under the flag and against us——

Mr. BINGHAM. "Your soldiers!"

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, your soldiers. For I am speaking of them now in contradistinction to the rebels—if you please. I say when the Democrats come and undertake to do honor to your old Union soldiers, and ask your assistance to enable us to tear down the veil, if any, and take away from them the contamination and stain of dishonor that rests upon the pension roll by fraud, you cry that it is opposition to pensioning your Union soldiers, when you know as a matter of fact that there is not a word of truth in your allegation. That is the complaint I make.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is it not a fact that fraud is presumed; that every pensioner who was granted a pension under the act of June 27, 1890, is presumed to be drawing it unlawfully? Don't you start out on that assumption?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No sir; not a bit of it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. In other words, the mere fact that the party is drawing a pension is evidence of wrong?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No sir; not at all. Neither does the Democratic party in this House nor the Administration so consider it. But we do assert here, and the Commissioner asserts it, and the Secretary of the Interior in his report asserts it, and the President of the United States tells us so in his message, that there is a wonderful amount of fraud connected with the whole business, and as Republicans and as friends of the true old Union soldiers who fought under the flag, why don't you stop it in honor to them and help to relieve them from the standing disgrace and degradation and dishonor that the presence of these fraudulent pensioners necessarily involves?

There stands a man [Mr. COGSWELL] whom I happen to know, and he would disdain to-day, and it would be disgusting to him, to put him in line with a man who was a bounty jumper, who had never seen service, who, though drawing a pension was not entitled to it, either under the old law or the law of 1890; and every true Union soldier would feel humiliated as long as one of those men is kept on the rolls. Yet when we undertake to purge the roll, you come in here and throw in our way every possible let and hindrance that you can.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not at all——

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me for a moment——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is an extra appropriation of $300,000, over and above last year, for the force of pension examiners in the field, and, as the gentleman says, for the purpose of uprooting fraud.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. This extra force has been in the field since May 27, and we know what has been accomplished during that time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do not make a speech in my time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all. I simply want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that from May 27——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thought you were going to ask a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. I am, after stating the facts. From May 27 to November 1, 1892, there were 345 cases, under the investigation of this force in the field, in which pensioners were dropped for fraud; while in this year, in the same time, with this large increase of force and spending a much larger amount, there have been only 388 cases, or only 35 more of persons dropped on account of fraud.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. My friend and colleague has asked no question. He wanted to make a little speech and get it into the RECORD right here. I want to call his attention to this fact, if he will look to the letter furnished by Judge Lochren at the request of Chairman DOCKERY, on page 2, he will find this statement:

Special examiners in the field March 1, 1893, 102.
Detailed from the service and in the field, 32.
Total, 134.
Special examiners in the field June 30, 1893, 63; detailed, 86.

Now, note that we are dropping the extravagant examiners and detailing from the Department men who are supposed to be more conversant and better acquainted with the work.

Listen again:

Average number in the field between July 30, 1893, and November 1, 1893, 225, 107 special and 118 detailed.

Now, while the Democratic Administration is adding to the field examiners it is doing so at less expense, from the fact that many of these men detailed only get to day $900, some of them $1,200, and some of them $1,400, and they only get their salary, as paid in the Bureau, with the $3 per diem covering their expenses added.

Mr. DINGLEY. If that is true, how does it happen that with an increase of force of 50 per cent there is an increase of 150 per cent in the appropriations asked?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is because they are engaged in the examining and unearthing of these frauds. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. But I understood you to say they were doing it with greater economy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will you please look at the frauds that have been unearthed in Virginia and see the cost to the Government? Will you take the one instance that has attracted so much attention, where the man had been absent for twenty years, and came back and his wife owned him as her living husband? That case is now in court. Look at the amount of money we are expending to settle that one question, whether the man is a genuine Union soldier or a fraud.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, the complaint we have to make in this matter is this: No one on this side of the House complains that any efforts are made in any direc-

tion, or at any reasonable expense, for the purpose of uprooting fraud. What we do object to is that, under the guise of this, there is so determined an effort to create the impression that there are gigantic and wholesale frauds.

Mr. PICKLER. When there are no facts to back them up.

Mr. DINGLEY. When the examination thus far does not show that there has been any foundation for the statements made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You must make your speech in your own time; and you can have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say to the gentleman from Maine that this is not the room of the Committee on Appropriations, and gentlemen must observe the rules of the House. If the gentleman does not desire to be interrupted, he must not be interrupted.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I first addressed the Chair, and the gentleman from Georgia allowed me to make the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman was going on with a dialogue, outside of the rules of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course, if the gentleman from Georgia objects, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, once for all, that the Administration, with Mr. Cleveland, the Secretary and the Commissioner, and the Democratic members in this House and in the other end of the Capitol, and the great Democratic party all over this country, North, South, East, and West, will ask nothing at the hands of the Republican party but that in the future you stand by the law that you passed when in power, through a Republican House, through a Republican Senate, with a Republican President—your own act of 1890.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Under your construction of it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; under your construction of it. We will take the construction of Mr. Bussey, a Republican Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and stand on that with you. If you will agree with us we will meet you there.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There is a very grave misconstruction as to Mr. Bussey's construction.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We will submit it to ten 12-year old boys in the public schools in Washington City, and take their construction of it, and stand on that.

Mr. PICKLER. They would come nearer doing justice to the soldier than this Administration has.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Just such a remark as that must come from a very hollow head or a very bad heart. [Laughter.]

A man may—

Says the act of 1890—

be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $12 per month and not less than $6 per month.

Proportioned how? Not the number of wounds received; not the number of impediments to labor and disabilities that have occurred after the service. That is your interpretation of it. That is Mr. Raum's interpretation, and that is the interpretation we are after; and that is the interpretation that Mr. Smith, Mr. Cleveland, and everybody else in connection with the Pension Office is determined to put down. What is the law?

Proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

Now, under the act of 1890 every Union soldier is entitled to a pension just to the extent that he is disabled. Let me see if you can understand that. I want my Republican friends to understand your own law one time. If he can work six hours in a day only, then he is disabled one-half.

Mr. GROUT. Twelve hours work a day!

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then you ought to supplement that disability with the pension mentioned in the law as the lowest amount. If he is disabled three-quarters, then you give him $8. If he is disabled totally the law prescribes his pension, and there is no chance of making any mistake about it. Now, gentlemen, why not stand on your own law; stand on a legitimate, fair construction of the law as expressed, if the English language can express anything.

I yield the floor, Mr. Chairman, and whatever time is left I reserve.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he sits down. Hollow-headed and bad hearted as we may be on this side——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. PICKLER. Men forget to be gentlemen in the House of Representatives sometimes. Here is my question:

Do you indorse the indiscriminate suspension of pensions that has been made by this Administration before the soldier has been notified of any charges filed against him?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You heard my remarks; and I will repeat them.

Mr. PICKLER. You can answer it, yes or no.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You can not frame a question and then frame my answer. You have not lived long enough for that.

Mr. PICKLER. Do you indorse the indiscriminate suspension of pensions by this Administration is cases of soldiers before they are notified that any charges are filed against them?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You have got my answer, and I will give it to you again. If these men claim pensions under the act of 1890, under the rating as Mr. Raum has ruled in Order 164, and it was a wrong rating, when the order went down, necessarily, under the law, and in equity, too, if you please, the rating went down and the pension went down with it; and the poor soldier is to blame and not the Government.

Mr. PICKLER. That is all a matter of fact, as to what the disabilities were, but what is principally objected to was the denial of the right to be heard before these suspensions were made; and these suspensions are not all under the act of 1890, but there is a large number of suspensions under the old law. What do you do with them?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. My answer went a step further. I said that as soon as complaint was made, and wherever there was evidence of any wrong having been done, those people were reinstated, and 9,000 men and women were reinstated on the rolls as soon as the facts appeared.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes; that was the case after the backdown.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There was no backdown at all.

Mr. PICKLER. Then, you indorse the theory that a soldier's pension should be suspended first and the question of his title to it should be tried afterwards?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Nobody has indorsed any such theory, and nobody has promulgated any such theory. That is another of your grave charges against the Administration that has no foundation or truth in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has five minutes remaining, which he reserves.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, this discussion was somewhat unexpectedly brought upon the House on account of the presentation of the urgent deficiency bill, but necessarily the debate must take a wide scope if we enter into the question of the suspension of pensions. The Administration, in taking possession of the Government, made, I think, a mistake in assuming that the people of the country at the last Presidential election had given an order of "about face" upon the pension question, and the President made the mistake of carrying that supposed order from the people a little further down the line by saying "about face" to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary communicated it to the Commisioner of Pensions, who in turn gave instructions to the clerical force in the Pension Office to reverse substantially their action upon everything that had been done in that office up to that time.

Since then the people, supposed authors of this command, have been partially heard from—I refer to the election of 1893—and I desire now to read briefly from an interview with Larry Neal, of the State of Ohio, who wrote the tariff plank of the platform upon which the Democracy stood in the late Presidential election. I desire to read his views as to the action of the Administration upon this pension question, and I commend it to the prayerful attention of gentlemen upon the other side of this chamber. He says:

It is absurd to claim that Ohio, at the last election, indorsed the McKinley law. The people were controlled by other questions. Ninety-five per cent of all changes in votes from the Democratic to the Republican party should be charged to the pension question, and for this the Administration at Washington was directly responsible. The action of the Pension Department in the matter of suspensions was utterly indefensible.

The Democratic party, to regain the confidence of the old soldiers and pensioners, must do that which ought to have been done years ago—pass a service-pension law, giving a pension to every honorably discharged Union soldier. Such a law will forever take the pension question out of politics. The sooner it is passed the better.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] does not speak in the same frame of mind, nor from the same standpoint, nor surrounded by the same influences as the defeated candidate for governor of the State of Ohio in the late election. I hold in my hand another interesting communication from the State of Ohio, a memorial presented to this body by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] a few days ago and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I shall read only a portion of this document, but it will be found exceedingly interesting reading. It is written upon the Cincinnati Enquirer letter heads, and is signed by W. A. Taylor, the recent candidate on the Democratic ticket for lieutenant governor of the State of Ohio, who makes this protest from under the majority of eighty and odd thousand that was heaped upon him in November last. Other defeated Democratic candidates are still to hear from. I say that I shall read only a part of this document, because a part of it attempts to reflect upon the Republican party, and I do not care to incorporate that in my remarks. [Laughter.]

To the House of Representatives in Congress:

Your memoralist begs leave to represent that the cruel and unjust treatment of some fifteen hundred pensioners in the State of Ohio during the months of June, July, August, and September, 1893, whereby they were maliciously, unjustly, and unlawfully deprived of their pensions for a long period of time, demands at the hands of your honorable body a thorough and searching investigation by a committee sent to the State of Ohio, so that the victims may not be inconvenienced in appearing as witnesses, and their accusers may be compelled to appear and disclose the motives that prompted them in filing the charges upon which the suspensions were recommended by the Federal officials charged with the duty of reporting to the Department of the Interior at Washington the true facts in each case referred to them by the Department. If such an investigation be ordered and the seal of secrecy be removed from the charges filed with the Department and the reports thereon of medical boards and special examiners of the Pension Bureau, your memoralist expresses the belief that the following, among other things, will be disclosed:

He here calls attention to the fact that they do not have access to the records of the Pension Office. He proceeds:

1. That the Government has been placed in a false and cruel attitude by its accredited and authorized agents and representatives.

2. That the Pension Bureau was deceived into this false attitude by a conspiracy of such audacity and magnitude as to stagger belief.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it will stagger belief.

3. That the charges upon which the major portion of these suspensions were made were a part of that conspiracy, and made as a part of it, and the suspensions were recommended by the duly authorizeded agents of the Pension Bureau, without investigation, or a desire to investigate the true character of these charges, and for the sole purpose of oringing the Government and its administration into disrepute, and to serve purely partisan ends.

By this he means to imply that these charges were made against fifteen hundred old soldiers in the State of Ohio by Republicans; that through Republican officials in the Pension Office the pensioners were suspended, and that by this means these old soldiers were induced to add their votes to the magnificent majority that was piled up for Maj. McKinley last November. It does stagger belief, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican party should adopt such a method, making charges of this kind in order to bring the old soldiers into trouble.

It reminds one of the story of the man who married the daughter of his enemy, and being asked why he did so, said it was to bring his enemy's family into disrepute. [Laughter.] In other words, the Republican party, it is claimed, has gone into the business of making charges with reference to the Pension Office in order to bring the Pension Office into disrepute.

The memorial goes on to say that the Republicans in the State of Ohio made use of this cruel and inhuman treatment toward the old soldiers and with the most deadly results to the Democratic party. And smarting under this, the memorialist winds up with a prayer. And it is interesting to hear a prayer from Ohio from the Democratic party:

Your memorialist believes that the honorable House of Representatives owes it to the public honor and to the sovereign justice of the Government of the United States to cause the most searching investigation to be made in the premises to the end that hereafter no citizen shall have his rights jeopardized and the Government shall not be brought into contempt and disrepute to serve the ends of a political party.

Respectfully submitted,

WM. A. TAYLOR,
A Citizen of Ohio.

Now, this memorial shows how this system may be abused. That a great political party, carrying out a conspiracy that staggers belief, should have made such charges as to result in the unwarranted and unfair suspension of 1,500 old soldiers in a great State, so as to politically revolutionize that State, making a transfer of so large a number of the voters from one side to the other, and that this can be done through a system of special examiners which is commended to the favor of this House by the gentleman from Georgia—that such wrong can be done ought, it seems to me, be evidence enough to show this House that the whole system of special examination upon secret charges ought to be trodden under foot.

Mr. Chairman, in the old days, in Venice they had what was called "The Lion's Mouth" into which in the dead of night charges were dropped against any citizen of the republic. Upon such charges he was called up for trial in secret, and condemned; and the ultimate overthrow of that republic was caused by such abuse of power. Yet the proposition now of the gentleman from Georgia is to make a "lion's mouth" of every post-office box into which every scoundrel may drop his unauthorized charges, may drop his venom, and that then a special agent shall, acting thereon, go around and seek grounds for suspension and cancellation of the pension, and thus perpetrate such a wrong as Mr Taylor of Ohio says was perpetrated in his State within the last few months.

It is not proposed, Mr. Chairman, to provide additional examiners under this bill. The bill proposes to take out of the Pension Office and start upon a duty of secret investigation through the country a large force of men who are to-day upon the rolls of the Pension Office as clerks, and who are to be transferred by asingle detail from the position of clerk in that office to that of special examiner in the field. Three hundred thousand dollars is asked for that purpose in addition to $225,000 already voted. Three nundred thousand dollars, assuming the rate of payment to be $3 a day as proposed, would provide for one hundred thousand days' service in the field.

We know, Mr. Chairman, how this system has worked. We know with what indignation it has been received everywhere—this secret piling up of charges followed by putting in the field someone employed for the purpose of hunting up causes for dismissal.

Somebody not very long ago sent a "commissioner paramount" to a foreign country charged with the duty of coming back and reporting that that country ought not to be annexed and that a queen should be restored to her throne. Now it is proposed to send out two or three hundred "commissioners paramount" all over the United States, inspired with the purpose of finding out how many pensioners can be dropped from the rolls. They are not dropping off fast enough. Over 33,000 of them went down into their sacred graves within the last year. But that is not rapid enough for the present Administration.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is time for this House, the Democratic side of it particularly, to rise up and rebuke the Administration upon this question. By a unanimous vote the other day the action of one "commissioner paramount" was rebuked by calling upon the Administration for certain papers. There was a unanimous vote on both sides of this Chamber, and a unanimous vote of the other House of Congress. The same method of doing business is on discussion before us here to-day; and it would be well for the Democratic party in this Chamber to say that they wish to return to the more wholesome action of Gen. Black, the former Commissioner of Pensions.

This proposition in the bill to appropriate $200,000 additional to the $225,000 already appropriated is an attempt to enlarge a system of espionage that has already worked great hardships and has met with condemnation at the hands of the people.

Another remarkable suggestion is found in the report of the Commissioner on page 5. He calls for $2,000,000 for next year's payment of his local Democratic medical boards. On page 4 it appears that last year only $888,233 was used for that purpose. Only one explanation can be made of this demand, and that is that the present Administration, when it gets its new boards all organized, intends to send every invalid pensioner in the country before them for a new examination. We may well be excused in looking with a very close scrutiny at all the suggestions coming from this source.

It is not Commissioner Lochren that we complain of here. He only speaks as he is spoken to; he only does as he is bidden. The Secretary of the Interior is the great man of the Chief Executive; and the Commissioner of Pensions is only the great man of the Executive's great man. And with all this hostility to the Union soldier, which permeates every action in the Department of the Interior, we find the Executive backing it up.

It is true that the Pension Office has been receding—slowly, by degrees, step by step—from the first advanced position taken by the Commissioner of Pensions in the revocation of order 164. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to call your attention to one of the orders made in pursuance of the order revoking 164. I read from the action of the medical referee, who, under instruction of Secretary Smith and of the Commissioner of Pensions, established a new line of ratings after the repeal of order 164. He says:

[Circular.]

MEDICAL DIVISION, PENSION OFFICE.

In the matter of rating cases under the act of June 27, 1890, the following directions will serve as landmarks only and will be subject to such variations as in the particular case may be required.

The ratings will be $12, $10, $8, and $6. The ratings of $12 will be allowed only in the following cases:

1. In cases where the claimant is clearly disabled from performing any effective manual labor.
2. In loss of either hand or arm.
3. In total deafness of both ears.

The minimum rate shall be allowed for a disability equivalent to anchylosis of elbow joint. If there are two or more disabilities demanding a rate of $6 the rating of $8 shall be allowed, and for two or more disabilities each demanding a rate of $8 the rating of $10 shall be allowed; but two or more disabilities each demanding a rating below $6 shall not be added to make a minimum rating, and such cases shall be rejected.

All specific ratings as published in the book of instructions have no application in adjudicating claims under this act.

THOMAS FETHERSTONEHAUGH,
Medical Referee.

It is true that this absurd order has since been revoked in the face of much just criticism.

Step by step with dogged obstinacy have these rulings been modified or withdrawn.

Notice the wording of this remarkable order. If there are two or more disabilities demanding a rating of $6 each, the rating shall be $8. Under this Administration, Mr. Chairman, twice 6 makes 8, when the question is the rating of a Union soldier's pension. And if there are two or more disabilities each demanding a rating of $8, the rating shall be $10. Twice 8 makes 10 under this Administration. And if there are two or more dis-

abilities demanding a rating below $6, these disabilities, one, two, three, four, or five, shall not be counted to make a rating of $6, but the cases shall be rejected altogether. Now does not this show on the part of gentlemen who are administering this charitable, just, and simple law for the benefit of the defenders of the country, a condition of mind that calls upon this House for its condemnation?

This House represents the country, and let the country's representatives call a halt upon all illiberal action against its defenders. And it is true that in both Houses bills are pending for the revocation and taking away of this assumed right on the part of the Commissioner of Pensions to suspend any claims without examination or notice.

It is contended, Mr. Chairman, that there was a great mistake made in the original action of Assistant Secretary Bussey and Commissioner Raum on this question; that the law of 1890 should be construed upon a different system from the former laws, and a different method of rating pensions adopted under it. If I were to grant that, even for the sake of argument, which I do not, we must recollect that 377,000 of these soldiers' claims have already been allowed, and the pensions rated under that law. It has been judicially considered by the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior, and for years past that construction has been approved both by the House and Senate in appropriating moneys to pay pensions thus granted.

Is it possible, I ask then, that these men whose unsettled claims were filed at a later period, and who were a little more unfortunate in being able to furnish the record evidence of their cases to be passed on, that because they have not been put on the rolls during Mr. Harrison's Administration they should be dropped altogether and left out in the cold and the 377,000 already on the rolls be permitted to remain and draw their pensions without question? Two-thirds of all the claims have been already disposed of, and the balance are simply pending unadjudicated, and the Secretary of the Interior now changes the method, the entire policy of adjudication, and adopts a different rule, overturning the action of his predecessor and taking away the right to the pension which may have already accrued.

Now, let me ask, is the new law susceptible of the construction adopted in the Bennett case? Is it fairly construed in the various orders and rulings of the Department since the decision of that case? I think not. In the first place, it is true that we have a large number of statutes on the question of pensions. In all of these statutes the word "disability" is used, or "pensionable disability;" and that was considered and construed to mean disability from manual labor. It makes no difference whether a man is a lawyer or a doctor or a preacher, if he is disabled under those laws, under the construction that has been given to them, it is a disability from manual labor. That was looked upon as the test or the basis of the claim.

Following up the first statutes on this subject we have a specific rate provided for the loss of an arm, a specific rate for the loss of a leg, another for the loss of an eye or both eyes, a specific rate for the loss of hearing, and various rates for other grades of disability. Following that up in its order we find the statute fixing the rates where no special rates are provided. Section 4699 of the Revised Statutes provides:

The rate of $18 a month may be proportionately divided for any degree of disability for which section 4696 makes no provision.

Here is a general rating of $18 a month which may be divisible. That has been divided into eighteen different parts; eighteen-eighteenths, a dollar representing one-eighteenth; and from 1873 down to 1890 the Secretary of the Interior has adopted a construction of the word "disability" and the rating therefor, construing what the word meant, and that disability was rated not in reference to the ability of the claimant to earn money with his brain, but his disability to earn money or a subsistence by manual labor. That was the law when the act of 1890 was passed; and the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions simply adopted that method of rating in carrying out the provisions of the act of 1890. Those who are present in the committee to-day who were members of the Fifty-first Congress know very well the object and purpose of that law.

It was claimed by many on the floor of the House, and it was a matter of common observation by the press and by the soldiers throughout the country, that there were thousands, yes tens of thousands of claims on file where the proof of the service origin could not be arrived at, and the law was passed by which the fact of disability should be accepted without reference to where, when, or how it was contracted. That would relieve the Department of the examination of that class of claims, and it was understood by all that it simply took away the necessity of bringing in proof of service origin.

A great proportion, however, of the claims that have been suspended are the claims of men whose disability was due to service origin, who by reason of the lapse of time, by reason of the death of their comrades, were unable to prove up the origin of the injury. Under this law not long ago a constituent of mine whose comrade, the only witness of the event, had died, put in a claim for being shot while on picket duty. His comrade being dead he could not make the proof required by the office. He made application, under the new law, and the Department gravely asked him to prove that the gunshot wound from which he suffered was not the result of his own vicious habits!

Such technical method of construing this law has given a widespread feeling all through this country that justifies Mr. Taylor and Mr. Neal of Ohio in their charge that the pension question was a potent factor in the election held there last month.

The President, however, says:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds.

He who accuses all men convicts only himself is an old maxim which I commend to the Executive.

I appeal to every honorable gentleman upon the floor of this House to say whether that is true of his own neighborhood. Has his neighborhood, or any part of his neighborhood, its well-known pension frauds?

By the silence of the gentlemen who are sustaining the Administration upon this question, by their silence now and by their silence during this debate, the President will be convicted of making an incorrect statement. There seems to be an impediment in his veracity, when we get to the pension question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. He is correct as to my neighborhood, sir.

Mr. LACEY. How many cases do you know of?

Mr. PICKLER. What are their names? We want to run them down.

Mr. LACEY. How many do you know of?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does not make any difference about the number. He is correct.

Mr. LACEY. We are talking about a tremendous number—"thousands of neighborhoods."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not know about that.

Mr. LACEY. How many neighborhoods in your district?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not know. I have only got one neighborhood.

Mr. LACEY. He has cited only one neighborhood in Georgia.

Mr. PICKLER. Let him give the name.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to have him give the number in Georgia, because we want to sit down upon them on this side of the House as well as on the other. Just give one out of the thousands and I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if he has brought this case to the attention of the Pension Office, as it is his duty as a Christian gentleman and a statesman to do?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, and I did it on the floor of the House in the last Congress. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] was present.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, that was a charge against some Republican.

Mr. LACEY. My friend says this is an old case that happened in the last Administration, and that he gave notice of that in the Fifty-second Congress on the floor of the House. Here we have this enormous number of black cats run down to a single one, and it is in a dark cellar.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No, I had a hundred of them.

Mr. LACEY. Now we have a hundred men in buckram. Did you give notice of the hundred men on the floor of the House or to the Commissioner of Pensions? Well, Mr. Chairman, what constitutes fraud against the Pension Office in Georgia may have a little different color from what constitutes fraud in Illinois and and in Iowa. It may be that my friend looks upon every man who claims a pension for helping to put down the rebellion as a fraud in fact and a fraud in law.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Down in our country it is like the small-pox. It has broken out on everybody's face. You can not tell who is and who is not.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman says it is like the small-pox, in Georgia. Now, what the old soldiers complain of is this: In 1864 the boys were marching through Georgia, while in 1893 Georgia is marching through the boys. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That seems to be the difference, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to see that thus far nobody has seen fit to come forward to champion the cause of the Secretary of the Interior except his old neighbor, who does it no doubt out of kindness and out of charity.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I call the gentleman's attention to this: As a matter of fact, every man living in Georgia, without reference to his Union or Confederate war record, who fought in an Indian war, Cherokee or otherwise, over in Florida or in any other Indian war for thirty days, or his widow if he is dead, gets a pension, without any disability?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, and there is not one single fraud on the list, not one.

Mr. PICKLER. How do you know?

Mr. MILLIKEN. You have not tried to find any there, and you do not want to find any.

Mr. LACEY. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to convince my distinguished friend from Georgia that a man who fought in the Black Hawk war, in the Seminole war, or in the Mexican war—particularly in the Mexican war, which has often been classed as a Democratic war—it is impossible to satisfy him that any man who comes under that law could be guilty of fraud.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] submit to an interruption right there?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I happen to know of a soldier of the Mexican war who was suspended along with the others, by the order you have been discussing. That was a case in my district.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask my friend from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if that is not the worst outrage he has heard of lately?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; I think there were several pensioners of the Indian wars suspended under that rule; several in my State and several in the Southern States, suspended all at the same time.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, is a pension a vested right?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Right upon that point. How is it possible that under the order revoking order No. 164 a pensioner on account of Indian war in Georgia should be suspended, when his service for thirty days entitles him, and if he is dead, his widow, to a pension; and the same thing as to the pensioners of the Mexican war?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. When there were ten times as many pensioners as there were Indians on the other side. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. LACEY. I will always yield to my friend from Tennessee. I always know where he is on the question of pensions.

Mr. ENLOE. There seems to be some difficulty in the minds of gentlemen over there about coming to the conclusion it is possible for a man to get on the pension roll fraudulently. I suppose that might answer the question as to the case in Georgia. Maybe he never was entitled to a pension.

Mr. LACEY. I have doubt, Mr. Chairman, that there have been fraudulent claims. I have no doubt fraudulent claims have been unearthed under this Administration and under the last Administration. I am not here pleading for fraud or defending fraud; but I am here prepared to say that this wholesale charge of "thousands of neighborhoods," this wholesale charge against the old soldier, as a class, that he is a fraud, a thief, and a scoundrel, is unworthy of the gentleman who has been indulging in it, whether by direct charge to that effect or by innuendo. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to my friend that this is to let the investigation go on?

Mr. LACEY. What I complain of is this. He says that he wants to withdraw hundreds of clerks from the Pension Office, where they are now engaged in connection with the adjudication of claims. He wants to turn the current of beneficence, and he wants to turn the current of kindness that was directed in that way by Congress, and that has flown in that direction for the last thirty years in an uninterrupted stream. He wants to drag the entire force to the outside, seeking for frauds, and going around constantly looking for something to charge against Union soldiers, instead of seeking to do justice to the claims blockaded there by the thousands.

It is not desired that the 124,000 claims passed upon favorably by Commissioner Raum in seven months should be held up in contrast to the 44,000 decided by the present Commissioner under the present rules in a like period and under the present influences. If I might adopt the simile of my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], "under the present low temperature in the Pension Office;" it is a chilly day when a Congressman goes to the Pension Office now looking up the rights of an old soldier. He will look to the left as he goes in and see piled up in the corridors six cords of papers, and if he asks a messenger what are these piles of papers, the messenger will tell him, "These are claims of old soldiers undergoing review." They are being examined again to see whether or not they were allowed incorrectly and to see if they are not fraudulent.

The Commissioner comes before the Committee on Appropriations and tells them that he has fifty men who work upon these cords of papers, and that they dispose of a thousand of them a day. Three hundred and seventy-seven days will yet elapse before the 377,000 shall be overhauled, and thus far there has been a suspension of about one-third of all claims that have been examined under the adoption of the new rule.

I noticed that enormous pile of papers when I first went to the Department during the special session. I passed there the other day and I found the same pile looming up, awaiting the action of the medical gentlemen, the referees, who are going through them and granting motions for new trials when no such motion had ever been made. And as fast as they are being disposed of others are being carted out, and the whole of the work of the previous Administration is being passed under review, and the present Secretary of the Interior and his Commissioner, acting, as I believe, under the direction of the Executive and not merely through any malice of their own, are engaged in the work of overturning the action of their predecessors.

Now, in the case of Noble *vs.* Railway Company (146 United States), where the Secretary attempted to reverse a ruling of his predecessor, Mr. VILAS, in regard to right of way for a railway, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the action of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the action of the Secretary of the Interior in matters of that kind give a vested right that can not be taken away by a change of administration. As great an authority as William Wirt, Attorney-General of the United States in 1825, decided that an Executive could not review the acts of his predecessor. (Opinions of the Attorney-General, volume 2, page 8.) A decent respect for authority requires that the action of a predecessor should stand.

When the people, in 1892, were voting for Benjamin Harrison or for Grover Cleveland, did they understand they were granting a new trial upon the pension question?

Did they understand that they were giving authority to Mr. Cleveland to pass in review before him all of the acts of his predecessors upon this question; that all that had been settled and determined, all upon which the old soldiers had been relying with absolute confidence, looking upon their pension certificate as a sacred instrument, as an annuity from the Government of the United States, a Government that knew not dishonor—did the people who voted for Grover Cleveland understand that they were opening up this whole question anew, and allowing him to overturn the action of Grant and Garfield and Arthur and Benjamin Harrison? Surely not. And the fact is significant that we find no defense of his course among the old soldiers upon the other side of this Chamber. God knows how they happened to join the Democratic party [laughter], but there are many of them over there; yet we have no defense of the Administration upon this question from them, and I believe that we shall not have any.

So far the Administration, in this matter, has been compelled to rely upon the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], in whose community he has told us that he knows of one hundred false and fraudulent pensioners. In his speech, however, he mentioned only four different neighborhoods, Norfolk, New Mexico, Buffalo, and a place in Iowa which he did not name, Lime Springs, and now again he mentions a place in Georgia. The "thousands" of neighborhoods where these fraudulent pensioners were to be found come down to five! The men in buckram were not more uncertain figures than these people that we have had described here so eloquently as the "thousands" of fraudulent pensioners. And in the Iowa case, to which reference has been made, those claims have been suspended simply because the claimants happened to have employed a certain attorney who had been guilty of fraud, or who was charged with fraud in other cases.

The office fixed upon that attorney or claimed to have fixed upon him frauds in other cases. I do not know whether the charge was rightfully or wrongfully made; his case is yet to be tried, and I do not want to prejudge it. But they claim to have fixed upon him some frauds in connection with this pension business, and for that reason they took up the whole list of that man's cases and suspended them all without notice; took them by wholesale and at one fell swoop wiped them from the face of the books, leaving the claimants the right to come in and prove their cases over again upon a rehearing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question: If that attorney was guilty of such fraud as has been charged, was it not legitimate and proper for an officer who had sworn to do his duty to the country to suspend action on all cases presented by him?

Mr. LACEY. With all due deference to my friend from Georgia, a man may sometimes hire a bad lawyer, and if I were a litigant I would not want to have the Supreme Court grant a new trial in my case because I had happened to employ a man that they did not like, or against whom charges were made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is not the question. Let me state the question again.

Mr. LACEY. I understand your question fully, and I will follow it up. We have in this case several hundred frauds charged. At Norfolk 231 are charged, and there are several cases in Iowa that were granted through the agency of the attorney in ques-

tion. I shall not name him because I have heretofore understood him to be an honorable man and, as I have already said, I do not wish to pre-judge his case.

Mr. TAWNEY. There are about a thousand in the first district of Minnesota.

Mr. LACEY. My friend says that there are about a thousand cases of this attorney's suspended in the first district of Minnesota, and those cases, I suppose, like the others, have been suspended simply because the claimants had happened to employ this attorney. Now, it seems to me that the fair way would have been to have served notice upon these pensioners, and given them an opportunity to show cause before suspending them. It is not a very pleasant thing for an old soldier who has lived in community for years to have it go out that his pension has been suspended. It casts a shadow upon him. It is like the case of a man indicted by a grand jury upon false and fraudulent evidence. Later he is acquitted upon trial, or a *nolle prosequi* is entered, but still he has suffered a great wrong. He has incurred disgrace which he may feel keenly and yet have no adequate redress.

But here we have a great Department of the Government charging a man, not with any suspicious act of his own, but dropping him without authority, dropping him maliciously, dropping him without notice from the pension rolls, and casting upon him the hardship of getting through a Minnesota or Iowa winter in some sort of way the best he can without the pension on which he has been relying; and this is done simply because he happened to employ a certain lawyer to present his case.

Mr. PICKLER. And without any assurance as to when the applicant will ever have a hearing.

Mr. LACEY. And that lawyer not proven guilty of any offense.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Who is to blame for the employment of that fraudulent lawyer—the soldier or the Government?

Mr. LACEY. Neither of them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Oh!

Mr. LACEY. The Government did not employ him. The attorney went before the Secretary of the Interior and asked permission to practice in that Department. The Secretary required him to get the certificate of a judge of a court in the neighborhood in which he had lived, certifying him to be an honorable, capable, and upright man. Then he had to be inducted formally into office, just as a practicing attorney has to do in the Supreme Court of the United States. He had to be thus authorized and empowered to present these claims. Yet my friend from Georgia, in his zeal and anxiety to strike down an old soldier somewhere, says if a man has thus run the gauntlet and got into the Pension Office as a practicing attorney it is all right to strike down the claims presented by that attorney simply because some one or two or three of the claimants may have been guilty of fraud with his assistance in the procurement of their pensions.

Mr. HERMANN. Is it not the fact that this attorney bore a good reputation and that there was no reason for assuming that he knew anything of the fraudulent character of any claims?

Mr. LACEY. I will say that this attorney has borne an unimpeached reputation, and I sincerely hope will be able to show not only the honesty and integrity of the claimants whose cases he has presented in the office of the Commissioner of Pensions, but also his own honesty. When there is simply a charge of crime, it is a severe thing on the floor of this House—in a great body like this, where the highest privilege prevails, where a charge can be made without proof, and where the member making the charge may go out free from any action or question elsewhere as to what he has said on this floor—I say it is a severe thing to thus charge a man with crime and to assume that because an offense is charged upon him, it has been proved against him, and that his clients should suffer as well.

How many of these fraudulent claims were there at Norfolk? The Commissioner reports 231. Yet we have those cases paraded with great editorials in every Democratic paper that has been standing by the Administration——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, and if they had gone on they would have cost the Government $350,000.

Mr. LACEY. The Norfolk frauds were unearthed by Commissioner Raum; and his successor in office comes in and finds this charge as a kind of "Maverick" wandering around, and he brands it and claims it as his own discovery. It is assumed that all these men would attain a certain expectancy of life: and in that way the Administration is credited with a saving of $350,000.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not admit that Commissioner Raum ever discovered any such thing.

Mr. LACEY. The other day the Administration sent over to Baltimore somebody to sit at the post-office window and watch when the soldiers came there to get their vouchers and pension drafts. The postmaster at that office was instructed to deliver none of those papers except to the pensioner in person; and detectives were placed at the windows to watch. As these old men came up—blind, lame, halt, disabled—and as the old widows marched up to the window and called for the papers, the pension detectives stood there to take their names and to make examinations as long as they would make if challenging a voter, to determine how many of these pensions were fraudulent.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LACEY. Let me finish this remark before you interrupt me. That matter was followed up; and the newspapers were full of accounts of "the Baltimore fraud." It was proclaimed that another one had been added to the "thousands of neighborhoods" infected by fraudulent pensions; that Baltimore had joined the procession with Norfolk and with New Mexico, New Mexico which you are about to admit into the Union with all this fraud hanging to her skirts. But when the matter came to be looked into, how many of those pensioners were fraudulent? A silence so deep and dense that you could feel it fell upon the Pension Office, and we have not heard another word about the "Baltimore frauds" which were paraded with so much unction by the Commissioner immediately after this supposed discovery. The mare's nest which he thought he had found, turned out to be no mare's nest at all; there were no eggs in it. So that Baltimore can claim now that she is not one of the "thousand neighborhoods." She can exclaim "Thou canst not say I did it."

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to know where the gentleman gets his information about the completion of the investigation at Baltimore?

Mr. LACEY. I get it from the wonderful silence of the Bureau. No hen ever clucked and cackled so loudly over a new-laid egg as the Pension Office does when it finds or thinks it has found that some old solder has been guilty of fraud. And when the Baltimore fraud was discovered we heard all of this noise and fuss throughout the country. The papers were filled with it all over the land, but they have been singularly silent for the last three months.

Mr. ENLOE. I want to call the attention of the country to the fact that the gentleman is manufacturing opinion. He is not basing his argument on information. Does the gentleman know anything about the facts?

Mr. LACEY. May I ask my friend from Tennessee, who has given so much of his distinguished time and attention to the Pension Office in the last three years, if it is true that they discovered any pension frauds in Baltimore when they got through with their investigation?

Mr. ENLOE. They have not got through.

Mr. LACEY. They have not got through. Ah! Well, when will they get through?

Mr. ENLOE. Well, when we give them this money.

Mr. LACEY. Yes, give them this money and they will find frauds enough if you pay them to do it. There is no question about that. That is just what I complain of in regard to the increased number of men to be sent out to hunt up and find out fraud. I know that many of the men sent out will be friends to the soldiers. There is no doubt of that. There will be honorable, intelligent, and worthy men who will be sent into the field to perform this duty. But they understand very well what they are sent for, and they know that their rating in the office will depend on the fraudulent cases they find and report on, not on the honest men that they can find, but on the number of dishonest ones that they may discover.

Like another Diogenes, they will go around night and day with a lantern, not for the purpose of hunting up honest men, but trying to find some dishonest ones, and their own rating will be made in the Department on the basis of the reports they make. That is the trouble about the matter. Every clerk in the office has his special rating, and a certain number of cases are given to him for allowance or disallowance. They are examined, when he makes his report, by his superiors, and if the claim that he recommends for allowance should be disallowed then he gets a discount or his rating is cut down like a boy at school for answering a question wrong.

If, on the other hand, he disallows a case and that is sustained by the office he is rated higher in his class, and they rapidly fall into the way of getting the views of their superiors and following them.

They necessarily echo the sentiments of those who review and approve or disapprove of their action. Each clerk wants his own rating to be good with his Department. They know what is expected of them. There is an odor about the offices in Washington, an atmosphere, as my friend from Illinois suggested, but

certainly an odor that permeates the entire office, and you can tell who is in power by the action of the men in the office.

Mr. PICKLER. Especially in the Pension Office.

Mr. LACEY. They sneeze when the Commissioner takes snuff, and the Commissioner uses Administration snuff. And so, Mr. Chairman, when you find a change of Administration, when you find a change of method, when you find a change of policy, it goes clear through every man's work in that Bureau or Department. And those men who go out on this business as employés feel that if they are to stand well with the chief of the division, with the Secretary, with the Commissioner, the head of the Bureau or the Executive they must find as many frauds as possible, if they have to manufacture them.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to ask the gentleman this question. I am informed that it is true the records in the Pension Office show that an Ohio regiment that served one hundred days during the war has 614 of its members on the pension rolls. Now, I will ask the gentleman if there is not a slight suspicion of fraud there?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all.

Mr. BALDWIN. And if there is not need for an investigation?

Mr. LACEY. There is not. It is not an unreasonable condition. Let me show the gentleman why. I was in the Army twice. First for about seven months. And I believe you, Mr. Chairman [Mr. HATCH], took me prisoner, or helped to; at least some of your men did. I was taken sick, was discharged, and went home and got well. If I had remained in the service I should have died or been in a pensionable condition to-day, which I am not. But I was discharged, went home, and got well. Afterwards I reënlisted for three years, and served for that time without sickness.

Now every member here who has been in the Army knows very well that the first hundred days is the trying ordeal in a soldier's life. The first three months of any man's service in the Army is the hardest of his life. Why, Waterloo closed a hundred days' campaign. That was all there was of it. And the hundred-day men were largely boys, young fellows, well-grown children, and they were taken from their mothers' arms. Yes, we robbed the cradle and the grave both for hundred-day men and they were sent to the field, and as a matter of course, being tender and unaccustomed to such hardship, they suffered most. Out of a thousand men in one regiment, six hundred of them are in their graves, and Helena's hills are planted thickly with graves of men from the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, and Forty-seventh Iowa regiments, who did not serve longer than a hundred days, most of them being prostrated by the hardships of war not being, so to speak, acclimated.

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman is indulging in sentiment.

Mr. LACEY. Not at all; I am indulging in fact.

Mr. BALDWIN. Were I engaged in this discussion, I should try to put aside sentiment. I should get down to business, strictly. Now, the privations and hardships of the soldiers were not so great. I say that as a soldier who suffered perhaps as many hardships and privations as most soldiers. Now, I beg of the gentleman to throw aside sentiment.

Mr. LACEY. Throw aside sentiment!

Mr. MILLIKEN. And patriotism!

Mr. LACEY. Let us throw aside patriotism! Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my friend. I do not believe we should forget sentiment. In fact, the pension laws are the outgrowth of justice on the one hand, and of a patriotic sentiment upon the other. [Applause on the Republican side.] I approve of that sentiment, and it is a sentiment that we can afford to teach to our children; and every dollar that is paid to a pensioner of the late war is an object lesson, an object lesson to the boys who are growing up, who see the men who fought against the Union cause hobbling around without any pensions, and who see the men who fought for the flag drawing stipends from the Government, and rewarded. It is a good sentiment, and we must not forget it. We must not forget the motive, the purpose, and the charitable aim that the various Congresses have had in view when they passed the laws upon this question. Whether they were Democratic or Republican, they have been nearly uniform in their action.

And let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that there have been no truer friends of the Union soldier in this House than many of the men who wore the gray, men who learned in the face of danger and of battle to respect their opponents. We have had some of the most earnest and persistent defenders of the Union soldiers from the Confederates, who have been members of this body in past times. Mr. Chairman, I regret to see my friend from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] in his zeal to set himself right with the Administration after the tremendous slip that he made on the silver bill, now joining hands with the Administration upon the pension question, hoping thereby to make himself perfectly solid with the powers that be

Perhaps I ought not to criticise his motives. No one should do that. Many of our Confederate friends upon the other side are the best friends of the Union soldier. After capturing Union soldiers they divided their bread with them. After captures on the other side the first thing they commenced to do was to divide what they had, and I believe the distinguished roughrider from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] has always been a true friend of the Union soldier upon the floor of this House, and I want to give him credit for it.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Will you allow me to say one word? You said in the North they had to tear soldiers from their mother's arms. In the South that never occurred. They went willingly, and their mothers, God bless them, said: "Go and do your duty." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. I think I never made the statement which the gentleman attributes to me. If I did I will take it back. I say that both in the North and in the South there was a feeling among the mothers that I can not, at my present time of life understand. I can not understand how those mothers could give up their boys on both sides; but I know it was charged that in the South the cradle and the grave were robbed in order to fill the last conscription.

Mr. HEPBURN. Governor Brown of Georgia said it.

Mr. LACEY. I am told that Governor Brown, of Georgia, made use of that expression.

Mr. PICKLER. There were a large number of deserters on that side, all the same.

Mr. LACEY. At the present hour it seems that service against the flag counts for more in the minds of the people of the South than service under the flag does in the localities that loyally supported the Union in the late war. In this Congress there are 59 Confederate soldiers in the House and 23 in the Senate. On the other hand there are 54 Union soldiers in the House and 12 in the Senate. Less than one-third of the Union was engaged in this revolt, and yet there are 16 more Confederate soldiers in Congress than there are of those who fought for the Union. This is not well. I would exclude no man from public place because of the choice of the wrong side in that struggle.

I recognize the fact that there is an inverted kind of patriotism that puts the State ahead of the nation, and this misguided patriotism led our Southern brethren to place their State above the nation, and to fight against the Union on the ground that the State was their country. I recognize the high excitement of those days, the bitter prejudices that inspired the young and brave men who took the losing side; and I recognize the feelings that actuate their friends and neighbors in standing by them. But whilst service under those circumstances is forgiven, and may well be forgiven, it is a national misfortune for service against the flag to be recognized as a valid recommendation to public trust. It should be content to be forgotten as well as forgiven. And yet it is evident to-day that Confederate service is not merely forgiven and forgotten, but is remembered and regarded as worthy of national reward in and of itself and on its own account.

This is not right, and its moral influences are bad for the future. That in twenty-eight years after the war is over, one out of every six members of the House of Representatives should have served in the rebel army, and one out of every four of the United States Senate should have served against the Government, shows that while the Unionists are ready to forget the war, those who took the other side recall it most earnestly. Denunciations of those who are upon the pension roll are freely indulged in, and leaders on the Democratic side make the statement that the pension roll must be cut down. The grim reaper, death, is carving with his sickle keen, but he does not reduce it fast enough for these people.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter my protest against this attack upon the Union soldier. When A. J. Smith with his army corps marched from Mobile, Ala., to Montgomery, in 1865, as the corps went by a plantation two dogs came rushing out and barked at them, and a kind-hearted little girl called out to her mother: "Mother, come quick, the dogs are going to bite the army." She wanted to protect them. The boys laughed at the little girl, and went marching by with their drums beating, their colors flying, their guns over their shoulders. They were not afraid of the dogs, or of anything. They were young, vigorous, and brave. They marched on to Montgomery. That was at a time when the shell of the Confederacy was crumbling, and the war was about to be over; but to-day, Mr. Chairman, those men are no longer young, they are no longer vigorous. They are no longer able in all cases to protect themselves. They need protection in many instances. Let us say, in the House of Representatives, that the dogs shall not bite the army; that we will protect them here and now by our votes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I was just thinking, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] concluded his remarks, that I had

not witnessed any more pitiable spectacle in this House than the alleged line of defense upon which he entered for the ex-Union soldiers. I did not know, until I heard those who champion the cause of the old soldiers to-day, and who claim that this bill is an attack upon them, that there was a real Union soldier who would stand up and vindicate pension frauds, or would object to any investigation which sought to develop them. I do not believe that such self-constituted champions represent the ex-Federal soldiers. This question of pensions is a great question. The Pension Bureau is the greatest bureau in the Government. It disburses nearly one-third of the revenues of the Government. It holds out the greatest temptation to the cupidity of men who seek to get money by illegitimate means. It is absolutely necessary that the Government shall stand upon the defensive and protect its Treasury while it protects the deserving pensioners against association with fraud. If the Pension Bureau does not strangle fraud, then fraud will strangle the Pension Bureau and with it the system.

I am astonished that gentlemen think it proper to attack an appropriation to maintain the integrity of a bureau which disburses such vast sums of money, and which employs an army of 5,000 persons in its operations. This seems to have been made the occasion to go into a general political discussion in criticism of the pension policy of the Administration.

Now, if the criticisms passed upon the Administration were just, I would not open my mouth in its defense. I am not here to seek any party advantage in a discussion of this question. I believe that in dealing with the appropriation of money for the payment of pensions and for the investigation of frauds in the Pension Office we ought to treat it as a business proposition and discuss it from a business standpoint.

It looks very strange to me that a gentleman should rise in his place on this floor and say: "Mr. Chairman, I am not a defender of or an apologist for fraud," and yet spend his time in hurling rocks at those who are seeking to unearth the fraud and to punish the criminals who have committed fraud against the Government. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] seems to me to occupy a very unenviable attitude. While he says he is no apologist for or defender of fraud, he stands in the attitude of an accomplice. A man who goes out to commit a burglary usually carries a friend with him who stands guard for him while he commits the burglary. The gentleman stands in the attitude of keeping the dog away until the house is looted.

I am not astonished that a man who is drawing a pension in violation of law should object to any investigation. No honest man can object to it. A criminal hates a detective. There is no more odious sight to a criminal than an officer of the law. The lawless hate and despise those who represent law, order, and the good of society. That is all natural, but it seems strange to me when a proposition is made for an appropriation of money to investigate frauds that have been committed in the Pension Office, that gentleman rise up here, gun in hand, to attack the Administration, because the Administration is seeking to investigate these frauds. Exposing fraud and punishing those guilty of crime is paraded to the country as hostility to the soldier. I am astonished that a gentleman who cares for his reputation should arise in his place here and say that it is a hostile act to the honest pensioner of this country for the Government to investigate, expose, and punish those who have fraudulently obtained places on the pension roll. Every patriotic man ought to favor it.

THE WEIKE CASE.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] in his speech took occasion to arraign the Administration because it revoked order No. 164. I called his attention then, and I call it now to the fact that the decision in the Weike case, made by Assistant Secretary Bussey, and the decision in the Bennett case, made by Assistant Secretary Reynolds, do not differ one particle so far as the principle laid down is concerned. I will ask the Clerk to read the decision in the Weike case, so that this House may clearly understand what it is.

The Clerk read as follows:

I return herewith the papers in the case of Henry H. Weike, who is receiving a pension under certificate No. 478173, on account of rheumatism and resulting disease of heart.

The original application alleging rheumatism was filed April 4, 1887. In April, 1890, the claim was allowed for rheumatism and resulting disease of heart at $2 per month from April 4, 1887, and $8 from February 26, 1890.

October 28, 1890, he filed an application for increase and rerating, and February 24, 1891, he filed an application under the act of June 27, 1890, alleging disability from urinary trouble, dyspepsia, habitual constipation, and rheumatism, which rendered him partially unable to earn a support. Both claims were rejected, from which action an appeal was taken.

The reports of medical examinations and the other evidence in the case failed to show that any error has been committed in rating the disability resulting from rheumatism. The rejection of the claim for increase and rerating is, therefore, affirmed.

The report of a medical examination had since the application under the act of June 27, 1890, was filed, recommends a rating of eight-eighteenths ($8) for rheumatism, and four-eighteenths ($4) for disease of the urinary organs, but does not show the existence of any of the other disabilities alleged. The latter disease is not shown to be the result of vicious habits, and the disability resulting therefrom may, consequently, be taken into consideration in fixing the rate of pension under said act.

Conceding that $8 is the correct rate for the disability resulting from rheumatism, the question arises, is the claimant necessarily entitled to a higher rate because another disability is shown to exist? In other words, when more than one disability is involved should the rate which would be allowed under the old law for each disability be added to the others to determine the total rate?

The following order (No. 164) was, with the sanction of the Department, issued by you October 15, 1890:

"That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits and which incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above $6 and less than $12, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin; and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above $12 per month, shall be rated at $12 per month."

The foregoing order has governed the practice of your Bureau in the matter of rates under the act of June 27, 1890, since the date of its issue. It appears, however, that said order, as understood by the Department when approving it, may have been misconstrued by your Bureau so far as it has been your practice to add the separate nominal and schedule rates allowed for several disabilities in making a rate under this act.

This has resulted by reason of the fact that it has been your practice under the old law to combine these rates where the total does not exceed seventeen-eighteenths. The question as to the correctness of that practice is not now before the Department for decision. It is deemed proper to state that the Department, in approving said order No. 164, did not intend that small rates should be added together, as, for example, three or more rates of two-eighteenths in order to make a rate under the provisions of said act. A man may have two or more separate afflictions, either one of which, considered singly, entitles him to a $2 rate under the old law, and yet in the aggregate they may not disable him for the performance of manual labor to a much greater degree than either of them existing alone. Or he may have one serious disability and one or more slight disabilities, the latter of which do not have any appreciable effect upon the degree of incapacity for manual labor occasioned by the former.

The basis of rates under the act of June 27, 1890, is inability to earn support by reason of incapacity for manual labor due to a permanent mental or physical disability not the result of vicious habits. In determining whether an applicant is entitled to a rate under said act for the character or disability aforementioned the only question is: Is he, from the causes involved—be they one or many—disabled for the performance of manual labor to the extent represented by the fractional rate of six-eighteenths. If so, he is entitled to the minimum rate of $6. And so on until the maximum rate of $12 is reached.

It is directed that the views herein expressed be observed in future adjudications of claims under the act of June 27, 1890. (Decisions of the Secretary of the Interior in appealed pension claims, volume 6, 1892, pages 193, 194.)

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, that decision was rendered by Assistant Secretary Bussey under the Harrison Administration. It was a Republican decision and it overturns order No. 164. I want to call particular attention to a portion of it. The Secretary refers to order No. 164, and says: "The foregoing order has governed the practice of your Bureau in the matter of ratings under the act of June 27, 1890, since the date of its issue." Then he goes on and says, "The basis of ratings under the act of June 27, 1890, is inability to earn a support by reason of incapacity for physical or mental labor due to a permanent mental or physical disability not the result of vicious habits." He says that it is not proper to add the minor disabilities together for the purpose of making a rating, and he directs the Commissioner, in future adjudications upon the cases arising under the act of June 27, 1890, not to add the minor disabilities together as a basis for rating. Now, that is exactly what Assistant Secretary Reynolds decided in the Bennett case. The ingenious gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] ignores the fact and launches his wild criticisms at this administration for adhering to the principle laid down in the Weike case. The only difference between the two cases is that Mr. Reynolds formally revoked order 164, while Mr. Bussey simply directed Commissioner Raum to conform in his future rulings to the principle that, under the law, these minor disabilities should not be added together for the purpose of determining the rate at which pensions should issue under the act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. Chairman, that disposes entirely of that portion of the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] in which he arraigned this Administration upon that point. The gentleman from Illinois is simply a defender of Raum. Mr. Bussey's decision was correct, and he knew and Commissioner Raum knew what the law was when they were putting 377,000 names on the rolls under the act of June 27, 1890, prior to the decision in the Weike case. They put those men on the rolls in disregard of the law. Mr. Bussey never saw the light upon this question until just before he retired from office. He was wilfully blind. Raum first opened the doors and let in for political purposes 377,000 pensioners. Many of them were pensioned in violation of law. The action of the Department in many of those cases was entirely in contravention of the law. After they got them pensioned and used them at the polls, and their party was defeated, they turned around and locked the door. Secretary Bussey then says that the rulings of the Pension Bureau heretofore have been wrong, and that henceforth they must conform to the law.

What is the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] here? He is criticising this Administration because it is administering the law as it was construed by Assistant Secre-

tary Bussey under the Administration of President Harrison, instead of following Raum's rulings. When the gentleman was on the floor I called his attention to the fact that this action of the Bureau had been misrepresented all over this country for political purposes, and I affirm it is misrepresented in the debate here by gentlemen on the other side of the House for the same purpose. No lawyer would risk his reputation on the assertion that there is any difference in the principle laid down in the Weike case by Bussey under Harrison, and in the Bennett case by Reynolds under Cleveland.

NO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST VETERANS.

Now, having disposed of that question, I invite attention to some other criticisms we have heard in this debate. One is the criticism upon Commissioner Lochren because he does not give a preference to pension claims arising under the act of June 27, 1890. I charge that there was fraud, that there was corruption, that there was bribery used for the purpose of securing favors in the Pension Office under the former administration. I charge that orders 149 and 151, which enabled pension attorneys here to press forward these claims at the expense of the old law claims, were bought and paid for by George E. Lemon, a pension attorney in this city, who has made himself a millionaire out of the preference he was able to secure in the Pension Office for the claims which he represented. This administration revoked those orders and placed every claimant on an equal footing. To that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] objects.

In answer to his challenge to show fraud, I will say that I could pile up the evidences of fraud here until no gentleman in this House could stand up before an intelligent audience acquainted with the truth and deny the fact that the Pension Bureau has been honeycombed with fraud and corruption for years past. Here are two volumes of testimony of more than 1,000 pages taken before a committee of the House in the Fifty-second Congress, showing that the Commissioner of Pensions was in collusion with pension attorneys, that he was not only misinterpreting the law in order to get men on the pension roll, but that he was in collusion with pension attorneys for the purpose of defrauding the Government of the United States, at the same time disgracing the pension roll.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the report to which the gentleman refers show that the old soldiers were guilty of those frauds?

Mr. ENLOE. No true and honest soldier was ever guilty of a fraud. There are men in this country claiming to be soldiers who are knowingly the beneficiaries of fraud, and there are men on the pension rolls to-day who committed perjury for the purpose of getting on the rolls, and there are men who now seek to conceal these frauds.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. Is it not a fact that the two volumes of testimony taken by that committee to which the gentleman refers, and of which I believe he was the moving spirit, were thought of so little importance by the Democratic majority of this House that they have refused the gentleman a hearing upon the subject ever since that report was brought in.

Mr. ENLOE. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the fact. I am sure that the gentleman does not desire to misrepresent.

Mr. PICKLER. It never has been discussed in the House.

Mr. ENLOE. Yes it has. I have discussed it here pretty freely in the past, and the gentleman tried to break the force of the discussion at that time, as he does now. The trouble with the gentleman is that when it comes to a matter relating to pensions his memory becomes faulty and his mind is so blinded by prejudice that he can not see or recall plain facts.

Mr. PICKLER. I am a little radical.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, I say this Commissioner did right; that if there is any class of soldiers in this world whose claims are entitled to preference over those of other soldiers it is the men who went to the front and received disabilities in the line of duty; and it was wrong for Commissioner Raum to give preference to men who went out and served perhaps but thirty days—men who never went to the front, never saw a Confederate battle flag, and never smelt the smoke of battle. I am therefore astonished that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois should come back into this House, and on this floor in the discussion of an appropriation bill stand up before the country and attack the present Commissioner of Pensions, a gallant Union soldier, because he has seen proper in the administration of the law to give the old soldiers who received their disabilities in the line of duty an equal showing with the thirty days men.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me another question?

Mr. ENLOE. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENLOE. I will have to yield to the inevitable. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. ENLOE. Go ahead with your question.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he has ever heard any of the Republicans on this side during any Congress criticize Mr. Cleveland's former Commissioner of Pensions, Gen. BLACK?

Mr. ENLOE. Gen. Black is not on trial.

Mr. PICKLER. Why is it we are criticising the present Commissioner, while we did not criticise Mr. Cleveland's former Commissioner?

Mr. ENLOE. I suppose your political necessities are greater now than they were formerly. [Laughter.]

Now, I want to go a little farther in regard to those criticisms. It is said here that the Administration has nobody to defend it. I am under no special obligations to the Administration. I bear no commission to make defense for it. It needs no defense for what it has done in this matter; and if it should need defense for anything, it would be that it has not gone far enough and fast enough in digging up these frauds.

RERATING FRAUDS.

Why, sir, I have right here a list of cases which ought to be attended to at once; and if I were the Commissioner of Pensions I would have it done. Here is the record of an investigation made by Secretary Noble, or by a commission appointed for that purpose by his order, and it shows over 3,000 cases, many of which were improperly and illegally rerated. That abuse has never been corrected. That was a fraud, and before Commissioner Tanner retired from office it got to be a bold robbery of the public Treasury through a combination of officials in the Pension Office. That fraud ought to be righted. It cost the taxpayers several millions of dollars. Who will defend that?

More than that; when I was conducting the investigation before the Raum committee in the Fifty-second Congress, I had occasion to know something of the complaints throughout this country about the frauds existing in different localities. I do not know what the information of the President may be as to the existence of frauds in the different neighborhoods: but I do know that while the committee was prosecuting that investigation my correspondence from old soldiers all over this country brought to my attention a large number of neighborhoods where there were frauds, and frauds by the wholesale. I could not get the committee to go away from Washington to investigate those frauds. I could not get the committee to summon the witnesses here, that they might be examined before the committee. I was advised, during that investigation, of the frauds at Norfolk, Va., at Baltimore, at Boston, at Troy, and Buffalo, New York, and the frauds in Iowa and New Mexico. There were charges of fraud in Kansas and in Tennessee, and in many different localities throughout the country. If those charges are followed up, it will be shown that the President is not in error in saying that there is fraud in hundreds and thousands of neighborhoods in this country. Thank God we have a President who has the courage to tell the truth.

But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] complains that the Pension Office does not adjudicate cases fast enough. Well, sir, the Commissioner is doing pretty well. He is adjudicating them as fast as he can do it honestly and fairly. Complaint is made that he has rejected a good many cases. That shows that he has been making honest investigations and adopting an honest interpretation of the law. If the gentleman's standard of efficiency should prevail, the man who would not look even at a single fact recited in a case would stand at the head of the list for promotion. The man who would pass cases through without examination would be promoted for making the best record in that office. I am not in favor of that sort of official efficiency. I want these cases thoroughly investigated. I want every soldier in this country who is honestly entitled to a pension to have it: I want him to have all that he is entitled to under the law: but I do not want a single man upon that pension roll who is not entitled to a pension, and I believe that every such man on the roll is a disgrace to it.

I furthermore believe that there is not an honest Union soldier or any other man in the land, who is not a political juggler playing on the stage for political effect, who does not, from the bottom of his heart, want to see every man dropped from that roll who is not honestly and rightfully entitled to be there.

WE WILL FURNISH THE PROOFS.

But, you say, there are no evidences of fraud. I say we have abundant evidence, and the work is only begun. We have not more than broken through the crust yet. Before the four years of this Administration expire we will be able to furnish gentlemen on this floor and elsewhere with specific instances enough to satisfy the most radical infidel of the wisdom and the justice of the policy of investigation.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. ENLOE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You admit that a fraud should be proved, not presumed?

Mr. ENLOE. I certainly do. But we will furnish proof——

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Let me get through. My question is this: Would you charge any claimant whose claim had been allowed by a judicial officer—for he acts judicially when he presides over the Pension Bureau and decides on these claims—is fraudulent, unless some one made a specific charge to that effect, and substantiated the charge by satisfactory proof?

Mr. ENLOE. I think possibly if I had commenced the administration of the Pension Bureau as Commissioner Lochren did, I would have pursued the line of policy in that regard which has governed the Bureau since the establishment of the pension system.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. But you do not answer my question.

Mr. ENLOE. I am going to answer it. I say he did exactly what every other Commissioner did before him, when he suspended cases where he believed, or had reason to believe, that they were improperly allowed, and in doing so he ordered an investigation: just as the practice had been before.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. The gentleman is not referring to what I asked him.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, wait a moment, I will come to it. If the pensioner was improperly on the roll, the Government suffered no further loss than it had sustained up to the time of his suspension.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. But that is begging the question.

Mr. ENLOE. Will you wait until I get through, and you can put it again if I do not answer it satisfactorily.

If the man was properly on the roll no wrong was done to him by suspension that was substantial in its character, because he resumed his pension after clearing his title right where he left off. He did not lose a cent by the investigation. That was the practice under every former administration of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You are in favor, I presume, of a roving commission to go around and find out frauds, or manufacture them?

Mr. ENLOE. I am in favor of continuing the practice that has always nominally prevailed in the office, of investigating and punishing fraud.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Then you believe in a roving commission to hunt up supposed frauds?

Mr. ENLOE. Very well; if the gentleman will interrupt me, let him go on.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You have a precedent in the hunt for witches in England a century or more ago, when the English Parliament employed Mathew Hopkins as a witch finder, just as you want to employ two or three hundred fraud finders to hunt up suppositious cases of frauds committed by pensioners.

Mr. ENLOE. Is that all? [Laughter.]

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. And your song is like that of Mathew Hopkins, who went about repeating:

> Hath not this present Parliament
> A leiger to the devil sent
> Fully empowered to trot about
> And find revolted witches out?
> And has he not within a year
> Hanged fourscore of them in one shire?

Mr. ENLOE. I hope the gentleman from New York feels better now. If I had had that on my stomach and had gotten rid of it I would feel better, too. [Laughter.]

But I resume my argument, Mr. Chairman. I am not so certain but what it is right, when a pension has been granted a soldier, that it should not be suspended where the fraud is not manifest until it has been investigated and shown that he is not entitled to it. I do not know but what I am willing to follow the Indiana statesman on that question. I mean the distinguished Indiana statesman. I understand that there are some distinguished statesmen from Indiana not on this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. Some of them are. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. I am sure of that, but those to whom I allude are not on this floor. I understand some distinguished statesmen from Indiana are going to antagonize the pension policy of this Administration. I have seen such a statement in the newspaper press. I am astonished that anybody from Indiana should want to criticise the administration of the Pension Bureau. There never has been a State in the Union that has received greater consideration in the matter of pensions than the State of Indiana.

I do not pretend to say that she did not send out many soldiers, and good ones, and that she is not entitled to fair and equal consideration. I do say that she has been favored by every Administration in that line. She has been the pension pet. I do not know whether or not this Commissioner is making a discrimination. I believe he is not. Perhaps the charge the gentleman from Illinois brought against him may be the gravamen of his offense to Indiana; that is, that he has not discriminated in favor of any soldier or class of soldiers, nor in favor of any State.

Commissioner Lochren will lift the Pension Bureau above the level of a debasing, demoralizing, and corrupting political machine. I do not believe that pensions will be given as bribes to voters under his administration. It has been done, but the honest people of this country have ordered a change. Special examiners will not be sent out to bribe pension attorneys to manufacture testimony and commit perjury to blacken the character of a member of Congress who dares to expose dishonesty. That was done in Indiana during the last administration. The present Commissioner has not shown favoritism to anybody. He stands for justice and equality before the law.

If he is to be assailed for enforcing the law by the distinguished statesmen who have been out to Indiana and made speeches declaring their purpose to attack him, or by anybody here, I for one stand ready to defend the action of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. Chairman, I will take up my line of argument again. The gentleman says, "Where do you find any evidences of fraud?" I have a number of cases here that have been investigated, and I could furnish other similar cases until the record of them would burden even the indulgent publisher of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The list I give will perhaps temporarily appease the appetites of the gentlemen on the other side who want names and cases. I think I can repeat the dose as often as they get hungry enough to require it.

LIST OF CASES.

Here is a small installment to which I invite your attention. It covers only a short period of time and I could make it much larger if necessary, but I only cite these cases as samples of many of a similar character:

Widow's certificate No. 94592, widow's original No. 370013, Laura Ann Gregory, now Huggins, Samuel Gregory, F, Thirty-sixth United States Colored Troops, Norfolk, Va.: Widow's claim filed January 15, 1867, alleging soldier killed September 29, 1864, at Deep Bottom, Va. Certificate issued May 16, 1867, at $8, from September 29, 1864. In February, 1874, special examination showed that pensioner, on January 24, 1867, had remarried one William Reid, and she was dropped from the rolls. September 12, 1889, Laura Ann Gregory, now Huggins, again applied as widow of Samuel Gregory, the soldier, swearing that she had not been remarried up to 1880. The original papers, for some cause, not having been discovered the latter claim was admitted, and she was pensioned from date of soldier's death to August 5, 1880. There is abundant evidence to show remarriage to Reid in 1867, both by verbal testimony and by record. September 8, 1893, case submitted for prosecution for perjury.

Certificate No. 332445, Penelope Ives, now Barber, James M. Ives, D, First North Carolina Infantry, Blount Creek, Beaufort County, N. C.: Subsequent to filing of claim and before allowance the claimant remarried, but in executing voucher for first payment and voucher for quarter ending August 4, 1892, she swears she has not remarried. September 7, 1893, submitted for prosecution for perjury.

Certificate No. 8261, Indian war, Sarah Welch, widow of William Welch, Pansey, Henry County, Ala.: Submitted for prosecution of John T. Welch, under sections 4746 and 5418, Revised Statutes, United States. Evidence shows that said John T. Welch forged the names of William Pierce and N. J. English to a material affidavit and forwarded the same to the Pension Bureau.

Certificate No. 555183, Robert Powell, D, Third Tennessee Mounted Infantry, Link, Tenn.; original No. 1016086, Tilman Giles alias Robert Powell, D, Third Tennessee Mounted Infantry: Submitted September 7, 1893, for prosecution of claimant for perjury in attempting to obtain two pensions covering same period.

Certificate No. 658656, Francis Coker, C, Second California Infantry; original No. 738000, Francis Coker alias George W. Abbott, F, Fifth United States Artillery: Submitted for prosecution September 6, 1893, for perjury and false claim. Coker testified that he was not in any other service than Company C, Second California Infantry, but subsequently filed a claim alleging service in Company F, Fifth United States Artillery, subsequent to his discharge from Company C, Second California Infantry. Evidence from the War Department, and other evidence, shows them to be one and the same person.

Certificate No. 342177, David Cornelius, father of Tobias Cornelius (and others): C. A. Martin, Kendall Creek, Pa. Submitted for prosecution September 4, 1893, for extorting an illegal attorney fee of $140.

Certificate No. 868759, Henry Boyakin alias Henry Boyd, San Francisco, Cal.: Submitted for prosecution August 29, 1893, for filing false affidavits in support of his own claim for pension.

Widow's original No. 482687, invalid original No. 663866, Rachel Rose, now Cage, Claiborne Rose: Andrew Lott, Wayside, Miss. Forgery of affidavits and names of witnesses, as well as the justice of the peace before whom they purport execution. Held by United States commissioner, August 14, 1893, in $500 bond for next term of court.

Certificate No. 10486, Henry Duffee, 1110 Locust street, Camden, N. J.: Submitted for prosecution August 17, 1893, for perjury. In affidavit executed January 24, 1891, swears that he has not been in the military or naval service since September 16, 1864; whereas he served from February 8, 1864, to February —, 1865, on United States steamship Clyde, and from March 5, 1866, to July 13, 1866, under the name of Henry Gilmore, on United States steamship Chattanooga. The perjury is material, in that by means of it he secured payment for a period during which he was already in the service and receiving pay from the Government.

John Eighmy, Amsterdam, N. Y.: Submitted for prosecution August 15, 1893, for forgery and filing false claim in the case of Eliza Van Buren, widow of John, original No. 524236. Facts show that claim is false. Claimant married soldier subsequent to passage of act of June 27, 1890. Marriage certificate altered to make date of marriage appear as March 21, 1871, when in fact the marriage occurred March 21, 1891, and the identifying witnesses are fictitious. Charged, that the defendant committed the forgeries.

Eugenia F. Etheridge, Princess Anne Court-house, Va. Submitted for prosecution August 14, 1893, under sections 4746, 5418, 5421, and 5438, Revised Statutes, United States, in claim of Ann Brockett, widow of John, original No. 12621. Defendant filed claim for Ann Brockett, as said widow, September 17, 1892. Defendant added to affidavits of three witnesses, only one of whom was sworn. Examination shows that all the evidence in the case is worthless and affiants have no knowledge of contents of affidavits.

Mattie Mattingly, widow of John, certificate No. 376636, Louisville, Ky.: Submitted for prosecution August 15, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes, United States. February 20, 1892, defendant filed declaration, swearing that she was the legal widow of the soldier. Certified copy of marriage license shows that soldier was married to Mildred Bradley, September 11, 1877, and his marriage to claimant was barred.

Mary Jones alias Mary Scott *et al.*, all of Little Rock, Ark.: Submitted for prosecution August 5, 1893, for perjury and making false claim in case of widow's certificate No. 361412, Mary Jones alias Mary Scott, widow of Blount Scott, Company G, One hundred and thirteenth United States Colored Troops. Evidence shows that claimant was never married to the soldier, but, on December 3, 1867, was married to Sampson Jones. All parties held under bond for appearance.

Charles Priess alias Charles Price, and W. C. Mann, West Virginia: Arrested for false personation and forgery of three pension checks in the pension claim of Charles Price, certificate No. 405000. Examined before United States commissioner, and bonds for grand jury.

Julia Shannonhouse *et al.*, Norfolk, Va.: Submitted for prosecution August 5, 1893, under section 5392, Revised Statutes United States. Claim of Julia Shannonhouse, widow of Monroe Shannonhouse, Company I, Thirty-fifth United States Colored Troops, No. 410221. In declaration claimant swears she is the widow of soldier, who died March 8, 1881, and that she has not remarried; and repeated this allegation in affidavits of July 19, 1890, and August 5, 1890, supported by joint affidavit of William H. Selden and Joseph Sawyer. In fact, she was married to William H. Selden September 12, 1887.

Mariano Gonzales, Corrales, Bernalillo County, N. Mex.: Forgery in claim No. 1000081, Aliandro Martinez. Defendant confesses. Held in bond of $1,000 for the grand jury.

Dr. Charles G. Duncan, Socorro, N. Mex.: Held in bond of $3,000 for grand jury, August 16, 1893, for making and forwarding false certificate in case certificate No. 801150, of Juan José Chavez.

Ella E. Roe, or Williamson, 403 East Adams street, Syracuse, N. Y.: Submitted for prosecution August 3, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Edward J. Williamson and Ella E. Roe were married September 10, 1867, and divorced October 10, 1881. Soldier filed claim in 1883, and died in 1890. Defendant executed declaration, No. 480589, to complete invalid claim, swearing she was his widow.

John McGrew, 450273: Presented a false claim for pension. In default of bail defendant in jail at Parkersburg, W. Va.

Sam. Adkins and Lexce Belmy, Alabama: Submitted for prosecution July 31, 1893, under sections 5439 and 5392, Revised Statutes of the United States. Declaration filed March 10, 1892, signed Lexce Belmy, and executed by Sam. Adkins. Proof shows that Lexce Belmy, true name Lexer Belmer, served in Company E, One hundred and thirty-sixth United States Colored Troops, and died fifteen or twenty years ago. Falsely personated by his brother, aided by Sam. Adkins.

Harriet Harris, widow of Jesse Harris, Company L, Tenth United States Cavalry, certificate 249147, Arkansas: Submitted for prosecution July 29, 1893, for perjury and presenting false claim. Claimant pensioned from November 21, 1882, at $8, and March 19, 1886, and thereafter at $12. Evidence proves that she was married to Jack Pippin November 26, 1884, which she now confesses. Held in bond for grand jury.

Joseph and John Bailes, Putnam, W. Va.: Indicted for making false and fraudulent evidence in claim of Isabella Vaughn, mother of Stephen Vaughn, certificate 314212.

James C. Rice, Breckinridge, Mo.: Submitted for prosecution July 19, 1893, under section 5438, Revised Statutes of the United States. Certificate 5781, Mexican war, and 22805. James C. Rice and Solomon Bacon. Proof shows James C. Rice was never a Union soldier or in the Mexican war, but is falsely personating Solomon Bacon, Company C, Fifteenth United States Infantry, Mexican war, who is already in receipt of a pension.

Harry Laughlin, Athens, Ohio: Submitted for prosecution June 24, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes of the United States. Facts: Harry Laughlin, of Ohio, who was never enlisted, personated his nephew of the same name, an Illinois man, and applied for pension August 7, 1891, as Harry Laughlin, Company K, One hundred and ninety-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry. Certificate 639052.

Jennie Best, Minnesota, original No. 436126: Submitted for prosecution June 28, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes of the United States. Facts: July 10, 1890, she applied for pension as widow of Nelson Best, swearing that she had not remarried since the death of the soldier, which occurred July 14, 1876. Proof shows that she was married December 31, 1880, to R. H. Gardner, at Waterloo, Iowa.

Perlina Amsdill *et al.*: Submitted for prosecution June 17, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: In declaration, widow's certificate No. 362022, the defendant, Amsdill, swore that she was the widow of William Amsdill, the soldier; that she married him December 18, 1868; and that her former husband was dead before that time. Two witnesses swore with her that they well knew her former husband; that he died about April 14, 1868; that they saw his remains after death and attended his funeral. Proof shows the statement is false.

Amanda Lebo, now Thomas, widow of Spencer Lebo, Company C, Fifty-seventh United States Colored Troops, certificate No. 393362: Submitted for prosecution June 20, 1893, of Charles and Amanda Thomas. Evidence presented for the claimant shows that claimant and Thomas were not married until May 12, 1892; whereas the public records of Pulaski County, Ark., show that they were married May 20, 1868. Both held in bonds for grand jury.

Nancy Patterson, widow of Andrew Patterson, E, Ninety-ninth Pennsylvania Infantry, certificate 253893: Submitted for prosecution July 16, 1893, of Nancy Kinkaid, 1221 South Twenty-first street, Philadelphia, Pa., under sections 5392, 5393, 5418, and 5435, Revised Statutes United States. Pensioner died March 23, 1893. May 24, 1893, defendant, her daughter, personated her mother and, accompanied by two witnesses, presented herself at the Philadelphia agency, swore that she was the widow of her father, and received the payment due on the certificate by check drawn in her favor as the pensioner. Indicted.

Mary Tate, widow of Ben Tate, K, Fifty-seventh United States Colored Troops. Submitted for prosecution June 10, 1893: Mary Tate alias Patrick *et al.* Pensioner filed claim as widow of soldier September 11, 1888, swearing that she had not remarried since his death, July 15, 1864. Claim allowed on her testimony and that of codefendants. Each subsequent quarterly payment supported by same evidence. Proof shows she remarried July 30, 1871. Held in bond for grand jury.

Charles Lewis, Kansas City, Kans., B, Twelfth United States Colored Heavy Artillery, original invalid 1001690: Submitted for prosecution June 2, 1893, of Charles Lewis, alias Charles Smith, under sections 5438 and 5392, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Charles Lewis, of Kansas City, falsely personated Charles Lewis, of Lexington, Ky., the soldier. Held in bond for grand jury

Jackson E. McCoole, Cleveland, Conway County, Ark.: Submitted for prosecution June 1, 1893, under sections 5418 and 5421,

Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Evidence tends to show that in claim, old war, Company C, First United States Cavalry, he forged additions in favor of his claim to affidavits filed in support of it. Held in bond for grand jury.

Rebecca Kramer and R. S. Yost: Sections 5392, 5438, 5421, and 4746, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Rebecca Kramer, widow of Henry H. Kramer, widow's certificate No. 286654 (B, Forty-seventh Pennsylvania), remarried March 19, 1893. Her child Ellanora died July 29, 1892. Pensioner swore every quarter that Ellanora was living, and on May 4, 1893, swore that she had not remarried. Yost certified under seal of office that he swore Abraham Green and Edward McGrady, when in fact he did not. Rebecca Kramer held in bonds ($500) for grand jury.

Mary Long, widow of John Long G, First United States Colored Cavalry, certificate No. 277445, Norfolk, Va.: Section 5392, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Claimant filed declaration November 26, 1888, alleging that soldier died June 6, 1886, of catarrh of head contracted in service. Proof shows that his death resulted from amputation of leg, which was injured while working as a laborer on the docks at Norfolk, Va.

John Miller, Vincennes, Ind.: Section 5392, Revised Statutes, United States. Defendant filed claim January 25, 1889 (Invalid Vt., No. 613294), as of John Miller, Company E, One hundred and forty-third Indiana Infantry. Claim allowed June 13, 1891. Investigation shows that he is not the soldier, and that the true John Miller lives at Adyeville, Ind. Submitted for prosecution May 22, 1893.

Rachel Davis, Pulaski, Tenn.: Submitted for prosecution May 18, 1893; sections 5392 and 5438 Revised Statutes, United States. Defendant filed declaration as widow of Robert, alias Edmund Davis, Company G, One hundred and eleventh United States Colored Troops. Widow's certificate 195892 issued, allowing $8 per month and $2 per month for alleged minor child. Investigation shows that her husband Robert is not identical with the soldier Edmund, and that the minor child claimed for is not a child by either Robert or Edmund.

Rosetta James, widow of America James, certificate 276889, Norfolk, Va.: Sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes, United States. Proof shows that pensioner married Nixson J. Johnson, March 31, 1891. License to marry and return of record. Held under bonds.

George W. Dyer, Tacoma, Wash.: Submitted for prosecution April 27, 1893, for embezzlement of ward's funds. Defendant was the guardian of Nicholas Strike, Company A, First Minnesota Infantry, invalid certificate, No. 11347. He converted to his own use $875 of his ward's funds, substituting in final account $900 worth of worthless mining stock which he had charged to pensioner.

Jane James *et al.*, Norfolk, Va.: Submitted for prosecution on May 18, 1893, for perjury and subornation of perjury in filing false claim. Jane James is widow of Richard James, Company H, Second United States Colored Cavalry. In claim No. 418921, filed declaration July 19, 1890, alleging that she was soldier's widow, and had so remained ever since his death; which, as facts, were repeatedly sworn to by the other defendants. Investigation shows that claimant was remarried to Edmund Reddick in 1885, and is recognized by him as his wife. Held in bonds for grand jury.

Sallie A. King, 23 Maple street, Nashville, Tenn.: Submitted for prosecution May 11, 1893, under section 5421, Revised Statutes, United States. Defendant, as guardian of the minors of John Brown, Company H, Twelfth United States Colored Infantry, claim No. 372412, filed affidavits in the claim purporting to be made and signed by certain affiants before R. H. Page, justice of the peace and notary public. Investigation shows that these affidavits were all executed and signed by defendant before R. H. Page, and that she afterwards erased her signature and substituted the names of the affiants. Held for the grand jury in bonds of $1,000.

E. C. Mosely, jr., *et al.*, Little Rock, Ark.: Submitted for prosecution May 4, 1893, for perjury, subornation of perjury, and forgery, in claim widow's original No. 414985, of Martha Benton, widow of Thomas Benton, Company B, Twenty-ninth United States Colored Infantry. Facts: Soldier died July 3, 1866. Claimant remarried June 29, 1867, to James Hickey, and again January 28, 1883, to Harmon Scruggs. In her application filed February 11, 1890, she swears that she has remained the widow of soldier Thomas Benton to the present date. E. C. Mosely, jr., reiterates the fact of continued widowhood in affidavit filed November 10, 1891. Claim supported by affidavits of Ephraim and James Cooper. All affidavits prepared by E. C. Mosely, jr. All parties held in bonds for grand jury.

Lemuel C. Reeves, Burlington, N. J.: Submitted for prosecution May 3, 1893, for forgery, in presenting false claim in the case of invalid certificate No. 438851, Austin E. Vanarsdale, Compay E, First New Jersey Infantry. Facts: Pensioner died May 11, 1889. July 20, 1889, widow applied for accrued pension due soldier, and then herself died August 23, 1889. Reeves, attorney, wrote pension agent relative to fee, and was advised that widow had not been paid, and fee could not be paid until she executed her voucher and check was sent her. Defendant thereupon prepared affidavit and signed witness's name to same, forwarding it with fictitious marriage certificate, and the claim was allowed and his fee paid. Indicted June 21, 1893.

William Ward *et al.*, Norfolk, Va.: Submitted for prosecution May 2, 1893, under sections 5392, 5393, and 5418, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Hayward Tucker, Company C, Thirty-seventh United States Colored Infantry. Soldier died in service, October 21, 1865. Alameter Tucker, widow's claim No. 258624, filed January 14, 1880, but failed to complete claim and afterwards died. Minors' No. 398291, filed June 3, 1889. Mother in 1885 drew bounty and pay due at date of death of soldier. April 11, 1891, Amy Tow, No. 508802, filed as mother of soldier. Proof shows that she was induced to personate the mother of soldier by William Ward, who also induced illiterate witnesses to make affidavits in the claim.

Henry Billingsly, Isaac Haskett, and Samuel Clark: Sections 5438 and 5392, Revised Statutes United States. Facts: Henry Billingsly falsely personated Henry Wilson, Company K, First United States Colored Heavy Artillery, and surreptitiously obtained his discharge, obtaining pension certificate thereon, No. 566157. Haskett and Clark committed perjury in support of Billingsly's case. All indicted July 14, 1893. Convicted and sentenced July 17, 1893.

Ben. C. alias Samuel M. Vannover: Section 5438, Revised Statutes, United States. Defendant falsely personated his brother, Samuel M. Vannover, Company E, Two hundred and ninth Pennsylvania Infanty, invalid original No. 1118811. Defendant was never enlisted in the service of the United States. Arrested, admits guilt, and inculpates George B. and George W. Carley, who promised to aid him in his claim.

John Smith, Mayflower Plantation, Louisiana: Sections 5414 and 5435, Revised Statutes, United States. Defendant charged with receiving checks in five pension cases and fraudulently indorsing the name of the pensioner thereon and cashing the same. In default of $1,000 bond, sent to jail to await action of grand jury.

Herbert L. Miller, Brighton, Mass.: Submitted for prosecution April 25, 1893, under section 5486, Revised Statutes, United States Facts: Defendant appointed guardian of Jackson B. Baker, Company H, First Massachusetts Infantry, invalid certificate No. 10153, on May 8, 1889, and has regularly drawn the pension since that time. Pensioner an inmate of insane hospital at Worcester, kept entirely at Government expense. Defendant admits that he has used his ward's money, about $3,000, in his business.

Ellen Hyland and Dennis Ryan, Dakota Territory: Submitted for prosecution April 25, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes, United States. Claimant as widow of Robert Hyland, Company G, Seventh United States Infantry, filed declaration, original No. 517651, June 13, 1891, alleging that her husband died of injury of left side and disease of lungs. Proof shows that soldier's death was caused by lightning and that claimant and her attorney, Dennis Ryan, were acquainted with that fact.

Mary Keys Morris, widow of Henry Keys, Company G, First United States Colored Cavalry, widow's original 551925, Princess Anne Court-House., Va. Submitted for prosecution April 19, 1893, under sections 5392, 5421, and 5438, Revised Statutes, United States. Claimant filed her claim, alleging that she was the widow of soldier, who died January 10, 1880, leaving four minor children. These allegations were all witnessed by her codefendants, Mrs. E. F. Etheridge and Dr. R. C. Perkins, of the same post-office. Special examination shows that soldier died in 1885, leaving no minor children. Claimant admits guilt, and incriminates the other defendants.

Eliza Ward, Mrs. Eugenia F. Etheridge, Wilson Parsons, and John Ward, Princess Anne Court-House, Va.: Submitted for prosecution April 17, 1893, under sections 5392, 5393, 5421, and 5440, Revised Statutes, United States. Defendant Eliza Ward falsely personated Ann Waters, widow of James, Company G, First United States Colored Cavalry, No. 559967. Filed claim September 9, 1892, swearing that she married soldier in 1852 and lived with him until his death in 1865. Her affidavits were tested by the codefendants, Mrs. Ethridge preparing the whole claim. Evidence shows that Nancy Waters, widow of soldier, died in 1886. All defendants bound over for the grand jury.

Alvira Stanfield, now Wilson, Little Rock, Ark.: Submitted for prosecution April 20, 1893, under sections 5392 and 5438, Revised Statutes of the United States. Defendant filed claim July 3, 1890, widow's certificate No. 311240, as widow of Thomas Stanfield, alleging that she had not remarried since the death of her husband, Thomas Stanfield, Company K, Fifty-fourth United States Colored Troops, October 1, 1868. Examination

shows that she remarried Alexander Wilson January 19, 1873. In default of bond, defendant in penitentiary awaiting trial.

Henry Carter alias Henry Harris alias George Barrett alias Ellis Harris, 313 Washington street, Vicksburg, Miss.: Submitted for prosecution April 10, 1893, for perjury and false claim. The defendant falsely personated Allen Harris, Company K, Forty-seventh United States Colored Infantry, filing original invalid 696784. Proof shows that the soldier died October 3, 1874. Defendant confesses that he is not the soldier; never served in the Army by that name, and was never called by that name until two years ago, when W. T. Bowman, of Vicksburg, Miss., began to fix up his pension claim; that he never knew a man named Allen Harris; does not know any man in Company K, Forty-seventh United States Colored Troops, who lost an arm, and never heard of Robert Crane, a codefendant, who testified for him in the claim, until two years ago, when Mr. Bowman began to fix up his pension claim. Defendant's wife, Amanda, swears that she has lived with him from years before the war; that his name was Henry Carter at the time of the war, and she has never heard him called Allen or Ellis Harris until the last two or three years, during which he has been working for a pension.

Phœbe Compton, Richard Hanna, Terre Haute, Ind.: Submitted for prosecution April 10, 1893, for perjury. Facts: Phœbe Compton on July 21, 1886, filed her declaration (widow's certificate No. 372068) as widow of Benjamin Compton, Company F, One hundred and thirty-third Indiana Infantry, alleging that she had not remarried. On July 15, 1890, she filed declaration under the act of June 27, 1890, reiterating that statement. Certificate issued and pension was paid. Special examination shows that she was married to one John Reed, at Cincinnati, Ohio, six or seven years after the death of the soldier, more than fifteen years ago. Also, proof shows that she was advised and counseled by Richard Hanna, a codefendant.

John Morganson, Siloam Springs, Ark.: Forgery in his pension claim, original invalid No. 379520, as of Company K, Fifty-second Indiana Volunteer Infantry. Indicted May 13, 1893. Convicted June 5, 1 93, and sentenced.

Mary C. Ostrander, Barnstable County, Mass.: Forgery in her claim as widow, Navy certificate 6841, of Archilaus H. Ostrander, United States Navy. Confession of guilt, conviction and sentence, in April, 1893.

William H. Markham, W. C. Markham: Submitted for prosecution March 25, 1893, for perjury. William H. Markham, as claimant, invalid original, No. 476301, as of Company E, Fifty-second Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, in declaration alleged the loss of a finger by accidental pistol wound in August, 1864. His son, the codefendant, by affidavit corroborated that statement. Proof shows that he lost the finger at Evansville, Ind., in a sawmill, about 1881.

Leonard T. Eastman, guardian of Alfred P. Eastman, Company G, Twentieth Michigan Infantry, insane, invalid certificate, No. 111343, Scott City, Kans.: Submitted for prosecution March 21, 1893, for embezzlement. Proof shows that the guardian embezzled about $3,000 of the soldier's money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] said about the frauds at Baltimore.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me another question before he leaves that branch of the subject?

Mr. ENLOE. I am not going to leave that branch now.

Mr. PICKLER. I would be glad to ask my question now, if the gentleman will permit. I understood the gentleman, in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS], to say he was in favor of sending out these special agents and examiners through the country and reëxamine every case that is on the pension rolls.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, the gentleman did not understand me correctly. I did not say that.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the gentleman's position? What cases ought to be examined?

Mr. ENLOE. All cases where the office has reason to believe there is fraud.

Mr. PICKLER. What kind of reason?

Mr. ENLOE. Charges.

Mr. PICKLER. Charges by whom?

Mr. ENLOE. On information.

Mr. PICKLER. A letter from somebody?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. Simply on a letter?

Mr. ENLOE. A letter, or a statement of a member of Congress, saying, "I know a man who is drawing a pension who is not entitled to it, and I want an examiner to investigate it."

Mr. PICKLER. It has always been the rule to do that.

Mr. ENLOE. If you would do your duty in that respect, I have no doubt you would occasionally find a case of fraud in your own district.

Mr. PICKLER. That has always been done, under every Administration.

Mr. ENLOE. Why, then, are you cutting up about it?

Mr. PICKLER. What is the necessity for this extra force?

Mr. ENLOE. Because of the extra number of frauds that Commissioner Raum and your party put on the pension rolls.

Mr. PICKLER. Is it not a fact that you want to go into every neighborhood, and try to run down some poor old soldier and take his pension away from him?

Mr. ENLOE. No honest man is afraid of an officer who is hunting for a thief.

Mr. PICKLER. Honest men's pensions are being suspended, and that is not fair.

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman wait a moment? The statement has been made here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], that this Bureau started out by suspending these cases, but that they afterwards restored the men who had been improperly suspended. They charge the Bureau with doing wrong in suspending certain pensioners, and then they are sorely aggrieved because those men were restored by the Secretary's order. They regret very much to see a Democrat do right. It is a spectacle which to the Republican eye, I suppose, is somewhat refreshing, because it is not often they can see any right in the action of a Democratic official.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, if the gentleman will allow me, I believe the gentleman made a reference to myself?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes; I did.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman does not want to misrepresent me?

Mr. ENLOE. Certainly not.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I said that by virtue of the public indignation there were 9,000 pensioners restored who had been wrongfully suspended, and that there ought to have been ,000 more, in my judgment, restored who were not restored.

Mr. ENLOE. I suppose the gentleman will give credit to the Commissioner of Pensions for the intention to discharge his duty in that regard. Whether that was a concession to public clamor or not I am not here to say. So far as I am concerned, if I had been the Commissioner of Pensions, and I had issued an order to suspend these cases, and I had believed that they were on the rolls in violation of law, they would have been suspended to-day, and until every one of them had been investigated, unless my superior, the Secretary, had intervened.

Mr. PICKLER. No doubt you would suspend all of them.

Mr. ENLOE. I have no objection to the gentleman indulging in side remarks. I will not be diverted by them. I would do what I believed to be my duty, and I believe that the Commissioner of Pensions has done the same. I believe he is an honest man, and I believe he is a fearless man. I believe he is making an honest Commissioner of Pensions. I do not agree with him about everything. He did not do a great deal that I have wanted done. There are a lot of men in that office whom I would turn out if I had the power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I will address myself to the Baltimore cases, to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] referred.

BALTIMORE FRAUDS.

For several years periodical complaints have reached the Bureau touching irregularities and frauds in connection with pension claims in Baltimore. From time to time attempts have been made to reach the core of the evils, but the adverse combinations have been so powerful as to often defeat the aims of justice. Over 7,000 pensioners are actually or nominally residents of Baltimore. Gradually the business of executing vouchers and cashing checks has passed into the hands of attorneys in that city, who have often likewise been the sole custodians of the certificates of the pensioners. Thousands of vouchers executed in the offices or bureaus of certain attorneys found their way to the pension agent, giving as the address to which checks should be sent the office number of some particular attorney. Over 2,000, for instance, were so addressed for the last quarterly payment to the office of a single attorney in Baltimore. When the checks are sent from the agency, although the post-office regulations forbid the delivery of a pension agent's letter to any person other than the pensioner, or a member of his family duly authorized, yet they have been customarily delivered to the attorneys in question.

These checks are deposited in bank to the private account of the attorneys, and they check out the sums necessary to pay the pensioners, reserving for themselves such advances as are alleged to be due them, plus a charge for executing the vouchers, and for cashing a check drawn on the United States assistant treasurer. Quite recently it was resolved to refuse delivery to the address of attorneys, and require the pensioners to apply in person for their mail, identifying themselves properly, or else to supply

their bona fide address as householders or residents. So radical a step as this invited the indignation of the interested attorneys, who besought the Postmaster-General to direct the delivery of the pension mail to them as addressed. Small wonder that such anxiety existed, when it is understood that a single one of these attorneys derives a yearly income of nearly $1,000 from the mere execution of pension vouchers and cashing of pension checks. But the Postmaster-General enforced the law, and the post-office authorities at Baltimore conformed thereto. The result was that for several days the pensioners were obliged to identify themselves at the general delivery, and receive their checks in person, as it was competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the law, to direct that they should do, whenever in his opinion their interests demanded it.

Now, I will not go further with that except to say that so far as this part of the work about which the gentleman complains is concerned it was intended for the protection of the pensioners in Baltimore against the imposition of pension attorneys who held their checks, who received their money and who gave them out of it what they saw proper to give. From the investigation that has already been made by the Department it has been shown that there are people there drawing pensions who do not know the amount of pension they receive and do not see their pension certificates once in a year, and some have never seen them.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. You mean their pension checks?

Mr. ENLOE. No; their pension certificates. The check is delivered to the attorney, and the attorney cashes it and charges them for cashing it, and then pays them whatever he sees proper out of it.

The regulations established under sanction of law, require that the pensioners shall produce their certificates when they execute their vouchers. Yet this experience at Baltimore showed that the rule was wholly disregarded.

The safeguard intended to protect against imposition was thus broken down; and there was no adequate means of showing that the pensioners were alive, or that they had actually executed their vouchers at all.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Are we to understand that these pension checks, the checks by which the pensions are paid, are not drawn to the order of the pensioners?

Mr. ENLOE. They are drawn to the order of the pensioners, but an attorney, acting under their authority, has been regularly receiving these checks, depositing them in bank to his credit and collecting the amount, and then requiring these pensioners to stand at the front of his office until after nightfall to receive the pittance which he gave them out of their pensions.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. In the information you have, out of which you are reading, is there any assertion that any one of these pension checks has ever been indorsed by power of attorney?

Mr. ENLOE. I have no information upon that. I suppose they show upon the checks that they are properly indorsed.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Is there any intimation that any one of these checks was cashed fraudulently?

Mr. ENLOE. It can not be cashed fraudulently. It is a check of the Government. If properly indorsed there can not be any fraud in cashing. There may have been fraud in the indorsement.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Has not the pensioner the right to indorse his check?

Mr. ENLOE. I have not time to go into every detail on this subject to furnish the gentleman all the information he seeks. I am only giving the line of investigation in Baltimore, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will you take the page and the charges that you are reading from——

Mr. ENLOE. You wait until I get through and probably you will have intelligence to comprehend.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I doubt it very much.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, I do, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. So far as that is concerned, have you announced one solitary thing that is illegal?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes; it is not legal to take a pension certificate in pledge for the payment of a debt or a loan.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. You have not any proof that that has been done.

Mr. ENLOE. How do you know that?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. At least you have not delivered it up to date.

Mr. ENLOE. I say that the Pension Office has abundant proof, and if the gentleman wants it he can get it there.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I do not think the Pension Office has it.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit a question?

Mr. ENLOE. I will.

Mr. LACEY. Inasmuch as this matter that he is examining is quite voluminous, will he inform us whether, when it is all examined, it shows any fraud on the part of the pensioners themselves or whether the whole matter does not turn finally upon frauds against pensioners?

Mr. ENLOE. I want to tell the gentleman that because I gratify his desire for information to some extent, I am not going to follow it up *ad infinitum*. Here is one instance, the case of a woman 30 years of age, who presented herself to receive a pension as the dependent mother of a soldier who died in 1862, and, as it appeared, she had executed the vouchers for some years on the representation that the true pensioner, her mother, had been bedridden during all that time. Now, this shows how it would be possible under such a system to divert the pension money from the proper pensioner, and how persons not identified for the purpose of receiving letters or of receiving a check could have been put on the pension rolls fraudulently and could have drawn such pensions indefinitely.

Mr. LACEY. Does that report disclose the name of that party?

Mr. ENLOE. It is not disclosed here, but you can get it at the Pension Office.

Now, there has been some talk about the frauds at Norfolk, Va., and I want to give the House a little outline of the work that has been done there.

NORFOLK FRAUDS.

For several years periodical complaints of violation of the pension laws at Norfolk, Va., have come to the Bureau.

On May 5, 1893, a commission of six examiners was sent to that city to make investigation in the cases that required it.

It was found that one W. R. Drury, a pension attorney, had been in the habit of imposing false testimony as well as false declarations on the Bureau, and mulcting pensioners out of large sums of money for alleged service rendered in prosecuting claims. In fact, it appears that out of the proceeds of this business Mr. Drury had purchased a truck farm and built three dwelling houses. Investigation developed the fact that the declarations filed by him were void in many cases. The witnesses were mythical, the seal was illegally used, the jurats were false, and in not a few instances the nominal claimants knew nothing of the existence of their applications. As a result of the work, the commission recommended that two hundred names be dropped from the rolls for invalidity of the declarations, and advised prosecution in more than thirty cases.

A considerable number of indictments have resulted against Drury, and as he was abetted in his schemes by one B. A. Richardson, jr., indictments have likewise followed against him for conspiracy and the making of false certificates. Nor did the work of the commission end here, for other prosecutions followed, directed against the various local attorneys and subagents, and in various cases against claimants and witnesses. Persons standing high in social circles have been found to have instigated frauds of the most audacious nature. I will not give their names, because indictments against them are triable at the approaching term of court at Norfolk. Any Representative who is curious enough to inquire can, if authorized to do so, obtain the fullest details respecting these frauds from the dockets of the Pension Bureau.

Norfolk seems to have been a perfect hotbed for maturing all imaginable schemes to outwit the United States; and the vigorous action on the part of the Bureau has had a most salutary effect in that community.

Examination shows that in 167 cases recommended to be dropped from the roll by the commission, there was paid to the pensioners, under the act of June 27, 1890, the sum of $54,074.43. The future payments, likely to accrue on these certificates, calculated from life-insurance tables of probable expectancy of life, amount to $343,260.39. Including all admitted cases in which Drury figured in any capacity, the commission estimates that the Government has paid out $150,000; that pending claims rejected, in which the declarations are fraudulent and invalid, will save the Government at least another $100,000: and that the entire future expectancy of all cases handled by Drury amounts to, say, $650,000.

The supervising examiner having this work in charge in his report says:

After five weeks' work in Norfolk, I am convinced that the country is honeycombed with fraud, in which the methods of Drury and Richardson are copied by almost every notary and attorney having anything to do with pension papers.

This state of facts was known to exist at Norfolk during the last Administration, but the eyes and ears of justice in the Pension Bureau were closed, though the hand of authority seems to have been always open palm upward. Hence all this squirming under exposures of fraud, corruption, and perjury. Hence all this labored effort to belittle the work of the Bureau. Hence all this masquerading as the friend of the soldier.

(NOTE.—Since the delivery of these remarks Eugenia F. Ethridge, white, has pleaded guilty in the Federal court at Norfolk, Va., to seventeen indictments for pension frauds, and Ella Ethridge, colored, has been convicted of perjury in pension cases.)

Mr. Chairman, I will state right here, lest I should forget it, that there never was a more iniquitous piece of legislation enacted than the act of July 1, 1890, which authorized declarations to be made in pension cases before justices of the peace and notaries public. That legislation opened the door wide to fraud, and it has resulted in more fraud than any other single act that has been passed by Congress.

The influence of that legislation will be found running through these cases wherever fraud has existed all over the country. It will be found that in many cases the witnesses have never appeared before the men who have attached their jurats; that the witnesses have never seen the justice of the peace or the notary public; that men's affidavits and declarations have been filed which were made out in batches of twenty and thirty at a time, and in the absence of the witnesses certified by the justices and notaries. When the regular pension appropriation bill comes up I hope to get that law repealed.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Have you found anybody who justifies any such conduct as that?

Mr. ENLOE. I have not found anyone who attempts to justify it by direct methods, but I have found gentlemen here throwing rocks at those who are exposing these fraudulent practices.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. No; not such practices as those.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, what sort of frauds would you defend? What objection have you to the special examiners going into the field in the line of their duty? The law presumes that every officer does his duty until the contrary is proven.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Do you want me to answer?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes; next week; not now. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the New Mexico cases. There has been much fraud practiced there, and I want to give some idea of the character and extent of it.

NEW MEXICO FRAUDS.

In the Territory of New Mexico an anomalous condition of things was found to exist. The military and medical history supplied by the War Department developed the fact that in a very large percentage of claims from that Territory the soldier's descriptive list varies from the description in the certificate of medical examination. In some instances a difference of eight inches exists in the height of the person. Difference of age likewise was found, sometimes being as much as fifteen years between the man examined and the man described by the War Department. In this way the question of identity, going to the very substance of the claims, necessarily was raised.

Moreover, the military and medical histories received from the War Department show, in over 12 per cent of the claims filed from that Territory, complications of venereal diseases. These represent only a part of those who have a record of treatment. The majority have no record of treatment for any cause. A large number of claims under the act of June 27, 1890, are based upon disabilities which present in their pathological suggestions a diathesis based on specific diseases.

In illustration of the methods resorted to in presenting these claims to the Bureau, it may be remarked that P. A. Marcellino, of Socorro, N. Mex., acted as subagent in over 200 claims. In all of these cases the claimant's post-office was given as box "K," Socorro, N. Mex.; which box was rented by Marcellino. By this means he obtained possession of all correspondence relating to the claims. Not only did he forge evidence in support of these claims but when the checks and vouchers came to his possession through the use of box "K," he forged the signatures and indorsements of the pensioners, and obtained and converted to his own use the proceeds of such checks. This practice likewise extended to bounty claims. He himself has pleaded guilty on twenty-seven counts charging him with various offenses connected with these claims, and is now undergoing penal servitude therefor on a seven-years sentence.

In the face of such facts, and in the light of the damaging evidence against him, it is a serious question as to how far other claims that have passed through his hands are tainted by fraud.

Marcellino is not the only attorney who has drawn large quantities of mail to his hired box. Not less than ten other attorneys have pursued the same practice. Remembering the transactions of Marcellino, through the use of box "K," the necessity is apparent for a careful examination to determine whether the box address in these instances has been used as a cover for improper practices.

To show the reckless manner in which claims have been prosecuted in New Mexico, it may be noted that out of 214 claims filed by Marcellino 10 of the claimants are deserters, 44 are not on the rolls at all, 8 had no service, 1 was cashiered, 1 reported killed in action, and 2 were never discharged, making 66 in all. Of 148 soldiers (whose claims were filed by him) found on the rolls, only 21 have record of treatment in service for any cause; and of these 43 per cent were treated for venereal diseases.

Moreover, it is shown by competent proof that certain postmasters in New Mexico, not a few in number, have acted as agents for these claims, in violation of law, and have the greatest interest in the allowance of the claims. Even the examining surgeons appointed as the trusted officers of the Government have been drawn into the scheme for pushing claims at all hazards against the United States. One such examining surgeon has been found to be the subagent of a Washington attorney. In regard to the examinations made by another examining surgeon, the high ratings uniformly recommended by him and his failure to notice in his certificates the contributory agency of venereal disease, though a large number of applicants examined by him have a record for the same, is well calculated to cast grave doubt upon all work by him in connection with these claims and to render it unsafe for the Pension Bureau to continue the adjudication of claims on his certificates.

Another examining surgeon in New Mexico is to-day under a bond of $3,000, for the approaching term of United States court, for prosecuting pension claims in violation of law, and upon charges of making false certificates for the guidance of the Bureau in adjudications. For instance, acting with Marcellino, he would at some time examine persons who desired a pension, yet could not aver any particular disability. For a moneyed consideration this examining surgeon would make an examination and formulate a certificate setting up certain disabilities as the basis for a claim. Such claim being then filed, when the Bureau, in ignorance of the design, directed an examination of the man to determine whether he really suffered from the disabilities claimed, and whether they were due to vicious habits, instead of conducting said examination in good faith, he simply made a duplicate of his sometime voluntary examination, and, giving it a date to correspond with the order from the Bureau, sent it forward to be relied upon in settling a claim for pension.

These combined facts led the Bureau to organize a commission to proceed to New Mexico for the purpose of testing the claims filed, so that the work of adjudication might safely proceed and the agents of crime be exposed and punished. So widespread and deep were the vices attached to the claims from New Mexico that the Government could not rely upon any evidence supplied. Accordingly, over 1,600 claims were submitted to the commission for thorough investigation. The commission included a picked and trained force of special examiners, six in number, specially equipped for intelligent, thorough, and impartial investigation. And because upon sufficient evidence it was shown that the Bureau could not rely upon those who had been trusted as its examining surgeons, there was added to the commission a special medical board, selected from the skilled physicians connected with the medical referee's office of the Bureau itself, and who were acquainted with the Spanish language. The work of this commission has demonstrated the wisdom of its formation. A very large percentage of the claims examined are such as must be rejected for invalidity of the instruments of evidence or upon the question of general merits. In others, no pensionable degree of disability is found to exist; and in yet others, want of honorable discharge or vicious habits; and the work of the commission is not yet ended.

It is not deemed expedient to state by name who are the offending postmasters, surgeons, and attorneys, inasmuch as proceedings in the court of the United States, begun or contemplated, might be embarrassed thereby. But the evidence is in the knowledge of the Bureau and can and will speak for itself.

It will be of the greatest interest, in this connection, to note some of the advantages to the United States resulting from the work of this commission from a pecuniary standpoint, as serving to illustrate the necessity for ample appropriations to maintain an efficient corps of traveling examiners for the better information of the Bureau in adjudicating claims for pension. Between July 10, 1893, when the commission began its work, to the 31st of August, 1893, the special examiners engaged took 1,250 depositions, and rendered reports in 231 claims, at a total cost of $2,298, being an average cost of $9.94 for each report. The medical examiners, during the same period, made 263 physical

examinations of pensioners and applicants, at an expense of $674.65, an average cost for each physical examination of $2.37. It costs the Government ordinarily $6 for the first five examinations made by a board, and $3 for each above five, not more than twenty, examinations to be made daily. At this rate it would have cost the Government $1,518, or thereabouts, to make the 263 examinations in the usual way, showing a saving of $843.35.

In addition to this, the amount of future payments saved to the United States is worthy of attention, which, on the basis of the American table of mortality, will mount up to the large sum of $113,996.

By a report from the commission, of recent date, the results of their work thus far may be summed up as follows:

TABLE A.

Original cases:	
Admission	27
Rejection on legal grounds	104
Rejection on medical grounds	27
Certificate cases:	
Continuance and resumption of payment	43
Reduction	1
Dropping on legal grounds	6
Dropping on medical grounds	12
Miscellaneous, criminal, and preliminary reports	11
Total	231

TABLE B.

	No. of cases.	Estimated saving to United States.
Rejection for invalidity of declaration	39	$68,518
Rejection on ground of no disability, the former medical examination stating that the applicant was disabled in a ratable degree	9	16,848
Dropping from rolls on ground that pensioner is not disabled	12	20,124
Reduction, the disability not being as great as reported by the examining surgeon	1	1,044
Disability not due to service, act of July 14, 1862, claim	1	1,592
Applicant not in United States service—sent a substitute	1	1,968
Nondependence of widow	1	1,792
Widow remarried prior to filing, act of June 27, 1890, claim	1	274
No title—dependent father's claim, the mother surviving	1	624
No title—dependent mother's claim, widow surviving	1	1,212
Total	67	113,996

These figures and facts speak for themselves, and need no comment.

The Commissioner of Pensions, in his statement to the Committee on Appropriations, says:

The amount of actual saving in these 231 cases is included in the statement of total savings: $1,130,259.06.

The amount of future saving to the United States is worthy of attention, and a computation, based on the American tables of mortality, in 67 of these cases, indicates a future saving to the Government of $113,995.

The number of cases reported to date is 656 (nearly ten times the number on which the above estimate is based), and for that number the amount of future savings should reach $1,139,950. To this amount should also be added the amount of actual savings included in statement of actual savings from May to December 1, 1893.

It should be remembered, too, that there are 1,448 claims of this character still pending investigation.

INDIAN TERRITORY FRAUDS.

But I will add a little more to the history of fraud. Even the semicivilized Indian out in the Indian Territory has found out that Uncle Sam has a highway that leads to the Treasury through the Pension Bureau, and he is trying to imitate his white brother; and in this instance, it appears, with very fair success.

It appears that one Thomas Bear, of Fort Gibson, Ind T., succeeded in securing appointment as subagent for a firm of Washington attorneys, and in that capacity he has sent to them about 200 pension claims. Being a Creek Indian himself, he was unable to speak the Cherokee language, and in his business with the Cherokees used an interpreter. In drawing up claims for pension he says he fixed the dates of marriages, births, and deaths from information derived from the parties applying, but admits that where they were unable to tell anything definite about it he fixed the dates the best he could, although he knew nothing personally as to the facts. He admits that he fixed such dates often in declarations and affidavits, because he knew the papers must show dates or no pension would be allowed; and it was not his intention to file claims for people who would get nothing. It seems that two certain persons were usually present when he drew up papers for pension claimants, and they generally acted as identifying witnesses. However, he wrote their names and made their cross-marks to the papers and did not ask them to touch the pen; and he is unable to say whether they knew all the people to whose papers their marks appear. He admits that these two men are to receive something for their services.

After "completing his work," as he calls it, he took the papers to the clerk of a certain court, when, as Bear says, the clerk would write his name to the papers and put his seal on them, not requiring claimants or witnesses to be present, and no person swore to any of the papers! All that the clerk required before applying the seal to the papers was that the claimants' and witnesses' names be written, and their cross-marks made to each paper; and if omitted in any instance, Bear says that at the direction of the clerk he would write the names and make the marks, and the seal would then be affixed. This clerk has since died. But, as appears by Bear's statement, the clerk's brother was his deputy, whose signature many of the papers bear. But none of the papers bearing his name were sworn to by claimants or witnesses! But this is not all. It appears that in the absence of the clerk, Bear would go to the clerk's office, take the seal, and apply it to the papers he prepared, and write the clerk's name to the papers, and in some cases put his name on them as witness to cross-marks of identifying witnesses whose names were written on the papers. He says he does not know how many such papers he fixed up, but "there were a good many," including also fee agreements for $25, prepared in the same manner.

And these spurious declarations and affidavits were sent by him to the Washington attorneys to be filed before this Bureau, without their knowledge, as he avers, that the papers were not genuine.

The average mind will doubtless be struck at once by the fertility of resources of this untutored child of the forest—a species of unsophistication so artful and well contrived, as to deliberately defraud the United States out of many thousands of dollars, with an unblushing effrontery that is almost Napoleonic in its daring.

This serves to illustrate some of the methods by which the United States has been defrauded and compelled to pay out large sums of money on spurious proofs. There are abundant evidences pointing to the fact that Bear's tactics have been employed by many pension attorneys throughout the United States.

The untutored child of the forest has discovered that the profession of love for the old soldier is the best possible cloak for fraud.

I want to go a little further and refer to the cases out in Iowa which have been mentioned by my friend from that State. I presume that these cases have given him some trouble and that his constituents are complaining that their pensions have been suspended. I will give a brief outline of developments out there in the investigation by the Pension Office.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to have the indulgence of the Committee of the Whole for a few minutes more.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I move that the gentleman's time be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have ten minutes more in which to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. PICKLER. Let him have time enough to finish.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

THE IOWA FRAUDS.

Mr. ENLOE. As far back as 1888 or 1889, complaints began to reach the Pension Bureau that George M. Van Leuven, jr., of Lime Springs, Iowa, was practicing irregularities in connection with the preparation and prosecution of pension claims. These complaints have multiplied from time to time until it became evident that a searching investigation was made necessary. A skilled and reliable examiner was directed to proceed with an investigation, and in June of 1893, the results of a preliminary survey were laid before the Bureau. The practices disclosed were of a most astonishing character, showing a system of action that clouded every claim that had passed through the medium of this attorney, even if it did not effectually impeach the integrity of all instruments of evidence on which claims had been prosecuted or allowed.

Mr. Van Leuven has for many years been doing a large pension business. He, perhaps, had pending when this informal investigation began upwards of a thousand cases, including claims for increase. His reputation for success and his assiduous methods of soliciting business have tended of late to largely increase his clientage. It was most natural therefore that the attempt of the Government to elicit the truth in respect of his practices and their effect upon pending or adjudicated claims should create much comment. The general understanding of the public being confined to a proceeding against him for violation of a Federal statute regulating fees in pension claims, it was thought in certain quarters that the strong efforts on behalf of the Pension Bureau to elicit facts were an invasion of a citizen's constitutional rights, and some of Mr. Van Leuven's friends denounced

such efforts as highhanded outrages, and threats of damage suits were freely indulged in by him and his adherents.

It was not consistent with public policy nor the interests of justice to unveil immaturely to the public eye the real facts revealed in the progress of a most conscientious and painstaking investigation. But that they were of a most alarming character will be appreciable to anyone who reflects upon them.

In view of the fact that this investigation is yet progressing, and that the fruits thereof will be likely to receive consideration before the United States grand jury, shortly to convene, it would be manifestly injudicious to expose now the proofs of turpitude that the Government is in possession of. Yet it can work no injury to state in a general way that it has been developed in proof that a deep-laid and systematic conspiracy has been unearthed, the effect of which is to show that if the United States has not been betrayed by those upon whom it was bound to rely, it has not been for want of deliberate intent on their part to that end. It was a part of Van Leuven's plan, and necessary to his success, that he should control certain important boards of examining surgeons in the region in which he operated. This he did by skill and artifice, through the secretaries of such boards, obtaining at last such ascendancy that he not only was able to prepare the way for such examinations and ratings as he desired, but even causing the original certificates of the examining boards to be submitted to him at his office before the same were transmitted, as they should have been, to the Pension Bureau, by the secretaries of boards.

Not only was this a palpable violation of the regulations controlling examining boards, but it accomplished two results that were vicious and illegal. It enabled Mr. Van Leuven to take copies of the certificates, which he preserved in his private files, thereby unauthorizedly possessing himself of the confidential information of the Bureau; and, worse still, by means of this knowledge it enabled Van Leuven to suggest such changes as he desired made in the certificates themselves, which changes were effected, not through the disclosures of the medical examinations, but solely upon the direction or suggestion of Mr. Van Leuven. No reflecting mind can fail to discover the peril and vice of such a system, whereby the fountains of reliable information were poisoned at their very source, causing the Government to expend large sums of money not upon the findings of fact, but upon the unauthorized desire of a claims attorney, formulated through the medium of officers who were sworn to a faithful discharge of a high public duty, and who were receiving pay from the United States for the very service by means of which the Government was misled and deceived.

Claimants were induced to ask for orders to appear before these very boards, in almost every instance, and were advised and required to pay over sums of money, amounting in some cases to as much as $50, upon the understanding that it was for the boards, in consideration of special benefits to be expected. It is painful to read the confessions of men who were, step by step, drawn into the power of Van Leuven, until they were wholly at his mercy. And it is not surprising that one of them wept bitter tears as he sketched the progressive steps by which he was bound in the toils. Claimants were notified as to what and how they should answer the interrogatories of the agents sent to investigate their claims, and these advices were based upon and made to conform to the matter contained in the certificates that lay in the private archives of Mr. Van Leuven.

It is not proper to expose the proofs on which these statements rest. But they will pass into the treasury of public knowledge through the annals of the courts; and the public will stand aghast at the magnitude of a system that was specially devised to pillage the public Treasury; a system rendered all the more dangerous and deadly because of the high social standing of the agents through whom such purpose was effected; the far-reaching effect of which has made it unsafe to adjudicate any of the many claims passing through these instrumentalities, without a searching investigation in every instance and a careful test of such as have already been admitted and passed to payment.

The illustrations found in these wholesale conspiracies are not alone.

Every species of crime known to the pension laws has been employed in the frantic scramble for pension payments. The individual cases are perhaps not less fruitful of suggestion than the wider spread conspiracies. They embrace false personation, perjury, forgery, and all of the offenses on the statute books.

The Van Leuven cases in Iowa are the cases of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] complains because they have been suspended. I maintain that the facts as developed by the Pension Office show that every one of these cases which passes through the hands of that attorney and through the hands of those boards is tainted with a suspicion of fraud, and that they ought to be investigated before any more money is paid on them.

THE FAMOUS NEWBY, ALIAS DAN BENTON, CASE.

There is another celebrated case to which reference has been made; that is, the Newby, alias Dan Benton, case. This case arose out in Illinois, at the town of Carmi, I believe. A man by the name of William Newby volunteered from that town, went into the army, and fell in battle at Shiloh on the 6th of April, 1862. His wife had been drawing a pension for thirty years. An ex-convict from the State of Tennessee, named Dan Benton, went over to the town of Carmi, from which his family originally came. He had been raised there and was familiar with all the surroundings. He knew enough about everybody in that neighborhood to be able to claim that he was the soldier Newby, who had been for thirty years dead.

Although he was twenty years younger than Newby, he went into that community and presented himself as the long-lost soldier. Newby had been identified by his comrades when he fell on the battlefield and was buried at Shiloh. Newby had blue eyes, Benton did not. But this fraud from the penitentiary went into that community and was so successful in his fraudulent personation that some of the people actually formed a Newby organization and raised money to defend the man when he was tried in court for attempting to perpetrate a fraud on the Government by applying for a pension under the name of William Newby. He claimed for injury to the head and resulting insanity, and if successful would have received about $20,000 in arrearages.

Mr. FUNK. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows how many witnesses testified in that trial that this man was really Newby? Does he know that Newby's own mother, his wife, and two brothers so testified, in addition to many other witnesses?

Mr. ENLOE. I will answer the question.

Mr. COX. If my colleague will yield for me a moment, I would like to answer this question. I wish to say that I was in the court-house in my town when this man, who made application for this pension, was convicted of horse-stealing.

Mr. FUNK. You suppose him to be the same man.

Mr. COX. I knew the man.

Mr. FUNK. But 150 other persons say that he is not the man you say he is.

Mr. COX. He lived not 2 miles away from me.

Mr. FUNK. But I cite the testimony of numerous witnesses who were brought up in the same neighborhood.

Mr. COX. I do not know what those people may have testified; but I saw him convicted of horse-stealing; and I knew the man, because he lived within 2 miles of my residence.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very peculiar case. It is a very celebrated case. It will go down in the pension history of this country as the Tichborne case has gone in English history; for this man is a greater fraud than was the Tichborne claimant.

Mr. FUNK. Well, it is pending in the Supreme Court is it not?

Mr. ENLOE. It is pending in the Supreme Court, but a jury of honest citizens in the town of Carmi decided that he was a fraud, notwithstanding; and I assume that the jury acted honestly on the facts presented to them.

Mr. FUNK. Has the gentleman ever heard of any other such cases where juries have decided, and on an appeal the Supreme Court has reversed them?

Mr. ENLOE. That is not the question here.

Now, further, Mr. Chairman, there were sixty witnesses for the Government who testified in this case. There was in the neighborhood of $20,000 dependent on the verdict of the jury. I would rather trust to the verdict of twelve honest men, four of them I understand being Grand Army men—I say I would rather trust to their verdict to dispose of a case of that kind than a self-constituted organization which seems to have been gotten up to swear Newby's case through.

Mr. FUNK. I suppose that was an "organization of fraud," his mother, brothers, and his near neighbors? That was a fraudulent organization, was it?

Mr. ENLOE. His brother and sister testified that it was not Newby. And it was shown that Dan Benton was a complete fraud——

Mr. FUNK. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. ENLOE. Oh, yes.

Mr. FUNK. I want to say to the gentleman that I am personally acquainted with ten different men, that I consider as reputable as any gentlemen holding seats in this Hall, who claim that they have known this man from childhood and swore positively on the stand that it was Newby. They are, I say, as reputable as any gentleman who occupies a seat on this floor. Yet the gentleman comes here and says that it is an "organized fraud" on the part of the old soldiers to rush the case through.

Mr. ENLOE. I never said that. I did not say the old soldiers had gone into an organized fraud; though some may have done it.

Mr. FUNK. Well, you endeavored to convey that impression.

Mr. ENLOE. No, sir. If the gentleman will get out of my time now I will proceed. I did not say that old soldiers had gone into the fraud.

Mr. FUNK. You intimated as much.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, you were not in it, I suppose?

Mr. FUNK. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. ENLOE. Very well; just let me proceed now.

I say that the Government brought sixty witnesses and proved this man's career. They traced Dan Benton for twenty years through the penitentiaries and poorhouses where he was known as "Rickety Dan" down in Tennessee. He had a family in Tennessee and they were all Rickety Dans. This man Newby had a family and there were no Rickety Dans in his family. All of these facts were proved by reputable witnesses on the stand. The old soldiers and comrades of William Newby who buried him at Shiloh were witnesses for the Government.

Mr. FUNK. So you say; but notwithstanding that fact there is another side to the question.

Mr. ENLOE. In answer to the gentleman's excitable wrath I will just refer him to the decision of the jury, and if he sees fit to do so let him impeach the verdict of a jury of his own State.

Mr. WISE. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. ENLOE. Certainly.

Mr. WISE. I would like to state in reference to this Newby case that I read the statement of the surgeon of his regiment, who said that he was with him when he died and saw him die, the real Newby. He saw him when he was wounded and saw him when he died.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all there is in this case. The fact is plain that it is a stupendous fraud. I intend to address myself to a criticism at this point if I can have the attention of the House for a few moments. Criticism has been made of the Pension Bureau because it spends so much money investigating cases of that kind. Here is a case with 200 witnesses in it, a case involving $20,000, and if it had not been investigated, notwithstanding the expense involved, this "Rickety Dan" from the penitentiary of Tennessee would have mulcted the public Treasury to the extent of $20,000, and he would have been living in luxury in Carmi to-day, dishonoring a dead soldier and disgracing his name.

I say it was right to expend the money, and we want to furnish enough of it to continue just such investigations to their legitimate results. It is an isolated case, we may be told. But I could stand up here and bring to light from the records of the Pension Office case after case, day after day, until gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber would cry out "Hold, enough."

Mr. FUNK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. ENLOE. I have only a minute.

Mr. FUNK. It will not take a minute to make the inquiry and it can be answered yes or no.

Mr. ENLOE. Very well; be brief.

Mr. FUNK. Have you never known any similar case to the Dan Newby case, where there was mistaken identity?

Mr. ENLOE. I have known of a great many cases of false personation, and that is what this is.

Mr. FUNK. Do not you know that there have been three or four similar cases to this that have been brought to the attention of the courts and the public?

Mr. ENLOE. There have been a number of cases tried for false personation. This is not the first one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be indulged a moment longer—my time has been taken up—I am aware of the fact that this business of false personation, this business of loaning out official seals to be attached to affidavits of witnesses, this business of taking affidavits of witnesses by the wholesale, and carrying affidavits to a notary public who has never seen the witnesses and who could not identify them, is being carried on all over this country, or it was being done under the former Administration.

I investigated some of those pension attorneys. There was one out at Topeka, Kans., who filled that country with fraud, and yet he could not be disbarred under the former Administration. There was one at Buffalo, N. Y., William Bowen Moore, having a similar record, and if that man does not land in the penitentiary it will be because he does not get his deserts.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the gentleman referring to the Kansas case?

Mr. ENLOE. No; the name of the Kansas man was Legg. He was at Topeka. His record was steeped in fraud. This man at Buffalo is William Bowen Moore, who was indicted under the former Administration, and his case was to be tried before the Federal court, but the former Commissioner of Pensions not only refused to disbar him, but instructed the special examiner to dismiss the case against him. I hope he will now have a chance to face an honest jury of his countrymen.

There is another species of fraud, all too common in practice. Congress, with a view to protecting both the Government and the pensioner from fraudulent design, enacted on April 18, 1884, a law to punish whosoever, falsely assuming to be an officer of the Government, shall extort thereby any money or other thing of value.

The class of adventurers who fatten upon the credulity of expectant pensioners is very large, and the Pension Bureau has fastened the proofs of guilt on many of this ilk.

Only a few days ago the arrest of one Charles Tarr alias Dr. Charles H. Woods was effected for violation of this act. Passing through the western counties of Pennsylvania as an itinerant physician, he represented that he was especially commissioned by the Pension Bureau, at an annual salary of $1,800 and his expenses paid, to examine claimants for increase of pension with a view to putting them upon the "sick list" of the Bureau, after which they would receive a liberal allowance for their support during the balance of their lives. In every case he exacted the payment of a sum of money for what he called a "docket fee."

These men are adventurers of the most unscrupulous class. In one such case the offender, when taken, had just concluded a most powerful sermon at a camp-meeting; and when arrested resisted, and drawing a pistol seriously wounded the marshal who served the process. As their efforts are bent almost wholly to the injury of pensioners or claimants for pension, the Bureau has at all times lent the effective help of its trained examiners to detect and punish these human leeches, who set the law at naught.

There is no need to multiply further instances to show that the frauds with which the Bureau is concerned are neither technical nor constructive, but actual and flagrant. The best evidence on that point is the evidence which the trial dockets of the courts of the United States afford.

Between April 1 and December 16 of the present year, the proceedings taken at the instigation of the Pension Bureau show as a result 137 arrests, 197 indictments, and 105 convictions.

This furnishes data of the most convincing kind to show that this Administration is attacking fraud in its stronghold; and that the Bureau of Pensions is a most efficient agent to that end.

Instead of meriting rebuke and cavil and censure, it should enlist the hearty sympathy of every patriot, and especially of those who respect the rights of the deserving soldier. Instead of hampering the operations of such a Bureau, they should be enlarged and greater facilities afforded to put into effective force the laws that so severely punish those who seek to debauch justice and ruthlessly plunder the public Treasury by means of corruption and fraud.

The remedy is simple and plain. Give larger appropriations to aid the Bureau in its operations. Already the operations of its agents avail to save the country, in five months' time, almost a million dollars, in round numbers. With enlarged appropriations and greater force we may safely look for such a saving of the public money as will give lasting credit to the promise of this Administration to reform abuses and administer the laws in honesty.

In addition to the saving of more than $1,000,000 already effected, the Bureau has under investigation a large number of cases tainted with fraud, and yet the work has only commenced. I call attention to the following statement of the Commissioner to the Committee on Appropriations:

Number of cases pending investigation December 1, 1893, in which fraud is alleged or suspected.

Location.	Number.
New Mexico	1,448
Iowa	599
Indian Territory	539
Tennessee	71
New York *a*	96
Total	2,753

a This investigation is only in its preliminary stage. It will, no doubt, exceed in extent the New Mexico investigation.

I repeat that it is not my purpose to unjustly uphold this Administration, and I would not attempt to defend it in anything wrong; but it is right to make all necessary appropriations to investigate pension frauds, and to purify the pension roll; and I dare assert that every honest Union soldier and every honest taxpayer in this country will applaud the Administration and the Congress of the United States for doing it. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is recognized.

Mr. DINGLEY. I will yield to a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Before the committee rises, I would like to make an arrangement with gentlemen on the other side as to the amount of time to be consumed. We have now had four hours and a half of debate, equally divided. If this bill does not get into the Senate pretty promptly it can not be passed before the holidays, and certain bureaus will be put to great trouble about it. I have no desire to force the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to speak this afternoon. I know it is Saturday, and he is tired. I would like to make an arrangement by which the debate can be limited on Monday, and I make what it seems to me is a very liberal proposition. I propose an hour and a half on a side. We have had four hours and a half, equally divided.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that it seems to me this urgency deficiency bill ought to pass during Monday's session. An hour and a half on a side for general debate, it seems to me, ought to be satisfactory. There will then be a little time for debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. DINGLEY. The difficulty about that is, there are four gentlemen who have asked for half an hour each, including the half hour I intend to occupy.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Suppose you have an evening session.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. We can not get a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Possibly we might go on to-night.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would prefer not to speak to-night.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] might take half an hour to-night.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Very well, I make that proposition to the gentleman from Illinois, that the debate shall be limited to an hour and three-quarters on a side, and that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] shall occupy so much time this afternoon as may be agreed upon.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In addition to that?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. No; I will make this proposition: That we shall have an hour and a half on a side on Monday, and that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may occupy half an hour this afternoon, which time shall not be counted.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is all right.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Let the gentleman from Massachusetts have half an hour this evening, and then that there be an hour and a half on a side for general debate on Monday. That is satisfactory.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, it has been agreed between myself on the one side and the gentleman representing the minority on the other, and I now ask unanimous consent of the committee to make the agreement valid, that debate shall continue for half an hour this evening, to be occupied by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and that on Monday there be three hours of debate, to be equally divided between the two sides, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] controlling an hour and a half for the minority, and I to control an hour and a half for the majority.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the bill be open for amendment then?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It will.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be recognized for one-half hour this evening and that debate be closed after three hours on Monday, to be equally divided between the two sides, under the control of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] on the one side, and on the other by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I would like to say at the beginning, I have here in connection with what I desire to say quite a number of suspended pension cases which I do not desire to take the time of the House to read, but I ask unanimous consent to print them as a part of my remarks without reading them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent now to print certain suspended pension cases in connection with his remarks. Without objection that order will be made.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much space will that require?

Mr. MORSE. Not much.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much?

Mr. MORSE. Not much; I can not tell exactly.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much?

Mr. MORSE. I can not answer the question definitely. Not much.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not want to object, but I do desire to know how much space it will occupy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object.

Mr. MORSE. I will have to take the time of the House to read them, then.

Mr. COGSWELL. Can not my colleague indicate about how much it would take?

Mr. MORSE. About half a dozen pages of typewriter.

Mr. SPRINGER. That does not amount to anything.

The CHAIRMAN. At the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks the Chair will submit the request again.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, not enough has been made of the soldier vote, sons of veterans, and their relatives and friends in bringing about the tremendous cyclone which buried the Democratic party at the last election in six or seven great States of the Union. On Monday, September 25, I stood in my place on this floor and uttered these words:

> Mr. Chairman, I have not the slightest doubt but when the loyal and patriotic people of this country are heard from in the coming election they will rebuke the Administration for its unkind, unjust, and unpatriotic conduct towards these defenders of the flag, and toward the men who sprung to the defense of the country when the life of the nation hung trembling in the balance, and who saved us, a nation among the nations of the earth.

This sentence was prophecy, Monday, September 25; it was history on the evening of Tuesday, November 7.

It is in order here and now to present some facts connected with this business of purging the pension roll, which have come to my knowledge.

THE PRESIDENT S MESSAGE.

In his message to Congress at the opening of the regular session in December, the President makes this astounding statement—"thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners." Is that statement true? If so it is capable of being proved. I represent a district having a large soldier constituency. I live in a town of 4,500 inhabitants that sent many of her bravest and best sons to the war, and quite a number of the survivors draw pensions. I do not know among them one single fraudulent pensioner. I am a member of the same Grand Army post with them, and have a personal acquaintance with every one of them.

There are forty-two towns and cities in my district, and four times as many hamlets and villages; and I stand in my place, as far as my district is concerned, and throw that charge back to the President of the United States, and say that it is a slander upon the Union soldiers of my district, and that it is not true.

There are 356 members on this floor, representing a similar constituency. Do you, gentlemen, know thousands of fraudulent pensioners in the communities you represent? If so, stand up on this floor and tell us the names.

I say that charge is a libel upon the men who went to the front and periled their all that the Republic might live, when some men stayed at home or sent a substitute, and in one case allowed him to die in the poorhouse after he got back.

At the Republican State convention, held in Boston Saturday, October 7, to nominate governor and other State officers, and one of the most harmonious and enthusiastic conventions ever held in Massachusetts, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on the subject of pensions:

> We have been assailed in the past by our party opponents on the ground that we were too liberal to the soldiers of the Union. We count such a charge from that source an unexampled honor.
>
> Surely no such accusation will ever be made against them. Too cowardly to attemp the repeal of the pension laws which they have denounced, they seek to accomplish by administration what they dare not do by legislation.
>
> They are striking hundreds of individual cases from the rolls. They take away the pension of widows under the pretense that they will look into them afterward to see if they were honestly granted. They execute the pensioner first and try him afterward.

Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that the excuse for the present policy of the Pension Bureau is that it is a desire on the part of that office to make the pension roll a "roll of honor," and to eliminate from it unworthy and illegal pensioners.

Now, I am certain if Congress and the country were assured that the Administration was honest in this profession the policy would receive the indorsement of the country. There is no disposition on the part of the patriotic men or of the soldiers themselves to countenance or tolerate fraud or a pension obtained by fraud.

And no one will go any further than myself in any necessary legislation to guard the Pension Bureau from dishonest, illegal, and unworthy claimants.

But I think that it is not difficult to show that the policy of the present Administration goes entirely beyond this, and under the garb and pretext of eliminating fraud and making the pension roll a "roll of honor" it has stricken down and suspended

pensions to which the applicants were clearly entitled under the law.

And the same charge, I am satisfied, can be sustained by overwhelming evidence which I have in my possession, and which has been sent to me from all parts of the country since the Commissioner gave my recent correspondence with his Bureau to the press.

I confess that it is not an easy problem in the present business situation to do exact justice to the taxpayer and the soldier. And it has been well said by a patriotic gentleman "that we need both patriotism and patience in considering the different phases of the subject."

The consideration of this subject is in no way confined to dollars and cents. A successful attempt is being made to degrade the pensioner and to make light of his service, and to deny his patriotic service to the country.

No man is more interested in the integrity of the pension roll than the soldier himself, and he can be relied upon to expose dishonesty.

The argument that because a man is suffering from wounds or disabilities contracted in the service is able, in spite of such wounds or disabilities, to earn a livelihood, therefore he is not entitled to a pension—I say that such an argument as that is fallacious, unjust, and will not receive the indorsement of the country.

If a soldier must be a pauper before he can draw a pension, then the pension system had better be abolished altogether and the soldier made a town or State pauper rather than a national pauper.

All this talk about the pension roll as a "roll of honor" is a mere blind, and is not honest; it is used to cover hostility to the soldier.

This talk of the Democratic party about pension reform is a part and parcel of their talk about tariff reform: the former means death to the soldier and the latter means free trade and death to the great manufacturing interests of the country.

The cry of pension reform does not come from the friends of the soldier or from the men who fight him in the open. The men who stood up to be shot at for $13 per month had no thought of a pension or pecuniary reward for their service.

Their loyalty and patriotism may be dimmed by aspersion and by charges of base and sordid motives for a time, but history will do justice to their honor and unselfish patriotism.

The Pension Bureau certainly presents a strange spectacle. In addition to this expenditure in the field the employés of that Bureau have been turned from the legitimate business of examining pension claims and passing upon the merits of the claims to the most extraordinary business of what is called "purging the pension roll."

Numerous illustrations have already been given as to what that is. Take notice that $200,000 have already been spent for this purpose, of investigating pension claims, and now the honorable Secretary of the Interior calls for two hundred thousand more, making near a round half million expended in the "purging" and "roll of honor" business.

Take notice that this money would go a long way in paying the little $6, $8, or $10 per month that these spies have succeeded in taking away from the poor pensioner.

Where is the legal authority for such an expenditure for such a purpose, namely, reviewing and undoing the official adjudication of his predecessors.

This Administration appears to be a law unto itself. It utterly failed and refused to enforce the Chinese exclusion act, it hauled down the flag in the Sandwich Islands, the Secretary of the Treasury fails to buy the silver authorized by the act of Congress. And now comes the Secretary of the Interior, and asks for $200,000, to be expended in what he calls "purging the pension roll."

Public buildings voted by the Fifty-first Congress, and for which the money has been appropriated and set aside, so far as I can learn are all at a dead standstill, nothing is being done on them, certainly not in my section of the country. All of which is very unsatisfactory to the people of this country.

And, Mr. Speaker, what a howl would have gone up from the Democratic papers and speakers for the nonenforcement of some of these laws if the tables were turned and Benjamin Harrison was President and the Republicans were in control of this body. Why, I submit that this Chamber would have echoed and reechoed with denunciation of a Republican Administration that had been guilty of so overriding the laws of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that incompetency and imbecility mark the Administration at every point. In the Treasury Department, Secretary Carlisle undoubtedly precipitated the panic by an authorized interview, in which he said "it might be necessary to pay the Government's obligations in silver."

That moment the cable flashed his words across the ocean, and the return of our securities and the panic began. Had he said instead that the Government would sell $500,000,000 worth of bonds, if necessary, to maintain the parity of the metals, there would have been no return of our securities and no panic. The United States Treasury is bankrupt and empty, and, worse than that, there will be a deficit for the current year of $75,000,000.

Incompetence and blundering, or worse, mark every act of the State Department. The conduct of our affairs and negotiations with the Sandwich Islands by the President, Secretary Gresham, and Paramount Commissioner Blount have made us the laughing stock of the world. The Secretary of State, in a letter on the situation given to the press, before communicating the facts to Congress, gave the country and the world clearly to understand that the Army and Navy would be used by our Government to put the dissolute Queen back on the throne from which all the intelligent people of those islands had removed her. Mr. Willis was sent there with instructions, we suppose, to put this proclamation in execution; but after examining the situation and seeing the strength of the Provisional Government, its army and defenses, the message which he must have sent to the President makes us think of the inquiry of the man, "Who struck Billy Patterson?" And the end is not yet. All this in painful contrast with the wise and far-reaching statesmanship and foreign diplomacy of Benjamin Harrison.

Incompetency and a want of patriotism and loyalty mark the administration of the Interior Department and the Pension Bureau, as has so fully been set forth in this debate. It has been truly said that the thermometer was 20° below zero for loyal men and soldiers of the Union in the Pension Bureau.

In short, ten months' of complete control of all departments of the Goventment has fully demonstrated the utter incompetency of the Democratic party to manage the great Treasury Department, the State Deparment, the Interior Department. As a party of obstruction and destruction the Democratic party is a success; as a party of action and construction, a miserable failure. And as the result, business is prostrate, factories are closed or running on part time, with reduced help and reduced wages. The home market for our agricultural products is largely reduced; gaunt hunger and want stare thousands of our countrymen in the face in consequence of the Democratic control of the Government.

Could there be an election in this country to-morrow, could the people speak at the ballot box once more now, they would not only rebuke the Administration for its unjust and unpatriotic administration of the Pension Bureau, but there would not be a bubble on the water above the place where "Cleveland, Retrenchment, and Reform" went down.

There can be no prosperity until the country is returned to the patriotic, the protection, and the financial policy of the Republican party. And may Almighty God in his infinite mercy hear the cry of our distressed brethren and speed that day.

Referring to the matter of secret spies of the Pension Bureau visiting soldiers under guise of friends, and inducing them to make statements to be used against them, and to deprive them of their pensions, attention is asked to the following petition. If what is alleged in this petition is true the officers of the Government responsible for it deserve the execration of all patriotic and just men:

On September 15 Senator CULLOM presented in the Senate a petition signed by a large number of ex-soldiers, residents of Illinois, alleging that they were beset by detectives of the Government, traveling in disguise, secretly cooperating with those who have been distinguished by their antipathy for those who fought for the flag. It is alleged that these spies, with friendly pretenses, visit the homes of pensioners, and with the basest hypocrisy and fawning deception seek to find some clue to furnish information to the Pension Office to deprive old veterans of their pensions. The petitioners ask protection against the methods of Government officers who seek to brand pensioners as perjurers and criminals without the right of being heard in their own defense, and to be shielded from the false and base imputation of those high in power who seek to discredit and dishonor the Union soldiers of the late war, and to be protected in their old age from the severity and bitterness of party and political persecution.

General Raum, former Commissioner, in a discussion of the legal right of an Executive to review the acts of his predecessors, shows that the decisions of the United States courts and the opinions of eminent lawyers have been against such a contention, and he concludes by saying with regard to Secretary Hoke Smith's arbitrary action:

> I have no hesitation in saying that such a proceeding has no warrant in law, is contrary to the well-established usages of the Government, and is a gross usurpation of authority.

THE COUNTY OF THE PENSIONER IS NOW GIVEN.

Under the decision of the former Commissioner of Pensions, when the list of pensions granted was furnished to the press, the residence of the pensioner was withheld, for the very good reason that it let loose on him a horde of pension claim agents, many of whom are thoroughly honest and reliable men, some of them unfortunately are not, and the latter wrote the soldier in a way to make him dissatisfied with the bounty of the Government.

This rule of Commissioner Raum has been abrogated by the present Commissioner, and he goes one better, and he gives not only the State, town, or city, but he gives the county as well—Worcester, Mass., for instance, a city of 84,000, has added to it Worcester County; Lowell, Middlesex County; Brockton, Plymouth County; Boston, Suffolk County.

I am at a loss to understand what this addition is for. The only explanation that I can possibly see is that the list of pensions granted is so ridiculously small that it is necessary to somehow or other pad the list, especially since the whole force of the Pension Bureau has been turned from the legitimate business of examining claims to that of unearthing frauds and reviewing the decisions of the former Commissioner.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. I will ask if you do not know the reason given by Commissioner Raum for not giving the residence of the pensioner, when applied to by newspaper reporters for the information, was that it was for the protection of the Washington claim agents; for as soon as the pensioner's name was given other claim agents at once wrote him for his business, and that the agents here complained that it was troublesome to them to have their business thus interfered with.

Mr. MORSE. That was not the reason given to me for the action of Commissioner Raum, and, as he is a gentleman of honor and integrity, I do not believe it. I would like to ask what earthly use it would be to give Worcester, Worcester County, when that is a city of 84,000 inhabitants?

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. There is no occasion for publishing the list of allowances if you do not give the State, county, and post-office of the claimant whose claim is allowed.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair state how much time I have remaining?

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. If it is a bit of news, it is of interest to the pensioner to know whether he is the John Smith whose claim is allowed or it is some other John Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eleven minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I can not yield further, as my time is so limited.

In further reply to the gentleman from Indiana I say the evident reason for adding the "county" in the case of large cities such as I have given is to pad the list, as not unfrequently the published list of pensions granted gives only two, three, or six in a great State like Massachusetts, and without the wadding of counties it looks very small.

The following clipping cut from the National Tribune, a paper published in this city, is pertinent and germane to this discussion. The pension roll is large, but the war was the greatest war of all history:

THEY FORGET.

The people who express surprise at the size of the pension roll forget the immense magnitude of the struggle for national salvation.

They forget that it represents the bodily disabilities incurred in the longest, the greatest, and the bloodiest war in modern history.

They forget that over 2,000,000 men fought for four long years, during which time the rifle and cannon were not silent for a single day; that more than 2,000 battles took place, many of them the bloodiest ever known; that 125,000 men were actually shot dead on the field; that 360,000 died from disease produced by the hardships of a soldier's life, and nearly 500,000 were more or less severely wounded by the missiles of the enemy.

They forget that this means more hard fighting was done and more lives lost than in all of the armies of Europe put together in the last seventy-five years.

If they would remember these things they would be astonished that the pension roll is not much larger than it is.

Proportioned to the number of men, and the amount of fighting done by them, the pension roll of the United States is really much smaller than that of any nation in Europe.

The following illustrates one of the suspended pensions, or pension frauds, unearthed by the Commissioner of Pensions, referred to by the President in his message:

The Toledo Blade says on the tomb of an old man in Willow Cemetery nigh that city should be inscribed:

ALEXANDER CAVASHERE,
Killed by
HOKE SMITH,
September 3, 1893.

The old man was of Company H, Second Ohio Heavy Artillery, and was 83 years of age, and had a wife. His sole dependence was his pension, and that was cut off. He is said to have been worried to death by the loss. He could not work any more. The Blade remarks:

"Before he could get that pension again, he must take weeks, perhaps months, or even years, to go over and collect all the evidence possible from scattered comrades, and prove his innocence, the high court of the Confederacy having pronounced him guilty.

"And so he despaired and died.

"Died at the age of 83, while fat men in office were haggling over his quarterly stipend."

Here is another illustration:

HANOVER, MASS., *October 16, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: In my great trouble I write to you, hoping you can give me some help.

I am one of the many soldiers who have had their pensions suspended.

I am an old man, all used up with rheumatism and suffering with a bad hernia, which latter I received while in the service. I can not do a day's work. Have been obliged to call on the town for help.

I have sent in two affidavits since my suspension. As my sixty days have nearly expired I am feeling anxious.

Hoping you can assist me, I remain, yours, respectfully,

MARTIN S. POPPY.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

TAUNTON, MASS., *October 12, 1893.*

MY DEAR SIR: I want to say a few words on what the Department has asked me to do. "You are required to make a statement of the treatment of a soldier who was wounded and taken to Andersonville while there." I answered the Department that the question was outrageous. I knew nothing of treatment they received there. But of the few who survived their tale of woe was enough to deter anyone that was human from asking such a question. My very blood boils with rage to such infamous procedure. Those poor wounded soldiers who fought and saved the country to be treated like dogs is too bad: too bad. It seems as though it will not long continue by a just God.

Very respectfully, yours.

S. P. HUBBARD, M. D.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.

The above letter is from a prominent and reputable physician in my district, who was himself a soldier in the Army. He is justly indignant at an inquiry addressed to him in regard to the condition of a man who served time in Andersonville. He takes it for granted, and claims that the Pension Bureau should know that any man who escaped that living hell would of necessity have disabilities that would entitle him in his old age to a pension.

The following quotation from a letter received from an eminent citizen of Philadelphia, a learned lawyer, jurist, author of law books, and an ex-judge, is self-explanatory and in point, and expresses the sentiment of the country:

The suffering patriots who have been physically injured in the service of their country, and who are now slandered and reviled by their country's servants, will soon be heard in their vindication. "Who dare strike a tribune of Rome?"

F. CARROLL BREWSTER,
214 West Washington Square, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hear what the Grand Army boys say:

HEADQUARTERS COLLINGWOOD POST, NO. 76, G. A. R.,
Plymouth, Mass., October 4, 1893.

DEAR SIR AND COMRADE: That you may have additional evidence in your endeavors to show the injustice of the Pension Department in their treatment of veteran soldiers, we have a case of one of the members of this post. It is that of the quartermaster-sergeant, Arthur S. Byrnes, who, drawing a pension of $12 per month, under the act of 1890, has been suspended without notification.

His case is one of the plainest and clearest of his deserving it, and all in town are indignant about it, as it shows that the plea of fraud in his case can not be sustained. The account published in the Old Colony Memorial in this case is a true statement, and indorsed by all.

I send this to you by a unanimous vote of this post.

I am, yours, in F., C., and L.,

W. B. ALEXANDER, *Adjutant.*

Hon. E. A. MORSE, *Washington, D. C.*

The soldiers of the country are cautioned against making application for increase. It is made a pretext for canceling or reducing what little pension they already have, as the following letter will show:

TAUNTON, MASS., *October 9, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: I drew a pension of $4 per month under the general law, claim No. 616764, and under act of June 27, 1890, of $8 per month, for malarial poisoning and bronchitis. Two years ago I had muscular rheumatism very bad, under doctor's care two months, and have had nine attacks since for a short time. My attorney advised me to apply for increase; I did apply, and was ordered before a medical board.

When I heard from my application, which was July 6 last, I was advised that my degree of disability didn't entitle me to any pension under the law of June 27, 1890, but I was entitled to $4 per month under general law. What must I do to get the $4? I looked for a voucher for $4 on the 4th of September: haven't got it yet. I need it badly, for I had a boy 12 years old die last winter and a girl 18 years old die seven weeks later.

I owe over $100 for doctors' bills and $75 for undertaker's bill. I am working seven hours a day and it takes all for to live on.

I never vote the Democratic ticket, and that was why I was rated so low, perhaps.

My pension was sent me April 13, 1891, both the same day and date.

Yours, truly,

A. M. GOVE,
Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry.

To Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.

The following correspondence is self-explanatory:

GOODELL, HANCOCK COUNTY IOWA, *October 7, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: I see that you are raising your voice for honorable treatment for the old soldiers. I wish to tell you the treatment I have received from the present Administration. The 13th of July, 1893, I received notice that my pension was suspended during medical examination and was ordered to report myself for examination before the Mason City board, which I obeyed.

I know that the sworn report of that examination, if it could be seen, would show that the disabilities which drew the pension before do exist.

On the 10th of September I wrote to Mr. Lochren a letter requesting him to let me hear the result of it, but he refused to even reply. What I hate the worst is to be branded as a perjurer and a fraud, as I am the only man in the county that I have heard of that has been suspended.

Why he selected me as his victim is what I would like to have him explain. The number of my certificate was 503852, and I know that it was not obtained through fraud or perjury, and to be classed as such is rather humiliating. I have written to Hon. J. P. DOLLIVER, the Congressman from this district, about it, and hope that the combined efforts of the fair-minded men in power will have the courage to stop such usurpation of power and hatred.

It puts me in mind of his illustration of the twelve apostles, as he said there was one Judas Iscariot; very appropriate, very.

And if you succeed in getting a committee appointed to investigate the way he conducts the department, I wish you would hand this letter to the committee, as he will not answer a soldier who was honorably discharged from the United States service. I will have to wear the brand that he has stigmatized me with; but ever hoping for your success, I remain yours, a private in "C," One hundred and seventy-fourth Volunteer Infantry.

ALBERT DE KALB WHITE.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

The first notice that many of the pensioners receive that their pension has been stopped is from the agent when they go to draw their little stipend, as the following will show:

WEYMOUTH, MASS., *September 9, 1893.*

COMRADE: I was very much disappointed last Thursday when I went to the Pension Office after my pension to learn for the first time that my pension was suspended. I have received $8 per month, and expected to get it then. I am the only one here that I have heard of what has had his pension suspended.

I applied for an increase two years ago, and was examined last year, and since the present Commissioner took office I have been examined again, and have heard nothing from it. My disability I claim was a sunstroke which I received in the service, and the examining board examined the lower part of my body for the sunstroke. Please excuse my writing to you, but I am so disappointed I want to give vent to somebody. I shall be 72 years old the 19th day of November next, if I live; it will take about that time to starve me, I guess.

Now, if you can help me get what I think belongs to me, I should thank you very much.

Yours, in F., C., and L.,

OLIVER HOUGHTON.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE,
Member of Congress.

I suppose I may be pardoned for adding the vote or resolutions of Post 13, of Massachusetts, I have received which are complimentary to myself.

I am in receipt of similar votes and resolutions from numerous posts of the Grand Army of the Republic in diferent sections.

FLETCHER WEBSTER POST, NO. 13,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, G. A. R.,
Brockton, Mass., September 28, 1893.

DEAR SIR AND COMRADE: At the last regular meeting of this post it was voted "that the adjutant express to Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE the appreciation of this post for his earnest efforts in behalf of the pensioners of this Government."

My dear comrade, what more can I say? The above vote not only expresses the sentiments of this post, but the sentiments of thousands in your district at home.

May God bless you and yours for your noble stand for justice, truth, and temperance in the nation's capital.

Sincerely yours, in F., C., and L.,

JOSEPH R. REACH,
Post Adjutant.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE.

The following is a sample of hundreds, if not thousands, of private letters I have received:

MILFORD, N. H., *September 27, 1893.*

MY DEAR SIR: I deem it a pleasure as well as a duty to assure you of my highest appreciation and gratitude for your able and manly defense of the pension laws of 1890. It is a matter of vital import to thousands of worthy veterans in all parts of the country.

Respectfully,

W. W. HEMENWAY,
Late Captain, Eighteenth Massachusetts Volunteers.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE.

The following cases of suspended pensions are illustrations of many more, and justify my charge that that action of the Commissioner in these and thousands of other similar cases is illegal, unjust, a usurpation of authority, and a violation of the laws of the country.

I send to the Clerk's desk and ask him to read these cases as far as my time will allow.

The Clerk read as follows:

Certificate No. 538417, Frank Dunn, Ferry, Mich., Company A, Second New York Mounted Rifles: Was receiving $8 per month for chronic diarrhea and sciatica. Had claim pending for increase and additional disease of heart, catarrh, and trouble with head. Affidavit of William C. Wells, M. D.: "Known claimant eight years; often treated him for catarrh of head for past two years; never saw him without head tied up on this account. Wholly disabled." Affidavit of P. H. McGahn: "During past two years claimant has been unable to be out winter or summer without wraps around head by reason of catarrh." Suspended July 1, 1893.

Certificate No. 643769, George Allerback, Company C, One hundred and tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers: Was pensioned at $8 per month for rheumatism and piles. Had claim pending for increase and additional disease of heart and general debility and disease of lungs. Furnished testimony of physician and neighbors showing disability, and not due to vicious habits. Suspended June 25, 1893.

Certificate No. 693397, Angus Fraser, Allegan, Mich., Company C, Third Michigan Light Artillery: Was drawing a pension of $8 per month for disease of stomach. Had claim pending for increase for shell wound of right hip, pleurisy, rheumatism, and heart disease. Furnished affidavit of Dr. E. E. Bronson stating emphatically claimant wholly disabled. Suspended July 1, 1893.

Certificate No. 732215, Kirk Johnson, Grand Rapids, Ohio, musician, Eighteenth Ohio Volunteers: Was receiving $6 per month for rheumatism. Claim pending for catarrh, disease of lungs, hernia of right side contracted during an attack of catarrhal pneumonia from severe coughing. Affidavit of Dr. C. B. Cole showing this to be the case. Suspended August 8, 1893.

Certificate No. 713626, Edgar E. Grilley, Sitka, Mich., Company C, Tenth Michigan Volunteers: Was receiving $8 per month for bronchitis. Had claim pending for increase, and additional disease of eyes and heart. Furnished testimony of physician and two neighbors in original claim under new law. Suspended June 28, 1893.

Certificate No. 772330, Frederick Yahn, Rockford, Ohio, Company M, Third Ohio Cavalry: Was pensioned at $6 per month for injury to eyes and chronic diarrhea. Had claim pending for increase and additional, viz, disease of heart and nervous system and varicose veins of right leg. Furnished affidavit of Dr. W. C. Cole, who had known the claimant for seventeen years, examined him, and found him to be almost a total physical wreck. Also testimony of physician and neighbors in original claim, showing wholly disabled. Suspended July 1, 1893.

Certificate No. 109093, Edwin R. Beach, Bradner, Ohio, Company K, Seventy-second Ohio Volunteers: Was receiving $6 per month for injury of right hand and catarrh. Was formerly pensioned at $3 under general law for disease of eyes. Had claim pending for increase and additional deafness, disease of respiratory organs, effects of "grip," rheumatism, dyspepsia, chronic diarrhea, piles, varicose veins, and dropsy of both legs, and disease of heart. Furnished testimony of Dr. W. H. Palmer, Edward Sloyer, Jesse Harpter, and Elizabeth O. Beach. Suspended (date unknown).

Certificate No. 648583, John Phillips, Tontogany, Ohio, Company B, One hundred and forty-fourth Ohio Volunteers: Was receiving $3 per month for rheumatism. Had claim pending for increase and additional, viz, disease of kidneys, dyspepsia, and heart failure, also disease of prostate gland. Affidavit of J. B. Alford, M. D., was furnished describing disabilities, "which prevent him from laboring to any extent." Also Dr. George B. Spencer, "unable to perform manual labor." Suspended August 19, 1893.

Certificate No. 766364, William Hoover, Paulding, Ohio, Company H, One hundred and seventy-fourth Ohio Volunteers: Was pensioned at $6 per month for left incomplete hernia. Had claim pending for disease of throat, deafness, catarrh, disease of lungs, and heart rheumatism, paralysis of left side of body and face, and general debility. Furnished affidavit of Dr. P. A. Dix, showing claimant at least two-thirds disabled for labor. Suspended July 15, 1893.

Certificate No. 587816, Timothy McGill, Rushmore, Ohio, Company H, One hundred and thirty-sixth Ohio Volunteers: Was pensioned (rate unknown) for varicose veins of left leg, pharyngitis, and disease of heart. Had claim pending for increase and additional, viz, varicose veins of right leg, catarrh, dyspepsia, disease of kidneys, rheumatism, vertigo, and general debility. Furnished testimony of Dr. A. Page, showing incapacity for manual labor. Suspended June 28, 1893.

Mr. MORSE. I have many more similar cases, but my time does not admit my presenting them.

Finally, I believe I have established the charges with which I began: first, that great injustice is being done the soldiers: second, that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions is overriding the law and assuming legislative as well as judicial prerogatives.

I renew my request that I may be allowed to incorporate the balance of these cases of suspension in my remarks.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much?

Mr. MORSE. There are only two remaining on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HATCH, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4763, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TYLER, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAPHAM, for ten days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. MURRAY, until after the Christmas holidays, on account of important private business.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4794) to promote the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLISH: A bill (H. R. 4796) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase of additional ground in Newark, N. J., adjoining the custom-house and post-office building, and for the improvement thereon and the erection of additions thereto," approved March 1, 1888—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4797) to remove obstructions from the streets of the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KRIBBS: A bill (H. R. 4798) to indemnify the sender of registered domestic mail matter lost or destroyed in the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAPEHART: A bill (H. R. 4799) to provide for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Huntington, in the district of West Virginia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 4800) to amend the record of H. H. Gale, Company G, Fifth New York Infantry, and Company A, Permanent Party, Fort Wood, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4801) for the relief of Dr. John R. Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4802) for the relief of Philip Milbauhr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLANCHARD: A bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of E. A. Givens, sr., Arcadia, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4804) granting an honorable discharge to Abraham Trout—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4805) to provide pension to Ralph E. Summers for services in the Oregon Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN (by request): A bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Andrew Gray—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4807) for the relief of Solomon Weese—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) for the relief of John McGee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) for the relief of George Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 4810) granting a pension to John V. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRIBBS: A bill (H. R. 4811) granting a pension to Mary Trimble, the crippled, helpless, and destitute daughter of Benjamin Trimble, late of Nevins' Independent Battery, Light Artillery, Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) granting a pension to George Van Vliet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) restoring Sarah J. Thompson, late Sarah J. Wilson, to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4814) granting a pension to Mary E. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) granting a pension to Annie E. Hetherington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 4816) for the relief of Lewis Miller Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4817) for the benefit of S. Collier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Stone, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) for the relief of James Sexton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) for the relief of Granville Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) for the benefit of Levi Hooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4822) for the relief of Thomas Stone's heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) for the relief of B. F. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4824) for the relief of Mrs. R. Clarendon Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 4825) for the relief of Emmart, Dunbar & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4826) for the relief of Patrick Daly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4827) for the relief of Sallie M. Fletcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) for the relief of Tabitha Stephens—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WELLS: A bill (H. R. 4829) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to liquidate and pay certain claims against certain of the Menomonee tribe of Indians in Wisconsin—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Papers for the claim of Maria McMurdie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: Petition of the Frankfort Typographical Union, No. 164, in favor of Senate bill 1136—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petitions of merchants, dealers, and jobbers in playing cards, protesting against putting a tax on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the employés of the Standard Plate Glass Company of Butler, Pa., against change of tariff duties on plate glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of the Pittsburg Plate Glass Company of Creighton, Pa., against change in tariff duties on plate glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENLOE: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of William Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the employés of Stinson Brothers, carpet manufacturers, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania: Petition of 86 citizens of Clinton County, Pa., against a reduction of the tariff on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Assembly No. 9783, Knights of Labor, against a reduction in the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNER: Petition of employés of manufacturers of mother-of-pearl shell buttons, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against placing a tax on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of John Scanlin to remove the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mary Brennan to remove the charge of desertion against her husband—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POST: Petition of Hibbard Spencer, Bartlett & Co., and 13 other firms of Chicago, against the charge of specific duties to ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELL: Petition of Agnes A. Niver, for leave to bring suit against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Brief; stamp duty on conveyances made between October 1, 1862, and October 1, 1872—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WANGER: Protest of Warwick Iron Company and other employers of labor, workingmen, and others, of Pottstown, Pa., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Affidavit to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas D. Wagnon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of I. L. White and 1,052 others, employés of the Merrick Thread Company, of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of John D. Walsh and 543 others, employés of the Hadley Thread Company, of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

STEPHEN M. WHITE, a Senator from the State of California; HENRY M. TELLER, a Senator from the State of Colorado, and WILLIAM V. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory thereto, and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "Donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants on said lands;

A bill (H. R. 73) supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled "An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives;"

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States;

A bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 97) donating two obsolete cannon to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa.; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1021) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

A message in writing was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

Mr. HARRIS. The message from the President of the United States ought to be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, with accompanying documents. The Secretary will read the message.

The Secretary read the message, as follows:

MESSAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In my recent annual message to the Congress I briefly referred to our relations with Hawaii and expressed the intention of transmitting further information on the subject when additional advices permitted.

Though I am not able now to report a definite change in the actual situation, I am convinced that the difficulties lately created both here and in Hawaii and now standing in the way of a solution through Executive action of the problem presented, render it proper and expedient that the matter should be referred to the broader authority and discretion of Congress, with a full explanation of the endeavor thus far made to deal with the emergency and a statement of the considerations which have governed my action.

I suppose that right and justice should determine the path to be followed in treating this subject. If national honesty is to be disregarded and a desire for territorial extension, or dissatisfaction with a form of government not our own, ought to regulate our conduct, I have entirely misapprehended the mission and character of our Government and the behavior which the conscience of our people demands of their public servants.

When the present Administration entered upon its duties the Senate had under consideration a treaty providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the territory of the United States. Surely under our Constitution and laws the enlargement of our limits is a manifestation of the highest attribute of sovereignty, and if entered upon as an executive act all things relating to the transaction should be clear and free from suspicion. Additional importance attached to this particular treaty of annexation, because it contemplated a departure from unbroken American tradition in providing for the addition to our territory of islands of the sea more than 2,000 miles removed from our nearest coast.

These considerations might not of themselves call for interference with the completion of a treaty entered upon by a previous Administration. But it appeared from documents accompanying the treaty when submitted to the Senate, that the ownership of Hawaii was tendered to us by a Provisional Government set up to succeed the constitutional ruler of the islands, who had been dethroned, and it did not appear that such Provisional Government had the sanction of either popular revolution or suffrage. Two other remarkable features of the transaction naturally attracted attention. One was the extraordinary haste—not to say precipitancy—characterizing all the transactions connected with the treaty.

It appeared that a so-called committee of safety, ostensibly the source of the revolt against the constitutional Government of Hawaii, was organized on Saturday the 14th day of January; that on Monday, the 16th, the United States forces were landed at Honolulu from a naval vessel lying in its harbor; that on the 17th the scheme of a Provisional Government was perfected, and a proclamation naming its officers was on the same day prepared and read at the Government building; that immediately thereupon the United States minister recognized the Provisional Government thus created; that two days afterwards, on the 19th day of January, commissioners representing such government sailed for this country in a steamer especially chartered for the occasion, arriving in San Francisco on the 28th day of January, and in Washington on the 3d day of February; that on the next day they had their first interview with the Secretary of State, and another on the 11th, when the treaty of annexation was practically agreed upon, and that on the 14th it was formally concluded and on the 15th transmitted to the Senate. Thus between the initiation of the scheme for a Provisional Government in Hawaii on the 14th day of January and the submission to the Senate of the treaty of annexation concluded with such government, the entire interval was thirty-two days, fifteen of which were spent by the Hawaiian commissioners in their journey to Washington.

In the next place, upon the face of the papers submitted with the treaty, it clearly appeared that there was open and undetermined an issue of fact of the most vital importance. The message of the President accompanying the treaty declared that "the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government," and in a letter to the President from the Secretary of State, also submitted to the Senate with the treaty, the following passage occurs:

> At the time the Provisional Government took possession of the Government buildings no troops or officers of the United States were present or took any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the Provisional Government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdiction and when they were in effective possession of the Government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the Government.

But a protest also accompanied said treaty, signed by the Queen and her ministers at the time she made way for the Provisional Government, which explicitly stated that she yielded to the supreme force of the United States, whose minister had caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support such Provisional Government.

The truth or falsity of this protest was surely of the first importance. If true, nothing but the concealment of its truth could induce our Government to negotiate with the semblance of a government thus created, nor could a treaty resulting from the acts stated in the protest have been knowingly deemed worthy of consideration by the Senate. Yet the truth or falsity of the protest had not been investigated.

I conceived it to be my duty therefore to withdraw the treaty from the Senate for examination, and meanwhile to cause an accurate, full, and impartial investigation to be made of the facts attending the subversion of the constitutional Government of Hawaii, and the installment in its place of the Provisional Government. I selected for the work of investigation the Hon. James H. Blount, of Georgia, whose service of eighteen years as a member of the House of Representatives, and whose experience as chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in that body, and his consequent familiarity with international topics, joined with his high character and honorable reputation, seemed to render him peculiarly fitted for the duties intrusted to him. His report detailing his action under the instructions given him and the conclusions derived from his investigation accompany this message.

These conclusions do not rest for their acceptance entirely upon Mr. Blount's honesty and ability as a man, nor upon his acumen and impartiality as an investigator. They are accompanied by the evidence upon which they are based, which evidence is also herewith transmitted, and from which it seems to me no other deductions could possibly be reached than those arrived at by the commissioner.

The report, with its accompanying proofs, and such other evidence as is now before the Congress or is herewith submitted, justifies in my opinion the statement that when the President was led to submit the treaty to the Senate with the declaration that "the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government," and when the Senate was induced to receive and discuss it on that basis, both President and Senate were misled.

The attempt will not be made in this communication to touch upon all the facts which throw light upon the progress and consummation of this scheme of annexation. A very brief and imperfect reference to the facts and evidence at hand will exhibit its character and the incidents in which it had its birth.

It is unnecessary to set forth the reasons which in January, 1893, led a considerable proportion of American and other foreign merchants and traders residing at Honolulu to favor the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. It is sufficient to note the fact and to observe that the project was one which was zealously promoted by the minister representing the United States in that country. He evidently had an ardent desire that it should become a fact accomplished by his agency and during his ministry, and was not inconveniently scrupulous as to the means employed to that end.

On the 19th day of November, 1892, nearly two months before the first overt act tending towards the subversion of the Hawaiian Government and the attempted transfer of Hawaiian territory to the United States, he addressed a long letter to the Secretary of State in which the case for annexation was elaborately argued, on moral, political, and economical grounds. He refers to the loss to the Hawaiian sugar interests from the operation of the McKinley bill, and the tendency to still further depreciation of sugar property unless some positive measure of relief is granted. He strongly inveighs against the existing Hawaiian Government and emphatically declares for annexation. He says: "In truth the monarchy here is an absurd anachronism. It has nothing on which it logically or legitimately stands. The feudal basis on which it once stood no longer existing, the monarchy now is only an impediment to good government—an obstruction to the prosperity and progress of the islands."

He further says: "As a crown colony of Great Britain or a Territory of the United States the government modifications could be made readily and good administration of the law secured. Destiny and the vast future interests of the United States in the Pacific clearly indicate who, at no distant day, must be responsible for the government of these islands. Under a territorial government they could be as easily governed as any of the existing Territories of the United States." * * * "Hawaii has reached the parting of the ways. She must now take the road which leads to Asia, or the other which outlets her in America, gives her an American civilization, and binds her to the care of American destiny." He also declares: "One of two courses seems to me absolutely necessary to be followed, either bold and vigorous measures for annexation, or a 'customs union,' an ocean cable from the California coast to Honolulu, Pearl Harbor perpetually ceded to the United States, with an implied but not expressly stipulated American protectorate over the islands.

"I believe the former to be the better, that which will prove much the more advantageous to the islands, and the cheapest and least embarrassing in the end to the United States. If it was wise for the United States through Secretary Marcy thirty-eight years ago to offer to expend $100,000 to secure a treaty of annexation, it certainly can not be chimerical or unwise to expend $100,000 to secure annexation in the near future. To-day the United States has five times the wealth she possessed in 1854, and the reasons now existing for annexation are much stronger than they were then. I can not refrain from expressing the opinion with emphasis that the golden hour is near at hand."

These declarations certainly show a disposition and condition of mind which may be usefully recalled when interpreting the significence of the minister's conceded acts or when considering the probabilities of such conduct on his part as may not be admitted.

In this view it seems proper to also quote from a letter written by the minister to the Secretary of State on the 8th day of March, 1892, nearly a year prior to the first step taken toward annexation. After stating the possibility that the existing Government of Hawaii might be overturned by an orderly and peaceful revolution, Minister Stevens writes as follows: "Ordinarily in like circumstances, the rule seems to be to limit the landing and movement of United States forces in foreign waters and dominion exclusively to the protection of the United States legation and of the lives and property of American citizens. But as the relations of the United States to Hawaii are exceptional, and in former years the United States officials here took somewhat exceptional action in circumstances of disorder, I desire to know how far the present minister and naval commander may deviate from established international rules and precedents in the contingencies indicated in the first part of this dispatch."

To a minister of this temper full of zeal for annexation there seemed to arise in January, 1893, the precise opportunity for which he was watchfully waiting—an opportunity which by timely "deviation from established international rules and precedents" might be improved to successfully accomplish the great object in view; and we are quite prepared for the exultant enthusiasm with which in a letter to the State Department dated February 1, 1893, he declares; "The Hawaiian pear is now fully ripe and this is the golden hour for the United States to pluck it."

As a further illustration of the activity of this diplomatic representative, attention is called to the fact that on the day the above letter was written, apparently unable longer to restrain his ardor, he issued a proclamation whereby "in the name of the United States" he assumed the protection of the Hawaiian Islands and declared that said action was "taken pending and subject to negotiations at Washington." Of course this assumption of a protectorate was promptly disavowed by our Government, but the American flag remained over the Government building at Honolulu and the forces remained on guard until April, and after Mr. Blount's arrival on the scene, when both were removed.

A brief statement of the occurrences that led to the subversion of the constitutional Government of Hawaii in the interests of annexation to the United States will exhibit the true complexion of that transaction.

On Saturday, January 14, 1893, the Queen of Hawaii, who had been contemplating the proclamation of a new constitution, had, in deference to the wishes and remonstrances of her cabinet, renounced the project for the present at least. Taking this relinquished purpose as a basis of action, citizens of Honolulu numbering from 50 to 100, mostly resident aliens, met in a private office and selected a so-called committee of safety, composed of thirteen persons, seven of whom were foreign subjects, and consisted of five Americans, one Englishman, and one German. This committee, though its designs were not revealed, had in view nothing less than annexation to the United States, and between Saturday, the 14th, and the following Monday, the 16th of January—though exactly what action was taken may not be clearly disclosed—they were certainly in communication with the United States minister.

On Monday morning the Queen and her cabinet made public proclamation, with a notice which was specially served upon the representatives of all foreign Governments, that any changes in the constitution would be sought only in the methods provided by that instrument. Nevertheless, at the call and under the auspices of the committee of safety, a mass-meeting of citizens was held on that day to protest against the Queen's alleged illegal and unlawful proceedings and purposes. Even at this meeting the committee of safety continued to disguise their real purpose and contented themselves with procuring the passage of a resolution denouncing the Queen and empowering the committee to devise ways and means "to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii."

This meeting adjourned between 3 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. On the same day, and immediately after such adjournment, the committee, unwilling to take further steps without the coöperation of the United States minister, addressed him a note representing that the public safety was menaced and that lives and property were in danger, and concluded as follows: "We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces." Whatever may be thought of the other contents of this note, the absolute truth of this latter statement is incontestable. When the note was written and delivered, the committee, so far as it appears, had neither a man nor a gun at their command, and after its delivery they became so panic-stricken at their position that they sent some of their number to interview the minister and request him not to land the United States forces till the next morning.

But he replied that the troops had been ordered, and whether the committee were ready or not the landing should take place. And so it happened that on the 16th day of January, 1893, between 4 and 5 o'clock in the afternoon, a detachment of marines from the United States steamer Boston, with two pieces of artillery, landed at Honolulu. The men, upwards of 160 in all, were supplied with double cartridge belts filled with ammunition and

with haversacks and canteens, and were accompanied by a hospital corps with stretchers and medical supplies. This military demonstration upon the soil of Honolulu was of itself an act of war, unless made either with the consent of the Government of Hawaii or for the bona fide purpose of protecting the imperilled lives and property of citizens of the United States.

But there is no pretense of any such consent on the part of the Government of the Queen, which at that time was undisputed and was both the *de facto* and the *de jure* Government. In point of fact the existing Government instead of requesting the presence of an armed force protested against it. There is as little basis for the pretense that such forces were landed for the security of American life and property. If so, they would have been stationed in the vicinity of such property, and so as to protect it, instead of at a distance, and so as to command the Hawaiian Government building and palace. Admiral Skerrett, the officer in command of our naval force on the Pacific station, has frankly stated that in his opinion the location of the troops was inadvisable if they were landed for the protection of American citizens whose residences and places of business, as well as the legation and consulate, were in a distant part of the city, but the location selected was a wise one if the forces were landed for the purpose of supporting the Provisional Government.

If any peril to life and property calling for any such martial array had existed, Great Britain and other foreign powers interested would not have been behind the United States in activity to protect their citizens. But they made no sign in that direction. When these armed men were landed, the city of Honolulu was in its customary orderly and peaceful condition. There was no symptom of riot or disturbance in any quarter. Men, women, and children were about the streets as usual, and nothing varied the ordinary routine or disturbed the ordinary tranquility, except the landing of the Boston's marines and their march through the town to the quarters assigned them. Indeed, the fact that after having called for the landing of the United States forces on the plea of danger to life and property, the committee of safety themselves requested the Minister to postpone action, exposed the untruthfulness of their representations of present peril to life and property.

The peril they saw was an anticipation growing out of guilty intentions on their part and something which, though not then existing, they knew would certainly follow their attempt to overthrow the Government of the Queen without the aid of the United States forces.

Thus it appears that Hawaii was taken possession of by the United States forces without the consent or wish of the Government of the islands, or of anybody else so far as shown, except the United States minister.

Therefore the military occupation of Honolulu by the United States on the day mentioned was wholly without justification, either as an occupation by consent or as an occupation necessitated by dangers threatening American life and property. It must be accounted for in some other way and on some other ground, and its real motive and purpose are neither obscure nor far to seek.

The United States forces being now on the scene and favorably stationed, the committee proceeded to carry out their original scheme. They met the next morning, Tuesday, the 17th, perfected the plan of temporary government, and fixed upon its principal officers, ten of whom were drawn from the thirteen members of the committee of safety. Between 1 and 2 o'clock, by squads and by different routes to avoid notice, and having first taken the precaution of ascertaining whether there was any one there to oppose them, they proceeded to the Government building to proclaim the new government.

No sign of opposition was manifest, and thereupon an American citizen began to read the proclamation from the steps of the Government building almost entirely without auditors. It is said that before the reading was finished quite a concourse of persons, variously estimated at from fifty to one hundred, some armed and some unarmed, gathered about the committee to give them aid and confidence. This statement is not important, since the one controlling factor in the whole affair was unquestionably the United States marines, who, drawn up under arms and with artillery in readiness only 76 yards distant, dominated the situation.

The Provisional Government thus proclaimed was by the terms of the proclamation "to exist until terms of union with the United States had been negotiated and agreed upon." The United States minister, pursuant to prior agreement, recognized this Government within an hour after the reading of the proclamation, and before 5 o'clock, in answer to an inquiry on behalf of the Queen and her cabinet, announced that he had done so.

When our minister recognized the Provisional Government the only basis upon which it rested was the fact that the committee of safety had, in the manner above stated, declared it to exist. It was neither a government *de facto* nor *de jure*. That it was not in such possession of the Government property and agencies as entitled it to recognition is conclusively proved by a note found in the files of the legation at Honolulu, addressed by the declared head of the Provisional Government to Minister Stevens, dated January 17, 1893, in which he acknowledges with expressions of appreciation the minister's recognition of the Provisional Government, and states that it is not yet in the possession of the station house (the place where a large number of the Queen's troops were quartered), though the same had been demanded of the Queen's officers in charge. Nevertheless, this wrongful recognition by our minister placed the Government of the Queen in a position of most perilous perplexity.

On the one hand she had possession of the palace, of the barracks, and of the police station, and had at her command at least 500 fully armed men and several pieces of artillery. Indeed, the whole military force of her kingdom was on her side and at her disposal, while the committee of safety, by actual search, had discovered that there were but very few arms in Honolulu that were not in the service of the Government. In this state of things, if the Queen could have dealt with the insurgents alone, her course would have been plain and the result unmistakable. But the United States had allied itself with her enemies, had recognized them as the true government of Hawaii, and had put her and her adherents in the position of opposition against lawful authority. She knew that she could not withstand the power of the United States, but she believed that she might safely trust to its justice.

Accordingly, some hours after the recognition of the Provisional Government by the United States minister, the palace, the barracks, and the police station, with all the military resources of the country, were delivered up by the Queen upon the representation made to her that her cause would thereafter be reviewed at Washington, and while protesting that she surrendered to the superior force of the United States, whose minister had caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the Provisional Government, and that she yielded her authority to prevent collision of armed forces and loss of life and only until such time as the United States, upon the facts being presented to it, should undo the action of its representative and reinstate her in the authority she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

This protest was delivered to the chief of the Provisional Government, who endorsed thereon his ackowledgment of its receipt. The terms of the protest were read without dissent by those assuming to constitute the Provisional Government, who were certainly charged with the knowledge that the Queen instead of finally abandoning her power had appealed to the justice of the United States for reinstatement in her authority; and yet the Provisional Government, with this unanswered protest in its hand, hastened to negotiate with the United States for the permanent banishment of the Queen from power and for a sale of her kingdom.

Our country was in danger of occupying the position of having actually set up a temporary government on foreign soil for the purpose of acquiring through that agency territory which we had wrongfully put in its possession. The control of both sides of a bargain acquired in such a manner is called by a familiar and unpleasant name when found in private transactions. We are not without a precedent showing how scrupulously we avoided such accusations in former days. After the people of Texas had declared their independence of Mexico they resolved that on the acknowledgment of their independence by the United States they would seek admission into the Union. Several months after the battle of San Jacinto, by which Texan independence was practically assured and established, President Jackson declined to recognize it, alleging as one of his reasons that in the circumstances it became us "to beware of a too early movement, as it might subject us, however unjustly, to the imputation of seeking to establish the claim of our neighbors to a territory with a view to its subsequent acquisition by ourselves." This is in marked contrast with the hasty recognition of a government openly and concededly set up for the purpose of tendering to us territorial annexation.

I believe that a candid and thorough examination of the facts will force the conviction that the Provisional Government owes its existence to an armed invasion by the United States. Fair-minded people, with the evidence before them, will hardly claim that the Hawaiian Government was overthrown by the people of the islands, or that the Provisional Government has ever existed with their consent. I do not understand that any member of this Government claims that the people would uphold it by their suffrages if they were allowed to vote on the question.

While naturally sympathizing with every effort to establish a republican form of government, it has been the settled policy of

the United States to concede to people of foreign countries the same freedom and independence in the management of their domestic affairs that we have always claimed for ourselves; and it has been our practice to recognize revolutionary governments as soon as it became apparent that they were supported by the people. For illustration of this rule I need only to refer to the revolution in Brazil in 1889, when our minister was instructed to recognize the Republic "so soon as a majority of the people of Brazil should have signified their assent to its establishment and maintenance;" to the revolution in Chile in 1891, when our minister was directed to recognize the new Government "if it was accepted by the people;" and to the revolution in Venezuela in 1892, when our recognition was accorded on condition that the new Government was "fully established, in possession of the power of the nation, and accepted by the people."

As I apprehend the situation, we are brought face to face with the following conditions:

The lawful Government of Hawaii was overthrown without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot by a process every step of which, it may safely be asserted, is directly traceable to and dependent for its success upon the agency of the United States acting through its diplomatic and naval representatives.

But for the notorious predilections of the United States minister for annexation, the committee of safety, which should be called the committee of annexation, would never have existed.

But for the landing of the United States forces upon false pretexts respecting the danger to life and property the committee would never have exposed themselves to the pains and penalties of treason by undertaking the subversion of the Queen's Government.

But for the presence of the United States forces in the immediate vicinity and in position to afford all needed protection and support the committee would not have proclaimed the Provisional Government from the steps of the Government building.

And finally, but for the lawless occupation of Honolulu under false pretexts by the United States forces, and but for Minister Stevens' recognition of the Provisional Government when the United States forces were its sole support and constituted its only military strength, the Queen and her Government would never have yielded to the Provisional Government, even for a time and for the sole purpose of submitting her case to the enlightened justice of the United States.

Believing, therefore, that the United States could not, under the circumstances disclosed, annex the islands without justly incurring the imputation of acquiring them by unjustifiable methods, I shall not again submit the treaty of annexation to the Senate for its consideration, and in the instructions to Minister Willis, a copy of which accompanies this message, I have directed him to so inform the Provisional Government.

But in the present instance our duty does not, in my opinion, end with refusing to consummate this questionable transaction. It has been the boast of our Government that it seeks to do justice in all things without regard to the strength or weakness of those with whom it deals. I mistake the American people if they favor the odious doctrine that there is no such thing as international morality, that there is one law for a strong nation and another for a weak one, and that even by indirection a strong power may with impunity despoil a weak one of its territory.

By an act of war, committed with the participation of a diplomatic representative of the United States and without authority of Congress, the Government of a feeble but friendly and confiding people has been overthrown. A substantial wrong has thus been done which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires we should endeavor to repair. The Provisional Government has not assumed a republican or other constitutional form, but has remained a mere executive council or oligarchy, set up without the assent of the people. It has not sought to find a permanent basis of popular support and has given no evidence of an intention to do so. Indeed, the representatives of that Government assert that the people of Hawaii are unfit for popular government and frankly avow that they can be best ruled by arbitrary or despotic power.

The law of nations is founded upon reason and justice, and the rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations. The considerations that international law is without a court for its enforcement, and that obedience to its commands practically depends upon good faith, instead of upon the mandate of a superior tribunal, only give additional sanction to the law itself, and brand any deliberate infraction of it not merely as a wrong but as a disgrace. A man of true honor protects the unwritten word which binds his conscience more scrupulously, if possible, than he does the bond a breach of which subjects him to legal liabilities; and the United States, in aiming to maintain itself as one of the most enlightened of nations, would do its citizens gross injustice if it applied to its international relations any other than a high standard of honor and morality.

On that ground the United States can not properly be put in the position of countenancing a wrong after its commission any more than in that of consenting to it in advance. On that ground it can not allow itself to refuse to redress an injury inflicted through an abuse of power by officers clothed with its authority and wearing its uniform; and, on the same ground, if a feeble but friendly state is in danger of being robbed of its independence and its sovereignty by a misuse of the name and power of the United States, the United States can not fail to vindicate its honor and its sense of justice by an earnest effort to make all possible reparation.

These principles apply to the present case with irresistible force when the special conditions of the Queen's surrender of her sovereignty are recalled. She surrendered not to the Provisional Government, but to the United States. She surrendered not absolutely and permanently, but temporarily and conditionally until such time as the facts could be considered by the United States. Furthermore, the Provisional Government acquiesced in her surrender in that manner and on those terms, not only by tacit consent, but through the positive acts of some members of that Government who urged her peaceable submission, not merely to avoid bloodshed, but because she could place implicit reliance upon the justice of the United States, and that the whole subject would be finally considered at Washington.

I have not, however, overlooked an incident of this unfortunate affair which remains to be mentioned. The members of the Provisional Government and their supporters, though not entitled to extreme sympathy, have been led to their present predicament of revolt against the Government of the Queen by the indefensible encouragement and assistance of our diplomatic representative. This fact may entitle them to claim that in our effort to rectify the wrong committed some regard should be had for their safety. This sentiment is strongly seconded by my anxiety to do nothing which would invite either harsh retaliation on the part of the Queen or violence and bloodshed in any quarter.

In the belief that the Queen, as well as her enemies, would be willing to adopt such a course as would meet these conditions, and in view of the fact that both the Queen and the Provisional Government had at one time apparently acquiesced in a reference of the entire case to the United States Government, and considering the further fact that in any event the Provisional Government by its own declared limitation was only "to exist until terms of union with the United States of America have been negotiated and agreed upon," I hoped that after the assurance to the members of that Government that such union could not be consummated I might compass a peaceful adjustment of the difficulty.

Actuated by these desires and purposes, and not unmindful of the inherent perplexities of the situation nor of the limitations upon my power, I instructed Minister Willis to advise the Queen and her supporters of my desire to aid in the restoration of the status existing before the lawless landing of the United States forces at Honolulu on the 16th of January last, if such restoration could be effected upon terms providing for clemency as well as justice to all parties concerned. The conditions suggested, as the instructions show, contemplate a general amnesty to those concerned in setting up the Provisional Government and a recognition of all its bona fide acts and obligations.

In short, they require that the past should be buried, and that the restored govenment should reassume its authority as if its continuity had not been interrupted. These conditions have not proved acceptable to the Queen, and though she has been informed that they will be insisted upon, and that, unless acceded to, the efforts of the President to aid in the restoration of her government will cease, I have not thus far learned that she is willing to yield them her acquiescence. The check which my plans have thus encountered has prevented their presentation to the members of the Provisional Government, while unfortunate public misrepresentations of the situation and exaggerated statements of the sentiments of our people have obviously injured the prospects of successful Executive mediation.

I therefore submit this communication with its accompanying exhibits, embracing Mr. Blount's report, the evidence and statements taken by him at Honolulu, the instructions given to both Mr. Blount and Minister Willis, and correspondence connected with the affair in hand.

In commending this subject to the extended powers and wide discretion of the Congress, I desire to add the assurance that I shall be much gratified to cooperate in any legislative plan which may be devised for the solution of the problem before us which is consistent with American honor, integrity, and morality.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 18, 1893.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the reading of three papers accompanying the message, the instructions of the Secretary of State to Minister Willis, dated October 18, November 24, and December 3.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to permit the Secretary, before complying with that request, to read a list of the documents which come with the message, so that we may understand what is here?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield for that purpose, if there is such a list.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose the Secretary can give a summary of the documents which come with the message.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States in response to a resolution of the Senate, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution passed by the Senate on the 6th instant, I hereby transmit reports of the Secretaries of State and of the Navy, with copies of all instructions given to the respective diplomatic and naval representatives of the United States in the Hawaiian Islands since the 4th day of March, 1881, touching the matters specified in the resolution.

It has seemed convenient to include in the present communication to the Senate copies of the diplomatic correspondence concerning the political condition of Hawaii, prepared for transmission to the House of Representatives in response to a later resolution passed by that body on the 13th instant.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 18, 1893.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, unless someone wishes to have all the accompanying documents read, I ask for the reading of those which I have indicated.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have the list of documents accompanying the message read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. List of papers. First——

Mr. HOAR. I will waive my request until after that of the Senator from New Hampshire has been complied with, and the clerks can then get the list ready.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire whether it would not be better to read the instructions to Mr. Blount first, and take them in order.

Mr. HALE and others. Oh, no.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The papers indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[No. 4.—Confidential.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 18, 1893.

SIR: Supplementing the general instructions which you have received with regard to your official duties, it is necessary to communicate to you, in confidence, special instructions for your guidance in so far as concerns the relation of the Government of the United States towards the *de facto* government of the Hawaiian Islands——

Mr. BUTLER. May I inquire what the motion is in regard to the reading of those papers?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from South Carolina that there is no motion pending. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] called for the reading of certain papers transmitted by the President with the message which has been read.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it not be just as well to have those communications printed? Why delay and waste the time of the Senate in reading them?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire called for the reading of the papers, and no objection has been interposed.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand, and I appeal to the Senator just to allow them to be printed. I have no objection to their being read, but——

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that it would take a long time to print all the documents which have been transmitted with the message. My eye has rested upon three very short communications which I think it would be useful to the Senate to hear read at this time; but if Senators prefer to have all the accompanying papers read, of course I will withdraw the request that those three shall be read. However, I know these communications the Senate will wish to hear, and as they contain substantially the instructions given by the Secretary of State I think they ought to be read in open Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not the slightest objection to the letters being read, so far as I am personally concerned. The only point I make is that it is an unnecessary consumption of time; that is all. I do not desire to have them all read.

Mr. CHANDLER. It would not take five minutes to read those I have indicated.

Mr. VOORHEES. I desire to say a single word. All these papers ought to be read together, or else none of them except the message itself should be read. The rest should be ordered to be printed. I do not think it fair at all that a Senator should pick out certain portions of the communications, aside from the message, in order to have them read at this time. They should stand together. The communication the President made to us has been read, and if it is the sense of the Senate to hear more, we should hear all; if not, we should publish the message and accompanying documents.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Indiana to call for the reading of the accompanying documents?

Mr. VOORHEES. No, sir; I do not. I object to the reading unless it is the sense of the Senate, but I am not going to call for it; it must be expressed in some other way than upon a request of mine. However, I shall object to the reading of garbled extracts and excerpts that suit the occasion. I do not ask for the entire reading, but these papers should be published as accompanying documents, as is usually the rule. What I object to is the reading of excerpts here and there, spots and places.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Indiana that the request of the Senator from New Hampshire was that certain papers which he indicated should be read. No objection having been interposed, the Chair ordered them to be read, and the Secretary had commenced to read the papers called for.

Mr. VOORHEES. I must beg pardon of the Chair; I was not aware that the Secretary had proceeded to that stage. I did not know that consent had been implied and that the reading had commenced, or I would have objected sooner.

Mr. SHERMAN. It will take but a few moments to read the papers which have been specified.

Mr. BUTLER. I happened to be absent from the Chamber in the cloak room at the moment when the reading of the papers was commenced, and when I came in I simply made the inquiry which I did of the Chair and an appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire. Now, if it is in order, and I have a right to make an objection, I shall object to the further reading of the letters; and I would accompany that with a motion to refer the message with the accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that they be printed.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator will not do that. These instructions to Mr. Willis we have been waiting for with great anxiety, and there is an intense desire on the part of Senators to know what those instructions were. The President has sent in the instructions, and now the simple request is that those instructions may be read. It will not take five minutes.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Maine whether all the papers will not be published by to-morrow morning, and then the basis for the instructions will also be published, so that we can see the basis and the reason for the instructions themselves.

Mr. FRYE. But the President has given us, and it has been read to-day, the full basis of all those instructions.

Mr. FAULKNER. In substance.

Mr. FRYE. Very carefully drawn, too; as ably as any advocate could have done it. It seems to me there ought not to be an objection to the reading.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not object to the country knowing everything that has been communicated, but I submit that the reading is a waste of time, that is all.

Mr. FRYE. It will not take five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not the slightest objection to everything being given to the public; but, as the Senator from Indiana has suggested why the accompanying documents should be garbled and a part read and not all, I can not understand. I shall insist upon my objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me? In view of the statement which the two Senators have made that apparently there is an attempt to have read in the Senate garbled extracts, I think it wise that I should state what led me to select these three documents.

I went to the desk and asked that I might see the package which accompanied the President's message. I found that it contained a large amount of matter, much of which I thought had been already printed and given to the public. I noticed, however three short communications which constituted the instructions given by Secretary Gresham on the dates named, October 18, November 24, and December 3, the day before Congress met, which I saw could be read in five minutes; and therefore I indicated those as documents which I thought might very well be read to the Senate. I made no invidious selection. I selected those which I thought the Senate would want to hear. It seems to me that either all should be read or that at least these three should be read, and that no good is to be accomplished by the Senator from South Carolina in opposing the read-

ing of these three short documents, which contain the sum and substance of all the people of the country at this time want to know and which they now wish to know very much.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the other documents, the reading of which he did not call for, have not been all or nearly all printed before, and discussed by the Senate?

Mr. CHANDLER. It occurred to me that they had.

Mr. HOAR. So only the reading of the new ones is asked for.

Mr. CHANDLER. I may be mistaken about that, but I knew these had not been made public, and therefore I selected them.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose simply for the purpose of suggesting that the President's message is always read, and every precedent is against reading the accompanying documents. Now, let the message go to the appropriate committee with the accompanying documents. There need be no delay. That committee can determine which of the accompanying documents shall be printed and go to the public. One day is not going to be very prejudicial to the great interests of this country or to any individual.

Mr. BUTLER. I merely desire to say in reply to what has fallen from the Senator from New Hampshire that I think he and the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senate and the whole country will survive until to-morrow, when perhaps these documents can be printed. I have not the slightest objection that everything in connection with the President's message and the Hawaiian matter from beginning to end shall be given to the public. I have no such motive as that. I have no desire to suppress anything, but I merely made the motion in the interest of what I thought was good, practical common sense, economy of time, etc.

Now, I renew my motion to refer the message with the accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE. I suggest to the Senator to change, if he makes it, to one to print and refer.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire will state his question of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understood that the reading of the papers had commenced at my request and by unanimous consent. The Senator from South Carolina interrupted the reading with a suggestion, which I was glad to hear; but it seems to me that now the reading should proceed under the order which had been made before the Senator rose.

Mr. VOORHEES. Before this matter passes away, I desire to say in justice to myself that I had not the slightest conception or knowledge—I could not have had—of what the Senator from New Hampshire desired to have read. It was not because it was one thing or another that I objected, but on the ground stated so well by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]. I knew that every precedent of the business of the Senate was against such a proceeding, and I did not hear, I could not hear, what the Senator from New Hampshire indicated as desiring to have read. It is not because I want to suppress the reading of anything. Of course it is not. We shall be ready not merely to have read and heard and read ourselves, but we shall be ready to consider all these questions before the American people.

Mr. FAULKNER. I rise to a point of order. It strikes me that under the usages of the Senate these papers can not be read except on motion and the action of the Senate by a majority vote. In reference to the question whether the reading by the Secretary had been begun, I desire to say that the Senator from South Carolina, at the very moment the Secretary commenced reading the document called for by the Senator from New Hampshire, rose and addressed the Chair, and the Secretary had not proceeded over two or three lines before the President of the Senate recognized the Senator from South Carolina, and he made the objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from West Virginia allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FAULKNER. Of course.

Mr. CHANDLER. In view of that statement I withdraw the claim that the reading shall proceed under the announcement of the Chair, and call the attention of the Chair to Rule XI, which is pertinent to the suggestion which the Senator from West Virginia has just made. I am willing to have the case disposed of under that rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read Rule XI.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XI.

OBJECTION TO READING A PAPER.

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Chair——

Mr. HOAR. I call for the yeas and nays on the question.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope the Chair will recall the fact that during the extra session, lately closed, the question of the construction of this rule arose in the Senate, and there seemed to be an almost unanimous consent that the decision of the Chair at that time was correct, and that the rule applies to papers which are in the nature of public documents. A public document can be read at the desk on the vote of the Senate; a paper not a public document can not be read at the desk, under Rule XI, if it be objected to. That seems to me to be the distinction. If unanimous consent is asked and objection is made to the reading of any part of these communications, I submit that it is the right of any Senator to move that the paper be read notwithstanding the objection, and it is within the power of the majority to order its reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the rule announced is the rule the Chair adheres to, and the Chair, under Rule XI, submits to the Senate the question.

Mr. FAULKNER. I desire to say, in justice to the views I myself take of the rule, that I suggested in the remarks I made that the paper could only be read on the motion of a Senator and by a vote of the Senate. The construction of the Senator from Nebraska is, I think, clearly correct. The only objection I have to the reading of the papers is that I think we ought to send all the papers to the public at the same time. The Senator from Massachusetts is entirely mistaken when he is under the impression that the papers accompanying the message have already been published. Many of them refer back to a period anterior to those which have been heretofore published.

Mr. BUTLER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTLER. I inquire if the motion to commit does not supersede the motion which is now about to be submitted by the Chair? I have a motion pending to refer the message and the accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that they be printed. I inquire if that does not take precedence, under Rule XI, of the motion just submitted?

Mr. MILLS. I desire on that subject to call the attention of the Chair to Rule XXII, which reads:

When a question is pending no motion shall be received but—
To adjourn,
To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain,
To take a recess,
To proceed to the consideration of executive business,
To lay on the table,
To postpone indefinitely,
To postpone to a day certain,
To commit.

There is now a subject being considered by the Senate. I do not care what the subject may be or what stage it may have attained in the consideration of the Senate, it is pending, and that pending question is the question made by the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the reading of a paper. The Senate has a right to adjourn pending that motion, or to fix a date to which it will adjourn, or to take a recess, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or to commit the whole subject to a committee, all these motions having precedence of the other motion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from Texas is mistaken. A motion has not been made by me that a paper be read; but I called for the reading of a particular paper in connection with the President's message. The Chair has stated that under Rule XI the question whether it shall be read or not, it being objected to, is to be submitted to a vote of the Senate. I respectfully suggest to the Chair that the motion to refer without reading ought not to intervene upon that transaction. How can the Senate know whether it wants to refer the paper or not until it determines whether or not it will have it read? The question is not upon a motion, but upon a rule.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, suppose, pending the request or motion, whichever it may be, of the Senator from New Hampshire, I move that the Senate take a recess, can anybody doubt that that is in order? If I move that the Senate adjourn, can anybody doubt that that is in order? If I move, as the Senator from South Carolina has moved, that this matter should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, Rule XXII says that motion takes precedence of the motion to read. There can be no doubt about it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, the statement made by my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, does not change the condition. He says he did not make the motion, but the rules do make the motion, whether he made it or not. When a bill is pending before the Senate, it may be to engross, nobody moves to engross, but the Chair puts the motion because the rule puts it; it may be

to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair puts that motion, and it goes to the Committee of the Whole; it may be to go out of Committee of the Whole into the Senate; no one makes that motion; the rules already provide for the motion and makes the motion. The Chair simply puts the motion because parliamentary law requires the motion to be put and prescribes the motions and the order in which they shall be made.

The Senate was proceeding under the motion made by the rules, whether it was made by a Senator or not, to the consideration of this question, and pending the consideration of the question, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] made a privileged motion having precedence of that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], which is to commit; and it has precedence of every other motion except those motions enumerated, as my friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] says, in the same rule and giving precedence to them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that under Rule XI no motion is necessary in order that the sense of the Senate may be taken in regard to the objection of the Senator from South Carolina to the reading of the paper; it is a matter for the Senate to determine; and pending the vote, the Senator from South Carolina moves to commit to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That the Chair holds to be a privileged question, and the Chair will submit that question to the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. And that is a debatable question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I inquire of the Chair if the question is debatable?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is debatable, as the Chair understands.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be best for the Senate and for the country that these instructions should be read at this time. I can not conceive of any reason why Senators should object. The Senator from South Carolina puts his objection distinctly upon the ground of the want of time. I beg to say to the Senator that he has himself occupied more time upon the floor than would have been required for the reading of all the papers for which I called.

The message of the President, which has been read at the desk, contains a statement that he has not yet been able to restore the Queen of Hawaii because the conditions that there should be a general amnesty and a recognition of all the bona fide acts and obligations of the Provisional Government were not acceptable to the Queen. The President distinctly states that this is the reason why he has accomplished nothing.

I believe that the three papers, for the reading of which I have asked, the instructions of Secretary Gresham to Minister Willis of October 18, the instructions of November 24, and the telegram of December 3 will show to the Senate and to the country that the reason that the President's plan of restoration miscarried was not because the Queen was not willing to accept the conditions of amnesty and a recognition of the acts of the Provisional Government, but because she could get no assurance that the Army of the United States should be used to restore her to the throne and to maintain her upon the throne.

I think, Mr. President, that the instructions, when they are read to the Senate, will prove that the President has been inaccurate when he attributes the failure of his policy of restoration solely to the refusal of the Queen to grant amnesty to the members of the Provisional Government. I think that the Senate will have no doubt about the inaccuracy when we see those instructions. I think the Senate will also discover that there has been a disingenuousness, to say the least, upon the part of the President in dealing with the Provisional Government of Hawaii.

It appears that the President expected when he signified his decree that the Queen should be restored and the Provisional Government destroyed, that thereupon there would be a universal acquiescence in his decision, and that when the communication was made known to the Queen of the intention of the President, the Queen was not merely unwilling—if she was so unwilling—to grant amnesty to the members of the Provisional Government, but was convinced that she could not be restored and could not be maintained upon the throne without the Army of the United States. Therefore it becomes material to know what the instructions were which were given by the President to Mr. Willis as to the use, if any, which should be made of the soldiers of the United States.

If it should turn out that Mr. Willis was instructed that if the Queen asked whether or not the soldiers of the United States could be used to place her upon the throne and to keep her there, she should be told that the President had no authority to use the Army for that purpose without the consent of Congress, but if the Provisional Government asked the very same question, whether or not the troops would be used to effect the restoration, that Government should be told, not as the Queen would be, that the Army would not be used without the consent of Congress, but that the President felt bound to exert all his constitutional powers to effect the restoration—if, I say, these should turn out to be the exact instructions, then I submit that the President has disingenuously, at least, treated this subject in his message to Congress, and that he has not stated the case fully and exactly and literally as it exists: that is to say, that the failure to carry out the plan of restoration was not because the Queen would not grant amnesty to the members of the Provisional Government, and all persons who aided in establishing it, but because she could not get the assurances from Mr. Willis that the soldiers of the United States would be used to place her upon the throne and to maintain her there after she had been thus restored to her royalty.

Mr. President, these are points upon which the country needs to be informed at the earliest possible moment; upon which the Senate needs to be informed at the earliest possible moment; and why any Senator should object to having the exact and literal instructions of the Secretary of State, representing the President, to Mr. Willis read at the Secretary's desk, when they are so brief that they could have been read and could have been known to the Senate and could have gone to the country half an hour ago, it is impossible for me to conceive, unless the Senators who make the objection fear the effect upon the country of the disclosures in some of these papers which are now unread and unpublished upon the table of the Senate.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire knows that that paper of instructions is now in the press, in type; that it has been flashed all over the country, and the insinuation that anybody is trying to suppress it is not worthy of the Senator or anbody else.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know that the facts are as the Senator states. I think this is a most anomalous proceeding in the Senate of the United States. I never yet heard an objection made to the reading of a public paper upon the table of the Senate which could be read in five minutes; and I am at a loss to understand why the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Indiana, and the Senator from West Virginia are so determined that these three brief papers, which tell this whole story, shall not be read from the Secretary's desk of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President —

Mr. FAULKNER. As the Senator from New Hampshire referred to me, I would ask him, before he takes his seat, if he has ever known any Senator to get up on the floor of the Senate to request the reading of only portions of a paper accompanying a President's message, to the exclusion of all others?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, over and over again. Senators have gone to the desk when there were bulky communications and have asked that particular papers which contained the point of the whole case should be read. That has been done repeatedly.

Mr. FAULKNER. I would ask the Senator further, whether we may not disagree as to whether those three papers contain the entire point and the basis of the message of the President? It was for that reason that I objected. I am willing that the Senate shall sit here and have every paper accompanying the message read, but I am unwilling that the Senator from New Hampshire, or any other Senator, shall select from the documents which accompany the message of the President a few, and then have the others postponed until to-morrow.

I desire to say further that the Senator knows that there is no suppressing of any information. The Senator knows that he can now ask for the reading of all the papers.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts rises to a question of order, which he will state.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] has not been recognized by the Chair as entitled to the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from West Virginia that the Chair had recognized the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. HOAR. Now, I yield to my friend from West Virginia with entire pleasure, having asserted my right. [Laughter.]

Mr. FAULKNER. I am under great obligations to the Senator from Massachusetts for his extreme courtesy. It is not very often that the Senator from Massachusetts yields to anyone. [Laughter.] I feel that he has, therefore, bestowed upon me a distinguished personal courtesy, for which I extend him my sincere thanks.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator is talking very well indeed so far, and I am glad to hear him.

Mr. FAULKNER. I was interrupted in the remarks I was making. I only rose for the purpose of addressing an inquiry or two to the Senator from New Hampshire, and was by his answer led off into other remarks.

I would simply say in conclusion that if the Senate desires to sit here and hear all the documents read which accompany the

President's message, so far as I am concerned I am willing to have those documents read; but I shall not consent, as a member of the Senate, to a partial reading of the accompanying documents, and I think it not according to the universal custom of the Senate, and therefore hope the Senate will sustain the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to commit.

Mr. HOAR. I rose not to take part in this discussion, but only to call the attention of the Senate and of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who have raised this proposition, to a fact which I think probably they have not ascertained, and I should like the attention of the Senator from South Carolina and of the Senator from Indiana.

All the matter which accompanies the President's message, as I understand, consists in old or new public documents which have been printed and I think are entirely known to the Senate and to the public, except the three short matters, the reading of which the Senator from New Hampshire has asked for, which come in in manuscript. They are new. The Secretary thought they would take five or six pages of our ordinary print, but I should not think they would take more than four, certainly not more than five or six.

I quite agree that Senators would be entirely right in rising and saying that they would not tolerate the picking out from a document certain matters which, taken alone, might make a one sided case, but should insist on reading the whole. That, however, is not this case.

It is the case of a message, to which there are attached printed documents in regard to the Hawaiian question, coming down from President Harrison's time, some twenty or thirty in number, including Mr. Blount's report, which has been in our hands in print for three or four weeks. What the Senator from New Hampshire asks, however, is simply some new additions to our present information, contained in manuscript, the chief one being the instructions to Mr. Willis, which, as I said, would not make more than three or four pages, and could have been read in five minutes and perhaps in three. That is all there is of it. Does the Senator think it is worth while to have a discussion about such a question?

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not think it is.

Mr. HOAR. If I may be pardoned an additional suggestion, those experienced parliamentarians on the other side will understand, if the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to refer the message and accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations comes up, I can debate that motion, or the Senator from New Hampshire, or any other Senator, and the Senator debating it can read as a part of his remarks the instructions to Mr. Willis; so that we are not discussing a question of any practical importance anyway.

Mr. VOORHEES. I think myself that we are magnifying a matter which might have passed along without such attention being drawn to it. The Senator from New Hampshire, however, rose, and without explaining what he had in mind or to what part of the accompanying documents his suggestion related, called for the reading of two or three papers. We could not very well hear on this side, and he did not point out the character of what he desired to have read. I confess, had I known that it embraced simply the instructions to Mr. Willis, so far as I am concerned, although the rule is the other way, I should not have made an objection.

But there has been so much temper and feeling and partisan bias exhibited on this subject, and so much, if Senators will pardon me, of unfairness, as I conceive, that the bare attempt of a Senator on either side of the Chamber proposing to pick out certain parts to have read, contrary to all the precedents of the Senate, contrary to its usages, at once excited my opposition, and I fell back immediately upon the rule, as Senators on the other side would have done if the situation had been reversed. This much it is proper to say.

So far as suppressing information is concerned, that is utter nonsense. The instructions to Mr. Willis are now being published in all the afternoon newspapers. It is only because I thought a step of unfairness was sought to be taken to the prejudice of the message, that I took the ground that the accompanying documents should all be published or all be referred with the message; and that is a fair construction, in my judgment.

So far as the accompanying papers are concerned, the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts is that many of them have been published heretofore. That is a matter of course, because the scope of the Senator's resolution went back to 1881, I think. If the papers have already been published and are subject to criticism, why did the Senator ask for their republication in this form? I do not want to be critical or hypercritical.

Mr. HOAR. I desired to get them all together.

Mr. VOORHEES. As the Senator suggests, the only good reason was that they should all be put together in this form.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, it is partly that and partly because there might have been instructions in former Administrations since 1881, which were then deemed confidential and not made public. My resolution was that, if the President deemed it not incompatible with the public interests, he should send in all the instructions since 1881. I understand he now sends them in, and in the very printed documents in which they existed.

Mr. VOORHEES. I know nothing about that. I inquire, Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], to commit the President's message and accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from Indiana is not occupying the floor——

Mr. VOORHEES. I yield to the Senator from Iowa with pleasure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. I only wish to say a word upon this subject. I take it for granted, of course, that the message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed. I confess some desire to have read at the Secretary's desk the brief documents to which our attention has been called, and I think it has been the uniform custom—I will not say the courtesy of the Senate, because that seems to be rather an old phrase and somewhat in disrepute—but it has been the uniform usage of the Senate when a Senator asks for the reading of a document or a paper, if it is not a long paper and will not occupy much time, to have that paper read. That has been the usual custom.

I remember very well at the last session when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] was making a most elaborate argument upon the public question we were then discussing and had spoken for some hours, he sent to the Secretary's desk a long document, being a letter addressed by a gentleman in Missouri to another gentleman in Missouri, and asked that it be read. Objection was made that it was not within the rules of the Senate; and thereupon under Rule XI the question was submitted to the Senate and by a large majority—I remember that I voted with the majority because I believed where a Senator desired to have a paper read which was in his opinion of public importance, that the Senate should allow it to be read at the time—and I think every Senator upon the other side of the Chamber voted to have that paper read, which occupied a half hour.

I have not seen these papers, except to glance at them casually at the desk, and I am sure that they can be read in ten minutes. It is now said by the Senator from Indiana that these papers are to be printed in the evening newspapers, and that if we will all wait until we receive the 5 o'clock edition of the Washington Star we shall have here an opportunity of reading what the public will have read two or three hours in advance.

I submit to the Senate that these are documents of great moment, especially the instructions of the Secretary of State, under the direction of the President, to a minister who went to Hawaii upon a delicate and important public mission, in which the people of the United States are greatly interested. If I were Secretary of State and a request were made in this Chamber for the reading of an important document, written by me, of instructions to my minister, I should think, as a matter of courtesy to me as Secretary of State, the document should be read here.

I hope now, after all that has been said about it, that whatever there is on this subject shall be disposed of by unanimous consent, that the three papers referred to may be read, and if afterwards any injustice appears to have been done for the reason that some other paper is not read, I am willing, for one, to sit here and listen to the reading of that paper also. I think justice to all concerned requires that. Therefore I hope before the reference is made that the papers referred to may be read.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have said over and over again, and I now repeat, that there is not a syllable or a word or a line in those papers which I desire to suppress and keep from the public. That is all, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] says, idle nonsense. The mere intimation or suggestion by anybody that I desire to suppress anything is simply nonsense. I do not think that I can use any milder term.

I have said that my objection to reading the papers was that we all know the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] very well; we understand perfectly well his tactics in political matters. If he can get the advantage of a political adversary by garbling a report or a communication, we know perfectly well that he will do it. If the Senator from New Hampshire had stated what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has just stated, I do not know that I should have interposed any objection, but the Senator from New Hampshire gets up and selects certain papers from the accompanying documents submitted by

the President, and asks that they be read, and the universal suspicion is that that Senator had some object, some nigh-cut that he wants to take on the President or the Democratic party. That is a fact, and we all know it.

The Senator says that he is surprised that anybody should object. I do think that Senator ought not to be surprised at it. He knows perfectly well that we have to be on the lookout for him all the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I beg right at this point to thank him for the compliment he has just paid me.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is entirely welcome to the compliment, I assure him; but it is a fact all the same. I have not a single particle of objection to reading the papers. The only question I had was as to the economy of time.

Mr. CULLOM. Then let the papers be read.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not yielded the floor yet. I want to submit a few more brief remarks.

I think, in common fairness to the President and common fairness to the Secretary of State, that if any papers in connection with these three documents, the reading of which has been requested, affect them in any way, they ought to be read, and I scarcely think that anybody will charge the Senator from New Hampshire with any desire to be guilty of a special courtesy to the Secretary of State or the President of the United States.

If the Senator from Iowa had made that request, I might have suspected that his desire was to indulge in the utmost courtesy to the Secretary of State and to the President, and that no other motive actuated him.

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. BUTLER. That, I have no doubt, would be universally conceded on our side. If the Senator from Iowa desires to have the papers read, if the Senate can afford to stand it, I have not the slightest objection to having them read, but it is a little surprising to me that the impetuosity of the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Iowa can not be restrained until to-morrow morning. I think the country will survive whether these papers are read or not. The anxiety, the earnestness, and the assiduity with which those Senators are following up this question is praiseworthy, and I commend them for it. It is an indication that the times are improving, that they want to sustain the present Administration, and give it all the courtesy and consideration which any Administration has received. So, with that view, and with the assumption that that is the object, that they are trying to protect the Secretary of State and the President, I shall withdraw my objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Pending the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to commit, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] asks unanimous consent for the reading of the papers indicated.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi objects.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Mississippi will kindly yield to me a moment, I wish to say in reply to the Senator from South Carolina that we are happy to be informed on this side of the Chamber that whenever we wish to accomplish a partisan object slyly and without suspicion, it behooves us to put forward for that purpose the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. [Laughter.] For my own part, I shall gladly agree to his leadership whenever a partisan purpose is to be slyly accomplished.

But, Mr. President, I beg to ask the Senator from South Carolina why it should be assumed in this case, of all others, that I was actuated by a partisan motive? The Senator must know that for three months during the extra session I was humbly following the lead of President Cleveland and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES]. [Laughter.] Did I act in good faith on that occasion? I thought I did; I tried to do so; and I trained with the President of the United States and the Senator from Indiana to the best of my ability. I only regretted that upon the question then pending we did not find with us, sustaining the President and the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from South Carolina. [Laughter.] I am afraid the Senator from South Carolina was influenced by other than a motive of high public duty when he dissented from the recommendations of his President and the recommendations of the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Finance.

I trust when we again make a fight for sound money in the Senate, actuated thereto by a message of President Cleveland and under the distinguished lead of the sound-money Senator from Indiana, the Republicans on this side of the Chamber will be able then to ally with themselves the Senator from South Carolina.

Why this talk about partisanship upon this question of Hawaii? Did not the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] the other day, with high-sounding sentences, declare that he was incapable of being influenced by partisanship in discussing a question of foreign affairs, and did he not then undertake to speak for the Democratic side of this Chamber, and did we not all on this side of the Chamber realize that the Democratic party were utterly incapable of taking a partisan view of a question of foreign affairs? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the announcement of the Senator from Delaware that such was the noble and magnificent position of the Democratic party on the Hawaiian question, struck deep into the hearts of the Republicans upon this side of the Chamber, and since then we have been equally imbued with the desire that the Hawaiian question should be disposed of without the slightest partisanship. Therefore, I think the Senator from South Carolina was unwarranted in singling me out for denunciation on the ground that I am seeking, when asking to have these instructions read at this time, some partisan advantage of the President, whom I supported so constantly and so loyally upon the silver question. The President of the United States is necessarily dealing with this question in a nonpartisan way.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator imagines for one instant that what I said was in the form of denunciation, I desire now to apologize to him in the most unqualified manner, and I now extend to him my unqualified apology for the slightest suspicion that I intended to denounce him in any way. I will say now to that Senator, since the announcement of his nonpartisan patriotism has been made, it has sunk very deeply into my heart. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad that I have been able to teach a lesson to the Senator from South Carolina. That lesson is this, that upon matters of this kind connected with foreign relations he should follow the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who has announced, presumably by authority and after consultation with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who is the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that this question of our relations with Hawaii shall be treated from a nonpartisan standpoint. I regret that the Senator from South Carolina for a little while found himself imbued with a partisan spirit and desired to attribute partisan motives to others. I hope now that he will reverse——

Mr. BUTLER. I apologize, Mr. President.

Mr. CHANDLER. That he will reverse himself and resume his judgment, and hereafter we shall be sure that he deals with questions of foreign affairs without partisan spirit, as we all know, in the height of his statesmanship, he deals with every public question—without the slightest regard for political parties. [Laughter.]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know what the precedents of the Senate are in reference to the matter now before us, but I do know what is just and right. Here is a case attempted to be made against the President. He sends in, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, his message with the documents called for by the resolution of the Senate, and we have here, I think, a very unjust, not to say unprecedented state of affairs. When the message is read, of a large number of documents accompanying it two or three are selected for the purpose of being read and the great mass are not to be read. I say it is just, right, and fair, when we go into the reading of the documents, that the whole case shall be put before the Senate and before the country, and not a part of it. I object, therefore, to the reading of these selected papers unless all are read, because, as I have stated, when a case is put before the country and before the Senate the whole of it ought to be put before the country and the Senate, and not a part of it.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, just one word in response to the suggestions made by the Senator from Mississippi. I asked unanimous consent that these three papers might be read at the desk. As I understand the situation in which we are placed at this moment by the rules of the Senate or by the suggestions made on the floor, the Senate passes a resolution requesting the President of the United States to furnish to us certain documents and papers. The documents and papers in response to that resolution are sent to the Senate. They are here on our table in the possession of the Senate. I think by all parliamentary rules, certainly by all proper parliamentary rules, unless some Senate rule intervenes, I have the right as a Senator on this floor to have every paper read respecting the subject sent here by the President in pursuance of the resolution of the Senate. But I do not ask that all the papers shall be read.

Now, is it possible that under our rules, when papers are at the desk called for by us, we are to be forced to vote for their reference to a standing committee of this body without knowing what they contain and without having the privilege of an investiga-

tion and examination of them? Is that a part of the system of rules we have adopted in this body?

The Senator from Mississippi says he objects to a partial case. I seek to make no case. Here is a long message from the President dealing with this question and stating that he submits with his message certain papers, specifically alluding to the instructions sent to Mr. Willis, our minister at Hawaii. Is it possible that that is not an important question and a distinct question? Are we to read all the testimony, all the statements by Mr. Blount through the months of April, May, June, and July, his communications, his letters, his cross-examinations, his statements to the Secretary of State? Are we to be required to listen to all those at the desk in order that we may have the brief, confidential instruction, now for the first time sent to the Senate, given by our Secretary of State to his minister?

I submit, Mr. President, that if the rules of the Senate require us to submit to that they surely should be dispensed with so far as making such a discrimination is concerned.

I move that the three documents indicated be read at the desk pending the question of reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in order that, for one at least, I may know what the instructions contain.

Mr. FAULKNER. It strikes me that a motion to refer has precedence of the motion of the Senator from Iowa. I understood that the Senator from South Carolina had withdrawn his motion, and although I do not agree with his attitude in withdrawing it, yet I propose to follow the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this side of the Chamber, even when I do not agree with them, as they have special charge of this particular matter.

Mr. MILLS. The Chair has ruled that a motion to commit has precedence of a motion to read, and for the Senator from Iowa to make his motion again is to go behind the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. ALLISON. Then the rules of the Senate require that a document which is in our possession must be referred to a committee and ordered to be printed without a Senator knowing what it contains.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I will ask for correct information from the Chair whether the motion of the Senator from South Carolina has been withdrawn. Though I do not agree with the attitude of the Senator from South Carolina, yet he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I propose to follow the members of that committee on this side.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is not advised that the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to refer the President's message, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on Foreign Relations has been withdrawn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does that motion include the printing of the message and accompanying documents?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It includes the printing. Pending the motion of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the three papers indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire be read. To that request the Senator from Mississippi objects?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. HOAR. The motion of the Senator from South Carolina being pending, to commit the papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I call for the reading of the three papers which the Senator from New Hampshire asked to have read, and which are included in the motion to refer. I desire that my call, if it be objected to, be submitted to the Senate under Rule XI for its vote.

Mr. STEWART. Without debate.

Mr. CALL. I should like to submit a single suggestion to the Senate. The fifth clause of the seventh rule of the Senate provides as follows:

> The Presiding Officer may at any time lay * * * before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose.

I submit what does the term to "lay before the Senate" mean? Does it mean the announcement that a message or a document has been received from the President of the United States, or does laying before the Senate mean such a presentation of the subject as will inform the Senate what is in the message? In my judgment it can not be laid before the Senate unless there be a presentation in some form of the substance of the communication.

Mr. HOAR. On the vote of the Senate, if the question shall be put to a vote, I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MILLS. I make the point of order that the call by the Senator from Massachusetts for the reading of the papers is consideration. It is the consideration of the subject, and the rule says that pending the consideration the motions specified shall have precedence in the order in which they stand arranged. A motion to commit has precedence of a motion to consider the subject in any of its aspects, whether to read a paper, to make a speech on it, to amend it, or to do anything else with it.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to suggest to the Chair that I do not deem myself to be making a motion under Rule IX. My right stands just as if a motion were pending under that rule to commit a bill, and I should ask that the bill be read for information before the vote is taken to commit it. These papers are the subject of the pending motion. There is a motion to commit and a motion to print certain papers, and on that motion, to use the language of the rule, I call for the reading that we may know what we are voting upon, and what we are to commit, and what we are to print. I conceive that the special rule (which was not intended to compel the Senate to submit to the reading of voluminous documents) is that, as incident to the various motions set out, the Senate shall know by having read what it is acting upon. On that point I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MILLS. I will test the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts. Suppose a bill were pending and the question were the engrossment of the bill, and the Senator from Massachusetts should call for the reading of the bill, and then a Senator should move to adjourn. Which would have precedence, the reading of the bill or the motion to adjourn?

Mr. CHANDLER. Undoubtedly a motion to adjourn or to take a recess.

Mr. HOAR. All admit that.

Mr. CHANDLER. But when the subject is under consideration whether a paper shall be referred, and a call is made that the paper, the reference of which is to be submitted to a vote of the Senate, shall be read, is not that the highest question of privilege?

Mr. MILLS. Then the Senator begs the whole question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Texas if it is not the highest kind of a privileged question, whether the paper shall be read.

Mr. MILLS. All these questions are privileged. The motion to adjourn is a motion of the highest privilege of the body. The reading of a paper is the consideration of the subject. If the Senator admits that a motion to adjourn may be put to the Senate in preference to the reading, then he admits all the other motions provided for in Rule XXII. It would certainly be in order——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me at that point? The reason why I do not admit it is because the reading of a paper is expressly provided for by the rule. The question shall be decided without debate whether the paper shall be read.

Mr. MILLS. But Rule XXII says that when any question is pending, whether it is that a paper or any other part of a message shall be read, then certain motions shall have precedence. One is that the Senate shall adjourn; another that it shall fix the day to which it shall adjourn; and another is to commit the whole subject, without reading any papers, to the committee, in order that the committee organized by the parliamentary body may investigate the subject and bring it back to the Senate on a report, and enable the body to consider it more intelligently. I hold that the motion of the Senator to demand the reading is not in order.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator give us any rule?

Mr. MILLS. Rule XXII.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought before I left the Chamber a moment ago that the Chair understood me to have withdrawn my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not so understand the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. So I have been informed. I withdrew the motion to commit, in view of what had been said by the Senator from Iowa, and I so stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa renew his request?

Mr. ALLISON. I renew my request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa renews his request for the reading of the papers indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire. Is there objection?

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not object, because it is the view of the Senators representing the Committee on Foreign Relations that that request should be granted. In my judgment I do not agree with the committee, but I shall not object to unanimous consent.

Mr. CALL. I want to say before this action is taken that under the provision of the rule it is very clear to me that the Chair can not lay before the Senate a communication from the President without presenting to the Senate information as to what the matter is. What does laying before the Senate mean, in the sense of the rule? Does it mean presenting a subject in such form that the Senate can not know what it is? Surely not. It is not laid before the Senate in the sense of the rule unless it is presented in such form that the Senate may know what it is.

Then the rule goes on to say that any motion shall be suspended

to allow the President of the Senate to lay before the Senate a communication from the President. If these words do not mean the reading of the matter or the presentation of the substance of it, then they are idle, they mean nothing. There is no sense in laying papers before the Senate in such form that the Senate can not understand the matter; and the rule makes that a question of privilege. The message has been laid before the Senate by the President of the Senate under that clause.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none. The papers indicated will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, October 18, 1893.*

[No. 4.—Confidential.]

SIR: Supplementing the general instructions which you have received with regard to your official duties, it is necessary to communicate to you, in confidence, special instructions for your guidance in so far as concerns the relation of the Government of the United States towards the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

The President deems it his duty to withdraw from the Senate the treaty of annexation which has been signed by the Secretary of State and the agents of the Provisional Government, and to dispatch a trusted representative to Hawaii to impartially investigate the causes of the so-called revolution and ascertain and report the true situation in those islands. This information was needed the better to enable the President to discharge a delicate and important public duty.

The instructions given to Mr. Blount, of which you are furnished with a copy, point out a line of conduct to be observed by him in his official and personal relations on the islands by which you will be guided so far as they are applicable and not inconsistent with what is herein contained.

It remains to acquaint you with the President's conclusions upon the facts embodied in Mr. Blount's reports and to direct your course in accordance therewith.

The Provisional Government was not established by the Hawaiian people, or with their consent or acquiescence, nor has it since existed with their consent. The Queen refused to surrender her powers to the Provisional Government until convinced that the minister of the United States has recognized it as the *de facto* authority, and would support and defend it with the military force of the United States, and that resistance would precipitate a bloody conflict with that force. She was advised and assured by her ministers and by the leaders of the movement for the overthrow of her Government that if she surrendered under protest her case would afterwards be fairly considered by the President of the United States. The Queen finally wisely yielded to the armed forces of the United States, then quartered in Honolulu, relying upon the good faith and honor of the President, when informed of what had occurred, to undo the action of the minister and reinstate her and the authority which she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

After a patient examination of Mr. Blount's report, the President is satisfied that the movement against the Queen if not instigated was encouraged and supported by the representative of this Government at Honolulu; that he promised in advance to aid her enemies in an effort to overthrow the Hawaiian Government and set up by force a new government in its place, and that he kept this promise by causing a detachment of troops to be landed from the Boston on the 16th of January and by recognizing the Provisional Government the next day, when it was too feeble to defend itself, and the constitutional government was able to successfully maintain its authority against any threatening force other than that of the United States already landed.

The President has therefore determined that he will not send back to the Senate for its action thereon, the treaty which he withdrew from that body for further consideration on the 9th day of March last.

On your arrival at Honolulu you will take advantage of an early opportunity to inform the Queen of this determination, making known to her the President's sincere regret that the reprehensible conduct of the American minister and the unauthorized presence on land of a military force of the United States obliged her to surrender her sovereignty for the time being and rely on the justice of this Government to undo the flagrant wrong.

You will, however, at the same time inform the Queen that when reinstated the President expects that she will pursue a magnanimous course by granting full amnesty to all who participated in the movement against her, including persons who are or have been officially or otherwise connected with the Provisional Government, depriving them of no right or privilege which they enjoyed before the so-called revolution. All obligations created by the Provisional Government in due course of administration should be assumed.

Having secured the Queen's agreement to pursue this wise and humane policy, which it is believed you will speedily obtain, you will then advise the Executive of the Provisional Government and his ministers of the President's determination of the question which their action and that of the Queen devolved upon him, and that they are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority.

Should the Queen decline to pursue the liberal course suggested, or should the Provisional Government refuse to abide by the President's decision, you will report the facts and await further directions.

In carrying out these general instructions, you will be guided largely by your own good judgment in dealing with the delicate situation.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. Q. GRESHAM.

Inclosure: Mr. Gresham to Mr. Blount, confidential instructions, March 11, 1893.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram sent through dispatch agent at San Francisco.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, November 24, 1893.*

The brevity and uncertainty of your telegrams are embarrassing. You will insist upon amnesty and recognition of obligations of the Provisional Government as essential conditions of restoration. All interests will be promoted by prompt action.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, December 3, 1893.*

Your dispatch which was answered by steamer on the 25th of November seems to call for additional instructions.

Should the Queen refuse assent to the written conditions, you will at once inform her that the President will cease interposition in her behalf and that while he deems it his duty to endeavor to restore to the sovereign the constitutional government of the islands, his further efforts in that direction will depend upon the Queen's unqualified agreement that all obligations created by the Provisional Government in a proper course of administration shall be assumed, and upon such pledges by her as will prevent the adoption of any measures of proscription or punishment for what has been done in the past by those setting up or supporting the Provisional Government. The President feels that by our original interference and what followed we have incurred responsibilities to the whole Hawaiian community, and it would not be just to put one party at the mercy of the other.

Should the Queen ask whether if she accedes to conditions active steps will be taken by the United States to effect her restoration or to maintain her authority thereafter, you will say that the President can not use force without the authority of Congress.

Should the Queen accept conditions and the Provisional Government refuse to surrender, you will be governed by previous instructions. If the Provisional Government asks whether the United States will hold the Queen to fulfillment of stipulated conditions you will say the President, acting under dictates of honor and duty as he has done in endeavoring to effect restoration, will do all in his constitutional power to cause observance of the conditions he has imposed.

GRESHAM.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection the message of the President, with the accompanying documents, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HAWLEY. And printed.

Mr. HOAR. Has a motion been made to that effect?

Mr. VILAS and others. No.

Mr. HOAR. I make that motion. I move that the message and accompanying documents be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOLPH. Printed and referred.

Mr. HOAR. I move that they be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I desire the motion under the rule to go over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory thereto and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants on said lands; and

A bill (H. R. 73) supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled "An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives."

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Territories:

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and

A bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 97) donating two obsolete cannon to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that an appropriation of $500 be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for traveling expenses for inspector of furniture for public buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PASCO presented petitions of Frank E. Saxon and 15 other business men of Hernando County, of J. M. Barco and 16 other business men of Levy County, and of J. M. Fleming and 25 other business men of Citrus County, all in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a term of the United States circuit and district courts at Ocala, Marion County, Fla.; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., praying for the establishment of a navy-yard at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Fairfield, Washingtonville, Madison County, Washington Court-House, Chicago, Centerton, Bryan, New Richmond, Rutland, and Scioto and Pike counties, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS. I present a memorial of several thousand iron miners in the mines of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and the memorial of John Cailson and several hundred iron miners at Ely, Minn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on iron ore, representing that they are out of employment, and that the mines in which they formerly worked are closed. I move that the memorials be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the St. Paul (Minn.) Press Feeders' Union, praying for Government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of the Nashville (Tenn.) branch of the Journeymen Stone-Cutters' Association of North America, praying that the Government of the United States become the owner or take control of the telegraphic system of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. TURPIE presented the memorial of A. Steffen, a tobacco manufacturer of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on Sumatra and other leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, presented a petition of lithographers of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for an increase in the duty on lithographic plates from 25 per cent ad valorem to 50 per cent ad valorem; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 163, of Superior, Wis., praying for the establishment of a governmental telegraph system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Port Townsend, Wash., stating "that a commercial necessity exists to have a suitable life-saving station established on the Pacific coast between Cape Flattery and Destruction Island," and praying that an appropriation be made for that purpose; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORDON presented a petition of the Savannah (Ga.) Cotton Exchange, praying that an appropriation be made for an examination of the old inland route between Savannah and Wrights Rivers, in the State of Georgia; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Sumter County (Ga.) Farmers' Alliance, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the circulating medium; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Columbus, Ga., praying relief for corporations and others using evidences of indebtedness as a circulating medium during the recent unprecedented stringency and financial depression; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Macon, Ga., of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., and of the Georgia Bankers' Association of Macon, Ga., praying relief for banks issuing clearing-house certificates during the late financial stringency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 968) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home, reported it without amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1113) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4013) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 971) to open, widen, and extend alleys in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 832) to simplify the form of deeds of conveyance, trust, and releases of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1086) to close alleys in square No. 751, in the city of Washington, D. C., reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 356) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from sale certain land in the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

FORT BRIDGER MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. CAREY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 165) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Bridger abandoned military reservation, in the State of Wyoming, to report it with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all public lands now remaining undisposed of within the abandoned military reservation in the State of Wyoming known as the Fort Bridger military reservation, are hereby made subject to disposal under the homestead law only: *Provided*, That actual occupants thereon upon the 1st day of July, 1892, shall have the preference right to make one entry not exceeding one quarter section under existing laws if qualified, which shall include their respective improvements: *Provided further*, That any of such lands as are occupied for town-site purposes and any of the lands that may be shown to be valuable for coal or minerals shall be disposed of as now provided for lands subject to entry and sale under the town-site, coal, or mineral land laws, respectively.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was to add at the end of the bill the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reserve from disposal, under the provisions of this act, any lands included in said reservation which may have heretofore been used for cemetery purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill known as the bill to repeal the Federal election laws, for the purpose of submitting some remarks upon it.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1293) to relieve Benjamin F. Church from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1294) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin Hartley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE of California introduced a bill (S. 1295) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1296) for the relief of Andrew Gray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1297) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1298) to remove from the rolls of the Army the charge of desertion against Neil Patton, late of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, and to grant grant him an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its

title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1299) for the relief of John B. Roach and William F. McPherson, executors of John Roach, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEFFER. I desire to introduce another bill, and in view of the importance of the subject-matter of the bill I ask unanimous consent that it may be read at length.

The bill (S. 1300) to provide funds for immediate use in relieving want and destitution throughout the country was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas want and destitution among the poor and unemployed people is advertised in the newspaper press of the country; and

Whereas it appears that there is urgent need of money to relieve the distress occasioned by such want and destitution; and

Whereas it appears further that the distress has reached a degree beyond present ability of local arrangements to properly relieve; and

Whereas Congress has heretofore granted relief in cases of pressing emergencies in the several States: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That in the name and on behalf of the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required to deliver to the presidents of the boards of national relief commissioners of the several States herein authorized to be appointed, the several amounts of money and in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

SEC. 2. That whenever, within ten days after the approval of this act, the governor of any State or Territory shall certify to the President of the United States that there is, within the limits of such State or Territory, distress among the poor and unemployed people; that such distress exists among and affects large numbers of people who are, by reason of their poverty, unable to help themselves; that such distress has reached a point beyond the capacity of present local arrangements to adequately relieve, or that if funds have been provided for relief purposes they have been exhausted or are not available for immediate use in the impending emergency; and when the governor shall further certify that he has designated three competent persons—naming them—of different political and religious affiliations to take charge of and apply any funds delivered to them by authority of Congress for the purpose of relieving want among the poor and unemployed people of their State, the President shall immediately appoint and commission such persons to act as a board of national relief commissioners to receive and apply money provided by this act, the first named of such commissioners to act as president, the second as treasurer, and the third as secretary of the board of national relief commissioners for the particular State or Territory, and he shall thereupon notify the Secretary of the Treasury of said appointments. The members of said board shall take the usual oath of office and the treasurer shall execute a bond in the sum of $100,000, to be approved by the United States district attorney for the district in which the capital of the State or Territory is located, conditioned for the faithful discharge of his duties and that he will properly account for all moneys intrusted to him under the provisions of this act. The oaths of the commissioners and the bond of the treasurer shall be filed in the office of the clerk of said district court. The commissioners shall immediately meet at the capital of the State or Territory and organize. On notice from the said United States district attorney and the governor of the State or Territory, in a joint communication, that the board of national relief commissioners is duly organized as required by this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be delivered to the treasurer of said board one-fourth part of the aggregate amount of money herein allowed to such State or Territory, and he shall not at any time pay or deliver to such officer more than such one-fourth part unless the governor, at the end of thirty days after such payment, shall certify that the distress continues and that more money is required to relieve it, in which case another one-fourth part of said aggregate amount may be forwarded, and so, on like certificate by the governor thirty days after each payment, another one-fourth part may be sent until the aggregate sum is all paid: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount allowed to each State or Territory shall not exceed $1 for every ten inhabitants of such State or Territory as shown by the census of 1890.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of $6,300,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, and the said amount shall be provided as follows: First. All the silver dollars now in the Treasury, and not covered by certificates outstanding, shall be used; and if these be not enough to supply the whole amount required, second, the Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately cause to be coined from any silver bullion now in the Treasury standard silver dollars enough to make up the whole amount.

SEC. 4. That the several boards of national relief commissioners are hereby authorized to turn over to duly authorized officers of municipalities and of private relief organizations, in the several counties, cities, and towns of their respective States and Territories, such portions of the moneys intrusted to them by this act as they may deem best to make the provisions of this law most effective.

SEC. 5. That the members of said boards of national relief commissioners and all other persons participating in the distribution and application of the funds herein provided shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed and held to be officers of the United States, subject to be dealt with as such in case of fraud, embezzlement, or theft.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that the bill may be laid on the table temporarily, and to-morrow as soon as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has concluded his remarks, or as soon thereafter as I can get the floor, I shall submit some remarks on the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1301) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hiram Somerville; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAREY introduced a bill (S. 1302) to establish the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1303) for the relief of the Overton Hotel Company, of Memphis, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1304) to make Commodore William P. McCann, of the Navy, a rear-admiral on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HUNTON introduced a bill (S. 1305) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of certain corporations within the District of Columbia, approved October 1, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1307) to prohibit horse-racing in the District of Columbia between the 1st day of December and the 1st day of April, each succeeding year, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1308) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1309) to provide for the provisional government of foreign countries and places acquired by treaty or otherwise; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. FRYE. I should like to have the bill read at length.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the United States shall acquire dominion over any foreign country or place, by treaty of annexation or otherwise, the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint a governor for the same and a legislative council, to consist of any number of persons not less than five nor more than twenty-five, whose acts shall be subject to revision or repeal by Congress; and, unless the treaty of annexation or cession shall otherwise provide, said governor and council shall constitute and conduct a provisional government for such country or place until Congress shall otherwise provide by law.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1310) for the relief of Alfred M. Burnham; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1311) for the relief of George F. Rider; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 1312) for the relief of the heirs of Charles B. Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 46) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan the Columbian caravels to the American National Red Cross, Incorporated; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 47) concerning the appropriation for the introduction of a water supply to the station of the United States Fish Commission in Lake County, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE.

Mr. HARRIS. Some days ago a joint resolution proposing to extend Massachusetts avenue through the Naval Observatory grounds was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I referred the joint resolution to the Secretary of the Navy, and he sends me a communication and the draft of a bill in respect to the Naval Observatory grounds that I think important. I therefore move that the communication be printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN, it was

Ordered, That Mr. J. A. McCreary, of Emporia, Lyon County, Kans., have leave to withdraw from the files all documents and papers filed by him to accompany Senate bills Nos. 1816 and 1817, introduced during the Fifty-second Congress, subject to the rules.

On motion of Mr. HUNTON, it was

Ordered, That the papers relating to the claims of the stockholders of the Seaboard and Roanoke Railroad Company be taken from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Claims.

ADDITIONAL SENATE MESSENGER.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms is hereby authorized and directed to employ an additional messenger at a salary of $1,440 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided for.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate a list of the judgments of the Court of Claims rendered since March 4, 1893, on which there has been no appeal, and the time for appeal has expired.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, in addition to the number already ordered by law, 15,500 copies of the fourteenth annual report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, uniform with the preceding volumes of the series, of which 3,500 shall be for use of the Senate, 7,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Geological Survey.

MARITIME CANAL OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. MORGAN. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask its consideration, if that is according to the rule. I am not quite certain whether I have a right to do so or not.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee to consist of three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, be raised, whose duty it shall be to examine into and report upon the present condition of the Maritime Canal of Nicaragua, now being constructed under a charter granted by the Congress of the United States and under concessions granted by the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and the prospect of the completion of said work under the control and with means to be raised by the said Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, and such other matters connected with the construction and control of said canal as may better enable Congress to determine what legislation, if any, is proper and necessary for the promotion of the general welfare of the people and Government of the United States.

2. Said committee may hold its sessions during the sessions of Congress, at any place in the United States, and may proceed to Nicaragua and Costa Rica and there conduct the examinations required by these resolutions, and the expenses of said committee incurred on the part of the Senate shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and the expenses incurred on the part of the House of Representatives shall be paid out of the contingent fund of said House.

3. Said joint committee shall choose its chairman and appoint a clerk and stenographer, and a sergeant-at-arms, who shall have, respectively, an allowance of $6 per diem while in the service of the committee, and said committee shall report upon the matters committed to them by these resolutions.

Mr. HARRIS. The resolution will have to go the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. That was the question in my mind.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will so hold. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to make an inquiry on that point. The suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee is true in respect of a resolution passed merely by authority of the Senate. All resolutions passed by authority of the Senate which incur expenses imposed upon the contingent fund of this body must of course go to that committee. This is a concurrent resolution, and I wish to inquire whether that does not make a difference.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg leave to suggest to my friend from Alabama that any resolution, whether a Senate resolution or a concurrent one, that makes a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate is required by law to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Then perhaps I am in error. I was quite uncertain and mentioned the fact that I was uncertain about it at the time the resolution was introduced. However, I should like to say a few words upon the resolution.

The Congress of the United States finds itself now in an attitude in reference to the Nicaraguan Canal which requires in good faith to its own people and in good faith to all the governments of the world that we should determine whether we intend to take any legislative steps for assisting the canal project or not. It may not be the judgment of Congress that the United States ought to be in anywise connected in the way of financial support with the construction of the canal, or it may be that the judgment of Congress is that we ought to take the subject up and become its patrons and benefactors to the extent that we should have the control of it. I mean, of course, the actual and financial control; I do not mean the political sovereignty over the country where the canal is to be constructed.

But it is due to the Maritime Canal Company, which has spent about six or seven million dollars in the construction of the work; it is due to the people of the United States, and particularly to the people of the Western coast of the United States, that this line of communication shall either be adopted and executed by Congress, with all convenient and economic speed, or else that we shall at once announce our intention not to do this thing, and not to interfere with it, so that the company, chartered under our laws, can go abroad or come to the people of the United States or the States of the American Union and obtain funds for the building of the canal as a private enterprise and conduct it hereafter without any interruption from the Congress of the United States.

What I desire to do, as a friend of the canal, is to have the subject disembarrassed of the difficulties with which it is continually contending. I believe that, notwithstanding the stringency of the times, the great difficulty in raising money upon securities of any kind, if Congress had never interposed an objection and had never undertaken to legislate upon this subject at all, the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, under the great powers and beneficial advantages we have given it in the charter, and under the encouragement of the Governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, with the assistance of other governments of the world (which in the absence of assistance from us they have a perfect right to render), would to-day have been in a career of decided prosperity. It would have been working along, and would have commended itself to the world as an institution which was really established in the public faith and confidence and would work out in spite of all opposition and all embarrassment.

I say this, Mr. President, because of the enormous advantages which must inure to the holders of the stock of the Maritime Canal Company whenever the canal is completed. We have but one example to which we can refer of an international character to sustain and support the proposition which I am now advancing, and that is the example of the Suez Canal. That was not built by a government, it was built by private enterprise, assisted by the Khedive of Egypt, but most largely out of the funds of the people of France, who subscribed to the securities of that company, taking its bonds, etc. But it has eventuated in Great Britain buying up the interest of Egypt in the canal and making a vast amount of money, four or five fold the money they put into the canal. It has been completed and is now being duplicated—that is to say, enlarged to double its former size—and the income from it is something that is wonderful, connected with such a vast investment. There is perhaps no investment approaching it in magnitude in the world that yields an income so great and so steady and so perfectly secured.

Therefore I feel authorized to say, upon the example of the completion and prosperity of the Suez Canal, that if the canal across the Isthmus of Darien were built through Nicaragua (which is now the only place where a canal is possible, according to the consensus of the opinion of the whole civilized world), it would be one of the most profitable investments to be found in the reach of the enterprise of financial men in the world. So I argue, indeed I conclude, that if the United States Government had not interfered in anyway with this matter that canal would have gone on prosperously.

But at the same time the burden of it upon the people of the United States would have been something enormous. Congress made an effort to relieve the people of the United States from this very heavy burden by taking up the subject and proposing to advance the money for the purpose of building the canal, so as to bring the cost of construction down to the lowest dollar possible, and so that in realizing profits upon the stock of the canal we could save to the people of the United States and of course to the people of the rest of the world a dollar and a half or two dollars a ton upon all the merchandise that might pass through the canal back and forth.

The proposition here was to get control of the enterprise (which, so far as we are concerned, was in its financial features at least a private enterprise) and work it for the benefit of the people of the United States so as to make it cost them as little as possible, and thereby get as low a rate of toll as possible. That was the effort in Congress, but we have had much opposition, and doubt, and distrust, and difficulty about the matter.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the Congress of the United States interfering with this matter any farther except upon a conclusive determination of the two bodies that they intend to take it up and dispose of it. If we do not intend to assist in building the canal, in the name of conscience let us take our hands off it, so that the men who have invested their money in it and who have the credit, as they believe and as I believe, to build the canal, may go along and do it. The people of the United States want this connection between the two oceans. The people of the world want it. The progress of this age demands it. It is the grandest work that has ever entered into the conception of the human mind. But it is not a recent conception. It is 150 years, or perhaps 200 years old. It has been going through the thought of statesmen in various countries for more than a century, yes, for more than two centuries, and has always received the approval of the most sedate minds that have ever attempted to investigate it.

The object of my resolution is to enable a committee of Congress, to be composed of three gentlemen from each House, to go down there. I will not be one of them, because owing to present circumstances it is impossible for me to go upon such a mission, but there are other gentlemen who are willing to go. They can there determine what is the present condition of the work on the canal and the prospect of the work and examine into every fact connected with it of every kind and character, political, financial, and commercial, and come back and make

their report to the two Houses of Congress. Then we shall be prepared to enter determinately upon the question whether we will or will not take part in the building of the canal. That is the first question to be settled. After we have determined, for instance, that we will build the canal, the question as to the mode of construction, the measures by which we can secure the Treasury of the United States, and by which we can realize to the people of the United States the reduction of the tolls upon the canal, are all matters of detail about which the two Houses can very readily agree. There is no danger of our going wild about it at all. We can take this measure up after the Senate and House have concluded that it is their duty to build the canal and dispose of the details, I think, without any serious difficulty whatever.

My friend, the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], and myself were invited before a committee of the House of Representatives the other day to express some opinions and give some information that we were supposed to have upon this question. The proposition of which I am now speaking originated in the other House with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I understand that they have made a unanimous report to that body of some kind, I do not know precisely what, but favorable to the sending of a joint committee of the two Houses to Nicaragua; and I thought that it was my duty perhaps, as a friend of the measure, to introduce this scheme in order that it might undergo amendment if necessary, and, at all events, consideration.

I ask that the Committee on Contingent Expenses of the Senate, if they appreciate the value of this matter as I think it deserves to be appreciated, will take up the resolution as soon as possible and report it back, because if the committees can be raised they really ought to go immediately and avail themselves of the holiday recess, so that their absence from Congress will not be a very long one.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

THE RUSSIAN THISTLE.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday last I introduced a bill proposing to give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for the destruction and extermination of the new agricultural pest which has in recent years taken possession of many acres of Western land, known as the Russian thistle or Russian cactus. I requested that the bill then lie on the table and gave notice that to-day I would call it up and submit some remarks thereon. I ask that the Secretary may read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 1237) providing for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to employ competent agents, not exceeding ten in number at any one time, whose duty it shall be, under instructions from the Secretary of Agriculture, to make examinations and investigations, at such points as may by him be deemed necessary, and to report to him with respect to the existence of the noxious plant or weed known as saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus in any of the States or Territories of the Union, and upon receipt of conclusive information that such noxious plant or weed exists and is growing and thriving upon any of the lands in any State or Territory it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to instruct the said agents to employ and direct all necessary help and to proceed, in the proper season, to destroy and exterminate all such saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus wherever found upon the highways, in cultivated fields, upon abandoned lands, or upon the public lands, or upon railroad or other land grants, and to prevent its spreading to adjacent States or Territories or communities. The compensation of said agents shall be at the rate of $6 per diem, with all necessary expenses, while engaged in the actual performance of their duties, and the compensation of persons employed in the work of destroying and exterminating the thistles as aforesaid shall not exceed $2 per diem for adult males and $1 per diem for females and for males under 15 years of age.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the speedy and effectual destruction and extirpation of all saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus, as aforesaid, and to certify such rules and regulations to the executive authority of each State and Territory and invite said authorities to cooperate in the execution and enforcement of this act.

SEC. 3. That the sum of $1,000,000, to be immediately available, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall report annually to Congress, at the commencement of each session, a list of the names of all persons employed, their sex and age, and submit with such report an itemized statement of all expenditures under this act, and give full particulars of the means adopted and carried into effect for the destruction and extermination of all saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus in the various States and Territories wherever found; also to report concerning the extent and manner of State cooperation.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, this is a new subject, especially new to Congress, but it is by no means a new question. There is ample precedent for such legislation in the act of 1884, known as the pleuro-pneumonia act. I have had considerable hesitation in offering this measure, because I know there is a general aversion to what is known as paternalism, and that it will bring up the old question between national authority and State authority. However, after a personal investigation of the magnitude of the thistle pest and the trouble that it is giving the farmers of the West, and after examining all the reports which have been made upon it by officials sent out from the Agricultural Department, I concluded that there is but one way by which it may be eradicated and driven out of the agricultural sections of the West, and that way I have provided, I believe, in the bill which has just been read.

As I have said, there is but little known concerning this new agricultural pest. I find in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1891 but a very brief reference to it, which I will read. The Secretary says:

The variety Tragus is not known to be native in this country, but its home is in Russia, and it has more than likely been introduced from that country either with forage seed or brought over in some way by emigrants.

However it may have become introduced in the West, one thing is certain, and that is that it is rapidly spreading and threatens to be one of the very worst weeds with which the farmer will have to contend. It has already gained a strong foothold in North and South Dakota, extending eastward into Minnesota and Wisconsin, and is common in northern Nebraska, and has been recently detected along railroad tracks near Denver, Colo.

I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the fact that it has invaded his State and is doing a great deal of damage, as I shall show by reports from the Secretary as I proceed.

I have read about all the reference to this pest in the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1891. I find in that report also a letter from the president of the Dakota Irrigation Company, dated October 28, 1891, addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture. I shall read a brief extract from that letter. The writer says:

This obnoxious weed has become so formidable in some portions of the State, notably in Scotland, S. Dak., where the Russians formerly settled, that many farmers are driven from their homes on account of it. A man who was there some time ago states that farmers were leaving their land by the dozens, simply because of this evil. As to the soil it affects, the plants are found in different soil, but thrive best in high, dry places, railroads being the favorite position, and the poorer the soil the more vigorously it grows. It is also found growing abundantly in cultivated fields, springing up among crops that are being cultivated, especially in wheat fields, but not as much in cornfields, as there they have a chance to kill the weeds as fast as they start. It is never found in low, wet places, and very seldom on the unbroken prairie. The weed is similar to the old-fashioned tumble-weed, and as it has millions of seeds, any field where one of these plants has grown will be literally covered with the seeds.

From the best authority I can obtain, there is no question but that the Russians brought the seed to this country. It is claimed that the tender plants make good feed for stock; I have noticed that cattle and sheep eat them when the weeds are very young, but the plant grows quickly and in a short time the stalk becomes hard, and then nothing will touch it. It is becoming a very serious question with our farmers how to free their land at this time, and unless some method is devised to stop its growth or exterminate it a great many acres will become valueless in a very short time.

In the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1892 I find this reference to the Russian thistle, which may be considered additional to what I have read from the report of 1891. The Secretary says:

The Russian thistle grows best on high, dry land. The plants are less numerous and robust in wet than in dry seasons, not because they can not stand wet weather, but because they are more crowded by other plants. The thistle appears to grow equally well in alkaline and nonalkaline soils. The absence of trees and fences, the strong winds, and the methods of farming followed in the Northwest are particularly favorable to its distribution and growth. The policy of growing only a few very profitable crops has induced the farmers to break up a larger area than they can work well.

Wheat is sowed over acre after acre, sometimes merely drilled in on the furrow, or even on unplowed stubble land. Where whole sections and even townships form one continuous wheat field, an acre here and there so grown up to weeds as not to be worth harvesting, does not seem to be of much importance; but it is in such places that the principal development of thistle seeds for the succeeding year takes place. Plowing in the spring or early summer is especially favorable to the growth of the Russian thistle, since it then obtains a thorough foothold in July, and, being able to stand dry weather better than other plants, takes complete possession of the soil.

In addition to this I find in a publication from the Department of Agriculture known as Farmers' Bulletin No. 10, dated 1893, a report on this subject. This, I will say, was written by a gentleman who went to the West to investigate the Russian thistle and came back and made a report to the Secretary of Agriculture, which is very lengthy. I shall only read passages from it which indicate the growth and the extent of the pest. The writer says:

It will take possession of a field to the exclusion of everything else, and it draws from the land a large amount of nourishment that might otherwise go to make useful plants. In these respects it merely partakes of the properties of all weeds, except that it spreads and multiplies more rapidly, and hence takes more space and more nourishment.

Some of its special characteristics render this thistle much more troublesome than other weeds. It is armed with spines quite as sharp and much stronger than those of common thistles. Because of these it is difficult to drive horses through a field where the plants are abundant. In some sections the farmers find it necessary to bind leathers about the horses' legs while at work.

* * * * * * *

Thrashers find it almost impossible to get gloves thick enough to keep the spines out of their fingers, yet thin enough to work with.

The Russian thistle is the worst rolling tumbleweed on the prairie, and in time of prairie fires is easily blown across a fire-break of any width, carrying

fire to stacks and buildings. The weeds bank up against wire fences, causing them to be blown over by the force of the wind, and are sometimes carried into the groves on tree claims, making it impossible to cultivate. * * * When large and well developed they are bulky and stiff, making it very difficult to run harvesting machinery or even a plow. On railroad grades they prevent the growth of grass and other plants that would keep the banks from washing.

The Russian thistle originated in Eastern Europe or Western Asia. It has been known in Russia many years and has quite as bad a reputation in the wheat regions there as it has in the Dakotas. It was introduced in Bonhomme County, S. Dak., about fifteen years ago. Reports differ as to the method of its introduction. There is little doubt, however, that it was first brought there in very small quantities in flaxseed which was imported from Europe. * * * The few plants grown from the foreign seed grew, produced seed, and increased slowly and almost unnoticed until about six years ago (1886).

* * * * * * * *

The Russian thistles are most wonderfully adapted for spreading and covering new territory. As tumbleweeds they are carried for miles by the wind, scattering seeds as they go. By this means alone they often advance 5 or 10 miles in a single season. Single stray weeds may doubtless be blown much farther. The general advance is in the direction of the prevailing winds or the most frequent high winds, but the shifting breezes beat the plants about and seed all the area occupied. In many localities where a few plants were first seen four or five years ago every spot of land where the sod has been broken is now occupied. On every badger burrow and overfed spot in the prairie; on every roadside, railroad embankment, fire-break, and neglected garden; on every field of early-plowed land or stubble may be seen a patch of thistles. The seeds are not here and there, as with Eastern weeds, but they are everywhere. The few plants introduced four or five years ago have seeded the land for miles in every direction.

Plants are carried long distances on the railroads by stealing rides on the brake-rods and on the engines. They are also carried in the bedding or earth on stock cars. The seed is carried in flaxseed to considerable extent, but in none of the other grains raised in the West.

Whenever the plants or seeds thus carried by man are dropped they make new centers of growth, from which they may be scattered to the surrounding country by the wind. They grow larger and more abundant some years than others; but even during their off years they keep on spreading over new territory.

Here is an estimate made by the writer of this report of the damage done by the pest in 1892. He says:

In the badly infested area more than 640,000 acres are devoted to wheat-raising. The average loss on this land that may be attributed to the Russian thistle alone can not be less than 5 bushels per acre, and 3,200,000 bushels of wheat at the minimum price of 50 cents per bushel—

That was the farm price last year. Since then the Sherman act has been repealed and now the farm price is about 40 cents—

indicates a loss to the farmers of the two Dakotas of $1,600,000. The loss in other crops, the injuries caused by the spines and the fires caused by the plants jumping firebreaks will bring the total loss to something more than $2,000,000 for the year 1892.

Here is a loss to agriculture in the Western States of upwards of $2,000,000 in one year.

I called upon the Secretary of Agriculture recently and had compiled at the Department an estimate of the loss for the year 1893, by way of contrast, showing the extent and growth of this weed. The estimate is as follows:

ESTIMATE OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY THE RUSSIAN THISTLE IN 1893.

About one-tenth of the corn crop of the two Dakotas has been damaged at least 1 per cent, causing a loss of	$5,000
Fully one-third of the oats crop has been damaged 10 per cent, a loss of	500,000
The flax crop in many places has been a total failure, and the damage to the entire crop is not less than 33⅓ per cent, a loss of	600,000
About 10 per cent of the wheat in North Dakota and about 75 per cent of that in South Dakota is grown in the infested area. The damage to wheat in this area is fully 20 per cent, a loss of	3,000,000
The damage to potatoes and other crops, and to farm machinery and stock, and due to fires carried by the thistles is at least	200,000
The damage in Iowa and Nebraska	90,000

Making a total loss of $4,395,000 for the present year. If the pest continues to spread, as it certainly will unless effective measures are taken to destroy it, it will soon cover the wheat fields of all the Western States. In five or six years, if it is not checked, the States of Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota will be completely overrun with it.

I have one other item of evidence to offer in connection with what I have already read. It is from Prof. H. L. Bolley, botanist of the Government experiment station of North Dakota. He thus speaks of the thistle in a recent special bulletin:

Of its damaging capabilities I need only note that entire fields of large area may be seen into which it would be extreme cruelty to force a team, because of the large size, density, and thorny nature of the brush. Within the area of its distribution in South Dakota (most of that portion known as the James River Valley) many farms are being abandoned, the cactus having taken full possession.

From Lisbon to Edgeley, and southward from these two points, there may be seen many fields which in the spring gave promise of a good yield of wheat. At this date the ground is occupied by a solid mass of cactus brush; and there was no harvest. Three years ago farmers in that region were hardly aware of the existence of such a weed, but were at times interested in a few stray ones tumbling across the prairie. Sixteen years ago the weed did not exist in the Dakotas; yet in 1892 Government officials estimated the damage upon wheat land alone as being $1,600,000.

This report was made by a gentleman who is on the ground and who has observed the growth and spread of the thistle.

Having thus reviewed the reports of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the thistle for the years 1891–'92, I now submit a brief review of the most recent information on the subject. The following memorandum is furnished by Mr. Coville, in charge of the division of botany of the Agricultural Department. It is from information recently gathered by Assistant Botanist Dewey, who has done all the field work in connection with the Russian thistle. Mr. Dewey returned from the affected districts only a few days ago. The history of this terrible plague is thus brought down to date. It was prepared especially at my request, to be used in connection with the data already submitted:

In September and October, 1892, a field agent was sent by the United States Department of Agriculture to investigate the damage done by the Russian thistle in North and South Dakota. A report of this investigation was subsequently published as "Farmers' Bulletin, No. 10," of the Department of Agriculture, giving a map of the area infested at that time by the weed, an estimate of the damage caused by it, and an account of some of the methods which might be used to stop its progress. The information brought out in this bulletin would have done a great deal toward enabling the people of those States to repress the Russian thistle, if it had been widely disseminated among them, and if they had been impressed by State or national legislation with the danger of the weed with which they had to deal.

In November of the present year the same region was examined by the same field agent, and the facts brought out are such as to cause the greatest apprehension regarding the future of wheat-growing in these and adjacent States. The rapid spread of the weed is indicated by a map showing its distribution at the present time compared with its known distribution in 1892, both these maps being based on data brought together by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The map referred to is on exhibition in the Chamber. The green background represents the area covered by the thistle in 1892, the red indicates the spreading of the thistle in the year 1893. It will be seen by reference to this map that the thistle is found as far South as the north line of Kansas, and as far North as the Dominion line. It also appears as far West as Wyoming, and as far East as Milwaukee, Wis. It is only a question of time when it will extend from ocean to ocean, and from Texas to the North Pole, unless checked, and checked without delay.

Mr. Dewey then goes on to give the history of the weed in the United States. He says:

In 1873 it was first introduced in Bon Homme County, S. Dak., in flaxseed brought from Russia. Four years later Yankton County was invaded. Ten years after its first introduction it was spread to Hutchinson, Douglas, and Charles Mix, the tier of counties to the north and west.

In 1888 it was first noticed in many new localities and probably fresh seed was introduced in some of the Russian flax fields in the northwestern part of South Dakota during that year. Since 1888 the pest has been rapidly covering all the region infested, and at the same time has been spreading to new localities, so that now it is really troublesome over an area of 25,000 square miles, equal to half New England, and it has become scattered but has not yet become really troublesome over an additional area of at least 25,000 square miles, equal to half of New England.

The information received by the Department of Agriculture up to the present time shows that the weed is scattered over seventy-five counties in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Wyoming; that the average damage done by it in the region is approximately 20 per cent of the entire crop; that in the seventy-five counties in which the weed positively occurs about two-thirds of the land is infested by it.

The agencies by which the seed is transported to new areas are principally in flax and wheat seed, by transportation on trains and by the wind. It is also carried about by families moving from one point to another, and by threshing machines traveling from farm to farm. The damage thus far done is probably slight in comparison with the amount which may be expected in the future, if we estimate the damage on the basis of the rapidity with which the plant spreads, and the fact that in the areas already infested by it, it is annually causing greater damage per acre. From some localities reports have been received that the entire crops were rendered worthless by this weed.

The problem of eradication in the counties now infested is a problem of the greatest difficulty, requiring the expenditure of a large sum of money, and the active coöperation of all the inhabitants, together with a carefully arranged and executed plan of work.

Many different means to check the progress of the weed have already been suggested by the Department of Agriculture. Among these are late summer fallowing, early fall plowing, burning, and pasturing it with sheep. None of these methods have, however, any efficacy if they are not universally applied.

In this connection Senators will understand that it is useless for a single farmer or any community of farmers to undertake to rid their land of the thistle while any other number of farmers neglect to do so, because the winds will simply carry the seeds over the lands which had been protected against it. The result is the next year the industrious farmers will have as great a crop of thistle as their neighbors who failed to take proper precautions. So it must be apparent that any move against this enemy must be made all along the line simultaneously and by some preconcerted measure adopted, I believe, as it should be, by Congress, and under rules coming from the Secretary of Agriculture, because the States are simply powerless to deal with it. On account of the present low prices of grain all over this country the farmers can not afford to add another single dollar to any acre which they cultivate. They are now putting every dollar of money and every hour of time they have into the preparation of their lands for their crops year after year, and the necessity of expending any amount on their farms in addition to the usual expenses incident to the raising of crops would simply drive them out of business.

The report of Mr. Dewey concludes as follows:

With regard to the further spread of the weed, the greatest emphasis should be placed upon the question of pure seed of grain, flax, and other crops. So important a matter is this that it is almost necessary that State and national legislation should be enacted making obligatory the inspection

of all seed exported from the infested area. If such steps had been in vogue when the Russian thistle was first introduced into the United States, it would have been easily exterminated, and no more single important item in dealing with the weed can be suggested than this.

Mr. President, the closing paragraph of this report gives a very fair illustration of the damage which is being done, and I again call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to this paragraph, because it pertains to the ravages of the Russian thistle in his State.

In the single county of Woodbury, in the State of Iowa, it is estimated that the damage done by this weed during the season of 1890 was practically none; in 1891, $2,000; in 1892, $10,000, and in the present season, $50,000.

This is in one county in Northwestern Iowa.

The amount of damage indicated in this estimate is not so alarming as the rate of increase which it shows. The damage to the crops was much greater during the present year (1893) than in the previous year (1892), but owing to the difference in the price of grain the increase does not appear so large as it really is. The damage in 1892 was estimated at $2,000,000. This year it is estimated at $4,395,000, showing an increase of $2,395,000 in spite of the decreased prices and decreased crops due to other causes.

Mr. President, I have been at considerable pains to collect everything I could concerning this plant, and consider that I was very fortunate a few days ago in making the acquaintance of a distinguished Russian scientist, who is now traveling over the United States, and is at present in this city, and who gave me much valuable information. I refer to Prince Galitzen, who is a member of the Russian Geographical Association, and also a member, I believe, of the agricultural society of the province of Pultava, in Russia, and himself a large landowner and agriculturist.

Prince Galitzen tells me that four years ago, when he left Russia, he passed through the southwestern portion of Siberia, and there found stretches of this thistle for five or six hundred miles in the most fertile parts of that country. It had driven every farmer out of that section. He also tells me that the Russian Government, which has been engaged in the great work of irrigation and putting in large irrigating ditches in southwestern Siberia for some years, has abandoned the project chiefly on account of the thistle. He states that the pest has overrun the country largely in the provinces of Ural and Kieff, which comprise the most fertile agricultural region in Russia, and that the peasant farmers are simply fleeing in terror before it.

He has had no report from there since he left concerning the pest, but has no doubt that by this time the Russian Government has concluded to take hold of it, and assist the local governments in driving it out, or, at least, attempting to do so. He says the local governments are utterly powerless to cope with it, and we can well understand that with the condition of the farmers to-day all over this country and the low stage of the exchequers of the various States of the Western country, the seat of agriculture in this country and the great breadbasket of the world, they are unable to cope with it alone, because it must be attacked all along the line simultaneously on every spot of land where it is found.

Of all the pests of agriculture of which I have ever heard, in my judgment, this is the worst, and in fact I believe it exceeds in its power for destruction all others put together.

The chief reason why the Government of the United States should take hold of the matter is that in sections where it is most prolific, where it is doing the greatest amount of damage, there is yet a very large area of unclaimed land; in other words, public domain, and I know from personal observation that on the public lands in many parts of my State the thistle has taken complete possession, and they have become the breeding ground for it.

We can well understand how futile it is for any farmer to attempt individually to keep it out of his fields, when those fields are surrounded by the thistle on the public lands and on the abandoned farms. In such places it thrives most prolifically. Another reason why Congress should act, it seems to me, is that the seed of the thistle was brought to this country by immigrants, and the immigrants came here under the provisions of treaties and laws that came from Congress. In this respect it is in the same category with cholera, pleuro-pneumonia, or any other dread disease, against which Congress legislates without question.

Mr. President, in view of the importance of agriculture in this country, when we consider the fact that agriculture is the basis of our industries, indeed the corner stone, and we may say the structure itself, of the Republic, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to take action respecting this terrible scourge to the greatest of all our great industries. I simply occupy the time of the Senate this morning for the purpose of laying before it the information which I have gathered in order that Senators may have a compact document hereafter to which they may refer in considering this question.

I now move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be so referred, in the absence of objection.

PROPOSED FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, were it not that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has given notice that he desires to address the Senate to-morrow, and also the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], considering that so much time has been occupied in the morning business, I should be disposed to defer the speech of which I gave notice some days since until some other day, but, although it may be tiresome to the Senate, I think I shall proceed.

I ask that the resolution of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution referred to by the Senator from Oregon will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MORRILL on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That all parts of the President's message relating to the tariff, internal revenue, and income tax, together with that relating to these who, it is said, after a hard struggle for tariff reform, are solemnly pledged to it, be, and hereby are, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOLPH Mr. President, upon the second day of the late special session of Congress, immediately after the receipt of the President's message, in which he attributed the then depressed condition of our industries and our finances to the operation of the Sherman law, I embraced the opportunity to dissent from his views, and to very briefly state that, in my judgment, the controlling cause which had brought disaster to our industries, which had closed our factories and mills, which had thrown our laborers out of employment, which had forced collections, made money scarce, and caused the suspension and failure of our banks, and the falling off of the revenues, was the same cause which had always, during the whole period of our national existence, produced similar disastrous effects in this country, viz., the threatened abandonment of the protective system, the fear of hostile tariff legislation; and I then asserted, what I now repeat, that the only real prosperity this country has ever enjoyed has been under the protective system, and that all business and financial reverses that have overtaken our people can be directly traced to the abandonment, or the proposed abandonment, of the protective policy.

There have been periods of comparative prosperity, owing to conditions in Europe or in our own country growing out of wars or failure of crops, which created a more favorable and more profitable market than usual for our surplus agricultural products, and helped to prevent ruinous competition of foreign products with our domestic manufacturers—periods during which a moderate protection to American industries was sufficient to make them moderately prosperous. But the fact remains, as is fully demonstrated by our experience for more than a century, that labor, being the source of all wealth, national and individual prosperity can only be secured by such protection to domestic industries as will give employment to American labor, so that all our people shall be engaged in the creation of wealth.

Being in favor of the measure so long before the Senate for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and being desirous of securing an early vote upon it, not because I regarded it as the source of our troubles, or supposed its passage would greatly relieve our prostrate industries, but because I believed the continued purchase of silver bullion was contrary to sound financial principles, and therefore if persisted in must eventually impair the credit of the Government and at the same time greatly diminish the purchasing power of our silver currency—during the discussion, as I was about to say, I contented myself with briefly dissenting from the claim made by the President and the political majority in Congress that our business troubles resulted from the operation of the Sherman law, promising that when that measure should be disposed of, and there was a suitable opportunity to do so, I would undertake, by reference to our history, to show that our business and financial depression should have been expected from, and was the natural and logical result of the success of the Democratic party; a success that carried with it the control of the executive branch of the Government and of both branches of Congress, thus placing that party in a position to carry into effect its pledge to overthrow the protective system and to enact a tariff for revenue only, like those of 1833, 1846, and 1857.

What has happened has been predicted by Republican speakers for years, if the Democratic party should secure control of the executive and legislative departments of the Government. The men who managed the great industries of the country saw the South again in the absolute control of the Democratic party. They were admonished also by Mr. Cleveland's free-trade message of 1887; by the passage through a Democratic House of the Mills bill; by the attitude of Democrats in both branches of Congress in recent years; by the action of the Demo-

cratic national convention of 1892 in substituting the radical Neal resolution for the moderate resolutions on the tariff reported by the committee on platform, that the South has not changed its attitude on the tariff since South Carolina declared protective laws to be unconstitutional and null and void, and that if the United States should attempt to force the tariff laws within her borders she would destroy the Union.

Actuated by the instinct of self-preservation, these managers and promoters of American industry and enterprise paused to see where the threatened blow would fall, and diminishing their products, getting rid of their surplus and forcing collections, made ready for the threatened storm. Every industry, every calling, felt the shock, and the wheels of our great industrial system were stopped. To properly trace the history of protective legislation in this country, it is necessary briefly to allude to the causes which led to the separation of the colonies from the mother country and to the adoption of the present Constitution.

THE CAUSES WHICH LED THE COLONIES TO DECLARE THEIR INDEPENDENCE OF THE MOTHER COUNTRY.

Among all the causes which alienated the colonies from Great Britain, the most potent was her persistent policy of refusing, hindering the colonists from making for themselves the things they needed; of suppressing by hostile legislation every attempt in the colonies at manufacturing, even the most ordinary and necessary articles; a policy intended for the purpose of making the inhabitants of the colonies producers of raw materials for English markets only, and wholly dependent on Great Britain for the manufactured articles they consumed. Time will not permit me to enumerate the various hostile acts of the British Parliament to suppress and destroy manufactures in the colonies. They are familiar to every student of American history. The system of repression was complete. It extended to almost everything the colonists undertook to make for themselves. In pursuance of this policy the ship building and the shipping interests of the colonies were destroyed by the British navigation act.

These many acts of oppression, calculated to make the colonists entirely dependent upon the mother country, and which were only aggravated by every attempt to obtain redress, produced great discontent among the colonists; and when Great Britain, not content with making them producers of raw materials for the British markets, and consumers of British manufactures only, sought to replenish her treasury by internal taxation in the colonies, and by customs duties on importations of foreign goods forced upon them by British policy, the discontent ripened into resentment and open rebellion. The story of the stamp act and of the tea party in Boston Harbor are familiar. It was commercial tyranny against which the colonists rebelled. It was commercial freedom which they sought, and it was to obtain this that finally, driven to desperation and willing to hazard life and honor in the struggle, they declared their political independence of the mother country.

The commercial policy of Great Britain, and causes which led to the formation of a new constitution, were discussed by United States Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, on January 23, 1832, in a powerful speech in the Senate upon the tariff question, from which I quote the following. He said:

> The want of a power to protect the great interests of commerce, navigation, agriculture, and manufactures, all of which rest upon the same basis, led to the call of the convention which formed our Constitution. Without the power to protect these great interests, no Constitution would have been formed, and if that power were taken away, dissolution would inevitably ensue.
>
> While we were colonies to Great Britain she endenvored, by rigid restrictions, to confine our industry to such agricultural pursuits as would not interfere with her own; and, by restrictions still more rigid, did she endeavor to prevent the establishment of manufactures in this country; and even the great Chatham, the distinguished friend of this country, to whom we have long sung praises and erected statues, declared that he would not willingly permit the manufacture of even a hobnail in these colonies. By an act of Parliament, in the year 1750, it was made a criminal offense to erect any mill or other engine for slitting or rolling iron or any plating forge to work with a trip hammer or any furnace for making steel. The punishment for this offense was a fine of £200 and the abatement of any such work as a nuisance.
>
> The governors of the respective provinces were bound to see this law carried into effect, under a penalty of a fine of £500, the loss of their office, and a disqualification to hold office. By another statute, hatters were restrained from taking more than two apprentices each, and not for any period less than seven years, and from employing negroes in their business, and the colonists were prohibited from transporting hats or home manufactured woolens from one province to another.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Immediately after the establishment of our independence Great Britain endeavored to obtain from us all the advantages which she had derived from us while colonies without extending to us the advantages we had enjoyed from the indulgence of the mother country; and in this they succeeded while we were held together, not united, by the old confederation till our country was on the brink of ruin. It will not be time misspent to examine the plans and schemes adopted in Great Britain, and which she is still pursuing in part to get possession of our commerce and navigation, and to prevent the growth of our manufactures. Lord Sheffield, in his observations on the commerce of the American States, puts the policy of Great Britain on these subjects in a clear point of view
>
> In page 255, he says: "Nothing should be done to court the attention of foreigners to participate in a trade of which our superior skill in manufacture, our capital as merchants, our spirit of enterprise, and many other circumstances applicable to our situation, has, in a manner, secured to us a monopoly. For if we are consistent and understand our own situation, a great share of the American trade is still in the power of Great Britain as is consistent with her interest, and this, too, upon principles which will render it more secure than volumes of treaties, namely, those incitements which arise from mutual convenience and mutual interest; but above all, upon the score of interest alone, the merchandise of Great Britain must ever be preferred in America. But the encouraging of the American States to build ships for us is holding out a premium for the emigration of our shipwrights, together with the various industrious classes connected with shipbuilding, to the country where timber and iron abound, and where, consequently, shipbuilding may be carried on to the greatest advantage."
>
> The unsettled condition of the American States since the preliminaries of peace were ratified, and the turn of affairs there, which might have been well foreseen, by no means justify any gratuities on the part of this country (Great Britain), which in the present state of things can not afford any sacrifices. We have only to let the confusion of the new States settle as they may without troubling ourselves about them. If a commercial treaty were as much to be wished, as it certainly is not during the present ferment, there is no power with whom it could be made with any certainty of being carried into effect. But it is plainly impossible to make a commercial treaty with the American States without giving them some valuable privilege for which they have precluded themselves from making any adequate return.
>
> The treaty of peace and subsequent acts, opened the ports of Great Britain and Ireland to them, in the same manner as their ports were opened to us, when they repealed their restraining laws. A brisk trade has already begun, and it is unnecessary to prove on which side the advantage is—between the traders who ask for credit or the traders who give it. Every account from America says that British manufactures are selling at a considerable profit, while other European goods can not obtain the first cost. Every day's experience shows that this country, from the nature and quality of its manufactures, and from the ascendency it has acquired in commerce, will command three-fourths of the American trade.
>
> It is said that the mode of doing business likely to prevail, particularly in the Southern provinces, will be what is denominated a wholesale trade, to be carried on by European, or rather British, merchants, who will form connections at home and carry out cargoes of assorted goods to be sold by the package unopened to those who retail, and who will receive in return within the year from the American merchants the produce they may collect, which will be shipped off by the British wholesale merchants. This is the species of trade that British subjects should wish to pursue. Without being concerned in retailing goods, they should endeavor to monopolize the supplies in wholesale to country merchants. This will enable them to deal to a great extent with half the hazard formerly experienced, and it will, besides, give them the sole command of the shipping business.
>
> It is not probable that the British merchants will choose, in the new state of affairs to fix their stores, as formerly, in Virginia and Maryland. They may rather adopt the expedient already mentioned, of sending out agents or partners with wholesale cargoes, to be sold to merchants who may not have credit here; and they may be very safe while their creditors are on the spot ready to compel punctuality, and to receive and ship their produce. This line of commerce, although the profits at first may be smaller, will ultimately be more advantageous to the British merchant. Large sums of money will not, as formerly, be sunk in debts. The returns will be more certain and less liable to those disappointments which prevailed when every American planter was a British creditor.
>
> A great improvement upon this ingenious plan of Lord Sheffield to engross the commercial business of this country, is the auction system as now carried on in the city of New York, where seven-eighths of the business is in the hands of the agents of British merchants and manufacturers.
>
> In page 276, Lord Sheffield says: "It is certain that the confusion of the American States can now only hurt themselves. They must pay Europe in the best manner they can for clothing and many articles, for which they are not likely to have the credit they had while in more settled circumstances. If one or more States should prohibit the manufactures of any particular country they will find their way to them through other States and by various means. The difficulty will only raise the price on consumers in the States where the articles are prohibited.
>
> "The British manufactures found their way to every part of the country during a most rancorous war, and the most strenuous American manufacturers acknowledge that no imposts or excise laws will for a long time be regarded in America. In the meantime, and at all times, Britain will have nothing to apprehend. The United States will hardly enter into real hostilities with Britain. Britain need not quarrel with them at all; but, should either happen, some stout frigates cruising between Halifax and Bermuda, and between the latter and the Bahamas, would completely command the commerce of this mighty continent."
>
> The views of Lord Sheffield were realized. Great Britain could not cause our manufacturing establishments to be abated as nuisances, but she completely controlled our manufactures by regulating our commerce, and by the same process destroyed our navigation and shipping interests. Each State adopted its own system for raising revenue and protecting its industry, and this brought them into immediate collision and conflict with each other. New York and Pennsylvania laid duties upon foreign imports; the duties were paid in the cities of New York and Philadelphia, and went into the treasuries of those two States. New Jersey derived her supply of those imports through those two cities, and of course paid taxes to the amount of the duties upon such imports, not into a common treasury for the benefit of the United States, but into the treasuries of New York and Pennsylvania for their exclusive benefit. This was a burden which nothing but force could oblige any State to bear. New Jersey, sooner than submit to this tyranny and oppression of her sister States, abandoned every idea of protecting her industry, and made Perth Amboy a free port.
>
> This measure was calculated completely to defeat the objects of New York and Pennsylvania, and as completely to answer those of Great Britain. Similar conflicts took place between other States, which were attended with similar results. And it became evident that the power to regulate commerce must be vested in one General Government, or that a total dissolution of the Union must take place. Agriculture was neglected for want of a market, commerce languished; even our coasting trade was in the hands of foreigners, and the manufacturing establishments, which had grown up during the war, were everywhere abandoned in despair. All this Lord Sheffield had clearly foreseen. The remedy for these evils was the convention that formed the Constitution of the United States; this Lord Sheffield had not foreseen.
>
> By the Constitution of the United States, Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the States, and with the Indian tribes. Under this general power, Congress may permit foreign nations to participate in our carrying trade, or they may prohibit them.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is now well understood that the great secret of national wealth in any country consists in finding profitable employment for all the citizens or subjects of such country who are willing to labor, and this can not be done without directing that labor to the great objects of agriculture, commerce,

navigation, and manufactures. No nation can become great or rich by agriculture alone; none by commerce, navigation, and manufactures alone. A small part of the population of a thickly settled country can till all the lands of that country; the residue must be idle if no other employment is afforded them. If they engage in commerce and navigation, these can employ but a very few in comparison with the whole; and unless they engage in manufactures, at least for themselves, a considerable portion of the people must remain idle for want of employment.

Where the population is not dense, a small part engaged in agriculture can produce all that the residue want; and if they have no foreign market for their produce, as is the case with the grain-growing States in this Union, a large portion of the people would be idle. In fact, the wealth and prosperity of this country depends upon the vigorous pursuit of all those branches of industry.

* * * * * * *

We can now interpret the golden dreams of those who think to seize the occasion of the extinguishment of the public debt to prostrate the protective system, when, as they fondly believe, Great Britain will manufacture for us to the amount of many millions beyond what she does now, when there will be no refusal on the part of this country to take foreign manufactures, and when there will be no limit to the consumption of American cotton in Europe.

These dreams will never be realized. The protective system may be destroyed; property to the amount of millions may be sacrified and abandoned; the whole industry of the grain-growing States may be paralyzed; a scene of distress may prevail over the land, such as we have never yet witnessed; but the British, the French, and the Dutch will buy no more cotton than they want, and so much they will have, for to that extent it is more valuable to them than gold.

Great Britain makes war upon our manufactures with a perseverance that is without a parallel, and refuses to take the produce of the Eastern, Western, and Middle States. These States have no defense against this system but to exclude as far as they can the manufactures of Great Britain by substituting their own.

* * * * * * *

There is an article now going the rounds of the Southern papers, which, I fear, expresses the exasperated feelings of a portion of the South, I hope a small one, against the other sections of the Union. The article is headed "A call to arms." The author continues: "The crisis is now coming on when our politicians—I mean our popularity hunters—will discover that none but Whig principles will prevail" (so far it is to be hoped he is right); but he proceeds, "With the public debt must inevitably go its offspring, the American system. There will be a hard struggle for it. The United States Bank, the sugar-planter, the iron-master, and the Lowells and Appletons will die hard."

This is quoted from the United States Telegraph, of the 10th of this month, taken from the Richmond Inquirer. How the United States bank became a part of the American system, said Mr. D., I know not. All the stockholders in Europe, and in the Southern States, are enemies of the protective system of this country. But leaving the bank out of the question—"the sugar planter, the iron master, and the Lowells and the Appletons, will die hard." Yes, they will die hard—in the language of the Senator from Georgia, they will die in the last ditch. But their struggle for life will be here—in the two Houses of Congress. To the majority they submit—they will neither threaten nor resist the laws.

But what says the Senator from South Carolina upon this subject? He does not sound a beat to arms, but he anticipates with raptures the moment of the extinction of the public debt, as it will, in his opinion, remove the foundation of the protective system. This, he exclaims, is the great national jubilee! "Now, now is the time for action! We have reached Mount Nebo! We stand upon the top of Pisgah, and shall we perish in the sight of the Promised Land?" Moses perished there, and was buried in the land of Moab, and no man knows his sepulchre unto this day. If by this promised land is meant the abolition of the protective system, the destruction of the manufacturing establishments of the Western and Eastern, and the Middle States, the wasting of property to the amount of millions, and the dooming to poverty, wretchedness, and misery, thousands upon thousands of our worthy, industrious, economical, and laborious citizens, then I do most fervently pray that the honorable Senator may never pass Mount Pisgah, nor riot in this land of promise, but that he may long remain in the land of Moab, till he shall reach a good old age, even the age of Moses, if it shall please Heaven, and that it may be said of him at his last day, that "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

From an address issued by the Harrisburg convention of farmers and manufacturers, in 1827, I quote the following:

Chatham, the illustrious Chatham, the great friend of political rights, had no idea of permitting a feeling of independence to grow up in this country—no willingness that our fathers should ascertain their own strength; and for these reasons it was that he said, "America should not be allowed to manufacture a hob-nail" with his approbation. By these severe and selfish policies he intended to keep us hitched up to the car of England's king. This was the grand principle on which the "Mother country" acted. The governors, and judges, and soldiers, and clergy, and all others, sent hither in the pay of the king, were instructed to encourage us in hewing wood and cultivating the earth, and in sending all our raw materials "home," and to discourage the establishment of work shops or the manufacture of anything which could be supplied by importations.

The declaration of political independence was made good by sacrifices and sufferings, by deeds of patriotism and heroism, which fill a brilliant page in the world's history, and are a source of pride to all Americans. During the eight years of the Revolutionary war our trade with Great Britain was cut off, and trade with other countries made so difficult and hazardous, that the people were largely thrown upon their own resources for what they consumed. As a result, many manufactories of the articles in common use were started and successfully conducted. The spinning wheel, the loom, the forge, the tannery, the shoe shop, the cabinet shop, and kindred industries, furnished employment for the people, and became sources of wealth: and, in spite of the great expense of the war and the loss of the labor of those engaged in it to protective industries, the country experienced a degree of prosperity previously unknown in its history; a prosperity traceable to the inability of foreign countries to supply the necessities of the colonists and the necessity which forced their production at home. Peace came at last. The independence of the colonies was assured. They supposed that with peace and independence nothing but prosperity awaited them; but they soon found that their complete emancipation required the adoption of a policy which would protect them against the undue competition of the products of other countries and thus foster and protect domestic industries.

A PERIOD OF FREE TRADE.

The Continental Congress having no power to impose duties on imports and to regulate commerce with foreign countries, the country, from the time peace with Great Britain was declared until the passage of a tariff act by the First Congress after the adoption of the present Constitution, practically enjoyed free trade. It is true that one or more of the States in which the power to impose duties upon imports was vested imposed a low duty on imported goods, inadequate for the protection of domestic industries; but other States did not impose duties upon imports, and there was nothing to prevent goods entering the ports of one State free of duty from being carried into other States. This period is the only one of absolute free trade that this country ever had, and it is both interesting and instructive to note the results. If we can draw useful lessons from experience it would seem as though our experience under free trade during this period should help to guide us in the matter of tariff legislation to-day.

The country was speedily flooded with British goods; large shipments of foreign manufactures were also made to the United States from almost every country of Europe. Many of the goods were not adapted to our necessities. Merchandise was imported in such quantities that there was not store room for it; and we are told by writers of that day that quantities of merchandise lay upon the wharves unhoused for many days. Our industries, which had thriven during a long, desolating war, were destroyed. The people bought largely of foreign goods. All the specie in the country was sent abroad to pay for importations. The power of the people to pay for goods was exhausted. The surplus of foreign goods was so great that the prices fell in many instances far below the cost of production in the country of their manufacture. Domestic industries were ruined; property would not sell for enough to pay taxes; labor was unemployed; bankruptcy was universal, and discontent prevailed everywhere. There was loss of confidence between man and man; despondency, suspicion, and desperation seized men's minds, and the general discontent soon ripened into riots and insurrections.

An armed force surrounded the houses of assembly at Exeter, N. H., and held the assembly prisoners until the mob was dispersed by the militia. Mobs made a tumult in Connecticut, but were overawed by the vigilance and promptness of the governor. In Massachusetts the discontent ripened into Shay's rebellion. Three western counties of North Carolina declared their independence and set up an independent State called Franklin. A conspiracy was formed in the county of Washington, Va., for the purpose of becoming a part of a new State. The Connecticut settlers at Wyoming rose in insurrection against the State of Pennsylvania and proposed to form a State of their own. Forced into idleness and starvation the universal suffering of the people threatened not only the peace and safety of the land, but seemed to indicate that our forefathers were incompetent for self-government and to foreshadow the failure of our experiment of republican government. The fathers of the Republic were alarmed

Washington wrote to David Stewart November 19, 1786, as follows:

However delicate the revising of the Federal system may appear, it is a work of indispensable necessity. The present Constitution is inadequate; the superstructure is tottering to its foundation, and without help will bury us in its ruins.

He wrote to Edmund Randolph, November 19, 1786, as follows:

Our affairs seem to be drawing to an awful crisis: it is necessary, therefore, that the abilities of every man should be drawn into action in a public line, to rescue them, if possible, from impending ruin.

And to John Jay, a letter from which I quote the following:

What astonishing changes a few years are capable of producing! I am told that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical form of government without horror. From thinking proceeds speaking, and thence to acting is often but a single step.

Speaking of this period of free trade, Hildreth, the historian, in his history of the United States, says:

The large importation of foreign goods, subject to little or no duty and sold at peace prices, was proving ruinous to all those domestic manufactures and mechanical employments which the nonconsumption agreements and the war had created and fostered. Immediately after the peace the country had been flooded with imported goods and debts had been unwarily contracted, for which there was no means to pay. The imports from Great Britain in the years 1784 and 1785 had amounted in value to $30,000,000, while the exports thither had not exceeded $9,000,000. The lawyers, whose fees were thought enormous and who were fast growing rich from the multiplicity of suits with which all the courts abounded, were regarded with no very favorable eyes by the mass of the citizens, impoverished by the same causes to which they owed their wealth. There was an abundance of discontented persons more or less connected with the late army, deprived by the peace of their accustomed means of support, and without opportunity to engage in productive industry.

The community, from these various causes, was fast becoming divided into two embittered factions of creditors and debtors. The certificates of the public debt, parted with at a great discount by the officers and others to whom they had been given, were fast accumulating in the hands of a few speculators able to wait for better times. With the example of the old tenor paper before their eyes, an opinion gained ground among the people, oppressed by taxes to meet the interest on these debts, that the holders of certificates by purchase were only entitled to receive what they had paid—an opinion which tended to still further depreciation. Others of the debtor party had more extensive views. Stop and tender laws were called for, and in some States were passed. New issues of paper money were demanded, which, by their depreciation, might sweep off the whole mass of debt, public and private. Such issues were made in New York and Rhode Island, in which latter State John Collins had just been elected governor. The Rhode Island paper soon depreciated to 8 for 1. Laws were enacted to enforce its circulation; but, though similar to those formerly recommended by Congress to support the credit of the Continental money, they were now generally denounced as oppressive and unjust, and obtained for Rhode Island an unenviable notoriety.

Even those States which issued no paper money were far from enjoying a sound currency. The excessive importation of foreign goods had drained the country of specie. The circulating medium consisted principally of Treasury orders on the State tax collectors and depreciated certificates of State and Federal debt. Even among those in favor of meeting the public liabilities by taxation there was a lack of agreement as to the way in which taxes should be raised. The excessive importation of foreign goods and the consequent pressure upon domestic manufactures had diminished a good deal of the old prejudice against customs duties. A party had sprung up in favor of raising a large part of the public revenue in that way, thus reviving the old colonial schemes for the protection of domestic industry by duties upon foreign goods. This, however, was opposed by the merchants as injurious to their interests. They came forward as the champions of free trade, and insisted upon the old system of direct taxation. A large part of the people seemed quite disinclined to submit to either method.

The weakness for some years so evident in Congress had begun to extend to the States. Not only was the idea in circulation of separating into two or three confederacies, but some of the principal States seemed themselves in danger of splitting into fragments.—Pages 465, 466, 467, and 468, *vol. 3.*

I could continue this description of the condition of the country under free trade with similar quotations from all the contemporaneous writers of that period, but this quotation will suffice. A recent writer, after citing numerous authorities concerning the condition of the country during this period, sums up the case as follows:

The testimony so far presented establishes conclusively the following points:

1. That only very low duties on imports (scarcely to be dignified by the name of restriction) were levied by any State, and that these duties were rendered nugatory by the counteracting laws and practices of other States.
2. That in consequence the system of free trade with foreign nations existed with hardly any impediment whatever.
3. That the country was inundated with the influx of European and Asiatic merchandise.
4. That manufacturing establishments in the Confederation were crippled, prostrated, or utterly ruined by the overmastering competition from abroad.
5. That an exhaustive drain of specie for export speedily followed, until the American people, from New Hampshire to Georgia, were left almost completely without a circulating medium.
6. That property, real and personal, depreciated to a frightful degree.
7. That, in the absence of ability to engage in legitimate enterprises, a craze for speculation seized upon the community, mainly taking the form of traffic in public and private securities.
8. That bankruptcy became general, the courts were crowded with suits, the prisons overflowed with debtors, the lawyers fast acquired wealth by the multiplicity of fees, and the farms, houses, and personal property of the unfortunates were sacrificed to clear off trifling obligations.
9. That even necessary taxes often could not be collected without a levy and sale.
10. That relief was sought in stay laws, installment of debts, property-tender acts, suspension of the operation of the courts, emission of paper money, and various like expedients.
11. That all the supposed palliatives served only to intensify the universal distress.
12. That the movement of events was steadily from bad to worse until perplexity and foreboding became the predominant feelings of the time.
13. That the parent cause of this brood of evils was the free-trade system, which led, by a succession of cumulative consequences, to greater and still greater calamities.

Need I add anything more to depict the deplorable condition of the country during the only period in its history when foreign importations came into the country free of duty?

As is always the case in times of business depression and distress, many people clamored for relief by legislation; they demanded the issue of paper money, stay laws, the scaling down or repudiation of public obligations. The poorer classes arrayed themselves against their more fortunate neighbors. The very foundations of human society were weakened, and security for life, liberty, and property was largely destroyed. At last, however, the people began to learn the true cause of all their calamities, and came to understand that in order to restore and maintain prosperity, domestic industries must be protected from undue foreign competition; and from then on the sentiment in favor of a stronger government, with power to regulate commerce with foreign countries, and to protect American industries, grew day by day.

THE MOVEMENT FOR A STRONGER GOVERNMENT WITH POWER TO PROTECT AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

At Mount Vernon in March, 1785, a movement for a stronger government and more perfect union was born. The movement at first was for a convention, to be composed of delegates from the States, to be appointed by their Legislatures. Its object was to devise some measure, under the Articles of Confederation, for the regulation of commerce, with a view to the protection of domestic industries and the augmentation of the power of Congress to deal with the question. The movement originating with Washington received the indorsement of Virginia by the adoption by the Legislature of that State in January, 1786, of a resolution calling for a convention of the States and by the appointment of delegates.

A majority of the States appointed delegates to the convention, which met at Annapolis, Md., in September of that year; but as it was attended only by representatives from five of the States, being a minority of the States, the convention adjourned without other action than a report that adequate provision for the regulation of commerce could not be made under the Articles of Confederation, and a recommendation to Congress for the calling of a convention to frame measures by which the powers of Congress might be enlarged. Congress acted upon the recommendation, and called a convention, which met at Philadelphia in May, 1787.

The present Constitution was the result of their deliberations. The convention was composed of delegates appointed by the Legislatures of the States. The new Constitution was not to be a league or compact between the States, but was intended to be the work of the people of the United States, not the mere expression of the voice of the States, and its submission to the people for approval or disapproval was provided for. Congress sanctioned the proposed constitution, and it was submitted to the people for ratification; and when it had been ratified by the requisite number of States the power to regulate commerce and protect domestic industries was taken from the States, and, with the imposition of a duty corresponding to the power, conferred upon the Federal Government.

POWER TO PROTECT AMERICAN INDUSTRIES THE MOST IMPORTANT FEATURE OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

The most important provision of the new Constitution was the provision conferring on Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, between the States, and with Indian tribes. The power of Congress to protect American industries and American labor by imposing duties upon importations of foreign merchandise was made a corner stone of the new political fabric.

THE PEOPLE REJOICED AT THE PROSPECT OF RELIEF TO OUR SUFFERING INDUSTRIES.

The adoption of the Constitution and its ratification by the States were celebrated by public rejoicings and street parades in the principal towns. The people understood that the important provision of the new Constitution was that conferring upon Congress the power to regulate commerce, and they rejoiced because they confidently expected the new Government would provide protection to home industries, and by thus giving employment to domestic capital and domestic labor would be restored prosperity to the country. The adoption of the Constitution changed the situation and improved the condition of the country. Confidence was inspired. Hope took the place of despair. Courage succeeded despondency. Discontent subsided. Public order prevailed, and business, without waiting for legislation under the new Constitution, began to revive. All classes looked forward to the Government under the more perfect union for security for their investments and for protection to their labor. Improvement in every department of industry was manifest. I could quote from many of the public writers of that day in confirmation of this statement, but I will content myself with quoting from the History of the United States, by Tucker, the following:

The country, now buoyant with hopes, in proportion to the dangers it had recently escaped, and the evils it even then encountered, looked forward with impatience to the meeting of the first Congress under the new Constitution. The officers of the Army who had not made sale of their unsatisfied claims saw in the new Government, provided as it was with unlimited powers of taxation, the prospect of justice from their country. The other public creditors, who were generally people of property and influence, looked forward to have their claims doubled or even quadrupled in value. The merchant and shipowner confidently expected protection from the discriminating duties and navigation laws of other countries; and even the small manufacturing class hoped for the encouragement of a protective impost. The agricultural class, without looking for any immediate benefit from legislation, expected to share in the general prosperity and to profit by an improvement of the markets, both foreign and domestic. In the cities, especially, where these benefits were more fully appreciated, there were pompous and costly demonstrations of the general joy.

CONGRESS RESPONDED TO THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE.

When Congress met petitions from tradesmen and mechanics, praying the early attention of Congress to the encouragement and protection of American manufactures, were presented. Within a week from the time a quorum was obtained in the House of Representatives, James Madison brought forward the subject of the tariff. The first act of the session was an act providing for official oaths of officers under the new Government; and the very next act passed by a Congress composed largely of the men who had been delegates to the Constitutional Convention, was a tariff act, the preamble of which was as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported.

This act, with this preamble, was approved by President Washington. I cite these things to show not only that all classes believed authority had been conferred upon Congress to protect American industries, but that they regarded this provision of the Constitution as the keystone of the political fabric.

THE DECLARATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1892 THAT PROTECTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

I might leave this proposition here were it not for the declaration of the Democratic party, in its last national platform, that protection is unconstitutional. This remarkable declaration was adopted by a two-thirds vote of over nine hundred delegates, and appears to have been indorsed by a majority of the voters of this country in the election of President Cleveland. It was reserved to the Democratic party in 1892 to declare that the men who advocated, previous to the adoption of the Constitution, a stronger Government, with power to protect American industries; that the men who succeeded in having a convention called for the professed object of conferring upon Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign countries, that thereby American labor might be protected, and that the men who framed the Constitution had failed in the great object they had in view; that all the distinguished men who controlled public affairs at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and for thirty years afterwards, were mistaken in their interpretation of that instrument; that the men who composed the first Congress were either mistaken as to its true interpretation and meaning or made haste to violate its provisions by passing an act—the second act of the Congress—for the protection of American industries and reciting in its preamble that it was intended in part for that purpose. It was reserved, I say, to the Chicago Democratic national convention of 1892, more than a hundred years after the adoption of the Constitution, to declare that Washington, who presided over the Constitutional Convention, and who signed the first act of Congress passed pursuant to the power to regulate commerce, and his contemporaries and great associates in the Convention were ignorant of its true meaning. No further evidence is needed of the construction placed upon the Federal Constitution by its framers and the fathers of the country than their official acts. But extracts from the speeches of some of the great statesmen of the country will be interesting. I present some quotations from the speeches of Daniel Webster on this question. Everyone knows that upon all public questions Mr. Webster, the expounder of the Constitution, never spoke until by examination and consideration he could speak advisedly. In a speech to the citizens of Buffalo in June, 1833, he said:

The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution.

In an address delivered in Pittsburg, July 8, 1833, he said:

Gentlemen, it is an historical truth, manifested in a thousand ways by the public proceedings and public meetings of the times, that the necessity of a general and uniform impost system, which, while it should provide revenue to pay the public debt and foster the commerce of the country, should also encourage and sustain domestic manufactures, was the leading cause in producing the present National Constitution. No class of persons was more zealous for the new Constitution than the handicraftsmen, artisans, and manufacturers.

In a speech before the Whig convention at Andover, November 9, 1843, in discussing this question, he said:

There are two propositions to which I invite your attention:

1. Congress has power to lay duties of impost. No State has this power. This is a most important consideration.

2. Before the adoption of the Constitution, and while the States could lay impost duties, several of them had laid such duties with discriminations avowedly intended to foster their own products. They now can do no such thing. It must accordingly be done by Congress or not at all.

Now the power of Congress is to regulate commerce. And in all English history, and all our own history, down to the Revolution, and to the time of the adoption of the Constitution, importation of some articles was encouraged, and of others discouraged or prohibited, by regulations of trade. The regulation of trade, therefore, was a term of well-known meaning, and did comprehend the duty or object of discriminating, with a view to favor home productions. We find this to have been so, from the time of the Tudors and Stuarts down; and in America, the opinion I have stated was held by Otis, Adams, and the other great and eminent men of the Revolution. * * *

The whole history of the country from 1783 to 1789 proves this. That history is as important as that of any period of our national existence. We see in it the then infant States struggling under a load of debt incurred in the sacred cause of the Revolution, struggling under the extinction of commerce and prostration of manufactures, and struggling all in vain. These things produced that strong disposition which prevailed from 1784 to 1788 to establish a uniform system of commercial regulations, and extends also all proper encouragement to manufactures.

At Albany, August 27, 1844, he discussed this question in the following terms:

Now, I ask you again, how were these petitions for protection treated? Did Congress deny its power? Did it say that it could not possibly give them this protection, unless it should happen to be incidental? Did it say we have only a revenue power in regard to this matter? that is, we have the clear and undoubted power to take so much money out of your pockets and apply it to our own purposes; but God forbid that, in doing so, we should do you any good at the same time? Were these petitioners told that they must take care of themselves? that these were days of free trade, and everybody must have a right to trade on equal terms with everybody else?

Far, far from it. In regard to the subject of these petitions, we all know that the very first Congress secured to the navigation of the United States that which has been from that time to this the great foundation, not only of preference, but of monopoly—the whole coasting trade of the Union; and the shipwrights of America enjoy that monopoly to the present day, and I hope they will enjoy it forever. Look at the coasting trade of the United States, so vast in its extent. It is entirely confined to American shipping. * * *

But how did Congress treat these petitions from the cities of New York and Baltimore to extend protection to the mechanic arts? It granted them. It yielded it. And, except a formal act for taking the oaths, the very first act passed by Congress was to secure the coasting trade and protect the mechanic arts by discriminating duties, and thus carry out the clear and, according to historical testimony, the most manifest object of the Constitution.

Senator Rufus Choate, than whom there never was a more painstaking member of the Senate, March 14, 1842, said:

And who in that assembly of men—many of whom sat in the Convention which framed the Constitution, all of whom had partaken in the discussions which preceded its adoption—breathed a doubt on the competence of Congress to receive such petitions as these and to grant their prayer? "I conceive" (said the most eloquent of the eloquent, Mr. Ames), "I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment, and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare." But I have more to say before I have done on the proceedings of that Congress, and leave them for the present. In the meanwhile I submit to you that the proof is complete that the people who adopted the Constitution, universally and without a doubt, believed that it embodied this power. It was for that they received it with one wide acclaim, with tears of exultation, with ceremonies of auspicious significance, befitting the dawn of our age of pacific and industrial glory. Even those who feared its imperial character and its other powers, who thought they saw the States attracted to its center and absorbed by its rays, did not fear this power.

And now, sir, I wonder if, after all, the people were deluded into this belief! I wonder if that heroic and energetic generation of our fathers, which had studied the controversies and had gone through the tasks of the Revolution; which had framed the Confederation, proved its weakness, proved its defects; which had been trained by a long and dreary experience of the insufficiency of a nominal independence to build up a diffused, and massive, and national prosperity, if the trade laws of foreign governments, the combinations of foreign capitalists, the necessities of foreign existence, are allowed to take from the native laborer his meal of meat, and from his children their school, and depress his standard of comfortable life; which had been trained by experience, by the discussions of its ablest minds, in an age of extraordinary mental activity, and yet of great morality, sobriety, and subordination, peculiarly favorable to the task—trained thus to the work of constructing a new government, I wonder if such a generation were deceived, after all! I wonder if it was not living water, that which they supposed they saw gushing from the rock, and sparkling and swelling at their feet, but only a delusive imitation, struck out by the wand of an accursed enchantment! No, sir; no man who believes that the people of this country were fit to govern themselves—fit to frame a Constitution, fit to judge on it, fit to administer it—no such man can say that the belief, the popular belief in 1789, of the existence of this power, under the circumstances, is not absolutely conclusive proof of its existence.

And then, in addition to this, how do you deal with the fact that all the framers of the Constitution themselves, as well as every public man alive in 1789, and the entire intelligence of the country, supposed they had inserted this power in it?

Did not those who made it know what they had done? Considering their eminent general character, their civil discretion, their preparation of much study and yet more experience of arduous public affairs for the task; their thorough acquaintance with the existing systems, State and national, and with the public mind and opinions of the day; the long, patient, and solitary labor which they bestowed on it; the immediate necessity imposed on them of explaining and defending it to the country—in view of this, if you find them unanimously concurring in ascribing this power to the instrument, is it not the transcendentalism of unbelief to doubt? Do we really think we are likely to understand their own work now better than they did the day they finished it?

Well, sir, we have satisfactory evidence that the members of the Convention went, all of them, to their graves in the belief that the Constitution contained this power. Mr. Madison's opinion I have read. We have it on unquestionable authority that Mr. Gallatin has repeatedly said that, upon his entrance into political life in 1789, he found it to be the universal opinion of those who framed the Constitution, and those who resisted its adoption—the opinion of all the statesmen of the day—that Congress possessed the power to protect domestic industry by means of commercial regulations.

What a spectacle was presented to the country and to the world by the Democratic convention of 1892, when Watterson and Neal and their associates assumed to know more about what the Constitution meant than Washington, Madison, and their compatriots, who framed it in the midst of great national peril, business depression, and financial disturbances, for the express purpose of securing relief to the country, and who in Congress gave it a practical construction; more than the great expounder of the Constitution, Webster; more than the able, scholarly, painstaking, and brilliant Choate; and after more than one hundred years of legal and legislative construction declared that protection is unconstitutional. Well may an American citizen, preferring his own country to foreign countries, his own countrymen to foreigners, contemplating this unpatriotic and I might almost say treasonable declaration of the Democratic party and the subsequent success of the party, tremble for his country and almost despair of its future prosperity.

Mr. President, if I deemed it important to do so, I might continue the discussion of the constitutionality of protection by quoting from historians, statesmen, and the press of the times, and the debates in the Constitutional Convention, to show that it was the inability of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and to protect domestic industries that brought the country to ruin, bankruptcy, discontent, and insurrection, and that it was this same inability that came near making our experiment of self-government a failure, and that this defect was the cause of

a universal demand for a stronger government, with power to regulate the importation of foreign goods—a demand that resulted in the calling of a Constitutional Convention. I might also produce authorities to demonstrate that the framers of the Constitution, in language which from long use had a well-understood meaning, undertook to confer upon Congress the power to regulate commerce and protect domestic industries, and believed they had done so; that the people everywhere understood that this had been done, and looked to Congress for the speedy exercise of the power; and that during all our history legislation has proceeded upon the assumption that this power existed; but I will not prolong this discussion, as it will answer no practicable purpose.

The statesman who will, in the face of the facts of history, assert that protection to American industries and American labor is unconstitutional would not be convinced though Washington should rise from his grave and declare that the intention of the framers of the Constitution in adopting the clause authorizing Congress to regulate commerce with foreign countries was to enable Congress to protect American industries. "Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone."

I might follow the course of tariff legislation from the passage of the first act and show how our prosperity was affected thereby, until the passage of the more pronounced protective legislation of 1816, 1824, and 1828; but time will permit me to discuss only the more important tariff acts and their influence upon the national prosperity.

I will say, in a word, that the adoption of the new Constitution, conferring upon Congress the power to regulate commerce, and the legislation of Congress which followed for the protection of domestic industries, rescued the country from a condition of universal bankruptcy and suffering, from discontent, insubordination and violence, and restored comparative prosperity, revived industries, gave employment to labor, made republican government possible, and placed the young Republic on a firm foundation. The contrast afforded by these two chapters in our history, between commercial slavery and commercial freedom, between free trade and protected industries, between ruin, bankruptcy, and discontent and prosperity, comfort, independence, and contentment, is as strong as that between midnight darkness and noonday brightness.

THE IMPROVED CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY UNDER THE NEW CONSTITUTION AND PROTECTIVE TARIFF LAWS.

The improved condition of the country under the new Constitution and protective tariff laws and the position of Washington upon the tariff question is shown by the following extracts from his message to Congress. In his first annual message of January 9, 1790, he said:

The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures by all proper means will not, I trust, need recommendation.

In his second annual message, President Washington congratulated Congress on the favorable prospects of public affairs an abundant harvest and flourishing commerce, the improved public credit, and increased revenues. In his third annual message, he said:

Your observations, in your respective situations, will have satisfied you of the progressive state of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation. In tracing its causes, you will have remarked, with particular pleasure, the happy effects of that revival of confidence, public as well as private, to which the Constitution and laws of the United States have so eminently contributed.

In his fourth annual message he felicitated Congress on a "continuance of the national prosperity generally," and said:

The prosperous state of our revenue has been intimated.

In his sixth annual message he said:

When we call to mind the generous indulgence of Heaven by which the American people became a nation; when we survey the general prosperity of our country and look forward to the riches, power, and happiness to which it seems destined, with the deepest regret do I announce to you that during your recess some citizens of the United States have been found capable of an insurrection.

He commenced his seventh annual message in the following terms:

I trust I do not deceive myself while I indulge the persuasion that I have never met you at any period when, more than at present, the situation of our public affairs has afforded just cause for mutual congratulation.

And later on, after referring to the condition of Europe, said:

Our favored country, happy in striking contrast, has enjoyed general tranquillity—a tranquillity the more satisfactory because maintained at the expense of no duty. Our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures prosper beyond example, the molestation of our trade (to prevent a continuance of which, however, pointed remonstrances have been made) being overbalanced by the aggregate benefits which derives from a neutral position. Our population advances with a celerity which, exceeding our most sanguine calculations, proportionately augments our strength and resources, and guarantees our future security. Every part of the Union displays indications of rapid and various improvement, and with burdens so light as scarcely to be perceived, with resources fully adequate to our present exigencies, with government founded on the general principle of national liberty, and with mild and wholesome laws, is it too much to say that our country exhibits a spectacle of national happiness never surpassed, if ever before equaled?

President Washington commenced his eighth annual message as follows:

In recurring to the internal situation of our country since I had last the pleasure of addressing you, I find ample reason for a renewed expression of that gratitude to the Ruler of the universe which a continued series of prosperity has so often and justly called forth.

In the same message he said:

Congress have repeatedly, and not without success, directed their action to the recognition of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to secure a continuance of their effort in every way which shall appear eligible.

THE TARIFF OF 1816.

From the time the first tariff act for the protection of American industries was passed by the First Congress to the passage of the tariff of 1816, a number of acts were passed imposing duties upon imports, and designed for the protection of domestic industries, all of them affording encouragement to such industries, but none of them adequate to afford full protection. The time required to transport merchandise from Europe to this country and the cost and risk of transportation afforded considerable protection to our industries, and on that account lower duties were sufficient for their protection than are to-day required with improved means of transportation, while the profitable markets for our surplus agricultural products afforded by European wars and the stimulus to our manufactures imparted by our war with Great Britain all aided in giving this country a considerable prosperity under comparatively low duties.

President Madison, in his message to Congress December 1, 1815, recommended encouragement to the manufacturing interests. He said:

Under circumstances giving a powerful impulse to manufacturing industry, it has made among us a progress and exhibited an efficiency which justify the belief that with protection not more than is due to the enterprising citizens whose interests are now at stake, it will become at an early day not only safe against occasional competition from abroad, but a source of domestic wealth and of even external commerce.

At the Fourteenth Congress, which assembled December 4, 1815, and was in session until the 30th of April, 1816, a new tariff law, imposing increased duties upon importations, was enacted. The intention of those who favored the new law was to establish a system of protection to American manufactures.

Mr. Calhoun opened a speech in the House of Representatives on April 4, 1816, by saying:

The debate heretofore on this subject has been on the degree of protection which ought to be afforded to our cotton and woolen manufactures, all professing to be friendly to those infant establishments and to be willing to extend to them adequate encouragement.

Again, in the same speech, he said:

Coming, as he did, from the South, having in common with his constituents no interest but in the cultivation of the soil, in selling its products high and buying cheap the wants and conveniences of life, no motive could be attributed to him but such as were disinterested.

Again, discussing the necessity for protection to our manufacturing industries, he said:

It [protection] is to put them beyond the reach of contingency. Besides, capital is not yet and can not be for some time adjusted to the new state of things. There is, in fact, from the operation of temporary causes a great pressure upon these establishments. They had extended so rapidly during the late war that many, he feared, were without requisite surplus capital or skill to meet the present crisis. Should such prove the fact it would give a setback and might, to a great extent, endanger their ultimate success. Should the present owners be ruined and workmen dispersed and turn to other pursuits the country would sustain a great loss. Such would, no doubt, be the fact to a considerable extent if not protected.

Mr. Clay, in the same debate in the House on the 25th of March, said:

We all know that now is the time for encouragement, and that the domestic manufacturer has to struggle more at the end of a war, and at that moment the greater aid is necessary to support home against foreign competition.

And—

That the object of protecting manufactures was that we might eventually get articles of necessity made as cheap at home as they could be imported, and thereby to produce an independence of foreign countries.

Mr. Lowndes said in the same debate—

That he believed the manufacture of woolens, and particularly of blankets, required a decided present encouragement.

But the duties imposed by the act of 1816 were insufficient to afford adequate protection to many manufactures which had been built up during the war, and the excessive importations of foreign goods caused by our low tariff and the depression of prices in Great Britain soon prostrated and destroyed them.

THE BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL DEPRESSION OF 1819.

The termination of the commercial advantages enjoyed by England during the European war, and the cessation of the vast war expenditures by Great Britain, revolutionized the industrial system of England in 1819, greatly reduced the prices of commodities, and reacted on the industrial condition of the United States. The New England States suffered from excessive bank expansions, from the loss of their foreign market and of their domestic market for provisions, which the war and the prosper-

ity of our industries had created. Farmers suffered from a ruinous fall in the prices of their commodities, and manufactures were undersold by foreign goods sent out by English manufactories for the purpose of crushing the rising manufacturing establishments in the States.

The attention of all classes was directed to Congress for relief, and meetings were held in the Northern States in favor of an increase of the tariff. The farmers of the country, anxious to secure a market for their products, were zealous advocates of protection to American industries. On September 27, 1819, a convention of delegates from nine States of the Union assembled at New York to urge upon Congress better protection to American industries. The favorable effect of the legislation of 1816 is shown by President Monroe's first annual message, transmitted to Congress December 2, 1817, the opening paragraph of which is as follows:

At no period of our political existence had we so much cause to felicitate ourselves at the prosperous and happy condition of our country.

And later said:

Our manufactories will require the continued attention of Congress. The capital employed in them is considerable, and the knowledge required in the machinery and fabric of all the most useful manufactures is most valuable. Their preservation, which depends on due consideration, is connected with the high interests of the nation.

When his third annual message was sent to Congress, December 7, 1819, the changes in Europe resulting from a cessation of wars, great industrial depression in England, and the depreciation of the value of manufactured articles, enabling them to be profitably transported into the United States, had so affected our industries and disturbed our finances that the condition of the banks and of the industries of the country were discussed in the message.

This portion of the message is exceedingly interesting and instructive. It reads almost like a description of our recent business and financial disturbances. It shows that cheap material and cheap labor will not secure industrial prosperity, that financial disturbances follow business disturbances, and that undue competition from foreign manufactures was the cause of business and financial disasters of that period. He said:

The great reduction in the price of the principal articles of domestic growth, which has occurred during the present year, and the consequent fall in the price of labor, apparently so favorable to the success of domestic manufacture, have not shielded them against other causes adverse to their prosperity. The primary embarrassments which have so deeply affected the commercial interests of the nation, have been no less adverse to our manufacturing establishments in several sections of the Union.

The great reduction of the currency, which the banks have been compelled to make in order to continue specie payments, and the vitiated character of it where such reductions have not been attempted, instead of placing within reach of these establishments the pecuniary aid necessary to avail themselves of the advantages resulting from the reduction of the prices of raw materials and labor, have compelled the banks to withdraw from them a portion of the capital heretofore advanced to them. The aid which has been refused by the banks has not been obtained from other sources, owing to the loss of individual confidence from the failures which have recently occurred in some of our principal commercial cities. An additional cause of the depression of these establishments may probably be found in pecuniary embarrassments which have recently affected those countries with which our commerce has been principally prosecuted.

Their manufactures, for the want of a ready and profitable market at home, have been shipped by the manufacturers to the United States, and in many instances sold at a price below their current value at the place of manufacture. Although this practice may, from its nature, be considered temporary or contingent, it is not, on that account, less injurious in its effects. Uniformity in the demand and price of an article is highly desirable to the domestic manufacturer.

It is deemed of great importance to give encouragement to our domestic manufactures. In what manner the evils adverted to may be remedied, and how far it may be practicable in other respects to afford to them further encouragement, paying due regard to all the other great interests of the nation, is submitted to the wisdom of Congress.

No adequate relief to our embarrassed industries was provided by the next Congress. The time was mainly occupied in the discussion of the slavery question; and to meet a deficiency of revenue a loan of three millions was authorized, which was made. But, notwithstanding this loan of three millions, when the next Congress assembled the Treasury was empty and a floating debt of four millions was to be provided for. Again the adoption of measures which would have at once revived our industries, produced prosperity, and filled the Treasury was postponed. A loan of five millions was authorized. Appropriations for fortifications and for the Navy and the Army, and for other purposes, were greatly reduced. Again the slavery question was the all-absorbing topic. To show the condition of the country during this period I will quote from speeches in Congress during the tariff discussions of 1824:

Mr. Martindale, of New York, in the House, February 24, 1824, said:

I rise under a deep conviction of the vast importance of the principles of the bill upon your table, and my utter incompetency to a satisfactory discussion of them. But, sir, my great anxiety that those principles should finally prevail, and that they should now prevail, believing, as I do that the condition of the country imperiously demands their adoption, and my consciousness, too, sir, that that country on this occasion expects that every man should do his duty, have determined me to make an attempt to overcome my extreme diffidence and approach the discussion of this most momentous subject. It is a subject deeply interesting, sir, inasmuch as it is the commencement of a new system of policy, fraught with principles which must produce interminable and most salutary consequences, and inasmuch as it is the very first measure of the Government which looks seriously and extensively to the protection of the native productions of the country.

This system, sir, is to bring into existence from our own soil and from the labor of our own countrymen that which would not exist without it, and in addition to that which we now produce as a substitute for what we buy. It looks through the medium of the mechanic and artisan to the farmer; it can reach him in no other way; it can protect him no other way. Unless I greatly mistake the character of the bill, and labor under so strong a delusion that I am led to believe a lie, it is fraught with manifold and lasting blessings to our common country.

* * * * * * *

I propose to inquire, sir, if there be any evils under the pressure of which this nation suffers. Is full employment provided by the nature and distribution of our occupations for every class or community? Do none stand idle because no man hireth them? Does not the agriculture of the country languish and the laborer stand still because, beyond the supply of food for his own family, his produce perishes on his hands or his fields lie waste and fallow, and this because his accustomed market is closed against him? It does, sir. From every section of this extended country we hear complaints of poverty and individual distress. From the North, from the East, and from the West—in all directions, sir, but from the cotton-growing sections—hundreds of petitions and memorials have reached us, pouring forth the loud voice of supplication and prayer for some measures of protection and relief.

These have proceeded from the yeomanry of our country, from the industrious mechanic, from the farmer as well as from the manufacturer. And will gentlemen suppose that these complaints are feigned and causeless? Our own personal knowledge excludes the supposition. Let each member of this committee take the circuit of his district (excepting always the highly favored commercial and cotton-growing districts) and inquire individually of his agricultural and manufacturing constituents: Sir, are you clear of debt, and if not, have you the ready means of payment? Have you a ready market for all the surplus produce of your farm to the utmost ability of your farm to produce by the labor you can command? Do you keep as many sheep as your farm can sustain, and can you sell the wool they produce? Is your farm adapted to the culture of flax and hemp, and if so, where can you find a market? The answers these several questions will receive would show the accumulated and various distresses of his constituents.

There is, sir, multiplied and deep distress in this country. We are not in that prosperous and happy condition that some gentlemen would feign persuade us to believe. This distress presses harder upon the farmer and manufacturer, I know, sir, than upon any other class of our fellow-citizens. The reason is obvious. While the merchant was growing rich in exchange of his importations for the farmers' produce during what may be termed emphatically "the golden days of commercial prosperity," the farmer was consuming these importations to the extent of his ability to purchase. He did not even then become rich. When all his produce commanded an unexampled price and a quick sale, the merchant turned the exchange more to his own advantage than to the farmers', by paying the price of the purchase of the produce by the imported articles of consumption. While this extraordinary demand for the productions of our soil continued, a corresponding activity in our agricultural pursuits was excited, and a kindly soil rewarding the labors of the farmer with abundant crops, enabled him to sustain for the time habits of expense and indulgence to which he had not been accustomed.

But this day of unclouded prosperity was soon to be overcast. The years of plenty were soon to be succeeded by years of dearth and famine. The European markets were closed against the articles of food with which our farmers had been accustomed to supply them; and thus they were suddenly deprived of the means of satisfying an unabated demand for foreign manufactures. We suddenly discovered the defective organization of our community. We now found ourselves a nation of mere farmers and merchants, producing our own food, to be sure, but dependent on the merchant for our clothing to a vast amount, together with almost every article of domestic convenience without the adequate means of purchasing them. Foreign nations no longer stood in need of our food; they produced a sufficiency for their own use. But we needed their manufactures and could not supply them ourselves. This showed at once a defective distribution of the labor of the community. We were incapable of satisfying our own wants from our own resources. Clothing and domestic utensils are as necessary as food, and we can supply but one; and that one we can supply to ten times the amount of the demand.

Mr. Clay, in the House, Wednesday, March 31, 1824, said:

In casting our eyes around us, the most prominent circumstance which fixes our attention and challenges our deepest regret, is the general distress which pervades the whole country. It is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by successive unthreshed crops of grain perishing in our barns and barn-yards for the want of a market; by the alarming diminution of the circulating medium; by the numerous bankruptcies, not limited to the trading classes, but extending to all orders of society; by an universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labor; by the ravenous pursuit after public situations, not for the sake of their honors and the performance of their public duties, but as a means of private subsistence; by the reluctant resort to the perilous use of paper money; by the intervention of legislation in the delicate relation between debtor and creditor; and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of the whole mass of the property of the nation, which has, on an average, sunk not less than about 50 per cent within a few years.

This distress pervades every part of the Union, every class of society; all feel it, though it may be felt, at different places, in different degrees. It is like the atmosphere which surrounds us—all must inhale it, and none can escape it. In some places it has burst upon our people without a single mitigating circumstance to temper its severity. In others, more fortunate, slight alleviations have been experienced in the expenditure of the public revenue and in other favoring causes.

* * * * * * * *

What, again I would ask, is the cause of the unhappy condition of our country, which I have faintly depicted? It is to be found in the fact that, during almost the whole existence of this Government, we have shaped our industry, our navigation, and our commerce in reference to an extraordinary war in Europe, and to foreign markets, which no longer exist; in fact that we have depended too much upon foreign sources of supply, and excited too little the native; in the fact that, whilst we have cultivated, with assiduous care, our foreign resources, we have suffered those at home to wither, in a state of neglect and abandonment.

* * * * * * * *

The greatest want of civilized society is a market for the sale and exchange of the surplus of the produce of the labor of its members. This market may

exist at home or abroad, or both, but it must exist somewhere, if society prospers; and wherever it does exist, it should be competent to the absorption of the entire surplus of production. It is most desirable that there should be both a home and a foreign market. But, with respect to their relative superiority, I can not entertain a doubt. The home market is first in order, and paramount in importance. The object of the bill under consideration is to create this home market and to lay the foundations of a genuine American policy. It is opposed, and it is incumbent upon the partisans of the foreign policy (terms which I shall use without any invidious intent) to demonstrate that the foreign market is an adequate vent for the surplus produce of our labor. But is it so? Foreign nations can not, if they would, take our surplus produce. If the source of supply, no matter of what, increases in a greater ratio than the demand for that supply, a glut of the market is inevitable, even if we suppose both to remain perfectly unobstructed.

* * * * * * *

I would trouble the committee with only one other quotation which I shall make from Lowe, and from hearing which the committee must share with me in the mortification which I felt on perusing it. The author says: "It is now above forty years since the United States of America were definitely separated from us, and since their situation has afforded a proof that the benefit of mercantile intercourse may be retained, in all its extent, without the care of governing, or the expense of defending, these once regretted provinces." Is there not too much truth in this observation? By adhering to the foreign policy, which I have been discussing, do we not remain essentially British, in everything but the form of our Government? Are not our interests, our industry, our commerce, so modified as to swell British pride, and to increase British power?

* * * * * * *

Sir—

Said Mr. Webster, in the House April, 2, 1824—

the object of the bill before the committee is to aid the industry of the country by adjusting the proportions of the several branches to the state of the country; to aid the introduction and progress of manufacturing industry by relieving it from the pressure of European competition; to sustain agriculture by providing a domestic market for provisions and raw materials, and to secure a permanent and increasing commerce by providing the materials which are necessary to sustain it. The produce of industry is the nutriment of commerce; and our shipping can not for any length of time exceed the number which that will sustain.

Peace in Europe has cut off the carrying trade and diminished our commerce in provisions, and the future prosperity of our foreign commerce is involved in the success of our domestic manufactures. However desirable it may be to cherish and enlarge so important a branch of national industry, it would be delusive to expect it to thrive and prosper without employment.

The power of regulating its intercourse with other nations belongs to every independent government. It may admit the productions of other countries or exclude them. It may admit them freely or under what modifications it may deem proper. The only way in which domestic manufactures can be aided is by the imposition of duties; and this power in the distribution of authority between the General Government and those of the States is allotted to Congress, and they have complete sovereignty over the subject.

It will not be denied that it is the duty of government to exercise its powers in such manner as will be most conducive to the interests of the country.

* * * * * * *

It is not the density of population in the country, but the collection of people in towns and villages that facilitates a division of labor and furnishes a sufficiency of hands, and a market that will support a diversified industry. There is no certain rule, but the one before stated; when production exceeds consumption, and a portion of the people are without occupation for want of employment, the period has arrived when a division of labor has become necessary. This rule is certain, simple, without ambiguity, and admits of universal application.

The disposition or employment of the surplus population, is a proper subject of legislative regulation. This involves no interference with private rights, and no violation of the freedom of industry; the object is to provide employment for those who have none, whose industry is repressed by the policy or interfering industry of other nations, and which nothing short of legislative interference can relieve.

The growth of our manufactures is as effectually prevented by the moral restraints imposed by the superior advantages of those countries with whom we have a free and regular commercial intercourse, as if they were under legal restrictions, and no power less than that of the nation can control those obstacles.

This is an important branch of public policy; it is the true foundation of political economy, the basis of national wealth; every system that is not erected on this foundation rests on the sand.

The interference of Government to secure employment to this class of the population is absolutely necesear y to render the nation industrious. Industry will always be in proportion to its reward. If a farmer has no market for his surplus productions the supply of his own wants will be the measure of his exertions; and if there be no foreign demand for the surplus produce of the country the industry of the nation will be limited to the supply of the nation. The want of a market for surplus productions, as effectually limits the exertions of industry, as if the surplus was liable to the grasp of a licensed plunderer, as is now the case in Turkey. Whether the surplus of the farmer perishes on his hands or is taken from him by force the effect on industry is the same.

It is the policy of Government to provide objects for the occupation of all the citizens. The general prevalence of industry among the great mass of the people is indispensable to good order, peace, and domestic security; to prevent idleness, pauperism, and crime, and all those mischiefs which usually result from an unoccupied and necessitous population.

* * * * * * *

The United States since they were independent have, until recently, found it their interest to continue the policy that was imposed on them by Great Britain while colonies; they have devoted themselves almost exclusively to agriculture, and have exported their provisions and raw materials, and exchanged them for the manufactured goods of other countries, and chiefly for those of Great Britain.

While the war in Europe continued the demand for our provisions created an active industry and gave employment to all our citizens. The peace in Europe, by enabling those countries to augment the products of agriculture has destroyed the demand for our provisions, and has left us without a market for our surplus productions, or with a very limited one; many articles of agricultural produce can not be sold for the cost of production. This has paralyzed agricultural industry; the farmers have contracted their operations and diminished the number of their hands.

Improved land has fallen, and become the most unprofitable subject for the investment of capital. The whole estimate of real estate in New York fell 18 per cent under the advantage of a vast expenditure, from 1815 to 1821. Many, who a few years since purchased their farms on credit, have been obliged to sell them at a sacrifice. In many cases of partial payments, farms have been sold for less than the sum for which they were mortgaged, and the owners are ruined. The uncertainty of a market for the productions of agriculture forbids purchases on credit, and a large class of industrious citizens are without any certain or constant means of employment.

Our manufactures are excluded from our own markets as well as from those of other countries by the superior advantages of British manufacturers. Their industry languishes, and many of them are thrown out of employment as well as the farmers; many of our forges are abandoned; factories erected at great expense are shut up; many flouring mills are idle, and many vessels are lying at our wharves for want of freight. The number of paupers, especially that class which require only occasional relief, is rapidly increasing. The expense of paupers in New York increased from 1815 to 1822 from $245,000 to $470,000.

Permanent paupers to the whole population in England are in the ratio of 1 to 22; in Pennsylvania, of 1 to 265; in Delaware, of 1 to 227; in New York, of 1 to 220; in Connecticut, of 1 to 150; in New Hampshire, of 1 to 100; in Massachusetts, of 1 to 68.

Perseverance in our present condition will increase and aggravate these evils. It is the settled policy of the manufacturing nations of Europe to derive the means of subsistence from their own soil, and without a market for our surplus productions, or a division of labor by the introduction of new branches of industry, a portion of our population will be without employment.

Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, May, 1824, said:

That some radical change in our system of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is required is incontestably proved by the distressed condition of all those branches of industry. To apply the remedy is the business of Congress.

The prosperity of a nation can be only secured by fostering and protecting its industry. The whole secret of national wealth consists of finding profitable employment for all who are willing to devote themselves to labor.

* * * * * * *

The importance of protecting industry applies more forcibly to the United States than to any other country. With a vast extent of fertile country, under various climates, producing nearly everything that our wishes or necessities require, if we are not prosperous and happy, it must be because we do not rely upon our own resources, but depend upon foreign nations for those supplies which nature has placed at our own doors. By the policy heretofore adopted we suffer Europe to prescribe the laws which regulate the prosperity, or rather adversity, of this country. To this may be attributed the distress which has prevailed in almost every section of the United States for the last eight years.

* * * * * * *

In the last eight years we have imported for our own consumption more than one hundred millions worth of manufactures, which we might have made and ought to have made for ourselves, while a large portion of our population have remained idle for want of employment.

* * * * * * *

Manufactures can not succeed unless capitalists can be induced to vest their capital in establishments necessary for those purposes. It is in vain to call upon our population not engaged in agriculture to work at manufactures when no capitalist will employ them. It is in vain to call upon the capitalist to invest his money in manufacturing establishments when such investment would probably result in the loss of his capital. If the capitalist could compel the people to work at as low a rate of wages as is given in Europe we could succeed; but men will not do that unless famine is staring them in the face, which will not be the case in this country for some centuries to come—when our population shall begin to press upon subsistence.

The capitalist must be enabled to derive a reasonable profit upon his investment, giving a reasonable price for labor, or he will reserve his money, the value of which is enhanced by the distress of the country.

TARIFF ACT OF 1824.

Congress was at last brought face to face with the necessity of affording protection to our industries, and providing the necessary revenues to support the Government by increased duties upon imports; and to do this the tariff act of 1824 was passed. As has always been the case when a protective tariff law has been enacted, our languishing industries at once revived, new industrial establishments sprang into existence, providing employment for labor, supplying also a market for agricultural products; money became plenty; the Treasury, no longer depleted and well-nigh bankrupt, contained in its vaults an ample and generous supply of funds; in short, the nation entered upon an era of prosperity such as this country had never before enjoyed.

I could multiply proofs almost without limit to show the great and beneficial effect of the tariff of 1824; to show that new life was infused into every branch of industry, that agriculture, commerce and manufactures alike flourished, that labor was employed, that wages improved, that everyone was prosperous, and the Treasury was full. President Adams, in opening his annual message of December 6, 1825, said:

In taking a general survey of the concerns of our beloved country, with reference to subjects interesting to the common welfare, the first sentiment which impresses itself upon the mind is of gratitude to the omnipotent Dispenser of all good for the continuance of the signal blessings of His Providence, and especially for that health which, to a usual extent, has prevailed within our borders, and for that abundance which, in the vicissitudes of the seasons, has been scattered with profusion over our land.

In his second annual message, of December 9, 1826, he said:

With the exceptions incidental to the most felicitous condition of human existence, we continue to be highly favored in all the elements which contribute to individual comfort and to national prosperity. In the survey of our extensive country we are generally to observe abodes of health and regions of plenty.

In his third annual message he said:

The productions of the soil, the exchanges of commerce, the vivifying labors of human industry, have combined to mingle in our cup a portion of enjoyment as large and liberal as the indulgence of Heaven has, perhaps, ever granted to the imperfect state of man on earth.

In his fourth annual message he said:

If the enjoyment in profusion of the bounties of Providence forms a subject for mutual gratulation and grateful acknowledgment, we are admonished at this return of the season, when the representatives of the nation are assembled to deliberate upon their concerns, to offer up the tribute of fervent and grateful hearts for the never-failing mercies of Him who ruleth over all.

And later, in the same message, he said:

The condition and prospects of the revenue are more favorable than our most sanguine expectations had anticipated.

President Jackson, in his first annual message, said:

In communicating with you for the first time, it is to me a source of unfeigned satisfaction, calling for mutual gratulation and devout thanks to a benign Providence, that we are at peace with all mankind, and that our country exhibits the most cheering evidence of general welfare and progressive improvement.

Later, in the same message, he stated his position upon the subject of protection, as follows:

The agricultural interests of our country is so essentially connected with every other, and so superior in importance to them all, that it is scarcely necessary to invite to it your particular attention. It is principally as manufactures and commerce tend to increase the value of agricultural productions, and to extend their application to the wants and comforts of society, that they deserve the fostering care of government.

Speaking of the revenues, he said:

The state of the finances exhibits the resources of the nation in an aspect highly flattering to its industry and auspicious of the ability of the Government in a very short time to extinguish the public debt.

In his Maysville road veto of May 27, 1830, President Jackson said:

As long as the encouragement of domestic manufactures is directed to national ends, it shall receive from me a temperate but steady support.

THE TARIFF OF 1828.

The increase of duties by the act of 1828 was not made without a general demand for increased protection by the manufacturing States. Conventions of farmers and manufacturers were held, and Congress was besieged with petitions for adequate protection to American industries. A general convention of agriculturists and manufacturers, and others friendly to the encouragement and support of the domestic industry of the United States, assembled at Harrisburg, Pa., July 30, 1827, composed of delegates from Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia; and after a five-days session, adopted an address to Congress praying for increased protection to American producers, more especially to wool and woolen manufactories.

This address, which was prepared by a committee of the ablest members of the convention, is a masterly production, covering the whole question of the tariff, and is worthy of a careful perusal by the statesmen of to-day. I quote from it as follows:

The principle of protecting the domestic industry has been adopted in most nations, and exists wherever a prosperous people are found. Without it misery must prevail; and no more than a grade of happiness beyond that which pertains to savage life, can be expected, men being clothed in skins and having their homes as if in dens and caverns. There are natural causes of soil, climate, and condition why these things should be, as well as many incidental or artificial circumstances that bear upon them, and also something which may be called a value in human life that must be respected. This is the cost of subsistence, and forbids "freedom of trade."

There is no speculation in the proposition. It is a fact that a man in France may be as well subsisted for one-half less than a man in England; that a Spaniard does live on food upon which an Englishman would nearly perish, and that an East Indian would starve out a Spaniard on the same supplies. We speak of persons performing labor, or, in other words, producing value. It is important, then, that these parties can freely exchange commodities. The operation of natural causes or determinable habits would enrich the one and beggar the other.

The address thus refers to the fact that some persons have recently denied the power of the United States—

To perform the natural operation of protecting the national industry, as practiced by nearly every other civilized nation, as indispensable to the preservation of its own existence: and it is asserted that this power had been exerted from the beginning, and that the preamble of the first act passed under the new Constitution for raising revenue recited that the act was necessary for "the encouragement and protection of manufactures."

Attention is called to the fact that the commerce and navigation of the United States had been protected to the utmost extent to which protection might go. That "heavy discriminating duties" on imports and tonnage were levied—the coasting trade prohibited to foreigners; reciprocity was always demanded, and restriction met with restriction at every step. And continuing:

But what American heart is not warmed when the result of this decisive protection of commerce and navigation is presented to view, which has raised up our tonnage to be second only to that of Great Britain; which has caused the starry banners to be displayed with honor from the burning line to the icy barriers of the north and south; which has demonstrated the momentous truth, a truth worth all the sophisms of the old and new school of amalgamated economists, that protection, or even prohibition, has no necessary relation to the cost of articles to the consumer, seeing the proud fact is that we excel all nations in the celerity, certainty, and cheapness of our transportation; the foreign, through protection; and the coasting, by prohibition.

The discussion in Congress of the tariff bill of 1828 is both interesting and valuable. I submit a few extracts:

Mr. Mallary of Vermont, in the House, March 4, 1828, said:

Manufacturers, we all know, are constantly accused of being governed by sordid and selfish views. They are charged with hostility to all other classes of the people. They are held up to observation as a body of iron-handed monopolists. From whom do these accusations come? The severest are from a few seaboard merchants and foreign agents. A numerous body of American merchants, distinguished for their wealth and talents, are among the warmest and ablest advocates of the American policy.

Sir, in a country like the United States, where all may engage in what employment they choose, there can never be a monopoly by any body of manufacturers. The extent of the country, the favorable positions every where afforded, the industry and enterprise of the people, will always be a safeguard against the least danger. You might as well maintain that the farmers are monopolists, the mechanics are monopolists, as to lay the same charge against the manufacturer.

But, sir, I maintain that the tendency of protecting domestic manufactures is to prevent a most dangerous and powerful monopoly, a moneyed aristocracy that would be resistless, overwhelming.

I mean, distinctly, the mercantile interest on the seaboard. If this nation, great and extensive as it is and will be, was composed of farmers and merchants alone, what would be the consequence? The seaboard would be the place of exchange for domestic and foreign productions. This would be effected at a few points favored by nature. Profits and gain would, from necessity, be confined to a few. The farming interest must sustain all the charges and expenses of transportation of its productions—heavy, bulky—while the merchant would at all times secure to himself his reward, whatever may be the sacrifices and losses of the farmer. On the seaboard, therefore, all the moneyed capital of the nation would concentrate. The interior would be in dependence, debt, and bondage.

I am not insensible to the importance of foreign commerce. But that alone never did, and never can, make a nation of extensive territory prosperous. History proved the fact. To be sure, large cities have sprung into existence by trade. Nations, or states possessing small domain like Venice and Genoa, may have become rich and powerful by foreign commerce.

A country as extensive as France, or Germany, or Russia, or the United States never could have wealth, competence, and the ordinary comforts of life universally distributed without the aid of domestic manufactures. There might be a Hanseatic League of cities, rich and powerful, showing defiance to the proudest monarchs, while the countries which supported them would remain poor, depressed, and miserable.

There might be a rich and flourishing Dantzic, with wretched Poland in the rear to sustain it.

Mr. Wright, of New York, in the House, March 10, 1828, said:

And here, sir, it is my duty to premise that it has been my object, and I believe it to have been the object of the majority of the committee, to frame a bill which should have in view the protection of the leading interests of the country. I have supposed that in all laws having a reference to the protection of the domestic industry of this country, agriculture should be considered the prominent and leading interest. This I have considered the basis upon which the other great interests rest, and to which they are to be considered as subservient. Still this is not to be considered as entitled to protection exclusive of the manufacturing interest. I do not believe that a law which would be injurious to manufacturers would be beneficial to agriculture; but I do believe that protection to manufactures should be given with express reference to the effect upon agriculture, and that no protection can be wise or consistent with the policy of this Government which has not for its object to add strength and vigor to this great and vital interest of the country. The same may be said of the commercial interest, as it also is only subservient to the great interests of agriculture.

Mr. Barnard, of New York, in the House, March 17, 1828, said:

Manufactures have kept very exact pace with civilization. And the history of commerce itself is little else than the history of the progress of manufactures. In that age of the world when manufactures were little known that company of Ishmaelites "coming from Gilead, bearing spices, balm, and myrrh, going to carry it down to Egypt," I dare say, thought themselves driving a very extensive and profitable trade. The commerce of the celebrated commercial cities of Italy were never so flourishing as when they became manufacturers to supply the necessities of the Crusaders in the holy wars. The prosperity of English commerce is dated from the encouragement which was given to the English manufacturers, and at this day is almost wholly dependent upon them, either directly or indirectly, for its successful prosecution.

Under the tariff act of 1828, a new impetus was given to American industry, resulting in increased prosperity, increase of industrial wealth, and a full Treasury.

THE CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE REPEAL OF THE ACTS OF 1828 AND 1832.

President Jackson, in his third annual message, said:

Among the happiest effects of the improved relations of our Republic has been an increase of trade, producing a corresponding increase of revenue beyond the most sanguine expectations of the Treasury Department.

And later:

A modification of the tariff which shall produce a reduction of our revenue to the wants of the Government and an adjustment of the duties on imports, with a view to equal justice in relation to all our national interests, * * * is deemed to be one of the principal objects which demand the consideration of the present Congress.

This portion of the President's message was referred in the House to the Committee on Manufactures, which, as well as the Committee on Ways and Means, had been selected with a view to the modification of the tariff. Mr. Adams of Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, on the 23d day of May, 1832, reported a new tariff bill. Mr. McDuffie, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, had previously reported a radical tariff bill to meet the views of the ultra free-trade advocates, and had submitted a report denouncing the tariff laws and the protective system as taxing the South for the benefit of the North.

Mr. McDuffie having forced on the discussion of his bill in the House, on June 1 the first section of the bill was struck out by a vote of 81 yeas to 42 nays.

The Adams bill, after a protracted and heated discussion, passed

the House by 132 yeas to 65 nays; and passed the Senate July 9 by 32 yeas to 16 nays; and was approved by the President.

This act was a very liberal concession to the South. It provided for a great reduction of the revenue, and considerably reduced the duties upon articles which came into competition with articles of domestic manufacture. It was supposed it would be received by the advocates of free trade and by the dominant party in South Carolina as at least a temporary settlement of the disturbing question of the tariff; but those who had yielded their own views on the subject to conciliate the Southern discontents were disappointed. The day after the passage of the act the representatives of South Carolina who favored nullification as a remedy for their supposed grievances met at Washington and adopted and published an address to the people of South Carolina, the concluding sentences of which were as follows:

> They will not pretend to suggest the appropriate remedy, but after expressing their solemn and deliberate conviction that the protective system must now be regarded as the settled policy of the country, and that all hope of relief from Congress is irrecoverably gone, they leave it to you, the sovereign power of the State, to determine whether the rights and liberties which you received as a precious inheritance from an illustrious ancestry shall lie tamely surrendered without a struggle, or be transmitted undiminished to your posterity.

Following this address, meetings were held in South Carolina at which the tariff act just passed was denounced. Those who attended them were pledged to support the State government in measures to resist the enforcement of the tariff laws, and the people were urged to opposition to the General Government.

Notwithstanding the exertions of the respectable, law-abiding portion of the community, the discontents secured a majority in both houses of the Legislature. As soon as the complexion of the Legislature was known, Governor Hamilton convoked it. Immediately after assembling on October 22, 1832, a bill was reported and passed authorizing a convention to meet at Columbia on the 19th of the following month of November. Without going into details, it is sufficient for my purpose to state that the convention passed an ordinance declaring all acts of Congress imposing duties on imported goods, and more especially the laws of May 19, 1828, and July 14, 1832, to be absolutely null and void within that State, and declaring it to be the duty of the Legislature of the State to pass such laws as would be necessary to carry the same into effect from and after the following February.

This ordinance concluded with the declaration that any attempt on the part of the United States to reduce the State to obedience, or to enforce the revenue laws otherwise than through the civil tribunals, would be deemed inconsistent with the continuance of South Carolina in the Union, and the people of that State would proceed to organize a separate and independent government. A copy of the ordinance was officially transmitted to President Jackson by the governor of South Carolina. The Legislature met when the convention adjourned, and passed the laws required by the ordinance. Acts were passed authorizing the governor to call the militia into service to resist any attempt by the General Government to enforce the revenue laws, to accept volunteers, to call out the whole military power of the State, and provision was made for the purchase or arms and munitions of war. The Union was imperiled. The existence of the Government was threatened. Federal action became imperative. All the available military force of the Government was ordered to assemble at Charleston, and a sloop of war was sent to that port to protect the officers of the Government in the performance of their duties.

President Jackson, in his annual message of December 4, 1832, said:

> It is my painful duty to state that in one quarter of the United States opposition to the revenue laws has arisen to a height which threatens to thwart their execution, if not to endanger the integrity of the Union.

And on the 11th day of December, 1832, he issued a proclamation abounding in patriotic utterances, appealing to the people of South Carolina to retrace their steps, and announcing his determination to execute the laws and to preserve the Union by all constitutional means. I quote from that proclamation the following:

> Look on this picture of happiness and honor and say, we, too, are citizens of America. Carolina is one of these proud States; her arms have defended, her best blood has cemented this happy Union. And then add, if you can, without horror and remorse, this happy Union we will dissolve; this picture of peace and prosperity we will deface; this free intercourse we will interrupt; these fertile fields we will deluge with blood; the protection of that glorious flag we renounce; the very name of Americans we discard.
>
> And for what, mistaken men! for what do you throw away these inestimable blessings—for what would you exchange your share in the advantages and honor of the Union? For the dream of a separate independence—a dream interrupted by bloody conflicts with your neighbors, and a vile dependence on foreign power. If your leaders could succeed in establishing a separation, what would be your situation? Are you united at home—are you free from the apprehension of civil discord, with all its fearful consequences? Do our neighboring republics, every day suffering some new revolution or contending with some new insurrection—do they excite your envy? But the dictates of a high duty oblige me solemnly to announce that you can not succeed.
>
> The laws of the United States must be executed. I have no discretionary power on the subject—my duty is emphatically pronounced in the Constitution. Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution deceived you—they could not have been deceived themselves. They know that a forcible opposition could alone prevent the execution of the laws, and they know that such opposition must be repelled. Their object is disunion; but be not deceived by names; disunion by armed force is treason. Are you really ready to incur its guilt? If you are, on the heads of the instigators of the act be the dreadful consequences, on their heads be the dishonor, but on yours may fall the punishment—on your unhappy State will inevitably fall all the evils of the conflict you force upon the Government of your country.
>
> It can not accede to the mad project of disunion, of which you would be the first victims. Its First Magistrate can not, if he would, avoid the performance of his duty. The consequence must be fearful for you, distressing to your fellow-citizens here, and to the friends of good government throughout the world. Its enemies have beheld our prosperity with a vexation they could not conceal; it was a standing refutation of their slavish doctrines, and they will point to our discord with the triumph of malignant joy.
>
> It is yet in your power to disappoint them. There is yet time to show that the descendants of the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Rutledges, and of the thousand other names which adorn the pages of your Revolutionary history, will not abandon that Union, to support which so many of them fought and bled and died. I adjure you, as you honor their memory; as you love the cause of freedom, to which they dedicated their lives; as you prize the peace of your country, the lives of its best citizens, and your own fair fame, to retrace your steps.
>
> Snatch from the archives of your State the disorganizing edict of its convention; bid its members to reassemble and promulgate the decided expressions of your will to remain in the path which alone can conduct you to safety, prosperity, and honor; tell them that, compared to disunion, all other evils are light, because that brings with it an accumulation of all; declare that you will never take the field unless the star-spangled banner of your country shall float over you; that you will not be stigmatized when dead, and dishonored and scorned while you live, as the authors of the first attack on the Constitution of your country! Its destroyers you can not be. You may disturb its peace; you may interrupt the course of its prosperity; you may cloud its reputation for stability, but its tranquillity will be restored, its prosperity will return, and the stain upon its national character will be transferred and remain an external blot on the memory of those who caused the disorder.
>
> Fellow-citizens of the United States! The threat of unhallowed disunion, the names of those (once respected) by whom it was uttered, the array of military force to support it, denote the approach of a crisis in our affairs, on which the continuance of our unexampled prosperity, our political existence, and perhaps that of all free government, may depend. The conjuncture demanded a free, a full, and explicit enunciation, not only of my intentions, but of my principles of action; and as the claim was asserted of a right by a State to annul the laws of the Union, and even to secede from it at pleasure, a frank exposition of my opinions, in relation to the origin and form of our Government, and the construction I give to the instrument by which it was created, seemed to be proper.
>
> Having the fullest confidence in the justness of the legal and constitutional opinion of my duties which has been expressed, I rely with equal confidence on your undivided support in my determination to execute the laws, to preserve the Union by all constitutional means, to arrest, if possible, by moderate, but firm measures, the necessity of a recourse to force; and if it be the will of Heaven that the recurrence of its primeval curse on man for the shedding of a brother's blood should fall upon our land, that it be not called down by any offensive act on the part of the United States.
>
> Fellow-citizens! the momentous case is before you. On your undivided support of your Government depends the decision of the great question it involves, whether your sacred Union will be preserved, and the blessing it secures to us as one people shall be perpetuated. No one can doubt that the unanimity with which that decision will be expressed will be such as to inspire new confidence in republican institutions, and that the prudence, the wisdom, and the courage which it will bring to their defense will transmit them unimpaired and invigorated to our children.

I have thus fully presented the condition of the matter of the attempted nullification of South Carolina at the time Congress met in 1832 to show the attitude of the South upon the tariff question; to show that a dissolution of the Union was first threatened on account of the tariff and by the advocates of free trade, and for the purpose also of showing the causes which influenced some of the friends of protection at that Congress to favor the compromise act of 1833, by which the protective policy was striken down, and the country plunged into bankruptcy and ruin, and great distress brought upon the people.

As I proceed, it will appear that South Carolina did not stand alone in her hostility to the tariff laws, but that such hostility extended generally throughout the Southern States, and that it continued until those States attempted to secede and destroy the Union; that it was one of the causes which, when the South could no longer control the Administration and Congressional legislation, led to the rebellion. This hostility to the protective policy exists in the South to-day; and it is this fact, connected with the success of the Democratic party, dominated as it is by the South, that has produced the prevailing widespread disaster to the industries of the country. I will incorporate in my remarks extracts from some of the more important speeches delivered in the Senate and the House during the discussion of the tariff bill of 1832.

Mr. Clay, January 11, 1832, in the Senate, said:

> It forms no part of my present purpose to enter into a consideration of the established policy of protection. Strong in the convictions, and deeply seated in the affections, of a large majority of the people of the United States, it stands self-vindicated, in the general prosperity, in the rich fruits which it has scattered over the land, in the experience of all prosperous and powerful nations, present and past, and now in that of our own. Nor do I think it necessary to discuss that policy on this resolution. Other gentlemen may think differently, and may choose to argue and assail it. If they do, I have no doubt that, in all parts of the Senate, members more competent than I am will be ready to defend and support it.

* * * * * * *

> In making this inquiry, the first question which presents itself is, whether it is expedient to preserve the existing duties in order to accumulate a surplus in the Treasury, for the purpose of subsequent distribution among the

several States. I think not. If the collection, for the purpose of such a surplus, is to be made from the pockets of one portion of the people, to be ultimately returned to the same pockets, the process would be attended with the certain loss arising from the charges of collection, and with the loss also of interest while the money is performing the unnecessary circuit; and it would, therefore, be unwise. If it is to be collected from one portion of the people and given to another, it would be unjust. If it is to be given to the States in their corporate capacity, to be used by them in their public expenditure, I know of no principle in the Constitution which authorizes the Federal Government to become such a collector for the States, nor of any principle of safety or propriety which admits of the States becoming such recipients of gratuity from the General Government.

Mr. Hayne, in the Senate January 16, 1832, stated the Southern position on the tariff, and foreshadowed the attempt of South Carolina to nullify the laws. He said:

The gentleman from Kentucky set out with the declaration that he did not deem it necessary to offer any arguments in favor of the American system: "that the protecting policy stands self-vindicated; that it has scattered its rich fruits over the whole land, and is sustained by the experience of all-powerful and prosperous nations."

Sir, we meet these positions at once by asserting, on our part, that the protecting system stands self-condemned in our own country by the desolation which has followed in its train, and the discontents it has produced—condemned by the experience of all the world, and the almost unanimous opinion of enlightened men in modern times. And now, having fairly joined issue with the gentleman, we might put ourselves upon the country, and submit the case without argument; nor should I have any fears for the result if the issue was to be tried and decided by an impartial tribunal, free from the disturbing influence of popular prejudice and delusion, and the strong bias of interests, personal, pecuniary, and political.

* * * * * * *

Let not gentlemen so far deceive themselves as to suppose that the opposition of the South to the protecting system is not based on high and lofty principles. It has nothing to do with party politics, or the mere elevation of men. It rises far above all such considerations. Nor is it influenced chiefly by calculations of interest, but is founded in much nobler impulses. The instinct of self-interest might have taught us an easier way of relieving ourselves from this oppression. It wanted but the will to have supplied ourselves with every article embraced in the protective system, free of duty, without any other participation on our part than a simple consent to receive them.

But, sir, we have scorned in a contest for our rights to resort to any but open and fair means to maintain them. The spirit with which we have entered into this business is akin to that which was kindled in the bosom of our fathers when they were made the victims of oppression; and if it has not displayed itself in the same way it is because we have ever cherished the strongest feelings of confraternity toward our brethren, and the warmest and most devoted attachment to the Union. If we have been in any degree divided among ourselves in this matter, the source of that division, let gentlemen be assured, has not arisen so much from any difference of opinion as to the true character of the oppression, as from the different degrees of hope of redress. All parties have for years past been looking forward to this crisis for the fulfillment of their hopes or the confirmation of their fears. And God grant that the result may be auspicious.

Mr. McDuffie, May 28, 1832, said:

Free trade is the great doctrine of political reformation in modern times; it is to the commerce and the social condition of nations what the reformation of Luther was to the Christian religion. * * * I should regard it as the proudest monument that we could erect to the glory of this Republic, the chosen habitation of freedom, to set an example on this subject to the other nations of the earth. It would stand, sir, as a beacon light on the great ocean of human affairs, to conduct all nations to the haven of prosperity. Yes, sir; let us plant the tree of free trade, and water it, that its branches may be extended to the uttermost extremities of the earth, and the Christian and the philanthropist will joyfully concur in anticipating the blessed period when, beneath its fruitful and refreshing shade "the nations of the earth may pitch their tents in peace." * * *

Mr. Chairman, owing to the peculiar circumstances in which she has been placed, and not because she claims to have more intelligence or patriotism than the other Southern States, it has been the lot of South Carolina to be in the van of this great struggle for constitutional liberty. Virginia and North Carolina, in proportion to their population, furnish a comparatively small amount of the exports upon which the protecting system directly operates. Georgia has been engrossed in maintaining her rights in another contest with this Government; and the people of the new States of the Southwest, cultivating a fresh and fertile soil, recently acquired at the minimum price, can as well afford to make cotton at 6 or 8 cents a pound as those of South Carolina can at 10. They can sustain this oppressive system with comparatively little suffering when the older planting States will be utterly ruined. But they have too much sagacity not to see that when the tide of ruin shall have swept away the States which stand first in the march of the oppressor, they are destined to be the next victims.

South Carolina, then, is fighting the common battle of all the Southern States. She threw herself into the breach as a forlorn hope, when all the auspices were against her; and, whatever may be the result of the contest, I can not but regard her destiny as a happy and glorious one. Nothing elevates the character of a people to so high a point as a disinterested struggle for liberty; and I do not believe there is at this moment a spot upon the face of the globe where the spirit of freedom is higher than in South Carolina. There is no vulgar ambition mingling in this controversy. In adverting to historical analogies, I have been struck with the strong resemblance between the situation of the Southern States in this apparently unequal contest and that of the Grecian states which united to resist the Persian invasion.

Ours, to be sure, is a civil struggle, not to be waged with the vulgar implements of war, but by the sovereign, the legislative, and the judicial powers of the States. South Carolina is fully aware of the responsibility she has assumed and of the peril she must encounter; but no great object can be accomplished without great sacrifices. Had it not been for the heroic spirit of Leonidas and his immortal band, who devoted themselves at Thermopylæ for the common cause of Greece, the light of Grecian liberty might have been extinguished forever, and the destiny of mankind entirely changed. And I do confidently believe that if South Carolina fails in the struggle she is now waging, the brief days of American liberty will be numbered.

Senator Holmes of Maine, January 30, 1832, said:

I should not, probably, Mr. President, have thrown myself on the indulgence of the Senate, had not the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hayne] denied the power of Congress to protect our manufactures, and intimated an opinion that a State might annul the acts of the Federal Government. And although the few sentiments which he uttered on the subject came in at the close of his remarks, and seemed rather as an afterthought, yet, as he has embodied them in the speech, I can never let doctrines so dangerous pass without my decisive disapprobation. Here every friend of the Constitution should be upon the walls—he should "cry aloud, and spare not." Here, we should repeat again and again; here there should be "line upon line, and precept upon precept." And though my little bark has been pelted and shattered by the storms and tempests which invest the capes, shores, and seas of public life, yet, frail as it is, I will venture to launch it into the boisterous ocean of debate, if thereby I can contribute aught to save the Constitution of my country from the shipwreck to which it is exposed.

* * * * * * *

And what is this power to "regulate"? It is to make rules to govern. And what is a rule? It is a law. We all remember when, in our incipient studies, we were taught that a law was "a rule of civil conduct, prescribed by the supreme power of a State, commanding what is right, and forbidding what is wrong." The supreme is the legislative power; and this must be supreme over the subject-matter and person on which it is called to act; and the "right or wrong" is determined by the decree of the judiciary, to whom, in free governments, this duty is confided. The word rule, is, in the Constitution synonymous with law. "Uniform rules of naturalization," and "rules for the government of the Army and Navy," are made by enactments, and are, to all intents and purposes, laws. To regulate commerce, therefore, is to prescribe rules to govern the exchange of the products of agriculture and manufactures, and it is a power over the whole subject-matter, except where restrained by the Constitution itself. It would seem to me that this inference is irresistible, and that, unless the regulation of commerce includes that of the exchange of its objects, it is nothing but an abstraction.

But if I am wrong in this the Constitution has failed of its design. It originated in the want of power to reciprocate the favor, and retaliate the injuries of foreign nations on this very subject of trade. This power of protecting our own manufacturer was urged as the chief reason for its adoption. Some States had, notwithstanding the Articles of Confederation, undertaken to expound treaties. Congress on the 13th of April, 1787, came to the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the several States can not explain, limit, or control a national treaty, but such treaties are the supreme laws of the land by the Articles of the Confederation."

In 1784, April 30, a resolution of Congress recommended to the several States to vest the United States in Congress assembled, for the term of fifteen years, with power to prohibit any goods from being imported into or exported from any of the States, in vessels belonging to or navigated by the subjects of any power with whom the United States have not formed any treaties of commerce; and also, of prohibiting the subjects of any foreign State, etc., unless authorized by treaty, from importing into the United States any goods, etc., which are not the produce or manufacture of the dominions of the sovereign whose subjects they are. (5 Marshall's Washington, 70.)

"The idea of compelling Great Britain to relax somewhat of the rigors of her system by opposing it with regulations equally restrictive seems to have been generally taken up." (*Id.*, 69.)

So, also, note Mr. Adams's letter, recommending that Congress should have the power:

"The Boston petitioners request that the numerous impositions of the British on the trade and exports of these States may be forthwith contravened by similar expedients on our part." (*Id.*, 77.)

"The Pennsylvania memorial, after stating that other nations will not be restrained by any apprehensions, as long as the power remains severally with the States, of being met by any consistent and effectual restrictions on our part, prays Congress to recommend to the States to give it the necessary power over the commerce of the United States." (*Id.*, 78.)

Washington, in a letter to a friend in Great Britain, thus states: "They [the people] now see the indispensable necessity of a general controlling power and are addressing their respective assemblies to grant it to Congress." (*Id.*, 78.)

Again: "I do not see that we can long exist as a nation without lodging somewhere a power which will pervade the whole Union in as energetic a manner as the authority of the State governments extends over the several States." (*Id.*, 95.)

"Suppose, as has been contended, that the Federal power of taxation were to be confined to duties on imports, it is evident that the want of being able to command other resources would frequently be tempted to extend those duties to an injurious excess." (1 Federalist, No. 35, p. 8.)

The more intelligent adversaries of the Constitution admit the necessity of the power of taxation, but they qualify their admission by a distinction between what they call internal taxations; the latter of which they explain into commercial imposts, or rather duties on imported articles; they declare themselves willing to concede to the Federal Government. (1 Federalist, No. 30, page 19.)

Our manufactures are another great object which has received no encouragement by national duties on foreign manufactures, and they never can, by any authority in the old Confederation.

The question is, have these been encouraged? Has Congress been able, by national laws, to prevent the importation of such foreign commodities as are made by raw materials as we ourselves raise. (Mr. Dawes of Mr. Elliot's Debates, volume I, page 76.)

Mr. Pierce (opposed to the Constitution) was afraid the impost would be abandoned for direct taxation. (*Id.*, 91.)

Mr. Williams of New York, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that when the moneys arising from impost and excise should be insufficient, then a requisition for a direct tax upon the States should be made, and, on refusal, Congress should levy the tax. (1 Elliot's Debates, pages 294, 295.)

Chancellor Livingston, in objecting to this amendment, remarked that if the manufactures of this country were always to be in a state of infancy, if the amendment were only a temporary expedient, the provision might consist with good policy; but, at a future day, an enlarged population will render us a manufacturing people, the imposts will then necessarily lessen, and the public wants will call for new sources of revenue. (*Id.*, page 303.)

Mr. George Mason opposed the power to lay direct taxes. (2 Elliot, page 64.)

Mr. MADISON. Direct taxes will only be recurred to for great purposes. (*Id.*, 96.)

Mr. NICHOLAS. Money can not be raised more judiciously than by imposts. It is not felt by the people. But he insisted that the power of direct taxation was necessary. (*Id.*, 98.)

Mr. MARSHALL answered the objection that direct taxation was unnecessary. (*Id.*, 197.)

Mr. MONROE contended against direct taxation because the impost and back lands were sufficient. (*Id.*, 222.)

Mr. MADISON. I admit that the imposts will increase until the population becomes so great as to compel us to recur to manufactures. (*Id.*, 228.)

Mr. SPENCER of North Carolina. I would give them the power of laying imposts, and I would give them the power to lay and collect excises. I con-

fess that this is a kind of tax that I would with great reluctance agree to exercise. But it is obvious that, unless such excises were admitted, the public burden will all be borne by those parts of the community which do not manufacture for themselves. (3 Elliot, page 77.).

Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania: "The future collection of the duties and imposts will, in the opinion of some, supersede the necessity of having recourse to internal taxation." (3 Elliot, p 289.)

Mr. Wilson again, on the same subject: It is not an important object to extend our manufactures and our commerce." (*Id.* 282.)

Mr. Martin, of Maryland, proposed in the convention for forming the Constitution that requisitions should precede direct taxation. (4 Elliot, Yate's Min., 30.)

Massachusetts convention ratified the Constitution, and proposed among other amendments that Congress do not lay direct taxes but when the moneys arising from the imposts and excise are insufficient for the public exigencies, nor then until Congress shall have first made a requisition upon the States. (4 Elliot, 210.)

South Carolina: "The General Government of the United States ought never to impose direct taxes but where the moneys arising from the duties on imposts and excise are insufficient for the public exigencies, nor then until Congress shall have made requisition upon the States." (4 Elliot, 214.)

New Hampshire in nearly the same words. (*Id.*)

New York nearly the same. (*Id.*, 218.)

Rhode Island: "No direct taxes without previous requisition, nor without the consent of three-fourths of the States." (*Id.*, 225.)

In the preamble of the act of the 22d July, 1789, the reason of that tariff is alleged to be to "pay debts and protect domestic manufactures." (1789, first session.)

To complete a temporary system [of revenue] in time to embrace the spring importations, Mr. Madison presented a scheme of imposts which had been recommended by the former Congress and had already received the approbation of a majority of the States, to which he added a proposition for a tonnage duty. Mr. Fitzsimmons, of Pennsylvania, moved to enlarge the catalogue of specific duties to include those calculated to encourage the productions of our own country and protect our infant manufactures, and others tending to operate as sumptuary restrictions upon articles of luxury. But though the propriety seemed to be admitted, yet the time was thought insufficient for a permanent and extensive plan. (5 Marshall, 190.)

Mr. Madison consented to subjoin the amendment proposed by Mr. F. and it was received. But a difference of opinion arose on filling the blanks as to particular articles; and no inconsiderable degree of watchfulness was discovered lest those States which were more populous, and whose manufactures were in greater progress, should lay protecting duties, whereby the industry of one part of the Union would be encouraged by premiums charged on the labor of another part. *Id.* 191.

On the tonnage question, Mr. Madison supported the affirmative, that we ought to have vessels enough to answer all the purposes of our commerce, to form a school for seamen, and to lay the foundation of a navy; and if this were a burden on some parts of the Union they ought to bear it for the public good. *Id.* 192.

You see, then, sir, after the Constitution was adopted and put in operation, what was the understanding of it by those who contributed to its formation and adoption. The very first public general law, approved on the memorable 4th of July, 1789, bore upon the face of it its design to protect domestic manufactures. If the Constitution has been violated the enormity was committed by its framers and adopters by the very first act which they did after their votes to support it, and thus, too, on the glorious anniversary of our independence. Its death wound was inflicted at its birthday, wantonly inflicted; there was no mistake, no plea of ignorance to shelter them; the protection of manufactures stood in glaring capitals conspicuously on its front. And, strange to tell, that from that time down to 1824, though we had had protection upon protection, and had experienced a partisan warfare in which the combatants were violent and vindictive, and not overfastidious about their weapons, not a lisp was uttered of this usurpation, nor the least pretense of the unconstitutionality of a protective tariff.

Sir, I put these historical facts against all the arguments made, or to be made, I care not how ingenious, subtle, or powerful. Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and a host of others, who made this same Constitution, could not have mistaken its design in this respect; and they either were right in the exercise of this power or willful and wicked usurpers.

Sir, it is most certain that if revenue must be the chief object of an impost, it is excluded from every other pursuit, as well as the protection of manufactures. How, then, could the tonnage act be justified? How could the famous resolutions of Mr. Madison, of 1794, discriminating against nations having no commercial treaties with us be justified? Now let us see what have been the Executive opinion and practice on this subject.

WASHINGTON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

"The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufacture, by all proper means, will not, I trust, need recommendation. But I can not forbear intimating to you the expediency of giving effectual encouragement, as well to the introduction of new and useful inventions from abroad as to the exertions and skill in producing them at home."

Was this for revenue?

Mr. Jefferson's report of 23d of February, 1793, made pursuant to a resolution of the House of the 14th of February, 1791:

"Where a nation imposes high duties on our productions, or prohibits them altogether, it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs, first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition with our own of the same kind, imposing on them duties lower at first, but heavier and heavier afterwards, as other channels of supply open."

Not for revenue, surely.

Message, November, 1804, he submits:

"Whether the great interests of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation can within the pale of your constitutional powers be aided in any of their relations."

Nothing of revenue in all this.

Again, "An immediate prohibition of the exportation of arms and ammunition is submitted to your consideration."

Nor in this.

Message of December, 1806:

"Shall we suppress the impost and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?" This looks like protection.

Mr. Madison's message, December, 1810:

"Although other objects will press more immediately on your deliberations a portion of them can not but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of securing to our manufactures the success they have attained, and are still attaining under the impulse of causes not permanent, and to our navigation the fair extent of which it is at present abridged by the unequal regulation of foreign governments." This, too, is protection.

In the clause of the Constitution which declared that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, the word "commerce" comprehends "navigation;" and a power to regulate navigation is as expressly granted as if that term had been added to the word "commerce." (Gibbons vs. Ogden, 9 Wheat., 189–193.)

Exceptions from a power mark its extent. (*Id.*, 191.)

The power to regulate commerce extends to every species of commercial intercourse between the United States and foreign nations, and among the several States. (*Ib.*, 193).

Like all other powers, it is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and has no other limitations than such as are prescribed it by the Constitution. (*Ib.*, 195.)

It is the power to prescribe rules by which commerce is to be governed. It seems to imply in its nature full power over the thing to be regulated, and necessarily excludes the action of all others that would perform the same operations on the same thing. (*Ib.*, 209.)

Sir, unless the United States have an ultimate, effectual decision and determination of conflicts between State and Federal power, the Constitution is a misnomer. A constitution of government and no power to govern without the consent of the constituent? Legislative authority to make laws, to be executed only at the will of those on whom they are to operate? Judiciary and executive power, to be met and opposed with effect by those from whom these powers emanated? A government containing in its constitution a revolutionary principle which can destroy it? And yet this dominated a government. Palpable absurdity. Your confederation was a "perpetual league," and its energies would be exerted upon the different members only by advice or actual force—war. The name and nature of this was changed, and we have a Constitution conferring legislative, judiciary, and executive powers as absolute upon those matters on which they are designed to act as such powers can be.

I am aware that, at times, States have attempted to put on airs and set up their own against Federal opinions. But they have always been in the wrong and were compelled to retract.

* * * * * * *

But, sir, agriculture has been specially protected. Of this I *do* not complain; far from it. It is the first, the great interest—the foundation of all the rest. The earth is to us what the mother is to the child—our best nurse, our dearest and kindest friend; and although she sometimes frowns on us in her storms, her blasts, and her pestilence, yet she again smiles in her gentle breezes, her refreshing showers, and genial sunshines; and when we arrive at the evening of life and need repose, she kindly receives us to sleep in her bosom. But, metaphor aside, I would speak practically to practical men. And I aver that no nation ever did more for agriculture than the United States has done. Indeed, none ever had the means. We commenced as the great landholder. The public lands were pledged to pay the public debt; but this was but a secondary consideration. The primary object was settlement, cultivation, wealth, strength—an extension of civilization and an augmentation of the means of happiness.

Every facility given to the purchase of these lands was a premium on agriculture. * * * It was bringing so much agricultural capital into the market at a reduced price. It, to be sure, diminished the value of this kind of capital already invested by overstocking the market, and it diminished the revenues of the capital by increasing the production.

* * * * * * *

It is said that the cotton-growers can never manufacture the raw material which they produce. It would seem strange that it is so; and one of the reasons given by the Senator from South Carolina is stranger still. It is this, that one of our enterprising Yankees erected a factory there, and a negro burnt it down. It is not stated that he was governed by the anti-tariff mania, nor what induced the incendiary to perpetrate the crime. But to make this case a good reason against the success of manufactures there, I suppose if the negro had burnt the owner's dwelling-house he ought to live out of doors, because houses would not succeed at all.

This anecdote might lead to a train of thinking upon the subject of a certain class of population, which I choose to exclude; and, when the Senator is disposed to be merry at the expense of New England, and sneer at our "wooden ware and notions," instead of retorting, I will join in the laugh. It is true, our "wooden ware," our elegant cabinet work, not excelled by any in the world, does not adorn the parlors, drawing-rooms, bedchambers, and even the churches, of the rich and the favored South. We are, in this sense, your "hewers of wood," if not your "drawers of water." But of one thing be assured, we do not intend to hew your wood or draw your water for nothing. We intend to be paid, and well paid, for it. And, as to our "notions," "I guess" that New England notions will bear comparison with any other notions whatever.

But, nevertheless, protection must be abandoned. It is "sectional and unequal"—"accursed, ruinous, fatal policy"—"a case of life and death." "Give us back the merchants bankrupted by our policy—the sailors, ships, farmers, and, above all, harmony," and we consent to—what? Why, that every factory shall be razed to its foundation! This, indeed, is very, very liberal; it looks quite like a compromise. Give me your food and raiment, and your money, too, and make me contented with it in the bargain; and, in consideration thereof, I will consent that you may go and starve. Sir, I have a small objection to the acceptance of this liberal offer—a want of reciprocity. We have now our all, nearly, vested in manufactures, and the industry of the country is engaged in them. We have no knowledge of any rich nabobs, nor of operators under taskmasters. These things may exist in the South, but they belong not to New England.

On the 2d of February, 1832, Mr. Clay contrasted the condition of the country during the period prior to the tariff of 1824 and during the period which followed the act of 1824, in the following graphic language:

Eight years ago it was my painful duty to present to the other House of Congress an unexaggerated picture of the general distress pervading the whole land. We must all yet remember some of its frightful features. We all know that the people were then oppressed and borne down by an enormous load of debt; that the value of property was at the lowest point of depression; that ruinous sales and sacrifices were everywhere made of real estate; that stop laws and relief laws and paper money were adopted to save the people from impending destruction; that a deficit in the public revenue existed, which compelled Government to seize upon and divert from its legitimate object the appropriation to the sinking fund to redeem the national debt; that our commerce and navigation were threatened with a complete paralysis. In short, sir, if I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824.

I have now to perform the more pleasing task of exhibiting an imperfect sketch of the existing state of the unparalleled prosperity of the country. On a general survey we behold cultivation extended, the arts flourishing, the face of the country improved, our people fully and profitably employed, and the public countenance exhibiting tranquillity, contentment, and happiness. And if we descend into particulars, we have the agreeable contemplation of a people out of debt; land rising slowly in value, but in a secure

and salutary degree; a ready though not extravagant market for all the surplus productions of our industry; innumerable flocks and herds browsing and gambolling on ten thousand hills and plains covered with rich and verdant grasses; our cities expanded and whole villages springing up, as it were, by enchantment; our exports and imports increased and increasing; our tonnage, foreign and coastwise, swelling and fully occupied; the rivers of our interior animated by the perpetual thunder and lightning of countless steamboats; the currency sound and abundant; the public debt of two wars nearly redeemed; and, to crown all, the public treasury overflowing, embarrassing Congress, not to find subjects of taxation, but to select the objects which shall be liberated from the impost. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the establishment of their present Constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

This transformation of the condition of the country from gloom and distress to brightness and prosperity has been mainly the work of American legislation, fostering American industry, instead of allowing it to be controlled by foreign legislation, cherishing foreign industry. The foes of the American system, in 1824, with great boldness and confidence, predicted: First. The ruin of the public revenue, and the creation of a necessity to resort to direct taxation. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hayne], I believe, thought that the tariff of 1824 would operate a reduction of revenue to the large amount of eight millions of dollars. Second. The destruction of our navigation. Third. The desolution of commercial cities. And fourth. The augmentation of the price of objects of consumption, and further decline in that of the articles of our exports. Every prediction which they made has failed—utterly failed. Instead of the ruin of the public revenue with which they then sought to deter us from the adoption of the American system, we are now threatened with its subversion, by the vast amount of the public revenue produced by that system. Every branch of our navigation has increased. As to the desolation of our cities let us take, as an example, the condition of the largest and most commercial of all of them, the great Northern capital.

* * * * * * *

Thus, sir, has this great system of protection been gradually built, stone upon stone, and step by step, from the 4th July, 1789, down to the present period. In every stage of its progress it has received the deliberate sanction of Congress. A vast majority of the people of the United States has approved, and continues to approve it. Every Chief Magistrate of the United States, from Washington to the present, in some form or other, has given to it the authority of his name; and, however, the opinions of the existing President are interpreted south of Mason and Dixon's line, on the north they are, at least, understood to favor the establishment of a judicious tariff.

The question, therefore, which we are now called upon to determine is not whether we shall establish a new and doubtful system of policy, just proposed and for the first time presented to our consideration; but whether we shall break down and destroy a long-established system, patiently and carefully built up and sanctioned, during a series of years, again and again, by the nation and its highest and most revered authorities. And are we not bound deliberately to consider whether we can proceed to this work of destruction without a violation of the public faith? The people of the United States have justly supposed that the policy of protecting their industry against foreign legislation and foreign industry was fully settled, not by a single act, but by repeated and deliberate acts of Government, performed at distant and frequent intervals. In full confidence that the policy was firmly and unchangeably fixed, thousands upon thousands have invested their capital, purchased a vast amount of real and other estate, made permanent establishments, and accommodated their industry. Can we expose to utter and irretrievable ruin this countless multitude without justly incurring the reproach of violating the national faith?

Senator Ewing, of Ohio, in the course of a speech in the Senate, on the 17th day of February, 1832, describing the effect of the tariff of 1824 on the farming interest, said:

The state of things which I have dwelt upon somewhat at large was that of our whole country in 1823-'24. It was in the situation of the farmer, with his ten boys, who could find employment but for eight; and such, more especially, was the situation of the Middle and Western States. The low state to which our farming interest was reduced, the low price to which our fine lands and the products of lands had sunk, produced unexampled pecuniary distress, and called aloud for relief. Our statesmen were not slow in discovering the cause of the evil and in applying the remedy; hence their united support of the tariff of 1824—the merit of which I claim for them—for the Middle and Western States; and will not agree that it shall be transferred, as a subject of either praise or blame, to New England.

The effects anticipated from the tariff were such as have, in fact, followed it; and which, it is fair to say, resulted from it. Men and capital were transferred from agriculture to manufactures. In those sections of the Union, as New England, in which the land is poor and unproductive, and which abounds in capital, and is thickly peopled, their manufactures, which had once been prostrated by a ruinous competition, revived, and new ones were, to a vast extent, established. The competition of their labor and their capital was withdrawn from the farming interest, and that section of the Union, instead of contributing her mite, as before, to crowd and glut the market of the large Atlantic cities, with the products of agriculture, herself thereafter furnished the best and most certain market for the rich products of the West.

Senator Dallas of Pennsylvania concluded a speech in the Senate February 29, 1832, as follows:

If there be any—certainly there are none upon this floor—who seek to distract the peace and dissolve the bonds of our federative Government, who would put at hazard, in pursuit of temporary projects, or to indulge ambitious aspirants, the repose and institutions of the Republic, who contemplate change and revolution, I beseech such men to extend their forecasting vision into the future, and to confront posterity. Let them be warned by anticipating the judgment of that tribunal. The excitements of the day may be gratified; they may delude themselves into the belief that they are laboring to vindicate the Constitution, or to uphold the principles of human liberty, but if they recklessly involve the American people in the horrors, uncertainties, and fatal consequences of civil war, and of violent disruption, they must be content to receive, as a merited reward, an immortality of detestation.

Their party and paltry pretexts will be forgotten; their refined discrimination in theory, and their high-wrought declamation will be forgotten; even their virtuous passions will cease to extenuate their offense; and all posterity, struggling in vain to recombine the elements, and to rebuild the edifice of our great and glorious and happy Confederacy—amid the desolation of perpetual conflicts, and in the darkness of sectional bondage—will doom them to loud, deep, and everlasting execration. Let no man, sir, seek elevation or renown at the price of the National Union and tranquility. He will never find it. Failing, he must rank, during life, among the few outcasts whom we have yet engendered; and if he achieve his country's ruin, when dead, the burning lava of universal hatred will roll hissing over his grave; and, though like "the aspiring youth who fired the Ephesian dome," he should acquire fame, it will be the fame of bitter and boundless abhorrence.

Mr. Crawford of Pennsylvania, in the House May 29, 1832, said:

Our countrymen had, what is always found in company with character and honor, firm hearts, determined to redeem their situation, and conform, as far as might be, their habits and pursuits to their new condition. Bringing to their efforts economy and industry, it is to this much abused system that we are mainly indebted for a prosperity that has realized the dreams of the visionary, and overgone the calculations of the most sanguine. It is impossible to look upon the picture which the country north, east, and west, and a portion of that south of us, presents for the gratification of the mental eye, without shrinking from the idea that so much competency, and comfort, and happiness are to be destroyed, that the fountains of so much of all that is desirable are to be dried up, which only require to be kept open to furnish a stream of abundance and independence of useful occupation, and an adequate reward for it, which are the elements of individual and collective felicity.

Mr. Appleton of Massachusetts, in the House, May 30, 1832, said:

It must be apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the question of the tariff, as connected with the bill on your table, and the accompanying report of the Committee on Ways and Means, so eloquently explained and enforced by the honorable gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of that committee, assumes a character altogether new in this House. It is not a question of the general expediency of a system of protection to domestic manufactures; it is not a question of modification or improvement of the tariff; it presents the naked question, whether a system of protection, founded on impost duties is at war with the eternal principles of justice, and should consequently be abandoned? * * *

Under these circumstances, let me ask is South Carolina prepared to abandon the Union, and meet the horrors of a civil war, on the strength of the theory of the gentleman from South Carolina, for a nonenity—a mere abstraction—a figment of the brain? I am aware the excitement of South Carolina is no mockery. I agree with the gentleman that it is not the spirit of vaporing; but I believe it, to use his own works, "an arrant delusion, as antisocial as it is unjust." A fearful responsibility rests somewhere!

As to the honorable gentleman from South Carolina himself, it were little to say he is sincere: he is even beyond enthusiasm. I can attribute to him on this subject nothing short of downright fanaticism. I apply this word in the conviction of its truth, and in the spirit of charity. Who can have attended to the spirit of his whole address, without perceiving that his own mind is made up? Who can have noticed the kindling of his manner when he spoke of "glorious rebellion:" his picture of the prosperity of South Carolina in a state of separation; of the glorious harvest which free trade would furnish her; and not perceive that nothing short of the influence of fanaticism could have so wrought upon him, unless one could attribute to him the unholier motive of a criminal ambition?

South Carolina prosperous, separated from the Union! Her population doubled in ten years! What but infatuation can think so? What will free trade do for her? All the ports of the United States are as free now as they can be for foreign trade. Every article of foreign merchandise can be bought and sold in them for exportation, free of duty. In the language of the gentleman himself, I say to him, it is time to pause. For Heaven's sake pause!

Mr. Davis of Massachusetts, in the House, on the 6th of June, 1832, made a speech, which is valuable for its recital of the causes which brought about protective legislation, as well as an argument against the doctrine of secession. He said:

I must beg leave, if the committee will bear with me, to draw their attention to things forgotten, to go back into matters of history connected with the policy of this Government. It has been said, history is philosophy teaching by example. Whatever may be thought of this as an aphorism, it is unquestionably true that experiment is better than theory, and that our knowledge is greatly improved by the lessons of wisdom which lie in past times.

Whoever will examine our colonial history will not fail to learn that one of the great causes of discontent among the colonists and of complaint against the mother country was that she fettered the industry of the colonies. A distinguished statesman said, America shall not manufacture a hobnail.

So jealous was England of her own interests, so watchful of the prosperity of her manufactures, that she was unwilling we should shoe a horse without driving the nails forged by her labor. She lived up to this policy; compelled us to trade with her; boasted that we took her surplus goods, the orts and ends of her manufactures, such as no other people would buy; and that the trade greatly enriched her. This was all true; but it made our fathers almost as poor as the aborigines whom they had displaced. This unequal condition could not exist, and it by and by created discontent, which brought on the Revolution; the colonies were severed from the parent country, and the people of these States supposed themselves to be independent. They looked upon themselves as detached from Great Britain, and all other governments acknowledged them to be so, and such was the fact *de jure*, but *de facto* they were still miserably dependent, and continued so until they extricated themselves in the manner I shall point out.

The war terminated in 1783, and the country, by its great efforts, sacrifices, and privations, was naked and destitute. This being well known, peace was scarcely ratified before Great Britain emptied her warehouses of goods and poured them into this country. They were everywhere sold and the people everywhere became indebted, under the expectation that the produce of the land would pay. But in this they were deceived; for Great Britain then pursued the same policy as now; she would buy nothing she could produce. Corn, wheat, beef, pork, butter, and cheese were shut out of her markets by high duties; and the consequence was that a scene of desolation and distress ensued which beggars description. The pressure of private and public debt became so grievous as to be intolerable. The people could not extricate themselves from the meshes in which foreign countries had entangled them by regulating trade, while this country had no power to countervail such regulations. Their cattle, their farms, the whole fruits of a laborious and ecouomical life, were swept away under judicial process to pay trifling debts, because, as labor had no value, property had next to none.

This was borne as long as a brave, resolute, and patient people could endure it; but when there seemed no alternative left but imprisonment for debt and starvation, they were wrought into madness, and began to inquire whether this was the fruit of the liberty they had achieved; and in this scene of discontent and dismay, that last and fearful remedy, rebellion, followed in one of the States at least. The people, in their despondence, offered open resistance to the courts, because executions came from that source; and they sought to overcome the process by which their property

was swept away, because they were unable to reach the real cause, and apply an efficient remedy to the real evil. It was soon seen that this violence and bloodshed endangered the liberties of the people, while it brought no relief from embarrassments. It was plain that debts could not be paid without the fruit of labor could be turned into money. It was equally plain that foreign countries had, by their regulations of trade, taken it out of our hands, and imposed such onerous conditions in favor of their own labor that we could not live under them. We had no regulations; it was, in every sense of the expression, a period of free trade such as is now earnestly sought for; and yet it was a period of dismay and distress such as had never been witnessed in this country.

How does this contrast with the picture of happiness which the glowing imaginations of the advocates of free trade in this House have described? Can we learn no wisdom from the calamities of that period. Or are we anxious for a repetition of those scenes of bankruptcy and ruin?

But let us see what the statesmen of that day thought and did to extricate themselves from the fatal embarrassments which beset them. They comprehended the cause of disaster; they saw that while they had no power to make general salutary regulations of foreign trade, other nations availed themselves of that circumstance to make regulations in favor of themselves, both oppressive and unjust toward the people of this country. They saw that such a state of things was equivalent to yielding to other powers the sole authority to legislate in matters of trade, and binding themselves to abide the provisions of such laws however injurious. They saw it differed but little from a state of colonial bondage, for Great Britain had at once so arranged the matter that she took more than all the profits of American labor.

The remedy for this evil was obvious. These selfish regulations could only be controlled by countervailing regulations, securing to our citizens benefits and advantages which would be an equivalent. This was the only remedy which could extricate the people from the net in which they were entangled; the only mode by which they could be relieved from British monopoly; for the right of foreign countries to make and maintain their laws could not be denied. Great exertions were therefore made to arrange a system of counteracting measures. The old confederation was, however, a mere league entered into by the States for belligerent purposes, and was in no respect adapted to the relations of peace. It conferred no power to regulate trade with foreign countries or among the States. The consequence was that these matters were left to be managed by the several States, and some levied duties and made regulations of one kind, some of another, and some made none.

This state of things was intolerable, and to obtain a system more efficient and beneficial, application was made by Congress to the States for a grant of power for this purpose by the Legislatures, but it was withheld by some and granted by others, with qualifications so variant and conflicting that it could not be exercised. Though the exertions to attain to this object had been great and powerful, yet the failure was so complete that all hope of success in that way was abandoned, and the most wise and sagacious statesmen began to look to a constitution forming a general government with larger powers, as the only remedy which could restore harmony and prosperity to a people poor and weary with contention. A proposition was made for a convention for that purpose. It was held, and the instrument which now forms the basis of this Government was framed, and having been sent to the people was ratified, and went into effect in 1789.

I now ask the attention of the committee to the doings of the first Congress. It met, and many of the members had been members of the convention which framed the Constitution. The first act passed, after providing for oaths of officers, had a twofold object: first, to restore public credit; and, second, to encourage American industry. And, lest there should be misapprehension as to this, the purposes of the act are distinctly set forth in the preamble. Can anyone pass these facts through his mind, and find a lingering doubt as to the objects of forming this Government? Can anyone review this history and then affirm that the principal object in giving a power in the Constitution to regulate trade was not to countervail foreign regulations and to aid American labor? But, sir, it is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the constitutional power. I have spoken of that on a former occasion, and my purpose now has been to glance only at the historical facts, for they need no argument to aid them.

What, permit me to ask, was the result of this wise policy? I can not do more ample justice to it than by quoting the language of a distinguished friend at a public festival—"the dead corpse of public credit sprang upon its feet." The effect on business was everywhere instantaneous and equally surprising. There was no interim between a state of deep, sullen depression and one of vigorous, laughing prosperity. This act, which laid the foundation of the great American policy, infused the vital principle into the drooping, disheartened spirits of all laborers. It restored a discontented community to tranquillity, and caused peace and happiness to pervade this widespread country; and from that day to this no people on earth have been blessed with such continued and eminent prosperity. If there be any parallel it has escaped my reading and my observation. What a contrast between free trade and the American policy! But to understand the wonderful vigor and power of industry when cherished and protected in its pursuits, let us follow this historical inquiry a little further.

The Constitution went into operation under all the load of Revolutionary debt which had been discharged; and the expenses of another war, amounting probably to $150,000,000, have been defrayed. This protecting act, and those which followed by strong duties, threw the whole navigating interest into our hands; we made and sailed our own vessels; it excluded all foreign vessels from the coasting trade; restored the fisheries to a better condition; did much for the mechanic arts and many kinds of manufactures; and restored the whole country to such a vigorous state of healthful action, giving to all employment and good wages, that the people of no nation have been so well fed, clothed, lodged, and felt so little of public burdens as the people of the United States; and now, sir, we have arrived at a period when the last remnant of public burden is about to be removed under the silent and easy operation of this system of public policy, which has been attended with such wonderful success that it seems almost to work by miraculous power.

Sir, is not this a fit season for joy, for mutual congratulations, for the outpouring of thankful hearts, for gratitude to Heaven for blessing with signal success the efforts of the Government to make a free, happy, enlightened people? And yet, what are we talking about? With these auspicious results before them, gentlemen are questioning the perpetuity of this Government; they endeavor to weaken our confidence in it; they talk boldly of disunion. What ingratitude! What disregard of the blessings of Heaven! It is the last topic which should find a place in the patriotic heart. It is a baleful deadly poison dashed into our cup which is overflowing with joy. Sir, I have not the power to express the sentiments which fill my mind. I can not give utterance to my surprise (and gentlemen will pardon me when I say my incredulity) when I hear them, at a crisis like this, talk of the oppression of this Government. I entreat them to escape for a while from their own gloomy reflections, to contemplate the unparalleled success of this Government; to behold the prosperity, the joy, the comfort, the happiness, it has everywhere diffused.

It has not, it is true, created kings or princes; it has failed, indeed, to satisfy the grasping hopes of the ambitious; but it has not failed of the object for which it was created; it has made a more enlightened, happy people than any other system of polity. I lament that the fervor, the glowing ardor, the untiring zeal, the eloquence, which I witness on this floor, is no better employed than in rousing suspicions and weakening public confidence in the free institutions of the country. I lament that it should be thought a grievous cause of complaint that a majority rules, and that a minority should be considered a more safe fiduciary of power than a majority.

These doctrines seem to unsettle the very principles upon which a republican government rests. And while I lament this perversion of reasoning, and that doctrines full of the evil spirit of revolution find even able advocates, I feel grieved that a rancorous and bitter spirit of hostility exists toward the free laborers of this country, for they constitute both the physical and moral strength of the nation; and you can not, sir, depress or injure them without giving the country a shock that will be felt at its remotest borders.

* * * * * * *

I desire the attention of the committee upon this subject, in its connection with the public policy of this Government. It involves momentous considerations, on which hang the destinies of our free institutions. The labor of the United States is divided into two kinds, free and slave. The latter is not labor, in the strict sense in which we employ the term, but the operation of capital, the same as we see it in horses and oxen. Slaves work not for themselves, and have nothing to hope or expect beyond the coarsest of food and clothing, and a hovel for a shelter. How widely different the objects of a freeman! He labors for himself and he aspires to objects beyond physical want. He aims at something higher than food, raiment, and lodging. He lifts his hopes to those moral and intellectual attainments which qualify him to become a free, enlightened, independent citizen, capable of appreciating the value of a republican government, and maintaining it by a discreet exercise of the elective franchise. Every voter is identified with and constitutes a portion of this Government; and nothing is more certain than that it will fall when the voter become too poor to educate their families—too poor to be enlightened themselves—too poor and debased to care whether they are freemen or slaves.

Sir, the laborer in this country—he who has no capital save the hands which God has given him—easily secures to himself all these inestimable blessings. Industry, economy, intelligence, and a fair fame, make him a pillar in society and a tower of strength to his Government. It is the earnings of labor which enable him to accomplish this. But if you curtail wages you lessen his means to become a useful citizen, and this course may be pursued until wages are as low as they are in Ireland; and then we shall have a people like the wretched potato population of that country. If the laborer is obliged to retrench expense because you reduce his pay, he will first spare his moral comforts, because physical wants are more urgent than moral. His family will cease to be educated, schools and churches will be diminished, and we may then look for that vice and profligacy which the enemies of manufactures and the mechanic arts have hitherto searched for in vain. Sir, I hope never to see the day when this Government shall be so unwise as to tear away the foundations on which it rests; when this nation shall disregard its peace and happiness by trafficking away its great moral power in an experiment upon England, to see if she can not be made to purchase a few bags more of cotton, and to sell us calicoes a cent or two in the yard cheaper.

Sir, let us not, in such a rash and foolish experiment, to gratify the insatiable avarice of the greedy planters, barter away the most precious of God's gifts—that lofty, manly spirit of independence which swells the bosom of the free, enlightened laborer. Let his heart continue to be filled with gratitude that he can safely depend on his own hands to supply the means of obtaining the moral and physical comforts of life. Such a laborer leans not on the rich for bread, nor does he look to the poorhouse as his ultimate home, but carries forth to his daily toil a proud consciousness that he can depend safely on his own hands; that the dependence between him and the rich is mutual, and as necessary to the one as to the other.

Mr. Evans, of Maine, in the House, June 11, 1832, said:

Mr Chairman, that the protective policy has contributed very much to the present prosperous and happy condition of this country, seems to me to scarcely admit of doubt. The honorable member from South Carolina [Mr. Mitchell] has inquired, "When was it not prosperous?" Sir, I think it was not prosperous during the period which intervened between the termination of the late war and the protective act of 1824. In that interval, as the gentleman himself declared, all the manufacturing interest which, under the influence of stern necessity, had grown up during the war was prostrated. Our navigation went abroad as before, but only to meet rivals where it had been accustomed to find employers.

The plains of Europe, which for a quarter of a century had been furrowed only by the massy wheels of artillery, now opened their bosoms to the implements of husbandry, and the sickle reaped its treasures where, for that long period, the falchion and the bayonet only had garnered in their dreadful harvests. Our agriculturists sent their productions abroad, but only to find producers where they had formerly found consumers. The consequence of this state of affairs everybody remembers. Commerce and avigation languished; manufactures were destroyed; agriculture was at its lowest depression; wages low; labor unemployed; real estate, farms, sacrificed; bankruptcy, dismay, and desolation spreading over the land.

This, sir, was not certainly a prosperous period. Now, all is reversed; labor is sure of employment and of remunerating wages. Agriculture finds a market and good prices; commerce and navigation are steadily advancing, and in a great degree prosperous. Population is rapidly multiplying. Towns and villages are springing up on the margins of all our rivers and streams, and in the interior of the country, and great public improvements, connecting the whole country together, are rapidly constructing. The condition of the people is wonderfully improved. The means of education are enjoyed and improved by the children of those who in their day had none. The physical and moral energies of the whole country are exerted to make it a great, and wealthy, and happy nation. Surely no man can look abroad over this land without beholding everywhere the signs of visible improvement, of great success, of extended prosperity.

The honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bell] has said that these were "vulgar evidences" of national prosperity. He did not inform us what are to be considered as refined proofs. Be they "vulgar" or not, no man can mistake them. They are palpable to the senses. We see them; we feel them; we hear them, and we can not mistake them. The gentleman very correctly remarks that we should not look at individuals, or particular towns, or districts, or States as evidence of the general prosperity, but should cast our eyes over the whole Union to observe the welfare of the whole. This is unquestionably the duty of every statesman. But, sir, national wealth and prosperity are only the aggregate of individual wealth and prosperity. Where these are generally diffused and extensively enjoyed, it is not a very "vulgar" evidence of public prosperity—of national strength. * * *

Mr. Doubleday, of New York, in the House, June 11, 1832, said:

I come, then, Mr. Speaker, to the conclusion that the Federal Constitution is a compact between the different States of this Union, as sovereign States;

that as no common arbiter has been appointed, each State, in the exercise of its inherent sovereignty, has a right to judge for itself of the infractions of the Constitution and of the mode and measure of redress, and consequently the right to resist or defend itself against unconstitutional and arbitrary power by the Federal Government or any of its departments; that this right is to be exercised under the deep and solemn responsibility of producing disunion or civil war; that when a State has determined to resist the measures of the Federal Government, whether it be a law of Congress or a decision of the Supreme Court, the Federal Government, if it resolves to enforce its measures, acts under the same deep responsibility, in which the people of the other States will participate unless they instruct their agents (their Representatives here) to repeal or desist from the prosecution of the obnoxious measures; and finally, that if the State assuming this attitude will not yield, and the Federal Government persists, there must either be a dissolution of the Union or an appeal to the sword. Our reliance that we shall never be reduced to this extremity is on a rigid adherence to the Constitution and that spirit of conciliation and concession in which the Constitution was formed.

Mr. Denny, of Pennsylvania, in the House, June 12, 1832, said:

The true question, notwithstanding all that has been said and although it has been called "a delusion," is, shall we prefer the productions of foreign labor and foreign countries to the productions of our own citizens and of our own country? Shall we protect and foster the industry of our own citizens, or shall we permit it to be destroyed by an unequal and unfair competition with foreigners? In the proportion that foreigners throw into our market their productions, in the same proportion is the industry of our country impaired and the laboring class deprived of the means of subsistence; and foreign labor takes the place of our own. If the foreign manufactures glut our market with their manufactures we become the principal sufferers. How to protect ourselves, how to protect the industry of our own citizens, and encourage labor, how to rescue us from a dependence upon foreigners, is the great object of the American system and the true foundation of the wealth of the nation.

We all agree that labor, workmanship, is wealth. Nations are made of individuals; national wealth is made up of individual labor and workmanship; diminish labor, throw it out of employment, and you diminish national wealth. If you substitute foreign labor for our own, you increase foreign wealth at the expense of our own nation. Throw ten or twenty thousand laborers out of employment by introducing the produce of foreign laborers and you inflict a serious injury upon the country, and confer a corresponding benefit upon the foreign country. That community is always the most prosperous in which there is full employment of labor. Those are wise measures of a government which add to the means of employing industry, and equally wise are those which tend to preserve or protect the productive industry of the country from the injurious operation of foreign regulations, from ruinous and unequal contest with foreign industry, and from a desperate competition with foreign bankrupts or foreign pauper labor in our own market. Such a policy is wise, it is dictated by sound sense, by the universal principle of self-preservation, and is pursued by every intelligent nation.

Labor must find something to operate upon; it is in the power, and it is the duty of a wise government to aid in giving such a direction to labor as shall best promote the interests of the country; and those interests are best promoted when the labor of the citizens is judiciously employed upon the resources of the country. Strictly speaking, it may be said that the basis of the wealth and power of a nation consists in its internal resources, physical, moral, and intellectual: these mutually aid each other. Physical resources call for, invite the exercise of, and furnish employment to, the intellectual and moral energies of a people intrusted with them. These intellectual and moral energies are stimulated to devise new modes and facilities for judiciously and most advantageously developing the physical resources, so that the nation shall derive from them in the fullest manner all the benefits which they are calculated to confer. Unless the nation avails itself of these resources the possession of them is of no account. * * * * *

Mr. Choate of Massachusetts, in the House, June 13, 1832, said:

Upon the whole, sir, I submit that it has not been ascertained since 1824 or 1828, that no further protection is necessary, nor that the proposed degree of reduced protection is all which is necessary.

Well, sir, has it been ascertained that protection is unavailing and inexpedient, it being now discovered to be impossible to introduce domestic manufactures by such means at all, or at least without great and disproportionate expense? Let it be premised that it is only four years since the system was consummated. Even if you date back from 1824, it is quite too short a time to develop the fair action of a complex policy like this. He is a bold statesman, and that is a bold party and a bold Administration, which will say that the result of such an experiment has demonstrated that this kind of industry can not be engrafted upon the stock of the masculine morality, energetic habits, the skill, perseverance, and frugality of this people. However the system had operated, nobody could say it had failed on a fair trial and therefore should be abandoned.

But I go further. I ask every member of this committee, if even the brief and in some respects unfavorable experiment which has been made does not prove conclusively that this seed is sown on good ground, and that, although it is yet but in the blade and the green ear, it will shoot higher and bring forth of full corn in the ear a hundred fold. You have not overrated the capacities of your country nor erred in your vision of her greatness. We see far enough to know that whatever of wealth, power, enjoyment, and aggrandizement a diversified, preserving, rewarded, intellectual industry will bestow upon a nation is already within our grasp. We see far enough to know that the same great power of the social world which reared and which upholds the strong columns of England's ocean throne will carry us up also to the same dazzling elevation, and cover us over, in the fulness of time, with the same brightness of glory. *Sic tibi etiam itur ad astra.*

Gentlemen say, however, that they admit you can introduce and establish manufactures by a protective policy, but it will cost too much. The price paid by the consumers of the country is too high, and the remuneration which we anticipate is too remote and too inadequate. Sir, this does not come to the point. You expected it would cost something thus to introduce manufactures when you adopted this policy. You expected a temporary enhancement of prices to the consumers, and you look forward to a great ultimate national compensation, overbalancing this sacrifice, "casting your bread upon the waters to receive it again after many days."

The true question is this: Has it been proved, by the experiment of these eight years, that it will cost more than you expected to establish manufactures by a protective policy? Do prices stand higher, or is domestic competition less enterprising and successful, or have manufactures thriven more feebly than you anticipated, rendering it probable that you will be forced to give, not too much for the whistle, but more than you meant to give. Sir, the reverse of all this has happened. The friends and foes of the system have alike been disappointed by its splendid and quick success. Prices have fallen from some cause, competition is crowded and bold, and manufactures have multiplied themselves, if it so pleases the gentleman from Tennessee, "beyond the dreams of avarice" or of enthusiasm.

Has the experiment proved that the successful introduction of manufactures, by aid of this kind of legislation, works out in any way an overbalance of national injury? Does it operate to diminish revenue or to depress trade, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, and the wages of labor? Do the great cities wither under this curse? Does the country wither under it? Does it begin to develop antirepublican and aristocratical influences in our society? No, sir. The gentleman from Tennessee himself admits that the eye of man never reposed upon a more soothing spectacle of general enjoyment and prosperity than that which this whole land—excepting only, what I do not except, the Southern region of misery—this moment presents. "Thrice happy, if we but knew our happiness."

Will it be said, however, that public sentiment has at length declared against the system, and that this is a new fact, relieving you of your pledge and requiring you to retrace your steps? Sir, it should be borne in mind that the Government settled this policy against a very divided public opinion, and therefore the continuance of such a divided opinion ought to be cautiously received, as a reason for receding from it. I do not know that in 1824 the weight of opinion was not against the protecting tariff. The literary press of this country and of England, the professed and perhaps sincere sentiments of British statesmen given out in Parliament about that time, the whole navigating and commercial interests, the united East and South, some of the first abilities of the day in Congress, encountered by great abilities, it is true, on the other side; these were against it, and yet it was adopted.

Was anybody so weak as to suppose that a trial of eight years would convert all this body of opposition over to the tariff? Can you, then, honorably urge this anticipated continuance of hostility, supposing it were undiminished, as a reason for giving up a system with which so many interests have since been intertwined, and which you adopted in defiance of that hostility? But, sir, that is not all. Every candid man who hears me will admit that public sentiment is more favorable to the preservation of the tariff than it was to its passage. The press, the elections, the voice of the Northern States, Maryland, of East Tennessee—everything proves it. * * *

Mr. Burges of Rhode Island (in the House, June 16, 1832) took the floor.

He commenced by saying that government and laws were established in aid of human labor, and that these aids were given to labor that, by its operations, human wants might be supplied and the condition of the human race improved. Not only laws and government, he said, but institutions for defense, for health, and for instruction, as well as machinery and land, were all instruments in the hand of labor; and all men, whether employed in furnishing or in using all these, were alike workingmen, fellow-laborers together in the great field of national toil, where every man is interested, and each one expects to be a sharer in the harvest, whether abundant or scanty, of national production. They all labor, not merely that they may accumulate, but that they may consume; not by avarice to store up, but, by the blessing of God, to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

* * * * * * *

We are told by the sages of South Carolina, or at least by one of them, that he who, by a sale of his own commodities, purchases those of others is truly the producer of those commodities. It has been gravely stated in this House that the Southern planter is a manufacturer of hardware, cotton and woolen cloths, whenever he exports his cotton, rice, and tobacco to Liverpool and exchanges them for those fabrics. These planters are thus manufacturers to the amount of $20,000,000, because they are growers of cotton, rice, and tobacco, exported to the amount of $20,000,000. They complain of the American system because it does not permit them as Southern manufacturers to bring their hardware, cotton, and woolen cloths into the American market free of duty, but does permit the Northern manufacturers to bring their fabrics into that market free of duty.

What a scheme of piracy and plunder is disclosed by this doctrine! The clods of this earth to whom accident may have furnished wealth can easily purchase the works of genius and labor, either mental or bodily, and they, by this purchase, become the producers of whatever may have adorned human ingenuity or effort in all the walks of science, letters, and art, whether useful or ornamental. Can we by the vile incantation of money call down from their splendid mansions and enwrap ourselves in the beams of glory of those men who, beginning with Moses and Homer, have risen age after age on the admiring eyes of mortals and now adorn and irradiate the whole firmament of the intellectual world? For if we can, by purchase, appropriate to ourselves the skill of the humblest artisan, so may we in like manner purchase the ingenuity of the most distinguished artist. The mere man of acres and slaves, because he grows cotton, can, therefore, by his own skill, build palaces or temples, adorn them with paintings or statuary, and fill his libraries with the science and literature of all ages, from the fertile and abundant resources of his own plantation.

Surprising discovery! Wonderful man who has "sought out so many inventions!" Has he purchased the orations of Cicero, of Demosthenes, or the divine rhapsodies of Homer, Virgil, Milton? Then is he truly, according to his own showing, the producer of these incomparable works. One-sixth part of the annual labor of some faithful slave, a single bag of cotton, has made this man of miracles the great author of all those works which have given immortality to men both in the ancient and modern world! Did any one of us, walle at the schools, admire any of these once the divine productions of antiquity; and are we now at times lighted up by scintillations from their holy fires? Why, sir, all this is mere darkness before the brilliancy of this wonder of our age; who, by the simple agency of a solitary slave, has really become the very incarnation of all the poetry and eloquence of all time.

This new potency of bargain and sale is truly a sublime discovery. All relations heretofore on earth seem to dissolve under it. The very mules of the West, sent down in droves and sold in South Carolina, acquire a new paternity by that sale, and thenceforth are the production of those planters who purchase them. Still more wonderful, had this very man who achieved this discovery made cotton and exchanged it not for books, but for slaves, he would not be a maker of poetry and orations, but, in the place of literature he would do no more than make slaves.

THE COMPROMISE ACT OF 1833.

When Congress assembled, President Jackson, in his fourth annual message, discussed the tariff and recommended that it should be dealt with so that none could complain of injustice. Referring to the arguments of the opponents of a protective tariff, he said:

A large portion of the people in one section of the Republic declares it not only inexpedient on these grounds, but as disturbing the equal relations of property by legislation, and, therefore, unconstitutional and unjust.

Doubtless these effects are, in a great degree, exaggerated, and may be ascribed to a mistaken view of the considerations which led to the adoption

of the tariff system; but they are, nevertheless, important in enabling us to review the subject with a more thorough knowledge of all its bearings upon the great interests of the Republic, and with a determination to dispose of it so that none can, with justice, complain.

It was evident, as soon as Congress convened, that the final contest concerning the protective policy was about to be waged, and that the policy of the Government, as evidenced by the acts of 1824 and 1828, was to be reversed; not because the country did not prosper under a protective tariff, but at the demand of the South; that while the Administration, by vigilance and firmness, had quelled for the time being the incipient rebellion in South Carolina, the legislative department was to allow the Government to be coerced into a course admittedly detrimental to the prosperity of the country. The Secretary of the Treasury urged upon Congress a reduction of duties. The portion of the President's message relating to the tariff was referred in the House to the Committee on Ways and Means, of which Mr. Verplank, of New York, was chairman.

Although the tariff bill of the previous session had been passed with the hope of satisfying South Carolina, and, as we have seen, by a large majority, it was now evident that to conciliate the South the protective policy was to be abandoned. On the 27th of December a tariff bill was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means.

It would be profitable to trace, in this connection, the proceedings of Congress concerning the threat of South Carolina to prevent the execution of the laws of the United States within her borders, and the discussion of the proposed tariff legislation, but it is only my present purpose to show that the act known as the compromise act of 1833 was passed to conciliate the South, and on account of the hostility of that section to the tariff system.

The abandonment of the protective policy at the behest of the South was not made without a protest, and the doctrine of nullification was ably discussed and forcibly denounced. Senator Poindexter of Mississippi, on the 19th of February, 1833, commenced a speech as follows:

I can not hope that any effort of mine will operate to arrest the action of this body; but the people whose future peace and happiness and everything dear to them is involved in the issue of this great struggle may find in the investigation of this subject the means of arriving at proper conclusions in relation to it. I feel the responsibility of the position which I occupy.

I know how vain it would be to indulge the belief that, with the simple weapons of reason and of truth, I could overcome the dumb eloquence of numbers so forcibly displayed in this Hall, arrayed in solid phalanx to carry into effect purposes of desolation and blood, which can neither be mistaken nor obviated save only by the deleterious results which may be felt in all their fury by a reaction on the heads of those who have contributed to put this ball of civil discord in motion. Under such discouraging circumstances I must be permitted to say that my views of this momentous question will be addressed to the calm and dispassionate consideration of a free and enlightened people, who alone can control the movements of this Government; and I wish it to be distinctly understood that I expect not, hope not, and mean not, to make an impression within these walls.

The theory of nullification, so freely denounced, and so much deprecated by honorable Senators who have preceded me in this debate, it is not my purpose at present to examine. When consolidation and the total prostration of the last vestige of State sovereignty is made the desideratum on which alone the Union can be perpetuated, I mean not to cavil about the remedy by which so great an evil may be averted. If, sir, I am left to choose between a total overthrow of the happy system erected by the wisdom of the patriots who framed the Constitution, and some efficient remedy to maintain it, I will not hesitate in the course which duty and patriotism so plainly indicate.

Mr. Clay, who was known as the father of the protective system, introduced in the Senate the bill which was to doom the protective system to a lingering death. His excuse for so doing I give in his own words.

On February 12, 1833, speaking on the proposed modification of the tariff, he said:

When I survey, sir, the whole face of our country, I behold all around me evidences of the most gratifying prosperity—a prospect which would seem to be without a cloud upon it were it not that through all parts of the country there exist great dissensions and unhappy distinctions, which, if they can possibly be relieved and reconciled by any broad scheme of legislation adapted to all interests, and regarding the feelings of all sections, ought to be quieted; and, leading to which object, any measure ought to be well received.

In presenting the modification of the tariff laws which I am now about to submit, I have two great objects in view. My first object looks to the tariff. I am compelled to express the opinion, formed after the most deliberate reflection and on a full survey of the whole country, that, whether rightfully or wrongfully, the tariff stands in imminent danger. If it should even be preserved during this session, it must fall at the next session. By what circumstances and through what causes has arisen the necessity for this change in the policy of our country I will not pretend now to elucidate. Others there are who may differ from the impressions which my mind has received upon this point. Owing, however, to a variety of concurrent causes, the tariff as it now exists is in imminent danger, and if the system can be preserved beyond the next session it must be by some means not now within the reach of human sagacity.

The fall of that policy, sir, would be productive of consequences calamitous indeed. When I look to the variety of interests which are involved, to the number of individuals interested, the amount of capital invested, the value of the buildings erected, and the whole arrangement of the business for the prosecution of the various branches of the manufacturing art which having sprung up under the fostering care of this Government, I can not contemplate any evil equal to the sudden overthrow of all those interests. History can produce no parallel to the extent of the mischief which would be produced by such a disaster. The repeal of the edict of Nantes itself was nothing in comparison with it. That condemned to exile and brought to ruin a great number of persons. The most respectable portion of the population of France were condemned to exile and ruin by that measure. But in my opinion, sir, the sudden repeal of the tariff policy would bring ruin and destruction on the whole people of this country. There is no evil, in my opinion, equal to the consequences which would result from such a catastrophe.

* * * * * * *

If there be any who want civil war, who want to see the blood of any portion of our countrymen spilt, I am not one of them; I wish to see war of no kind; but, above all, do I not desire to see a civil war. When war begins, whether civil or foreign, no human foresight is competent to foresee when, or how, or where it is to terminate. But when a civil war shall be lighted up in the bosom of our own happy land, and armies are marching, and commanders are winning their victories, and fleets are in motion on our coast, tell me, if you can—tell me, if any human being can tell its duration? God alone knows where such a war will end. In what state will be left our institutions? In what state our liberties? I want no war; above all, no war at home.

Sir, I repeat, that I think South Carolina has been rash, intemperate, and greatly in the wrong; but I do not want to disgrace her, nor any other member of this Union. No; I do not desire to see the luster of one single star dimmed of that glorious Confederacy which constitutes our political sun; still less do I wish to see it blotted out, and its light obliterated forever. Has not the State of South Carolina been one of the members of this Union in "days that tried men's souls?" Have not her ancestors fought alongside our ancestors? Have we not, conjointly, won together many a glorious battle? If we had to go into a civil war with such a State, how would it terminate? Whenever it should have terminated, what would be her condition? If she should ever return to the Union, what would be the condition of her feelings and affections? What the state of the heart of her people? She has been with us before, when her ancestors mingled in the throng of battle, and as I hope our posterity will mingle with hers for ages and centuries to come in the united defense of liberty, and for the honor and glory of the Union. I do not wish to see her degraded or defaced as a member of this Confederacy.

Mr. Clay, on February 25, 1833, said:

The friends of free trade insist that duties should be laid in reference to revenue alone. The friends of American industry say that another, if not paramount, object in laying them should be to diminish the consumption of foreign and increase that of domestic products.

* * * * * * *

All that was settled in 1816, in 1824, and in 1828 was that protection should be afforded by high duties without regard to the amount of the revenue which they might yield. During that whole period we had a public debt which absorbed all the surpluses beyond the ordinary wants of Government.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, I want to be perfectly understood as to the motives which have prompted me to offer this measure. I repeat what I said on the introduction of it, that they are, first, to preserve the manufacturing interest; and secondly, to quiet the country. I believe the American system to be in the greatest danger; and I believe it can be placed on a better and safer foundation at this session than at the next.

* * * * * * *

No, Mr. President, it is not destruction, but preservation, of the system at which we aim. If dangers now assail it, we have not created them. I have sustained it upon the strongest and clearest convictions of its expediency. They are entirely unaltered. Had others who avow attachment to it supported it with equal zeal and straightforwardness, it would be now free from embarrassment; but with them it has been a secondary interest. I utter no complaints—I make no reproaches. I wish only to defend myself now, as heretofore, against unjust assaults. I have been represented as the father of this system, and I am charged with an unnatural abandonment of my offspring. I have never arrogated to myself any such intimate relation to it. I have, indeed, cherished it with paternal fondness, and my affection is undiminished.

But in what condition do I find this child? It is in the hands of the Philistines, who would strangle it. I fly to its rescue, to snatch it from their custody and to place it on a bed of security and repose for nine years, where it may grow and strengthen, and become acceptable to the whole people. I behold a torch about being applied to a favorite edifice, and I would save it, if possible, before it was wrapt in flames, or at least preserve the precious furniture which it contains. I wish to see the tariff separated from the politics of the country, that business men may go to work in security, with some prospect of stability in our laws, and without everything being staked on the issue of elections, as it were on the hazards of the die.

* * * * * * *

If we adjourn without any permanent settlement of the tariff in what painful suspense and terrible uncertainty shall we not leave the manufacturers and business men of the country? All eyes will be turned with trembling and fear to the next session. Operations will be circumscribed, and new enterprises checked; or, if otherwise, ruin and bankruptcy may be the consequence. I believe, sir, this measure, which offers a reasonable guaranty for permanency and stability, will be hailed by practical men with pleasure. The political manufacturers may be against it, but it will command the approbation of a large majority of the business manufacturers of the country.

Mr. Davis of Massachusetts, in the House, February 25, 1833, said:

I am greatly surprised at the sudden movement made in this House. One short hour ago, we were collecting our papers and putting on our outside garments to go home, when the gentleman from Kentucky rose and proposed to send this bill to a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union with instructions to strike it all out and insert, by way of amendment, an entire new bill, formed upon entirely different principles; yes, to insert, I believe, the bill which the Senate now have under consideration. This motion was carried; the business has passed through the hands of the committee, is now in the House, and there is a cry of "Question!" "Question!" around me upon the engrossment of the bill. Who that was not a party to this arrangement could one hour ago have credited this?

We have, I believe, been laboriously engaged for eight weeks upon this topic, discussing and amending the bill which has been before the House. Such obstacles and difficulties have been met at every move, that I believe very little hope has of late been entertained of the passage of any bill. But a gleam of light has suddenly burst upon us; those that groped in the dark seemed suddenly to see their course; those that halted, doubted, hesitated, are in a moment made firm; and even some of those that have made an immediate abandonment of the protective system a *sine qua non* of their approbation of any legislation, seem almost to favor this measure.

* * * * * * *

Peacemakers, mediators, men who allay excitements and tranquillize public feeling, should above all considerations study to do it by means not of-

fensive to the contending parties, by means which will not inflict a deeper wound than the one which is healed. Sir, what is demanded by those that threaten the integrity of the Union? An abandonment of the American system, a formal renunciation of the right to protect American industry. This is the language of the nullification convention. They declare they regard the abandonment of the principle as vastly more important than any other matter; they look to that, and not to an abatement of duties without it; and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Davis], with his usual frankness, told us this morning it was not a question of dollars and cents; the money they regarded not, but they required a change of policy. They demand the pound of flesh, with the unyielding obstinacy of Shylock; and they require this House to apply the knife nearest to the heart; and shall it be cut away? Is it patriotic? Is it harmonizing public feeling? Is it saving the Union to drain out the life blood? What is this bill? I will not say it goes at once to such extremities, but it seems to me to contain a principle which works an unqualified abandonment of the protective policy, unless changes greater than we have a right to look for shall take place in our condition.

* * * * * * *

What will be the effect of this bill? The protection will be diminished from year to year. This will check the operations of capital; it will, I fear, stop investments, if it does not crush that enterprising, valuable class of young men who have entered upon business, relying upon their industry and capacity to carry them forward. They are in debt, and I fear timid creditors may fall upon them. Business then will be brought to a stand at any rate, and if bankruptcies ensue, will be diminished. This is precisely what some interested in manufacturing are selfish enough to desire, for they have money; wages will be cheaper if a portion of the mills cease to run and no new ones are erected, and the capitalists will by this means, in the end, gain more by a diminution in the competition in business and the reduction in wages than they will lose by the reduction in duties.

But, sir, this is a policy founded in such naked selfishness; it is built up so manifestly at the expense of those who have small capital, and of the laborers; it is so hostile to the first principles of protection which invite the free investment of capital from all quarters, that goods may be made cheap by the competition and the public be thus benefited, that no friend of American labor can give it his approbation on that ground. It may answer for a time the purposes of a few, if it operates as they anticipate; but should this prove so, it will be an unanswerable argument with the public for disapproving of it, for the causes which will make the measure valuable to some will make it injurious to the public.

Again, sir, I can vote for no bill which abandons protection. I think this does. It adopts the Carolina system for equalizing duties, by bringing them all to 20 per cent. It abandons the exercise of all right to discriminate, and in that, give me leave to say, abandons common sense, for the system of equalization has never, to my knowledge, until now found an advocate among financiers or political economists. It is, however, a very cunningly devised plan and worthy of its origin (Gallatin, in the free-trade report), for it contains a sweet poison that will destroy the last remnant of protection.

Mr. E. Everett of Massachusetts, in the House February 25, 1833, said:

He considered the bill, as originally reported in the Senate, as a total, an absolute abandonment of the protective system after 1842—at best, it was but a lease to the manufacturers for seven or eight years, or, perhaps, more properly speaking, a notice to wind up their concerns within that time; their destruction was slow, but sure. The existing protection was to go down, down, from year to year, until the end of the term, when the existing establishments were to be abandoned by the Government. He said the existing establishments, for new ones could not be expected. Prudent capitalists would not venture in a sinking concern.

About the same time was given that was allowed the bank to wind up; and were theirs a mere money business, they would have less reason to complain: but, unfortunately, their capital was fixed, and must be sacrificed. Factories and machinery were of no value unless in operation. The owners of flocks were not in a much less hopeless condition. He repeated that the bill, as originally laid on their tables, abandoned the protective policy. It reduced all duties to the same level, 20 per cent. Even the principle of discriminating duties was abandoned. In its present form, he admitted that principle was faintly perceptible.

Mr. Burges, of Rhode Island, in the House, February 26, 1833, said:

I protest against this measure, continued Mr. Burges, because, like that which has been stricken out of the bill to make room for its insertion, it proposes to provide for the wants of the Government, but does not propose to make any provision for the wants of the nation. It calls on the people for money to feed that Government, and at the same time takes away that protection of their labors by which the people have hitherto been enabled to feed themselves. Not less than 1,715,000 free white workingmen are annually employed in the agricultural, mechanic, and manufacturing labor of the Eastern, Northern, and Western States of this Union.

That part of these men thus employed in mechanic and manufacturing labor depend on that part of them employed in agricultural labor, in the same and other States, for a market for their fabrics; and a supply in return of food—of corn, wheat, flour, beef, pork, and other provisions—amounting annually to more than $27,000,000. They also look to them, and to other producers in many of the States, for a further market for like fabrics; and expect in exchange the products of their lands and mines, equal to $15,000,000 in amount annually. Those employed in the farming and mineral labors of these States look to such as are engaged in these mechanic and manufacturing labors for this market for their products, and therein for their supply, by this exchange, of those various manufactured fabrics annually to this great amount.

By the destruction of this mechanic and manufacturing labor, men employed in agriculture, whether on their own lands, or farming the lands of others, must lose that market; and not only lose their annual supply of those fabrics heretofore purchased in it, but their annual production left on their hands for want of a market, must, to this amount, annually be utterly lost to them. For in no other market of the world could they sell their breadstuffs and provisions, their wool, their lead, their iron, and steel.

* * * * * * *

How do the provisions of this bill insure the destruction of that system? By the utter abandonment of even the very principle of discriminating, countervailing, or protecting duties of impost on imported goods, wares, and merchandise. At the end of ten years these duties, that is, the whole system of imposts, are to be reduced to 20 per cent ad valorem, and to stand at that rate upon all imported commodities, such as are produced in our own country, by our own domestic industry.

* * * * * * *

This evil will fall on the whole country, and will be a just retribution for the cruel and unrelenting ruin which this profligate measure will have brought on the many hundreds of thousands of free, white workingmen, now employed in the mechanic, manufacturing and agricultural labors of the free States. When the domestic manufacturers, the owners of the mills and machines, by the working of which those men now earn their bread, and that of their families; when these owners find they must surrender a tenth part of their protection—a tenth part of the impost, over and above 20 per cent of the whole, they will call on their workingmen to surrender a like tenth part of their wages, or to leave their employment.

When will this first call be made? In the very dead of the next winter, when they and their families must perish or have employment. It will be repeated annually at that season. They will surrender rather than hear their children cry for bread when they have none to give them. This demand on labor for a reduction of wages will be repeated once a year, just as often as this bill makes a like reduction of the rate of that impost by which manufacturing labor and capital are now protected. At the end of ten years, when the whole protection is taken away, the wages of labor will be reduced to 20 per cent of its present amount. What a consummation of what a scheme!

Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, in the House, February 26, 1833, on the tariff, said:

That he was opposed to all further legislation at this time on the subject of the tariff. This Congress had already acted upon the subject. We have passed one law, and are *functus officio*. If the act of the last session, passed with so much unanimity as a final adjustment of this vexed question, is again to be disturbed, let it be by other hands; let us not be driven by a handful of nullifiers into a repeal of our own legislation before it has gone into effect, and before anyone can foresee whether its operation is to be beneficial or injurious. If we degrade ourselves by such an act of inconsistency the world can assign but one reason for our course, and that will be that a majority of 2 to 1 have been compelled to surrender their own deliberate judgment to the threats of a few nullifiers, thereby recognizing and establishing nullification, not only as a peaceable but as an efficient and constitutional remedy, proclaiming to the world that the United States is not a Government but a thing to be governed by the passions, whims, and caprices of each and every State in this Union.

* * * * * * *

Some gentlemen, however, indulge the hope that whatever is now surrendered will be recovered hereafter. This, he feared, was a vain hope. But why pass an act destructive to the best interests of the country, with the hope that those who come after us will repeal it? Will such an excuse as this satisfy our constituents? Will it satisfy our own convictions of public duty? But we are told by others that our successors will do worse; that they will destroy the whole system; that they will entirely repeal the act of 1832. We are therefore called upon to destroy this act, to murder our own offspring, lest it might perish by other hands, to cut our own throats to prevent others from doing it. "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." Let us live while we can. If the country must be destroyed, let the sin rest upon other heads. Let us do right, and leave the responsibility of doing wrong to others.

* * * * * * *

But, sir, if this precedent is to be now established by yielding to the demands of nullification; if the Constitution and laws of this Union are to be canceled by the South Carolina ordinance; if the legislation of Congress is to be repealed at the pleasure of every State in the Union; if our Government, established at the expense of so much blood and treasure, is thus to be overthrown and destroyed, I for one said Mr. S., shall escape the sin and the reproach by voting against this bill.

If, sir, the effect of the adoption of this measure shall be (as he firmly believed it would) to sap the foundations of the national prosperity, destroy millions of capital, and throw thousands of industrious people out of employment; if its effects should be to reduce to the level of the paupers of England the free and now prosperous labor of the country, to grind down alike the wages of the farmer and mechanic, to exhaust our currency, and spread poverty, wretchedness and ruin far and wide over this now prosperous and happy land, his constituents, to whom he was much indebted, should never have it in their power to say to him, "You contributed to bring this ruin upon us."

Senator Sprague, of Maine, on the 26th of February, 1833, made a speech, which for force and argument deserves a place among the great speeches made in Congress. He said:

This new school in politics teaches that the several States have, by the Constitution, only delegated certain powers, which each may resume at pleasure. The United States have the power to declare war, but each State has the reserved right to annul it, and be herself at peace. The United States may make treaties, but each State may, *ad libitum*, revoke this authority and terminate the compact. Express prohibitions are imposed upon the States; they may not declare war, make treaties, coin money, emit bills of credit, pass *ex post facto* laws, or those impairing contracts; and yet every State has reserved the right, at any moment, to cast off all these prohibitions.

She is fettered, indeed, but just so long only as it may be her sovereign will and pleasure! And actually to throw off all these restraints, to resume all these powers, is not revolution—it is legal, peaceable, constitutional remedy! It is pursuant to the Constitution, within its scope; and the State is still a member of the Union! The United States, the Constitution, and the Government, it is said, are but agents, a mere aggregation of delegated powers; yet the agency may be revoked, the delegation terminated, and the Constitution and Government remain! It will be no revolution! Can anything be more preposterous?

Sir, we all admit the original inalienable right of man, individually and collectively, to resent oppression, to overturn and destroy government, when, by perversions and corruptions, it has become subversive of the ends for which it was instituted. But this is the primary right of force, of revolution, of rebellion, by which government is overthrown and subverted. It is not pursuant to the law of the land; it is above and beyond it; it is in defiance of oppressive legislation. Can the destruction of the Government be legal? Can the annihilation of the Constitution be constitutional?

The distinguished member from South Carolina [Mr. Calhoun] has referred to the danger to which their slave property might be exposed if his doctrines be not established. Will he permit me to warn him of the greater danger of superseding the securities of the Constitution? Let him beware how he appeals from the plain stipulations of that instrument to the original and inalienable rights of man. Let him not lead the way in a course of reasoning which points directly to the inquiry, by what means one-half of the human beings upon the soil of South Carolina are held in absolute dominion as property by the other—how their natural and sovereign rights have been cloven down, and transferred to their masters. Be not wise beyond what is written. Abide by the Constitution; that is your best and highest security. From that solemn compact we will not depart. We have no inclination to

disturb it, nor to refine away its guarantees: they are the work of our fathers, and let them be forever sacred.

We have witnessed much controversy as to the origin of the Constitution. In my judgment, it is the work of the people of the several States, acting as separate communities. It was drafted by a convention and proposed to the States; but until their adoption it was a mere proposition, an unexecuted instrument having no efficiency. The ratification by the people of the several States imparts all its validity. They, having all power, could make it anything that they pleased. The people of Virginia and Maryland, for example, might agree to commingle in one mass, to amalgamate, to become, as by fusion, one people, abrogating entirely their State institutions and forming a new single government over a single community; or they might make a league, a mere confederation, or form a union anywhere between these two extremes, participating of both, embracing such extent or degrees of each as to them might seem fit.

And the same remark may be extended to the other States. Having this power, the only question is, how did they exercise it—what union did they form? The answer is to be found in the instrument itself—the Constitution. It has been much contested whether it is federative or popular. It is neither. It is both. In its origin and in the sources of the organization of the Government it is federative; in the action of the Government upon all those subject to its powers it is popular. The laws are made for and reach and operate directly upon individuals, passing by the local governments and penetrating beyond them, and scarcely recognizing the existence of the States as communities. The judiciary is coextensive with the legislative power.

Such being my view of the fundamental law of this nation, I can not recognize any right in a State to arrest and repeal the legislation of Congress. I dare not withhold my support from a measure which seems essential to the maintenance of the Government and the Constitution. If the Legislature of the nation should refuse to uphold and vindicate them at such a crisis, they must fall, and their authority be prostrated, I fear, forever. I could not forget the past, nor shut my eyes to the fact that the present alarming extent and threatening form of resistance and defiance have been consequent upon the tolerated practical nullification of the State of Georgia. The gentleman from South Carolina nearest to me [Mr. Miller] has assured us that such is the fact. Attempts have been vainly made to find a distinction between the two. In principle they are identical.

I regret that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forsyth], in his endeavor to render his defense of the one consistent with his condemnation of the other, has deemed it necessary to assail the Supreme Court of the United States—to pronounce the reasoning and argument of one of its most important decisions to be unworthy the lowest county court in any of the States. I can assure the gentleman that the country regards it far otherwise, and that the most vigorous and gifted minds deem it one of the most powerful productions of the wonderful intellect of the revered chief of that august tribunal. If, in the inscrutable ways of Providence, our institutions are destined to be subverted and left in ruins by the convulsions of revolution, that decision, and other kindred constitutional opinions from the same mind, will remain to after generations splendid and enduring monuments of intellectual and moral greatness, and, like the broken columns and classic remains of Athens and Palmyra, be the wonder and admiration of successive ages.

The time has arrived when the progress of nullification must be arrested, or the hopes of permanent union surrendered. The gentleman [Mr. Calhoun] assures us that his theory would make this Government a beautiful system! Beautiful as would be the proud and polished pillars which surround us, if resolved into their original rude and paltry pebbles; beautiful as the dashed mirror, from whose fragments are reflected twenty-four pigmy portraits, instead of one gigantic and noble original!

The triumph of that doctrine dissolves the Union. It must be so regarded by foreign nations; it is almost so even now. Already have the exultations of the oppressor and the laments of the philanthropist been heard beyond the Atlantic. They have looked with fear and hope, with wonder and delight upon the brilliant and beautiful constellation in our western hemisphere, moving in majestic harmony, irradiating the earth with its mild and benignant beams. Shall these stars now be severed and scattered, and, rushing from their orbits through the troubled air, singly and feebly sink into clouds of murky blackness, leaving the world in rayless night? Shall the flag of our common country, the ensign of our nation, which has waved in honor upon every sea—the guardian of our common rights—the herald of our common glory—be severed and torn into twenty-four fragments; and our ships hereafter display for their protection but a tattered rag of one of its stripes?

The gentleman [Mr. Calhoun] declares emphatically that this is a question of liberty or despotism. I believe it. In my conscience I believe it. If this Union be dissolved, despotism is the ultimate result. It requires no prophetic vision to see how it will be accomplished. Draw the line where you will, wars, frequent, inevitable wars, will ensue. Border nations have been considered natural enemies. History is a little more than a record of their contentions. Human nature is not changed on this side of the ocean. Indeed, there is hardly a nation, in any age or continent, which has given more unequivocal proof of devotion to military achievement and a spirit of martial adventure than the people of these United States.

Their having been once friends, so far from preventing or restraining, would but aggravate their mutual animosity. The sweetest substances become the most acrid by perversion. Fraternal feelings, corrupted or perverted, give new bitterness and intensity to hatred and revenge. We have already had two wars with Great Britain, who once held toward us a parental relation; and who can doubt that they would have been more frequent had we been separated only by an imaginary line? The different sections of the country, arrayed in arms each against the other, would know no bounds to their mutual exasperation. We should be told, in relation to the slave population, what the British Parliament were with respect to the Indian savages—that they were arms which God and nature have put into our hands. It would, indeed, be a sacrilegious abuse of that hallowed name—but the argument would prevail: a servile war would be kindled.

Relentless and fiendlike passions would be let loose to rage with unbridled license; and violence and havoc, conflagration and devastation, would ensue—the horrors of which could be depicted only by the imagination of a Milton or a Dante. It would seem that the severe regions of the North would have less to apprehend from hostile invasions. Southern chivalry, even if not in requisition for the defense of their own sunny lands would find little to invite them to arctic expeditions. Would they come to our rugged soil and more rugged clime, to our rock-bound shores and snow-capped hills? Would they penetrate a dense and teeming population of hardy, laborious and unyielding freemen—every valley a Thermopylæ and every hill a Bunker's—where "friends may find a welcome, and foes a grave?"

The North is by nature the region of strength. It has been so from the days of Attila, King of the Huns, to Platoff, hetman of the Cossacks. The Northern hive would again swarm upon the blooming and honeyed fields of the South. But is there any consolation in this? In such a contest victory is disaster and defeat is death. If this Union shall be severed free governments will for a while, perhaps, exist upon its fragments. But on both sides of the dividing line must speedily arise a chain of fortified places and military posts for protection against sudden incursions of predatory and border warfare, to which they are eminently exposed. Standing armies, to occupy these fortifications, and to repel the formidable danger of organized invasion, are the necessary consequences.

A martial spirit will be everywhere excited and military ambition universally dominant. One party will obtain success and advantages in the war to counteract which the other must give additional strength to the Executive arm. The first will resort to the same expedient to regain their preponderance and the weaker will then concentrate all their power in the hands of one man, that it may be wielded with the most efficiency for their protection. Imminent danger of destruction and the primary law of self-preservation will silence the voice of liberty; civil power will be submerged, and military despotism wave its horrid and resistless scepter over the ruins of the Republic.

This Union is not only the citadel of our liberty, but the depository of the hopes of the human race. He who shall be its destroyer will go down to future ages, associated, indeed, with its founder, the Father of his country—but with a contrasted immortality. No halo of glory will surround his brow, but on his head will gather the hissing curses of all generations—horrible as the snakes of Medusa. He will stand on the highest and blackest eminence of infamy—the detestation of mankind. If he meet not a traitor's death he will fill a traitor's grave, over which there will be no requiem but the groans of the oppressed and the execrations of the good. His monument will be of human bones, upon foundations slippery with human blood. However high may have been his elevation, his fall will be like that of Lucifer; and like him, sinking into his bottomless and boundless habitation of darkness and woe, he may exclaim—

> "Hail! horrors, hail!
> And thou, profoundest hell,
> Receive thy new possessor!"

Senator Robbins, of Rhode Island, March 1, 1833, in a speech in the Senate, said:

The bill carries with it the idea that the protective policy is an evil in itself, an evil to be deprecated and not to be tolerated for a moment, but to prevent a greater evil, namely, the evil of a sudden overthrow of the great establishments dependent upon it, and to be tolerated only for a few short years, to give an opportunity to those establishments to wind up their affairs and enable them, so far as that time will enable them, to prevent the consummation of their total ruin. The bill thus considers this protective policy as a great State criminal condemned to die, but whose sentence is respited for a few days to give him time to arrange his affairs, repent him of his evil deeds, and prepare for death, but whose doom is fixed and irrevocable; die he must.

Such an idea going out to the country, I think, must be pernicious in its effects, especially as it goes out from the professed friends, or some of them, of the policy, with its great champion at their head. It must repress the spirit of adventure; it must depreciate the value of those establishments; it must arrest the progress of the business at the point where it now is; no more capital will be invested in it, and the capital already invested will be withdrawn as far and as fast as it can be. The tide will have reached its high-water mark; it will now turn back and fall to low ebb, perhaps never to recommence its flood. These great establishments, so widely spread over the country, with all the industry dependent upon them, will be kept in a feverish, lingering state of existence, suspended between hope and fear, with much to alarm their fears, with little to animate their hopes. It can not be but this languishing state must ensue, for we all know how feeble is the hand when not seconded and invigorated by the impulses of the heart.

THE EFFECT OF THE COMPROMISE ACT.

The South prevailed. The protective system was stricken down. The act of 1833, as passed, provided for a gradual reduction of duties; but almost immediately after its passage its disastrous effects began to be felt. The prosperity of the country was checked, and business depression and financial stringency increased until the final culmination in 1837. May 10, 1837, all the banks of the city of New York suspended. The suspension of the banks of Albany, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Providence, Hartford, Boston, and the banks in every portion of the country followed. The Legislature of New York on the 16th of May authorized the suspension of the banks of that State for two years. A reliable author described the industrial embarrassment of the period as follows:

During the preceding two months—preceding the suspension of the banks—unprecedented embarrassments and difficulties were experienced among the mercantile classes, and were felt in all commercial towns of the United States, and especially in New York and New Orleans. The number of large failures which took place in New York in a short time was about three hundred, their liabilities amounting to many millions. In two days, houses in New Orleans stopped payment owing an aggregate of $7,000,000. In Boston one hundred and sixty-eight failures took place in six months.

A great pressure was brought upon President Van Buren to call a special session of Congress. A committee, appointed by a mass meeting in the city of New York, came to Washington to urge upon the President the importance of convoking Congress in extraordinary session. They presented an address to him, in which the condition of the country was graphically described, an epitome of which was published in the press of the day, as follows:

Under a deep impression of the propriety of confining their declaration within moderate limits, they affirmed that the value of their real estate had, within the last six months, depreciated more than forty millions of dollars; that within the preceding two months there had been more than two hundred and fifty failures of houses engaged in extensive business; that within the same period, a decline of twenty millions had occurred in their local stocks, including their railroad and canal incorporations, which, though chartered in other States, depended chiefly upon New York for their sale; that the immense amount of merchandise in their warehouses had, within the same period, fallen in value at least 30 per cent; that within a few weeks not less than twenty thousand individuals, depending upon their daily labor for their daily bread, had been discharged by their employers because the

means of retaining them were exhausted, and that a complete blight had fallen on a community heretofore so active, so enterprising, and prosperous; the rulers, they declared, had produced a wider desolation than the pestilence which depopulated our States, or the conflagration which laid them in ruins.

The President was, at last, compelled to act, more by the condition of the revenues than on account of the distress of the people, and issued a proclamation on the 15th of May convoking Congress on the first Monday of September. The following is the opening clause of the proclamation:

Whereas great and weighty matters, claiming the consideration of the Congress of the United States form an extraordinary occasion for the convening of them.

President Van Buren, however, ignored the true cause of the business depression and financial troubles, and refused to make such recommendations as, if made and acted upon, would have relieved the general distress. He said, among other similar expressions:

To avoid every unnecessary interference with the pursuits of the citizens will result in more benefit than to adopt measures which could only assist limited interests, and are eagerly, but perhaps naturally, sought for under the pressure of temporary circumstances. If, therefore, I refrain from suggesting to Congress any specific plan for regulating the exchanges of the country, relieving mercantile embarrassments, or interfering with the ordinary operations of foreign or domestic commerce it is from convictions that such measures are not within the constitutional providence of the General Government, and that their adoption would not promote the real permanent welfare of those they might be designed to aid.

Again he said:

I deeply regret that events have occurred which require me to ask your consideration of such serious topics. I could have wished that in making my first communication to the assembled representatives of my country I had nothing to dwell upon but the history of our unalloyed prosperity.

The tenor of this message, as can be easily seen, promised no relief to the public; and the special session, which continued forty-three days, enacted no legislation which to any considerable extent relieved the business of the country; and when Congress convened in regular session, the President informed it that:

The industry and prudence of our citizens are gradually relieving them from the pecuniary embarrassments under which portions of them have labored.

However, these embarrassments had not disappeared two years later; for in the opening portion of his third annual message, he said:

The ravages of fire and disease have painfully afflicted otherwise flourishing portions of our country, *and serious embarrassments yet derange the trade of many of our cities.*

The condition of the country during this period is shown by the following quotation:

Mr. Young of Kentucky, in the House, June 19, 1846, said:

Great as the prosperity of the country had proved under the tariff of 1824, it was not suffered to last. The Southern States refused to obey the law. The infamous doctrines of nullification were broached and sedulously propagated, until at length our happy Union was seriously threatened. Then it was that that great and eminent statesman, who deserved so richly the honorable title of the father of the American system, consented to sacrifice his own offspring to avert the horrors of civil war. With a sublime moderation he tempered the angry spirit which had been raised, and soothed it by agreeing to the compromise act. His object was attained. Civil war was avoided, but the consequences of the compromise were written in tears and blood. Hence came the awful distress of 1837.

A fearful revulsion took place in our business affairs. The scenes of 1819 were again revived. General distrust prevailed, and suits were multiplied, until the business of the country was so prostrated that it was no longer worth while to sue. As to its practical use and enjoyment, property became valueless. Notwithstanding the high prosperity which had prevailed in 1824 and 1825, when the revulsion of 1837 came, all were found to be in debt. As a mitigation of the general misery, many of the Western States passed relief laws, forbidding property to be sold under two-thirds of its value. This operated in some degree to prevent the general ruin which would otherwise have ensued. But if American labor had been protected in due time, no such legislative interference would have been required.

Similar quotations from authors and statesmen might be multiplied, but it is unnecessary. It is an historical fact, which no one will dispute, that the general distress brought upon the people by the abandonment of the protective system, and by the operation of the compromise act of 1833, was so great, and their appeals to a Democratic Congress for relief were so fruitless, that a political revolution took place which elected Gen. Harrison and placed the Whigs in power. The condition of the country was such, in the judgment of President Harrison, as to demand the assembling of Congress in extraordinary session.

THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION OF 1840 AND THE WHIG TARIFF OF 1842.

At the Presidential election of 1840 the Democratic party, which had controlled the Government for twelve years, was held responsible by the people for the universal business depression and financial disturbances and the widespread distress. The prevailing condition of the industries, the derangement of the finances, and the suffering of the people were rightfully attributed to the striking down of the protective policy, and the people decreed the retirement of the Democratic party from power and placed the Whigs in control of the Administration and of both branches of Congress. And although Mr. Tyler, who upon the death of President Harrison succeeded to the Presidency, grievously disappointed his party in regard to the tariff question as well as other questions, in 1842 an act was passed increasing duties upon imports and discriminating in favor of domestic industries.

Mr. Tyler was nominated for Vice-President from a supposed necessity of choosing a candidate for Vice-President from the South, after the nomination of Gen. Harrison, and without much attention to his principles or his political character. If it had been supposed that he would have succeeded to the Presidency, it is not likely he would have been nominated.

President Tyler justly subjected himself to serious criticism by accepting the nomination from the Whig party, and afterwards deserting the party when he accidentally succeeded to the Presidency. His Administration was popular with neither Whigs nor Democrats. It was a bitter disappointment to the Whigs. The majority in Congress in political accord with the new Administration was 7 in the Senate and about 50 in the House of Representatives. Congress, convoked in special session by President Harrison before his death, assembled May 31 and adjourned September 13.

The time of Congress was mainly occupied in a struggle with the President over bills to incorporate a bank, which caused the alienation of the Whig party from the Administration and the loss of all confidence between them. But several important acts were passed, among them an act relative to duties and drawbacks By this act a large number of articles placed on the free list by the act of 1833 were subjected to a duty of 20 per cent. At the second session of the Twenty-seventh Congress, which met December 6, 1841, and continued until August 31, 1842, a new tariff law was passed, by which ample provision was made for the public revenue and protection afforded to American manufactures and other branches of national industry. This bill received the approval of President Tyler, although he had previously returned, with his veto, two different tariff bills, the first being a provisional revenue bill, vetoed on June 29, the other, vetoed August 9, being substantially the bill finally approved, excepting that it provided for the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands.

THE BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF THE TARIFF OF 1842.

The proofs of the immediate beneficial results of the protective tariff of 1842 are abundant. President Tyler, in his third annual message, said:

We have new cause for the expression of our gratitude in the preservation of the health of our fellow-citizens, with some partial and local exceptions, during the past season, for the abundance with which the earth has yielded up its fruits to the labors of the husbandmen, for the renewed activity which has been imparted to commerce, for the revival of trade in all its branches, for increased rewards attendant upon the mechanical arts, for continued growth of our population, and the rapidly reviving prosperity of the whole country.

This prosperity continued; and in his fourth annual message he said, in proof of the beneficial effect of the tariff of 1842 upon the credit and finances of the country:

The credit of the Government, which had experienced a temporary embarrassment, has been thoroughly restored. Its coffers which, for a season, were empty, have been replenished. A currency nearly uniform in its value has taken the place of one depreciated and almost worthless. Commerce and manufactures, which had suffered in common with every other interest, have once more revived; and the whole country exhibits an aspect of prosperity and happiness. Trade and barter, no longer governed by a wild and speculative mania, rest upon solid and substantial footing, and the rapid growth of our cities in every direction bespeaks most strongly the favorable circumstances by which we are surrounded.

Senator Evans of Maine, January 23, 1844, speaking concerning the compromise act, said:

Now, one of the good effects of the act of 1842 was to settle the market—to put an end to that uncertainty which created fluctuations of prices. Manufacturers, knowing what they had to depend upon, could renew their efforts, engage more largely and with smaller profits in business, and produce their fabrics at less cost; so that they could afford to reduce prices and fully meet the demand by a regular and full supply. This was what the friends of the tariff law anticipated; and, whether by the operation of that law or not—whether admitted or denied to be from that cause—the fact was undeniable, that the result has justified the anticipation; for business is more prosperous than ever, and prices are growing cheaper without the producer being injured by the reduction.

Another thing that resulted from these causes was, that the home demand for agricultural productions was increased as the operatives in manufactories increased in the ability to become consumers. The agricultural producers were actually beginning already to feel the beneficial effects of the tariff law of 1842.

* * * * * * *

He could tell the Senator from South Carolina that his wish that his State should be left to herself could not be accomplished. She was a partner in this Union and had entered into a compact for a general government, from which she could not now be allowed to retire.

Again, February 5, 1844, Senator Evans said:

He would now ask, What was the state of the country previous to the year 1824? Why, with all our immense imports and seeming national prosperity

Government was forced to borrow money to go on, business declined, the shipping interest was neglected, and the country was going rapidly into ruin; but after 1824 the protective system gave a new impulse to trade, business revived; and after 1828 things wore still a better aspect, and continued to do so until the compromise act reached its lowest point of duty; then came another change; foreign articles increased, while the home fabric decreased, in price; there was no revenue; commerce declined, and the country was compelled to resort to loans to enable Government to carry on its operation. He might go back to the year 1789, and from that to the present he would be enabled to show the same causes producing the same effect—the lowest rates of duties injurious to revenue, commerce, and the general good of the country, and the highest productive of directly opposite results.

The honorable Senator will say all this is in opposition to elementary principles, and is not laid down by Adam Smith; it does not reach the conclusion which he reached three-quarters of a century back, and which, as he declared it true then, must be true forever. In mathematics and geometry a truth once attained is a truth forever; but in moral philosophy it is quite different. A true line of action to-day may be changed by to-morrow by causes springing up in the interim. What in the time of Adam Smith may have been admitted as truth experience since may have proved not well established. Since then, what has been the history of the world? Manufactures have improved, and steam, the great agent, was then unknown; and so little was thought of any benefit to be derived from manufactures, that Adam Smith himself expressly recommended this country (then colonies) to make agriculture their pursuit, and not to think of manufactures. The very article on which the honorable Senator seems to set so much value was not then known as an article of produce; it is since that period cotton has become a staple of the country. The views of Adam Smith were not entitled to the fullest credit.

* * * * * * *

The view which had been offered of the benefits to accrue to the South from a dissolution of the Union, if offered as an illustration, was, he considered, a most unhappy one, and could only be viewed in a favorable light by men (if any could be found) possessed of more zeal, but much less discretion, than the honorable Senator. He (Mr. McDuffie) had painted in most inviting colors the happiness that the proposed Southern confederacy would enjoy when freed from the shackles of the Government of the Union, and careering onward, under the direction of some form of separate legislation. He had permitted his imagination to dwell on the unexampled prosperity that was, under a dissolution of the Union, to bless his section of the country, quite regardless of what (if his views were correct) the result would be to all other portions of the States. He had the sagacity not to hold forth on any wrong that a disruption of the Union would inflict on our common country; but he described in glowing colors the great advantages, the unbounded wealth, and indescribable improvement which such disruption would confer on one part of the broken confederacy.

All these great advantages, he maintained, the South would gain by severance from the Union. The Southern confederacy would, under self-government, outrival the Hesperian gardens, and be blessed with perpetual verdure and eternal spring; become the depository of unbounded wealth, the land of unparalleled happiness—free from political convulsions, proof against national earthquakes, no possibility of being involved in war, but ever blessed with smiling peace.

* * * * * * *

To those who, under the influence of discontents more imaginary than real, would venture to attempt the carrying on of such a visionary scheme as that of forming separate confederations founded on homogeneous interests, he would recommend the study of that portion of mythological history which records the adventure of him who, but for one day, attempted to drive the chariot of the sun. They would find that his life was the forfeit of his temerity. Whoever attempts the dismemberment of this Union will live only in the reproaches of mankind; he may live in history, but it will not be on the page where are inscribed the names and deeds of the good and wise and great, the benefactors of mankind; but on that page where are recorded the names and acts of those who were the authors of civil discord and national calamity. He did not believe any portion of the South desired such results. He believed that they felt, with the people of the North, that all were bound together in one common cause, as one community—one nation. As such, we had achieved independence, renown, and an ascendency unparalleled in so short a time. To preserve these we must preserve the Union which has conferred such blessings.

Referring to the effect of the tariff of 1842, Mr. Evans, July 14, 1846, said:

But the tariff of 1842 is to be overthrown. The fierce and bitter denunciations; the outpouring of all sorts of opprobrious epithets directed against the existing law, proclaim the purposes of its opponents. Well, why is it to be overthrown? This is a question surely worth a moment's consideration. Has the tariff of 1842 accomplished that which its friends and advocates and supporters promised it would accomplish? Has it failed in the fulfillment of any single object which was designed to gain? Has it yielded an adequate revenue? Has it restored public credit and public confidence? All this we promised. All this we pledged ourselves to achieve. And how were our promises and pledges met?

Why, gentlemen, then on the other side—and I see many of them still here—ridiculed our professions and promises. They predicted a great decline in the revenue. They predicted destruction to our commercial interests. They predicted all manner of evil. It was maintained that we would not be able to obtain the loans necessary to carry on the Government—for the Treasury was then so impoverished that the Government was under the necessity of borrowing twelve or fifteen millions—and I recollect that one gentleman contended very zealously that we should be obliged to give $100 of scrip for $90 in cash.

Well, we passed the law authorizing the loan, and not a dollar could we get at any rate until this revenue bill was passed. Then, sir, money enough could be obtained and at a lower rate of interest than that authorized to be paid. The public credit advanced at once and continued to advance until the stocks of the United States reached, I think, a maximum of about 115 or 116 and at that sold rapidly after the enactment of this law, because everybody saw that we had a system which would enable us to carry on the Government, to pay the interest punctually and the principal when it became due. Look, then, at the working of the act of 1842. It did not go fairly into operation for several months after it was enacted. It can hardly be said that it was fairly in operation till the succeeding spring—the spring of 1843. About that time we changed the commencement of the fiscal year, so that our fiscal years now end on the 30th of June.

Take, then, the first whole fiscal year under the act of 1842, and you will find that it yielded us (after paying all the expenses of collection, drawbacks, and everything else, of which I will speak bye and bye) twenty-five and three-quarter millions. That was the result of the first year. In the second year (1845) the amount was twenty-six and three-quarters (almost), showing an increase of about a million. In the third year (just ended June, 1846) the net amount was $26,311,864, according to the best computation I could make, for the statements are quite contradictory. By the papers received this morning from the Secretary of the Treasury the amount is set down at $25,681,915. Thus is shown a constant increase, but an increase marked by an extraordinary uniformity.

The following extract from a speech made by Mr. Johnson of Tennessee in the House January 31, 1844, shows the acrimony with which the discussions in Congress were conducted. Mr. Johnson referred to the death of President Harrison as follows:

I am not superstitious, but I do believe the Almighty does now and then manifest His power in various ways, as in olden time; like the case of Saul of Tarsus, when journeying from Jerusalem to Damascus, he was struck with blindness. We read also of Herod addressing the people upon a certain day set apart for the purpose of receiving honor, such as was due only to the Supreme Being; and all the people shouted, and said his voice was like the voice of a god; and the angel of God smote him, and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost. Sometimes we see the power of God manifested in tempests, in the agitation of the mighty deep; sometimes we see His indignation flashing forth in the forked lightning; sometimes He sends forth a baleful comet, emitting from its fiery tale pestilence and death.

I might refer to instances in modern times; I might refer to the occurrences of 1840, when a most extraordinary excitement pervaded the community; when reason was dethroned and confusion and profanity reigned paramount; when hard cider and coon skins were substituted as the very emblems to be used with all the sacred rights of the Holy Communion; when men were diverted from the worship of the true and living God, to honor with whom they had succeeded in elevating to the highest pinnacle of human ambition, and whom the Almighty, in the display of His power, struck as a star from its sphere, down to the level of the tomb.

I give this as an instance of divine interposition. May we not trace it somewhat further? Who knows what might have been the result of his administration of the Government? Who knows but God expressly interposed to set an obstacle in the way of the accomplishment of those mighty calamities which would, peradventure, have been produced under his administration of the Government—the abolition of slavery and the dissolution of the Union?

At the Presidential election of 1844 the Democratic party was successful. James K. Polk was elected President and George M. Dallas Vice-President. The people were deceived, at least in some sections of the country, into the belief that the Democratic party, if restored to power, would not disturb the Whig tariff of 1842. The rallying cry in Pennsylvania was, "Polk and Dallas, and the tariff of 1842."

THE TARIFF OF 1846.

Reversing entirely the policy of the previous Administration upon the tariff, the principal recommendation of President Polk in his first annual message was for a revision of the tariff of duties on imports, with a view to a reduction of the rates of duty and a consequent withdrawal of the protection to industry afforded by the tariff of 1842.

With the election of a Democratic President, the Democrats secured a majority in both Houses of Congress, and the recommendation of the President was promptly adopted by Congress. A new tariff bill, on a plan drawn up by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Walker, was enacted, after a protracted discussion, by a vote of 114 to 94 in the House, and by 28 to 27 in the Senate. On a motion to discharge a committee to whom the bill was referred for amendment, the Senate was equally divided, when Mr. Dallas, the Vice-President, gave the casting vote in the affirmative, and the bill was passed, to take effect December 1, 1846. The tariff of 1846, while called a revenue tariff, was not such a tariff as is now advocated by the Democratic party. Under it discrimination was made in favor of American industries. Under the tariff act of 1842 the average rate of dutiable articles was $33\frac{47}{100}$ per cent. Under the act of 1846 it was cut down to $26\frac{32}{100}$ per cent.

ANOTHER DEMOCRATIC DEFEAT.

Again, in 1848, as in 1840, while Democratic division made Whig succession possible, the action of the Democratic party in repealing the Whig protective tariff act of 1842 and passing the tariff for revenue act of 1846, contributed to its defeat, and helped to bring about the election of Taylor and Fillmore, the Whig candidates for President and Vice-President. That it was well understood that the protective policy had again triumphed at the polls is sufficiently evidenced by the inaugural address and the first message of President Taylor and the subsequent messages of President Fillmore.

RESTORATION OF PROTECTIVE DUTIES RECOMMENDED BY PRESIDENT TAYLOR.

In his inaugural address President Taylor said:

It shall be my study to recommend such constitutional measures to Congress as may be necessary and proper to secure encouragement and protection to the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, to improve our rivers and harbors, to provide for the speedy extinguishment of the public debt, to enforce a strict accountability of all officers of the Government, and the utmost economy in all public expenditures.

In his first annual message, sent to Congress December 4, 1849, he said:

I recommend a revision of the existing tariff, and its adjustment on a basis which may augment the revenues. I do not doubt the right or duty of Congress to encourage domestic industry, which is the great source of na-

tional, as well as individual wealth and prosperity. I look to the wisdom and patriotism of Congress for the adoption of a system which may place home labor at last on a sure and permanent footing; and by due encouragement of manufactures, give a new and increased stimulus to agriculture, and promote the development of our vast resources, and the extension of our commerce. Believing that to the attainment of these ends (as well as the means of augmentation of the revenues to the prevention of frauds) a system of specific duties is best adapted, I strongly recommend to Congress the adoption of that system, fixing the duties at rates high enough to afford substantial and sufficient encouragement to our industry, and at the same time so adjusted as to insure stability.

Vice-President Millard Fillmore, upon the death of President Taylor, succeeded to the Presidency. Upon the question of the tariff he pursued the policy of the Whig party, as marked out by his predecessor; but the want of a Whig majority in Congress, and an unfortunate division of Whig members over the slavery question, rendering a return to the protective policy impossible. The act of 1846 was therefore continued in force, causing large importations of foreign merchandise, the prostration of our industries, and the constant drain of gold from this country to pay the balance of trade against us.

In his first annual message, President Fillmore, discussing the tariff, said:

I therefore strongly recommend a modification of the present tariff, which has prostrated some of our most important and necessary manufactures, and that specific duties be imposed, sufficient to raise the requisite revenues, and making such discrimination in favor of the industrial pursuits of our own country as to encourage home production without excluding foreign competition.

In his second annual message he effectually disposed of the arguments that low duties upon imports will increase the demand for our agricultural products abroad in the following language:

The policy which dictated a low rate on foreign merchandise was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand, and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show, incontestably, that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy. On the contrary, notwithstanding the repeal of the restrictive corn laws of England, the foreign demand for the products of American farmers has steadily declined since the short crops and consequent famine in a portion of Europe have happily been replaced by full crops and a comparative abundance of food.

How conclusive is this to show that our foreign market depends upon the world's supply and demand, on the character of the crops throughout the world, and is not affected either by protective or revenue duties. In the same message, alluding to the production of gold in California, he said:

The production of gold in California for the last year seems to promise a large supply of that metal through that quarter for some time to come. This large annual increase of the currency of the world must be attended with its usual results. These have been already partially disclosed in the enhancement of prices, and the rising spirit of speculation and adventure, tending to overtrading as well at home as abroad. Unless some salutary check shall be given to these tendencies it is to be feared that importations of foreign goods beyond a healthy demand in this country will lead to a sudden drain of the precious metal from us, and most disastrous consequences to the business and capital of the American people.

In his third annual message he said:

Without repeating the arguments contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it is coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing interests are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost, thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer, to that extent, is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus products.

In the third place, the destruction of our manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our own market, and he consequently raises the price of the articles sent here for sale, as is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England. The prosperity and welfare of every nation must depend upon its productive industry. The farmer is stimulated to industry by finding a ready market for his surplus products, and benefited by being able to exchange them, without loss of time or expense of importation, for manufactures which his comfort and convenience require. This is always done to the best advantage where a portion of the community in which he lives is engaged in other pursuits.

PRESIDENT PIERCE REVERSES THE POLICY OF HIS PREDECESSOR, AND URGES A STILL FURTHER REDUCTION OF DUTIES.

Again, at the Presidential election of 1852, the Democratic party was successful, and the Democratic idea of the tariff question prevailed. President Pierce, in his first annual message, said:

The second of the above-mentioned objects—

The application of the revenue to the discharge of the public debt and the reduction of the revenue—

that of the reduction of the revenue, is of great importance, and the plan suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury, which is to reduce the duties on certain articles, and to add to the free list many articles now taxed, and especially such as enter into manufactures and are not largely, or at all, produced in this country, is commended to your candid and careful consideration.

In his second annual message of December 4, 1854, he said:

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury presents a series of tables showing the operation of the revenue system for several successive years, and as the general principle of reduction of duties, with a view to revenue and not protection, may now be regarded as a settled policy of the country, I trust that little difficulty will be encountered in settling the details of a measure to that effect.

In his third annual message, he said:

It is now generally conceded that the purpose of revenue alone can justify the imposition of duties on imports; that in readjusting the import duties and schedules, which unquestionably require essential modifications, a departure from the principles of the present tariff is not anticipated.

Again, in his fourth annual message of December 2, 1856, he said, after referring to the revenues:

These considerations will justify a reduction of the revenue from customs so as not to exceed forty-eight or fifty millions. I think the exigency for such reduction is imperative, and again urge it upon the consideration of Congress.

THE REVENUE TARIFF OF 1857.

In February, at the second session of the Thirty-fourth Congress, a tariff bill was passed to carry out the recommendations of the President. It passed the Senate by a vote of 38 to 8, and the House by 124 to 71. Existing rates of duties were considerably reduced. The reduction upon distilled spirits and cordials was 60 per cent. Duties upon most manufactured articles of wool and iron were reduced 6 per cent. Wool, costing not more than 20 cents per pound, unmanufactured brass and copper, tea and coffee, dyestuffs, prints and spices, books, and apparatus for schools and public institutions, and other articles were placed upon the free list. This act went into force July 1, 1857. The effect of this reduction of duties upon articles coming in competition with similar articles produced in this country was the same as had been produced by all previous tariff legislation which either in whole or in part had removed protection from our industries.

The very moderate prosperity we had enjoyed under the tariff of 1846, and in consequence of conditions in Europe which had afforded us an unusually profitable market abroad for our surplus products, the expenditure by the Government of large sums to carry on the Mexican war, and the great yield of gold by the mines of California was destroyed. Our Treasury was depleted; our industries were suspended; our public works stopped; labor was deprived of employment, and the country was plunged into bankruptcy and ruin. Poverty and distress were universal. Although, as I have said, the new tariff act only went into effect on the 1st of July, 1857, the great financial crash of 1857 almost immediately followed, and by the 2d of December following, a period of five months and two days, the condition of the country had become so alarming as to require a Democratic President to present it to Congress in the most graphic language, and this most disastrous condition of our industries, our finances, and our revenues continued as long as the Democratic party controlled the Government.

A DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT COMPELLED TO CALL THE ATTENTION OF CONGRESS TO THE ALARMING CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY, PRODUCED BY FREE-TRADE LEGISLATION.

President Buchanan, in his first annual message, alluded to the then condition of the country in the following language:

In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture, and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactories suspended, our public works retarded, our enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

In his second annual message he again refers to the unsatisfactory condition of the country, and in attempting to give the causes, said:

The people were obliged to restrict themselves in their purchases to articles of prime necessity. In the general prostration of business the iron manufacturers in different States probably suffered more than any other class, and much destitution was the inevitable consequence among a great number of workmen who had been employed in this useful branch of industry. There could be no supply where there was no demand. To present an example—there could be no demand for railroad iron after our magnificent system of railroads, extending its benefits to every portion of the Union, had been brought to a dead pause. The same consequences have resulted from similar causes to many other branches of useful manufactures. It is self-evident that where there is no ability to purchase manufactured articles these can not be sold, and consequently must cease to be produced.

And subsequently, discussing the financial condition of the country, he said:

In connection with this subject it is proper to refer to our financial condition. The same causes which have produced pecuniary distress throughout the country have so reduced the amount of imports from foreign countries that the revenue has proved inadequate to meet the necessary expenses of the Government. To supply the deficiency, Congress, by act of December 23, 1857, authorized the issue of $20,000,000 of Treasury notes; and this proving inadequate, they authorized, by the act of June 14, 1858, a loan of $20,000,000 to be applied to the payment of appropriations made by law.

No statesman would advise that we should go on increasing the national debt to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. This would be a most ruinous policy. In case of war our credit must be our chief resource, at least for the first year, and this would be greatly impaired by having contracted

a large debt in time of peace. It is our true policy to increase our revenue so as to equal our expenditures. It would be ruinous to continue to borrow. Besides, it may be proper to observe that the incidental protection thus afforded by a revenue tariff would, at the present moment, to some extent increase the confidence of the manufacturing interests and give a fresh impulse to our reviving business.

In his third annual message, sent to Congress December 19, 1859, referring to the fact that, from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, it was probable there would be a deficiency of revenues, and advising against further loans, he said:

Should such a deficiency occur, as I apprehend, I would recommend that the necessary revenue be raised by an increase of our present duties on imports.

In his last annual message, sent to Congress the 3d of December, 1860, he said:

It is now quite evident that the financial interests of the Government will require a modification of the tariff during the present session, for the purpose of increasing the revenue.

On March 3, 1859, the last day of the Congress, President Buchanan sent to Congress a special message, from which I take the following:

An imperative sense of duty compels me to make an appeal to Congress to preserve the credit of the country. This is the last day of the present Congress, and no provision has yet been made for the payment of appropriations and to meet the outstanding Treasury notes issued under authority of law.

From the information which has already been communicated to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury it is manifest that the ordinary receipts into the Treasury, even under the most favorable circumstances, will scarcely meet the ordinary expenses of the Government during the remainder of the present fiscal year, ending the 30th of June. At that time nearly eighteen millions of Treasury notes will have become due, and many of those not yet due are daily paid for duties at the different ports, and there will be no means in the Treasury to meet them. Thus the country, which is full of resources, will be dishonored before the world; and the American people, who are a debt-paying people, will be disgraced by the omission, on our part, to do our duty.

These recommendations for increased duties upon imports, forced from a Democratic President by the condition of our industries and our finances, are remarkable when it is remembered that the Democratic party, then and now, deny that the then distressed condition of the country and the condition of the Treasury were caused by the tariff for revenue only of 1846 and 1857; and have even gone so far as to allege that the country prospered under and in consequence of that legislation.

A REVIEW OF THE TARIFF LEGISLATION PRIOR TO 1861.

Reviewing the history of tariff legislation prior to 1861, humiliating as the fact is, the act of 1833, by which protection to our industries was gradually removed, was passed at the behest of the South, enforced by the threat of disunion. Henry Clay, who had been an eloquent and constant advocate of the American system, explained his course in proposing a compromise by referring to the treasonable threats of South Carolina, and by saying that if the friends of protection did not then yield to the demand for a modification of the tariff, that at another Congress the opponents of the system would be strong enough to destroy it.

It appears that the tariff legislation of 1824 and 1828, under which the country enjoyed an era of prosperity unexampled in our history, during which every industry flourished, everyone was employed, individual and national prosperity assured, and the Treasury was overflowing, was overthrown at the command of Southern slaveholders, who emphasized their command with treasonable threats; overthrown because also of the fears of the friends of the protective system, who, to appease the South, abandoned their principles by making unreasonable concessions. The disasters to the industries of the country which followed the compromise act of 1833 produced a political revolution, brought the Whigs into power, who, in 1842, enacted a protective tariff, which started the country again on a career of prosperity, revived old industries, started new ones, and furnished employment to laborers. Upon the accession, however, of the Democratic party to power, at the demand of the South, a Democratic Congress again in 1846 struck down protection; and the policy of maintaining a tariff for the protection of American labor and American industries did not again prevail until the Republican party came into power.

It was not until after the enactment of the act of 1828 that the Southern opposition to the tariff assumed importance. Mr. Calhoun, as we have seen, had favored the tariff of 1816, with the avowed purpose of protecting American manufactures, but he now changed his position. It had become apparent that manufactures could not be conducted with slave labor, and, therefore, could not be established or profitably maintained in the South, and that protection helped to build up the industries of the North. The politicians of the South followed the lead of Calhoun. From that time forward hostility to the protective tariff and the extension of slavery became the leading principles of the political creed of the Southern Democracy. The Southern hostility to the tariff produced the nullification acts of South Carolina, and threatened the dissolution of the Union.

THE CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY FROM 1846 TO 1861.

The period from 1846 to 1861 is cited by the advocates of a tariff for revenue only as a prosperous period under a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. There were exceptional causes which prevented our industries from feeling at once the full effect of the changes in the tariff; and the supposed prosperity of the country has been greatly exaggerated. From 1847 to 1851 the balance of trade against us was more than $431,000,000, and there were but two years in the whole period when the balance trade was in our favor.

Under ordinary circumstances the country could not have paid this balance for a single year without producing great financial as well as business derangement. But the discovery of gold in California and the great yield of that metal from 1848 to 1860 enabled us to pay the balance of trade against us. We were, however, thereby deprived of the beneficial effect of the great production of gold, and Europe received in exchange for her products almost the entire yield of our mines.

The large importations of foreign goods under the tariff of 1846 not only prevented the development and prosperity of our manufactories, but the foreign market for our agricultural products was not greatly increased on account of our larger importations. The English corn laws were repealed in 1846. The Mexican war caused the expenditure among our people of many millions in excess of the ordinary expenses of the Government. The famine in Ireland and the revolutions in Europe followed in 1848, which so disturbed the industries of Europe that exportations to the United States were limited, while an increased demand was created abroad for our surplus agricultural products.

From 1846 to 1861 we exported only 65,440,173 bushels of wheat, while during a single year, the year 1872, under protection, we exported 72,000,000 bushels—6,000,000 more in a single year than the aggregate exports of the entire fifteen years under a revenue tariff. In each of the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1885, 1887, and 1891 we exported more wheat than we exported during the whole period from 1846 to 1861 under the Walker tariff. Mr. McKinley, in a public speech at Beatrice, Nebr., May 2, 1892, stated that—

We exported in a single year more wheat than was exported from 1790 to 1861 a period of seventy-one years. More wheat in a single year than during all the years from Washington to Lincoln.

I can not do better in discussing the causes which contributed to our very moderate prosperity for the ten years succeeding the tariff of 1846, than to quote the utterances of one of our most distinguished statesmen, from a speech made by James G. Blaine at New York City during the Presidential election of 1888. He stated the causes which contributed to postpone the culmination of the disastrous effects of the tariff of 1846, as follows:

THE EVIL DAY PUT OFF BY SPECIAL CAUSES.

Great apprehension was felt by Whigs and Democrats alike as to what effect the tariff of 1846 would have upon the industrial interests of the country. The protectionists expected that bad results would be visible within a year, but an extraordinary series of incidents, or accidents, if you please, postponed the evil day. Coeval with President Polk's approval of the tariff bill came the declaration of war with Mexico. That led to a demand of more than 100,000 men for enlistment and camp-followers, and caused an outlay of $150,000,000 beyond the ordinary expenditures of the Government within the ensuing two years. Before the great stimulus given to all departments of trade by these large disbursements began to lessen a great famine occurred in Ireland. That led to an altogether unprecedented export of breadstuffs, and that, of course, brought large shipments of money from Europe. Before the effect produced on our trade by the famine had ceased the European revolution of 1848 began, and trade and manufactures over the whole continent, from Madrid to St. Petersburg, were disturbed, and in many cases thrown into hopeless confusion and panic. This stopped importations and gave to the American manufacturer a far larger field than he could have had if a normal condition of business had existed in Europe.

THEN CAME THE DISCOVERY OF GOLD.

While these causes were in full operation and were producing a prodigious effect upon our prosperity the whole country was electrified, at the close of the year 1848, by the tidings that gold had been discovered in California, which we had acquired only a few months before from Mexico. The precious metals flowed to us in rich streams from the Pacific Slope for the next six years and opened avenues of trade unknown before. It drew young and vigorous men by hundreds of thousands from the older States, and gave to this great metropolis of the continent, the city of New York, an impulse the like of which it had never experienced before.

It was a historic epoch in the advancement of the country, and when, at the beginning of 1854, the output of gold showed signs of decline, a European war supplied fresh stimulus to the trade of the United States. The three leading powers of Europe, as powers were then reckoned, England, France, and Russia, engaged in a giants' contest on the shores of the Black Sea and the confusion which resulted throughout Europe for the next two and a half years afforded a rich harvest for the United States. Peace came in 1856. The spindles and wheels and looms, the forges and factories and furnaces of Great Britain and France were set going with renewed energy. The seas were once more unvexed and Russia poured forth her grain in the markets of western Europe to compete with the shipments from America.

RESULTS OF DELUSIVE PROSPERITY.

The last of the causes which has contributed to our prosperity in these ten years of happy accident was at an end and its course had so deluded our people with the Democratic fallacy that a low tariff leads to prosperity as surely as a protective tariff, that in the spring of 1856 Congress passed a brief tariff act lowering the duties still farther, and the United States set forth to depend upon its own energies, with a tariff that brought it directly in competition with the low-priced labor of Europe. We were no longer sustained by some extraordinary accident like war, or famine, or revolution

abroad, or the discovery of vast deposits of the precious metals at home. I need not tell the result. The panic of 1857 came upon the country with crushing and disastrous effect. Every interest was prostrated, and a Democratic President, within a year from the end of the last of the extraneous causes that helped us, was compelled in his message to Congress to portray the disastrous condition of the country in as strong colors as even protectionists would have painted. Mr. Buchanan said:

"With unsurpassed plenty in all the elements of national wealth, our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want."

And that was the downfall of the famous tariff of 1846. When left to stand alone it stood just one year. The people had not sufficiently heeded the tremendous influence of the accidental causes I have cited, and mistakenly believed that the ten years of prosperity were due to a low revenue tariff.

I will add the testimony of one more witness as to the effect of the tariff act of 1846 on our industries and the wages of labor. I read a letter from William Welch to the Boston Herald of October 5, of the present year:

TARIFF AND WAGES—LABOR WORKED SEVENTY-TWO HOURS A WEEK FORTY-SEVEN YEARS AGO AND FOR LESS MONEY.

HOPEDALE, MASS., *October 5, 1893.*

To the Editor:

In your issue of September 27 are a few lines headed "Its Tariff Record." Among other things the article says:

"Let it now make the Democratic tariffs of 1846 and 1857 its model, and renew the achievement which compelled enthusiastic praise from even the strongest of its political opponents."

I was about 12 years of age in 1846 and worked in a cotton mill in Rhode Island, and received $2 a week for doffing. The wages paid in the cotton mills at that time were fully 50 per cent lower than paid for the same work to-day. Back boys received $1.25 a week; mule spinners did not average $7 per week. Weavers on four looms did not average over $3.50 per week. It was a very good overseer who received over $9 a week. Good mechanics could not earn over $8 a week. Card strippers only received 58 cents a day, and they were men; card grinders from $4.50 to $5 a week. We all worked seventy-two hours a week. The best flour was $7 a barrel at retail. Sugar was at least one-third dearer than now. Prints were 12 cents a yard, and everything in clothing was equally as high.

These wages and prices continued till 1857, when nearly all the mills shut down and there was little work to be had. Soup houses were established in the cities, and in the towns mill people were assisted by the town. In the spring of 1858 business looked a little brighter and the factories again began to start. Our wages were reduced 25 per cent. There was no further change till about the second year of the war, since which time wages have been higher and people have had better food and better clothing than ever before.

Doffers receive on an average $4.50 a week, back boys from $3 to $5, and mule spinners earn from $11 to $15, and some even more. Weavers average over $6 per week, and overseers $3.50 a day the country over. Mechanics command, or have until within a few months, $2.50 a day. Card strippers get $1.05 a day, and card grinders from $9 to $10.50 per week. Now they work 58 hours a week in Massachusetts and 60 in the other States. Provisions, clothing, and in fact everything, is at least 40 per cent lower than in 1846 and 1857.

Can it be that the Herald wants the laboring people to be reduced to the condition they were in 1846 and 1857? Such would seem to be the case by advocating a return of the tariff which brought about such a distressful state of affairs. I am at a loss to understand how the Herald, of which I have been a reader for many years, and which has always seemed fair in its discussions of public matters, should advise a state of affairs so deplorable as that of 1846 and 1857.

WILLIAM WELCH.

OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM AT THE MERCY OF FREE TRADERS.

How long the South, if it had been less aggressive on the slavery question, could have controlled the Democratic party and the Government, and have maintained a tariff for revenue only, with a selfish regard for the cotton-planters of the South and a total disregard for the welfare of the free laborers of the North, whom the slaveholders contemptuously called "mud sills," is uncertain; it, however, not only determined to maintain a tariff which would prevent the development of the Northern States and the prosperity of the laboring classes of the North, but it determined also to maintain the system of slavery and to force its extension into the Territories, to require the capture and return of escaped negro slaves by the people of the North, against their convictions of right. The time came, however, when the South could not control the Northern contingent of the Democratic party upon the subject of slavery.

The party then divided; and the party of liberty and protection, the party opposed to the further spread of slavery, triumphed, and Abraham Lincoln became President of the United States. Then that portion of the Democratic party which so long had controlled and shaped its destinies saw that the scepter of its power had departed and it attempted to destroy the Union. Grave Senators who had taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States conspired against the Government, resigned their offices, and joined the Confederacy.

Officers of the Army and of the Navy, educated at public expense, living off of its bounty, and under moral and legal obligations to maintain its honor, glory, and integrity, deserted the service of the Government to join the ranks of traitors. States passed resolutions of secession. The flag was fired upon. The Union was imperiled. President Buchanan asserted that there was no power under the Constitution to suppress rebellion. The Republican party came into power. President Lincoln was inaugurated, and announced his intention to enforce the laws and maintain the Union. He called for volunteers, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific a wave of patriotism swept the North, gathering up the men who had been sneeringly called the "mud sills" of society, and hurried them to the defense of the national capital and of the Union. The war on one side was waged for the preservation and extension of slavery, for free trade, for servile labor, for a system which degraded labor and lowered the standard of manhood: on the other, for freedom, the Union, and for protection: for the system which dignifies labor and elevates and ennobles the laborer.

The senior Senator from Connecticut some time ago in a speech in the Senate said, substantially, that in the great contest which followed there could have been read between the stars and bars, as they floated at the head of the Confederate forces, the words "Slavery and free trade;" and between the stars and stripes upon the flag of the Union, as it was borne by the boys in blue to victory, the words "Liberty and protection." The cause of liberty and protection triumphed, the latter to be overthrown again in 1892 by the installation of the Democratic party—the same Democratic party as of old, in complete control of the South, dictating the tariff policy of the country, administering the beneficence of the Government, and measuring out the gratitude of the nation to the men who risked their lives and imperiled their health to put down the rebellion.

The Republican party came into power with an empty Treasury, with an impoverished country, under a revenue system which neither protected American industries nor furnished sufficient revenue for the economical conduct of the Government; when the Government was without credit, and when our bonds, drawing 12 per cent interest, sold in the markets of the world at 17 per cent discount. When treason stalked openly in the land, the National Capital was in jeopardy, the Union on the verge of dissolution, the Navy scattered, our arsenals plundered, the Treasury robbed, the whole Government service poisoned with treason, without money, without credit, without a Navy, without an army or munitions of war, the Republican party took control of the Government. It manned the ship of state, with President Lincoln at the helm, and with courage, with loyalty to the Union and republican institutions, with a belief in the justice of its cause, with confidence that in the end right would prevail, with hope and patience and determination, it entered upon the gigantic task of preserving the Union and of restoring the industries of the country. It raised immense armies, it provided a navy, it raised the funds necessary to carry on the war, it subdued the rebellion, and preserved the Union.

But it did more. Though hostile armies traversed and retraversed portions of the Union destroying industries and property and devastating the country, though millions of men were withdrawn from industrial and productive pursuits to engage in destructive and deadly warfare, though hundreds of thousands of lives were freely offered as a sacrifice upon the country's altar, though thousands of millions of dollars were expended to support and maintain an army and navy, it brought prosperity out of ruin and disorder. It started the wheels of industry. It gave employment to labor. It established the credit of the Government. It paid immense sums in the reduction of the public debt. It brought about a period of prosperity which, with slight interruptions consequent upon the inflation of the currency and the return to specie payments, continued for nearly a third of a century: a period of progress in all that makes a nation great and powerful and its people prosperous and happy, such as was never before witnessed in any country.

It adopted a policy which has healed the industrial wounds caused by the war, which has brought every portion of the country into closer relations of trade and commerce and mutual interest, which has caused the civilization which three-quarters of a century ago rolled across the Alleghanies to sweep over the Mississippi Valley and over the great plains and the Rocky Mountains, to find its western barrier only in the Pacific Ocean; which has caused the continent to be spanned by a network of railroads reaching every productive quarter, and the once American desert to be converted into homes of millions of free, intelligent, and happy people, and to be carved up into wealthy, prosperous, and populous States of the Union; which has caused great mercantile and manufacturing centers to grow up in every portion of the Union, giving profitable employment to millions of American citizens, and by domestic competition to decrease the cost of living by decreasing the price of many of the necessities of life; which has caused the capital, the skill, and the energy of the North to invade the South to open mines of useful metals, to erect factories and mills, and secure the prosperity of that section.

THE DISASTROUS RESULT OF THE DEMOCRATIC VICTORY OF 1892.

After nearly a third of a century, during which, with the exception of one Presidential term, and then there was a Republican majority in the Senate, the Republican party was in control of the Government, the Democratic party secured control of both branches of Congress and elected the Chief Magistrate of the Nation. In its national convention it was demonstrated that the

South was again in control. The party was committed by its platform to the ultra Southern view of the tariff; and the same causes which in 1841 induced President Harrison to convoke Congress in extraordinary session, forced Mr. Cleveland to call a special session of Congress, stating as the reason for doing so the following:

Whereas the distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation which pervades all business circles has already caused great loss and damage to our people, and threatens to cripple our merchants, stop the wheels of manufacture, bring distress and privation to our farmers, and withhold from our workingmen the wage of labor.

Note the parallels in our history. It will be seen that by Democratic control of the Government, and the control of that party by the South, by the passage of the compromise act of 1833 under threats of disunion, the tariffs of 1824 and 1828 were stricken down, our industries were destroyed, the public revenues diminished, our finances demoralized, and the country brought to a condition which produced a political revolution and made Gen. Harrison President, and that within less than two weeks after his inauguration the condition of the country induced him to issue a proclamation convoking Congress in special session "to consider the weighty questions of the condition of the revenue and finances of the country."

The Democratic party has come into power again, and, wedded to free trade, unwilling to be convinced by the great object lesson our present industrial condition affords that its tariff theories are wrong, denies that the Democratic success and the threat of free trade has stricken down our great industrial fabric, and deprived millions of our citizens of that employment necessary to secure their daily bread; and blind and obtuse as they ever have been when dealing with financial questions, our Democratic friends ransack history, and draw on their imaginations for causes to account for existing conditions. But the fact will go down in history to future generations that at the time of the last annual message of President Harrison the country enjoyed a wonderful degree of prosperity. Every department of human industry flourished. Every forge and loom and spindle was in operation, labor everywhere was employed, and the country was advancing with unabated rapidity in its grand march of civilization and of individual and national prosperity.

As time advanced the extent of the calamity which had overtaken the cause of protection became apparent; it was found that not only had the Democratic party elected a President and secured the control of the House of Representatives, but that the Senate, which under the previous Administration of President Cleveland, being Republican, had prevented the passage of the Mills bill, would be controlled by the Democrats, and that there was nothing in the way of the Democratic party carrying into execution the threat and promise contained in its platform to destroy the protective system. When this startling fact was fully realized the wheels of progress were immediately stopped. The mills, the furnaces, and the factories were closed. Every business industry began to prepare for the coming storm. Business operations were curtailed. Collections were forced. Confidence was shaken. Labor was thrown out of employment, banks failed, and bankruptcy and ruin everywhere prevailed.

The contrast between the general prosperity prevailing under the Harrison Administration and the business and financial distress which followed the succession of the Democratic party in November last, is admirably shown by the following extracts from President Harrison's annual message in December last, and the message of President Cleveland transmitted to Congress, convened in extraordinary session on the 8th of August last.

Opening of President Harrison's message to Congress, December, 1892.

In submitting my annual message to Congress I have great satisfaction in being able to say that the general conditions affecting the commercial and industrial interests of the United States are in the highest degree favorable. A comparison of the existing conditions with those of the most favored period in the history of the country will, I believe, show that so high a degree of prosperity and so general a diffusion of the comforts of life were never before enjoyed by our people.

Opening of President Cleveland's message to Congress, eight months later, August, 1893.

The existence of an alarming and extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives in Congress, to the end that, through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty with which they are solely charged, present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.

Is not the case complete? Does not our history conclusively prove that we have always prospered under a protective tariff, and that when the protective policy has been threatened or stricken down, individual and national prosperity has been destroyed?

IS THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INEQUALITIES OF WEALTH?

Our Democratic friends delight to contrast the wealth of the New England States, of New York and Pennsylvania, and other old States where manufactures flourish and where great centers of trade exist, with that of the new States of the Union and that of the Southern and Western States, which are almost exclusively devoted to agriculture, and to argue from the comparison that inequality of wealth is caused by unjust legislation—by legislation which promotes the interests of the few instead of that of the many. This is a superficial view of the subject.

If our friends would advance further into the subject they would find that this inequality is mainly the result of natural causes and is capable of a satisfactory explanation. The wealth of the New England States, of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and other manufacturing States has been accumulating for two hundred years. Much of it had been accumulated when all the States of the Northwest were still a wilderness, without a trace of civilization. It represents the accumulations of labor for more than two centuries. Wealth invested, money loaned out at interest, constantly produces wealth, so that the yearly accumulations of these old States, with their great manufacturing industries and moneyed corporations, represent not alone the wealth created by the labor for the year, but also the increase for vast amounts of property representing the accumulations of the product of labor in past years.

These great centers of trade in these older States have, from natural causes, become the great fields of financial operations, the Mecca of the successful business men of every portion of the Union. The great railroad corporations, no matter where their roads are located, have their principal offices in New York and Boston, or some one of the great Eastern cities; and the principal and interest of their bonds and dividends on their stocks are made payable there.

The great trust companies are also located and controlled in the great money centers. The great life and fire insurance companies, with their accumulated capital, are located there also; and as the profitable field for capital and the operations of great business enterprises is where capital is accumulated and business men congregate, all the great enterprises of the country are naturally drawn to these great moneyed business centers. If a mine of the useful or precious metals is discovered in one of the Rocky Mountain States, the discoverer forthwith goes to New York or Boston to endeavor to interest capital for the development of it, or for the purpose of selling it; and, if it is successfully worked, it is generally by a corporation located in some Eastern city and by Eastern capital.

If a railroad is projected to furnish the means of transportation to some remote section of one of the Western or Southern States, the aid of Eastern capital is sought, and the road, if built, represents Boston, New York, or Philadelphia capital. If a great irrigation ditch is to be constructed for the development of agriculture in the arid regions, appeal is made to Eastern capital to carry on the enterprise. If by some good fortune a citizen of one of these Western or Southern States secures wealth, he naturally drifts East; and though he may still continue to conduct business in the State he leaves, he becomes a resident of New York or Boston, and helps to swell the aggregate wealth of one of those cities.

While the New England and the other Eastern States have a population which has inherited the accumulated wealth of two hundred and fifty years, and its wealth is constantly increasing by the natural and legitimate income derived from its investments, and the natural and constant flow of capital to the money centers from every quarter of the Union, the population of the new States of the Northwest is composed largely of men who have left the older civilization of the East to become pioneers upon our western frontier; either young men who have not inherited wealth, and who were dependent for a livelihood upon the daily labor of their hands, or older men who had unsuccessfully struggled to acquire a competence in the older States, or who, beginning life with a competence, had been overwhelmed with adversity, and, in advanced years, turned to the newer States or Territories to find a home upon the public domain.

These new States, wealthy in the possession of an intelligent, enterprising, industrious citizenship, have not the accumulations of preceding generations. Their location and advantages do not draw to them the great moneyed establishments of the Union, and their accumulations of wealth by a natural law are constantly drawn to the great money centers. The yearly accretions of their wealth are mainly from the rewards of labor. Their citizens, as a rule, settled there without means. If the wealth of the East had not followed them, and been distributed by the much-abused loan agencies, they could not, in many instances, have provided themselves with shelter and the implements of husbandry. If they have given mortgages then these mortgages are evidences of prosperity. They show that their condition has been so improved that they have property which is good security for loans. The mortgages represent improved

farms, modern implements of husbandry, modern homes, churches, and schoolhouses. By means of money secured on the security of these mortgages, day laborers have become independent farmers, certain means of livelihood secured, and homes for families created where contentment and comfort reign.

Everyone who had carefully considered the matter knew that the census investigation would show just what it did establish—that mortgages, especially upon farms, are, in the main, evidences of prosperity. They represent the purchase price of farms by young men, the purchase price of lands which prosperous farmers have added to their original farms, the cost of valuable improvements upon farms, to add to their productiveness or the comfort of their owners. They represent improved labor-saving machinery; and when they are not evidences of prosperity they represent in most instances money squandered in idleness and dissipation. Ninety-five per cent of all the mortgages in this country represent and were the means of the improved condition of the mortgagors.

The continual talking about the unequal distribution of wealth, and the causes to which it is attributed by a class of people in this country not inaptly called "calamity howlers," and the continued falsifying of the facts, has for its object the creation of dissatisfaction with existing conditions, the rendering of personal and property rights insecure, the weakening of the respect of our citizens for law and order, the sapping of the foundations of republican government. The prosperous and wealthy are not alone concerned in the maintenance of law and order and in the prosperity of the country. The laboring, dependent classes, above all others, are interested in maintaining a stable government, in the maintenance of the laws which provide protection to all citizens alike, whether rich or poor, in such protection to capital as will secure its active employment in the great industries of the country which give employment to labor.

Discussion of propositions for legislative enactments to show their effect upon the condition of the people is legitimate and desirable; but I denounce the man who, for the purpose of advancing his own personal interests or the interests of his party, appeals to the prejudice of a class and seeks to array one class of citizens against another and to mislead the people by false statements, as an enemy to his country, deserving no better fate than that which has always overtaken men false to their country, men willing to sacrifice the country for a little temporary personal or party advantage. Concerning such a man we may ask, in the language of Addison:

> Is there not some chosen curse, some hidden thunder in the stores of Heaven, red with uncommon wrath, to blast the man who owes his greatness to his country's ruin?

THE CONDITION OF FARMERS AND LABORING MEN UNDER REPUBLICAN RULE WAS NOT AS BAD AS REPRESENTED.

I need not rely upon Republican testimony to show that the condition of the farmer and laborer has been constantly improving for the last twenty years. The junior Senator from Texas was chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means in the Fiftieth Congress and prepared and reported in the House the tariff bill which bore his name and secured its passage through the House. He is justly considered one of the most intelligent and able advocates of a tariff for revenue only.

In his able speech in the Senate recently in favor of the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law he presented a table showing the decline in prices of the products of the agriculturist and of articles consumed by farmers and laborers, which clearly shows that whatever the causes have been the decline of prices of articles consumed by farmers and laborers has been very much greater than the decline in the prices of agricultural products. At the same time he declared, what every one knows is true, that wages had constantly increased during the whole period under consideration. It has rarely been my good fortune in discussing a question to draw from an opponent so conclusive an argument to support my conclusions as this presentation of the junior Senator from Texas affords.

No one will question the accuracy of the figures presented. The only question upon which there can be a difference of opinion is as to what is the cause of the great decline in the price of articles of necessity. It will be observed that nearly all the articles named in the table which farmers buy are dutiable articles, and that in the brief period of twenty years these prices have declined 50 per cent and in some cases 75 per cent.

This table proves that domestic competition in the United States, which can only be induced under protection from foreign cheap labor products, has been and is still forcing down the prices of domestic products. This decrease in prices occurred under a protective tariff.

Our free-trade friends endeavor to account for this decrease and for the prosperity of the country in general by attributing it to every other possible cause. They are compelled to admit the fact of the great prosperity of the country, and when they are unable to account for it they say the country prospers in spite of bad legislation.

The showing made by the Senator from Texas as to the prices of articles produced by farmers and the prices of articles consumed by them applies with double force to show the improvement in the condition of the laboring classes not engaged in agriculture. While, as stated, wages have constantly increased, the prices of articles consumed by them, including agricultural products, have greatly decreased. The Senator said:

> I have constructed a table which I present here for the consideration of the public. I have taken the prices of silver from the report of the Director of the Mint. The prices of cotton, corn, wheat, bacon, lard, pork, beef, butter, cheese, and tobacco I have taken from the Statistical Abstract. These are the articles which the farmer sells. Then I have taken the articles which the farmer buys. Some of them are from the Statistical Abstract and others from the report of the Committee on Finance; the freight rates are from Poor's Manual, a standard authority on railway matters. The articles which the farmer buys are refined sugar, nails, iron, coffee, tea, sheeting, drilling, shirting, standard prints, print cloth, quinine, gobiets, window glass, undershirts, ginghams, carpets, pepper, and molasses. I have also included steel rails and freight rates. All these articles have fallen since 1873, as is shown by the table.

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891.

Years.	Silver, per fine ounce.	Gold value of silver dollar.	Articles that farmers sell.									
			Cotton, per pound.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Bacon and hams, per pound.	Lard, per pound.	Pork, per pound.	Beef, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.	Tobacco, per pound.
			Cents.	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents*
1873	$1.32	$1.004	18.8	61	$1.31	8.8	9.2	7.8	7.7	21.1	13.1	10.7
1874	1.30	.988	15.4	71	1.43	9.6	9.4	8.2	8.2	25.0	13.1	9.6
1875	1.23	.964	15.0	84	1.12	11.4	13.8	10.1	8.7	23.7	13.5	11.3
1876	1.17	.894	12.9	67	1.24	12.1	13.3	10.6	8.7	23.9	12.6	10.4
1877	1.18	.929	11.8	58	1.17	10.8	10.9	9.0	7.5	20.6	11.3	10.2
1878	1.16	.891	11.1	56	1.34	8.7	8.8	6.8	7.7	18.0	11.4	8.7
1879	1.12	.868	9.9	47	1.07	6.9	7.0	5.7	6.3	14.2	8.9	7.8
1880	1.13	.886	11.5	54	1.25	6.7	7.4	6.1	6.4	17.1	9.5	7.7
1881	1.12	.881	11.4	55	1.11	8.2	9.3	7.7	6.5	19.8	11.1	8.3
1882	1.13	.878	11.4	66	1.19	9.9	11.6	9.0	8.5	19.3	11.0	8.5
1883	1.10	.858	10.8	68	1.13	11.2	11.9	9.9	8.9	18.6	11.2	8.3
1884	1.10	.861	10.5	61	1.07	10.2	9.5	7.9	7.6	18.2	10.3	9.1
1885	1.06	.823	10.6	54	.86	9.2	7.9	7.2	7.5	16.8	9.3	9.9
1886	.99	.769	9.9	49	.87	7.5	6.9	5.9	6.0	15.6	8.3	9.6
1887	.97	.758	9.5	47	.89	7.9	7.1	6.6	5.4	15.8	9.3	8.7
1888	.97	.727	9.8	55	.85	8.6	7.7	7.4	5.3	18.3	9.9	8.3
1889	.93	.724	9.9	47	.90	8.6	8.6	7.4	5.5	16.5	9.3	8.8
1890	1.06	.809	10.1	41	.83	7.7	7.1	6.0	5.4	14.4	9.0	8.6
1891	.98	.764	10.0	57	.93	7.6	6.9	5.9	5.6	14.5	9.0	8.7
Average decrease	26	26	53	6	30	14	25	24	27	32	31	19

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891—Continued.

Years.	Articles that farmers buy.																				Freight rate, per ton per mile.
	Refined sugar, per pound.	Cut nails, per pound.	Bar iron, per ton.	Steel rails, per ton.	Rio coffee, per pound.	Tea, per pound.	Sheeting, per yard.	Drilling, per yard.	Shirting, per yard.	Standard prints, per yard.	Print cloth, per yard.	Quinine, per ounce.	Goblets, per dozen.	10 by 14 window glass.	Undershirts.	Ginghams, per yard.	Carpets, 2-ply ingrain, per yard.	Black pepper, per pound.	Molasses, per gallon.	
	Cts.	Cts.			Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.		Cts.			Cts.		Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
1873	11.6	4.90	$86.00	$120.50	16	95	13.31	14.13	19.41	11.37	6.69	$2.65	85	3.40	$1.41	13	$1.14	19	69	2.00
1874	10.5	3.99	67.00	94.25	20	100	11.42	11.75	18.04	9.75	5.57	2.50	80	2.97	1.25	11	1.02	20	71	.....
1875	10.8	3.42	60.00	68.75	18	60	10.41	11.12	15.12	8.71	5.33	2.25	70	3.18	1.12	10	.92	17	70	.....
1876	10.7	2.98	52.00	59.25	17	55	8.85	8.71	13.58	7.06	4.10	2.00	65	3.08	1.00	10	.82	14	55	.....
1877	11.6	2.57	45.00	45.50	20	55	8.46	8.46	12.46	6.77	4.38	3.00	50	2.97	.91	8	.81	14	54	.....
1878	10.2	2.31	44.00	42.25	17	45	7.80	7.65	11.00	6.09	3.44	3.50	45	2.42	.87	8	.75	12	40	.....
1879	8.5	2.69	51.00	48.25	14	40	7.97	7.57	11.62	6.25	3.93	3.60	40	2.42	.83	8	.67	12	36	.....
1880	9.0	3.68	60.00	67.50	15	40	8.51	8.51	12.74	7.41	4.51	3.00	40	2.42	.83	9	.85	14	53	1.25
1881	9.2	3.09	58.00	61.13	13	35	8.51	8.06	12.74	7.00	3.95	2.60	35	2.12	.83	8	.75	14	43	1.25
1882	9.7	3.47	61.00	48.50	10	35	7.45	8.25	12.95	6.50	3.76	2.45	35	2.12	.79	9	.78	17	50	1.23
1883	9.2	3.06	50.00	37.75	8	33	8.32	7.11	12.93	6.00	3.60	1.80	35	2.29	.79	8	.74	16	52	1.12
1884	7.1	2.39	44.00	30.75	11	33	7.28	6.86	10.46	6.00	3.36	1.43	33	2.16	.75	7	.66	15	50	1.12
1885	6.4	2.33	40.00	28.50	9	33	6.75	6.36	10.37	6.00	3.12	.83	30	1.91	.70	6	.58	14	45	1.04
1886	6.7	2.27	43.00	34.50	9	33	6.75	6.25	10.65	6.00	3.31	.70	28	2.01	.70	6	.58	14	44	1.01
1887	6.0	2.30	49.00	37.08	15	28	7.15	6.58	10.88	6.00	3.33	.53	28	1.70	.66	7	.60	15	40	1.03
1888	6.3	2.03	44.00	29.83	15	23	7.25	6.75	10.94	6.50	3.81	.49	27	1.76	.66	6	.53	15	38	0.97
1889	7.6	2.00	43.00	29.25	16	23	7.00	6.75	10.50	6.50	3.81	.38	26	1.70	.66	6	.52	13	39	0.97
1890	7.0	2.00	45.00	31.75	19	25	7.00	6.75	10.90	6.00	3.34	.35	26	1.70	.64	6	.48	10	40	0.93
1891	5.7	1.86	42.00	29.92	16	25	6.83	6.41	10.64	6.00	2.95	.30	25	1.70	.62	6	.50	9	32	0.92
Average decrease	50	62	51	75	11	73	48	55	45	47	56	89	70	50	56	54	56	52	53	54

Average reduction in ten farm products, 26.1.

Average reduction in nineteen other products, 55.4.

This table shows that from 1873 to 1891 silver fell 26 per cent, cotton 53, corn 6, wheat 30, bacon and hams 14, lard 25, pork 24, beef 27, butter 32, cheese 31, and tobacco 19. These are the articles which farmers sell. The average decline of the ten articles is 26.1 per cent between 1873 and 1891. During the same time refined sugar declined 50 per cent, nails 62, bar iron 51, steel rails 75, Rio coffee 11, tea 73, sheeting 48, drilling 55, shirting 45, standard prints 47, print cloth 56, quinine 89, glass goblets 70, 10 by 14 window glass 50, undershirts 56, ginghams 54, carpets 56, pepper 52, molasses 53.

These are the articles the farmer buys. Now, if what he buys declines at an equal ratio with what he sells he is just as well off at one time as another. But if what he buys falls more in price than what he sells he is benefited. When we average the articles he buys we find that the decline is 55.4 per cent. He has been benefited by the fall in prices, but the decline in silver has had nothing to do with it. * * *

These prices in the table show conclusively that the farmer has been benefited by the general fall of prices, because his products would buy more in 1891 than in 1873. In 1873 cotton was worth 18.8 cents per pound, and 1,000 pounds was worth $188, and at that time it would buy 766 gallons of illuminating oil, or 1,630 pounds of refined sugar, or 4½ tons of pig iron, or 2 tons of bar iron, or 1½ tons of steel rails, or 3,832 pounds of nails, or 1,412 yards of sheeting, or 1,230 yards of drilling, or 870 yards of shirting, or 1,653 yards of standard prints, or 2,810 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 1,000 pounds of cotton was worth $400, and at the prices of these same things at that time it would buy 1,428 gallons of oil, 1,754 pounds of sugar, 5½ tons of pig iron, 2½ tons of bar iron, 3¼ tons of steel rails, 5,322 pounds of cut nails, 1,464 yards of sheeting, 1,560 yards of drilling, 940 yards of shirting, 1,666 yards of prints, and 3,389 yards of print cloth.

With the exception of shirting, it would buy more of every other article enumerated, and the difference in that was very small. One thousand pounds of beef would buy in 1873 281 gallons of oil, 555 pounds of sugar, 1,282 pounds of nails, 490 yards of sheeting, 462 yards of drilling, 338 yards of shirting, 583 yards of prints, or 888 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 800 gallons of oil, 982 pounds of refined sugar, 3,010 pounds of nails, 849 yards of sheeting, 873 yards of drilling, 526 yards of shirting, 933 yards of standard prints, or 1,898 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of pork would buy in 1873 289 gallons of oil, 571 pounds of refined sugar, 1,319 pounds of nails, 504 yards of sheeting, 475 yards of drilling, 348 yards of shirting, 630 yards of standard prints, or 914 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 842 gallons of oil, 1,035 pounds of refined sugar, 3,172 pounds of nails, 893 yards of sheeting, 920 yards of drilling, 554 yards of shirting, 983 yards of standard prints, or 2,000 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of bacon and hams would buy, in 1873, 345 gallons of oil, 682 pounds of refined sugar, 1,554 pounds of nails, 602 yards of sheeting, 568 yards of drilling, 415 yards of shirting, 716 yards of standard prints, or 1,091 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,085 gallons of oil, 1,157 pounds of refined sugar, 4,066 pounds of nails, 1,111 yards of sheeting, 1,185 yards of drilling, 714 yards of shirting, 1,266 yards of standard prints, or 2,576 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of butter would buy, in 1873, 779 gallons of oil, 1,539 pounds of refined sugar, 3,553 pounds of nails, 1,359 yards of sheeting, 1,281 yards of drilling, 938 yards of shirting, 1,616 yards of standard prints, or 2,461 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 2,071 gallons of oil, 2,543 pounds of refined sugar, 7,795 pounds of nails, 2,123 yards of sheeting, 2,262 yards of drilling, 1,362 yards of shirting, 2,416 yards of standard prints, or 4,915 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of tobacco in 1873 would buy 413 gallons of oil, 833 pounds of sugar, 1,883 pounds of nails, 721 yards of sheeting, 680 yards of drilling, 498 yards of shirting, 858 yards of standard prints, or 1,307 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,243 gallons of oil, 1,526 pounds of refined sugar, 4,677 pounds of nails, 1,273 yards of sheeting, 1,357 yards of drilling, 819 yards of shirting, 1,450 yards of standard prints, or 2,949 yards of print cloth.

One hundred bushels of corn in 1873 would buy 279 gallons of oil, 551 pounds of refined sugar, 1,273 pounds of nails, 487 yards of sheeting, 458 yards of drilling, 336 yards of shirting, 579 yards of standard prints, or 881 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 830 gallons of oil, 1,007 pounds of refined sugar, 3,085 pounds of nails, 840 yards of sheeting, 896 yards of drilling, 539 yards of shirting, 956 yards of standard prints, or 1,954 yards of print cloth.

One hundred bushels of wheat in 1873 would buy 590 gallons of oil, 1,176 pounds of refined sugar, 2,709 pounds of nails, 1,039 yards of sheeting, 964 yards of drilling, 611 yards of shirting, 1,225 yards of standard prints, or 1,840 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,328 gallons of oil, 1,631 pounds of refined sugar, 5,000 pounds of nails, 1,342 yards of sheeting, 1,453 yards of drilling, 853 yards of shirting, 1,550 yards of standard prints, or 2,784 yards of print cloth.

From these figures, and maybe extended to other articles, it is clear and conclusive that the decline in prices has given all farm products a greater purchasing power. And yet it is urged that opening our mints to the unlimited coinage of silver will restore its price of 1873; and as all products have fallen through pure sympathy with it they will still sympathize with it and rise to their prices of 1873. If they did, the farmers would be ruined. If he is oppressed now, he would be confronted with bankruptcy if one-half or one-third of the purchasing power of his products should be taken away, and that would be the effect of a restoration all around of the condition of 1873. In that year the freight rate per ton per mile was 2 cents; in 1891 the freight rate per ton per mile was .929 of 1 cent, and 81,210,154,523 tons were moved 1 mile by all our railroads, for which, at the rate of .929 of 1 cent, they received as freight charges $754,185,910.

If the opening of the mints to free coinage is to restore the price of silver and all other articles to the rate of 1873, then that freight would cost $1,021,203,090. And that is much more than twice the sum that was paid in 1891. Did silver bring these freight rates down? Then to restore silver is to carry back the freight rates to 1873.

WHILE THE COST OF ARTICLES CONSUMED BY LABORING MEN HAS GREATLY DECREASED IN RECENT YEARS THERE HAS BEEN A STEADY RISE IN WAGES.

The United States Department of Labor recently collected for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, the wage rates in the United States for the period from 1840 to 1891, inclusive, a period of 52 years, the rates being taken from actual pay rolls. The investigation extended to almost every class of laborers, and from the information thus obtained the course of wages can be told with certainty.

The general result of the investigation is stated in an article by Hon. Caroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, in the Forum for October last. In this article the wages paid to a great many classes of laborers are stated for the periods of 1840, 1860, 1866, and 1891. A statement of the rates of wages is made for 1866, because, owing to the conditions growing out of the war of the rebellion, the inflation of the currency, and the depreciation of our paper, there was a great increase in the rates of wages between 1860 and 1866.

Assuming wages in 1860 to be represented by 100, the investigation shows wages in 1840 would be represented by 87.7 as compared with 1860; that in 1866 they stood at 152.2 as compared with 1860, and in 1891 they had increased to 168.6; that is to say, wages had increased in this country since 1860, under Republican rule and the protective system, 68.6 per cent.

These statements are supported by quotations of wages of skilled and unskilled workmen at the periods mentioned, taken from actual pay rolls in such a manner as to leave no doubt of their accuracy. Laborers in 1891 received gold or its equivalent, which certainly has greater purchasing power than legal-tender notes had in 1866, 86.6 higher wages than in 1860, and during the same period, as we have seen, the prices of articles consumed by laborers decreased upon an average of 55.4 per cent.

The distinguished Senator from Texas, in the speech already

referred to, discussed the subject of wages, and I quote from his speech as follows:

Mr. President, the wages of labor in this country and all over the world for a hundred years have been tending upward. They are higher to-day than they have been at any time in the past, and the wage earner, in whatever occupation employed, is deeply interested in the preservation of a standard of values as fixed and immovable as it is possible to make it. A few years ago our friends on the other side of the Chamber directed the Committee on Finance to make an investigation and report to this body the movement of wages and prices for a number of years. They took the year 1860 as a basis and compared it and other years with 1890. They intended to use these figures in their tariff battle of 1892. They intended to show that wages had been rising and prices had been falling, and the credit was due to a protective tariff.

When that time comes I will discuss with them the conclusions to be drawn from these facts. It is enough here to state the facts. Taking 1860 as the basis and calling it 100, the rate of wages increased to 1864 to 125.6 or 25.6 per cent, and to 1890 to 169.7 or 69.7 per cent. In 1860 and 1890 there was a gold standard, and in 1864 a depreciated paper standard. Wages went up in four years 25.6 per cent, but the money which the laborer earned was only the instrument which enabled him to procure the necessaries of life, and while it went up the ladder a few rounds, the necessaries of life that his wages had to buy to sustain himself, his wife, and children, had ascended the rounds of the ladder till they were lost in the clouds. The annual average wages of laborers in manufactories in 1860 was $288.95. The average monthly wage was $24.08, in gold. In 1864 it was 25.6 higher, or $30.24 in paper, and in 1890 it was 69.7 per cent higher than in 1860, and was $38.69 in gold. Now taking the official prices given by the Bureau of Statistics and the Finance Committee, the result is shown by the following table:

Purchasing power of wages of labor.

Articles.	1860. Monthly wages, $24.08.		1864. Monthly wages, $30.24.		1890. Monthly wages, $38.69.	
	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.
Standard sheeting, per yard	Cents. 8.75	275	Cents. 52.07	58	Cents. 6.83	566
Standard drilling, per yard	8.92	270	53.02	57	6.41	603
Bleached shirting, per yard	15.50	155	48.35	62	10.64	363
Standard prints, per yard	9.50	253	33.25	90	5.00	645
Print cloth, per yard	5.44	442	23.42	129	2.95	1,311
Cut nails, per pound	3.13	769	7.85	385	1.86	2,077
Refined sugar, per pound	10.00	240	30.00	101	4.00	859
New Orleans molasses, per gallon	53.00	45	150.00	20	40.00	128
Rio coffee, per pound	13.00	185	36.00	84	18.50	209
Tea, per pound	65.00	37	130.00	23	25.10	154
Ticking, per yard	17.00	141	70.00	43	12.00	322
Matches, per gross	48.00	50	100.00	30	37.00	104
Denims, per yard	15.00	160	88.00	34	11.00	351

WHO ARE THE TRUE FRIENDS OF THE FARMER AND LABORING MAN?

The men who are constantly endeavoring to make the agricultural and laboring classes dissatisfied with their condition, and who seek to array them against the manufacturing and wealthy classes, are not the true friends of the farmer and laboring man. There will not be in this country a general distribution of the wealth of the country per capita. The Government is never going to issue money for gratuitous distribution. There never will come a day when wealth will cease to be the product of labor useful y employed. The prosperity of every class of our citizens is intimately connected with the prosperity of every other class. A blow aimed at the manufacturing classes will fall heaviest upon the agricultural and laboring classes. My sympathies are with the great army of laborers. A considerable portion of my life has been spent upon the farm and at hard manual labor. All that I have, or have accomplished, is the result of hard work. I have no use for a man who despises labor and will not work.

All my life I have advocated those measures which I have believed to be in the interest of the masses. I attached myself to the Republican party because it was opposed to slavery and in favor of free labor; because it was in favor of protecting American labor; in favor of providing the means of general education and making American citizens free, intelligent, and independent. The Republican party abolished the system of labor which tended to degrade labor in this country and has sought to dignify and to protect labor. It provided homes to American citizens by the homestead law. It has sought by the protective policy to provide employment for all who are willing to work. It secured to settlers the means of reaching our vast public domain and provided them with the means for transportation of their products to market. It has, when in control of Congress, been constantly legislating in the interest of the laboring man. It has reduced the number of hours in a day's work upon public works. It has legislated against the importations of coolies, and against the coming to our shores of laborers under contract. It has established a Department of Agriculture to impart useful information to the people, to make costly experiments for their benefit, to distribute seeds and new varieties of fruits, vegetables, and grasses, for the protection of fruits, vegetables, and grasses from insects and blights, and for the prevention of diseases among domestic animals. It has provided for meat inspection, and successfully labored to secure the introduction of our products abroad. It has provided for the improvement of waterways, and the regulation and control of railroads to cheapen transportation.

If the time would permit, I might greatly extend the enumeration of legislation Congress has enacted in the interest of the laboring and producing classes. I have, in this body, supported every measure in my judgment calculated to benefit laboring men, sometimes even measures concerning which I feared the power of Congress to enact was doubtful. There have been visionary, impracticable schemes advocated in this body, in the alleged interest of the laboring classes, which would not have benefited any class of our citizens, and would have brought nothing but disaster and ruin upon every class, which I have not favored.

Standing as I stand to-day, opposing a policy fraught with misfortune and dire disaster for the laborer, a distinguished man, long since gone to his reward, used this language—language which I emphasize and adopt:

I have been, and I am for anything that will guarantee to the laboring classes that happiness which I in my youth saw them enjoy, and which I enjoyed with them. If the laboring class be to perish, perish, I say, the whole nation.

And so say I.

You can not reduce the laborer to a state of starvation and degradation without also destroying national prosperity.

HOW AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS ARE BENEFITED BY A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Upon the question still discussed as to the effect of a protective tariff on agriculture, I find in examining the proceedings of the Senate of March 19, 1824, a valuable report from the Senate Committee on Agriculture, submitted by its chairman, Mr. Van Rensselaer, for a unanimous committee, from which I quote. It shows that at that early day the fact that protection to home industries through undue foreign competition lessened competition in agriculture, and created a home market for agricultural products, and thus benefited farmers, was well understood. This report is found on page 1857, volume 2, first session of the Eighteenth Congress. The quotation is as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the resolution of the House of Representatives, instructing them to inquire if an increase of the duty now established by law, on any article of foreign growth or manufacture, will be for the interest of the agriculturist, and if there be any such article, to name the same, together with the additional amount of the duty which they deem beneficial to the agricultural interest, respectfully submit the following report:

That in the apprehension of your committee whatever increases the consumption of its products, whether at home or abroad, necessarily advances the interest of agriculture. He who cultivates the soil looks beyond the supply of his own wants for the profits of his labor. He looks to a market for the surplus products of his industry. The home market, in the opinion of the committee, is at all times to be preferred to the foreign market, when the reward of agricultural pursuits is equal, the former is less precarious than the latter; it is also more permanent and certain and above the reach of restraining and prohibitory duties of foreign hostility; and when the home market can be increased in its demands, without diminishing in a greater degree the foreign consumption, it would seem wise and prudent to promote its extension by every rational means within the sphere of legislation.

Your committee consider the increase of duties on many foreign articles now imported into the United States would promote the agricultural prosperity of the nation. A portion of population engaged in manufacture would necessarily depend on the farmer for subsistence, and create a more perfect and profitable division of labor than now exists. A new market would be opened and a new demand created for all the raw materials which new manufacturers would consume. It can not be denied that if all the manufactured articles now consumed by the people of the United States were manufactured within the bounds of our country from the raw material furnished by ourselves the value of our lands would be increased and the profits of agricultural labor considerably augmented. Demand and consumption would be directly extended—a great extent of soil now devoted to the growing of products that afford no sufficient stimulus to cultivation. The soil and climate of the United States are capable of producing the various articles necessary for such manufacturing establishments as will most naturally flourish in this country, and of such as would inevitably be consumed providing manufacturing labor should be extended.

By a comprehensive and rigorous system of policy calculated to unfold our agricultural resources a spirit of emulation and industry would be diffused over the land, a vast and active system of internal exchange would rise up, the expense of transportation in heavy articles would be in a great measure saved, and, in fact, that which should be ardently wished for in every agricultural country, a home market, would appear; this, too, would prove a market at once various in point of demand, but sure, steady, and unchanging. The policy, the caprice, the selfishness, and the hostility of other nations could not affect it. On this point, therefore, the committee can not entertain any doubt. The extension of domestic manufactures, depending on the production of such raw materials as can be found in this country, must increase the demand and consumption of those materials, and of course secure a new and ready market.

THE STOCK ARGUMENTS OF FREE TRADERS.

The two stock arguments made by the advocates of free trade are, first, that of unrestricted trade, the right to buy where we can buy cheapest; and, second, the securing of a wider market for our exports. I have, on several occasions, discussed these propositions at length in the Senate, and shown their fallacy;

and I do not care at this time to repeat what I have heretofore said. It is sufficient to say that to buy where we can buy cheapest, that is, to buy goods abroad for home consumption with the privilege of bringing them into this country free of duty, is for consumers in this country to avail themselves of the poorly paid labor of Europe and the pauper labor of Asia, to prefer the welfare of foreign manufacturers and foreign laborers to our own; to stop the manufacture of things we need in this country and to depend upon foreign countries for them; to take employment from our own people to give it to foreigners; to reduce the standard of wages in this country to the standard of wages in other countries.

All history shows that no nation can be prosperous which does not protect its own industries and its own citizens and, as far as possible, do its own work. The junior Senator from Texas, in his able speech upon the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, ridiculed the idea that protection tended to reduce the price of products, and used the oft-repeated assertion, that adding to the price of a commodity does not cheapen it. But it has often been shown that the duty upon dutiable articles is largely borne by the foreign producer; and, without discussing the proposition at length, I assert that domestic competition does reduce prices; that when, by a duty on a foreign commodity, which places American manufactures upon an equality with foreign manufactures, industries are built up, home competition is induced, and the skill, the enterprise, the energy and inventive genius of our people very soon reduce the price of the commodity to the lowest figure consistent with reasonable returns to capital invested and fair wages to labor, and often, indeed generally, the price is reduced far below that of the article at the time the protective duty was imposed.

Let those who wish advocate the interests of England, of China, and India, and prefer the welfare of foreign laborers to that of American citizens. For myself, I prefer the interests of my own country to those of any foreign nation, and the welfare of American citizens to that of the pauper class of Europe, the ryots of India, and the coolies of China. I want nothing I consume (and no true American does) cheaper than it will be manufactured under sharp competition, consistent with fair returns to capital and fair wages to labor, by a nation of seventy-six millions of people, the freest, most enlightened, and most energetic in the world.

That domestic competition under a protective policy does reduce the price of commodities, if proof is needed, is shown by our own experience. The table presented by the Senator from Texas, in his speech before referred to, shows a great depreciation of prices, not only of agricultural products, but of manufactured articles, for a series of years. This table, coming from so prominent a member of the Democratic party, and so distinguished an advocate of a tariff for revenue only, is worthy of careful consideration. It shows that under the protective system in this country the price of everything consumed by the laborer has greatly decreased, while wages have constantly increased.

Now, let me examine, for a moment, the argument that free trade would give us a wider market for our surplus products. The assertion is constantly made that if we do not buy of foreign countries they will not buy of us. I have, on former occasions, called attention to the fact that we do not buy of any foreign nation; that is, of the government; and no foreign nation buys of us. Our foreign commerce is carried on by individuals, and is regulated, like all commercial transactions, by selfish interests. If an importer is about to purchase goods, he does not stop to inquire whether the balance of trade is in our favor or against us, or what the tariff laws of other countries are. He buys where he can buy what he wants cheapest, and pays for his purchases with gold.

If a wheat merchant in Liverpool wants a cargo of wheat, he does not care what duties are levied on British products in American ports, but buys his wheat where he can buy cheapest, quantity and quality considered, whether what he buys is the product of our western prairies or of the Argentine Republic, whether it has been raised by Russian serfs or by Indian ryots. If exchange were carried on between nations only, or by barter, that is, by the exchange of products only, there might be something in the proposition that if we do not buy of foreign countries we can not sell to them. But foreign trade is not a system of barter. Gold is a tool of international commerce and the universal measure of value and the medium in which balances of trade are settled.

Our own experience shows that the balance of trade with other countries may be largely in our favor for years and the balance be received in gold. Our experience with other countries, Brazil for instance, shows that we continue a large foreign trade although the balance of trade may be, for many years, against us. The balance of trade between the United States and Brazil has been for years against us to the extent of about $50,000,000 per annum. The fact is that other countries buy of our products every year all they need for consumption. They would continue to do so if they could buy as cheaply of us as elsewhere, even though we were to build a Chinese wall around this country to prevent the importation of foreign products. And if we were to admit everything produced in foreign countries free of duty these same foreign countries, or rather the inhabitants of these countries would not buy a dollar's worth of our products unless these products could be purchased upon the most advantageous terms, or their necessities compelled them to purchase.

We might adopt free trade, and our wheat, corn, cotton, pork, and beef would still be compelled to compete in the markets of Europe with the products of every other country under the sun produced by cheap lands and cheap labor, and their price in London would be fixed, as it now is in London, in gold, by the universal law of supply and demand. Mr. President, there never was a greater fallacy than that free trade would give us a wider or better market for our agricultural products. It would, on the contrary, drive millions of men now engaged in manufacturing to agricultural pursuits, resulting in increased production and depreciated prices.

WHAT FREE TRADE MEANS.

Free trade does not mean that custom-houses are to be abolished and no revenue collected by duties upon imports, but it means a tariff system similar to that maintained by Great Britain, a system of tariff for revenue only: duties laid upon articles which do not come into competition with domestic productions, and the free admission of articles which do come into competition with articles of domestic production. It means, first, that goods manufactured in foreign countries shall be admitted into this country free of duty if the condition of the revenues admits of it. It means that the half-starved, underpaid and unemployed millions of Europe shall be given work which under a protective tariff would be done by American laborers, enabling these American laborers to live comfortably, to educate their children, and become independent. It means that the pauper laborer of India and China shall be brought into direct competition with American workingmen. It means either the closing of our mills and factories or that the return for capital invested in manufacturing industries shall be reduced to the rate of interest in the old countries, and that the wages of our workingmen shall be reduced to the starvation wages of laborers on the eastern hemisphere.

In a word, it means leveling down in this country of the condition of American laborers to that of the ignorant, half-starved, half-clothed masses of the countries of Europe and Asia. It means that the wheels of progress shall stop; that the development of our resources shall cease; that the prosperity we have enjoyed under Republican rule shall be destroyed.

The disastrous effect of threatened free-trade legislation has not been confined to manufactures or the particular interests directly affected by legislation or threatened legislation. All the industries of the country are inseparably connected, and all have suffered and will suffer alike; and if mills and factories are closed by tariff legislation, the idle operatives will crowd into other employments, producing competition and overproduction, low wages and low prices. If the manufacturer is forced to take small and continually decreasing profits upon his investments, investors in all other industries will receive smaller profits. If laborers in manufacturing industries are forced to submit to reduction of wages laborers in all other industries will be compelled to submit to a similar reduction. The success of the Democratic party and its control of Congress renders the repetition of the Democratic action in 1833 possible, and, so far as human foresight can tell, inevitable.

THE INDUSTRIES OF THE PACIFIC COAST IN JEOPARDY

If some evil genius, determined to blast and destroy the Pacific coast, had presided over and controlled the House Committee of Ways and Means, no more certain and speedy scheme could have been devised for that purpose than the bill agreed upon by the committee. The people of that portion of the Union west of the Rocky Mountains are almost entirely engaged in agriculture, lumbering, and mining. Manufactures are in their infancy, and as yet comparatively unimportant. Wheat growing, wool growing, the raising of cattle and horses, fruit raising, and hop growing, fishing, lumbering, and mining, are the principal industries. Every one of these industries will be stricken down and destroyed, or made unprofitable, by the passage of the Wilson bill.

The number of sheep in California, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Nevada, and New Mexico, in 1892, was 13,981,901, almost one-third of all the sheep in the United States. A large portion of the rugged soil of that region, unfit for cultivation, is utilized for sheep pasture. Thousands of pioneers make a living for themselves and their families by wool-growing; but the success of the Democratic party, upon a platform which denounces the protective system as a robbery and as unconstitu-

tional, in connection with the fact that whenever the Democrats in either House of Congress have had an opportunity they have voted for free wool, and that President Cleveland in his free trade message of 1887 advocated placing wool on the free list, has had the effect to discount Democratic tariff legislation, to curtail the purchase of domestic wool by manufacturers to present needs, and to reduce the prices of wool nearly or quite to free-trade rates.

The House committee has now confirmed the worst fears of the wool-growers and sounded the death knell of this great industry in the United States. The prosperity of the State of Oregon, more especially of the western portion of the State, is largely dependent upon the wool-growing industry. Last year wool brought there 16 cents per pound. This year, the highest price offered has been 10 cents. The prosperity of Montana and of other Pacific coast States, like that of Oregon, is largely dependent upon wool-growing; and wool in Montana has been worth this year only from 6 to 7 cents per pound. In Chicago, in the early days of September last, fine wool was worth from 14 to 16 cents, and coarse wool from 13 to 15 cents; while in the year 1891 the price of fine wool was 33 cents per pound, and of coarse wool 31 cents per pound; and 30 cents for fine, and 29 cents for coarse wool during 1892. These figures require no comment. They show that with free wool the wool-growing industry of this country will be destroyed.

I have received a communication from Hon. Charles Hilton, an extensive wool-grower of eastern Oregon, stating the effects which placing wool on the free list would have on that industry in Oregon, which I incorporate in my remarks. It is as follows:

THE DALLES, OREGON, *December 6, 1893.*

DEAR SENATOR: In a short time the question of the removal of the present tariff on many commodities will come before the United States Senate, and from what the papers tell us it is fairly reasonable to suppose that the principal industry of eastern Oregon (wool-growing) is seriously menaced.

Some time since, anticipating the action of the Democratic Congress, you asked me for some figures, which you could perhaps use in an argument you intended making in opposition to the removal of the tariff on wool, as you know my experience in wool-growing has been considerable, and I have been fairly successful.

I have been engaged in the business for eighteen years and have run from ten to twelve thousand head. I have made it a point each year for a period of thirty days to accurately ascertain the actual cost of all my sheep camps in the way of supplies, and you can accept the following figures as trustworthy, since they are an average from all these records.

COST OF RUNNING 2,000 SHEEP ONE YEAR.

Herder, at $35 per month		$420.00
Board, at $15 per month		180.00
Camp tender to help move and furnish camp		200.00
Salt, 2 tons, at $30		60.00
Hay, 50 tons, at $8		400.00
Extra help during lambing season		100.00
Extra help during winter feeding season		50.00
Shearing 2,000 sheep, at 7 cents per head		140.00
Board of shearers		30.00
Extra help sacking wool, etc		25.00
50 wool sacks, at 40 cents		20.00
Feeding horses used to supply camp, etc		180.00
Shoeing horses used to supply camp, etc		36.00
Furnishing camp—tents, blankets, rope, etc		30.00
Hauling 16,000 pounds wool to railroad, at ¼ cents		120.00
Cost of 16,000 pounds wool, as per above		1,991.00
16,000 pounds wool, at 6 cents	$960.00	
700 lambs, being increase, $1.25	875.00	
		1,835.00
Net loss on above basis		156.00

The only possible reduction that can be made in the cost of running a band of sheep is in wages—as the plow has driven the stock so far back into the hills that the cost of feed is greater, as there is so little land that will produce, and freight to and from the railroad figures largely in salt and other supplies, and shipping wool (my ranch is 80 miles south of Arlington).

Thus you will see that at 6 cents per pound for wool, which is the highest price we can expect with free wool for the class of wool raised here, calculating the weight of each fleece at 8 pounds, which is about the average, and the increase at 35 per cent (which is all an ordinary band of stock sheep will produce, as we have to carry the male until 2 years old and past before they are suitable for market and can not breed the ewes until 2 years old) the owner would be about $200 loser on the year's work. This leaving out of consideration all the taxes, interest on capital invested, and wear and tear to camp accoutrements, which is considerable.

If a wool-grower were running but one band of sheep several of these items would be greater, such as the expense of camp tending and horses—which I have divided by three—as one outfit attends to three sheep herders. Again, the average loss caused by wild animals and by accident during a year is at least 5 per cent, and this taken with the interest at 6 per cent on investments in real estate or the rent which must be paid to secure a winter range and feeding ground will considerably increase the loss of the wool-grower.

You are of course better posted than we can be as to the probable reduction in cost in manufactured material to be brought about by the annihilation of the wool industry in this country.

But when we are told that only three or four pounds of scoured wool goes into a suit of clothes, it does not seem probable that so small a reduction will be of any great advantage to the consumer, as the protected manufacturer is evidently to have so much the best of it that he will probably be given, or take, this small margin also.

For the last four or five years I have averaged 15 cents per pound for my wool and $2.75 for my mutton sheep. The latter can not now be sold for more than $1.50 (at the ranch), and our wool is now being sold in Boston for 10 cents. The cost of freight, including insurance and commissions, amounts to about 4 cents a pound.

But for the unfortunate accident of Democratic success in electing a majority in both Houses of Congress and a President, the price of this year's clip would have been considerably higher than before, as the immense amount of rags and shoddy imported during the six months before the McKinley law went into effect is about consumed, and the manufacturers who are now idle would be at work on our wool.

I am sure that you are working earnestly in opposition to free trade, and I sincerely hope that a resolute stand, such as you will take in our interest, will be successful.

There is one thing which you may not have had brought to your notice, and that is, that destruction of the sheep industry means the abandonment of thousands of acres of land which now furnish good sheep pasture in Eastern Oregon (and which once, though not arable, furnished bunch-grass range of high value for cattle-growing, have been so heavily stocked for a series of years that the bunch grass has been destroyed and will never return).

The only vegetation which now exists is weeds and the small sheep grass which will support nothing but sheep, and upon which they will thrive; take away the sheep and this is waste land and can never be anything else.

It would be impossible for us to continue the business under free wool; we would have to quit breeding and dispose of our sheep for mutton as they become of suitable age.

When the industry is destroyed in the United States, I apprehend, the foreigner will raise the price of wool probably to more than we have received under protection; but we will have no sheep, and it takes a long time to stock up a range, as sheep do not increase very rapidly. I am,

Yours very truly,

CHAS. HILTON.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH, *Washington, D. C.*

Not content with striking down this great industry of the Pacific coast the committee have threatened the existence of other leading industries of the coast by absolute free trade. Scattered all over the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the plains of California and the valleys of Oregon and Washington are fruitful orchards and vineyards, giving employment to thousands of American citizens and furnishing the finest of fruits to almost every section of the Union. Grapes, olives, oranges, lemons, prunes, plums, apples, peaches, pears, and all the smaller fruits are raised in abundance and in perfection, and with proper protection can be raised in sufficient quantities to supply the domestic demand. But a portion of our common country, that portion which controls the dominant party in Congress, and which has selfishly taken care of its own industries in the House bill, proposes to strike a disastrous blow at the fruit industry of the Pacific coast by placing some fruits upon the free list and by greatly reducing the tariff upon importations of others. The great industry of prune-raising in Oregon, Washington, and California is to be jeopardized by largely reducing the duty upon imported prunes.

I am in receipt of a letter from a large fruit-raiser in Oregon concerning the prune industry, which I will incorporate in my remarks:

SALEM, OREGON, *December 10, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: In regard to the duty on prunes I would say, in behalf of the fruit-growers of the Pacific Northwest, that it is necessary to maintain the protective tariff now in force to enable producers on this coast to establish that industry and develop it to perfection.

As yet prune-growing here is in its infancy, but when the trees planted in California are in full bearing, they will produce, in good season, 150,000,000 pounds of cured prunes. In five years, or less, Oregon and Washington will produce 50,000,000 pounds. The present year's product of this coast is about 40,000,000 pounds, for the season is not very favorable. There are many districts of Oregon and Washington where fruit-growing can be carried on, and our fruits are all exceptionally choice.

As you are aware, I have been for many years producing and curing prunes, and have given my experience to the public through the press. My experience shows that only the best methods of cultivation can succeed. In all countries fruit-growing is an uncertain business and subject to vicissitudes of climate as well as exigencies of trade and commerce. Our fruit-growers have to learn the best varieties to grow, the most effective and successful treatment of orchards, as well as ways and means for curing fruits to put them in the world's markets; not least, also, the best markets for cured fruits after they are produced.

The choice prunes of the present year's crop command only 4½ to 7 cents per pound, and will never go to any much higher figure. If the tariff is removed, or too greatly reduced, prices will go so low as to leave no inducement for care of our orchards, much less any inducement to plant wider areas. The issue involves the success of fruit-growing at large and the success of thousands who have predicated their hopes and efforts on the existing conditions. Fruit-growing at large is dependent, as our orchardists consider prunes their most important staple. If that fails it will discourage all effort.

Already the influence of the proposed change causes discouragement and makes men lose faith.

Grant us continued protection, and we will fully test the possibilities and capabilities of production and reach the greatest possible excellence, and place fruit-growing in this region on the best plane of artistic and scientific enterprise. We will not only supply fully the home demand, but establish our products in foreign markets and command success on the basis of excellence. The time will soon come when we shall furnish prunes throughout the United States at the lowest figure consistent with a living profit, and can defy free trade.

During the present year fruit-growers have reaped small returns on the Pacific coast. The citrus groves of San Bernardino, the vineyards and orchards of Middle and Northern California, the fertile reaches of the wide North Pacific have all gathered and marketed the fruits of 1893 without averaging to pay fairly the expenses of production. The prospect is not too encouraging at the best, and to remove the duty and admit foreign prunes free will cause such decadence of this widespread industry as will replace beautiful and well-kept orchards with more than desolation.

We respectfully object to the degradation of labor that must result from such reduction of duty, and ask for effective and reasonable protection as encouragement and support while we are struggling with a difficult problem—replacing the primeval forests of the late wilderness with fruitful orchards; with effort that can not succeed on the Atlantic, and it remains to be seen if they can prosper on the Pacific.

Give us needed aid and encouragement, and you will see that all we claim will be accomplished, and all we promise will be performed.

S. A. CLARKE.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH, *United States Senate.*

In Oregon and Washington hop-raising is an important and rapidly growing industry, furnishing employment to thousands of laborers, and largely adding to the wealth of those States. If this industry were properly protected the two States would soon furnish hops in sufficient quantity to supply the domestic demand; but that industry, too, is to be embarrassed in the general onslaught. The present duty upon hops is 15 cents per pound. By the Wilson bill it is proposed to reduce the duty to 8 cents per pound. The reduction, so far as it affects prices, must come from the profits, or supposed profits, of the hop-growers, and the result of the reduction of the duty will be to enable foreign hops to successfully compete with the domestic product, to prevent the growth of the industry, and destroy or render it profitless in this country.

Not content with the injury these proposed changes would work to the Pacific coast, it is proposed that the protective duties on many agricultural products provided for by the McKinley bill and previous legislation shall be removed, the barrier which we have erected against agricultural productions from Canada and other foreign countries broken down, and American farmers placed in free competition with Canadian producers. The provision of the Wilson bill in this regard may be briefly stated as follows:

Buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, oats, oat meal, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour are to pay a duty of 20 per cent; but each of the above articles shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States.

Of course, no country importing largely of our agricultural products will impose a duty upon them, and this provision of the Wilson bill means free trade with Canada, and with all other countries in the articles mentioned. Barley, under the McKinley bill, is subject to a duty of 30 cents per bushel, which has had the effect of limiting the amount of barley imported from Canada and stimulating its production by our farmers. But, by the Wilson bill, barley, barley malt, and barley pearled, patent or hulled, is subjected to a duty of only 20 per cent ad valorem. Duties upon live animals are largely decreased by the Wilson bill, and fixed at 20 per cent ad valorem. Duties upon dairy products, and upon beans, peas, hay, potatoes, and other vegetables which are not placed upon the free list, are largely reduced. The duty is reduced upon raisins and other dried grapes to 1½ cents per pound. Apples, green or ripe, apples dried, desiccated or evaporated, bacon and hams, beef, mutton, and pork, and meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved birds, and land and water fowls, cabbages, eggs and yolks of eggs, fish and insects, fresh fish, and many other products of agriculture are placed upon the free list.

Turning my attention to other provisions of the bill, I find that the great lumber interests of the coast are jeopardized. It is proposed to remove the tariff on lumber, and admit the products of the forests of Canada, manufactured from timber cut upon government lands purchased for a nominal consideration and by cheap labor, to compete with the products of our mills, manufactured from valuable timber by high-priced American labor; a change in our tariff laws which, if it should be consummated, will result in stopping our mills, in making profitless $300,000,000 of capital invested in the lumbering business, and in throwing out of employment thousands of men now employed in the industry.

I can not do better, in describing the effect of the removal of duty upon lumber and other products of wood, than by quoting an editorial from the Puget Sound Lumberman, as follows:

Fifty million dollars in round numbers represent the capital employed in the lumber industry on the Pacific coast. There are 340 sawmills and 404 shingle mills in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, whose output of lumber footed up last year 2,300,000,000 feet of lumber and 2,200,000,000 shingles, of the aggregate value of $27,000,000. The number of men employed in the logging camps of these States is 27,000, to whom are paid in wages annually $18,000,000. Naturally this industry, the mainstay of at least Washington and Oregon, is vitally interested in the tariff question.

British Columbia, which will compete with the three States above mentioned, possesses a greater lumber area than the three States combined. Last year Washington and Oregon shipped into California, which is a great lumber-consuming State, 325,000,000 feet of lumber and shipped eastward to the prairie States 150,000,000 feet and 1,100,000,000 shingles. It is conceded that British Columbia will cut seriously into the California trade, and perhaps compete to some extent with Washington and Oregon lumber in the Eastern States if lumber is placed on the free list.

The large cargo mills of British Columbia employing Chinese and kanaka labor, there being little or no restriction to the importation of alien labor there, are in a position to unload into California vast quantities of lumber in competition with the mills on this side of the line, which pay white labor higher wages than obtain in any other lumber industry section in this country. As fully one-half of the exports of lumber from Washington and Oregon find their way to California, this is a very serious matter. So far as the Eastern trade is concerned, there will be but little direct competition, the British Columbia mills not having found a market as yet, but directly a lot of cheap lumber from Eastern Canada gets into the prairie States via the lakes and on the Atlantic seaboard it will naturally handicap the shipment of Pacific Northwest fir, cedar, and spruce by rail.

I incorporate, also, in my remarks a communication from the Pacific Pine Lumber Company of San Francisco, to the House Committee of Ways and Means, setting forth the conditions of the lumber trade on the Pacific coast, and the effect which the removal of the present duty would have upon the lumber interest there. The communication is as follows:

PACIFIC PINE LUMBER COMPANY,
San Francisco, Cal., November 22, 1893.

To the honorable the Ways and Means Committee
of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: The lumber trade of the Pacific coast engaged in the manufacture of Douglas fir (commonly termed Oregon pine), spruce, and cedar lumber, noting per newspaper publication and otherwise the disposition of your honorable committee to place lumber on the free list in the proposed modification of the tariff, view such possibility with the gravest apprehension, and this company having taken an active interest in this question in 1883, is requested to submit to your honorable committee the condition of the lumber trade and the effect of such action, with especial regard to the situation on this coast and its relation to British Columbia, on the north.

In such direction, it premises by assuming that the only justification that can be alleged for removing the present duty on lumber is, either a limited supply within the territory of the United States (and accessible to its people), or a possibility that the present standing timber may, in holdings, be concentrated in the hands of a few, with the effect of unfairly raising the prices to the consumer. In refutation of such allegations, it would respectfully submit that the most casual investigation will determine the nonexistence of the first as a fact, or the second as a potentiality.

A few years ago the first of above-named positions had emphasis from the very great inroads made upon the standing timber of the northern frontier of the United States, with the coincident apprehension that the continuance, in the ratio then existing, would very soon leave the country without a source of supply within its own borders. So wedded was the main consuming class to the use of the principal product of said section that for a time no source of supply was deemed available except that existing in Canada, contiguous thereto; hence a temporary leaning towards the abrogation of duty on white pine, in order that such supply might be available.

The trend of sentiment in that direction was, however, of short life; the vast areas of yellow pines in the Southern States attracted marked attention, and the liberal investment of capital led to a phenomenal development of the lumber industry in that section, supplemented by so great an activity in the introduction of its products in the Territory previously the domain of white pine, that to-day the substitution is so fully accepted that any reliance upon Canadian timber is absolutely unnecessary, with the further certain effect that should same find entry to displace the Southern product, it would be a deathblow to this industry that in the past five years has so greatly enlarged the taxable values of that section.

Additionally to the "entree" of the Southern products in the Middle West of the United States, is a growing shipment trade by rail from the Pacific coast, increasing yearly and to continue increasing hereafter, provided the exclusion of the products of our northern neighbors is maintained, and should the old Northwest be entirely denuded of her timber, the new Northwest of the Pacific coast jointly with the Southern States, from their vast areas of virgin timber (as affirmed by the forestry reports of the Interior Department), positively guarantees for generations a full supply for the nation within its territorial limits.

The question of supply for the future being so well established from said sources, and assuming that the same excess producing capacity exists in the Southern States in relation to consumption, that is a condition on the Pacific coast, (where such capacity is nearly three times the consumption), the competition thereby engendered becomes a certain assurance of low prices to consumers, and it is indeed difficult to imagine any grounds whatsoever for opening the markets of the United States to foreign lumber.

Thus far this presentation may be deemed as applying to the country at large; there are, however, conditions existing on this coast that further appeal to the consideration of your honorable committee. We refer to methods of transportation and the advantages to the mill owner in British Columbia growing out of the protective tendencies of its government.

The shipping ports of British Columbia are adjacent to those on the American side and no farther distant from points of consumption, whether the shipments are by the way of the Pacific Ocean to domestic coast ports or by rail to the Eastern States. The American mill owner is by the laws of the nation compelled to use in the coasting trade tonnage of American register exclusively, while if our domestic markets are opened to the mills of British Columbia without restriction, the owners on that side would have the choice of all flags in their carriers, thus to all intents and purposes interjecting foreign bottoms into the coasting trade, though technically the voyage is from a foreign port.

Analogous conditions exist in the relation of the lumber manufacturers and shippers of Maine to those of the provinces east of that State, while the markets of the Middle West and Eastern States, that the Pacific coast manufacturers are now cultivating, would be divided with British Columbia, and the shipments to points closest to destination on the Canadian border be made over a foreign railroad, built and subsidized by foreign capital (paralleling competing roads on the American side), to the exclusion of traffic desired by and due to the transcontinental roads in the United States.

Again, the stimulation of the lumber industry on this coast is a great aid to the development of its merchant marine. During the depression in the shipbuilding industry in other parts of the United States such industry has been fairly active on the coast, and its fostering is of more than local importance, inasmuch as the majority of vessels of recent construction are carrying our flag to foreign ports, where it has been hitherto almost unknown. The effect of permitting foreign tonnage, built and run at lower cost, to invade the coasting trade, would be the same as upon American deep-water shipping, now practically driven from the seas, as also to effectually end as an industry shipbuilding on this coast.

Your protestant would also most respectfully submit to your honorable committee, that the protective tendencies of English governments to the north of us, in subsidizing railroads, steamship lines, and offering to industrial enterprises concessions in the way of land, etc., and especially in the system of rentals to mills at a nominal sum per acre per annum of timber lands (by which investment therein is avoided), is of marked advantage to the lumber industry on that side, as compared with the ruling rates of stumpage on the American side, or the otherwise necessity of large investments in timber lands by purchase (the interest on which, with taxes, etc., exceeds said rentals), unless the American industry has maintained to it the present protection, which it is feared your honorable committee is about to disturb.

Your protestant would further submit to your honorable committee, that the lumber trade of the United States represents a larger investment and affords labor to a greater number of employés, than any other single industry, while on the Pacific Coast the ratio of both investment and employés, as applied to volume of business, is far beyond that of other sections. No other industry has its outgrowth, except coal (which is likewise menaced by the proposed tariff changes), exists in the new Northwest in all that area west of the Cascade Mountains; it increases the taxable wealth,

gives employment to hundreds of thousands in mills, in woods, and on land and sea; its commerce and the trade stimulated to supply the mechanical wants of its plants, and the physical requirements of the myriads depending upon it for a livelihood, has made populous, magnificent cities on the shores of Puget Sound, and it is incredible that its destruction can be considered, when such destruction will be the inevitable result of the abrogation of the existing tariff as to this industry.

It is not to be expected that the lumber manufacturers of this coast, with the accumulations of a lifetime in the balance, and struggling against the disastrous effects of overproduction and consequent competition of late years, can view with complacency the further jeopardy threatened by the intimated action of your honorable committee, but it is not alone in the menace to individual interests that this protest has emphasis; pride of section prompts the inquiry: What possible compensation can be offered for this proposed disturbance? What gain to the section, State, or nation, is expected in return for the surrender of American markets to British Columbia (that has no products to export that this coast has not in surplus and will have in surplus for years to come) when such surrender involves the certain obliteration of taxable wealth created by this industry alone; destroys the labor and trade of thousands, transfers to alien ships and railroads the traffic our own require, and even places the handling of the trade at ports of consumption with a nonresident class who will not contribute a dime to the revenues of the country, leaving only to the American citizen the payment of the bill.

Such a course would indeed be "giving to those that have," since the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia have "protection" enough from the paternalism of their own Government, without like aid from that of the United States; and against such aid in any form the entire lumber trade of the Pacific coast, regardless of party affiliation, have now and always to most emphatically protest.

This company has the honor, both in voicing this protest and submitting same to your honorable committee, to subscribe itself on behalf of its confreres.

Very respectfully yours,

PACIFIC PINE LUMBER COMPANY,
E. M. HERRICK, *President.*

A great many people on the Pacific coast are, or have recently been, engaged in silver-mining. The ore produced by their mines is mainly low-grade ore containing lead; and even in prosperous times the mines could not be profitably worked for the silver alone. Notwithstanding the blow which this industry has already received in consequence of the fall in the price of silver bullion, the Democratic party proposes to give it another blow, which will utterly destroy it, and prevent its revival by classing silver ore containing lead, more valuable for silver than for lead, as silver ore, and allowing the free importation of the lead product of Mexico, produced from mines of great richness, by labor receiving less than one-third the wages necessarily paid to American laborers, thus to drive out the American product and close our silver and lead mines. Our fisheries are to be rendered less profitable by being compelled to submit to a disastrous competition with the products of Canadian fisheries.

The duty is to be removed from coal, and that industry in western Washington and around Coos Bay in Oregon is to be jeopardized or destroyed by competition from free foreign coal, mined by cheap labor. This is all in accordance with the Democratic platform, in which protection was denounced as a robbery and unconstitutional. But the Democratic governor of West Virginia and a large delegation of Democrats from that State appeared before the House Committee of Ways and Means and advocated the retention of the protective duty upon coal; and it is reported that when the governor was asked if there was any industry in West Virginia, protected by the tariff, from which protection could be safely removed, he answered in the negative. Mr. President, the free traders should bestir themselves in West Virginia; there is heresy there. The doctrine of a tariff for revenue only is in danger. The integrity of the Democratic party is threatened. It is a dangerous condition of things when a Democratic governor, and a large delegation of leading Democrats, make a pilgrimage to the national capital to plead for the continuance of the protective policy.

I might continue this statement concerning the character of the legislation proposed by the House bill and the effect of the proposed changes upon the industries of the Pacific coast, but I will not. Suffice it to say, that if that bill should become a law, it means free trade as to all of our most important industries. The effect upon the Pacific coast if this proposed legislation should be enacted into law would be to destroy millions of invested capital, to paralyze every industry, and bring want, ruin, and bankruptcy upon our people, and to compel us, in order that any industry can be conducted, to require American laborers to work for greatly reduced wages—a condition of things never experienced on the coast, and one to which our people will everywhere unwillingly submit. Is it proposed to treat the South in this manner? No; rice is to continue to receive fair protection. Sugar, which is a product of the Southern States, and mainly of a single Southern State, is to receive continued protection. If cotton were not raised largely in excess of the domestic demand, that would have been protected also.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Putting iron ore, coal, lumber, and the principal agricultural products on the free list, will be especially disastrous to the belt of agricultural, lumbering, and mining States along the Canadian border. Under the House bill, if it should become a law, we would have free trade in these articles with Canada. Extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the United States and Canada lie side by side, divided only by an imaginary line, with similar forests and mines, with the same character of soil, but with cheaper lands, cheaper labor, and more undeveloped resources upon the Canadian side. It is proposed to throw down the barrier which had protected agriculture in the United States and compelled the Canadians to contribute largely to our Treasury, and to admit the products of the cheaper soil and cheaper labor of Canada into the United States free. It is proposed that we shall make an exceedingly foolish bargain with Canada, and give her the markets of sixty-seven millions of people for the privilege of sending free certain agricultural products into a country having five millions of people.

But this disproportion between the population of the two countries is not the worst feature of the proposed reciprocity. The raw products of Canada and those of the United States are substantially the same. Reciprocity with Canada would mean a very different thing from reciprocity with Mexico or South American countries, from which, with reciprocity, we might get, in exchange for our products, products of those countries which we do not produce; but with the duty removed or reduced upon the products of the forests, the mines, and the soil of Canada, the only result will be to make farming profitable in Canada, to increase the amount of Canadian products annually exported to the United States, to crowd out of our home markets a like amount of our own products. The amount of Canadian imports will not greatly affect prices in the United States, but will affect domestic production, and relieve the Canadian producers from the burden of paying duties at our ports. It will result in benefiting the Canadian producer, in loss to our Treasury, and to American farmers exposed to Canadian competition.

Our tariff upon agricultural products has made farming unprofitable in Canada, has protected farmers on our northern frontier from undue competition with Canadian products, has added greatly to our revenues, contributed, as every one admits, by the Canadian producer, has caused such a difference in the prosperity of the two countries as to induce a very large immigration of the most industrious, enterprising citizens of the Dominion to the United States. All these advantages are to be absolutely thrown away, without any compensating benefits; and only to carry out an unsound theory concerning free trade in raw materials. Our people are to be further taxed; new schemes of taxation are to be devised to make them contribute to the revenues the amount which, under existing laws, is now contributed by Canadians.

The McKinley bill considerably increased the duties on many agricultural products, protected and stimulated agriculture in the United States, increased taxation upon importations of Canadian products into this country; but under the House bill this policy is to be reversed. This is but another example of the insincerity of the Democratic party when it professes friendship for the farmer and laboring man.

During the debate upon the Mills bill, in both branches of Congress, our Democratic friends indulged in all sorts of denunciation of the manufacturers of the country. No epithet was too severe to be applied to them. The protective policy was denounced as being intended, and practically operating, to enrich the manufacturers at the expense of the agricultural and laboring class. But a change has suddenly come over the Democratic party.

The manufacturers are no longer robber barons, thriving by the oppression and robbery of the producing classes; they have suddenly become, in the estimation of the Democratic leaders, a class to be preferred and protected. The doctrine of free trade is to be applied to the products of poor farmers who tend their flocks upon the hillsides of the great West; to the laborers who fell the forests and manufacture them into lumber; to the men who work the silver and lead mines; to the poor fishermen, who make a precarious living by hazardous employment during a portion of the year; to the toilers engaged in producing the products of the soil, the mines and the forests. Protection to manufacturers is to be continued, and they are to be further favored by giving them a chance to buy what our Democratic friends call "raw material," produced by the half-fed and half-clothed laborers of Europe.

The blow threatened against manufacturers is to fall and expend itself at last upon the producers of raw materials, upon the agricultural and laboring classes. But let no one be deceived. The blow at the farmer, the lumberman, the miner, and the laborer, while it will fall first upon them, will reach and be felt by every industry, by all classes and all sections. Why is it proposed to put wool on the free list, and to destroy an industry which has heretofore afforded a living to 150,000 small farmers in this country, and employment for as many additional laborers; an industry which has made farming profitable upon portions of

the rugged soil of the Eastern States not adapted to agriculture, and enables the mountain regions of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah to be utilized? Why destroy an industry which, with proper protection, would eventually make this the most extensive wool-producing country in the world, and enable us to furnish the raw materials for our own manufacturers?

As the result of the legislation proposed by the House bill, the flocks that graze upon the mountain sides of the great West, and the smaller flocks of the smaller farmers of the East, will be driven to the slaughter pen, the wool-growing industry will be destroyed, thousands of laborers thrown out of employment, thousands of farmers ruined, and all to make a market for the wool of Australia and South American countries, raised upon cheap lands with cheap labor, and with climatic advantages we do not possess. Foreign countries, as soon as our flocks are destroyed, will obtain a monopoly of our markets, and wool will probably be no cheaper to the manufacturer than it would have been with adequate protection to our wool-growing industry.

During the late Presidential election and since, there has been much said about Mr. Cleveland being better than his party. This was probably true so far as the question of free coinage of silver is concerned. But there has never been any reason to suppose that upon the tariff question he was not fully committed to free trade, or that, as many people have affected to believe, he would prevent radical tariff legislation and preserve American industries. He is more responsible for the present attitude of the Democratic party toward the tariff than any other Northern Democrat. He commenced the contest for free trade by his tariff message of 1887. By the use of Administrative influence he whipped his party in the House of Representatives into line with him, and has been perfectly consistent in fully indorsing and urging the passage of the Wilson bill, as follows:

After a hard struggle tariff reform is directly before us. Nothing so important claims our attention and nothing so clearly presents itself as both an opportunity and a duty—an opportunity to deserve the gratitude of our fellow-citizens and a duty imposed upon us by our oft-repeated professions and by the emphatic mandate of the people. After full discussion our countrymen have spoken in favor of this reform, and they have confided the work of its accomplishment to the hands of those who are solemnly pledged to it.

If there is anything in the theory of a representation in public places of the people and their desires, if public officers are really the servants of the people, and if political promises and professions have any binding force, our failure to give the relief so long awaited will be sheer recreancy. Nothing should intervene to distract our attention or disturb our effort until this reform is accomplished by wise and careful legislation.

* * * * * * *

Manifestly, if we are to aid the people directly through tariff reform, one of its most obvious features should be a reduction in present tariff charges upon the necessaries of life. The benefits of such a reduction would be palpable and substantial, seen and felt by thousands who would be better fed and better clothed and better sheltered. These gifts should be the willing benefactions of a government whose highest function is the promotion of the welfare of the people.

Not less closely related to our people's prosperity and well-being is the removal of restrictions upon the importation of the raw materials necessary to our manufactures. The world should be open to our national ingenuity and enterprise. This can not be while Federal legislation, through the imposition of high tariff, forbids to American manufacturers as cheap materials as those used by their competitors. It is quite obvious that the enhancement of the price of our manufactured products resulting from this policy not only confines the market for these products within our own borders, to the direct disadvantage of our manufacturers, but also increases their cost to our citizens.

* * * * * * * *

A measure has been prepared by the appropriate Congressional committee embodying tariff reform on the lines herein suggested, which will be promptly submitted for legislative action. It is the result of much patriotic and unselfish work, and I believe it deals with its subject consistently and as thoroughly as existing conditions permit.

I am satisfied that the reduced tariff duties provided for in the proposed legislation, added to existing internal-revenue taxation, will, in the near future, though perhaps not immediately, produce sufficient revenue to meet the needs of the Government.

The committee, after full consideration, and to provide against a temporary deficiency which may exist before the business of the country adjusts itself to the new tariff schedules, have wisely embraced in their plan a few additional internal-revenue taxes, including a small tax upon incomes derived from certain corporate investments.

* * * * * * * *

In my great desire for the success of this measure I can not restrain the suggestion that its success can only be attained by means of unselfish counsel on the part of the friends of tariff reform and as a result of their willingness to subordinate personal desires and ambitions to the general good. The local interests affected by the proposed reform are so numerous and so varied that if all are insisted upon the legislation embodying the reform must inevitably fail.

The report of the tariff hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means at the late special session makes an interesting and valuable volume. The reason urged by all those representing American industries for maintaining the protective system was that if protective duties are removed the disastrous effect will mainly fall upon the workingman. Their testimony shows that free raw materials will not enable American manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers without a great reduction of wages. Those who speak on the subject, as a rule, attribute our business depression to the threat of hostile tariff legislation. I can only make some hasty references to it as my remarks have already been unduly extended.

Mr. Henry Brunt, of Baltimore, Md., engaged in pottery manufacturing, said:

I have been engaged in the pottery business for about thirty-five years, most of the time in England. Since I became a man, I have spent ten years of my life in the pottery industry in England under free trade. I have spent twelve years in the pottery industry in America under protection; so that I think I am in a position to speak somewhat of the benefits, or otherwise, under free trade or protection.

I have had an experience as a workingman in England in the pottery industry. I have been engaged as a manager in England, and as such I have had to pay wages and engage men. I have had an experience as a workingman in the pottery industry in America, and I have been a manager, and am now a manager; so that whatever I say in connection with it will be drawn from my own personal knowledge, and not collected from books.

I come here to ask you gentlemen to maintain the present rate of duty on pottery, and I do so for several reasons. One of the reasons—which you have heard many times before—is because if the duty is reduced, the burden will fall on the workingman. In connection with this, I want to make a little statement about the difference I have paid for some labor in America and in England. Most of these comparisons are made with English manufacturers, chiefly, I suppose, because reliable statistics are more easily procured in England than in some of the other foreign countries. We can, consequently, compare the conditions in England and America better than we can the price and condition of things in other countries.

I have not a very long list, although it is on a long piece of paper; but I have taken the average of what I consider to be the regular number of men that it requires to run a pottery. I have started with what we call the engineer in England. I paid $6 a week in England, and $11 in America for an engineer. There are many places which are filled by women in England and men in America.

Mr. Fred Walker, a potter, of Trenton, N. J., said:

We ask that the present duty be maintained, chiefly from the fact that if a reduction should take place it would affect the wages of the operatives in this country. We have never received as much wages at any time as we are at present.

* * * * * * *

We believe as workingmen, that seeing as we receive over 60 per cent difference in wages between the man paid in England, France, and Germany in several branches of our industry, that we ought to be satisfied as wage-earners. We ask you to consider this. In a number of States manufacturers have been trying to improve their lines of products. We are producing a better grade of goods than has ever been produced before. I wish to corroborate what the manufacturers have said about the matter. We have now two potteries in the city of Trenton in the hands of a receiver—namely, the Eagle and the Brewer—both old concerns. They branched out to make the higher grade articles and they are now both defunct. That shows that this pottery industry is not what it is supposed to be. There is not the money to-day in the business that there was several years ago, because competition has forced prices down in this business.

And again, on behalf of the floor, encaustic, vitrified, and enamel tile manufacturers, he said:

Our principal reason for not being able to compete with foreign manufacturers is the difference paid for wages, the rates in many instances being less than one-third of those paid in this country.

The time has now come when a further reduction in prices will necessitate a reduction in wages now paid, and we are of the opinion that the wages are not excessive, and would regret exceedingly to be compelled to take any steps toward a reduction.

Mr. Frank L. Bodine, of Philadelphia, president of the Cohansey Manufacturing Company of New Jersey, made an interesting statement of the value of labor that enters into the production of glass, as follows:

The wages paid in digging and washing the sand, quarrying and grinding the limestone, cutting the trees and manufacturing into boxes, preparing the fire clay for use, mining the coal for fuel, together with the labor of transporting, all of which must be paid in addition to wages at the furnaces, amounts to 20 per cent of the total cost of finished window glass at the works.

Labor at the works in handling the materials, converting them into glass, and assisting the skilled labor adds 20 per cent to the total cost. Wages paid skilled labor of a high class to finish the materials into merchantable window glass amounts to 45 per cent additional, making the amount paid for labor about 85 per cent of the total cost at the works, not including plant or interest paid on capital. Such large proportion of cost paid for wages is multiplied many fold in effect by supplying workmen the means to consume the products of the farm, and to pay other labor for homes, clothing, and other necessaries and comforts of life.

So marked is the effect of building a glass furnace in any locality it is generally made the basis for establishing a town and improving the value of adjoining land through local demand for products of the soil.

Although cheaper wages are the main advantage of foreign manufacturers, there are others to be overcome. These are higher cost of plant (foreign costs being less than half the cost in the United States), low interest rates on investment both for plant and active capital, continuous work all the year, including Sundays, making three hundred and fifty days' product, while American manufacturers, being idle on account of hot weather from June to September, work but nine months, less Sundays, about two hundred and thirty-five days, a comparative loss of one hundred and fifteen days, product, so that foreign furnaces have 50 per cent longer run at the same outlay for plant, interest, and general expenses.

Mr. Joseph Horton, chairman and vice-president of the American Iron and Steel Association of Philadelphia, Pa., made a very interestiug statement concerning the manufacture of iron and steel. I will make but two or three brief quotations from it. He said:

The magnitude of this interest, I think, is not always appreciated either by our friends or by our enemies. This industry has run over twenty-nine States, making pig iron, bar iron, steel, etc., and is widely disseminated, therefore, from North to South and from East to West, and I think the number of workmen actually engaged is about 450,000, which, by the rules of ordinary calculation that each married workman has a family of five, a wife and a family, and while the number is sometimes more than five, it makes an average of about five for each workman, and that makes a population of 2,250,000 who are directly interested in this manufacture of iron and steel.

* * * * * * *

These foreigners, the men who make goods to send to America, are not citizens of this country and are not amenable to our laws. They are not liable to conscription, or drafting, or anything of that kind, for filling up our armies in case of war. They pay no tax of any sort into this Government, and merely to equalize their case with that of our working people it is simply just to our working people that those foreign competitors of theirs should pay to the United States Treasury something in the nature of a tax for the privilege of coming in here, and, as I say, they do it. It does not come out of the pockets of the American consumer. It comes out of the pockets of the European, and that we are prepared to show.

* * * * * * *

Now, then, I may speak upon one other point which belongs to that general treatment of the subject. We hear a great deal about class legislation; about taking by legislation money out of one man's pocket and putting it into another man's pocket. Now, then, this is a fantasy, a kind of bugaboo, and it has no real existence. There is no law which says John Smith shall pay John Jones so much per annum; there is no law which says John Smith, if he thinks John Jones is getting too much of this world's goods, shall not go into the same line of business. The laws are such that any man can go into any kind of business whatever. Any section of the country which thinks another section of the country is prospering too greatly will probably find, if it pays attention to the subject, it can itself go into the manufacture of that product, just as in the South they have found in regard to the iron and steel business.

The statements made concerning the manufacture of tin plates in this country are very interesting in view of the fact that by the House bill as agreed upon by the Ways and Means Committee the destruction of this industry is determined upon. Mr. F. G. Niedringhaus said:

A little over twenty years ago the manufacturers of tin plate in England, their agents and importers, succeeded in having the duty reduced to a merely nominal one of a cent per pound, barely a duty for revenue only, and thereby they crushed out the small attempt at that time to manufacture tin plates in this country. Now, that same influence is at work to-day, not so much for the reduction of the duty on tin plate but mainly for the destruction of the tin-plate industry which really does exist in this country to-day. Millions of dollars have been invested and thousands of people are employed in the industry. The duty was raised under the last so-called McKinley bill $1.20 per box.

Now, on this $1.20 per box the English manufacturer reduced his price 50 cents a box, leaving the balance to be paid by the American consumer. But, however, it must be stated that the weight per box has been gradually reduced by the English manufacturer to about 90 pounds per box, and the American manufacturer (speaking now for my own company) furnishes 108 pounds per box, so that really, when you consider that, the price has hardly been advanced to the American consumer.

The prices we pay for labor are 150 per cent advance on the English price. The duty imposed is perhaps 70 per cent. Now, labor gets all of that duty imposed and 70 per cent in addition, or, in other words, the labor gets the benefit of all the duty and the natural advantages which we possess in America. If we had labor at English pri es with our natural resources we can not only hold our own but we will beat them in their own market.

Now, if duty on tin plate is reduced to the former duty before the last act it will reduce labor wages one-third. If it is put on the free list it will put it to less than one-half. It was not only putting on the duty, but the American Congress attached to that duty in the last act a five years' limit, to allow the manufacturers and those who were willing to risk their money five years' time to demonstrate whether plate could be manufactured in America. Now, that has been practically demonstrated, and the mystery in which this business was clothed at the beginning has disappeared. The manufacture of tin plate is one of the most simple manufactures imaginable, and I can call your honorable chairman to testify in that respect, because he worked at the trade himself at one time.

Mr. W. C. Cronemeyer, of Pittsburg, Pa., said:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when, in former years, I appeared before this committee to plead for the American tin-plate interests, I had to make the statement that I represented an industry which did not exist in the United States. To-day I am happy to say that I represent an industry which does exist, and although it is yet very young (only about two years old) it is up to the present time a very healthy infant, which has grown vigorously under the most adverse circumstances.

I do not believe that any other industry, if ever so well protected, has been established so rapidly and with as few failures in the start as our young industry, and that in spite of its being called into life at the time of a serious depression caused by financial collapses in South America and England, and which had their reflex in this country, but the full force of which was happily averted because just at the time a tariff bill was passed by our Congress which filled our industries with new hope and our financial institutions with new confidence in the future of our industries. The tin-plate industry has grown in spite of a bill having passed the House of Representatives and hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles repealing the very law which only a few months previous had called this industry into life.

The following is a list of names of firms who have embarked in the tin and terne plate manufacture during the last two years, and the amounts which, according to their last report, they have invested in their plants:

Firms or companies.	Location.	Amount invested in tin-plate plant.
A. A. Thompson & Co	New York, N. Y	
Aliquippa Tin Plate Co	Aliquippa, Pa	$22,250.00
American Stamping Co	Brooklyn, N. Y	14,841.65
American Tin Plate Machine and Manufacturing Co.	Linfield, Pa	76,000.00
American Tin Plate Co	Elwood, Ind	300,000.00
Apollo Iron and Steel Co	Apollo, Pa	3,000.00
Baltimore Steel, Iron and Tin Plate Co	Baltimore, Md	
Britton Rolling Mill Co	Cleveland, Ohio	58,000.00
Blairsville Rolling Mill and Tin Plate Co	Blairsville, Pa	100,000.00
Cleveland Tin Plate Co	Cleveland, Ohio	12,000.00
Cincinnati Corrugating Co	Piqua, Ohio	2,000.00
Coates & Co	Baltimore, Md	
Cumberland Rolling Mill and Tin Plate Co.	Cumberland, Md	90,000.00
Columbia Tin Plate Co	Piqua, Ohio	4,000.00
E. Morewood & Co	Gas City, Ind	125,000.00
Falcon Tin Plate and Sheet Iron Co	Niles, Ohio	110,000.00
Griffith & Cadwallader	Pittsburg, Pa	15,000.00
Gummey, Spering & Co	Philadelphia, Pa	$25,000.00
Hughes & Patterson	do	
Indiana Tin Plate Manufacturing Co	Atlanta, Ind	
John Hamilton	Pittsburg, Pa	25,000.00
Kahn Bros	New York, N. Y	
Marshall Bros. & Co	Philadelphia, Pa	125,000.00
Matthar, Ingram & Co	Baltimore, Md	
McKinley Tin Plate Co	Wilkinsburg, Pa	21,000.00
Merchant & Co	Philadelphia, Pa	2,000.00
Moorewood Tin Plate Manufacturing Co.	Elizabeth, N. J	95,000.00
N. and G. Taylor Co	Philadelphia, Pa	400,000.00
Norton Bros	Chicago, Ill	400,000.00
New Castle Tin Plate Co	New Castle, Pa	200,000.00
Norristown Tin Plate Co	Norristown, Pa	
Phillips Tin Plate Co	Philadelphia, Pa	
P. H. Laufman & Co	Apollo, Pa	50,000.00
Pittsburg Electroplating Co	do	
Pittsburg Tin Plate Works	New Kensington, Pa	23,147.42
Record Manufacturing Co	Connecaut, Pa	30,000.00
Jas. B. Scott & Co	Pittsburg, Pa	10,500.00
St. Louis Manufacturing Co	St. Louis, Mo	400,000.00
Somerton Tin Plate Works	Brooklyn, N. Y	238,610.50
United States Iron and Tin Plate Manufacturing Co.	Demmler, Pa	250,000.00
Wallace Banfield & Co	Irondale, Ohio	250,000.00
Total		3,495,379.57

I could not ascertain the investment of ten of these above firms.

The following figures, taken from Special Agent Ayer's report, will illustrate more clearly the growth of this industry:

	Pounds.	Pounds.
First year.		
Quarter ending—		
September 30, 1891	26,922	
December 31, 1891	1,409,821	
March 31, 1892	3,209,225	
June 30, 1892	8,200,751	
		13,646,719
Second year.		
Quarter ending—		
September 30, 1892	10,952,725	
December 31, 1892	19,756,491	
March 31, 1893	29,566,399	
June 30, 1893	35,000,000	
		95,275,615
Total		108,922,334

The product in the last quarter of the fiscal year 1893 was 4,232 times greater than the production in the first quarter of the fiscal year, 1892. Did you ever hear of any other industry increasing to such an extent within years?

Mr. Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia, made an interesting statement concerning the wool industry, from which I quote:

More than half the whole clip of the United States is raised west of the Mississippi River. When the tariff law was passed in 1867 there were comparatively no sheep west of the Mississippi River. Our sheep were east at that time, with the exception of a few in Texas. That tariff made the duty 12 cents a pound, or 11 per cent ad valorem, and the high price which prevailed outside made the duty fully 15 per cent ad valorem protection. Under that condition of affairs the wool clip of the United States increased with strides and bounds. We outstripped every other nation in the world in that respect. We beat Australia, even, with its large acreage of perennial pasturage.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. JUSTICE. From the time of the passage of the law in 1867 up to its repeal in 1883. It was repealed in 1883, went into effect in 1884, and wool declined very rapidly from that time. From 1873 to 1884 the tariff on wool in the United States was under the law of 1867. In 1884 the repeal of the law had got into full operation, and the effect was fatal. The number of sheep in the United States in 1873 was 170,000,000. When the tariff of 1867 was repealed the tariff law of 1883 reduced the duty to 10 cents a pound. Woolens that had been protected by a duty of from 13 to 15 cents under the law of 1867 had increased enormously. With the reduction in 1883 to 10 cents a pound, a number of sheep in the United States were slaughtered. That tariff was inadequate. It was a protective tariff and not a revenue tariff. When a tariff fails to be protective it is a revenue tariff.

Under the revenue tariff of 1883, so far as wool was concerned, the wool clip of the United States decreased from 340,000,000 pounds in 1884, the first year after the new law went into effect, 12 per cent; but from 1873, under the tariff law of 1867, up to 1884, when it was repealed, the wool clip of the United States measured by the number of sheep had increased 100 per cent. No other nation in the world had approached us. Australia had increased in the same time from 280,000,000 pounds in 1873 to 460,000,000 pounds in 1883, while the United States had increased 100 per cent.

Take Great Britain, the only country which competes with us, and our condition is more favorable. In England sheep are fed. Although the winters are much harder the amount fed is less. The British clip decreased 19 per cent, while the United States was increasing 100 per cent. During the same years, while the wool clip was increasing 100 per cent, the Cape of Good Hope, with free trade, increased only 6 per cent.

* * * * * * *

Now, we will take the second period of inadequate protection from 1884 up to the time of the McKinley law. The increase in Australia was unchanged. During that second period, from 1884 to 1890, Australia increased 29 per cent; the Argentine Republic, under free trade, increased 23 per cent, and Great Britain had held its own. The Cape of Good Hope increased 6 per cent, and the United States (the only nation in the world to do so) decreased 12 per cent in her wool clip. It was because of this that the wool-growers of the United States demanded increased duties; and when the McKinley bill was passed they were accorded the beggarly increase of 12 per cent; but there was so much noise made about it that some think it was increased many times more than that amount.

* * * * * * *

It is fair to assume that what has happened to manufacturers will occur again; and if the tariff law which lasted from 1884 up to the passage of the

McKinley law was inadequate protection, then under a repeal the wool crop of the United States will be destroyed.

* * * * * * *

United States Consul-General Wallace, in his report, which is on file, states the reasons why wool in Australia is 12 cents a pound. It is because their land is largely owned by the Government, and fenced by the Government. The sheep do not even require to be herded. The only cost is the labor in shearing and the marketing of the wool and the sheep. Can we produce wool for 12 cents a pound?

This wool [indicating] will net 1 cent a pound on the basis of to-day's London values. The wool-grower of the United States is getting 1 cent a pound, while his competitor in Australia is getting 12 cents a pound. If there is any manufacturer present he knows that the farmer of America would have no market for his wool when it is only worth 1 cent a pound.

* * * * * * *

Mr. WHITING. Is in not a fact that nearly all the manufacturers have memoralized Congress that the present depression is due to the financial condition of the country?

Mr. JUSTICE. I think the best opinion of the manufacturers——

Mr. WHITING [interposing]. Have they not said it?

Mr. JUSTICE. They have said that the silver bill is the cause of it. When you repeal the silver law you will find that they fear tariff revision, and will think that it was the only cause of this depression; and there will not be a single mill started until they can see their way throught it. I am only repeating what has been said to me by manufacturers. I happen to know one or two cases where they are running now on full time. I am telling what I know. I know where mills have started up only because the wages were reduced 10 to 20 per cent. The mills I have in mind particularly have run out of orders, and have shut down. One man said to me: "We can not make goods at the present wages."

But the most unexpected defense of the protective system came from Hon. W. A. McCorkle, governor of West Virginia. He said:

We are to-day looking down to the sunny seas of the South for the glory and progress of West Virginia. We are looking there to-day for the magnificent development which we have begun in our region, which is pouring the golden dollars into the beautiful Kanawha.

We are asking that our coal may go down the Ohio, through the Mississippi jetties which you have built, and in a short time through the Nicaragua Canal. I tell you to give West Virginia a chance and she will certainly drive out the coal which comes from the Australian dominions of Her Majesty the Queen.

Now, I am a Democrat, and I am talking from a Democratic standpoint. I say that the spirit of selfishness should not reign supreme. I do ask that this committee will not lay its hands upon the industry, which will paralyze my beautiful State, and will render sterile her fair valleys. I know that perhaps you gentlemen are tired of these discussions; but you are here to-day to consider the question of the tariff on coal. I know nothing of the special refinements of the tariff, but I do know that if you take away this protection the interest must die. All we ask is our fair share of the policy of the country. I care nothing for the learned gentlemen who claim to know all about this question. I know not where they get their learning, but I know the people of West Virginia, I know the miners of West Virginia, I know the coal-land owners of West Virginia, and I know the men who dig the coal and they are here to-day. I do know the storekeepers in West Virginia, and in fact I know the people from the wealthy coal baron down to the poor devil whose house is at the mouth of the mine. I care not what your theories are. You will never strike a man who is interested in the coal industry but you will strike the coal miner, the railroad transporter, and the river man.

If you take the tariff off coal, which is less in proportion than the average duties, I believe it will hurt you; but putting aside the refinement of theories and controversies, the great proposition remains that you will hurt every man, woman, and child engaged in the coal industry. Therefore, I say, take your hands off the tariff on coal and leave it as it is.

Another thing I do know, and that is that politics to-day plays a part in that portion of the State. I mean to say that we were raised up as a buffet for armies to march against, when men pursued each other with cannon. We are to-day in that same border warfare in the great politics of this country; therefore I say, meaning no threat, "don't do it."

This appeal of the Democratic governor has been supplemented by similar appeals from Alabama and other portions of the South. The Southern position on the tariff is not in accord with that of the men who now control the recently developed mining and manufacturing industries in that region, and it is apparent that the appeals which have been made to the committee for protection to the industries of the South are but the beginning of a movement which will grow until in many of the Southern States the sentiment in favor of protection will be as strong as it is in New England.

The success of the Democratic party, even with the control of both the Senate and House, in 1888, would not have shaken confidence and demoralized business as its success on the platform of 1892 has done. In the Democratic national platform of 1888 a promise was given that in changing the tariff laws existing industries should not be destroyed. A similar provision, contained in the platform reported by the committee on resolutions at the last Democratic national convention, was deliberately stricken out, and protection denounced as robbery and unconstitutional.

Those who affect to believe, if there are any such since the President's message was received, that the protective system is not to be destroyed under the present Administration assume that the Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress will disregard the pledges of their party, abandon their position upon the tariff, and become suddenly converted to the doctrine of protection. No appeals on behalf of the industries of the country for continued protection to capital and labor will be of any avail. The protective policy is doomed so far as its fate can be determined by the Democratic party, as at present constituted. The hostility of the South to the protective system is portrayed in the following extract from the Louisville Courier-Journal, republished in the Press, of New York, with the comments of the Press, as follows:

STOP THIS! COL. WATTERSON.

"The more thorough and sweeping the reform the surer and speedier the relief. Every evil prediction is the voice of Mammon shrieking the torment of the damned. Every threat of ruin and confusion is the devil's bellman vainly seeking to sound hell's fire alarm. The long night is over. The dawn of a longer day has come. Presently its glorious sun will rise to brighten every prospect, and as the painted harlot of Protection, her orgy ended and her beauty gone, wends her way over the hill to the boneyard, millions of honest people will rejoice, wondering how the bleared and beastly thing could work so many spells and last so long."—*Henry Watterson in Louisville Courier-Journal.*

Yes, the dawn of a longer day's work and less pay for the American workman! The dawn of a period of unprecedented depression and ruin for American industries! The dawn of poverty and lack of employment for those who under protection have always found plenty of work and good wages. The glorious sun rises, it is true since the Democratic victory, but not over brightened prospects. Its bright rays reveal closed factories and mills and warm the forms of idlers in the market place and public squares. The Press wishes the long night was over, but fears it has but begun, and that the devil's bellmen, in the shape of sheriff and auctioneer, have started on their rounds of ruin and desolation.

Mr. President, it is assumed that the political majority in Congress has been commissioned by the American people to strike down the protective system, and enact a tariff for revenue only, to adopt the English system of free trade, and upon the face of things, there is ground for the claim. The last Presidential election was fought ostensibly upon the tariff issue. The platform of the Democratic party contained a more radical declaration against a protective tariff than ever before made by any political party, and the issue was squarely made by the Republican platform. The Democratic candidate for President was the great apostle of free trade in this country, and at the election received a majority of votes. The result of the election was to make it possible for the Democratic party to put its threat against the protective policy into execution.

But I have my own views as to the causes which defeated the Republican party and placed the Democratic party in power. I do not think the result was a deliberate verdict of the people upon the tariff question. The Democratic victory was rather the result of a world-wide dissatisfaction with existing conditions and government everywhere, because it is charged with the execution of the laws, the maintenance of public order, and the protection of personal and property rights—a dissatisfaction increased and intensified in this country by the unfortunate labor troubles at Homestead and elsewhere.

But whether I am right or wrong about the causes of the Democratic victory, one thing is now as certain as anything can be which has not been ascertained by actual demonstration, and that is, that present conditions have furnished an object lesson which has had a wonderful effect in the campaign of education upon the tariff question. The closed mills, silent machinery, broken banks, and unemployed millions are more eloquent advocates of the protective system than human orators. Wherever the people of the North have had an opportunity, since the Presidential election, to speak, their voice has been, with no uncertain sound, for the protection of American labor. If a vote could be taken to-day upon the question whether the protective system should be maintained or destroyed, the verdict would be overwhelmingly in favor of its maintenance.

Persistent attacks upon the protective policy, gross misrepresentations as to the purposes and effects of protection, exaggerated statements concerning the unsatisfactory condition of the agricultural and laboring classes, and pretended sympathy with the laboring classes in their controversies with their employers, the long period of prosperity under Republican administration and Republican policy, during which our previous experiences under a tariff for revenue only were forgotten, and the general dissatisfaction with the existing order of things brought the Democratic party into power. But the threat of legislation hostile to our great industries, coupled with the power of the Democratic party to put the threat into execution, was sufficient to arrest the tide of our business prosperity and bring upon the country industrial and financial distress.

As the great industries of the country closed, laboring men learned, what those who had studied the question in the light of our history and experience knew before, that the prosperity of our great industries is necessary to their prosperity; that money invested in business industries must be idle unless it can be profitably employed; that idle capital means idle men, and idle men means starvation; that a hostile blow aimed at the manufacturing interests falls heaviest on the laboring classes. The experience of the country since the 4th of March last has taught the people a lesson which all the efforts of the friends of protection failed to teach.

The late contest in Ohio was fought squarely on national issues. The tariff question was the overshadowing issue. Governor McKinley, on the one side, represented the Republican

policy of protection, while Mr. Neal, the man who in the Democratic national convention of 1892 moved to strike out the tariff plank of the platform as reported from the committee, which contained a recognition of the fact that there is a difference in wages in this country and in foreign countries, and which also contained a promise that existing industries should not be ruthlessly destroyed by a revision of the tariff, and who in lieu thereof submitted a resolution declaring that protection was robbery and unconstitutional, represented, on the other side, the tariff-for-revenue-only policy. The result was a sweeping victory for protection. The Republican majority in Ohio was the largest ever given in that State, except when Vallandigham was beaten in the midst of the war of the rebellion.

Accepting the claim insisted upon by the Democrats that in electing Mr. Cleveland the people indorsed, and, so far as their votes went, committed the Government to the policy of a tariff for revenue only, then our Democratic friends, in order to be consistent, must acknowledge that the evidences that public sentiment concerning the tariff has changed since the election of Mr. Cleveland, as afforded by the result of the late elections, are not confined to Ohio. The victories in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, and Iowa leave no room for doubt that there has been a complete revulsion of public sentiment on the question. We have witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the Democratic governor and leading Democrats of a great State, committed by their national Democratic platform to the doctrine that protection is robbery and unconstitutional, pleading with a committee of another branch of Congress for the continuance of protection to the industries of their State.

Mr. President, ordinarily I would not attempt to prevent the Democratic majority from committing an act that would prove to be political suicide; but so great and disastrous will be the consequences of a destruction of the protective system, that I sincerely hope our Democratic friends will pause in their purpose to force free trade upon the people of the United States, and that they will take notice of the changed public sentiment of the country, and taking this notice, they will cease in their efforts to destroy the industries of the country.

Mr. BERRY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

ALEXANDER AND CHALMERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General transmitting the papers in the claim of Alexander & Chalmers for service in defense of Indians; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments:

Mr. MAHON, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BUNDY, as a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, and also as a member of the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

ANNIE V. MUMFORD.

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk (H. Res. 101) for the relief of Annie V. Mumford, widow of Oliver Mumford, late captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

The joint resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I wish to ask the gentleman whether this case is an exception to the class of cases covered by the bill which passed the Senate a few days ago?

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. I think not. I think this case will be covered by that bill if it ever becomes a law.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I see no occasion for this special legislation, as a bill passed the Senate a few days ago, which will soon come before the House and which will comprehend all such cases as this.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the pending appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. HATCH in the chair).

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the pending bill, the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on Saturday last unanimous consent had been given that general debate should be closed to-day at the expiration of three hours, an hour and a half to be under the control of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] and an hour and a half under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if it be agreeable to the minority, we will begin the debate this morning, and I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I had no thought of taking any part in this discussion, nor would I do so now were it not that gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber have charged the present Administration with being unfriendly to our Union soldiers. Especially have they mentioned in that connection the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions. Mr. Chairman, I deny the charge. I confess that my relations with the President are not of that intimate, confidential, social character claimed by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN]. [Laughter.] I have never been taken into his confidence, never invited to his councils. I have not talked with him on the question of finance, the question of pensions, the question of tariff reform, or on the Hawaiian affair; in fact, I have never talked with him upon any question at all. I have been willing—as has every Democratic and Populist member of this House—to advise the President on these questions. I have been especially desirous to advise with him regarding the distribution of the political patronage of my Congressional district. And yet, Mr. Chairman, I have full faith and confidence in President Cleveland, and I am in full accord with his Administration. I know him to be an honest man and a just man, and, as such, I know him to be the friend of the honest soldier. It has been my good fortune to have come into closer relations with the Secretary of the Interior. Prejudiced at first, from my acquaintance I have learned to honor and to respect him. He is a big, broad-gauged, brainy man, as honest and as just as God makes men, and the honest soldier need have no fear from his administration of the affairs of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, it would ill become me as a Representative from the State of Minnesota to sit silently in my seat while gentlemen on the other side of this House are impugning the motives and questioning the actions of the Commissioner of Pensions, one of the most distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth I have the honor in part to represent. After an intimate acquaintance with the character and reputation of Judge Lochren for nearly a score of years, I say without qualification that the men who fought to preserve intact the Union of States, which we all love, have no firmer friend, no warmer champion, no more self-sacrificing comrade than the gentleman who presides to-day over the Pension Bureau. For three years, commencing in April, 1861, William Lochren was himself a soldier, enlisting in the ranks in a regiment which has gone into history as one of the bravest, truest, and best organizations that graces the annals of our country.

He was, sir, the full partner of the best and bravest in all the sufferings which have been so sentimentally and so eloquently portrayed by our Republican friends. He endured the wearing marches; joined in the songs and story of the bivouac when the day's toil was over; was awakened at dawn by the same long roll, and went into the conflict carrying his life in his hand as ready as the readiest to deliver it up at the demand of patriotic devotion. He suffered with them uncomplainingly the cold blasts of the wintry wind and the torrid heat of the summer sun. He made acquaintance, as they, with wounds at Gettysburg and with disease in the fever-infected swamps of the Chickahominy. He

was no pampered soldier, with wealth, or position, or family influence that might provide for him a soft berth and hand down unearned promotion by the utterance of the wish.

Sir, through three years of storm and stress, from private soldier to the rank of captain, every honest step of his promotion was marked by scars, every sentence of his well-won commissions punctuated and accented by deeds of courage and constancy. He was the soldier without fear and without reproach. Is it necessary to recall to this House the heroic charge of the First Minnesota at Gettysburg—a charge that ranks with Thermopylæ in courage, in which more than 70 per cent of those engaged went down in wounds and death? Sir, there was no Minnesota name marked "missing" at the vesper roll call on that fatal 2d of July, 1863. Dead, or wounded, or present. Such is the record embalmed in the record division of the War Department in this city. Every man accounted for. No stragglers; no shirkers; no deserters; no coffee-coolers! My honored fellow-citizen, Judge Lochren, was one of the immortals of that famous charge—an event, Mr. Chairman, which stands to-day and will stand for all coming time as one of the sublimest acts of courage and devotion to duty embalmed in the history of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, does it look reasonable that any man with that history behind him could under any possible combination of circumstances be unfair or dishonest or ungenerous toward the comrades who marched beside him, fought with him, and suffered with him? Is it not a fact, sir, that all history shows that the purest and most self-sacrificing friendships are born of the comradeships of danger and distress and suffering?

Mr. Chairman, in Minnesota we all know Judge Lochren. We know him to be as brave, as faithful, as generous, as kindly as the Chevalier Bayard of old. But we know him to be just. In some of the details of his pension policy he may be mistaken, but in so far as one man can, he will stop peculation and rascality in that department of the civil government. He will have no pension attorney for a silent partner, no relative doing business "on the side" with that Bureau. If injustice is done to one of the suffering veterans it will be by accident, but I believe millions will through his efforts be saved to the people's Treasury from the chicane of pension sharks and undeserving claimants.

And the policy will be his policy. He will not hide behind President Cleveland or Secretary Smith, but will push forward courageously and honestly and faithfully, that justice may be done to the real, deserving veterans, as well as to those dishonest leeches who would fasten themselves upon the nation's Treasury.

Judge Lochren believes, as I do, that there is urgent need for pension reform; and for that reason he is, as I am, a pension reformer; a pension reformer from the soldier's standpoint, and in the interest of the worthy, deserving soldier.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlemen on the Republican side of this House oppose and resist all attempts in the direction of pension reform? Are they not alarmed at the tremendous annual expenditures for pensions? Can they believe that an honest pension roll would cost this Government $165,000,000 annually? Do they realize that this enormous expenditure is a tax, and that the people will soon weary of it; or has their experience in billion-dollar Congresses so familiarized them with enormous expenditures that this pension item is a mere bagatelle?

Does not the fact that six hundred and fourteen men on the pension roll from an Ohio regiment that served but one hundred days in the war, never in action, never on the skirmish line, never smelled the smoke of powder, never scented the battle even from afar, do not these facts excite a faint, nay, a strong suspicion that here was fraud and that an investigation is needed? If you ask me, as you have asked others, if I know of cases of pensions obtained through fraud, I answer yes, many of them, but I deny the right of any member here to demand of me the names of these pensioners. At another time and place I may give the names and prefer the charges, and, proving the charges, have these men stricken from the rolls.

I am a pension reformer in the interests of the worthy, deserving soldier. I desire to purify the pension rolls. I want to make it indeed a roll of honor. I do not believe that I offend any worthy, honest pensioner when I say that it is my belief that the pension roll is polluted by the names of cowards, perjurers, bounty-jumpers, and coffee-coolers. I say this as a soldier and a friend of the worthy, deserving soldier. I will do anything, more than has been done or more than is promised, for this class of soldiers, but I shall wage war against the men who are on the pension rolls through fraud. And yet the fault is not so much with the soldier who is pensioned through doubtful means as it is with the law that grants him the pension. In my judgment the pension act of 1890 is almost infamous. It invites the soldier to fraud and perjury. This backed up by the pension sharks, and instructions to the examining boards to deal liberally with applicants for pensions, and the sentiment encouraged by politicians which exists among our soldiers everywhere that the intent of the law of 1890 was to pension all soldiers—can we wonder that men honest in all things else have been dishonest in their methods for procuring pensions?

On Saturday last I charged the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] with too much indulgence of sentiment in his treatment of the pension question. Naturally the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] would indulge in sentiment. He was not a soldier, and therefore has a sentimental idea of the dangers, the privations, the hardships of the soldier. But the gentleman from Iowa was a soldier. He I doubt not has about the camp-fires of his army post, fighting over his battles again, agreed with the boys, as we all agree, that our years in the army, despite the hardships, the privations, and the dangers, were the happiest, the jolliest, and the best of all our lives. The laborer on our streets, in our mines suffers greater hardships, greater privations, and is liable to greater dangers in some instances than were the soldiers of our Army during the war. And if they knew the difference in conditions, would gladly change their toilsome days, their discomforts and privations for the better condition of the soldier.

I speak as one who had his full share of the privations, the hardships and the dangers of the Iron Brigade, a member of a regiment of that brigade that, I believe, did more fighting than any regiment in the United States service, and by the record of the War Department lost more men in battle than any other regiment in the Union armies. Nearly four year's service, twice wounded, seventeen months a prisoner in Southern prisons, I think I am competent to speak of the hardships, the privations, and the dangers of the soldier, and yet all these have I suffered to an equal extent in my experience in camp as a civil engineer. Why, Mr. Chairman, to many the war was a great, big, protracted picnic. And so I beg the gentlemen to discard some of their sentiment and get down to business on this pension question. And will these gentlemen claim that all this great army of pensioners are disabled as a result of their army service? Do they not know that the tendency of army life was to better the physical condition of men, and to lengthen rather than diminish the length of life? Was it patriotism that took us to the defense of the Union, or was it the hope of bounties and pensions? We used to hear much of the sentiment of patriotism. Now we hear little of patriotism, but a good deal of pensions. I have said that the pension law of 1890 was the worst that could have been enacted. There is the fault. A law which makes little or no distinction between the men of the call for the first three years' troops, in the spring of 1861, without bounty or promise of bounty, and the men who enlisted for ninety days, or the men who were drafted, or the men who were paid bounties of from hundreds to more than a thousand dollars, or the bounty jumpers, or the foreign hirelings, or deserters, coffee-coolers, and camp-followers. Under such a law is there not need for reform? And I say to our Republican friends, why have you not inaugurated this reform? Do so now, and let us follow and assist you in the good work. Why do you say to us, why do you say to me and my Northern friends, whenever the question of pension reform is raised in this House, "Hands off"? Is it because, as is charged, you own the soldier vote, and that under your pension legislation this vote is costing the people of this country $165,000,000 annually? In spite of your opposition, pension reform has got to come. The people can not and will not much longer stand this tremendous burden you have placed upon them.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the pensioner treats the pension law of 1890 almost as a huge joke. Let me give an incident which came under my own observation. I was in conversation with a pensioner whose pension was based on that painful, disagreeable disease, piles. I said to him that I had been a sufferer for twenty years from that disease, and had found relief and a permanent cure from a surgical operation; and I suggested such treatment in his case, assuring him that the expense would not exceed $25. "Surgical operation be damned!" was his reply; "I wouldn't take $500 for these piles. No piles, no pension." [Laughter.]

I have said that in the interest of the worthy, deserving soldier I am in favor of pension reform. They have nothing to fear from the reform I would work; not one of that worthy, noble band of heroes would I disturb. I would do more than pension them. I would scatter them about in the employment of the Government Departments of this beautiful city. They should have the preference in all Government employment regardless of their political faith. [Applause.] We have not done enough, we can not do too much for the worthy, deserving men who have preserved to us this glorious Union. I hope a reform has begun which will purify our pension roll and make it what our worthy, deserving soldier would have it, a roll of honor. I believe the provision of the bill now pending appropriating $200,000 for special examiners, is in the line of pension reform, and for that reason I shall vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the time of Mr. BALDWIN expired.

On motion of Mr. MORGAN, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BALDWIN to print the remainder of his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois was recognized and yielded thirty minutes to Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MORSE, desired five minutes additional on Saturday, which he was unable to obtain, I now yield him that amount of time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] for yielding to me a portion of his time.

Mr. Chairman, I was unable to conclude my speech on Saturday evening, and asked unanimous consent, to which objection was made, to incorporate in my remarks what I now send to the Clerk's desk to have read. Before it is read I desire to say that among the wrongs and harm done the pensioners by the present policy of the Pension Bureau in suspending the soldier's pension without notice and without a hearing, and through the medium of the present secret spy system—I say among the wrongs done the soldier is the constant fear created in the mind of all the pensioners of the country that their little stipend, upon which they have come to depend, may be stopped at any moment, and that the next mail may bring the appalling news, "suspended."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has correctly stated that many of the pensioners are old men now. While many of the soldiers are still in the vigor of manhood, all of us members of this House that served in the army on either side of the great struggle that began at Sumter in 1861 and ended at Appomattox twenty-eight years ago next April—I say that those of us that served on either side of the great struggle are boys no more; with us all the shadows are lengthening, and the soldiers of the war of the rebellion are on the sunset side of this mortal life.

Many of the pensioners are now old men, suffering from disease and wounds and disabilities of increasing years; some no doubt weak in body and mind both.

I send to the Clerk's desk to be read an extract from the last report of the chairman of the board of trustees of the Massachusetts Soldiers' Home, who happens to be no less a person than John G. B. Adams, at present commander-in-chief of the national department of the Grand Army of the Republic. Commander Adams describes the effect of this fear upon the inmates of the home, and gives an illustration of the one of the fraudulent pensioners discovered by Commissioner Lochren and described by the President in his message. I send the same to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Within the past six months another trouble has arisen that has caused much anxiety and unhappiness to our sick men; that is, the constant fear that they will be suspended from the pension rolls, and their families be deprived of what they now receive. This anxiety is not without cause, for the ax of the Commissioner of Pensions has already fallen. In order that you may fully understand the case, I include it in this report.

Silas Force, formerly of Company A, Second Massachusetts Infantry, was admitted to the home June 23, 1893. August 8 he received the following letter:

"[3-510. Finance division. E. M. E. S.]

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
"*Washington, D. C., August 7, 1893.*

"SIR: I have to advise you that it appears from medical evidence on file in this Bureau that you are not ratably disabled for earning a support by manual labor under act June 27, 1890, from the effect of disease of rectum. Payment of pensions on your certificate, No. 683768, has therefore been suspended, pending the receipt of such answers as you may desire to make; all statements of yourself or others to be made under oath. If after a period of sixty days from this date you have failed to satisfactorily rebut the evidence referred to, and no sufficient reason appears why an extension of time should be made, your name will be dropped from the pension roll.

"Such evidence must be submitted in the form of affidavit, and the envelope inclosing them to this Bureau should be addressed to the Commissioner of Pensions, and marked in the lower left-hand corner 'Finance Division.' This letter should be returned therewith.

"Very respectfully,

"WILLIAM LOCHREN,
"*Commissioner.*

"Mr. SILAS FORCE,
"*27 Spencer Avenue, Chelsea, Suffolk County, Mass.*"

Now, what are the facts in this case? Since Mr. Force was admitted to the home he has been a patient in the hospital, totally disabled; can not get from his bed to a chair; can not feed himself without assistance, and requires the constant attendance of another person. All these facts were known to the Pension Department months before the letter suspending him from the rolls was written, as in May last he forwarded an affidavit from Dr. Holbrook, of Revere, who was his attending physician, that he was totally disabled and would never again be able to perform manual labor; and this statement was supported by two reliable comrades belonging to the same post of the Grand Army, who had been acquainted with Mr. Force for the past ten years.

Mr. Force now being suspended, he can receive nothing until he again proves his claim and the suspension removed. Sworn certificates of his disability have been forwarded by Dr. Pratt, surgeon of the home, and statements made to the Pension Bureau by the superintendent and others in regard to his disability.

If it takes as long as it does to get an original pension Silas Force will be with his comrades "in the Home beyond the river," where no letters from the Pension Commissioner can trouble him.

Mr. MORSE. Referring to the position of the Pension Office in regard to the suspension of pensions and its interpretation of the disability act of June 27, 1890, and also with reference to the Commissioner's letter addressed to me in August last and given by him to the press—the following opinions from various newspapers covering a large section of the country, may be a source of information to the Commissioner, to Congress, and the country, and is added to my speech under the leave to print voted by the House:

[From the Boston Journal.]

BUMPTIOUS MR. LOCHREN.

The ostensible reason for the insulting letter which Pension Commissioner Lochren addressed to Congressman MORSE was that the latter had made use of a "penalty envelope" in sending to a veteran the reply of the Pension Bureau to his application, together with his own comments on the decision.

The penalty envelope in question had been sent to the Congressman by the Commissioner for the express purpose of permitting the former to forward the decision of the Bureau, and the offense of Mr. MORSE, if an offense was committed, was in inclosing or permitting his clerk to inclose his own letter with it. For this act, the Commissioner, in a letter happily without parallel in official correspondence for coarse and vulgar abusiveness, assumed to hold the Congressman up before Congress and the country as attempting to cheat the Government out of a 2-cent postage stamp.

This was all that the Commissioner's attack upon Congressman MORSE was founded on, and if the latter had been guilty of a technical violation of the law, in making this use of a penalty envelope, the letter of the Commissioner would still be a deplorable example of petty malignity.

It appears now, however, that there was not even a technical violation of the law, but that the use which the Commissioner accused the Congressman of making of the penalty envelope was precisely such a use as the law contemplates. Upon this point the following decision, reported by the Washington Post, is conclusive:

"A few days ago Mr. Edwin S. Hopkins, who is acting as secretary to Representative MOON of Michigan, inquired of the Post-Office Department whether a communication to a pensioner could be forwarded in the penalty envelope sent by the Pension Bureau containing the status of a claim. The question was examined into by Assistant Attorney-General Thomas, of the Post-Office Department, who in reply quoted the section of the postal laws and regulations which allows the penalty envelope to be used for 'official information and indorsements relating thereto.'

"Under the provisions of this section,' wrote Mr. Thomas, 'a member of Congress may make indorsements on a letter from the Pension Office sent to him for transmission to a claimant.'

"As this decision did not cover a letter inclosed with the papers from the Pension Office, another inquiry was made, eliciting a reply that the Congressman's letter need not be written upon the official papers, but could be separately inclosed."

If the Commissioner is not totally wanting in honor, it would seem fitting for him to make an apology for his exhibition of bad manners as public as his offense.

[From the New York Press.]

THE RETREAT OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

The pretense is advanced that the Cleveland Administration has merely "modified" its outrageous order arbitrarily suspending scores of thousands of Union pensioners and requiring them to reproduce testimony proving their right to draw pensions within sixty days or be dropped from the rolls. This pretense is a particularly thin and silly sham. The Administration has not "modified" its position toward the gray-haired men whose valor and patriotism upheld this Republic; it has been ignominiously driven from the stand it has taken.

For the present, at least, the rout of the soldier-haters is complete. Public indignation, aroused by the Press, has forced them to precipitate retreat. Not even Bourbonism is rash enough to invite certain disaster by defying public opinion or face assured defeat before the courts of justice.

The order of Mr. Cleveland's Secretary of the Interior reversing every principle of justice by assuming that Union veterans were guilty of fraud in drawing legally granted pensions, and requiring them to prove their innocence to the satisfaction of boards of Democratic partisans, was as indefensible in law as in morals. From the moment when the issue of the legality of Hoke Smith's wholesale suspension of pensions was raised by the Press, the outcome was certain. The Administration would have been overwhelmingly beaten if it had ventured to contest the point in the courts. The path of inglorious retreat was the only way out of the dilemma.

The Press will not hesitate in its championship of the interests of the men who crushed secession and human slavery. It will not fail to scrutinize with the utmost vigilance every move of the Administration which threatens injustice to Union veterans, their widows, or their orphans. It will keep up the fight for the rights of the soldiers until those rights are made secure by the return of the Republican party to power in the National Government.

[From the Biddeford (Me.) Journal.]

Comrade Lochren may have been a wise and impressive judge, but he is the lightest weight Commissioner of Pensions the country ever had. His vulgar 2-cent insult to Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts has earned him the contempt of self-respecting men of all parties.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren has a temper that he ought to be as much ashamed of as he should be of his treatment of some of his old comrades. The man who could write such a letter as that sent by Lochren to Congressman MORSE, of Massachusetts, is not fit to be at the head of the Pension Office.

[From the Hingham (Mass.) Journal.]

Congressman E. A. MORSE'S correspondence with Pension Commissioner Lochren is something funny. Lochren made a great mistake in a "2-cent" allusion. Supposing that Mr. MORSE did use a Government stamped envelope; what has that to do with the important question involved—a thoroughly disabled pensioner put on the rack? Lochren will be made to apologize. Mark it down.

[From the Cambridge (Mass.) Chronicle.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren ought to have known better than to accuse ELIJAH A. MORSE of trying to cheat the Government out of a 2-cent postage stamp. Those who know Mr. Morse know he isn't that kind of a man. His hand and purse are always open to the poor, and especially to the veteran soldier.

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine.]

There is reason to believe that the vigorous letter of Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE, of Massachusetts, to Commissioner Lochren, and the wide pub-

licity that was given to it, was very largely responsible for the back-down of the Pension Department from its high-handed policy of suspension.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Journal.]

Representative MORSE comes back at Commissioner Lochren for charging that he used a penalty envelope sent to convey information to a pensioner for private correspondence. Those who know the Massachusetts Representative, who was born Indiana, will laugh at the idea of his saving 2 cents, as he is not only wealthy, but generous and far above petty meanness. Mr. MORSE says his clerk might have used the envelope through ignorance, inclosing a private letter in it; but if that is the case, the envelope will show by the handwriting, and the Commissioner has the envelope.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier.]

As Pension Commissioner Lochren has been compelled to reverse himself in the matter of the veterans' suspension order, it is now in order for him to reverse himself in his indecorous conduct toward Congressman MORSE. As a late judge on the bench, with a favorable local reputation, Mr. Lochren ought to show some consideration for his former constituents by maintaining a dignified bearing in his new office.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette.]

Congressman E. A. MORSE, of Canton, will make the bumptious United States Pension Commissioner very weary before he gets through with him, or we miss our guess. Mr. MORSE does not stay crushed worth a cent, and this time he has just cause for complaint. The insinuation of the Pension Commissioner's letter, that a man of MORSE's standing, who is easily worth a million of dollars, would attempt to cheat the Government out of 2 cents by using a penalty envelope is too ridiculous to seriously consider.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press.]

The correspondence between Congressman MORSE and Pension Commissioner Lochren is interesting and spicy. So far the Congressman seems to have the best of it. To charge a Congressman with defrauding the Government of 2 cents is no answer to a serious accusation. The Commissioner seems to have a curious lack of tact. The country did regard the pension list as a serious burden, and believed that there were many frauds, but it did not ask and does not want a wholesale suspension for technical irregularities. Mr. Lochren might have done the country a service, but he seems to be engaged in making his Department odious.

[From the North Attleboro (Mass.) Chronicle.]

The pension discussion between Congressman MORSE and Commissioner Lochren has attracted much attention throughout the country. Partisans of the Commissioner seem to think that the Chief of the Pension Department sat heavily on Mr. MORSE and that the Congressman would not be able to rise. Mr. MORSE did his plain duty in the case and the Commissioner lowered himself greatly in the estimation of candid men by his treatment of the Congressman. There was too much of saying "you are another" by the official possessed of a little brief authority.

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Standard Union.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren was a judge before he took service under Mr. Hoke Smith, the eminent Georgian, who just missed the late war, but who is trying to make up for it by knocking out Union pensioners. Judge Lochren was also a Union soldier, but it isn't pleasant to dwell on that fact—what will impress the average reader who peruses the correspondence between him and the Hon. ELIJAH MORSE, member of Congress from Massachusetts, is the fact that Judge Lochren does not possess a judicial mind, the peculiar tone of his official communications warranting that belief. Mr. MORSE wrote in behalf of a constituent, a veteran whose pension had been monkeyed with by some of Smith's men, and it appears, by some inadvertence of a clerk, a Government "penalty" envelope was used. Mr. Lochren did not like Mr. MORSE's remarks, and permitted himself to speak of the Congressman as "an ill-informed demagogue," with "a capacity for willful and malignant lying," and also used the envelope incident on which to have a charge of "sordid meanness," intimating that Mr. MORSE was willing to violate a law of Congress "in order to save 2 cents"—a charge that only a Democratic mind seems capable of stooping to. Mr. MORSE'S offense was in standing up for a soldier whom Judge Lochren's chief had "turned down."

[From the St. Albans (Vt.) Messenger.]

Whatever may be the merits of the particular pension case about which a controversy has arisen between Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts and Pension Commissioner Lochren, there will hardly be two opinions as to the want of dignity displayed by the Commissioner in his reply to the Massachusetts member. It would not in the least affect the justice or injustice of the action of the Bureau in suspending a pensioner that Mr. MORSE used a Government penalty envelope to convey a letter to him, and the charge that he sought to "swindle the Government out of the sum of 2 cents" is puerile and contemptible in the extreme. Other portions of Mr. Lochren's letter savor altogether too much of bluster and billingsgate to be worthy of the Commissioner or the position he unfortunately occupies. Both the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates have need to learn that they do not embrace all there is of the Government of the United States, and that even a veteran pensioner has some rights they will be compelled to respect even if their claims for fair and courteous treatment are disregarded.

[From the Dover (N. H.) Republican.]

Commissioner of Pensions Lochren has got himself into a nice pickle by writing a saucy and impudent letter to Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts in regard to a veteran whom Mr. MORSE wants to get onto the pension roll. Judge Lochren shows himself to be as much of an ass and as bitterly opposed to veteran soldiers as his superior and master, Hoke Smith, is; both seem to be determined to cut off ten pensioners from the roll to every one they put on. How long are the patriotic people of this country going to suffer this sort of abuse of veterans to go on?

[From the Portsmouth (N. H.) Chronicle.]

In accusing Hon. E. A. MORSE of using a United States penalty envelope to save 2 cents, Commissioner Lochren shows that he is no gentleman but a man worthy to be the lickspittle of Hoke Smith and the other ex-Confederates who are now taking ample revenge upon the Union soldier for the beating they received thirty years ago. It is a pleasure to see that the better class Democratic newspapers condemn Judge Lochren in unmeasured terms for his insult.

[From the North Attleboro (Mass.) Chronicle.]

Commissioner Lochren has modified his decision regarding the suspension of pensions, so that no more suspensions will be made except in cases where the record plainly shows that the recipient of a pension is not entitled to it. The Commissioner should never have departed from this solid ground. In bringing about this result, the controversy with Congressman MORSE no doubt exerted the greatest influence. It is a great victory for Mr. MORSE, and we congratulate him on the vindication which has come to him in the action of the Department itself.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin.]

Commissioner Lochren was wrong again when he charged Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts with misusing a franked envelope. The Post-Office Department decides that Congressman MORSE violated no privilege. Gen. Lochren owes an apology to the gentleman from Massachusetts for his bad manners.

[From the Old Colony Memorial, Plymouth, Mass.]

WELL ANSWERED

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, who so ably represents this district in Congress, has, without distinction of party, always stood by the interests of the men who fought the war for the Union, himself having been one of the very first to go to the front when the call was made for defenders of the flag. He has no sympathy with the present policy of punishing patriotism which has obtained under the change of parties, and in his communication to Pension Commissioner Lochren shows the stuff of which he is made.

The letter is in answer to one from Mr. Lochren refusing to reopen examination of the case of a pensioner, William H. Rollins, of Brockton, which had been rejected on what appeared to Mr. MORSE and all others knowing the circumstances to be erroneous grounds. Lochren's answer was so ungentlemanly that the correspondence has attracted much attention, and the opinion of fair-minded men is that so boorish an official ought no longer to hold a position which he fills with such ill grace and manner, whatever may be his other qualifications.

The feeling at Washington is general that the wide publicity given the Morse-Lochren correspondence caused a back down of the Pension Office, as shown by a new rule governing suspension of pensions, issued on Friday morning.

[From the Plymouth (N. H.) Record.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren evidently thinks he is a "bigger man" than a member of Congress, and has written a letter scoring Congressman MORSE, of Massachusetts, for having inadvertently used a penalty-stamped envelope for private mail. Mr. MORSE replies in a dignified way, and it may be ardently hoped that this old soldier, whose sole occupation seems to be to beat old soldiers out of their pensions, will soon hear from the lively member from Massachusetts.

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Me.]

We publish elsewhere in this issue a scathing letter of Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE, of Massachusetts, in reply to a sloppy and vituperative communication from the Hon. William Lochren, the tool through whom Hoke Smith, of Georgia, does the dirty work of the ex-Confederacy in raiding the pensions of Union veterans. Mr. MORSE'S letter is dignified but vigorous. He refuses to descend from the level of a gentleman into the mire of billingsgate, or to employ the vituperative threats used by Commissioner Lochren, but he does not fail to make himself very clearly understood.

It will be remembered that Congressman MORSE has stated some significant facts which men who stood for the integrity of the Union in the dark days of civil strife will do well to seriously consider. Mr. MORSE is not in the slightest degree intimidated by the bullying tactics of Mr. Lochren. He is not a man to be disconcerted by the vaporings of political light-weights, especially such a one as Lochren, who is notoriously a mere figurehead; a political jumping jack operated by strings in the hands of Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and the ex-Confederate influences that dictate his action.

Mr. MORSE calls timely attention to the notorious fact that vastly more pensions are now being suspended or canceled than there are new ones issued. He sets the ratio at 10 to 1, which, judging from such reports as the department has deigned to make public, we should say was an exceedingly conservative estimate. Another fact that Mr. MORSE calls attention to is the appointment of ex-Confederates upon boards of pension examiners.

Some weeks ago the Journal called attention to work of the Pension Bureau under the Cleveland régime in making the boards of pension examiners solidly partisan. It cited as a case in hand the pension board at Augusta, which under Harrison was composed of two Republicans and one Democrat, and under Cleveland is composed of three Democrats, as an example of the way in which this work was being done. We did not apprehend at that time, however, that men who bore arms against their country would ever be placed in position to pass upon the disabilities of Union veterans; but such things appear to come naturally and easily under the sway of a Georgia Bourbon. The unholy and vindictive assault which is being made upon the pensions of Union veterans by men who were either active exponents of or sympathizers with treason during the dark days of the rebellion is well calculated to make the blood of loyal citizens boil with just indignation. In calling attention to its outrages and refusing to hold out false hopes to deserving veterans during the continuance of the present Administration, Mr. MORSE is doing the country and his constituents a most worthy service.

[From the Westboro (Mass.) Chronotype.]

Congressman MORSE and Pension Commissioner Lochren have been having a sharp tilt on the pension question, and for gentlemanly treatment MORSE has the best of it, and seemingly the most just cause.

[From the Philadelphia Press, August 23.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren was severely criticised by members of Congress to-day for the letter he wrote to Representative MORSE of Massachusetts, and which he has given to the public. There has been a growing feeling of dislike toward the Interior Department on the part of both Republicans and Democrats, because of the course that has been followed in making wholesale suspensions in pension cases. As shown in a recent article in the Press, these suspensions are really in effect a condemnation of a man before trial and a sentence to punishment without an opportunity to be heard. The policy has been openly condemned by so prominent an administration mouthpiece as Senator VOORHEES, and the feeling has been general that the head of the Interior Department and the head of the Pension Office, as well as the President himself, have very little sympathy with the veterans.

The letter made public to-day by Mr. Lochren, addressed to Mr. MORSE, discloses the Pension Commissioner in light of a bully. The Commissioner in this letter denounces Mr. MORSE in language that no gentleman would use toward another. He speaks of "specimen of Mr. MORSE'S capacity for willful and malignant lying," and of his "sordid meanness." He charges Mr. MORSE with "swindling" the Government out of 2 cents. The whole tenor of the letter and the language used, coming from the head of the most important Bureau in the Government, is generally condemned by members of Congress, as showing the Pension Commissioner to be a man unfit for his place.

Mr. MORSE intends to call the matter up in the House, and the policy of the Administration in making wholesale suspensions of pensions without giving the pensioners a hearing is likely to bring on a debate which will show that a great majority of the House does not uphold the Administration in that course. The subject has already been brought before the Senate, and if it were not for the silver debate it would be likely to occupy attention there also.

[From the New York Press, August 23.]

AND THIS IS LOCHREN.

As to the merits or demerits of the dispute between Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE and Commissioner of Pensions Lochren, the Press does not assume to judge

We do know, however, that a bureau official should at all times conduct himself with dignity, and answer all communications with politeness and decency.

Secretary Mr. Hoke Smith can not afford to sustain his subordinates in such cheap, discourteous bluster as this: In a letter, replying to Mr. MORSE, Mr. Lochren suggests that Mr. MORSE is an ill-informed "demagogue" with "a capacity for willful and malignant lying," and afflicted further with a development of "sordid meanness," which impels him to violate a law of Congress by wrongfully using a Government penalty envelope to convey a "silly libel," and thereby "swindle his Government out of the sum of 2 cents."

What manner of man is Lochren to thus fill up the Government copy-books and waste the time of Government stenographers in writing such balderdash as the above? And all because Mr. MORSE wanted some poor soldier's pension adjusted.

[From the Boston Traveler, August 28.]

AN UNWORTHY ANSWER.

Pension Commissioner Lochren, in his answer to Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE'S letter, has gravely erred, in temper, wording, and regard for official and personal propriety. Mr. MORSE'S letter was pertinent and courteous, and bore upon a matter in which he had the right to be actively interested.

That he should desire to bring to the attention of the Pension Department the case of a disabled soldier, who is in destitute circumstances and dependent upon charity, is certainly not to his discredit. To reply with a petty charge of the unwarranted use of an official envelope in another case for the purpose of cheating the Government out of 2 cents, is unworthy of the Pension Commissioner. Moreover, it is utterly beside the question. It is the "you're another" retort of the school-boy, and can not excuse the departmental delay in dealing with the deserving claim of one of the nation's defenders.

It is to be hoped that Mr. MORSE'S dignified rejoinder will recall the Commissioner to a sense of his duty, and that there will be no more bandying of picayune charges in a matter which is of vital import to a man who served his country in her hour of need.

[From the Boston Traveller, August 30.]

No one who regards the proprieties of official station in this country will defend for a moment the extraordinary response of Commissioner Lochren to Congressman MORSE, which the Traveller published a few days ago. As to the merits of the case in controversy we do not presume to judge, but nothing in that case can possibly excuse the indecency of the Commissioner's reply.

[From Boston Journal, August 29.]

COMMISSIONER LOCHREN'S OUTBREAK.

Pension Commissioner Lochren has a reputation for gallantry in the field, and he has usually been assumed to be a gentleman, but neither courage nor courtesy is apparent in his letter to Congressman MORSE. We do not support Mr. MORSE in all his controversies, but it must be clear to any unprejudiced person that in this instance he has been made the object of a petty insult, such as ought to be impossible in the relations between a Department officer and a representative of the people in the national House.

Mr. Lochren's attempt to present Mr. MORSE to Congress and the country as guilty of saving a 2-cent stamp by using a penalty envelope is a bit of cheap malice which hurts the man who makes the charge rather than the object of it. The charge is entirely unsupported, but all that it amounts to, on Mr. Lochren's own statement of it, is that in a penalty envelope which the Commissioner inclosed to Mr. MORSE for the purpose of forwarding to a pensioner the reasons of the office for refusing a pension, there was also sent a letter from Mr. MORSE to the pensioner, conveying his opinion of the transaction.

Whether the Congressman's clerk sent his letter in a separate envelope, or whether he was careless enough to inclose it in the same envelope which conveyed the explanations of the Pension Office, is a question which only a small-minded man could suppose would be of any public interest. The idea that Mr. MORSE intended to swindle the Government out of the value of a 2-cent stamp is too ridiculous to be seriously stated.

For his public acts we have felt that a good deal of allowance ought to be made for the Commissioner of Pensions, as the tool of the Georgian, Secretary Hoke Smith, who is at the head of the Department of which the Pension Office is a bureau. But this exhibition of small personal malignity is a painful surprise, and makes it difficult to respect the officer who is guilty of it.

[From Wellesley (Mass.) Review.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren has the notoriety of having written to Congressman MORSE the most scurrilous insulting letter that, it is safe to say, ever disgraced department official correspondence—so narrow, mean, and malicious as to have been an antidote to its own poison, and made its author contemptible for his vicious attempt at spiteful revenge.

The Commissioner addressed an open letter to a pensioner of MORSE'S district for his indorsement, in an official "penalty envelope" as customary. MORSE made his reference to the matter on another sheet instead of indorsement of the Commissioner's letter and forwarded in same inclosure to his constituent, as he had a perfect right to do under postal regulations. Whereupon the Commissioner calls him liar and swindler, in trying to cheat the Government out of 2 cents by meanly and illegally using the official envelope for private use. Now that Lochren is publicly exposed as an "ignoramus," as well as a blackguard, he will best serve his own interests by apologizing to MORSE and subsiding to common official decency.

The following, from an indignant physician, is self-explanatory and a specimen of other letters I have received from the medical profession:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *September 9, 1893.*

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE:

DEAR SIR: I wish to express to you the interest the whole medical profession will have in regard to the stand you have taken in regard to pensions. The Pension Bureau seems to regard all veterans and physicians as liars, and of late seems to utterly ignore our (sometimes) hard work in making out affidavits. He does not seem to recognize the fact that an honest physician will not examine a pension applicant unless he thinks his case a just one. During a practice of seventeen years I have suffered mental disturbance on account of injustice done to deserving soldiers, and have seen some of them die before their pensions were granted. One case that I am interested in now is H. P. Gavitt, of this city, who has double hernia, produced by kick of a horse while on duty. He has had his papers completed for a year or more, and has been required to send duplicates, but can get no satisfaction from the Commissioner. And Hon. NELSON ALDRICH has written two or three times in regard to it, but the Commissioner does not condescend to answer the Senator at all.

One of the cases you have taken up—Rollins, I think his name is; the one with the injured eye—is liable to be much worse than he is now, for it would not be strange if he lost the other eye by sympathetic ophthalmia.

I hope that you will be able to teach the Commissioner manners as well as morals, and you may be sure of the hearty support of many outside as well as in your district.

Respectfully, yours,

———.

The above is from an eminent physician. I regret that I have not permission to use his name.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the appropriation made by this bill contemplates an expenditure for special pension examiners twice as large as that of last year and of the year before, with a force twice as large, it seems to me that there should be some further explanation than has yet been given of the necessity for such an increase.

If the purpose of this increased appropriation is to enable the Pension Office to investigate applications now pending for pensions, with reference to expediting the same, either for allowance or for rejection, there can be no question of its propriety. And yet, when I look at the work which the Pension Office has been accomplishing during the past six months in this direction, with a force already 50 per cent larger than last year, I must confess that I do not see any increase of adjudications to justify the increased cost of a force enlarged from 139 last March to 241 on November 1. Indeed, there have been 35 per cent less adjudications in the first four months of the present fiscal year than in the same period of the preceding fiscal year; showing that, whatever may have been the object in enlarging this force, the increase has not resulted in expediting the adjudication of cases in the Pension Office.

If, on the other hand, the object of the increase is to investigate in good faith probable fraudulent pensioners now upon the rolls, and there is any reason to believe that the force is not already large enough for this purpose, there will be no objection to any increase required by the public interests.

The only question which is raised in my mind in reference to these points arises from the fact that nothing has been presented thus far in any information that has been laid before the committee which seems to show that there is a necessity for such a largely increased force for either of these legitimate objects. Yet in matters of administration like this, where the administrator must be left to his own judgment, in large measure at least, as to expenditures for the purpose of promoting the public interests, I do not feel justified in standing in the way of whatever appropriation the responsible majority of this House may think necessary.

While taking this position with reference to this expenditure, I desire to add that from remarks which have been made on the other side, especially by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], it would seem that this increase of expenditure is justified by them mainly on the theory that the pension list is "honeycombed with fraud." The gentleman from Tennessee has made that distinct charge. Even the President of the United States in his recent message to Congress has stated that there are "gigantic and wholesale frauds" to such an extent that "thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners."

Mr. Chairman, I desire to take exception to this increase of expenditure so far as it is placed upon any such assumption as that. There is nothing in any of the facts that have been presented either to the committee or to Congress that justifies any such theory. The gentleman from Tennessee was pleased to say that we on this side of the House are criticising this increased expenditure and this increased force because we do not desire to remove fraudulent pensioners from the roll. I repel the insinuation as unjust and unfounded. Wherever any appropriate measures can be taken with a view of removing from the roll any fraudulent pensioner, I am sure that this side of the House will cheerfully coöperate in any appropriation that may be necessary for the purpose of accomplishing this object. What we and all other friends of the Union soldier object to is the attempt to create the impression that the pension roll is honeycombed with fraud, with a view of discrediting the pension system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without detaining the committee at this time with any general discussion of the pension question that may be at issue, I wish to call attention in the first place to the fact that the investigations into alleged or suspected cases of fraudulent pensioners by this increased force of special examiners in the eight months from March 4 to November 1 clearly show that there is no foundation for the charges that the pension rolls are honeycombed with wholesale and gigantic frauds. These special examiners in the field have been increased from an average of 155 last year to 241 on the 1st of November. During these eight months there have been referred to and reported on by examiners in the field 1,560 cases of alleged or suspected fraudulent pensions.

These 1,560 cases referred and reported upon have shown only 388 cases where pensioners have been dropped from the roll on account of alleged fraud—in many cases only technical fraud. It must be supposed that all cases of alleged or suspected fraud

have been referred to the force in the field for investigation; yet the whole number so far reported upon (and undoubtedly these cases have been made special) has been only 1,560; and the whole number in which the allegation of fraud has been sustained is only 388.

And I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in a corresponding period of last year, with a force in the field very much less than now, when there was no studied attempt made in official circles to create the impression that wholesale frauds existed in the pension rolls, 345 pensioners were dropped from the rolls for frauds in cases reported by those special examiners then in the field. So that with this increased force only 43 more cases of fraud have been sustained by the investigations of this force in the field than were sustained by the reduced force with the reduced expenditure one year ago.

Now, when you bear in mind the small proportion of these cases of alleged or suspected fraudulent pensioners upon the roll, only 1,560 cases committed to and reported on by the force in the field in eight months, and only 388 in which the reports sustain the allegation, and when you bear in mind that on the 1st day of July last there were 966,000 pensioners upon the pension roll—743,643 of them Union soldiers and sailors—you will see at once how exceedingly small the percentage of fraudulent names upon the rolls must be.

And I say now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], who has made these allegations of wholesale fraud, as well as to President Cleveland, that there can not be shown in the adjudications of any court of claims in the land a smaller proportion of fraudulent or improper adjudications than is shown in the case of the Pension Bureau. I say further to the gentleman that I should be entirely willing to compare the determinations by Congress itself, approved by the President, of applications or claims on account of war claims, so called, with the adjudications in the Pension Office, and I am sure that the Pension Bureau would not suffer in the comparison.

I have alluded, Mr. Chairman, to these facts for the purpose of removing from the mind of the House and so far as possible from the public mind the impressions which seem to have prevailed for sometime in view of the allegations which have been made, that the pension roll was "honeycombed with fraud"—meaning by that to carry the impression that the proportion of fraud was so large as to make the adjudications by the Pension Bureau an exceptional object of criticism and condemnation as compared with the adjudication of claims by any other court or quasi court in the land.

In all things human it inevitably happens that there are imperfections. There is no court whose adjudications are always right. There is no body of men, no organization on the face of the earth, that does not contain some men who ought not to occupy that place.

What I object to, Mr. Chairman, is the constant presentation of the small proportion of the fraudulent cases that are proved in connection with pension adjudications, the parading of them before the public as if they were specimens of the general character of the work that is done in the Pension Bureau. I am sure that when we fully examine the facts we shall find that the adjudications of the Pension Office, considering the magnitude of the work that has been accomplished, considering the difficulties inevitably attending that work, have been on the whole wonderfully correct and wonderfully free from fraud. Even the Norfolk and the New Mexico cases which have been alluded to were not all cases of pensioners already upon the rolls; they were in part, at least, cases of applications for pensions where the pension attorney had forged evidence, where, of course, the examiners in the field were called upon to look up the evidence of fraud in that connection. In many of the cases the claimants had not been placed upon the roll.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow an interruption there?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I think the gentleman will find that he is mistaken. If he will examine the testimony he will find that some of these have been placed on the roll.

Mr. DINGLEY. Some of them have been, but as I understand the great mass of them have not been.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But if the gentleman will examine the testimony he will find he is mistaken in that statement.

Mr. DINGLEY. Well, I have been informed that the great mass of those where forgery had been alleged or proved were not placed on the roll.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to say to my friend from Maine, if he will permit me, that that is just where he is mistaken. They were on the rolls.

Mr. DINGLEY. All of the cases?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I can not say that all of them were, but the great majority—nearly all.

Mr. DINGLEY. However that may be, Mr. Chairman, my experience in dealing with the Pension Office in the adjudication of pension claims is that when a name has been improperly placed upon the rolls by fraudulent means it does not take but a short time for the neighbors of such person, or someone connected with him, who has discovered the fraud, to report the facts to the Pension Office.

But, as I was about to say, we must all admit that in all human affairs there is a liability to some errors and some fraud. It can not be avoided, and all that can be done is to endeavor to prevent, so far as possible, any such frauds from creeping in; but this does not justify the use of them as an argument against the whole system.

Mr. Chairman, neither is there anything arising from the large number of suspensions of pensions under Secretary Hoke Smith's order of May 27 which justifies the inference which has been made, that they show gigantic and wholesale frauds. On the contrary, the result of these suspensions proves the reverse. Over 12,000 pensioners—12,822, I believe, to be exact—were suspended under this order between the 27th day of May last and the 1st day of November. Now, the impression that was given when these suspensions were made was that the pension roll was honeycombed with fraud, and that this was an effort to purge it.

Yet as a matter of fact within three months from the time of these suspensions the Pension Office itself, in most cases without a single scrap of new evidence being presented, on their own motion, or rather under a modified order of Secretary Smith, incited thereto undoubtedly by popular indignation, restored 9,128 of the suspended 12,822 pensioners and resumed the payment of their pensions. This act of itself shows that the action of the Pension Office under the order of Secretary Smith, on the 27th of May last, was unjustifiable and was confessed by the Secretary himself to be such, and that it was a wholesale assault on the pensioners of the land, without any justice or justification or good reason; because if there had been any just cause for continuing the suspension of these 9,000 soldiers they would not have been restored to the rolls without new evidence.

And there is no pretense now that any considerable number of the remaining 3,700 pensioners still suspended November 1, were suspended for any fraud or for any cause except the fact that Secretary Smith had so changed the construction of the law of 1890 from the construction which had been given to it for two years and a half, that a large number of soldiers pensioned under the old construction of the law had now been declared by Secretary Smith to be no longer entitled to pension under his construction of that law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we look at all of these facts it seems to me that the evidence is as conclusive as any evidence can possibly be that there is no ground for the cry which has been set up from one end of the country to the other that the pension rolls of this land are so honeycombed with fraud that there must be such unjust proceedings instituted as we have seen in the last six months, in order that they may be restored to their proper condition.

I desire again to emphasize the fact that, so far as there are any names on the pension rolls that are fraudulent, I am sure that no gentleman in this House, no friend of the Union soldier desires to interpose any objection to the purifying of the list from the names of any which should not be upon them. What we object to, Mr. Chairman, upon this side of the House, what the Union soldiers of the country object to, is the attempt under this general cry of wholesale and gigantic fraud to create prejudice and hostility to the whole system of pensions and thereby injure the interests not only of the Union soldiers but of that great portion of our people who sympathize with them and believe that to the men who went forth, taking their lives in their hands in the defense of the Union, we owe the fact that to-day we have a nation.

We object to any action in this respect unjust and discriminating in its character. We say that whenever a name is placed upon the pension rolls payment should not be suspended until the pensioner himself has had notice and an opportunity to be heard in his own defense, and then, if it can be shown that he is not entitled to be the recipient of the pension which a grateful Government gives, let him be dropped from the rolls. But this wholesale suspension of men from the pension rolls without an opportunity to be heard or to present any evidence, after adjudication of their rights by a department of the Government, and this branding of them throughout the country as fraudulent pensioners, we condemn as wrong and unjustifiable; and in behalf of the Union soldiers of the country, speaking for them as I think I may, I protest with all my heart against such an indignity.

I desire to say right here, before taking my seat, as an act of justice to the Commissioner of Pensions, that when interrogated by the Committee on Appropriations he disclaimed the belief that there were wholesale and gigantic frauds upon the pension rolls, and I call attention to exactly what he did say in response to the questions propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

CANNON]. It will be observed, too, that he was speaking in this connection of persons not placed on the roll, but of applications for pensions where there was more liability to be cases of forgery or fraud than in the cases of the names which had been already placed on the rolls.

I quote from the hearings before the committee:

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In your judgment what percentage of claims is fraudulent?
Mr. LOCHREN. I could not give you any percentage.
Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it not exceedingly small compared with the whole?
Mr. LOCHREN. It is not large, I trust.
* * * * * * *
Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And really, dishonesty is the exception?
Mr. LOCHREN. I think that is true in all human transactions.

To the credit of the Commissioner of Pensions let it be said, that when examined by the Committee on Appropriations in reference to this matter, he disclaimed any responsibility for the representations which have been made all throughout this country that the pension roll was honeycombed with fraud, filled with gigantic and wholesale frauds. On the contrary, he intimated without question his belief that the proportion of frauds upon the pension roll is no larger than in the case of any other human transaction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with that fact in view, that so far as the pension roll is concerned the proportion of fraudulent names is no larger than in the adjudications of any court of claims, or the adjudications in Congress itself, I ask you why there should be circulated broadcast throughout this land the impression, put in exact words, almost, that this pension roll is honeycombed with fraud? For I say to you that the investigation thus far made, even the investigation of the Commissioner of Pensions, has shown that the percentage of frauds is exceedingly small; and the attempt to create the impression of the existence of exceptional fraud in pension adjudications, when a similar charge is not presented against the courts of the land, is unjust and uncalled for. [Applause on Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COOPER].

[Mr. COOPER of Indiana addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

[Mr. BINGHAM addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS].

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to that part of this appropriation which is to be used, as the Commissioner says, for the purpose of helping out the pending cases; that part of it which is to be used by examiners in getting evidence, that the applicants are not strong enough or able to procure. That is all right. I am only opposed to using this appropriation for the purpose of hunting down pensioners whose pensions have heretofore been granted by the various Pension Commissioners who have held that office.

The great argument which the Democratic party advances against the whole pension business is the argument of economy. It has been the policy of this country not to have a standing army. Instead of having a standing army, we rely upon a volunteer army; and in all the wars in which we have been engaged, we have always agreed with the volunteer when he enlisted that we would pay him a certain sum per month for the time he was in the service, take care of him if wounded or disabled, and take care of his family if he was killed.

That is a part of the contract, in every war, with every volunteer; and as soon as the war is over the volunteer goes back to his farm or to his work bench and ceases to be a soldier. Now, if we had a standing army, as Germany has, of 500,000 men, it would cost this country $400,000,000 to maintain it. We have no such standing army. Our few regulars cost us about $20,000,000 a year, and there are just about enough of these for national police. Adding that to the pensions, our whole military establishment does not cost us more than $180,000,000. That is much less than the cost of maintaining an army of defense by any of the great powers.

Has the volunteer the right to have his contract fulfilled on our part? He certainly has.

Every Congress that has heretofore had the subject under consideration has voted that he has. I do not suppose that the Democratic party to-day would give any soldier a pension if the question was considered *de novo*. But pensions have been granted. We have a pension roll, and it is not very convenient to abolish it. Now, what is a pension? The law establishes it, and the law establishes a court before which a claimant shall appear and present his case. That court is presided over by a judge. That judge is the Commissioner of Pensions; and when he has passed upon a given case, he has decided the law and the facts of that case, and that case enters into a judgment, and is *res adjudicata*; and you can not take that man's right to a pension away except under some known mode of attacking a judgment.

The Government may appeal from the judgment to the Secretary of the Interior, but that is never done. You may attack it for fraud; but you must allege your fraud. Fraud is never presumed. You must not only allege it, but you must prove it; and until you prove it the pensioner holds his pension; and if Grover Cleveland or any other man suspends it, then he commits an act in violation of law. He commits an arbitrary and despotic act.

I agree that if you give the man notice that he has obtained a fraudulent judgment granting him a pension, and give him an opportunity to appear and cross-examine the witnesses against him, and have his day in court, then, if the judge finds that he did get his judgment fradulently, it is all right to set it aside; but if you do not take that course, you commit a violation of the law, and when this administration suspended 20,000 pensioners because it disagreed with a former Commissioner who had passed upon the cases, it acted in violation of law, and its action can not be sustained.

What right has one judge to sit in review of another judge of coördinate jurisdiction? None whatever. What right, for instance, has Commissioner Lochren to sit in review of Commissioner Dudley or Commissioner Raum? Does not the law give to each of them the same jurisdiction? Were not Dudley or Raum charged with the same duty, to pass upon cases, that Lochren has, and when either of them has passed upon a case, can another Commissioner reverse his action because he differs with him upon the law or the facts? Not at all. You can not appeal sidewise from one judge to another of the same jurisdiction. If this were not so, one Commissioner of Pensions might spend his entire time and employ the entire force of the Pension Bureau in reëxamining the cases decided by his predecessors.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Suppose this case, which has actually occurred. A man obtained a pension under the law on the ground that he had served ninety days, and it turned out that he had been only thirty days in the service; does the gentleman think that he ought to continue to receive that pension?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I will answer the gentleman. When they have notified that man that he has got a pension wrongfully, that he was only thirty days in the service, and have given him a chance to show that they are mistaken, and then they have gone forward and proved their case, of course he should not longer receive the pension.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But *pendente lite* he must have the pension; is that the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Yes, sir. There is no power given by law to suspend a pension *pendente lite*. The fraud must be proved before the pension can legally be suspended.

The Commissioner might mistake the law and hold that thirty days' service entitled him to a pension. It may have been an error of fact. Whether it be an error of law or an error of fact, it must be legally established before the pension can legally be suspended.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. When the record shows that he served only thirty days instead of ninety days, must he continue to draw the pension pending further inquiry?

Mr. PICKLER. The record does not show that, or else he would not have got his pension.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It does show that.

Mr. TRACEY. The records of the War Department would show it.

Mr. PICKLER. No sir; that is an impossibility as the gentleman puts the case.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. The sweeping accusation of the President against Union veterans and the widows of Union veterans finds no support in the facts. He said:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds.

I represent a district which has in it nineteen towns and a city divided into twenty wards—a present population of at least 200,000. At the latest Congressional election in that district 41,321 votes were cast, being 15,752 more than were cast at the same election in the district of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], who made his usual vituperative and dyspeptic speech against the old veteran pensioners on Saturday, and 25,142 more than were cast at the election in the Fifth district of Georgia, represented by the leader on this floor of the attack on the Union soldiers and their widows who draw pensions. In fact the vote in my district lacks but 427 of being equal to the combined votes of the districts represented by these two gentlemen.

The gentleman from Georgia could name but one case of fraud in his district, while the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe, could mention none. These frauds are always afar off. They are in New Mexico or Iowa or Norfolk.

Charges of frauds in pension cases have been made by Southern Democrats continually, ever since the first pension was granted to a Union soldier. There is nothing serious in it. That there should now and then be a fraudulent case, out of more than a million of claims, is to be expected. But the frauds in pension cases, so far as they have been ascertained, are far less in proportion than in banking or any department of business.

It is the interest of every honest pensioner that no one should receive a pension unjustly, and when this extraordinary charge appeared in President Cleveland's message, it immediately attracted the attention of Commander-in-Chief John B. Adams, of the Grand Army of the Republic, and his response came with the directness and vigor characteristic of the man. He issued a general order calling attention to the President's statement, and urging comrades, posts, and departments to—

report to the honorable Commissioner of Pensions, Washington, D. C., any person known to be in receipt of a pension not justly entitled to the same under the law, and to forward a duplicate of said report to these headquarters at once. Let the cases of fraud be proven, not implied.

Commander Adams also improved the opportunity to say in his order:

The information that comes to these headquarters daily of comrades totally disabled whose pensions have been suspended, and of widows, whose husbands were killed in battle, being suspended until they can prove that their husbands were naturalized citizens of the United States, leads the commander-in-chief to believe that the statement is broader than can be substantiated by facts. If these wrongs actually exist, the commander-in-chief pledges the support of the Grand Army of the Republic to those who attempt in the line of duty to rectify these wrongs, assuring them that the Union veterans are as anxious to guard the Treasury of the nation in time of peace as they were to defend its flag in time of war.

Now, to return to Monroe County, N. Y., which comprises the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this House. As I have already said, there are twenty wards and nineteen towns in that district, and probably at least half a thousand neighborhoods, and several thousand veterans. In 1881, in order to disclose frauds if any existed, the veil of secrecy was removed from the pension roll, and the name, residence, and amount of pension of every pensioner, with the designation of his company and regiment and the amount of pension, was gazetted in the public press. There were just about one thousand pensioners then in my district, and their names were published in the four daily papers of Rochester, and in some of the weeklies. There were on an average about two pensioners to a neighborhood.

Not a single fraudulent case was discovered. And I may add that my district is a fair sample in this respect of the whole country. The case is not different now. Judge Lochren, the Commissioner of Pensions, when questioned on the subject by the Committee on Appropriations, said:

I think that there have been instances where considerable frauds are shown to have been committed, as in Norfolk, New Mexico, and to a certain extent in Iowa. The examination of cases has developed the fact that the claims have come through attorneys who are shown to have been engaged in the commission of extensive frauds. The principal cases occurred at the places I have mentioned.

The only frauds which are mentioned are frauds alleged to have been committed by pension attorneys. No soldier or soldier's widow has committed any fraud. No one will justify or apologize for frauds of attorneys. The attorneys who are charged with fraud are exceedingly few in number.

There is one at Norfolk, one in New Mexico, and one in Iowa, and no others mentioned. These are all that can be found in the forty-four States and four Territories. And we have had during the last year 247 men on the hunt for them. Two hundred and forty-seven special examiners ought to find a good many fraudulent pensioners if, as the President declares, "fraudulent pensioners" exist in thousands of neighborhoods. It does not appear that this battallion of 247 special examiners have found a single "fraudulent pensioner" in any neighborhood. It does appear that there are 2,753 cases in which fraud "is alleged or suspected."

It does appear that 15,698 pensions were suspended between May 1 and November 1, 1893, and many before that, and that 8,871 cases remained suspended on November 1, 1893. These suspensions were on suspicion and not on evidence. The fact that between May 1 and November 1, 1893, nearly 10,000 suspended cases were resumed, shows that there was no legal evidence against the pensioners. The amount of money of which pensioners have been deprived by these improper suspensions from May 1, 1893, to December 1, 1893, is $1,130,259.06.

In overruling his predecessors, the Commissioner has obeyed, without doubt, the directions of his superiors, the Hon. Hoke Smith, Secretary of the Interior, and the Hon. Grover Cleveland, President of the United States. Judge Lochran was a soldier himself and all his sympathies are naturally with the Union veterans. The raid on the pensioners is ordered by the President. The libelous defamation of the pensioners was uttered by him in his message. What has been done against the pensioners has been ordered to be done by the President of the United States. He and his party must bear the responsibility.

I quote the following answers of Commissioner Lochren to questions submitted to him by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in his recent hearing before that committee:

The CHAIRMAN. There is in the urgency deficiency bill an estimate of $300,000 for a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of special examiners for 1894. Will you please explain to the committee why you ask for this sum?

Mr. LOCHREN. We have in the hands of the special examination division for examination between 17,000 and 18,000 cases. The present appropriation with the force in the field will not last more than three months, or until January. Unless there is an increase in the force those cases will have to wait.

The CHAIRMAN. Under your present distribution of examiners and with the number of cases undergoing examination the appropriation would expire in January, so that if you continue the examination of present cases and such other cases as may arise, which you think it will be proper to examine, there would be no money to do that work after January?

Mr. LOCHREN. Not after some time in the latter part of January.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the character of these 17,000 or 18,000 cases which are now undergoing examination?

Mr. LOCHREN. The character is various. In a large part of them the testimony which has been furnished by the claimants is not sufficient apparently, and they have sent special examiners into the field to get the testimony the claimants are unable to get—testimony of parties of whom the Bureau has knowledge but whose testimony the claimants are unable to get. These are perhaps the largest class of cases. In all the other cases the testimony is doubtful and unsatisfactory, and we have to reexamine witnesses whose testimony has been presented. There is also a class of cases where the testimony is suspicious, and to get other witnesses whose testimony would be necessary or which would show fraud, as the case might be. Generally it is for the purpose of getting at the truth where evidence is not satisfactory to the examiners in the Bureau, or where it fails to be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. In what mode is an examination of these cases inaugurated?

Mr. LOCHREN. The board of review sends cases down to the special examination division for the purpose of a special examination. They are looked over, and if it is deemed proper that they ought to be sent to the field, they are sent to the examiner who is stationed at the place nearest to the residence of the witness, and he is instructed as to what particular points the examination is to cover. In the course of his examination he may find, and often does, that he can examine other witnesses.

It is all right to aid claimants and investigate pending cases in this way, and to appropriate a sufficient amount for that purpose. But the appropriation should be limited to that. This appropriation is not so limited. This money should not be used for the purpose of worrying existing pensioners. It should not be used for the purpose of setting bloodhounds upon their track. It should not be used in a vain endeavor to smell out fraud where there is no sign of fraud.

The law gives the soldier a pension if he proves his case. When he has proven his case and his pension has been granted, that is final. No arbitrary power exists anywhere to take it away from him. His pension is part of the law of the country. If the President stops his pension arbitrarily he breaks the law. The President should not be a lawbreaker. His authority is not paramount to that of the law. The law does not empower the Executive to stop a soldier's pension at his will.

It takes money and a good deal of money to pay the pensioners, but the money has been earned and is justly due. We should perform our promises, and we will. This nation has always paid its pensioners, and it always will. It pays them gratefully, as paying for value received. The enemies of our veterans will not long prevail. They may hold the reins for the time being, but "the triumphing of the wicked is short," and Grover Cleveland will go out of office on the 4th of March, 1897.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent that all gentlemen who have spoken, or who shall speak, in this general debate may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD, so that both sides may have an equal opportunity.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of this committee during the short time I shall talk, to the real question presented by this proposed appropriation. To do this fairly, it seems to me that I should begin by asking the Clerk to read the portion of the bill now under discussion, which will be found on page 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENSION OFFICE.

For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, $200,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I have heard one voice raised during this debate against the making of this appropriation. What is this appropriation for? It is for the pur-

pose of carrying out existing law. The law in its present form has been enforced since 1882, although it was amended as late as the act of March 3, 1891. What is the purpose of making this appropriation, and for what are these special examinations authorized by law? Beginning with the law of 1862, amended in 1864 and again in 1872, and again in 1882, I call the attention of the committee to section 4744 as it appears on page 22 of the "LAWS of the United States concerning the payment of the army and navy pensions" issued by the last Commissioner of Pensions in 1892. It will be seen that the matter of making these appropriations has obtained at least since 1882, if it did not begin as early as 1862. What is the existing law upon this subject? I now ask the Clerk to read section 4744 as amended by the act of July 30, 1883.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4744. The Commissioner of Pensions is authorized to detail, from time to time, clerks or persons employed in his office to make special examinations into the merits of such pension or bounty land claims, whether pending or adjudicated, as he may deem proper, and to aid in the prosecution of any party appearing on such examinations to be guilty of fraud, either in the presentation or in procuring the allowance of such claims; and any person so detailed shall have power to administer oaths and take affidavits and depositions in the course of such examinations, and to orally examine witnesses, and may employ a stenographer when deemed necessary by the Commissioner of Pensions, in important cases, such stenographer to be paid by such clerk or person and the amount to be allowed in his accounts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, by this it is plainly to be seen that there is no purpose in this appropriation at all to authorize the sending abroad of spies or detectives; and I am sure I am not going outside the truth when I say that such a thought has never entered the mind of the Commissioner of Pensions in asking for this appropriation. While I shall vote for the appropriation, I would be glad if it were so limited as to make it certain that no part of the fund shall be used for any such purpose. But at any rate, it seems clear from the language of this law that no clerk or other officer could be detailed from the Pension Bureau for any such purpose as that.

I desire also to call attention to section 4744 as it appears on page 22 of the volume already referred to, and to section 3, on page 59 of the same volume:

SEC. 4744. The Commissioner of Pensions is authorized to detail, from time to time, clerks in his office to investigate suspected attempts at fraud on the Government, through and by virtue of the provisions of the pension law, and to aid in prosecuting any person so offending, with such additional compensation as is customary in cases of special service; any person so detailed shall have the power to administer oaths and take affidavits in the course of any such investigation.

SEC. 3. "That in addition to the authority conferred by section 184, Title IV, of the Revised Statutes, any judge or clerk of any court of the United States in any State, district, or Territory shall have power, upon the application of the Commissioner of Pensions, to issue a subpœna for a witness, being within the jurisdiction of such court, to appear, at a time and place in the subpœna stated, before any officer authorized to take depositions to be used in the courts of the United States, or before any officer, clerk, or person from the Pension Bureau designated or detailed to investigate or examine into the merits of any pension claim and authorized by law to administer oaths and take affidavits in such investigation or examination, there to give full and true answers to such written interrogatories and cross-interrogatories as may be propounded, or to be orally examined and cross-examined upon the subject of such claim; and witnesses subpœnaed pursuant to this and the preceding section shall be allowed the same compensation as is allowed witnesses in the courts of the United States, and paid in the same manner."

I desire to call attention to the fact that section 3 of the act of March 3, 1891, was reported from the Committee on Appropriations, of which the honorable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was then chairman, and the appropriation now under consideration proceeds in the same direction. It seems to me, therefore, that there need be no hesitation on the part of the most ardent friend of the soldier in voting for this appropriation, and voting for it with the confident belief, with the absolute certainty, that not one penny of the money which we appropriate by this bill will be used for the purpose of sending unauthorized spies and detectives into the field, but that it all will be employed for the purpose of furthering the liberal pension laws of the United States and aiding worthy applicants in the adjudication of their claims.

Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me it would be entirely out of the question for me to enter into a general discussion of many matters which have been talked about during this debate. These things of which I have endeavored to speak hurriedly and brokenly are those, it seems to me, which are immediately pertinent to the question presented to us when we are asked to vote for or against this appropriation.

As to various questions which have been alluded to—the suspension of pensions, order 164, order 240, repealing or suspending the previous order, the Weike case and the Bennett decisions, and the proper construction of the law of June 27, 1890—I hope in the future to have ample opportunity in this body to discuss each one of these questions fairly, freely, fearlessly.

While I can not undertake to now discuss those questions, yet by reason of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has in his remarks specially called my attention to certain things, and because of allusions which have been made by my colleague on the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], I wish to make a single remark in order to avoid the possibility either here and now, or in the future and elsewhere, of being misunderstood in regard to this matter. On the first day of the present session of this House I had the honor to introduce the first bills upon any subject introduced into this body, being House bills 4406 and 4407, as expressing my sentiments upon certain phases of this question.

I ask the Clerk to read section 1 of House bill 4406.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any pension heretofore or that may hereafter be granted to any applicant therefor under any law of the United States authorizing the granting and payment of pensions, on application made and adjudicated upon, shall be deemed and held by all officers of the United States to be a vested right in the grantee to that extent that payment thereof shall not be withheld or suspended until, after due notice to the grantee of not less than thirty days, the Commissioner of Pensions, after hearing all the evidence, shall decide to annul, vacate, modify, or set aside the decision upon which such pension was granted. Such notice to grantee must contain a full and true statement of any charges or allegations upon which such decision granting such pension shall be sought to be in any manner disturbed or modified.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this very bill is now under consideration by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the honor to be chairman, it would be manifestly improper for me to go into the discussion of that measure at this time, but I hope I may have the opportunity in this House to discuss it in the future. The language of that bill, as I understood it when I prepared it and as I understand it to-day, is the expression of my opinion as to the order of things in one particular which should govern in the adjudication of pension claims. I believe further that persons who undertake to interfere in the administration of pension claims should be held to a strict accountability for the truth of every word they utter. With that conviction in my mind I prepared House bill No. 4407, of which I will ask the Clerk to read the first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to willfully communicate or cause to be communicated, either verbally or otherwise, to any officer or other employé of the United States having any duty or act to perform in connection with the administration of any law of the United States authorizing the granting, increase, or payment of pensions to any persons, any false statement with intent to thereby defeat or suspend the granting or payment of any pension to any pensioner or applicant for a pension under any such law.

SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person to communicate or cause to be communicated, in any manner, to any person who has been granted a pension under any law of the United States, a false statement that such pension has been withdrawn or payment thereof suspended by the action or decision of any officer of the United States who, by any law, has any duty to perform in connection with the administration of any law of the United States authorizing the granting, increase, or payment of pensions.

SEC. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person to communicate, or to cause to be communicated, to anyone who shall then have pending, under any law of the United States authorizing the granting, increase, or payment of pensions, an application for the granting, increase, reissue, or payment of a pension, any false statement that such application has been either granted or denied by any officer of the United States having a duty to perform in connection with the adjudication of such applications.

SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful for any person to circulate or report any false statement that any application for the granting, increase, reissue, restoration, or payment of any pension under any law of the United States concerning the granting of pensions, has been either granted or denied by any officer of the United States having any duty to perform in connection with the adjudication of any such application.

SEC. 5. That any person who shall willfully commit any act declared unlawful by either of the preceding sections of this act shall be guilty of a criminal offense against the United States, and be subject to prosecution therefor in the courts of the United States, and, upon conviction therefor, shall be fined in any sum not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, to be collectible as are fines in other crimes against the United States.

SEC. 6. That any person who shall commit any act declared unlawful by either of the first four sections of this act shall be guilty of fraud, and no person shall be entitled to profit thereby in any manner; and the person guilty of such fraud shall be liable, as in tort, in damages to any person injured by such fraud.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, these two sections of these separate bills express my opinion that the pensioner is entitled to notice before his pension is suspended, and that the man who induces a suspension by making a false statement ought to be punished, even if his statement is not made under oath.

There is another matter to which I wish to allude, although I can not enter into a discussion of it at this time. I refer to the alleged frauds in the pension rolls. I wish to call the attention of the committee to expressions made by Commissioner Lochren when he was before the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. LOCHREN. A great many cases of forged testimony have been shown by special examination.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is that rare, or the exception?

Mr. LOCHREN. I trust it is the exception. There were many in Norfolk, and a great many in New Mexico. Perhaps the practice of some of the attorneys, and the claims coming from particular claim agents, may be honeycombed with fraud.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In your judgment, what percentage of claims is fraudulent?

Mr. LOCHREN. I could not give you any percentage.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it not exceedingly small compared with the whole?

Mr. LOCHREN. It is not large, I trust.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. We all trust it is not large.

Mr. LOCHREN. I think where it does occur it is more often the result of the dishonesty of claim agents than from any other cause.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In connection with this Bureau, considering that the amount of money involved is $150,000,000 to $160,000,000 a year, is it not true, in your judgment, that honesty averages quite as well in that Bureau as it does in the ordinary adjudications throughout the country, or the world?

Mr. LOCHREN. I think the old soldier is as honest as other men—quite as much so.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And really, dishonesty is the exception?

Mr. LOCHREN. I think that is true in all human transactions.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire to record here and now this declaration, coming from my experience in matters of this kind—never as a claim agent, but as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House during three Congresses—that no action of this House can make the pension roll a roll of honor, for it is one to-day. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, did the treason of Benedict Arnold reflect upon that great body of patriots who made American independence possible? It did not; it simply branded upon his own brow his own crime; but it detracted nothing from the gallant men who went through that war upon the side of the colonists. Is it possible that any man will urge that the cowardice of Hull reflected upon Andrew Jackson and Gen. Scott and the armies which a second time marched to victory in the second war for American independence—the war of 1812? No; it did not.

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand here as the apologist of fraud; but I do say that the fact that some men like Newby, who is now being punished for his crime, have been able to get upon the pension roll is not a disgrace to the laws under which he sought a pension, and is no disgrace to the brave men who are drawing pensions under our laws to-day. [Loud applause.]

(Here the hammer fell.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will occupy a portion of his time now.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, it is a great luxury to us to listen to a speech like that which has just been uttered by my friend from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN]. We have been accustomed heretofore to see the Democratic management of this House in its attacks on the pension system put forward to deride the old soldiers of the Union army, men who were disqualified for so mean a task by personal bravery and gallant service in the war for the preservation of the Union, and who, in the service of their party, had learned to despise their comrades' service of their country.

I have sometimes thought that the line which marks the distinction of opinion on the pension question is not a line drawn altogether by the civil war, because the best speech heard in this House in behalf of the disability pension act of 1890 was delivered by our friend Mr. Coleman of Louisiana, who had been himself a Confederate private, and the speech against the old soldiers which seemed to me to reflect the least credit on the debate was delivered by a gentleman whose record was such as to warrant him in saying that he not only fought for his country, but had suffered in a rebel prison as well. We will be excused, therefore, if we believe that the line of difference is, in a degree at least, the line of politics; and it is, if I may be permitted to so express it, the poison of Democracy rather than the experiences of the rebellion that perverts men's ideas and opinions on the pension question, and enables that party to look without decent consideration upon the claims of the surviving soldiers of the national army.

I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to enter upon any crimination of the President, who has originated the odious policy which prevails to-day in the Pension Bureau, or of the Secretary of Interior, who is nominally responsible for it, or upon the Commissioner of Pensions, who has, with more than necessary good-cheer, presided in its execution. I give to the Commissioner of Pensions the benefit of all of the eulogy which was read here this morning by his friend from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN], and while it was disfigured by an unnecessary libel upon Gen. Raum, the late Commissioner of Pensions, I do not seek to disparage the gallantry of the gentleman who occupies the position of Commissioner of Pensions under the present Administration.

If the gentleman from Minnesota had been in the last Congress, however, he might have known something of the troubles of his friend from Indiana [Mr. COOPER] and his friend from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] and might display less disposition to slander the late Commissioner of Pensions. For these two very active gentlemen spent the entire term of that Congress in collecting alleged testimony againt Gen. Raum, and yet their own Democratic associates in the House despised it with such contempt that they did not even notice the matter during that entire Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I rose, however, to call attention specially to a few instances in my own neighborhood growing out of the prevailing pension policy of the present Administration. For after all, this pension business is to be judged, not by what is said here or there, but by the facts which are within the reach of the public, and these will in the end control public opinion on the question. We take the position that the methods by which the present pension roll has been made have afforded greater assurance of the justice of these claims than can possibly be secured in the secret proceedings by which thousands of the pensioners have been dropped from the pension roll without even such a hearing as the law gives to the most worthless criminal. We claim, that in the suspension of these pension claims, whatever be its motive, the facts exhibit a negligence that has already made the Administration offensive throughout the United States wherever the spirit of national gratitude has not been smothered by avarice or supplanted by sectional passions.

For example, in the community in which I live, in the State of Iowa, resides an old shoemaker who has been crippled, disabled, and left helpless for many years. He was drawing a pension, but was dropped from the rolls and was notified that he had sixty days in which to make good the claim which by patient waiting had been allowed him in the orderly adjudication of the Department, and to-day this old man enjoys the sympathy of every citizen in his neighborhood, without regard to politics, because they all know the injustice that had been done to him. If, however, it is said that you can not prove a general charge of injustice against the Department by citing a single case of that character, let me give another one. In the neighboring county to the one in which I reside, an old soldier was dropped from the rolls a few weeks ago, and the effect upon his shattered strength was such that he became violently insane and was removed immediately to the insane asylum. Here is a man who was pensioned for mental disability, whose pension was suspended wrongfully, and he is now a public charge in the insane asylum of the State.

But if it be said that that is not enough to show the gross negligence of the Department in the selection of these cases, I would direct your attention to a case occurring in Jasper County, Iowa, where a widow, hardly yet returned from the grave of the soldier, was comforted by this delicate expression of the national sympathy—a printed circular reciting the cheap and false pretense that the soldier's "disability no longer existed in a pensionable degree." That was true, for the man, dying of the disease for which he was pensioned, had gone out of the reach of either gratitude or malice. I will make a still more perfect illustration of the criminal negligence that seems to guide these stupid efforts to unearth fraud.

In the city of Winterset, one of the thriving cities of Iowa, the interested inquirer can verify the case of an old soldier whose widow, seven months after his death, received notice that the medical evidence on file in the office of the Commissioner showed that the soldier's disabilities no longer existed in a pensionable degree.

Now, I would like to inquire of any intelligent man, without regard to his politics, how the Pension Office, if it is acting fairly and carefully and truthfully, can send a notice like that to a man's afflicted family, without even taking the pains to know that death had taken him from the pension roll seven months before the notice was issued.

We have a good many patriotic Democrats out in Iowa like my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN], who understand both the rights of the citizen and the rights of the soldier; and through cases like these our people, practically without distinction of party, have come to believe that this reform is an effort on the part of the President of the United States, covering his action by the gallant record of the Commissioner, to make the pension system odious in the United States and to bring injury and injustice upon the surviving veteran of the old Union Army; and I have taken the floor here to-day to protest in the name of the old veterans of Iowa, without respect to their politics, against an administrative policy which may fitly be described in the language of the New York Sun, applied to another subject as "a policy of national infamy." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking any part in the discussion over this appropriation bill, and I would not have done so if I had not seen a tendency in the debate to make the subject of pensions and the pension list and the pension administration somewhat of a partisan question.

I am not personally familiar with the course of the previous discussions in this House upon this subject, but I have been under the impression—and it has been a source of infinite pride and satisfaction to me—that the legislation in Congress upon the subject of pensions has not been marked by partisan or sec-

tional divisions. I have been glad to see on the part of men who were my adversaries in the great conflict a generous and chivalrous disposition to accord pensions to every worthy Union soldier, and I hope that disposition will continue as long as any of us on either side survive.

I am unwilling to admit, Mr. Chairman, that any party in this country has a right to claim exclusive credit for a desire to do justice to the Union soldier. Certainly so long as I have a voice to raise here, or anywhere, my honorable political adversaries on the other side shall not have that privilege. I take it for granted, Mr. Chairman, that every member of this House on either side desires to eliminate from the pension rolls every name that is not honorably there. I assume that the officers of the Government, charged with the execution of the pension laws, are desirous of performing their duty in order that no name shall be placed on the pension list by them which should not go there. I hope, sir, to see this question, if possible, kept out of politics, and kept aloof from all sectionalism. The only way to do that is to keep the pension roll, as it was designed to be, a roll of honor.

Now, as to the general charge that the pension list is honeycombed with fraud, with gigantic and wholesale frauds permeating it, I do not believe that statement to be true. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] My intercourse with soldiers who receive pensions, many thousands of them in my State, authorizes me to repel that charge as unfounded and unjust to them. [Renewed applause.]

Here in this debate we have had cited to us a number of prosecutions instituted and conducted during the fiscal year, a few over 100, and the number of convictions 73, out of a pension roll to-day of 966,000. Compare that record with the records of the courts of this land, bringing to their aid counsel learned in the law, and the utmost discrimination in the sifting of testimony, the utmost care in the pure administration of justice; and in the records of those courts we will find thousands of cases, compared with these hundred cases, where imputations of fraud have been cast wholesale over the administration of justice. Near me sits an honorable member of this House [Mr. BLACK of Illinois] who presided over the Pension Bureau for over four years. I would like to ask him how many of the cases he adjudicated, in which he allowed pensions, were in his judgment impeached by fraud? I do not believe that in his administration he ever allowed one pension case to pass his hands without being thoroughly satisfied that it was honestly deserved.

Now, sir, in this incidental debate on an appropriation bill, I do not care to go extensively into the subject; but at the proper time I shall have much to say upon it. To-day I content myself with repelling this imputation, thus generally cast upon the good faith and integrity of my comrades in arms. [Applause.] I do not believe it is true, and I say this, in conclusion, that no party will long rule in this country, and no ruler will possess or deserve the confidence of the American people, who casts unmerited stain upon the pension rolls of this nation. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I thought the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] did not use all his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has ten minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have long been accustomed to such assaults upon the pension roll as has recently been indulged in by the President of the United States. For a long time it has been the habit of many gentlemen, members of this House, and in other places, to indulge in assaults upon the pension roll. We have become accustomed to it.

I assure the members of this House that there is no one more willing than myself that the pension roll should be purged of everything that brings upon it dishonor, and no member of the House upon this side would object to the erasure of every unworthy name upon the roll.

But the opposition that there is to the proposition before the House is the settled belief that it is not for the purpose of simply taking from the rolls the names of those that ought not to be there, if there be such, but it is for the purpose of harassing, disturbing, and terrorizing those whose names are or ought to be there. Two hundred and forty thousand dollars was borne by the last appropriation bill for the purpose of this class of examinations, the sum supposed to be ample for the purpose for the entire fiscal year; yet we are now told that that is already or will speedily be exhausted. What has become of it?

It was deemed amply sufficient for the legitimate purposes of investigating in the field, for the purpose of the investigations in regard to these claims that have been pending and are now pending. The exhaustion of the appropriation shows that it has been used for the illegitimate purpose of trying to spy out, trying to find in an improper and ignoble way something that will justify these charges that have been so lavishly made.

Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN] comes in with a new assault upon the pension roll. No one has heretofore been ready to decry the services or to belittle the sufferings and fortitude of those who aided in putting down the most gigantic rebellion that was ever known.

Ah, gentlemen, was not that a herculean task! The records of time show no such achievements as were accomplished by the Federal army. Think of it! Eleven millions of brave, chivalric, warlike people absolutely overcome in the short space of four years. Think of the difficulties that nature threw in the way. The broad rivers, the ranges of mountains, the narrow cañons that had to be passed, scaled, and crossed by the invading forces, every one of them defended by brave, chivalric men. In other countries—in the late war between France and Germany—there were broad highways of travel, there were bridges, there were cantonments for their troops, they had to carry no commissary supplies; they lived upon the country. A dense population gave camps and shelter to the invading troops.

Not so with us. And yet the gentleman from Minnesota tells us that this was a mere play spell, a protracted, prolonged picnic, a mere hilarious and joyous occasion. Why, does not that gentleman know that 67,000 brave men, his comrades, perished on the field of battle; 43,000 died of wounds received in battle; 29,000 perished in the prison pens of the South; 25,000, it is estimated, died from casualties, and 235,000 died of disease contracted in the service while their names were still upon the muster rolls. Four hundred and ten thousand men of that grand army perished while their names were still upon the muster roll.

Think of it! If you could resummon their shades, if you could place them in their old places, constituting a grand army corps, armed and equipped with a necessary train as it should be supplied with, and started upon a march for the city of Boston, the rear guard would not have left the city of Washington when the advance guard would have reached its destination. This great destruction of life is more than 25 per cent of the actual participants in battle, and yet the gentleman from Minnesota tells us that this was a protracted, prolonged picnic, that their service was scarcely such service as entitled them to recognition now from a grateful country!

Ah, and gentlemen of his ilk inveigh against the magnitude of the pension roll. One hundred and sixty-five million, they tell us, and sometimes over, expended, and, sometimes under their breath they tell us, squandered for the payment of pensions.

Why, gentlemen, the pension roll is a necessary part of our system of military defense. Our fathers started upon the theory of a small standing army and a large volunteer force for purposes of emergency. You must be just and true to the old volunteer soldier if you expect the volunteer portion of our system to continue to be effective. Contrast our system as a whole in the matter of cost with others. Five hundred and fifty thousand men compose the standing army of Germany. It costs $117,000,000 annually. Five hundred and fifty thousand of the flower of their youth are withdrawn from the productive energies of that nation. Suppose their average earning capacity to be $200 a year—ours is shown to be $409 a year, but suppose that they earn on an average less than half as much as we do—there you have $110,000,000 more to be added to the cost of the military system of Germany; making a total of two hundred and twenty-seven millions as compared with our one hundred and eighty millions. Look at France, where 490,000 men constitute her standing army, costing $150,000,000. Add the other $100,000,000 lost to the state because of the withdrawal of that number of men from the wealth-producers of the land, and you have $250,000,000 that the military system of France costs as compared with our $180,000,000.

Even in point of economy, measured by dollars and cents, and taking the flood time of cost in our own system, it is still infinitely better, infinitely cheaper than theirs, and the pension roll and honesty in the observance of the obligations of the pension roll are absolutely essential to our system. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has been consumed. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has thirty-four minutes remaining.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that the gentlemen on the other side who have participated in this debate do not intend to vote against the provision in this bill which has been the excuse and not the cause of this discussion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], my courteous colleague on the committee, said substan-

tially that the main object of this provision is to aid the somewhat careless and ignorant applicant for a pension certificate who has not made out his claim properly and for whom the Government makes this provision in order that his claim, if an honest claim carelessly made out, may be put into proper shape and allowed. I take it for granted that that gallant soldier will not, for a political purpose, refuse to grant to his somewhat careless and ignorant comrades this generous mode of having pension certificates issued for their benefit.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] practically admitted that they did not intend to antagonize this provision. We are, therefore, really in the attitude of having a political discussion for the purpose of exciting political prejudice, and having the old soldier brought forward again, not for his benefit, but for the benefit of those for whom he may be hereafter expected to vote. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I shall not enter into that domain of discussion, nor have I any defense of the Commissioner of Pensions, the Secretary of the Interior, or the President of the United States.

Defense intimates that there is cause for censure. Defense is hypothecated upon the implied admission that somebody has done wrong. If any wrong has been committed in the administration of any one of these great offices—for the office of Commissioner of Pensions is great, not in its pay, but in its relation to these vast expenditures, and to the worthy and honorable objects for which it was created—if any wrong has been done in the administration of these great offices, I want the strictest and most rigorous investigation, and whatever searchlight science may invent that can give us full knowledge of the archives and the practices in that great Bureau will receive from me most ready assistance. That Bureau has been held to be sacred ground upon which no ordinary man shall tread, a Holy of Holies, into which no ordinary man shall enter.

The mission of the Democratic party, if it have any in this respect, is to tear away the veil, open it to the light of honest investigation, put the taxpayer by the side of the Commissioner of Pensions, honestly enroll every gallant soldier who deserves it, and drive out of that Pension Office every fraudulent man whose name has gotten upon those rolls. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is the whole of it. Whoever under these statutes has the right to be put upon that pension roll give to him an inexpensive and expeditious mode by which he can obtain his certificate.

Whatever there is in the statute that makes it expensive or makes it slow for the honest pensioner to obtain his pension, I will unite with my friends on either side to repeal. If there has grown up, by decisions or otherwise, anything which ought to be removed in order to give to those pensioners, rapidly passing away by the lapse of time, the certificates to which they are entitled, let us remove it. But, gentlemen, do not put yourselves in the attitude of using this generous and universal sentiment in favor of the honest pensioner for the defense of the fraudulent claim agent or the fraudulent applicant.

The Representative from Iowa talked of an object lesson. He said that there were in the country wounded Federal soldiers and wounded Confederate soldiers, and that the youth of the country saw in these object lessons that pecuniary reward followed those who had adhered to the flag, whilst only the diseases and injuries of war, succeeded by a heroic struggle in the battle of life followed treason. Do not add to that object lesson a picture for the youth of the country where they shall see the claim agent a convict in the penitentiary, a fraudulent applicant receiving the money, and distinguished Representatives refusing to help to put other fraudulent men in the penitentiary and defending the fraud. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, what are the facts? This is no new provision. We gave $580,000 in 1885 and $580,000 in 1886; and I shall put in my remarks a list of these appropriations up to two years ago. We have now given $200,000; and as it is not enough, we give $200,000 more, which was less than was given at any time during the period from 1884 up to the last two years.

Then the act of 1890 had gone into effect. The whole force of the Pension Office so far as could well be done was turned upon those applications. The need for examinations in the field was not supposed to be so great; and so that appropriation was cut down to $200,000. The cases which could readily be decided under that act have now been adjudicated. Frauds have arisen, and *a priori* they must necessarily arise under the construction that was given to that act by the Commissioner of Pensions and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. I hold in my hand a copy of the act of 1890.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Will the gentleman from Kentucky allow me a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman will excuse me. I have only thirty minutes in which to cover this whole case.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I yielded to the gentleman; and I would like to ask him a single question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Very well.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Do you claim that a pension is obtained by fraud, if the Commissioner in granting it makes an error of law?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I can not better illustrate what I claim than by referring to an application for a pension which was based upon a service of over ninety days. Through an error of the War Department the records seemed to show that this man had served ninety-five days, when he had in fact served only thirty days. He obtained his pension therefore absolutely in violation of law. He knew that he had served only thirty days, even if nobody else had known it. He was a fraudulent pensioner. What right had he to ask anything except that his name should be stricken from the rolls? That is a concrete case, and that is my answer to the gentleman from New York. I will insert in the RECORD a letter showing the facts in that case.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I thought you were complaining of erroneous rulings by one Commissioner which had been changed by another Commissioner.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I say that under the ruling of the Commissioner there necessarily resulted a certain carelessness in that Department; for there can not be on the part of the head of a Department a construction evidently erroneous (I use no language stronger than that) without those under him being animated by his spirit in the construction and administration of the law.

When the act of 1890 was under consideration we heard from eloquent gentlemen on both sides of the House that among these old soldiers were many with whom the warfare of life had gone badly; that some of them were supported by charitable associations; some were in almshouses; that disabilities which had their root in the war had developed by operation of time or mischance and now could not be proved to have originated during the war. So an act was passed by which those worthy old people suffering under disabilities, the victims really of the war and the objects of local charity, were no longer to be humiliated by accepting local charity, but were to be put upon the pension roll, the burden of their support being thus distributed over the whole country.

And in order that this act might include only persons who were thus deserving, certain conditions precedent were specified in the act: first, the service must have been for not less than ninety days; second, the discharge from the service must have been honorable; third, this disability must in the first place be of such a character that it did not result from the soldier's own vicious habits, and in the second place, it must incapacitate him from earning a living by manual labor. It was not supposed that the beneficiaries under this law would be a very large class. The second section of the act of June 27, 1890, provides as follows:

SEC. 2. That all persons who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now, or who may hereafter be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $12 per month and not less than $6 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support; and such pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Pension Office after the passage of this act, upon proof that the disability then existed, and shall continue during the existence of the same.

But there was placed upon that law very soon, by Order 164, a construction which substantially changed the whole law by making the disability under it not one which would incapacitate the soldier from earning his living by manual labor, but merely such as amounted to a pensionable disability under the old law. Now, pensionable disabilities under the old law were not determined with reference to incapacity for manual labor. No idea of manual labor was embraced in that old law. A man was pensioned for losing one finger or for being a little deaf—$15 a month was the rate at that time—or, for the loss of one eye, a pension of $17 a month was granted.

So under order 164 the applicant for pension did not have to prove himself incapable of earning his living by manual labor, but simply that he had incurred a pensionable disability.

In regard to fixing rates of pensions under act of June 27, 1890.

That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above $6 and less than $12, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin; and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above $12 per month, shall be rated at $12 per month.

GREEN B. RAUM, *Commissioner.*

Approved:
CYRUS BUSSEY, *Assistant Secretary.*

Accordingly in the Bennett case and in a great many other cases pensions were allowed to men who were entirely capable of earning their own living—whose disabilities did not affect their capacity in that respect in the least degree.

In the administration of that law no effort was made to ascertain, nor was the applicant required to prove, that the disability, whatever it was, had not been occasioned by his own vicious habits. Practically the only question considered was whether the man had been in the service for ninety days and whether he had incurred a pensionable disability. Altogether there were issued under this law alone over 400,000 certificates.

Under such an open violation of law in that department (for no clerk, whether he had passed a civil-service examination or whether he had been sanctified by the civil service act by reason of having been in the department before its passage, could fail to have sense enough to know that such was not the law) pensions were issued with great rapidity and with the utmost carelessness. It could not but occur to me in examining this matter that it would be found there was not a single provision of the act which had not been carelessly administered or misconstrued.

So I said to the Commissioner, "Will you do me the favor to look into your archives and find me (I do not care to have you go into the matter very largely) cases of persons who have received pensions in spite of a dishonorable discharge, or cases of persons who have received pensions without serving the full time specified by the law." And in less than twenty-four hours the Commissioner sent me the particulars of a case where a man had been dishonorably discharged, yet received his pension, and the case of a man who had served only thirty days and received his pension. I append the letters of the Commissioner as to those cases.

There are cases arising in connection with two Delaware regiments where men received pensions because upon the face of the papers the regiments claimed to have been organized at a certain time and discharged at a certain time, when in point of fact the regiments were not called out until long after the day of organization, so that none of their members served ninety days.

Now this provision requiring service for a period of ninety days, this requirement of the honorable discharge, this incapacity to earn a living by manual labor were a part of the conditions precedent which this Congress put upon the applicant before he could require others of our citizens equally meritorious, equally deserving of our consideration, to put their hands in their pockets to pay the pensioner anything.

One would judge from what we hear in this debate that the General Government has some inexhaustible fund from which may be drawn at any time any amount that may be needed for this purpose. Not one dollar does this great imperial corporation, known as the United States of America, own, save in the coined sweat of her citizens, earned by their own labor and taken by the taxgatherer to pay it obligations. Every dollar that is given to one of these pensioners comes perhaps from some widow, some laborer, some toiler, who has a right to demand and to know that the money taken out of his pocket before it shall go to the support of other people and their children shall be properly expended, and that the person to whom it is given shall come within the terms of the law.

No number of gallant soldiers, no number of dead and wounded heroes brought by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] from the battlefields of the war, is or can be an excuse for the illegal and dishonest confiscation of the money of the taxpayers of this country for the payment of fraudulent pensions obtained by fraudulent means or by the official declarations of careless officers at the heads of bureaus. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, $1,520,000,000 have been paid to the pensioners of the late war. The burden of payments to be hereafter made reaches down to our grandchildren; for the Revolutionary widows are still on our rolls. Whosoever in the war bore himself well, whosoever under these acts is entitled to be put upon the roll, I for one would like to see the act consummated to have him put upon that roll as speedily as possible. Let us make out the rolls of those who are entitled to the bounty of the Government as rapidly as we can, so that we may know exactly the burden that we have to bear on this account. But when gentlemen say it is a mere bagatelle, these frauds, they are wholly mistaken.

I hold in my hand the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, which shows that thirty-seven hundred and odd cases were examined by the experts between the 1st day of June and the 30th of November, of which number 2,040 were recommended for admission, that is, they were honest applicants, with sufficient claims, who had their claims made up properly by the examiners, and they obtained the benefit of the salary paid to the examiners who investigated the cases. Seventeen hundred and forty claims of the total were recommended for rejection; that is to say, the taxpayers got the benefit of that number of cases submitted.

In other words of the thirty-seven hundred and odd claims the proportion was 2,040 out of the total of honest claims that were made clear by the examination and recommended for allowance, and 1,700 of them were fradulent on an examination of the claims and were rejected by the examiners.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And four-fifths of them were Republicans.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. And my friend says four-fifths of them were Republicans. I am not going into the political question.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] says that the frauds now existing are small. I do not know what he means by gigantic frauds. In a great city like Philadelphia with her mighty population, a glorious city which I love and which has grown rich and prosperous, built upon economic laws which drain the people who live where I come from, I say to such a city it may be that these numbers do not mean something gigantic. But I find here fraudulent claims in number nearly as large as the population of half of the cities in the district I represent: New Mexico 1448, Iowa 599, Indian Territory 534, Tennessee 71, New York 96, and with this comment as to New York:

This investigation is only in its preliminary stage. It will no doubt exceed in extent the New Mexico investigation.

Here are frauds where 1,448 persons have received the sum of $150,000 who were not entitled to anything. Is this a fairly gigantic fraud, when they are to receive the money through a series of approaching and coming years? When four thousand fraudulent claims are being presented is it not a gigantic fraud, not perhaps to Philadelphia with her great wealth, but to some humble home where dollars are very scarce, where the tongue and buckle rarely can be made to meet, where every night the snow falls the track of the wolves' feet are found to be at the door when they rise in the morning to begin their ceaseless labors of another day. These things are appalling to the President of the United States, and thank God he is the President of the common people who work for a living. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, let us think for a minute. The amount annually paid is $160,000,000. Last year it was $156,000,000. This year it is $165,000,000, and it will be $160,000,000 next year, an average of $160,000,000. This is not capital: it is income—so much a year. It is as if we owed a debt that was capitalized and we were paying the interest. We can borrow money at 3 per cent. What is the debt thus capitalized at 3 per cent? It is a debt of $5,330,000,000 resting upon the shoulders of the American people, more by $500,000,000 than the entire taxable value of the sixteen Southern States in 1890, more than the taxable value of any State of the Union, excepting the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania.

Five thousand millions of dollars is the capitalized debt upon which we pay the interest to this vast army of pensioners. I do not complain of the honest money paid under these statutes, but I complain of every effort made by any gentleman to incite passion and prejudice that will keep on this roll those who are not entitled to go thereon. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], I arraign, with the utmost courtesy, at the bar of public opinion to-day, not for their defense of the true soldiers of the country, but for the effort which in their names they are making to prevent this Administration from purging that roll of fraud. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Can we not lay aside the partisan differences that may divide us upon economic questions, and take this up as a question of practical business expediency? Here is the amount that is to be paid. Here are the soldiers that are entitled to it. Here are the widows that are entitled to it. Here is an army, not numerous, not vast, but persistent, clamorous, unscrupulous, who carry the banner of the Union, who dress themselves in the uniform of the soldier, who are championed by pension agents, who march with beating drums into this House and say to members, "If you do not put us on the roll, in the name of the old soldier we will send you to private life." I for one am in favor of driving that army of mercenaries out of the Capitol and of saying to them, in the name of the true soldier, "You disgrace the flag, you dishonor the uniform, who desire to steal from the part that is set aside for your brethren who fought in the field." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, once before when I discussed this question, I alluded to the personal circumstances that connected me with the late war. I do not desire to repeat what I then said, but I can say this afternoon, in the presence of God and this august body, that in this work and duty that I have had to perform, there has been nothing but the utmost kindness for the Federal soldier. One of the men, whom I love best in all the world, beside my own sons, is a Federal soldier now residing in this city.

As chairman of this committee, I appeal to the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if I did not furnish him with every opportunity to make the investigation as searching as possible. In controlling the time that was allotted to me I gave to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SICKLES] and to my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] part of the time, though they might not agree with me in the views I hold.

I have but one purpose. In the late canvass the Democratic party made a pledge that, as to the currency, it would take up the question and try to solve it so that we should have a flexible and yet a stable currency, in which the legislation would be just to the industrial activities of the East, to the mine-owning and growing interests of the West, and to the great exporting product of the South: that on the question of the tariff it would turn its face in the other direction, and make a tariff that would take burdens off labor, tear down barriers between us and foreign peoples, make the sea ours, and give to our manufacturers the markets of the world: that it would in this question of pensions find where the lines that run in the interests of the taxpayer and the lines that run in the interests of the pensioner would meet, so that generosity to the old soldier would still be justice to the taxpayer; and this afternoon I feel only desirous of carrying out that pledge.

Wherever there is a Federal widow, wherever there is a wounded soldier, wherever there is a man or woman entitled to a pension, I am ready to legislate for him or her all that is necessary to give a cheap and expeditious mode of receiving his or her dues. Let us not, in their name, give to honesty its defeat and crown fraud with the rewards of profitable victory. [Applause on the Democratic side].

APPENDIX.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: In answer to your verbal request for a brief statement as to the necessity existing for the additional appropriation asked of $300,000 for the per diem and expenses of special examiners of this Bureau, I will say that there is now in the hands of the special examination division upwards of 18,000 cases sent from the adjudicating divisions to be examined; that there are now in the field about 240 men employed in this work, and that the appropriation for their per diem and expenses will be exhausted in the latter part of the month of January next, if the present force is retained in the field. Unless an additional appropriation is granted the work must be discontinued, the force recalled, and probably a large number of the special examiners discharged. The adjudicating of the cases requiring special examination will be thereby indefinitely postponed.

The cases sent by the adjudicating divisions for special examination are of various kinds:

1. A large class consists of cases where the claimants are unable, or fail in some way, to furnish sufficient evidence to establish their claims, and there seems to be probability that in the hands of experienced special examiners the lacking evidence may be found.

2. Cases where the evidence may on the face of it appear sufficient, but is of a character to arouse well-grounded suspicion of fraud. In such cases the special examiners interview the witnesses and other persons whom they ascertain to have knowledge of the matters testified to, and take their depositions if deemed of importance; but after notice to the claimant and opportunity given to participate and to bring forward other witnesses.

3. Cases where information is received tending to the belief that the claim is fraudulent.

As all the evidence filed in support of a claim for pension is *ex parte*, the only possible way to protect the Government against the grossest fraud and imposition is by sending suspicious cases to special examiners. The fact, well known throughout the country, that the evidence in cases is liable to be thus tested has doubtless a salutary influence to deter the unscrupulous. But still in several cases very extensive frauds have been discovered by special examiners, usually arising from the dishonest transactions of a single claim attorney.

At Norfolk, Va., one W. R. Drury, a claim attorney, imposed upon the Bureau false and forged declarations and evidence of mythical witnesses, sharing the proceeds with the negroes whom he caused to represent the colored soldiers. Through the work of special examiners he is in the penitentiary, and over 200 of his pensioners dropped from the rolls. In 167 of these cases allowed under the act of June 27, 1890, the Government had paid $54,074.43. The future payments on these same certificates, as estimated according to life-insurance tables, would amount to $343,260.39. The trial of Drury's accomplices has begun before the United States court; and since I began this letter I am advised of the conviction of one of them, followed by sentence this day to five years in the penitentiary and a fine of $2,000. It is estimated that the Government has paid in pensions in all of Drury's fraudulent cases about $150,000, and that the future expectancy of the same cases would amount to nearly four times that sum.

In Socorro, N. Mex., a claim agent adopted the same plan of forgery, perjury, and false personation of soldiers. His practices were discovered by special examiners, and he is in the penitentiary under a seven years' sentence, and his cases are now, and for several months have been in the hands of a competent corps. His operations were even more extensive than those of Drury.

In Iowa a claim attorney adopted a different plan, and by corrupting witnesses, and to some extent certain medical boards, procured pensions to which the claimants were not entitled, or at higher rates than they were entitled. This also was discovered by special examiners, and much convincing evidence of his guilt obtained by them. Seven hundred and upward of these cases have been sent to special examiners, and the trial of the claim attorney is expected to take place at the term of the United States court now in session.

To cripple the special examination division or its work would hinder or stop the work of the Bureau in a large class of cases. It would encourage fraud, and make it usually successful, by removing the only barrier against it which exists. The importance and beneficial results of the work of this division has always been recognized, and the appropriation for it during several years exceeded $500,000 each year.

Yours very truly,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. J. D. SAYERS,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 16th instant, and invite your attention to the case of Frederick Daus, pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, by certificate 680869.

The first War Department report in this case gave ninety-five days' service. The second report from the same Department, which was a correct report, gave thirty days' service only. The soldier was pensioned on the first report at $12 per month, from April 25, 1891, to May 2, 1892. This is one case of a large number of the same character.

It might be well to state in this connection that the first reports of the War Department indicated that the Fifth and Sixth Delaware Volunteers served from November, 1862, to August, 1863. Quite a large number of claims were allowed to these persons in consequence of these reports. On April 8, 1891, the War Department, however, informed this Bureau, in a general letter, that none of the men of the Fifth and Sixth Delaware Volunteers served ninety days during the war of the rebellion, inasmuch as Gen. Schenk did not call them into actual service prior to June, 1863.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS, OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1893.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your verbal request, I have to invite your attention to the case of Alexander Cabasher, pensioner by certificate No. 511482, act of June 27, 1890. Pension was granted in this case at $8 per month on the 8th day of December, 1890, to date from July 5, 1890, on account of injury of left leg and resulting varicose veins and rheumatism.

The original record shows this man to have been discharged with forfeiture of all pay, allowances, and without final statements, the enlistment involving fraud upon the part of the soldier. The soldier received a pension notwithstanding the fact that the act of June 27, 1890, forbids the granting of a pension except in cases where the soldier had an honorable discharge.

A second call was made upon the War Department to test the correctness of the original record. In a report dated July 7, 1893, the War Department states as follows:

"Inasmuch as Alexander Cabasher, the soldier referred to herein, was discharged the service with forfeiture of all bounty pay and allowance due, and without final statements, the enlistment involving fraud upon his part, his discharge is not viewed as honorable."

Upon this report of the War Department the pensioner was dropped from the rolls on the 4th day of November, 1893. How an allowance could have been made in this case originally surpasses comprehension. The name, in fact, was placed upon the pension rolls in actual violation of law.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE,
Chairman Subcommittee on Urgent Deficiency Bill,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 14th instant, asking for the following information:

First. The entire number of applications that have been filed for pension certificates in this office, growing out of the late war between the States; how many have been issued, and how many remain pending?

Second. What has been the entire amount of payments to pensioners on account of the late war; and of expenses of the Pension Office and system, excluding payments to pensioners?

In response, I have to advise you that up to and including the 14th day of December, 1893, there had been filed in this Bureau 1,741,275 original claims growing out of disability and death due to the United States service since March 4, 1861. During the same period there were issued by this Bureau 1,241,744 original certificates of the classes of pensioners above described. There remained pending, at the close of business on the 14th day of December, 1893, 499,531 original claims growing out of the war of 1861.

It is not practicable to furnish to you a statement showing the amount expended in the payment of pensions to war of 1861 pensioners, as distinguished from other persons who have been receiving pensions at the same time. Between July 1, 1860, and June 30, 1893, there was disbursed for pensions a total of $1,576,503,544.42. This, however, includes disbursements made to survivors and widows of the war with Mexico, survivors and widows of the war of 1812, and all pensions granted for disabilities contracted either in the military or naval service of the United States prior to March 4, 1861, but on account of which pensions have been paid since March 4, 1861. No attempt was ever made prior to the fiscal year 1876 to report separately the amount disbursed for pensions and expenses of disbursement. Since that time, however, the amount expended under each item of appropriation has, as required by the statute, been accounted for separately. Prior to 1876 the amount expended for pensions, and the expenses incident thereto, were reported in one gross sum.

This is the full information which is afforded by the records of this Bureau on the subjects of your inquiry.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE,
Chairman Subcommittee on Urgent Deficiency Bill,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Appropriations for per diem of special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for special examinations.

1885.		
Special examiners	$220,000	
Clerks detailed	360,000	
		$580,000
1886.		
Special examiners	220,000	
Clerks detailed	360,000	
		580,000
1887.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	320,000	
		510,000
1888.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		415,000

Appropriations for per diem of special examiners, etc.—Continued.

1889.		
Special examiners	$190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		$415,000
1890.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		415,000
1891.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		415,000
1892.		
Special examiners and clerks detailed		215,000
1893.		
Special examiners and clerks detailed, including deficiency of $25,000		225,000
1894.		
Special examiners and clerks detailed		200,000

Comparative statement showing number of cases pending special investigation on July 1, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, and 1893; the average number of special examiners employed, the number of reports made, the average cost per report, and the total cost of expenses of the special examination division for each fiscal year.

Year.	Average number of examiners.	Number of cases pending July 1.	Number of reports submitted.	Average cost per report.	Total cost.
1884	352	2,000	7,452	$45.98	$342,646.58
1885	308	13,169	29,356	15.40	514,269.18
1886	277	8,924	29,395	15.86	466,467.93
1887	253	9,081	31,010	13.33	427,404.20
1888	241	17,950	32,747	12.51	409,762.29
1889	254	15,806	41,164	10.62	412,374.32
1890	230	10,534	32,598	11.95	393,411.90
1891	198	3,517	24,359	14.27	347,599.80
1892	114	5,967	14,461	13.78	199,257.21
1893	120	14,551	17,101	13.02	222,586.07

The above data was obtained from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, which failed to show the average cost per case of each completed investigation.

Number of cases pending investigation December 1, 1893, in which fraud is alleged or suspected.

Location.	Number.
New Mexico	1,448
Iowa	599
Indian Territory	539
Tennessee	71
New York (d)	96
Total	2,753

(d) This investigation is only in its preliminary stage. It will, no doubt, exceed in extent the New Mexico investigation.

Statement of work received and disposed of by the special examiner's division from March 1 to December 1, 1893.

Month.	Number of cases received.	Number of cases disposed of.		
		Sent to board of review.	Sent to other divisions	Sent to adm. files.
March	1,253	739	202	2
April	1,745	546	107	1
May	2,145	444	158	3
June	3,684	459	677	2
July	2,182	415	308	0
August	1,274	559	328	1
September	1,226	557	362	3
October	1,538	688	246	4
November	1,680	785	298	6
Total	16,727	5,192	2,686	22
				2,686
				5,192
Cases on hand March 1, 1893	9,054	Total		7,900
	25,781			
	7,900			
Number of cases in division	17,881			

I now call for the reading of the bill by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time allotted for general debate is exhausted. The Clerk will read the bill by sections under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill by sections, read as follows:

Customs service: To defray the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs, being additional to the permanent appropriation for this purpose, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, $500,000.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to this increasing expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer any amendment?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was but a few years ago that the general appropriation, amounting to $5,500,000 per annum, and the amount coming to the Treasury from fines, penalties, and forfeitures, substantially covered all the expenses of collecting the customs revenue.

But within a few years these several deficiency bills have been coming in, and I know that they are increasing annually. For instance in the Fiftieth Congress there were in both sessions only $480,000 required. In the Fifty-first Congress there were $685,000 required. In the Fifty-second Congress there were $950,000 required to make up this deficiency, and here at the very beginning of this session we are asked to appropriate $500,000 as a beginning of the amount which will be required to defray these additional expenses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is high time that the Treasury Department be called upon to exercise greater care in these matters, and to diminish these expenditures; and for that purpose, that the attention of the committee might be called to these increasing expenditures—unnecessary, because the expense of collecting revenues from customs is not one which increases annually—I have moved to strike out the last word, and made these few remarks. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries: For supporting roof, strengthening floors, and general repairs to the so-called Armory building, now occupied jointly by the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries and United States National Museum, including reconstructing elevator, and for standpipes and fire-escapes, the work to be done under the supervision and direction of the Architect of the Capitol, $7,100.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after line 5, insert:

"That the appropriation made by the act approved August 5, 1892, entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes,' for the introduction of water supply to the station of the United States Fish Commission, Lake County, Colo., be, and is hereby, made available for the purchase of such properties adjacent to such station, and the water and other rights appertaining to the same, as will vest in the United States the practical control of the water supply of Rock Creek, and as also for any further expenditures for the introduction of said water supply."

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What is that amendment?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is an amendment introduced at the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. The amendment is all right.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (to Mr. CANNON of Illinois). It is to make a fund already appropriated available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pension Office: For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, $200,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after the word "dollars," in line 23, insert the following:

"*Provided, however*, That the clerks and other persons who shall be paid per diem and expenses under this appropriation shall be employed exclusively upon the investigation of original pension claims and claims for increase of pension."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized to offer his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky, having charge of this bill, what amount now remains of the $200,000 appropriated for special agents for the present fiscal year?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The Commissioner said the amount would be enough to run his office until the 1st of February—the last of January or the 1st of February.

Mr. HOLMAN. He did not state the exact amount of money remaining.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is impossible for him to state the exact amount.

Mr. HOLMAN. The committee is aware of the fact——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It was impossible for the Commissioner to state the exact amount of money, for the men in the field have not all returned their accounts.

Mr. HOLMAN. The committee is aware of the fact that the estimates for special agents to examine into pension claims for the present fiscal year and last fiscal year was $215,000 each year.

Mr. SAYERS. But the gentleman from Indiana will remember that the Commissioner of Pensions would not inform the committee as to what estimates were submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HOLMAN. I know that the committee had no information on the subject at all.

Mr. SAYERS. He declined to give us the information.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly; the Commissioner of Pensions refused to state the estimate he submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, but we all know the estimate submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury for this purpose for the years 1893 and for the present fiscal year 1894. I have no doubt the amount was reduced by the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Committee on Appropriations, after careful consideration of the subject, finally reduced the amount for both years from $215,000 to $200,000. I should have been glad if the committee had been accurately informed as to what portion of the $200,000 appropriated for this year still remains, and also as to the exact manner in which this $200,000 additional is proposed to be expended.

That there should be more or less fraud in such a vast transaction as the pensioning of a million of Union soldiers, their widows, and orphan children would be very natural and probable. But I must say, speaking from my own personal experience, that as a rule what are called frauds in granting pensions are largely technical frauds; and both Houses of Congress have at every session for years passed bills granting pensions to persons who for mere technical reasons have been dropped from the pension roll. In every session for many years past Congress has favorably considered such bills.

In all the cases that have come under my own personal observation, where there have been charges alleged of fraudulent methods in getting pensions, the ground upon which the pension was finally revoked was technical and not a real substantial case of fraud. There is not a session of Congress, I repeat, in which these technical irregularities or considerations are not set aside and the pensions granted or regranted if the pension had been revoked.

I do not wish anyone to have a pension unless justly entitled to it under the laws. The pension roll should be in every sense a roll of honor. If this $200,000 is intended, as it is alleged, to facilitate the adjustment and settlement of pension claims now pending and claims for increased pensions, I have no objection to the appropriation. My amendment simply requires that the expenditure of the money shall be for those purposes. But I protest against a general raid in any form on the pension roll. Democrats and Republicans are equally responsible for the laws under which these pensions have been granted. Both of the great parties have administered the Pension Office.

There is no evidence before Congress to justify the charge of widespread fraud in the granting of pensions. The Pension Office has already ample means for the detection of frauds if they exist. I assure you gentlemen the country will not tolerate any general charge of frauds in the pension roll on mere suspicion, nor will the country tolerate any revocation or suspension of a pension unless for fraud fully established nor until the pensioner shall have had a full and fair hearing.

[Here the hammer fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise for the purpose of hearing a message from the President; after which I will move to go back into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HATCH, from the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that they had had under consideration H. R. 4763, the urgent deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HAWAII.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President in response to a resolution of the House.

The message was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution passed by your honorable body on the 13th instant, I hereby transmit a report of the Secretary of State, with copies of the instructions given to Mr. Albert S. Willis, the representative of the United States now in the Hawaiian Islands, and also the correspondence since the 4th day of March, 1889, concerning the relations of this Government to those islands.

In making this communication I have withheld only a dispatch from the former minister to Hawaii, numbered 70, under date of October 8, 1892, and a dispatch from the present minister, numbered 3, under date of November 16, 1893, because in my opinion the publication of these two papers would be incompatible with the public interest.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 18, 1893.

The SPEAKER. This message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and printed. The Chair also lays before the House another message from the President.

[For message see Senate proceedings.]

At the conclusion of the reading there was applause on the Democratic side.

Several members addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. This message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the instructions to Minister Willis, for which the House resolutions called.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent any part of the papers accompanying the message can be read.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the House called for those instructions. The reading of that message is merely the reading of an argument.

The SPEAKER. This message has no relation to the resolution of the House. The response of the President to that resolution has been already read and referred.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I understood that the message just read was in direct response to the resolution of the House.

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that it certainly can not be the design of anybody, and I know very well that it is not the design of the Speaker of the House, to take advantage of any misconception which may have existed on this floor. The understanding certainly was, among the membership on this side, so far as I know, and, I think, generally throughout the House, that the message just read was in response to the resolution of the House; and if it be true that the President has transmitted certain documents with another brief message which has been slipped through here and referred with all the documents called for, without attracting the attention of the House, that certainly should not preclude us from obtaining the information which we called for and which has already been read in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Debate is not in order.

Confusion in the Hall.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to debate. I am rising to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order. The Chair will state the question. It requires unanimous consent to have these papers, or any part of them, read.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am rising to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has heard the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I beg the Chair's pardon, but I have not concluded.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman will proceed and will confine himself to the question of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will endeavor to do so, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a question of privilege, and make the point that when the House of Representatives, in its capacity as one of the coördinate branches of this Government calls upon another branch, under its constitutional power and authority, to furnish this House certain information, we ought to be permitted to have that information, and that no technical advantage should be taken—a technical advantage which certainly can have no permanent effect, because this matter will all go into the papers to-morrow morning—that no technical advantage should be allowed to prevent us from having the information for which the call has been made and which has already become the property of another branch of the Legislature by being read at its desk. It was called for as a matter of right and——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the gentleman from Maine is confining himself to the question of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I am. I desire to do so, and I ask the Chair——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Maine will allow the Chair to state what has occurred, the Chair thinks the gentleman will see himself that he is not in order except in asking unanimous consent. The House of Representatives adopted a resolution calling upon the President to furnish, if not inconsistent with the public interest, certain correspondence. That message has been sent to the House this morning; that message has been submitted to the House with the accompanying documents; that message has been read; and that message has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But, Mr. Speaker, that was not understood——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. It has already been referred.

The SPEAKER. The message last read is the message which the President in his annual message to Congress stated that he would at a subsequent period communicate, in relation to the Hawaiian matter.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Speaker will pardon me for saying that I rose immediately after the Clerk finished the reading to raise this question and to make this demand, so that the Speaker will not surely state——

The SPEAKER. Debate was not in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair surely will not hold that the reading of this second message precludes me from the right which I am now claiming?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman seems to think it customary to read the documents which accompany a message of this kind. The letter of instructions to which the gentleman refers, and which I hold in my hand, which I personally would be very glad to have read with the consent of the House, is not a part of the document in such a sense that it must be read to the House. It is one of the "accompanying documents." The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to this extract from the Digest, page 421:

Whenever taken up messages from the President are always read at length, the House never, as in the case of other communications, dispensing with the reading, but documents accompanying the messages are not usually read by the Clerk; and the message (but not the documents) is entered in full in the Journal.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Undoubtedly that is the usage of the House; but the fact that a member rises and demands the reading of a document of this kind takes it out of the category of "usage."

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The reading would not have been in order if the gentleman had asked it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, it is very frequently the case that when a bill is reported the accompanying report is not read, or the bill itself is not read *in extenso* upon the first or second reading. It is the usage of the House to pass a bill through those readings without the reading *in extenso;* but certainly when a member demands the reading of a bill at any such stage it becomes his right to have it read. And the Speaker will allow me to say—I need not remark that I do not undertake to speak as a parliamentary expert—that I can not conceive that the House should properly be called upon to act on a motion to print and refer documents concerning which it has no knowledge. The document in question might be incendiary; it might be obscene; it might be in contravention of public morals. [Laughter].

I will not characterize this particular document, for I am not undertaking to discuss the merits of this question: but it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, when I am called upon, as I have been, and am about to be again, to vote upon the question of the printing of a document and its reference to a committee of this House, I have a right as a member to call for the reading of the document. Whether we should read this vast mass of communications—whether the reading would be an advantageous use of the time of the House—is a question of expediency. But in the exercise of what I believe to be my right, I have called in this case for the reading of the *res gestæ*—the document of all others called for by our resolution; and it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, it is my right to call for that reading. I shall of course submit to the ruling of the Speaker upon this subject with great cheerfulness, because I have every confidence not only in his fairness, but in his ability as a parliamentarian.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that whilst he does not consider it a matter of right that this communication should be read——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will remind the Chair that it is referred to in the document just read.

The SPEAKER. It is. The letter is quite short, only three and a half pages of typewritten matter; and if there be no objection, the Chair will direct that it be read.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Let us understand what document it is the reading of which is called for.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, it is the letter of instructions from the Secretary of State to the present minister.

Mr. McMILLIN. If it is to be read let it be done with the understanding that it is by consent.

The SPEAKER. By consent.

Mr. McMILLIN. Because the establishment of a precedent of this kind would not do.

The SPEAKER. The document, if read, will be read by consent.

Mr. HITT. I ask that the Chair direct also the reading of two telegraphic dispatches of instruction appended to the letters of instruction of November 28 and December 3. They are very brief, and they cover the exact point now in question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will read these several documents.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. Do I understand that the papers about to be read were directly transmitted with the message?

The SPEAKER. They came with the message.

The Clerk will read

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[No. 4.—Confidential.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, October 18, 1893.*

SIR: Supplementing the general instructions which you have received with regard to your official duties, it is necessary to communicate to you in confidence certain instructions for your guidance in so far as concerns the relation of the Government of the United States towards the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

The President deems it his duty to withdraw from the Senate the treaty of annexation which has been signed by the Secretary of State and the agents of the Provisional Government, and to dispatch a trusted representative to Hawaii to impartially investigate the causes of the so-called revolution and ascertain and report the true situation in those islands. This information was needed the better to enable the President to discharge a delicate and important public duty.

The instructions given to Mr. Blount, of which you were furnished with a copy, point out a line of conduct to be observed by him in his official and personal relations on the islands, by which you will be guided so far as they are applicable and not inconsistent with what is herein contained.

It remains to acquaint you with the President's conclusions upon the facts embodied in Mr. Blount's reports, and to direct your course in accordance therewith. The Provisional Government was not established by the Hawaiian people or with their consent or acquiescence, nor has it since existed with their consent. The Queen refused to surrender her powers to the Provisional Government until convinced that the minister of the United States had recognized it as the *de facto* authority and would support and defend it with the military force of the United States, and that resistance would precipitate a bloody conflict with that force.

She was advised and assured by her ministers, and by the leaders of the movement for the overthrow of her Government, that if she surrendered under protest her case would afterwards be fairly considered by the President of the United States. The Queen finally wisely yielded to the armed forces of the United States then quartered in Honolulu, relying upon the good faith and honor of the President, when informed of what had occurred, to undo the action of the minister and reinstate her to the authority which she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

After a patient examination of Mr. Blount's reports the President is satisfied that the movement against the Queen if not instigated was encouraged and supported by the representative of this Government at Honolulu; that he promised in advance to aid her enemies in an effort to overthrow the Hawaiian Government and set up by force a new government in its place, and that he kept this promise by causing a detachment of troops to be landed from the Boston on the 16th of January and by recognizing the Provisional Government the next day when it was too feeble to defend itself and the constitutional Government was able to successfully maintain its authority against any threatening force other than that of the United States already landed.

The President has therefore determined that he will not send back to the Senate for its actions thereon the treaty which he withdrew from that body for further consideration on the 9th day of March last. On your arrival at Honolulu you will take advantage of an early opportunity to inform the Queen of this determination, making known to her the President's sincere regret that the reprehensible conduct of the American minister and the unauthorized presence on land of a military force of the United States obliged her to surrender her sovereignty for the time being and rely on the justice of this Government to undo the flagrant wrong.

You will, however, at the same time inform the Queen that when reinstated the President expects that she will pursue a magnanimous course by granting full amnesty to all who participated in the movement against her, including persons who are or have been officially or otherwise connected with the Provisional Government, depriving them of no right or privilege which they enjoyed before the so-called "revolution." All obligations created by the Provisional Government in due course of administration should be assumed.

Having secured the Queen's agreement to pursue this wise and humane policy, which it is believed you will speedily obtain, you will then advise the executive of the Provisional Government and his ministers of the President's determination of the question which their action and that of the Queen devolves upon him, and that they are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority.

Should the Queen decline to pursue the liberal course suggested, or should the Provisional Government refuse to abide by the President's decision, you will report the facts and await further directions. In carrying out these general instructions, you will be guided largely by your own good judgment in dealing with the delicate situation.

I am sir, your obedient servant,

W. Q. GRESHAM.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram sent through dispatch agent at San Francisco.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, November 24, 1893.*

The brevity and uncertainty of your telegrams are embarrassing. You will insist upon amnesty and recognition of obligations of the Provisional Government as essential conditions of restoration. All interests will be promoted by prompt action.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, December 3, 1893.*

Your dispatch, which was answered by steamer on the 25th of November, seems to call for additional instructions.

Should the Queen refuse assent to the written conditions you will at once inform her that the President will cease interposition in her behalf and that, while he deems it his duty to endeavor to restore to the sovereign the constitutional government of the islands, his further efforts in that direction will depend upon the Queen's unqualified agreement that all obligations created by the Provisional Government in a proper course of administration shall be assumed, and upon such pledges by her as will prevent the adoption of any measures of proscription or punishment for what has been done in the past by those setting up or supporting the Provisional Government. The

President feels that by our original interference and what followed we have incurred responsibilities to the whole Hawaiian community, and it would not be just to put one party at the mercy of the other.

Should the Queen ask whether, if she accedes to conditions, active steps will be taken by the United States to effect her restoration or to maintain her authority thereafter, you will say that the President can not use force without the authority of Congress.

Should the Queen accept conditions and the Provisional Government refuse to surrender, you will be governed by previous instructions. If the Provisional Government asks whether the United States will hold the Queen to fulfillment of stipulated conditions, you will say, the President, acting under dictates of honor and duty as he has done in endeavoring to effect restoration, will do all in its constitutional power to cause observance of the conditions he has imposed.

GRESHAM.

[During the reading of the foregoing, after the words "You will say that the President can not use force without the authority of Congress," there was loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. There is no question before the House. This matter is referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. These documents so clearly disclose the fact that the privileges of this House, as a constituent part of the Government of the United States, have been invaded——

Mr. ENLOE. I rise to a point of order. This speech is not in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I prefer to make my motion to the Speaker, and not to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ENLOE. Let the gentleman make his motion, then.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I trust the Speaker will allow me——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please send up his resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want to finish my sentence.

Mr. ENLOE. You want to finish your speech. You would better have your paper read first.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I object to any speeches. Debate is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Objection having been made, no debate is in order until it appears to the House that there is some question of privilege presented.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am on the floor, speaking to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The question of privilege must be stated or read from the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am stating it.

The SPEAKER. It must be read from the desk. The gentleman will send it up.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair does not hold that I may not state my question of privilege?

The SPEAKER. It must be read from the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let us understand——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a question of privilege, which I send to the Clerk's desk. [Cries of "Too late," on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is recognized.

Mr. BLANCHARD. You are too late.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have sent to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution——

Mr. COCKRAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I trust the Chair will not make a mistake——

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request gentlemen to resume their seats. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] is out of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does the Chair decline to allow me to have the question of privilege read?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine is out of order. The gentleman from New York is recognized. [Applause on the Democratic side and manifestations of derision on the Republican side.] Gentlemen will please resume their seats.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. What ruling?

Mr. BOUTELLE. That I have not the right to state a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not made any such ruling. The Chair has ruled that the gentleman has no right to rise to a privileged resolution and debate it until the resolution is read at the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I tried to send it to the desk, and the Speaker prevented me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair directed the gentleman to send it up.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the Speaker cut me off by recognizing the gentleman from New York. I offered to send up my resolution, and I offer to send it now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears in the message of the President——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I object, if this requires unanimous consent, while I have the floor——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] objects to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BOUTELLE demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 154, noes 20.

Mr. BOUTELLE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] makes the point that no quorum has voted.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yes, we will have the yeas and nays, and afterward a call of the House.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 0, not voting 188; as follows:

YEAS—165.

Alderson,	Cooper, Tex.	Hunter,	Pence,
Alexander,	Covert,	Hutcheson,	Pendleton, Tex.
Arnold,	Cox,	Ikirt,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Bailey,	Crawford,	Kilgore,	Pigott,
Baker, Kans.	Cummings,	Kribbs,	Reilly,
Baldwin,	Davey,	Kyle,	Richards, Ohio
Bankhead,	Davis,	Lane,	Richardson, Mich.
Barnes,	De Armond,	Latimer,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bartlett,	De Forest,	Lawson,	Robbins.
Barwig,	Dinsmore,	Layton,	Robertson, La.
Bell, Colo.	Dockery,	Lester,	Russell, Ga.
Bell, Tex.	Donovan,	Lisle,	Ryan.
Berry,	Dunphy,	Livingston,	Sayers,
Black, Ga.	Edmunds,	Lynch,	Schermerhorn,
Black, Ill.	English,	Maddox,	Sibley,
Blanchard,	Enloe,	Magner,	Simpson,
Bland,	Epes,	Maguire,	Sperry,
Boen,	Erdman,	Mallory,	Springer,
Bower, N. C.	Everett,	Marshall,	Stallings,
Branch,	Fellows,	Martin, Ind.	Stevens,
Brawley,	Fielder,	McCreary, Ky.	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fithian,	McCulloch.	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Forman,	McDannold,	Strait,
Bretz,	Fyan,	McDearmon,	Talbert, S. C.
Brookshire,	Geary,	McEttrick,	Tarsney,
Brown,	Geissenhainer,	McKaig,	Tate,
Bryan,	Gorman,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Ind.
Bunn,	Grady,	McMillin,	Terry,
Bynum,	Griffin,	McNagny,	Tracey,
Cabaniss,	Haines,	McRae,	Turner,
Cannon, Cal.	Hall, Minn.	Money,	Warner,
Caruth,	Hall, Mo.	Morgan,	Washington,
Catchings,	Hammond,	Moses,	Weadock,
Causey,	Hare,	Mutchler,	Wells,
Clark, Mo.	Harris,	Oates,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clarke, Ala.	Hatch,	O'Neil,	Whiting,
Cobb, Ala.	Hayes,	Outhwaite,	Wise,
Cockran,	Heard,	Page,	Wolverton,
Coffeen,	Henderson, N. C.	Paschal,	Woodard.
Coombs,	Holman,	Patterson,	
Cooper, Fla.	Hooker, Miss.	Paynter,	
Cooper, Ind.	Hudson,	Pearson,	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—188.

Abbott,	Bartholdt,	Brickner,	Campbell,
Adams,	Belden,	Broderick,	Cannon, Ill.
Aitken,	Beltzhoover,	Brosius,	Capehart,
Aldrich,	Bingham,	Bundy,	Chickering,
Allen,	Blair,	Burnes,	Childs,
Apsley,	Boatner,	Burrows,	Clancy,
Avery,	Boutelle,	Cadmus,	Cobb, Mo.
Babcock,	Bowers, Cal.	Caldwell,	Cockrell,
Baker, N. H.	Brattan,	Caminetti,	Cogswell,

Compton,	Hartman,	McCall,	Sherman,
Conn,	Haugen,	McCleary, Minn.	Sickles,
Cooper, Wis.	Heiner,	McDowell,	Sipe,
Cornish,	Henderson, Ill.	McGann,	Smith,
Cousins,	Henderson, Iowa	McKeighan,	Snodgrass,
Crain,	Hendrix,	Meiklejohn,	Somers,
Culberson,	Hepburn,	Mercer,	Stephenson,
Curtis, Kans.	Hermann,	Meredith,	Stone, C. W.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hicks,	Meyer,	Stone, W. A.
Dalzell,	Hilborn,	Milliken,	Storer,
Daniels,	Hines,	Montgomery,	Strong,
Denson,	Hitt,	Moon,	Swanson,
Dingley,	Hooker, N. Y.	Morse,	Sweet,
Dolliver,	Hopkins, Ill.	Murray,	Talbott, Md.
Doolittle,	Hopkins, Pa.	Neill,	Tawney,
Draper,	Houk, Ohio	Newlands,	Taylor, Tenn.
Dunn,	Houk, Tenn.	Northway,	Thomas,
Durborow,	Hulick,	O'Ferrall,	Tucker,
Ellis, Ky.	Hull,	Payne,	Turpin,
Ellis, Oregon	Johnson, Ind.	Perkins,	Tyler,
Fitch,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Phillips,	Updegraff,
Fletcher,	Johnson, Ohio	Pickler,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Funk,	Jones,	Post,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Funston,	Joy,	Powers,	Wadsworth,
Gardner,	Kem,	Price,	Walker,
Gear,	Kiefer,	Randall,	Wanger,
Gillet, N. Y.	Lacey,	Ray,	Waugh,
Gillett, Mass.	Lapham,	Rayner,	Wever,
Goldzier,	Lefever,	Reed,	Wheeler, Ill.
Goodnight,	Linton,	Reyburn,	White,
Graham,	Lockwood,	Ritchie,	Williams, Ill.
Gresham,	Loud,	Robinson, Pa.	Williams, Miss.
Grosvenor,	Loudenslager,	Rusk,	Wilson, Ohio
Grout,	Lucas,	Russell, Conn.	Wilson, Wash.
Hager,	Mahon,	Scranton,	Wilson, W. Va.
Hainer,	Marsh,	Settle,	Woomer,
Harmer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Shaw,	Wright, Mass.
Harter,	McAleer,	Shell,	Wright, Pa.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

For this day:

Mr. TURPIN with Mr. RAY.

Mr. CADMUS with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. TYLER with Mr. HULL.

Mr. BRICKNER with Mr. HARMER.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. CAPEHART with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. WALKER.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. HOOKER of New York.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi with Mr. CURTIS of ——.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. CHICKERING.

Mr. RITCHIE with Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. SNODGRASS] is detained from the House by sickness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices for the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 165; the nays none. No quorum has voted.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The motion is agreed to——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Division.

The SPEAKER. And the House stands adjourned until to-morrow morning at 12 o'clock.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HATCH (by request): A bill (H. R. 4830) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 4831) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a high wagon bridge at or near Sioux City, Iowa," approved March 2, 1890, as amended by acts of April 13, 1890, and February 7, 1893—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4832) to repeal the duties on woolen goods, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4833) to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4834) to validate all outstanding soldiers' additional homestead certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FORMAN: A bill (H. R. 4835) for the erection of a public building at the city of East St. Louis, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4857) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia: A resolution setting apart a day for the consideration of House bill 415—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A resolution to print 12,000 copies of the fourteenth annual report of the Director of the Geological Survey—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 4836) for the relief of Hannah A. Frisbie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) granting a pension to Mrs. George D. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of Mrs. William Loring Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) for the relief of James K. Bowman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 4840) for the relief of the estate of Michael Fillion, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 4841) for the relief of Mrs. A. Shirley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CABANISS: A bill (H. R. 4842) for the relief of Hugh V. Washington, of Macon, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 4843) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 4844) for the relief of Sarah Grisson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of Francis M. Perkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORMAN: A bill (H. R. 4846) granting an honorable discharge to Charles Held, late captain of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 4847) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. B. F. Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) to reimburse the State of Montana the sum of $120 for fees erroneously expended in certain land selections—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4849) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas H. Carpenter, late captain Seventeenth United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4850) granting a pension to Marcus D. Box, of Company D, First Missouri Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A bill (H. R. 4851) for the removal of the charge of desertion against Joseph Wright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4852) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamship Tallapoosa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of Sarah M. Hadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4854) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March

3, 1883, and commonly known as the "Bowman act"—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4855) making appropriation for the harbor of Saugatuck, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of William E. Keene—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: A joint resolution (H. Res. 101) for the relief of Annie V. Mumford, widow of Oliver Mumford, late a captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of W. T. Conley and 81 others, of Haverhill, Mass., for the passage of House bill for the establishment of a Government telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of all the employés of the Pittsburg Plate Glass Company, of Tarentum, Pa., against change of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against change of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against change of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FYAN: Petition of workmen of plate-glass works at Crystal City, Mo., against reduction of duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of the farmers and growers of cigar leaf tobacco and their employés and those interested in the cultivation of that product in the town of Hartfield, Mass., against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Protest of W. McNabb and 516 other citizens of Superior, Wis., against certain bills to authorize the building of bridges between Superior, Wis., and Duluth, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 123 workingmen of Ford City, Pa., protesting against any change of duties on imports as will close the various industries of the country or force permanent reduction of wages—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 100 workingmen of Ford City, Pa., protesting against any change in the duties on imports as will close the various industries of the country or force permanent reduction of wages—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: Protest of Sellwood Lumber Manufacturing Company of Oregon against the repeal of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest from H. R. Duniway and other lumber manufacturers of Oregon against repeal of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial and resolution of the Illinois Humane Society indorsing House bill 4182 for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William Heller, of Savanna, Ill., in favor of 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Petition of and papers in regard to the pension claim of David T. Stonebreaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: Petition in reference to House bill 996, first session Fifty-third Congress, on claim of owner of steamer Leesburg—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McALEER: Papers to accompany House bill 4769—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McETTRICK: Memorial of granite cutters and polishers, employés of Quincy (Mass.) granite industry, protesting against any reduction of the present ad valorem duty on dressed granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Typographical Union of Boston, Mass., and Central Labor Union of Boston, Mass., not to build Government Printing Office by contract—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of John C. Tobin and other workmen employed by the Roxbury Carpet Company, of Boston, Mass., protesting against any reduction of the present duty on carpets—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany House bill 4824—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Remonstrance of 16 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 5 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 60 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 93 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 46 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 79 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 80 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Protest of the brewers of Peoria, Ill., against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on malt liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Protest of the employés of John H. Seardefield, of New York City, manufacturers of gold leaf, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of citizens of La Crosse County, Wis., farmers and dealers in barley, against the reduction of the duty on barley, and the change from the plan of specific to ad valorem, as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELL: Seven petitions of citizens of South Carolina, praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the navigation of the Congaree River from the present head of navigation to the city of Columbia, a distance of about 2 miles—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Memorial of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the use of public funds for the support of sectarian or ecclesiastical institutions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial from the board of supervisors of Gogebic County, Mich., regardless of party, protesting against the placing of iron on the free list and showing that such action would depopulate the county and practically confiscate by destruction all the people have accumulated by prudence and economy in more prosperous times—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURPIN: Petition of 2,246 citizens of Birmingham, Ala., protesting against putting iron ore and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 636 citizens of Gurnee, Ala., praying that iron ore and coal be not put on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 246 citizens Bessemer, Ala., praying that iron ore and coal be not put on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 217 citizens of Blassburg, Ala., protesting against putting iron ore and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 126 citizens of Johns, Ala., protesting against putting iron ore and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 144 citizens of Blocton, Ala., praying that coal and iron ore be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 275 citizens of Robertson, Ala., praying that coal and iron ore be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 351 citizens of Columbianna, Ala., against the placing of coal and iron ore on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 127 citizens of Montgomery, Ala., praying that iron ore and coal be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 41 citizens of Bibb County, Ala., praying that coal and iron ore be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Memorial of R. S. Newbold & Son, Harrison Townsend, and other employers of labor, workingmen, and

others, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Potts Bros. Iron Co., Limited, employés, workingmen, and others, of Pottstown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 450 employés of M. J. Whittall's mills, Worcester, Mass., protesting against reduction of duty on carpets—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of Benjamin M. Warner and 63 others, tobacco growers of Hatfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Thomas Williams and 181 others, employés of the Blackinton Woolen Mills, of Blackinton, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that he Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad, and other improvements, over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BUTLER. I have some morning business I wish to present.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from Texas will not insist upon the motion now.

Mr. MILLS. If we do not dispose of the business to-day I fear there will be no opportunity to do it before the holidays.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a little morning business I should like to have disposed of before the motion is made.

Mr. MILLS. Very well. After the routine business is over I will make the motion. The business I desire to have disposed of will not take more than fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Texas allow me before he presses the motion to put a question to him?

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Texas is withdrawn.

Mr. HOAR. I merely desire to say that I made a motion yesterday in relation to the disposition of the matter then before the Senate, the President's message, and had expected to call the attention of the Senate to it at the conclusion of the morning business this morning. I have been appealed to by two Senators, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], who desires to address the Senate and is to be absent from the city, I believe, after he has completed his remarks, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], who gave notice of an intention to address the Senate this morning.

It is not my purpose, therefore, to press the motion until those two Senators have finished their remarks, and I suppose that when they have finished their remarks and the executive session which is desired has been concluded, it will be so late in the day that it is better not to press the motion until to-morrow morning. Therefore I shall not press it to-day. If any other Senator chooses to do so, I have no choice about that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the Royal Bag Manufacturing Company, of Charleston, S. C., praying that the so-called Wilson tariff bill be so amended as to prevent undue discrimination against burlaps and burlap bags; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented a memorial of the board of supervisors of Gogebic County, Mich., remonstrating against the reduction of duty on iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of Guernsey Lodge, No. 147, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Cambridge, Ohio, remonstrating against a reduction of duty on sheet iron and steel; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Mrs. Jennie Turnt, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the removal of the charge of desertion from the record of the late Capt. F. Turnt, Company H, One hundred and third New York Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of George W. White and 15 other cigar-makers of Grafton, W. Va., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT. I present a petition which purports to be the petition of 8,000 farmers of Hartford County, Conn., praying for the retention of the present rate of duty on imports of Sumatra tobacco. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE presented a petition of the Minnehaha County Medical Society, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., adopted at a meeting held December 7, 1893, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a bureau of public health in the Treasury Department of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented additional papers to accompany the bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Albert E. Redstone, of Tulare County, Cal., heretofore introduced by him; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of importers, dealers, and manufacturers of tin and terne plates, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against a change from specific to ad valorem duty, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the reduction of the duty on barley, as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill, and also against any change from a specific to an ad valorem duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORDON presented the petition of George R. De Saussure, of Atlanta, Ga., praying that State banks of issue be organized under such regulations as will secure a uniform currency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a memorial of Buhl Sons & Company and others, of Detroit, Mich., importers and manufacturers of tin and terne plates, remonstrating against a change from specific to ad valorem duties on imports, as provided in the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Supervisors of Gogebic County, Mich., remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection of animals in transit; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Pittsburg (Pa.) Petroleum Stock and Metal Exchange, remonstrating against the placing of petroleum on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Typographical Union, No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the placing of "all scientific publications, either of individuals or of institutions," on the free list as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRICE presented a petition of the board of directors of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, praying for the passage of House bill No. 3188, providing for the punishment of train robbers, wreckers, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Lincoln, Poland, Byesville, Brooklyn Village, Fayetteville, Carroll County, Licking County, and Toledo, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the National Lithographic Artists and Engravers' Association, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for an increase in the duty on lithographic plates; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 63, of Toledo, Ohio, and a petition of Typographical Union, No. 237, of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the erection of a building for the Government Printing Office, and requiring all work and the preparation of all material for the building to be done by day's

labor under the direction of a supervising architect, and not by contract: which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented the petition of W. J. Crosley, of Centerville, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to hasten the adjustment of an accumulation of claims on file in the Pension Office; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Guernsey Lodge, No. 47, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Cambridge, Ohio, remonstrating against the reduction of the tariff on sheet iron, steel, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Democratic ex-postal clerks of Northern Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Bynum bill to reinstate all ex-postal clerks who were removed by President Harrison for political reasons, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying that an appropriation of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be made, to be expended by the United States engineers upon a reconnoissance of the principal tributaries of the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio Rivers above the mouth of the Little Kanawha River, and including that river, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 575) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HUNTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1092) for the relief of John W. Daniel, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HUNTON. I am also directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 988) to open minor streets in the District of Columbia, to report it with an adverse recommendation. This bill is embodied substantially in another bill which will be reported by another member of the committee. The bill being considered useless, I report it adversely, and move that it be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 283) for the relief of Mary R. Wilcox, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

MARITIME CANAL OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. CAMDEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN on the 18th instant, for the appointment of a joint committee to examine into and report upon the present condition of the Maritime Canal of Nicaragua, reported it without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair). The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to-morrow morning to have that resolution taken up. Will it not be in order in the morning hour to-morrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will come up to-morrow morning in the morning hour.

Mr. COCKRELL. It will be in order to move to take it up then, but it does not come up as a matter of course. It is like any other report.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a concurrent resolution and goes to the Calendar, and it will be in order to move to take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes to the Calendar, and may be called up at any time.

LABORER IN LAW LIBRARY.

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL on the 4th instant, providing for an additional laborer in the Law Library of Congress, reported it without amendment, and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1313) to increase the pension of Anna M. Allen; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1314) granting a pension to Jerusha Sturgis, widow of Brig. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 1315) for the relief of Robert Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1316) for the relief of Nimrod D. Kenegster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1317) to establish a customs district at Port Royal, S. C.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1318) providing an appropriation for continued improvement of the Congaree River in South Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WASHBURN introduced a bill (S. 1319) for the relief of E. Douglass, late Indian agent at White Earth Indian Agency; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1320) to provide for the punishment of certain frauds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 1321) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of David Unsell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1322) for the relief of William Leach; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Select Committee on the Ford's Theater Disaster.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 1323) to impose a discriminating duty on tea imported from this side of the Cape of Good Hope, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Chambers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1325) for the relief of A. P. H. Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1326) for the relief of George W. Alexander; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1327) for the relief of James Legg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1328) for the relief of John M. Robinson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1329) for the relief of James Hooper; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1330) for the relief of night inspectors at the ports of New York and Baltimore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 1331) for the relief of Antoinette Acken; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1332) relating to the pay and retirement of mates in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1333) for the relief of the estate of Sally Sterrett Tate, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1334) to amend section 224 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the records of service of soldiers of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1335) for the relief of James Q. Shirley and the estate of Francis De Long; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAMERON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1336) to amend sections 4756 and 4757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by substituting the words "appointed persons," for the words "appointed petty officers"; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1337) authorizing the purchase of additional lots of ground adjoining or adjacent to the post office building in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1338) for increase of pension to George Hayes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1339) granting an increase of pen-

sion to Lucy A. Buttrick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1340) for the relief of Nelson Delap, surviving partner of Anderson Delap, of Madison County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1341) for the relief of J. J. Bailey, of Shelby County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. GORMAN, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to Thomas P. Morgan, jr., to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in his claim, upon complying with the rule relating thereto.

On motion of Mr. MANDERSON, it was

Ordered. That the Secretary of the Senate transmit the papers on file with S. 470, a bill for the relief of George H. Jewett, of Arlington, Washington County, Nebr., to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, for the use of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit the papers on file with S. 476, "A bill for the relief of John Palmer, Pine Ridge, Shannon County, S. Dak.," to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, for the use of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, it was

Ordered, That the papers relating to the claim of the heirs or assignees of Joshua Shaw be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, under the rules of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SENATE MAIL-CARRIER.

Mr. PLATT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to employ an additional mail-carrier in the Senate post-office, at an annual salary of $1,200, to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided for.

BRAZILIAN CABLE LINE.

Mr. FRYE. About two years ago a French cable company made application to our Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, for permission to land its cable from Brazil on the coast of the United States. Our Secretary of State investigated the matter and found that the company had, by authority of the law of Brazil, a monopoly, and that no other company, while that power was in existence, and it was *in perpetuam*, could be permitted to land a cable on the Brazilian coast. So our Secretary of State refused to grant the permission asked unless the company would authorize any cable company of the United States hereafter to land its cable on the Brazilian coast. That was refused by the company.

After Mr. Blaine retired, the company, I think under another name, or a modified name, applied to the then Secretary of State, Mr. Foster. For some reason or other his suspicions were aroused and he caused a thorough investigation to be made with a like result, and another refusal was given.

Subsequently the same company applied to both Houses of Congress. The bill was referred in the Senate to the Committee of Commerce, of which I had the honor to be chairman. We gave the parties a hearing. The company was represented by a Mr. Jefferson Chandler, an able attorney, residing, I think, in the District.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, and Mr. Partridge, the Solicitor for the State Department, appeared before us, as members of the committee will remember. We investigated the matter thoroughly, and found the facts to be as the Secretary of State had before found them, that this company had a perpetual charter; that so far as Brazil was concerned it was a monopoly, and no other company would be permitted to land its cable on the Brazilian coast; and our committee unanimously determined against the request of the company.

I am informed, whether truly or not I can not say, that that company recently appeared before the Secretary of State, and that he, without obtaining the information which the former Secretaries and which the Committee on Commerce procured, has granted to the company the right which it asked; and if it is true and there is no remedy to be had for it, then the United States will be perpetually kept from the landing of any cable on the coast of Brazil.

Mr. President, in view of these facts I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its adoption.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State inform the Senate whether permission has been granted to any foreign cable telegraph company to land its line on the coast of the United States since the 1st day of March, 1893; and whether permission had been refused such company prior to that date. Also, what reasons now exist for granting such permission, if it was granted, that did not pertain when it was previously refused.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HUNTON. I object to the present consideration of the resolution. I think the Senator from Maine is mistaken in the statement of the facts which he has just made to the Senate. In the first place, I understand the company proposes to run a cable from the shores of the United States to Cuba and its line is not to go to the shores of Brazil. Am I right in that, sir?

Mr. FRYE. No, sir; I think the Senator is not correct.

Mr. HUNTON. That is the way I understand it. Then in addition I desire to state that the Secretary of State, according to my information, took the ground that it was a matter with which he had nothing to do; that this was a company incorporated, and by the action of the Legislatures of both Virginia and South Carolina it had permission to land one branch of its cable upon the shore in Virginia near Norfolk and the other at Charleston, S. C.; and the Secretary of State, instead of giving permission to land the cable, as I understood the Senator from Maine to state, said that it was a matter with which he had nothing to do and that he would not interfere with it at all. I think his letter on file in the State Department will show that he so stated.

If I am correct in this statement of facts I suppose the Senator from Maine will not want any papers sent to the Senate from the State Department. The Secretary of State has taken the ground, I understand, that it is a matter with which the executive department ought not to interfere; that these two States by a formal act of the Legislature of each, having given permission to the company to land its cable upon the shores of the respective States, it is a matter between them and the company, and that the Federal Government has no right to permit or deny the right of the company to land.

Mr. FRYE. That is one of the very questions that was argued before the Committee on Commerce with great ability by Mr. Chandler—that those States had the authority to do as they had done and that the United States has no authority to intervene. But the committee unanimously held to exactly the contrary opinion. What I wish to know is precisely what has been done by the State Department. I desire the information just as much now as I did before. My impression is that the application to which the Senator referred was to land at San Domingo, not at Cuba.

Mr. HUNTON. The Senator may be right in that respect.

Mr. FRYE. And the company already has its cable from San Domingo to Brazil.

Mr. HUNTON. Not that company.

Mr. FRYE. Well, it may be called by another name.

Mr. HUNTON. It is an entirely different company.

Mr. FRYE. That is the inform tion I desire.

Mr. HUNTON. It is an entirela different company that carries the cable to Brazil. I merely desire to have the resolution go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the resolution will go over under the rule.

APPROVAL OF POSTMASTERS' BONDS.

Mr. COLQUITT. I ask the Senate to take up a bill that will give rise to no controversy, but which is important in the administration of the office of the Postmaster-General in its details. It is the bill (H. R. 2668) authorizing the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General to approve postmasters' bonds.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads what the present law is on this subject. Must the bonds be approved by the Postmaster-General?

Mr. WASHBURN. If the Senator from Georgia will allow me, I will state that under the previous law, before the creation of the office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, the bonds were approved by the First Assistant Postmaster General. Now it is proposed to transfer the same power to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That is all there is of the bill?

Mr. WASHBURN. That is all there is of it.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVENUE FROM INCOME TAX.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, a statement of the

amount of revenue derived from the income tax from 1863 to 1873; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. BERRY. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas asks for the present consideration of the bill indicated by him. The Chair hears no objection, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, this bill provides for the repeal of section 2002 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the bringing of armed troops to places of election, and of sections 2005 to 2031, inclusive, relating to the appointment, qualifications, powers, duties, and compensation of supervisors of election and special deputy marshals, and also for the repeal of sections 5506, 5511, 5512, 5513, 5514, 5515, 5520, 5521, 5522, 5523, and a part of section 643, relating to crimes and their punishment. All of these laws which it is now proposed to repeal relate to the supervision of elections by Federal authority.

The power to pass these laws originally is derived, or claimed to be derived, from the following clause of the Constitution of the United States:

ARTICLE I.

SEC. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

It has long been contended that this clause of the Constitution conferred upon Congress the power only to pass election laws when the States had neglected or refused to act in the premises, and that the laws now in question were not warranted by the provisions of the Constitution. Whether this be true or untrue I do not propose to discuss. The Supreme Court has decided in favor of the constitutionality of these laws, and each Senator will decide for himself whether or not that decision is binding upon him in construing the Constitution, which we have sworn to support in the enactment of all laws.

I propose to advocate the repeal of these laws and the passage of this bill, for the reason that I believe the laws now on the statute book to be vicious in principle and bad in policy, passed for an unjust purpose, and tending in their character to defeat the very object for which it is claimed they were enacted—that is, free and fair elections.

I take it for granted, Mr. President, that each Senator upon this floor is anxious to secure honest elections everywhere, and that each ballot cast by the citizen should be honestly counted, and any assumption upon the part of the Republican party, the Republican press, or Republican Senators that we desire the repeal of these laws in order that fraud may be perpetrated in elections is unwarranted by the facts, unjust to us, and an insult to all honest men. We are American citizens equally interested with you in the preservation of free institutions, and equally anxious to maintain the purity of elections. The only real question at issue is, can this purity and this fairness be best secured by the General Government or by the several States.

These laws which we seek to repeal are part and parcel of the reconstruction laws. They were passed soon after the close of the civil war; passed at a time of great political excitement; passed for the purpose of securing the supremacy of an ignorant race in the Southern States, upon whom the right of suffrage had but recently been conferred; passed for the additional purpose of enabling the Republican party to retain control of the State of New York and other leading States throughout the North.

If there was ever any excuse for their passage, if there was ever any condition of affairs to justify any man in supporting them, this condition has long since passed away, and there can be no excuse for their retention now.

I do not speak of the period of reconstruction for the purpose of reviving the bitter passions, prejudices, and contentions engendered by those acts, but that period is intimately connected with the passage of these laws. It is a dark period in American history, a blot upon the name of the Republican party. It can never be forgotten and ought not to be forgotten. It should serve as a warning not only to us but to those who come after us against the fatal policy of centralization of power in the General Government, against the policy of attempting to exercise by Federal authority that control and direction of local affairs which was intended by the framers of the Constitution to be regulated by the States alone. Its evil effects upon the Southern States and upon the country at large ought to serve as an overwhelming and unanswerable argument for the repeal of the laws connected with it, and all others of a kindred character.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] in a speech made in the Senate a few days ago used the following language:

I apprehend that no Senator will fail to perceive that this discussion brings us back to the identical question which our friends in the South attempted to settle at Sumter on that April day in 1861, and which reached a final settlement in 1865.

Mr. President, it is most remarkable to me that, whenever we attempt here to correct by legislation any evil which has grown up under Republican rule, we are almost invariably met with the answer that it is a measure which has been settled heretofore by war. When we ask the repeal of laws which pretend to give fair elections, because they are used as an engine of fraud, the Senator from Illinois tells us that this was an issue settled by the war.

When we attempt to modify the tariff law, which levies tribute upon the great body of the people of the United States for the maintenance and protection of a few individuals, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] tells us that the war which ended in 1865 was waged for free trade. This question is brought up on every possible occasion whenever the other side seek to perpetrate a fraud at elections under the pretense of protecting the ballot box, whenever they seek to take from the people of this country a large amount of their substance under the pretense of protecting American labor, or whenever they seek to take possession of a small kingdom under the pretext of improving the morals of the queen—in either and all these instances, when objection is made, we are met by the proposition that the people of the South engaged in rebellion and fired on Fort Sumter some thirty years ago. I submit that that is no answer to the proposition.

Mr. President, I deny that this discussion raises any such question. I deny the statement that there is any disposition upon the part of any Senator on this side of the Chamber to raise again the issues which were settled by four years of war. The great questions that the contest which began at Sumter in 1861 and ended at Appomattox in 1865 settled were these: First, that no State could secede from the Union or sever its relations with the General Government; and, second, that thereafter neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except for crime, should exist within the United States.

These we freely concede and have never denied. These were the issues upon which the battle was fought and decided against us. We accepted the verdict in good faith and have never sought to reverse it. The people of the South have never complained either of the conduct of the war or its final result. They entered the contest boldly and fearlessly and threw down the gage of battle to a superior foe. They showed in four years of war that they were in deep and deadly earnest, and believed in the principles their fathers had taught them. They displayed a courage upon the field of battle, an endurance under great privations, and a patience in defeat which command the admiration and respect of the civilized world.

When defeat came they accepted its consequences without a murmur, and are to-day as loyal to the flag of our common country, as solicitous for the honor and glory of this great Republic and for the happiness and prosperity of the people of all the States of this Union as are the people who followed Meade and Hancock at Gettysburg or those who gathered around Gen. Grant at Appomattox.

But if the Senator from Illinois intends to state that the war settled the question that the General Government had the right to control the local affairs and police regulations of the several States, or to state that because we believe that fair and honest elections can be better secured by the States themselves without the interposition of the General Government, that we are seeking to revive the issues of the war, then he misstates the facts of history.

We never complained of the war and its results, but we did complain of the passage of the laws which we now seek to repeal and others of a like character, enacted after the close of the war. They professed to pass these laws, and other reconstruction laws, in the interest of fair and honest elections, and yet they enabled the Republican party in the South to perpetrate the most glaring frauds at elections that the history of the Government has ever known. Under governments established by that party under these and other laws passed during that period, fraud and false counting became the rule and not the exception throughout the South.

The will of the people as expressed at the ballot box was habitually overthrown and disregarded, and men were foisted into high places of power and trust whom the people had repudiated at the polls, and these men by their acts of tyranny and shameless robbery perpetrated upon a helpless people cast a stain upon American manhood, and by their own wrongful acts they furnish to us here the strongest evidence that could be presented

why all laws that could bring about such a condition of affairs should be taken from the statute book.

The Senator is mistaken when he says that this was an issue settled by the war. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided again and again that the amendments to the Constitution passed soon after the war did not destroy the autonomy of the States, and did not take from them the power to regulate and settle their own local affairs, and every attempt upon the part of the Government to deprive the States of this power and to usurp the functions which properly belong to the States has without an exception resulted in great evil to the country.

For more than three-quarters of a century the times, places, and manner of electing Senators and members of Congress was regulated and controlled by the States and no laws were passed interfering in any way whatever with this control. During that time the Republic prospered as no country had ever prospered before. Peace and order prevailed everywhere. Frauds in elections, false counting, and illegal voting were of the rarest occurrence, and a charge of that kind made against a party or an individual was sure to excite the public mind and if proven, to bring the party or individual under the condemnation of all the people without regard to political affiliation.

Prior to the advent of the Republican party in the South, in 1868, I do not think I had ever heard, with one solitary exception in Louisiana, of the use of money in elections or of false counting brought against any party in any of the States of the South, but from 1868 to 1874, under Republican rule in my own State, and I presume it was so in other Southern States, the practice of falsifying election returns became so universal, so widely and well known, that they ceased to excite comment. And yet we find the Republican party here always posing as the champion of fair elections, ignoring these well-known facts and hurling charges of wrongdoing at their political opponents.

When the reconstruction acts of 1868 were passed, the whites in the State of Arkansas largely outnumbered the blacks, and the great and overwhelming majority of the whites were in sympathy with the Democratic party. But when these laws were passed and the right of suffrage conferred upon the negro the State was infested with a horde of adventurers from the North, men who could obtain neither power nor position in their former abodes, but there under the protection of the troops of the United States they took possession of the State government, framed a constitution and submitted it to the people, and when it was rejected by more than 10,000 majority, they deliberately falsified the returns and declared it adopted.

When the people protested militia forces were organized and swept over a large portion of the State, leaving murdered citizens and burning houses to mark the line of their march. The people were powerless and helpless to protect themselves for the reason that they knew that the United States Government was behind those who were controlling the powers of the State government. In the elections of 1870 the same frauds were perpetrated, and they became so shameless and glaring in the election of 1872, after the passage of the laws we now seek to repeal, that actual war ensued in 1874 between the opposing factions of the Republican party, and by reason of this contest the people were enabled to recover possession of their government.

This will serve to show, Mr. President, something of the different conditions which prevailed under the two systems; the one where the time, place, and manner of holding all elections were regulated by the people of the State, and the other where the General Government usurped the control of elections by the power of United States soldiers.

In the nature of things it will always follow that the purity of elections can be better secured by officials appointed by the State government than those appointed by the General Government. The election officers of the State are invariably selected from the immediate locality where the elections are held. They are as a rule reputable citizens who have homes and families in the country. They know that any fraud upon their part will inevitably blacken their character and lose them the esteem of their neighbors. They know that all such frauds sooner or later produce ill-feeling and tend to destroy the peace and good order of society and threaten the security of their property.

Where the entire responsibility rests upon them local pride will be a strong restraint upon any inclination they may have to falsify the returns. They know that it is absolutely impossible that practices of this character can be carried on to any great extent without detection, and however strong a partisan a man may be, it is only the basest of men who would be willing for their neighbors to know that they had deliberately stuffed a ballot box or falsified a return.

On the other hand, officers appointed by the Federal courts, supervisors and deputy marshals, do not bear the same responsibility to the local authorities and to the immediate community where the election is held as would judges of election and deputy sheriffs selected by the authority of the State government. The Federal courts are comparatively few in number, and the presiding judge can not have an intimate acquaintance and knowledge of men in every portion of the State, and therefore do not have it in their power to make the best selections for these officials. And the same may be said of the marshals of the United States, whose authority extends over many counties, while that of the sheriff is confined to the county in which he resides.

These, it seems to me, are unanswerable reasons why the power to hold and supervise elections for all officials, including members of Congress, should be conferred upon the States themselves and not the National Government. While these laws which it is now proposed to repeal remain upon the statute book there is something of a divided responsiblity and a divided control, which in the very nature of things produce jealousies, suspicions, and antagonisms which are liable at any time to bring about conflicts between the authority of the General Government and that of the State, and which in many instances will tend to defeat the will of the people as expressed at the polls.

Supervisors and deputy marshals appointed by the Federal authority to overlook and direct State officials in the discharge of their duty carries with it a suspicion of the integrity of the State officials, and tends to diminish the causes that induce men to do right for the sake of right, and to destroy that confidence and respect which all good citizens should have toward the officers of both the State and Federal Governments. A man is far more likely to be honest when he is trusted and placed upon his honor, and where he will get full credit for his good deeds, than where he is placed under suspicion and supervised by the officers of the General Government.

The Senator from Illinois says that these laws in no way influence or affect the election of State officers, but relate only to members of Congress. While this is true on the face of the laws it is not true in point of fact.

In those States where the members of Congress are elected at the same time and in the same place as the State officers, in every State where this condition prevails Republican supervisors and Republican deputy marshals have almost invariably used their office to control and influence the election not only of members of Congress, but of State officers also, and for this reason many of the States have refused, and very properly refused, to permit the State elections to be held at the same time and place.

Throughout the South wherever and whenever these supervisors and deputy marshals have been appointed they have had a large and controlling influence with the colored population. With many of these ignorant citizens the man who holds power from the General Government is regarded as all powerful and one whose wishes can not be safely disregarded, and that he is a kind of guardian for them, and has to a certain extent the right to direct how they shall cast their ballots; and those who have been appointed supervisors and deputy marshals in my State, at least by Republican judges and Republican marshals, have not hesitated to use this power and this influence on behalf of Republican candidates.

The chief supervisor in Arkansas to-day is Judge John McClure. The people throughout the State almost universally believe that he was perhaps more largely responsible for the frauds upon the ballot boxes which were committed from 1868 to 1874 than any other one man in the State. He has since he has held the office of chief supervisor used his power in every election to harass and annoy the election officers of the State in every possible way. He secured the appointment under President Harrison of assistant or special district attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas, and through this power and that of chief supervisor and under a Republican district judge succeeded in having indictments preferred against many of the best citizens of the State.

The prosecution and trial of these causes cost the Government of the United States many thousands of dollars, and notwithstanding it was a Republican judge and district attorney, and a majority of Republican jurors, nearly all of these parties were acquitted; and in the few cases where convictions were secured it was for some technical violation of the law where no fraud had been committed or intended, and where the result was in no way changed, and as I now remember, not a single man indicted was shown to have committed actual fraud in a single precinct within the State.

Laws that can be thus used ought to be repealed. They can do no good and they produce much evil.

Just preceding the election of 1890 a deputy marshal in the State of Arkansas, accompanied by a large posse which had been taken from the city of Little Rock, went into the county of Lee under pretext of summoning witnesses to attend the Federal court, and yet they showed by their acts that it was their

sole object and purpose to frighten and intimidate the negroes who had expressed a determination to vote the Democratic ticket. Written communications were distributed amongst the colored people commanding them to go to the polls and vote for the Republican candidate for Congress.

Mr. President, laws under which such men as our chief supervisor can be clothed with such power and which can be used for such purposes can be productive of no good. We want them abolished and we want our chief supervisor abolished with them; and because we thus seek to correct existing evils we do not thiak it is fair to charge us with seeking to reopen issues that were settled by the war. If fair and honest elections can not be secured by trusting the people of the several States then they can not be secured at all.

The whole structure of our Government is founded upon the theory that the great body of the people are honest, and if the time should ever come when the people are corrupt then the Government will fail; and if the people of any State can not be trusted to conduct their own elections then no kind of force used by the General Government will suffice to produce an honest result. The whole history of the Government shows that it is better to trust the people of the States, to permit them to control their own local affairs in their own way. Such was the intention of the framers of the Constitution, and every attempt to turn from their teachings has proven disastrous to our institutions.

These are the principal reasons why I favor the passage of the present bill, and I confidently believe that time will show that complaints of fraud in the election of members of Congress will be far less numerous when this power is intrusted entirely to the people of the several States of this Union.

The effort of the Senator from Illinois to arouse the passions and prejudices of the people of the North against this repeal by raising the cry that we are attempting to discuss issues settled by the war will fail of its purpose. That cry kept the Republican party in power many years but it can serve them no longer. We have no disposition to raise any question that was settled by the war.

The Senator from Illinois says that the people throughout the North are alarmed, that they are excited as they have not been since 1865, and prejudiced against the Democratic party because, as the Senator says, we propose to repeal the election laws and to reform and modify the present tariff law. This is a most remarkable statement for the Senator to make. But a few weeks ago the great majority of the Republican party and Republican newspapers, and many Republican members stood in the Halls of Congress and stated that the great business depression then prevailing throughout the country was due to the Sherman law. They said it was the bad Sherman law which had brought the trouble about.

While it was true that that law had been passed wholly by their votes, they sought to evade the responsibility which came from it by saying that they were forced to pass it to prevent the Democrats from passing a free-coinage law. The Senator from Illinois now shifts his ground when he sees that the repeal of the Sherman law has not brought relief. When he sees that cotton, wheat, and other farm products are lower to-day than they were on the 1st day of November, when the repeal was passed, the Senator shifts his ground and says that the Republican party are not responsible for it, but that it is due to apprehended legislation by the Democrats.

Mr. President, is that not a remarkable statement for the Senator to make upon this floor? The Republican party for thirty years has been responsible for all the laws which have been passed. Before the Democrats have had an opportunity to legislate upon these subjects, while the McKinley act is still part and parcel of the law of this land, the Republican party undertakes to shift responsibility and to say that the people are alarmed and excited because they are afraid that we will repeal that law.

Mr. President, the people of this country are not alarmed. It would be a most astonishing state of affairs if it were true that the people were alarmed at the fact that we propose to do that thing which they directed us to do; it would be an astonishing thing if the people of this country should now be alarmed after the action had in Chicago in July, 1892; for whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the ambiguity or uncertainty of the plank upon the question of the currency, there can be no difference of opinion, I believe, as to the meaning of the plank upon the question of the tariff. It was boldly and fearlessly declared. It was discussed in every State, in every county, and in every voting precinct throughout this Union.

It aroused an enthusiasm, Mr. President, which resulted in the election of a Democratic President, a majority of Democrats in the House of Representatives, and a majority in the Senate; and yet, before action is taken, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon tell us that the people are alarmed and excited because they fear that we will do what we promised to do and what we were elected to do.

The people are not alarmed, Mr. President. I have no doubt that those people who have long been the beneficiaries of these tariff laws, that those who for years and years have lived off of the sweat and toil of others are alarmed, and I have no doubt that they are using the great wealth which those laws have enabled them to accumulate to alarm and excite the people of this country. They do not hesitate to do that, and to employ the influence of newspapers and other agencies; they do not hesitate to close their factories, to stop work to throw men out of employment and bring distress upon their families, if they can thereby retain the benefits which they have so long enjoyed under this high protective system.

Mr. President, I trust that no Democrat will be alarmed at this cry. I trust no Democrat will be swerved from the discharge of his duty now; I trust that no Democrat is so timid as to be alarmed by methods, the objects and purposes of which are so patent and so clear. No Democrat who will hesitate to discharge his duty because of local interests and betray the trust which his people have placed in him, can hereafetr hope to march in line with that great body of Democrats who believe, as was declared at Chicago, that all taxes levied for any other purpose save and except the purpose of revenue, are contrary to the fundamental law of the land, a robbery upon the American people, perpetrated under the form of law.

Mr. President, it is not the alarm of the people which caused this distress. When President Harrison was inaugurated in 1889 the evil effect of the bad laws passed up to that time had fallen chiefly upon the agricultural districts of this country. Year by year and month by month there had been depression in the agricultural districts of this country; farm lands had depreciated in price and mortgages had accumulated to an extent which never existed before; but when the McKinley act was passed that depression increased with accelerated speed, and the ruin which had fallen upon the agricultural districts extended to every part of this Republic.

The Republican party, under whose laws these evils have fallen upon us, with that disposition to claim credit for everything that is good and throw the responsibility for everything that is bad on their political opponents, now turn around, before we have passed a single law, and say that the Democratic party is responsible; not for anything that party has done; not for anything the party has failed to do; but because they say the people are alarmed, because they believe the Democrats will be true to their pledges and do that which the people commanded them to do.

Mr. President, I did not intend to discuss the tariff laws here to-day. The tariff laws were discussed in 1892 throughout the entire United States. The question was submitted to that jury from whose verdict there is no appeal, and they with an overwhelming voice declared that the present tariff law, the McKinley act, should give way to laws which are intended for revenue only. That question has not yet come from the House of Representatives. When it does come, I have not a shadow of a doubt that the Democrats in the Senate will have the courage to stand by their policy and carry out their pledges in the spirit and letter in which they were written.

The present question is simply the repeal of the election laws, which I believe tend to bring about fraud rather than to prevent fraud. I sincerely believe that when these laws are repealed, when each State is left to regulate its own affairs in its own way, the cry of fraud in the election of members of Congress will greatly diminish, if it does not altogether cease.

I say to the Senator from Illinois, in all kindness, that it is not fair to attempt to give a sectional tinge to the repeal of the election laws or to attempt to say that we want to revive issues which were settled in the battles of 1865.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois need not be alarmed. We have no desire to raise any such question. The people of the South are back in the Union. This is our country as well as your country. We are entitled to the same rights and the same privileges to which all other citizens are entitled; no more, and no less. We have the right to express our views upon public questions without being eternally reminded that there was a time when we were in rebellion against the Government. We believe in this Government now; we are anxious to do all in our power toward its upbuilding, to contribute to its honor and glory; we are ready to stand by it, to protect and defend it at home and abroad under all circumstances and conditions, to speak for it, to work for it, and, if need be, Mr. President, to fight for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The bill will be restored to its position on the Calendar.

PAY OF EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. PEFFER obtained the floor.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Kansas kindly yield to me for a moment until a joint resolution which affects the pay of the employés of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the regular roll may be considered? It will only take a moment.

Mr. PEFFER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. COCKRELL. When the joint resolution is read, I shall ask for its present consideration. I hope Senators will give attention to it. It is the usual resolution which is passed preceding the Christmas holidays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Missouri.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month was read the first and second time by its title.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator from Kansas to yield one moment more until I may make a conference report which the House of Representatives is very anxious to have acted upon.

Mr. PEFFER. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri submits a conference report, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill (H. R. 4177) "to provide for further deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree upon said amendment.

The committee of conference recommend that Senate amendment numbered 2, which was agreed to on the report of a former committee of conference, be stricken from the bill and omitted in the enrollment thereof, as the provision has since been enacted by a joint resolution.

F. M. COCKRELL,
A. P. GORMAN,
S. M. CULLOM,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,
J. G. CANNON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COCKRELL. This bill was considered in the last extra session of Congress. Section 2 of the bill referred to the World's Columbian Exposition. That was agreed to in conference. Final action having failed upon the conference report, a separate resolution was passed. While the committee of conference had no actual jurisdiction of the matter, we thought it was best to report it to the Senate and have the action of the Senate in striking it out, as it is no longer necessary in the further consideration of the bill.

Amendment numbered 6 is the amendment about which we had a controversy as to whether the Senate had the right to regulate and control its own affairs. I move that the Senate adhere to its amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

FUNDS FOR RELIEVING DESTITUTION.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to take up Senate bill 1300, which was introduced yesterday and at my request left upon the table so that it might be called up to-day in order to enable me to make some remarks upon it.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1300) to provide funds for immediate use in relieving want and destitution throughout the country; which was read, as follows:

Whereas want and destitution among the poor and unemployed people is advertised in the newspaper press of the country; and

Whereas it appears that there is urgent need of money to relieve the distress occasioned by such want and destitution; and

Whereas it appears further that the distress has reached a degree beyond present ability of local arrangements to properly relieve; and

Whereas Congress has heretofore granted relief in cases of pressing emergencies in the several States: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That in the name and on behalf of the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required to deliver to the presidents of the boards of national relief commissioners of the several States herein authorized to be appointed, the several amounts of money and in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

SEC. 2. That whenever, within ten days after the approval of this act, the governor of any State or Territory shall certify to the President of the United States that there is, within the limits of such State or Territory, distress among the poor and unemployed people; that such distress exists among and affects large numbers of people who are, by reason of their poverty, unable to help themselves; that such distress has reached a point beyond the capacity of present local arrangements to adequately relieve, or that if funds have been provided for relief purposes they have been exhausted or are not available for immediate use in the impending emergency; and when the governor shall further certify that he has designated three competent persons—naming them—of different political and religious affiliations to take charge of and apply any funds delivered to them by authority of Congress for the purpose of relieving want among the poor and unemployed people of their State, the President shall immediately appoint and commission such persons to act as a board of national relief commissioners to receive and apply money provided by this act, the first named of such commissioners to act as president, the second as treasurer, and the third as secretary of the board of national relief commissioners for the particular State or Territory, and he shall thereupon notify the Secretary of the Treasury of said appointments. The members of said board shall take the usual oath of office and the treasurer shall execute a bond in the sum of $100,000, to be approved by the United States district attorney for the district in which the capital of the State or Territory is located, conditioned for the faithful discharge of his duties and that he will properly account for all moneys intrusted to him under the provisions of this act. The oaths of the commissioners and the bond of the treasurer shall be filed in the office of the clerk of said district court. The commissioners shall immediately meet at the capital of the State or Territory and organize. On notice from the said United States district attorney and the governor of the State or Territory, in a joint communication, that the board of national relief commissioners is duly organized as required by this act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be delivered to the treasurer of said board one-fourth part of the aggregate amount of money herein allowed to such State or Territory, and he shall not at any time pay or deliver to such officer more than such one-fourth part unless the governor, at the end of thirty days after such payment, shall certify that the distress continues and that more money is required to relieve it, in which case another one-fourth part of said aggregate amount may be forwarded, and so, on like certificate by the governor thirty days after each payment, another one-fourth part may be sent until the aggregate sum is all paid: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount allowed to each State or Territory shall not exceed $1 for every ten inhabitants of such State or Territory as shown by the census of 1890.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of $6,300,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, and the said amount shall be provided as follows: First. All the silver dollars now in the Treasury, and not covered by certificates outstanding, shall be used; and if these be not enough to supply the whole amount required, second, the Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately cause to be coined from any silver bullion now in the Treasury standard silver dollars enough to make up the whole amount.

SEC. 4. That the several boards of national relief commissioners are hereby authorized to turn over to duly authorized officers of municipalities and of private relief organizations, in the several counties, cities, and towns of their respective States and Territories, such portions of the moneys intrusted to them by this act as they may deem best to make the provisions of this law most effective.

SEC. 5. That the members of said boards of national relief commissioners and all other persons participating in the distribution and application of the funds herein provided shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed and held to be officers of the United States, subject to be dealt with as such in case of fraud, embezzlement, or theft.

Mr. PEFFER. The condition of the country at this time, Mr. President, is not only unusual, but it is extraordinary. It is generally believed, I think, that never in our history has there been as much want and destitution among the poor and unemployed people of the country as there is to-day, nor has there ever been a time when the destitution was so general as it is now, for it appears that it is not only in the manufacturing districts, not only in the large cities of the country, but in the smaller towns, and in many instances even out among the farmers in the newer and the less fertile regions of the country. I I was reading yesterday a statement purporting to show the number of unemployed persons in some of the cities of the country; but inasmuch as I shall call attention to that after a little time I shall pass it by, saying that it is safe to estimate that one-fourth of the entire population of the country at this hour is affected more or less seriously by the present distress among the working people.

The newspapers of the country, especially those which we call great and those which we sometimes criticise the most harshly, have been doing a great service in this matter; and it affords me pleasure to add that of the great institutions of this country which quite often come to the rescue of poor people, the newspapers are usually among the first. I remember many years ago, and so do other Senators here, when the New York Times instituted a series of excursions into the country for the little people who never saw the grass grow in the fields except on those occasions.

Other newspapers followed in the same line, and now we find that in Chicago, in New York, in Boston, indeed in all the great cities of the country, the newspapers are taking a leading part, first, in calling the attention of the people to the poverty-stricken condition of the poor, and, second, suggesting, and not only suggesting but proposing and acting upon, plans for practical relief. So common has this become latterly that the newspapers within the last twenty days are showing to the people in whole-page illustrations representing the postures of the poor who are begging for sustenance, pictures of great buildings wherein hundreds and thousands of people are huddled together like so many animals.

Within the last two weeks the New York Press sent its reporters out among these people, and in describing one particular district the reporter estimated the number of people and the number of square feet in the territory occupied by them and made the astonishing statement that if they were stood in equal spaces upon the surface of the earth they would occupy a little less than a square yard to the person, about half as many people as are massed in a column of soldiers when they are moving. And this, the reporter said, was not the most crowded place in the great city of New York.

I have recently read an article in the North American Review for December, calling attention to the matter of which I just spoke concerning the crowded condition of people in the city of New York. The editor of the Press, in referring to the people in that particular ward, also calls attention to this article, and I commend it to the careful consideration of every Senator.

I have before me one sample of the newspaper work to which I have been referring. It is the New York Herald of last Sunday morning, in which a whole page is devoted to that particular subject, with illustration and narrative.

Among the news items printed in the Herald of the 18th instant, the statement of a Roman Catholic clergyman, the Rev. Father Mahoney, is printed. This philanthropic man, having had a great deal of experience among poor people, had usually imagined that the average poor man was poor because of some fault of his own, either through drunkenness, improvident shiftlessness, or some other cause, as he states in this interview.

"Never in all my experience," said Father Mahoney, "has Brooklyn been in such a condition as at present. Right in the very midst of us hundreds of families are starving, and unless relief comes, and that speedily, the result will be appalling. I have seen strong men, steady and industrious, actually begging for bread to feed their starving children. For months they have been out of employment. There is no work for them, nor are there any indications that the situation will improve for two or three months at least."

Then the priest goes on to refer to his former opinions concerning the reasons why people are poor.

In an editorial article in the Herald, I think of the same day, under a scriptural quotation, "Ye have the poor always with you," the editor proceeds, after having asked the question whether this condition is always to exist, and says:

The question presses itself upon us just now, for hardly ever in the history of our industries has there been so much suffering as there promises to be this winter. Men out of employment are not to be counted by the thousands, but by the hundreds of thousands, and they are to endure pangs from no fault of their own, but in consequence of an unfortunate condition through which the country is slowly working its way toward a larger prosperity.

Again the Herald says, and this is editorial:

Everybody knows that business is dull and times are hard. Few realize how vast is the host of unemployed men and women, how steadily their ranks are growing, and how many thousands are in sore need of help because they are destitute and unable to get work. From every charitable organization and aid society in the city, from the police department, from every official and person brought face to face with the suffering poor come stories of widespread destitution which is simply appalling when fully realized, and shows that relief was never more urgently needed.

The writer quotes from Superintendent Byrnes, as follows:

The public at large are only beginning to appreciate the extent of the distress, but to me it is only too apparent. I realize it when I read the morning returns from the precincts and see that all the station lodging houses during the past night have been crammed to their utmost capacity. This means that hundreds, and perhaps thousands, have of necessity been refused admission, and have in all probability been forced to spend the night in the streets. Think what that must mean in weather such as this!

So says a man who is familiar with the haunts of vice.

From Philadelphia, under date of December 16, this announcement is made:

The employés of the blanket and cloth departments of John and James Dobson's mills, at the Falls of Schuylkill, have been notified that there would be no more work for them after to-day.

These two branches of the mills will be closed this evening for an indefinite period. This will throw about 900 persons out of employment.

That is one of a thousand similar dispatches which might be read. Now I read an extract from the New York Press, under the head of "The Battle of the Toilers," for the purpose of calling attention to the number of persons out of employment. Says the editor:

Last Monday the Press published the startling fact that in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cincinnati, where over one million were employed twelve months ago in manufacturing industries alone, fully one-third of the industrial population are at present unemployed.

A wonderful statement, Mr. President. Yet if it were limited to one locality, to one town, to one city, to even one State the matter would be small and could be easily handled; but we find upon investigation that it spreads out over the entire country, that one-third of the industrial population of the whole people are unemployed, and that that word of itself means that they are upon the verge of starvation, that the blackness of want in the future is immediately in front of them, gloomy, dismal, forbidding, repulsive.

Unfortunately—

Says the editor a little further along—

the existing condition of affairs in the larger centers of industry extends with even greater severity to the smaller cities. The census of 1890 makes the following returns:

Then here is a brief statement showing the number of people usually employed in the cities of Scranton, Troy, Newark, Cohoes, Newburg, and Pittsburg, making a total of 145,350 persons:

	Number employed.
Scranton	8,500
Troy	25,100
Newark	43,300
Cohoes	8,750
Newburg	3,200
Pittsburg	56,500
Total	145,350

Dispatches published in Sunday's Press from reliable and careful correspondents, who have been cautioned against exaggeration, show the following number unemployed:

Here are the figures:

Scranton	5,000
Troy	18,000
Newark	23,000
Cohoes	5,000
Newburg	2,000
Pittsburg	25,000
Total	78,000

A little army; yes, Mr. President, a great army, larger than Grant had at Shiloh. Seventy-eight thousand men and women. That means adult persons, not including the members of their families and those who are dependent upon them.

After making due allowance for other gainful occupations than those reported by the census, we find that fully one-third of the wage-earners in these six cities belong to the increasing army of the unemployed. The destitution in Pittsburg almost surpasses belief.

These statements come from reliable correspondents who were sent to the different towns for the purpose of ascertaining the facts and cautioned not to exaggerate the figures.

In one of the morning papers a few days ago were these startling headlines, "Boston's Big Burden. Leading Citizens Meet To-day to Plan to Help the Poor. Statisticians say Forty Thousand Men are Unemployed." Those are the headlines of the dispatch, and I read what follows:

Statistics gathered by Messrs. W. Clarke and R. B. Young, of the Andover House, in thirty-seven crafts, indicate a total number of idle men in Boston of 38,390.

These are only the men, not the women nor those who have been in the habit of doing the work of adults, though of tender years, nor the little ones, the old and decrepit, and the destitute from other causes.

A little further along other persons who attended this meeting, persons who had been specially commissioned to investigate the subject, put the number at 40,000, just as the headline stated: and in the same column of the same paper, from Providence, R. I., reference is made to the condition of things there occasioned partly by striking mechanics and partly by the general situation. I read from that dispatch:

The combination of an extensive and long-drawn out strike and a dull market has produced a depression here much more severe than that from which other cities are suffering. The Olneyville strike is now in its eleventh week, with no prospect of immediate settlement. The strike has thrown idle 8,500 persons; 1,000 jewelers are idle from causes due to general depression, and 1,000 employés of the Corliss Engine Company are out of a job. Here is a total of 10,500 laborers, men and women, in the army of the unemployed at the beginning of winter.

Reading further, we see Paterson and other places mentioned in the same category.

Now we come to Chicago, that wonder of wonders in the march of civilization. The article is headed, "In Chicago's Slums," with a line following in black-face type in these words:

Five-cent lodging houses where chairs take the place of beds.

Going down a few paragraphs, I find these words:

As a matter of fact there are many hundred persons in Chicago every night who can not purchase a lodging for lack of means, and who stay out so late that access to the station-houses is denied because they are already overcrowded. These people will then sleep anywhere. All they want is cover from the night.

That can be had in Chicago for 5 cents. But the lowest tramp, if fortune favored him with a dime, would shrink with horror from lodging in such a place. There are one or two places of the kind in Chicago and they are hard to find. When found they are the very apotheosis of degradation, dirt, and dinginess. Beside the 5-cent places those where admittance is a dime are palaces. For 5 cents the lodger is allowed the privilege of a chair until morning. Simply that and nothing more.

The keepers of such places form the lowest elements of society. They do not treat their patrons as humans nor yet as beasts of the field. The 5-cent wretch becomes an object for blows and kicks. When his nickel enters the greasy pocket that gapes for it he is then an atom of squalor, and he is treated accordingly.

And it goes on to describe one of those despicable places where these poor people are compelled to remain over night and through no fault of their own.

I read another dispatch from Chicago. This is under the date of the 16th instant:

Mayor Swift to-day issued an appeal to the people of Chicago for charity for the poor.

And these are the words that the mayor uses in his appeal:

Some thousands are congregated in cold and unwholsome public buildings, yet many other thousands, in their quiet cottages and apartments, are scarcely less destitute, and with the approaching cold of a long winter the calamity is certain to intensify. This pitiful condition threatens also the health and good order of our beloved city. Desperate men do desperate deeds.

A little further, and the reporter uses this language:

A further investigation shows that there are 5,000 poor girls here on the brink of starvation. A State street store yesterday advertised for ten girls to help over the holidays, and received 600 applications in a few hours.

Then, here are dispatches from Buffalo and other places. I find in one from Buffalo the following paragraph:

Postmaster Stauch has made an estimate of the number of men out of work, basing his calculations on the applications which have been received by him for aid. His figures show that there are between 17,000 and 20,000 men—

Men, Mr. President—

out of work, and that there are in the neighborhood of 50,000 persons suffering for food and clothing.

That is in Buffalo. It has gone so far, the same dispatch informs us, that many children are necessarily kept from school because of the poverty of their parents and their guardians.

I have here the statement of a reporter in the Chicago Times, referring to the city of Pullman, where one would suppose that thrift and comfort and ease ought to exist, if such things can exist anywhere in a manufacturing community. Yet the reporter goes on to show that even in Pullman wages have been in process of reduction for several years, steadily downward, until now the great need for money is to pay rent with, and the rent charges have been made uniformly high. In Pullman there are men, women, and children at the very door of death from want of food.

I have here a large number of dispatches from other places, but will not stop to read them nor ask even that they be inserted with my remarks. What I have read has been for the purpose of calling attention not only to the vast extent of destitution so far as the degree of want is concerned, but to show the large area that is covered by it.

Now, we come to the capital city of Washington. Here is a short article clipped from the News a few days ago. One paragraph I read:

It is doubtful indeed, if anybody except the police and an occasional newspaper reporter knows how startling is the wretchedness that lurks in the slums and purlieus. Even members of charitable organizations do not penetrate these depths; they are reserved for the eyes of the guardians of the law and for the men to whom the varying phases of life are an incessant practical study.

Here is something from the Washington Star. I read a paragraph from an article printed in that paper a few days ago:

The poor districts of the city are larger than one unfamiliar with the subject is likely to suppose, and the character of the poverty is worse than one can imagine who has not been through the dog-kennel houses, where six families live in a four-room house; where one's feet sink through the holes in the rotton floors, and where the smoke-covered walls are so thick with vermin that the investigator hesitates to return to the bosom of his family without first submitting to the kind offices of the Turkish bath attendant.

* * * * * * *

But it is in the outlying districts, where the squalid tenements cover whole blocks and square miles, that the suffering is greatest and where the sufferers can depend least on each other, all being in the same state.

And so the terrible danger spreads. Instances might be multiplied many times, and among the strange and cruel incongruities that appear about the situation, I find a New York dispatch in the Washington Post of November 25, introduced by the following words in glowing black headlines: "Money for the asking." "It is remarkably easy now in Wall street banking houses. Stock market brightens."

The dispatch goes on to show that there are $76,000,000 and upward of idle money in the banks of New York over and above their lawful reserve. I do not refer to that fact, however, at this time for the purpose of criticising the banks or saying anything about Wall street, but to impress upon the Senate the thought that in connection and contemporaneous with this wonderful and extraordinary distress we have a large amount of unused money. The great trouble is to get to it when it will do good.

In view of these things, Mr. President, the question logically arises, what are we going to do about this situation? What can we do? For the purpose of breaking the ice in this body I have prepared this bill. It is not a bill containing many provisions. It is not complicated by much machinery. It provides that the governor of any State or Territory, if destitution in his State exists to a degree beyond the capacity of the local authorities to handle, and he will appoint three competent persons of different political affiliations in that State to receive and distribute any funds that the Government may see proper to donate to the State for that purpose, and will so signify to the President of the United States, the President shall appoint the gentlemen named as national relief commissioners, and the Secretary of the treasury is authorized to issue and to deliver to the treasurer of the board one-fourth of the total sum which may in the end be used for that purpose, provided the first one-quarter or the second one-quarter or the third one-quarter is not sufficient, and the total amount appropriated for the entire purpose as I put it in the bill is $6,300,000, which was a mistake of mine.

It was intended to make it $63,300,000; and if anyone curiously disposed would estimate how far that would go in taking care of 3,000,000 men who are represented to be out of employment now—so estimated by the most careful statisticians, those in position to be best informed—he will see that if we give to each one of them as much as we are in the habit of paying on an average to the convicts in our State prisons, 50 cents a day, it would be $1,500,000 in a single day to these 3,000,000 persons. Continue it thirty days and you have $45,000,000, and if you continue it sixty days you have $90,000,000.

The bill is drawn upon the supposition and the expectation that the States and the cities and the localities where suffering exists will, as they always have done and as they are doing now, use all the means within their power to relieve the distress, and that a very large part of this donation, if it should be appropriated, would never be used. In many instances I doubt, even though the appropriation were made to-morrow, whether a dollar of it would be accepted at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (at 2 o'clock p. m.). The Senator from Kansas will please suspend. The morning hour having expired it is the duty of the Chair to order the first case on the Calendar to be called.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the Calendar may be temporarily laid aside that the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the Calendar may be laid aside that the Senator from Kansas may proceed with his remarks on the pending bill. There is no objection, and the Senator from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. PEFFER. And there are no expenses involved in the operation of this measure; that is to say, the machinery which is provided is such as would operate through channels already in existence. Every city to-day has its relief organization. Then there are a thousand and one private associations, bodies of men and women who are always ready to volunteer their services on such occasions as these—the same class of women who came to us in the times of war and helped us there. They are ready; they are thoroughly organized, and they are competent, reliable persons.

The instant that a bill like this should have the approval of the President its provisions would be telegraphed broadcast and be printed in the next morning's papers, and every officer of every organization, whether private or municipal, would be ready to perform the work that would be intrusted to him. One of the provisions of the bill is that the relief commissioners to whom the Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver funds shall in their discretion turn over such portions as might be deemed best to the classes of officers I have just named, so that there will not be a dollar of expense attending the practical operation of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill provides how the funds shall be raised, and that is a very simple process. It would not require the use of a dollar that is now in circulation. It would not require the use of a dollar that anybody seems to have use for. It requires, first, that all the silver dollars now lying idle in the Treasury not covered by certificates shall be used; and, second, that for the rest the Secretary shall immediately proceed to coin the silver bullion that is in the Treasury into silver dollars and use that. That would be a good way to get this silver into some useful line of duty.

I am aware of the objections which are urged to this class of legislation upon the part of many public men, that the Constitution provides for nothing of the kind. Indeed, some gentlemen go so far as to urge that it is in violation of the provisions of the Constitution. I shall not stop now to argue that point. I wish only to call attention to two or three simple propositions in connection with it. First, that there are a great many duties, a great many powers, a great many privileges, which we enjoy and which are conceded to us by common consent, that are not mentioned in the language of the Constitution; second, that there are a great many implied powers which are sometimes necessary to be called into requisition in the execution of powers expressly granted; and third, that there are a great many incidental powers which are nowhere either mentioned or alluded to in the Constitution—incidental powers of Government, powers which lie dormant in the meaning of the word "sovereignty," powers which any organized people may exercise, powers which sometimes are necessary in the execution of a great responsibility incumbent upon men and upon Governments.

There are great occasions, Mr. President, when nations, com-

munities, and individuals may call to their aid powers which, under ordinary circumstances, are not known to exist. It is like the case of a man striking in his own defense or of his leaping to the rescue of a friend in danger, or of one picking up his enemy by the wayside and doing good to him.

It is too late now, Mr. President, in the history of this grand people to say that we dare not do anything of this kind. Upon an examination of the record it will be found that there are many instances where the Congress of the United States has gone to the relief of suffering people in different parts of the country.

I wish to avail myself of this opportunity, lest I do not have another so good a one, to say that I have been aided very much in the collection of these facts by Mr. Amzi Smith, in charge of the Senate document room, a man whose learning, whose knowledge of his business, whose courtesy, whose promptness, whose untiring industry are worthy of a life-long position under the Government, and when old age creeps upon him, a pension to the end of his days.

Beginning with 1803, Congress voted aid to sufferers by fire at Portsmouth, N. H., and the next year like aid was granted to sufferers from like cause at Norfolk, Va. In 1812 Congress appropriated $50,000 to sufferers by an earthquake in Venezuela. In 1815 an indefinite sum was appropriated—how much was finally paid I have not had time to ascertain, and it does not matter—an indefinite sum was appropriated to sufferers by earthquake at New Madrid, in Missouri Territory. In another instance in 1836, an indefinite sum was appropriated to sufferers by fire in the city of New York; in the same year to sufferers by Indian depredations in Florida an indefinite sum.

At another time, $20,000 to sufferers from a like cause at Alexandria, Va.; again, in 1847, for transporting supplies to the people of Ireland an indefinite sum. We not only have gone to the rescue of our own people, but we have reached out our friendly hands to brethren on the other side of the water and have offered assistance there.

In 1863 Congress voted $200,000 to sufferers by Indian depredations in Minnesota; the next year $2,000 to sufferers by an accident at the arsenal in the District of Columbia; in 1866 an indefinite sum to sufferers by fire at Portland, Me.; in 1867 an indefinite amount for transportation of supplies to people in the Southern States, and for a similar purpose in 1867 another large amount. Where I use the word "indefinite" it is so used because I have not been able to ascertain what was the entire amount finally used. In the same year a direct appropriation was made for the use of sufferers in the South; the same year another appropriation of $50,000 was definitely made for the same purpose; again, in 1868, for the same purpose, an indefinite sum; in 1871, for transportation of supplies to France and Germany—what that was for I do not remember—and in 1872 to sufferers by fire at Chicago. Senators will remember that upon that occasion there were a great many army tents used and soldiers were placed on duty there under the immediate command of Gen. Sheridan. There was a large amount of money appropriated and Government property was used, besides the active presence of the Army in the case of that great fire.

In the same year a sum was appropriated to reimburse the postmasters at Chicago for losses. That might come under the head of legitimate appropriations, or appropriations under legitimate legislation, even in the face of criticism. In 1874 $190,000 were appropriated at one time to sufferers by the overflow of the Mississippi River, and at another time an indefinite sum for same purpose. In 1875 seeds amounting in value to $30,000 were distributed among persons who had been rendered destitute by raids of grasshoppers; the same year $150,000 was appropriated for a like purpose. In 1877 and in 1878 additional sums were appropriated, but these last two instances involved a very small outlay. In 1877, in the case of yellow fever in the South, $200,000 were appropriated.

There were a number of other cases. I shall not refer to any more of them, but will ask that the paper from which I am reading, in its tabulated form, may be inserted as an appendix to my remarks, and I shall not detain the Senate longer than to make a very brief summing up.

I think that the Senate ought to take some action upon this bill, more than to simply refer it to the Committee on Education and Labor, where I expect to ask that it be referred when I conclude my remarks; that there ought to be a report made upon it, and that promptly, whether yea or nay or by way of amendment.

I know that some Senators will argue that this subject is beyond the province of national legislation. Perhaps it is, Mr. President, but if it is, let the people understand it. The time is coming, in my opinion, when for all such purposes as this State lines must be utterly abolished. We never thought about State lines when we wanted to help the poor people who were in trouble in Portsmouth, or in Portland, or in Boston, or in Chicago or in Memphis, or in Savannah, or in New Orleans, or even across the water in Ireland. We paid no attention to State lines, nor even to the lines of our national boundary, in such cases, nor ought we; and if we are going to stand in such a case upon that doctrine, let us know it, so that the people in the course of events in the next few years—for we do not know what is coming—may amend our Constitution accordingly.

I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

APPENDIX.

Cases where relief has been granted by Congress to sufferers by fires, floods, earthquakes, diseases, etc.

U. S. Stats. at Large.		Date of approval.	Object.	Amount appropriated.
Vol.	Page.			
2	730	May 8, 1812	Sufferers by earthquake in Venezuela.	50,000.00
3	211	Feb. 17, 1815	Sufferers by earthquake in New Madrid, Missouri Ter.	(*)
5	6	Mar. 19, 1836	Sufferers by fire at New York	(*)
5	131	Feb. 1, 1836	Sufferers by Indian depredations in Florida.	(*)
6	49	Feb. 19, 1803	Sufferers by fire at Portsmouth, N. H.	(*)
6	53	Mar. 19, 1804	Sufferers by fire at Norfolk, Va	(*)
6	356	Jan. 24, 1827	Sufferers by fire at Alexandria, Va	20,000.00
9	207	Mar. 3, 1847	Transportation of supplies to sufferers in Ireland.	(*)
12	652	Feb. 16, 1863	Sufferers by Indian depredations in Minnesota.	200,000.00
13	416	July 4, 1864	Sufferers by accident at Arsenal, District of Columbia.	2,000.00
14	364	July 4, 1866	Sufferers by fire at Portland, Me.	(*)
14	567	Feb. 22, 1867	Transportation of supplies South	(*)
15	24	Mar. 29, 1867	——do	(*)
15	28	Mar. 30, 1867	Sufferers in South	(*)
15	28	Mar. 30, 1867	Seeds for destitute in South	50,000.00
15	246	Jan. 31, 1868	Destitute in the South	(*)
16	596	Feb. 10, 1871	Transportation of supplies to France and Germany.	(*)
17	51	Apr. 5, 1872	Sufferers by fire at Chicago	(*)
17	646	Mar. 12, 1872	Postmasters' losses at fire in Chicago	(*)
18	34	Apr. 23, 1874	Sufferers by overflow of Mississippi River.	(*)
18	45	May 13, 1874	——do	190,000.00
18	303	Jan. 25, 1875	Seeds to sufferers by grasshoppers	30,000.00
18	314	Feb. 10, 1875	Sufferers by grasshoppers	150,000.00
19	374	Mar. 3, 1877	——do	285.40
20	127	June 14, 1878	——do	663.00
21	1	Apr. 18, 1879	Refrigerating ship, yellow fever	200,000.00
21	66	Mar. 5, 1880	Contributions to colored emigrants free of duty.	(*)
21	303	Feb. 25, 1880	Transportation of supplies to Ireland	(*)
21	306	May 4, 1880	Sufferers by cyclone at Macon, Miss	(*)
22	44	Apr. 11, 1882	Sufferers by Mississippi River overflow, seeds to.	20,000.00
22	378	Feb. 25, 1882	Sufferers by Mississippi River overflow.	100,000.00
22	378	Mar. 10, 1882	——do	(*)
22	378	Mar. 11, 1882	——do	(*)
22	379	Mar. 21, 1882	——do	150,000.00
22	379	Apr. 1, 1882	——do	100,000.00
23	267	Feb. 12, 1884	Sufferers by Ohio River overflow	300,000.00
23	268	Feb. 15, 1884	——do	200,000.00
23	269	Mar. 27, 1884	Sufferers by overflow of Mississippi River, unexpended balance of appropriation for Ohio River overflow.	125,000.00
23	273	June 7, 1884	Sufferers by overflow Mississippi River	(†)
25	630	Sep. 26, 1888	Sufferers by yellow fever	200,000.00
25	631	Oct. 12, 1888	——do	100,000.00

* Indefinite. † Unexpended balance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator will withdraw that for a moment. I wish to have passed a little measure which was up for consideration the other day, and which will not take much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania withdraw his motion?

Mr. WILSON. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will not withdraw his motion. There are some matters in executive session which ought to be attended to.

Mr. CAMERON. The executive business, I think, will not detain the Senate in executive session more than a few minutes.

Mr. WILSON. I hope the Senator will not withdraw his motion for an executive session.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion submitted yesterday by Mr. HOAR, that the message of the President of the United States on relations with Hawaii be referred, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR moved that the message of the President of the United States in relation to diplomatic representation in Hawaii, transmitted in response to the resolution of the 6th instant be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed.

Ordered, That the consideration of the motion be postponed until to-morrow.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

INCREASE OF CAPITOL POLICE FORCE.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to call up the concurrent resolution reported by me on the 14th instant from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, proposing to increase the Capitol police force.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution; and it was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Board of Capitol Police be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to appoint twelve additional policemen at an annual salary of $1,100 each, one-half to be paid by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, out of the appropriations for miscellaneous items of the respective Houses, until otherwise provided for.

ACCOUNTS OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department. It is the bill we had up the other day and which was discussed quite freely. It simply proposes to change the method of transmitting notices of postal receipt deposits. It is recommended by the commission and by the Postmaster-General. There is no objection to it on the part of any officer who knows anything about business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CALL. I object, if an objection will carry it over.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Missouri will not prevail at this time and open up a question which I think ought to be discussed. If I can get a second I shall take the sense of the Senate by yeas and nays upon the motion. The question is whether a number of members of this body can be appointed by the President of an expired Senate to perform duties in this body to the derogation of the committees appointed by the Senate. Here is a bill that has not been referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. It is reported by what is called a commission. It undertakes to disregard entirely all the Senators upon that committee. A body nominated by the President of the last Senate, members of the present Senate, were appointed to take into consideration subjects that have been committed to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads; and it is assumed that the members of that committee are not competent to perform the duties which have been committed to them, one of which is the consideration and recommendation to the Senate of the pending bill.

I can not conceive the propriety of recognizing the power of the presiding officer of a body which has expired and which no longer exists, to designate the members of this body who are to perform duties in it, and that, too, when the Senate has since that time appointed certain Senators here as members of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whose opinion they have required this bill and all other amendments and improvements and changes in the postal service to be submitted. How can we recognize an authority of that kind?

Suppose these Senators had been appointed by the President of the last Senate and charged with the duty of considering a tariff bill and changes in the revenue system of the Government or the foreign relations of the country, is it to be supposed that the two great Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations would have submitted to such a designation of Senators paramount to them and to be substituted for them when selected by a policy which is not known in this body?

It seems to me the mere statement of this proposition shows how dangerous it is. The provision was agreed on by the members of a conference committee after the Senate decided adversely to the creation of a commission of this kind. The members on the part of the Senate were appointed by the officer of an expired Senate. Is it proposed that three members of the House and three members of the Senate shall agree upon a provision which shall create a body appointed by an expired authority with absolute power to continue their sessions indefinitely and perpetually, and to draw their warrants upon the Treasury of the United States for any amount of money they may see fit to expend? It does not matter that in this instance that authority would be executed properly, that the Senators and the members of the House who compose the commission are persons in whom the authority may be safely trusted, what is the precedent to be established? That there shall be designated, not by the Presiding Officer of this body, but by the Presiding Officer of an expired Senate, three Senators, who shall have power to incur any expense they see fit to incur, to determine upon the propriety of such expenditure, and draw their warrant upon the Treasury for any amount of money that they see fit to decide is proper and reasonable.

I insist, Mr. President, that this not only an unconstitutional authority, one which can not be created by statute, but that it is full of danger to the institutions of the country, and for that reason I shall ask for the yeas and nays upon the motion.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Let the Chair state the pending question before the Senator from Ohio proceeds.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Missouri to proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not see anything in the bill itself that is wrong. It seems to me it would expedite public business and dispense with a good deal of red tape in the passage of vouchers from the Sixth Auditor to the Postmaster-General and back and forth again. Therefore, so far as the proposition is concerned, I think it ought to be adopted. But it is equally clear in my mind that no measure of this kind, involving a good deal of detail and a good deal of technical knowledge, should be acted upon without reference to the regular committee. It seems to me that my friend from Missouri had better let the bill, which no doubt has been fully considered by him, go to a committee. So far as I can understand the subject-matter I approve of the object and the terms of the bill, but it appears to me that when such a measure is introduced from the commission which was organized at the last session of the last Congress it should be referred to the regular committee, the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads or the Committee on Finance, either of which would have jurisdiction of the subject.

It deals with the mode of keeping accounts and passing vouchers in the Post-Office Department, and although no doubt the gentlemen who were appointed as a commission to inquire into any defects in the modes of business in the various Departments of the Government have satisfied themselves upon the question, yet I think that when the bill is brought here it ought to be dealt with like any other bill; it ought to be referred to the appropriate committee. That certainly would not weaken it, because it proposes to make a very material and a very great change, and I think a favorable change. Still it ought to be examined by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads or by the Committee on Finance, and if either committee concur with the commission which has been organized, then as a matter of course we can vote upon it safely.

The commission, I understand, was appointed by an amendment to an appropriation act at the last session of the last Congress, and was rather in the nature of a committee of inquiry. It was a joint committee of the two Houses to inquire into the manner of conducting public business in the various Departments of the Government. I favored such a commission, and would be in favor of it now. I hope that the commission will be continued. But it is a mere committee of inquiry, not a regular committee of the Senate to pass upon an act of legislation. It certainly can not be considered in that light. It was not so considered by me, but rather as a committee of inquiry; and when the commission has made its inquiry and suggests its plans for reforming the public service its report, like any other matter, whether important or indifferent, ought to be referred to a regular standing committee of the Senate. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Missouri whether that course had not better be taken, and that all the measures legislative in their character reported from the commission should take the ordinary course pursued in

the consideration of other public measures; that they should be referred to standing committees of the Senate, and, having their sanction, no doubt would then be passed by the Senate without any objection.

It seems to me there is nothing in the point made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL]. I understand that this bill comes from the other House, and there is not a question of jurisdiction involved. The question is not whether we can pass such a law as is proposed; it is a question of the mode and manner of doing business in the Senate and not a question of jurisdiction. The other House having sent the bill to us we have jurisdiction, and we can pass it *nem. con.*, without reading, or dispense with the ordinary formula in passing bills.

But the question is whether a measure of this kind, of considerable magnitude, involving a vast sum of money, the passing upon $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 of expenditures in the Post-Office Department, should be passed without undergoing the scrutiny of a regular committee. That is the point which it seems to me is weak in the proposition. I think it would be much better to refer the bill to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and if that committee approves it, as it no doubt will, so far as I can understand the measure, then it will pass without any difficulty. Otherwise, it would introduce a new danger into our mode of conducting business. It is unusual to have a joint committee of the two Houses pass upon measures.

Each body is separate and distinct, and as distinctive, separate bodies, with no other connection except the necessity of having the joint action of the two Houses, the bill ought to be considered by an independent committee of the Senate. The committee which passes upon this measure should be composed of members of the Senate, not of the two Houses. A commission organized for the purpose of inquiry only, for the purpose of recommending such methods as may improve the public business, ought not to be armed with the power of reporting laws.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do I understand the Senator to make the point—I want to get at it exactly—that a joint committee appointed by Congress has no authority to report a bill for the consideration of the Senate?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that power ought not to be granted in any case to a joint commission.

Mr. COCKRELL. But the members who report to the respective bodies are members of that body and under their control. They do not make the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is true, but the House of Representatives have no right to report a measure to the Senate of the United States. Here is a commission composed equally of three members of the Senate and three members of the House. That joint committee can not report a bill to this body. It seems to me it would tear up——

Mr. COCKRELL. The three Senators make their report here. It is true it is signed by the members of the commission on the part of the other House. The members of the House make their report there.

Mr. SHERMAN. This is a separate and distinct body.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio one question. I had some experience years ago with a commission of this kind, and in the language creating the committee it was directed to investigate and report by bill or otherwise. I agree with the Senator that it is a bad practice to substitute for committees of the two bodies that have special work to do a joint commission, or joint committee; but if in the creation of the joint committee or commission it is declared that part of their duty shall be to report by bill or otherwise, does the Senator from Ohio think then that it would be out of place for them to report a bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I say that this commission might be authorized to report a bill to the Senate, but the question with the Senate would then be, as a separate and distinct body, independent of the House, whether that bill (because the reporting of the bill is simply the expression of the opinion of the commission) should be referred to a separate and distinct committee of the Senate and reported by it before action is taken upon the measure.

Mr. HALE. To be referred to a committee that has cognizance of that kind of business?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, that kind of business.

Mr. HALE. I think there is great force in that view.

Mr. SHERMAN. And while it might delay a little the passage of measures that are advised by the commission, it would still preserve the ordinary forms of parliamentary law, which requires a distinct committee to act upon every measure in either House, absolutely independent of the other. In this case I hope that that course will be pursued. The commission can go on and make their examinations. No doubt they will find many defects to correct. They can report them in the form of a bill or otherwise, and then their recommendations may be referred to the proper committee of the Senate having charge of that class of business.

Mr. COCKRELL. How about the Joint Committee on the Library? That is created by law.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Joint Committee on the Library is an exceptional committee in this body. It has undoubtedly reported bills, etc., but it deals with very small matters comparatively.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I have been upon the Committee on the Library a great many years, though I am not now. The theory of the Joint Committee on the Library is that it has a twofold authority. The Committee on the Library is a Senate committee pure and simple, and then there are certain statute powers given to the two committees together. But the Committee on the Library has always held (as the Senator I think will agree with me) that it has a right, even if the House members do not attend, to do the same thing that any ordinary Senate committee would do.

Mr. SHERMAN. Undoubtedly; it is a separate and distinct committee in each House.

Mr. HOAR. Formerly we would frequently report measures from the Senate Committee on the Library. After having passed the Senate they went over to the House, and there were referred, and the House Committee on the Library passed separately on them, just as the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee would have done, and the measures went through in that way. The two committees have certain joint authority, conferred by statute, principally the control of the library and the public garden here.

Mr. SHERMAN. The same is the case with the Committee on Printing. The Committees on Printing of the two Houses have certain joint powers, and they act upon those powers.

Mr. COCKRELL. By whom was that power given?

Mr. SHERMAN. It was given by law.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly, by law.

Mr. SHERMAN. In other words, the committees were authorized by law——

Mr. COCKRELL. The power conferred upon this commission was given by law, too.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know, but both the Committee on Printing and the Committee on the Library have always reported separately to each House as independent committees—not as a joint committee, but as the Committee on the Library or the Committee on Printing of the Senate or the House.

Mr. COCKRELL. This commission reports separately to each House. I reported a similar bill from the commission, and it is upon the Calendar. The other House proposed this bill. The two bills are identical, and I asked that the House bill might be taken up in lieu of the Senate bill. Now, we have made a report to the Senate, and it is printed here. We reported a separate bill to the Senate. The House members of the commission made a report to the House. They reported a separate bill. Those bills were identical. The House passed their bill and it came here and I moved to take it up instead of the one we reported. Now, your Joint Committee on Printing and your Joint Committee on the Library agree upon a bill. The members on the part of the House go and report it to the House. The members on the part of the Senate report it to the Senate. The House passes the bill first. It comes here. Would you not ask the Senate to take up and consider the House bill in preference to the Senate bill? If these committees have the jurisdiction given them by law, what difference does it make whether they are called a committee or a commission? It is tweedledum and tweedledee, it seems to me.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Committee on the Library and the Committee on Printing have certain executive duties as a joint body. Their action in this respect is not necessarily and not usually reported to either the Senate or the House. They pass upon questions of printing, etc., in the case of the Committee on Printing, and the Joint Committee on the Library controls the action of the Librarian of Congress to a certain extent, but when they act legislatively they are separate committees.

Mr. HOAR. Here is the rule under which the Committee on the Library have power to act jointly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, the Committees on the Library are two distinct bodies, organized one for the Senate and the other for the House, but they are authorized in certain matters to act jointly.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator please read the rule, and then I will read the provision of law relating to the commission.

Mr. SHERMAN. The rule providing for the appointment of standing committees of the Senate contains the following clause:

A Committee on the Library, to consist of three Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

And that joint action is provided for by a statute of the United States which defines their power. But whenever they report a bill to either the Senate or the House they are separate committees of the two Houses.

Mr. COCKRELL. The law creating the commission reads thus:

That a joint commission, consisting of three Senators, members of the Fifty-third Congress, to be appointed by the present President of the Senate, and three members-elect to the House of Representatives of the Fifty-third Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-second Congress, shall, during the Fifty-third Congress, inquire into and examine the status of the laws organizing the Executive Departments, bureaus, divisions, and other Government establishments at the national capital; the rules, regulations, and methods for the conduct of the same; the time and attention devoted to the operations thereof by the persons employed therein, and the degree of efficiency of all such employés; whether any modification of these laws can be made to secure greater efficiency and economy; and whether a reduction in the number or compensation of the persons authorized to be employed in said Executive Departments or bureaus can be made without injury to the public service: *Provided*, That the commission herein authorized shall have no jurisdiction to inquire into and report on pension legislation. Said commission is authorized to employ not exceeding three experts, who shall render such assistance as the commission may require in the prosecution of the investigation herein required, and shall receive such compensation as the commission shall determine to be just and reasonable.

The heads of the respective Executive Departments shall detail from time to time such officers and employés as may be requested by said commission in their investigations. Said commission or any subcommittee thereof shall have power to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths, and such process shall be issued and such oaths administered by the chairman of the commission or subcommittee, and the commission may report, by bill or otherwise, to their respective Houses of the Fifty-third Congress. All necessary expenses of said commission shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated upon vouchers approved jointly by the chairmen of said commission.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is all right, but when that joint commission report to this body that report should then be referred to a committee of the Senate, so as to secure the separate action of each House through organs of its own. The officers of the Senate who make up the Calendar recognize that and use the words "Joint Committee of Congress" instead of "commission." A commission may be employed to do almost anything, and it may be composed of persons outside of the Senate, as commissions have been organized outside of the Senate and outside of the House. Commissions may be organized as experts to inquire into a certain matter; but when it reports as a matter of course its report is referred to the appropriate committee. We had a commission on the tariff, and I believe it was composed partly of civilians and partly of members of Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; there were no members of Congress on it. They were all civilians.

Mr. SHERMAN. They were all persons outside of Congress; but they reported in the form of a bill, and that bill was referred to the appropriate committees of each House in its turn.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion to him right there, before he proceeds to another point?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. This joint commission, as it is called in the statute, is a single body, so that if the three members of the Senate and one member of the House of Representatives vote one way, and the other two, being a majority of the members of the House, vote the other way, the commission still would act and make its report. So, on the other hand, if all the members of the House and one member of the Senate had voted one way, the Senate might have something reported to it which a majority of its representatives had dissented from. So there is no body which can be treated as a committee of the Senate, whether it is a part of a joint committee or otherwise. That is one distinction between this case and the case to which the Senator from Ohio referred.

Mr. COCKRELL. I beg the Senator's pardon; there is no such distinction existing.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will look at the statute he will see it expressly provided.

Mr. COCKRELL. No report has been made, and no interpretation of the kind given to the language of the statute. Unless the six agree the House does not agree. That is the whole of it. There has been nothing done and no proposition made that a mere majority of the six members shall control the action of the commission. If another Senator and myself were to differ from the third Senator he would not join with the House members in agreeing to what we dissented from.

Mr. HOAR. But the statute is otherwise. Read it.

Mr. COCKRELL. All I want is to accomplish something in this matter. A great deal of time and labor have been given to the investigation of the methods of business. I venture to say that no sane man can affirm that the methods of business in our Executive Departments to-day are what they ought to be. I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that there ought to be changes made, and that the methods ought to be simplified. The business of the Departments ought to be brought up to current work. It is a shame and a disgrace to the Government that to-day there are over a million dollars due to the soldiers, their widows and orphans, according to our officials records, and yet we can not adjust and pay the claims, and will not do it. To-day claims for horses lost in the Mexican war are pending in the Treasury Department. So it is in every branch of the service.

Now, the methods of business must be changed, and the business of the Departments brought up to current work, like any other great establishment. We selected, in my judgment, three of the very best men we could have selected in the United States as experts to go through with this work. They are spending their entire time upon it. They go into every branch and bureau; they investigate; they trace the methods of business; they trace every item of business that is done, every entry that is made; they go from one desk to another; and when they have gotten through with all the methods of business they examine the law and the regulations of the Department, and after full consultation they make their recommendation of a change in the method of transacting the business, and show what will be the result of such a change.

In this case the proposition is a very simple one. It is simply a recommendation that the law shall be changed; that the notice of certificates of deposit, instead of being sent to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General's office, where it accomplishes nothing on earth and is simply delayed there in its transmission to the Sixth Auditor, shall go directly to the Sixth Auditor. That is all there is in this bill.

There is another bill here which has been reported which proposes to change the organization of the Sixth Auditor's office and to change materially the methods of business in the Sixth Auditor's office. That is an important bill, compared with this measure. This is simply a regulation. If it were not for the law, the Postmaster-General would make the change himself, but he can not change the present requirement by order, because the requirement is law.

That is the only reason why this measure is necessary. Many of the changes the experts have recommended have been approved in the Department, and carried out by departmental regulation. Some of them can not be carried out by departmental regulation, and therefore legislation is required. What I want to do is to accomplish something. It is nothing to me; it is for the interest of the public service; it is for the interest of the taxpayers; it is for the interest of Congress that these things shall be simplified and the business of the Departments brought up to current date.

If the business of the Departments were conducted to-day as the great business establishments of our country are conducted, nearly one-half of the labors would be taken off the shoulders of Congressmen. You all know how many letters you are getting about arrears of pay and bounty and deferred pension claims, and on all kinds of business matters. If the work was brought up to current, we should be relieved from that, the business would be in a better condition, and we could always ascertain the exact status of governmental transactions. As it is, we can not. We saw published in the newspapers only a day or two ago that supposed valuable papers had been stolen in regard to money orders and postal notes. The same thing may occur in other matters unless the business is promptly attended to.

The pending bill proposes a very small change. I am not disposed to run contrary to what may be the preference even of a minority of the Senate. I am perfectly willing that everything we report here shall be scanned, scrutinized, and criticised from an enemy's standpoint for that matter. I want action upon the bill. That is all I want.

If the Senate think that these matters ought to go to a committee, I am perfectly willing for them to go to a committee. I have no personal feeling in the matter. I think there is no occasion for the reference. I think that the commission has the right to report by bill, and that it is the business and the duty of the Senate to take up such bills and pass upon them just as if they had been reported by a regular committee, for it has been reported by three Senators, who are a committee as well as a commission, or part of a commission.

It is merely a technicality to raise the question as to how this bill got into the Senate. Suppose a committee which never has had a bill referred to it reports a bill to the Senate and the Senate passes it, has not the Senate jurisdiction of it? Suppose that the Presiding Officer of the body, without anybody ever having presented a bill to him or asking anything of him, should lay before the Senate a bill, that the Senate should take it up and discuss it, that it should be passed and go to the House of Representatives and passed there, would it not be as constitutional a law as if it had been referred to a committee, favorably reported, and passed in the usual way? The Senate, when a bill is before it, has jurisdiction of it beyond any question, and can pass it just as well before it goes to a committee as afterwards if satisfied with the investigation.

If the Senate think it necessary for the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, or if that committee think that their prerogatives have been assumed and intrenched upon and want this

bill, let the responsibility rest with them; they may have it; if they want to smother it they can do so, and if they want to report it they can do so.

There is nothing personal in this matter. If a majority of the Senate or any considerable number of the Senate think that bills reported by the commission should go to committees, let them go there, but let the commission be relieved from responsibility.

Mr. VILAS. I will say in respect to this bill that so far as the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is concerned, I am quite sure I speak for all of its members when I say that they desire only to discharge their duty according to the usages and methods of the Senate. What belongs to them to consider they ought to consider; what belongs to others to consider, they ought not to interfere with.

The joint commission is not a joint meeting of two committees, one on the part of the Senate and one on the part of the other House, but an independent body by itself, composed of six members appointed, as it happens to be directed by law, three from each of the bodies.

If the Senate desires to have that joint commission perform these duties, well; but they supersede necessarily in that event all of the committees; not alone the Post-Office Committee, but any committee which would naturally have charge of the regulation of affairs of the Treasury Department or any committee which would have charge of the affairs in the Interior Department, and there are various committees to which the various branches of business of the Interior Department properly appertain. This commission supersedes them all if that ground be taken.

However, I was going to ask the Senator from Missouri one question. I would draw his attention to the law as it stands at this time apparently upon the Revised Statutes. Section 407 of the Revised Statutes is the same as section 54 of the revision of the postal laws, which was passed in 1872, and that law now reads simply thus:

SEC. 407. The postal revenues and all debts due the Post-Office Department shall, when collected, be paid into the Treasury of the United States, under the direction of the Postmaster-General; and the Treasurer, assistant treasurer, or designated depositary receiving such payment, shall give the depositor duplicate receipts therefor.

There is, so far as I am aware, no statute which provides for the disposition of those receipts. That is left, as I understand, to the Postmaster-General by regulation; and it is in accordance with the theory upon which all of our postal laws are written. We have no statute which directs anything to be done in the postal service by anybody but the Postmaster-General. The whole theory of our statute is to command one officer to do all the duties, and he is authorized then to regulate the postal service under him and by means of him. The postal service, which is a great express business, is conducted as from a central head, with concurrent action on the part of all the various members of the force, numbering 150,000 men, if you include the clerks in the lower grade offices who are paid by the postmaster instead of out of the appropriation.

The Postmaster-General to-day, under this law, has power by regulation to direct how these receipts shall be disposed of; and I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri if he has considered this question in reference to it. The current payments of the postal service are not made by warrants on the Treasury, as in the case of all the other Departments of the Government, but the ordinary expenditures of the postal service are made by postmasters, under the orders of the Post-Office Department, addressed to the postmaster. Therefore, these orders are as a rule usually addressed to offices which have the deposits. There is a system of collection of the postal revenues by which the smaller postmasters deposit at some post-office known as a depositary post-office, and that office makes the payments of the ordinary expenditures of the postal service.

In order that the Post-Office Department shall know where this money is and upon what post-office to make its orders for the payment of the current expenditures of the postal service, it is necessary that these reports of the various depositing postmasters of the place where they have deposted and the amounts which they have deposited shall be promptly put in the hands of the Postmaster-General, or, more particularly speaking, of his aid in the performance of that branch of fiscal service of the Department, the Third Assistant Postmaster-General. Accordingly by regulation each postmaster who makes a deposit is required to make report at once to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, who thus keeps an account from day to day and time to time of the location and distribution of the moneys of the service, out of which the current expenditures are made.

There is another thing. The law requires postmasters to deposit with promptness. In certain cases they are required to deposit weekly, and the Post-Office Department is enjoined necessarily to see that this duty is performed. It is a necessity to the ready distribution of the business.

Perhaps the Senator from Missouri can explain why this provision, which takes from the Third Assistant Postmaster-General the information which he has been in the habit of receiving, will not interfere, but it seems to me that it is liable to interfere and disarrange the ordinary system by which the postal receipts are carried and by which the expenditures of the Department are made. Unless that can readily and satisfactorily be explained, it would strike me to be a reasonable thing that this subject should be inquired into by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads in the ordinary way in which measures touching the Post-Office Department are submitted to the appropriate committee, and as measures touching every other Department would naturally be sent to the appropriate committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me, I wish at some time, before he answers the important question put to him in the preliminary matter which has been discussed, to inquire of him whether this is a commission created by statute, voting by a majority, or whether it is a committee of each House acting concurrently with separate powers? The statute provides for one chairman and gives him authority to administer an oath, and there is no other chairman. Who, in fact, is the chairman of that commission?

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a separate chairman for each branch of the commission when the commission is sitting separately; but when the commission is sitting together Mr. DOCKERY, of the other House, is the chairman of the joint commission.

Mr. HOAR. Is there any provision in the statute for the three members of each House to sit separately?

Mr. COCKRELL. I think the Senator will find that in the last clause of the statute.

Mr. HOAR. I can not find it. As I understand, this commission and this matter of the chairman presents a very interesting and important question. The commission is just what it would have been if the statute, instead of saying three Senators and three members of the House of Representatives, had said three clerks in the Post-Office Department and three clerks in the Treasury Department. It has no other legal existence whatever except that. It met as one body, and not as two. It voted by a majority of four to two, if the members were all present, without the slightest regard to how that majority was made up, and it had but one chairman as provided for by law.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. HOAR. I am not mistaken about that. I am stating the fact with the law before me.

Mr. CULLOM. Each body organized separately.

Mr. HOAR. Then they did not follow the statute.

Mr. CULLOM. Then they appointed a chairman of the joint commission.

Mr. HOAR. That only shows a misunderstanding, as it seems to me, with great deference to other Senators, who may be right and I wrong. The misunderstanding which they exhibit here on the floor of the Senate in the effect of this statute is one which they entertained some time ago.

But the statute provides for a joint commission of three men to be appointed by one power and three by another, and the commission herein authorized shall have such and such jurisdiction. Then there is a provision in the statute about administering oaths, and it provides that they may send for persons and papers, and such process shall be issued and such oaths administered by the chairman of the commission or subcommittee.

Unless the committee of the Senate was made a subcommittee—the commission would have been a very different thing as a joint committee—its chairman could not have administered oaths. There was no such official provided by the statute—one chairman of one body; and that body, and not a subcommittee, have authority given by the law, and nobody else, it seems to me.

So I respectfully submit to my friend from Missouri and my friend from Illinois that they misconceive the effect of this statute if they take any other view of it.

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to be becoming very fashionable to report resolutions here creating committees or commissions, for they are substantially one and the same thing.

Mr. President, I confess that when the law under which the commission was created was passed, I thought it was a tolerably awkward piece of legislation, and, as some Senators may recollect, I endeavored to be excused from service on the commission; but it was thought, on account of the provision in the statute requiring the presiding officers of the two Houses of Congress at that time to appoint a commission, that if I should decline the vacancy caused by my resignation could not be filled. Therefore I concluded to remain on the commission.

It seems to me that what has been said here is simply sticking in the bark as to what ought to be done. Whatever may be the technical fact, whether this commission has the power to report bills to go upon the Calendar and be acted upon by the Senate or

not, unless we abolish the commission and undertake to make this proposed reorganization by some other means, it seems to me that whatever the commission may do in the premises will be thrown away, and what we are undertaking to do now can not be recognized as legitimate and proper.

The commission or committee, or whatever it may be called, has gone to work to try to improve the condition of the Departments in their organization. In the interest of a plain, simple way of doing business and in the interest of economy, we started in that line. We are incurring some expense in it, which the Government will have to pay. If we can not go forward and report bills here to the separate Houses, but if, upon the other hand, the bills we report are to be referred to the committees which have charge of the affairs of the different branches of the Government, the commission might as well be relieved from further service.

Take the pending bill, for instance, or any important bill which goes extensively into the question of the reorganization of the Post-Office Department. If we refer such a bill to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads under those circumstances, of what amount is the work which has been done by the commission? It seems to me that if we have experts and are paying for them, and the Post-Office Committee wants to take charge of the reorganization of the Post-Office Department, the commission had better disband and let the Post-Office Committee take charge of the question, and so of committees which have charge of the business of other Departments.

So I say that the technical objection which is urged here against the reception of a bill in this body and its consideration by the Senate until it has been referred to a standing committee which represents the Post-Office Department, for instance, we might as well adjourn the joint commission and let the committee take charge of that branch of the service.

The commission or committee, or whatever it may be termed, has gone into this work, I may say, with a little more energy and a little greater determination this year in attempting to see if there is not something we can do to improve the condition of the Departments than has been done heretofore.

I know that this reorganization has been going on nominally a great many years, but there has never been before, within my knowledge, that methodical arrangement by which the work can be done as thoroughly and successfully as we have been trying to do it under the joint commission since it has been organized.

So far as this little bill is concerned it is one which has been fully considered by the commission, as has been said by the chairman, for I recognize the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] as the chairman of the Senate wing of the joint commission, for that is what he is as a matter of fact, and he reports the bill here, not the bill which the House branch of the commission reported, but a similar bill. We have considered it, but as the House bill has come over, it is natural enough that we should take up that bill for consideration at this time instead of the other.

I think we ought to settle the question now whether these bills are to go, when the commission report them to the different committees, which will claim whatever bill seems to touch their particular line of official duty. We ought to settle the question whether when we report bills they are to be distributed out to the several committees of the Senate, or whether they are to go to the Calendar, to be considered as they come up in regular order. It seems to me that is the thing we ought to do, because if the commission are to do nothing more than to report bills, I think we are doing a great deal of work and incurring some expense, perhaps, which will amount to nothing to the country. The experts we have employed had better be employed by the several standing committees, and let them take hold of the question of reorganizing the several Executive Departments of the Government and excuse us from the work which we are trying to do under the statute, which, I confess, I have always thought is somewhat of an anomaly.

That is all I have to say about the matter, but it does seem to me that we are sticking in the bark when we technically object to the consideration of this bill and say that it ought to be referred to one of the standing committees before it is acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. I think the Senator from Illinois is quite right that the question to determine now is, whether it is proper for the Senate to consider the bills reported from the commission created by the act of the last Congress, without reference to the standing committees of the body.

I do not intend to criticise the action of the commission. I think, from what I have seen—and I have read the reports which have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a good deal of care—that they have unquestionably gone on in the right line, with a view to economy and with a view to relieving the Departments from the extra amount of red-tape which is said to exist in the conduct of the business of the various Executive Departments, and I am very glad to have the report of the commission. But I concur with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that the commission, created as it was and constituted as it is, ought not to be permitted to bring in bills for consideration by either House of Congress without reference to the proper standing committees.

At the time this commission was created, by the provision which the Senator from Missouri has read in the appropriation act, I objected very strenuously to the appointment of such a commission, to a commission to be appointed by the then presiding officers of the two Houses, consisting of gentlemen who were not members of Congress, who had not taken the oath of office, but who were appointed as individuals, so far as another branch of the legislative department is concerned. It so happened that the three members here were Senators and their terms had not expired, but the others were merely citizens of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. They were members of the House of Representatives at that time.

Mr. GORMAN. They were members of the House of Representatives-elect, but had not taken the oath of office and were therefore not actually members of Congress. They were simply prominent citizens of the United States, who were, in the course of time, to fill a high station as members of Congress.

The commission met and organized during the recess of Congress, and they employed experts, as the Senator from Illinois has stated—three very distinguished men in the railroad service of this country—whose reports to the commission in regard to the reorganization and change of methods in the Sixth Auditor's Office Senators will find in the RECORD of Friday last, the 15th. It is evident from this report of theirs that their general view is that the accounts and business of the Departments of the Government should be conducted as they are accustomed to seeing the affairs of great corporations managed. They evidently believe that the Treasury Department, which audits the accounts of the Post-Office Department, should have entire charge of the return of postmasters' accounts, and eliminate, as far as possible, all the checks and entries that are made in the office of the Third-Asssistant Postmaster-General. Simply because a few clerks are required to make the entries it is proposed to break up the system practically, which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] has described so vividly as to the Post-Office Department. To a certain extent that reform may be right, and I do not know that it is not; but I suggest that before radical changes of this character be made, it is at least wise that the standing committees of this body shall go over the work of the commission and of its experts and report to the Senate in the ordinary way.

Mr. President, how do these bills come here? They come here by the report of a commission—no, not a commission, but the bill pending before the Senate was reported in another place, signed by "ALEXANDER M. DOCKERY, JAMES D. RICHARDSON, and NELSON DINGLEY, jr., managers on the part of the House of Representatives," and "F. M. COCKRELL, JAMES K. JONES, and S. M. CULLOM, managers on the part of the Senate"—precisely as would be done in the case of a conference report. So when the bill came here it was signed in the same way, not only by members of this body as Senators, but by three members of another body.

I submit that the work of a commission of that character, no matter how constituted, whether they be heads of Departments or members of the two Houses of Congress, ought, when received for our consideration, to be properly referred to the committee having charge of the particular subject-matter.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire of the Senator from Maryland is there any objection to the provisions of the pending bill?

Mr. GORMAN. I can not answer the Senator positively; but after listening to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], who is very familiar with post-office affairs, who made a suggestion, which occurred to my mind, it is possible that there may be some objection to it, which, however, may be answered fully and completely by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL].

The point I make is that the Senate of the United States should never act upon a bill unless it has been considered by a standing committee or a special committee of its own, or by the body itself without the consideration of a committee, as we are compelled to do in certain cases; but that in general legislation all matters ought to be referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. HARRIS. I interrupted the Senator to ask the question I did for the purpose of suggesting that if a regular standing committee claims jurisdiction of the subject-matter and thinks it ought to have it, as a matter of respect to that committee, if for no other and better reason, I should say give it to them; but if the committee is not demanding the jurisdiction, and there is

no objection to the provisions of the bill, it seems to me it is sticking in the bark to inquire into exactly how the bill got on the Calendar or on the desk.

The bill under consideration, I understand, is a House bill. It comes to us as a House bill. It goes to the table as a House bill, and it is certainly a legitimate subject for our consideration as a Senate. If there be objections to the provisions of the bill of course I am willing to consider them.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Maryland has for the first time called my attention to an incomprehensible and stupid blunder in the Printing Office in putting in "managers" instead of "members." Nobody on the commission ever thought of signing his name in that way, and the clerks of the respective committees never did it. It is a mistake in the print. I was astounded when he read it. We never signed in that way, and it is a mistake in the print. It was signed "members on the part of the Senate" and "members on the part of the House." All the reports were signed that way. I never discovered that the word "managers" had been stuck in there.

Mr. GORMAN. Of course I do not know whose fault it was. Probably the Printer is at fault. I believe everything is charged to the Printer that gets wrong in the records. But the point of the case is not whether it is signed as managers on the part of the Senate and managers on the part of the House; it is a commission that was created by law. They are not managers upon the part of the House or upon the part of the Senate, and I agree with the Senator that it ought never to have appeared in the record.

Mr. COCKRELL. I merely want to show the Senator three reports here, two made in the Senate and one in the House, which are signed "members on the part of the Senate" and "members on the part of the House;" and that particular one happened to be signed "managers." Here is another one signed "members."

Mr. GORMAN. Of course I make no point as to whether it was signed "members" or "managers."

Mr. COCKRELL. But it is not the fact that it was signed managers.

Mr. GORMAN. I am glad I called the Senator's attention to it. But, apart from that, I submit that three members of the Senate and three members of the House had no right to sign such a report. Under the law the three Senators had a right to join the three gentlemen in another body and sign it as a commission created by the act so and so. They were simply a commission, as I have already said, and three members at least of the commission had no official position when the commission was created; they were simply citizens of the United States.

The Senator from Missouri knows that I would not reflect upon his work. On the contrary, if he were at the head of the commission, if he could have had the entire charge of it and had brought a bill before the Senate and said after my personal examination and my own control of it I know this is right, the measure would have had great weight with me, and I would not have been on my feet to oppose it after he could give such a personal indorsement to it; but the fact is, as we all know, that in the operation of all such affairs the head of a committee is the man who after all is responsible and is held responsible for the character of the bill that the committee produces and reports.

The members of the committee can aid him, and aid to a great extent, but after all, the careful thought and consideration the measure has received must come from the head of the committee and his clerks and experts. I am not content as a member of this body that the work of a commission whose head is not a member of the body shall pass through unless it undergoes the scrutiny of one of our committees.

The second bill relates to the Post-Office Department and the Sixth Auditor's Office. It reorganizes it, changes the condition as to the postal notes, etc. It is far-reaching and broad in its effects, and is the second of the series that is to come along. It seems to me, with due respect to all the members of the commission, that the series of bills affecting the same service should go before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads of this body, and I make that motion in this case. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM. Does not the Senator think, if these bills are to take that course, it will involve the necessity on the part of the several committees that get them of taking testimony and hearing the experts and going over the work again?

Mr. GORMAN. I think not. Take the bill that is found in the RECORD of December 15. There is an important bill where over a hundred thousand dollars are involved. You will find there the report of the experts, the report of the commission, the statements of the Post-Office Department officials, and so on. I do not suppose for one moment that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads would be required to go through all the detail again. They can revise what the commission have put in a concrete form.

Mr. CULLOM. I apprehend the Senator will find that if the several committees get the several bills and the commission continues its labors, those committees will be required, in order to satisfy themselves in their own judgment, to send for the same men and to go through the same investigation with the Post-Office Department and the Treasury Department and every other Department of the Government, or else their work will fail and everything that we have done will fall to the ground.

Mr. GORMAN. I will ask the Senator from Illinois, who is a member of the commission, what would prevent the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads from getting all the evidence and all the testimony and the data which the commission have?

Mr. CULLOM. Of course they could get it by having before them the experts, the Post-Office employés, the Postmaster-General, and all those persons; but the very purpose of the creation of the commission was to concentrate the work into a few hands, so that it would be accomplished and one general outline of government would be mapped out, and one reform would work properly with another.

Mr. GORMAN. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that I have not the slightest disposition to delay the good work of the commission. I have no doubt a great many of the suggestions they have made after the labor they have given to the subject will bear good fruit. I trust such will be the case; but I think it is too serious a matter to attempt to change the business of any one of the Departments without the most careful consideration, and I think it ought never to be done without a reference of the matter to a standing committee of this body.

Not only is that true in this case, but in another matter on which we are divided politically. Only a few days ago, on the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], when a bill had not been, as Senators on the other side thought, before the proper committee of this body, I as one member of the body said "that is right." We ought to have each of the measures properly considered by the committee that has full charge of the subject. A delay of a few days can not make any difference.

Mr. CULLOM. So far as I am personally concerned I have no feeling about this matter. The only thing that occurs to me in connection with it is that we are going to duplicate labor and duplicate expense, and probably the whole thing will break down and nothing will be accomplished. I shall be very glad to be relieved of any necessity to do anything in connection with the joint commission, but the commission started in in good faith to do the work. It has already done a good deal; it has already incurred a considerable expense; and it thought that it was getting at the very inner organization of the Departments. The commission thinks that we can save a great deal of unnecessary labor, a great deal of unnecessary expense, and improve the mode of doing the business of the Departments. The thing I fear is that if it is scattered out and the several standing committees, which I recognize as thoroughly able to do all this work, do not go into it as thoroughly as the commission has been doing, the chances are that much of the proposed legislation will fail. That is the only point that I am concerned about.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Maryland if he desires to have the bill referred to one of the standing committees of the Senate that he select the proper committee. I do not think he has selected the proper committee in the motion which he has made. The Senate has a standing committee on the Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments. This bill has reference to two of the Departments and their methods of business, to wit, the Post-Office Department and the Treasury Department. The committee I have named was created for the purpose of investigating and becoming informed of the methods of business and the conduct of business in the Departments.

It seems to me that if we are to establish the precedent of having all the bills which the commission may bring in and the reports which the commission may make to the Senate and to the House referred to a committee they had better go to the committee the Senate has established for considering the character of subjects which will be embraced in the bills. I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that it would be better, if he insists upon the motion to refer, to move to refer the bill to the Committee on the Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

Mr. CALL. There is no doubt, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is right. There is nothing in my observations thus far which contravenes the position which he took. A House bill comes properly before the Senate. Certainly it may be considered in the discretion of the Senate without reference to a committee. Any Senator may move to proceed to its consideration. Senators who are members of this anomalous body called a commission may do so.

Therefore, this House bill is properly before the Senate for consideration, but there are a great many other questions which arise in this case, pertinent to the consideration of the House

bill, which ought to be considered by the Senate. What are they? In the first place, the question as to the propriety of a statute of the United States giving authority to the Speaker of an expired House to designate members of a coming Congress who are to perform legislative duties, in view of the respect due to the members of the committee or committees who are specially charged with that work.

Here are the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments, constituted by the Senate. What is it to say by a statute of the United States that a Speaker of an expired House and the President of the expired Senate shall have authority to designate other Senators than those who compose those committees to perform their work? Why should other Senators be selected instead of those upon those committees? Why should the Senators who are assigned to perform these duties, after the Senate refused to approve the provision in the appropriation bill providing for a commission, be detached from the performance of the duties and others assigned to perform them?

That is one consideration. But what is the authority for it? Where do you get the authority for the Congress of the United States to enact a statute by which any other body than the existing Senate and the existing House shall designate the members who are to perform a duty? You speak of this as a commission. Let us see how it can be a commission. Its duties must be either legislative, executive, or judicial. Let us consider them. What are they? To examine into the conduct of the Executive Departments and to recommend measures to be passed by the two Houses. Is that a duty which can be committed to any other authority than the members of the two Houses? Let us see. The Constitution of the United States says the President of the United States "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." What did this commission do? They were appointed to consider the whole range of the Executive Departments, to take evidence, and to perform the duty of the President of the United States to recommend measures to Congress. As a committee of this body they may consider any measure which may be introduced here and report it to each House, but have they authority to recommend measures to Congress? Is not that a duty expressly given in the words of the Constitution to the President of the United States?

Again, "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." If it be a rule of proceeding of this House as to the manner in which a measure shall be introduced, as to the consideration which it shall have, and the method of its consideration, how can a statute of the United States give to the two Houses authority to prescribe unbending rules of proceeding for either? "Each House may determine." Has not the Senate determined that in the assignment of a Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, a Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments, a Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment?

Has not the Senate in this Congress decided that the Senators upon those committees shall have the consideration of these matters? The question is raised, and we are met by certain Senators who say, "I was assigned to perform that duty by the President of the last Senate." The members who report to the House say, "I was assigned by the Speaker of the last House to perform this duty, which the present Senate and the present House of Representatives in this Congress have conferred upon you, and I claim the right to do it."

Mr. President, it seems to me that nothing is clearer than that all legislative power is given to Congress. Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. All executive power is given to the President of the United States, and express provision is made that he shall recommend to Congress the measures which in his opinion are advisable to be passed. If this be a legislative duty it can not be assigned by the President and the two Houses of Congress to particular Senators in coming Congresses. Let us suppose that the statute had provided that the President of the expiring Senate and the Speaker of the expiring House should have the authority to designate certain members of the two Houses who should consider the entire subject of our fiscal relations and our system of finance, tariff, and otherwise, and this body had afterwards appointed its committee, would the Senator from Ohio and the members of the Committee on Finance have submitted to that action?

Would it not have been a declaration that they were incapable of performing their duty; and would it have had any validity as a matter of constitutional law? The question would be at once asked, Where is the power given to the United States by a statute, by an act of the two Houses to be approved by the President, to determine the rules of proceeding of each House? The phrase "each House" means the existing House, not the past House, nor the past Senate, nor the preceding President of the United States, but each separate body then existing. Beyond all question that is true. If they and they alone can determine their rules of proceeding what rule is there for any other conclusion in regard to it? It seems to me perfectly clear that each House separately may and must determine the rules of its proceeding.

Senators speak of joint commissions and joint committees. There is no authority in any House or in any Senate to impose a duty upon the members of the other body. The joint committees meet voluntarily. You may provide for the creation of a committee, and it may be said it may sit jointly with a like committee on the part of the other House, but you can not command it to do so. You can not command the members of the other House; and the other House can not command or make the members of this body members of a committee here. It must be voluntary. Each House may give its sanction to their sitting in joint committee, but the rule of the Constitution is plain: "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," and it must determine it; and it can not by any possibility communicate any portion of its authority or power to the members of another House.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that this is a matter of the most extreme importance, and it does not touch the question of the merits of the bill. The bill may be good or it may be bad. That is not the question. It does not concern us to know whether it is good or whether it is bad. By the custom and the rules of the Senate, bills coming here from the other House are referred, unless good reason is shown to the contrary, to the standing committees of this body for their consideration and their opinion.

I have a resolution here touching these questions which I have presented as reasons why the bill should not be hastily hurried through, and this commission vested with the entire authority of the Senate and everything they do approved. Why should we not say now that this method of proceeding is an unconstitutional and unlawful one?

I have a resolution here touching upon these questions and declaring the commission to be entirely void and without authority, first, because it is trespassing upon the executive power of the President of the United States, who alone can recommend to Congress measures of any kind; and, second, because it is an unjust and dangerous precedent to give to three members of the House and three members of the Senate authority, in their discretion, to employ any number of persons to revise the entire civil service of the United States, to supersede the committees of this body, to determine their own expenses and draw their warrant upon the Treasury of the United States for any amount of money that they may see fit in their discretion to demand.

Now, it does not matter that the Senators and the Members of the House who compose this extraordinary body called a commission are men of the highest character. That does not touch the question. It does not matter whether the bill they have introduced here may or may not turn out to be an important bill, but the precedent is itself a dangerous one, and an unlawful one, and one that opens the door of the Treasury to any amount of possible improper use.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it is very evident that this important question, which I am convinced should be discussed fully in all its bearings, will not be disposed of to-night; and therefore, if the Senator in charge of the bill has no objection, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1893.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Wayne MacVeagh, of Pennsylvania, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Italy, vice William Potter, resigned.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

John P. Irish, of California, to be naval officer of customs in the district of San Francisco, in the State of California, to succeed Edward P. Danforth, removed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

James H. Forney, of Idaho, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Idaho, vice Fremont Wood, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John W. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Joseph R. Harrah, whose term will expire December 20, 1893.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Signal Corps.

First Lieut. William A. Glassford, to be captain, to date from November 14, 1893.

Cavalry arm.

First Lieut. Eben Swift, Fifth Cavalry, to be captain, December 11, 1893, vice Hall, Fifth Cavalry, appointed assistant adjutant-general.

Second Lieut. J. Y. Mason Blunt, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, December 11, 1893, vice Swift, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. George W. Gatchell, Fourth Artillery, to be first lieutenant, December 11, 1893, vice Sawyer, Fifth Artillery, appointed assistant quartermaster.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Palmer G. Wood, regimental quartermaster, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain, December 11, 1893, vice Wilson, Twelfth Infantry, appointed assistant adjutant-general.

Second Lieut. Odon Gurovits, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, December 15, 1893, vice McCarthy, Twelfth Infantry, appointed regimental quartermaster.

Ordnance Department.

Second Lieut. Colden L'H. Ruggles, Third Artillery, to be first lieutenant, December 18, 1893, to fill the vacancy in the department caused by the retirement of Capt. Henry Metcalfe, October 26, 1893.

POSTMASTERS.

John D. Waterman, to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Winnebago and State of Illinois, in the place of Thomas G. Lawler, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

John G. Schwegman, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana, in the place of Isaac Jenkinson, removed.

Isaac Coombs, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Knox and State of Maine, in the place of F. A. D. Singhi, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

James Gillen, jr., to be postmaster at Houlton, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine, in the place of Eben Woodbury, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Jeremiah G. Shaw, to be postmaster at Biddeford, in the county of York and State of Maine, in the place of Elisha E. Clark, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Edward C. Morrissey, to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Jackson and State of Michigan, in the place of William L. Seaton, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

R. J. Bouchelle, to be postmaster at Columbia, in the county of Boone and State of Missouri, in the place of Samuel H. Elkins, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Rufus F. Ingalls, to be postmaster at Gorham, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire, in the place of George N. Dsmond, deceased.

James L. Carson, to be postmaster at Wapakoneta, in the county of Auglaize and State of Ohio, in the place of David J. Davis, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Patrick Roach, to be postmaster at Harbor, in the county of Ashtabula and State of Ohio, in the place of Crawford Large, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Thomas D. Wallace, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Clarke in the State of Ohio, in the place of Pearl M. Cartmell, resigned.

Calvin Clendenin, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of John S. Weaver, resigned.

E. J. McCune, to be postmaster at Shippensburg, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Frank E. Hollar, resigned.

Michael Mellett, to be postmaster at Shenandoah, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Henry C. Boyer, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Robert B. Armour, to be postmaster at Memphis, in the county of Shelby and State of Tennessee, in the place of R. F. Patterson, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Giles Devier, to be postmaster at Harrisonburg, in the county of Rockingham and State of Virginia, in the place of James Sullivan, removed.

H. W. Kinzer, to be postmaster at Front Royal, in the county of Warren and State of Virginia, in the place of Charles L. Pritchard, resigned.

E. B. Brundage, to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, in the county of Wood and State of Wisconsin, in the place of F. W. Burt, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

George D. Cline, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of St. Croix and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Henry F. Densmore, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

John O. Perkins, to be postmaster at Jefferson, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Frank P. Kispert, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14, 1893.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE CUTTER SERVICE.

John J. Herrick, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue Cutter Service.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

A. M. Dahlgren, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi.

Frank B. Earnest, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Corpus Christi, in the State of Texas.

POSTMASTERS.

William H. Peffer, to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

Matthew M. McAlpin, to be postmaster at Denison, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa.

Thomas J. Kelleher, to be postmaster at Waukon, in the county of Alamakee and State of Iowa.

John Lynch, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Marion and State of Kansas.

John H. Sherman, to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Clarke and State of Iowa.

W. L. Parker, to be postmaster at Sibley, in the county of Osceola and State of Iowa.

Samuel F. McConnell, to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Davis and State of Iowa.

George A. Elston, to be postmaster at Port Jervis, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

George W. H. Lucas, to be postmaster at Cherokee, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas.

W. J. Stonebreaker, to be postmaster at Hampton, in the county of Franklin and State of Iowa.

Thomas J. Eakin, to be postmaster at Emlenton, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania.

Benjamin A. Donovan, to be postmaster at Manheim, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

Orson A. Carlin, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1893.

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES TREASURER.

D. M. Kilpatrick, of Louisiana, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Charles H. Simonton, of South Carolina, to be United States circuit judge for the fourth judicial circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles D. Fullen, of Iowa, to be attorney of the United States for the southern district of Iowa.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

James B. Stevens, of California, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of San Francisco, in the State of California.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

True L. Norris, of New Hampshire, to be collector of customs for the district of Portsmouth, in the State of New Hampshire.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Edward R. Monk, of Wilcox, Ariz., to be receiver of public moneys at Tucson, Ariz.

John F. Hughes, of Pierre, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Pierre, S. Dak.

Joseph S. Halland, of Clapham, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Clayton, N. Mex.

Frank M. Broome, of Alliance, Nebr., to be receiver of public moneys at Alliance, Nebr.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

O. M. Welburn, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of California.

Joshua Jump, of Indiana, to be colector of internal revenue for the seventh district of Indiana.

James Phelan, of Michigan, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Michigan.

Calvin Page, of New Hampshire, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Hampshire.

S. M. McMillen, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio.

Louis P. Ohliger, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio.

J. Edward Kauffman, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of Texas.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICE.

Frank W. Walls, of Phœnix, Ariz., to be register of the land office at Tucson, Ariz.

Henry D. Ross, of Flagstaff, Ariz., to be register of the land office at Prescott, Ariz.

John C. Slack, of Folsom, N. Mex., to be register of the land office at Clayton, N. Mex.

Frank M. Hopkins, of Roscoe, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Aberdeen, S. Dak.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

George W. Haynie, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Evansville, in the State of Indiana.

William D. English, of California, to be surveyor of customs for the port of San Francisco, in the State of California.

George G. Tanner, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Indianapolis, in the State of Indiana.

POSTMASTERS.

George B. Zimpleman, to be postmaster at Austin, in the county of Travis and State of Texas.

James M. Robins, to be postmaster at Mineola, in the county of Wood and State of Texas.

Charles A. Morse, to be postmaster at New Market, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire.

Robert L. Nelson, to be postmaster at Bethany, in the county of Harrison and State of Missouri.

Thomas M. Blacklin, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota.

T. E. Doyon, to be postmaster at Redfield, in the county of Spink and State of South Dakota.

Thomas J. Johnson, to be postmaster at Norman, in the county of Cleveland and Territory of Oklahoma.

Anson Swett, to be postmaster at Antrim, in the county of Hillsborough and State of New Hampshire.

William W. Gardner, to be postmaster at Avoca, in the county of Pottawattamie and State of Iowa.

William W. DeWolf, to be postmaster at Reinbeck, in the county of Grundy and State of Iowa.

Henry M. Noyes, to be postmaster at Hyde Park, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont.

Thomas W. Killion, to be postmaster at Moulton, in the county of Appanoose and State of Iowa.

O. Ira Jameson, to be postmaster at Columbus Junction, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa.

John H. Howell, to be postmaster at Eagle Grove, in the county of Wright and State of Iowa.

John T. S. Williams, to be postmaster at Ogden, in the county of Boone and State of Iowa.

Charles Perry, to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Marion and State of Iowa.

Matthew M. Lenon, to be postmaster at Panora, in the county of Guthrie and State of Iowa.

Horace B. Tibbits, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of York and State of Maine.

Stephen M. Wilder, to be postmaster at Spring Valley, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota.

Hosea S. Merrifield, to be postmaster at North Berwick, in the county of York and State of Maine.

Oliver P. Hanna, to be postmaster at Sheridan, in the county of Sheridan and State of Wyoming.

John L. Shelton, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Henry and State of Missouri.

Alvin C. Frisbie, to be postmaster at Stanberry, in the county of Gentry and State of Missouri.

James H. Jordan, to be postmaster at Denver, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado.

C. H. Williams, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Jackson and State of Arkansas.

John A. Hinkle, to be postmaster at Batesville, in the county of Independence and State of Arkansas.

Myers C. Shook, to be postmaster at Preston, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota.

John M. Jackson, to be postmaster at Peru, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana.

James B. Chapman, to be postmaster at Hartford City, in the county of Blackford and State of Indiana.

D. L. Smith, to be postmaster at Sweetwater, in the county of Monroe and State of Tennessee

George B. Snyder, to be postmaster at Youngstown, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio.

Richard S. Wooldridge, to be postmaster at Harrisonville, in the county of Cass and State of Missouri.

E. J. McCune, to be postmaster at Shippensburg, Pa.

Michael Mellett, to be postmaster at Shenandoah, Pa.

Robert B. Armour, to be postmaster at Memphis, Tenn.

George D. Cline, to be postmaster at Hudson, Wis.

J. L. Phelan, to be postmaster at San Angelo, in the county of Tom Green and State of Texas.

John W. Lipscomb, to be postmaster at Luling, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas.

John W. Hogg, to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of Wise and State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair desires to lay before the House certain executive communications.

COMMERCE PASSING THROUGH ST. MARYS FALLS CANAL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting a report in reference to commerce passing the St. Marys Falls Canal, Michigan, during the season of 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

BENJAMIN P. BAILEY VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of fact of the court in the case of Benjamin P. Bailey *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DAVEY, until after the holidays.

To Mr. LAWSON indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution which I desire to offer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] states that he has a privileged resolution which he desires to offer. The Clerk will report the resolution in order that the House may see whether it is privileged or not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears from the message of the President, this day communicated to Congress, that an attempt has been made recently by the executive department of the Government to effect a change in the territorial limits of the United States without any consultation with the House of Representatives, and without making any stipulation or provision for obtaining the consent of this House to such change: and

Whereas it is essential to the stability and safety of this Government that the powers and duties of this House on all matters and proceedings involving any change in the limits of the United States, either by acquisition or by cession of territory, be ascertained, settled, and defined, that they may be at all times asserted and defended: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That a committee of seven members be appointed by the Speaker to examine into the rights, powers, privileges, and duties of the House of Representatives on all questions and proceedings affecting or involving the territorial integrity of the United States and to report their conclusions as to the nature, extent, and character of such rights, powers, privileges, and duties, together with such recommendations for the assertion and defense of the same as to the committee may seem proper and expedient.

Mr. COCKRAN. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from New York desire?

Mr. COCKRAN. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee an Rules.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I desire not to lose the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman propose to investigate simply what took place and was completed nearly a year ago, and to refuse to investigate that which has taken place recently and is as yet undetermined, in relation to this same question?

Mr. COCKRAN. That is precisely what the gentleman proposes to do. I propose to test the constitutional powers of this House, which are not involved in any recent proceeding.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to that resolution, or a substitute for it.

[Confusion in the Hall].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask gentlemen to be in order.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution which I desire to offer as an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] submits the resolution which has just been read, and moves that it be referred to the Committee on Rules, and on that motion he demands the previous question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that, under the rule, that resolution goes to the Committee on Rules, and therefore that the motion of the gentleman from New York to refer it and the demand for the previous question are unnecessary.

Mr. COCKRAN. If the Speaker holds that, I am content.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It goes to the Committee on Rules as a matter of course, and, under the rules, it goes without debate.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is a resolution to raise a special committee, and the Chair is inclined to think that under the rules of the House, when the point is made against its consideration, even though it is privileged it must be referred to the Committee on Rules, because there is an express provision of the rules to that effect. The rules provide——

Mr. COCKRAN. If the Chair holds the point of order well taken I am content.

The SPEAKER. One moment——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, by Rule XI all proposed legislation touching the order of business goes to the Committee on Rules, and it has been held repeatedly that a resolution raising a committee goes to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Clause 51 of Rule XI provides that:

All proposed action touching the rules and joint rules and order of business shall be referred to the Committee on Rules.

This is a proposition to raise a special committee——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, if the demand for the previous question is voted down will not the resolution be open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds, under the point made by the gentleman from Kentucky, that this resolution must be referred without a motion; and it will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine states that he desires to offer a privileged resolution. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the executive communications just read to the House clearly disclose that the rights and dignity of the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of the Congress of the United States have been invaded by the executive department in furnishing secret instructions to a minister plenipotentiary of the United States to conspire with the representatives of a deposed and discredited monarchy for the subversion and overthrow of the established republican government to which he was accredited and to which his public instructions pledged the good faith and sympathy of the President, the Government, and the people of the United States: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that any intervention by the Executive of the United States, its civil or military representatives, without authority of Congress, in the internal affairs of a friendly, recognized government to disturb or overthrow it and to aid or abet the substitution or restoration of a monarchy therefor, is contrary to the policy and traditions of the Republic and the letter and spirit of the Constitution and can not be too promptly or emphatically reprobated.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I make the point of order that that is not a privileged resolution and should be referred to a committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I make the further point of order——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman——

Mr. DINGLEY. Is nothing privileged if offered on this side of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] makes the point of order that this resolution is not privileged. What is the point of the other gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE]?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The point of order I make is that this resolution must go under the rules to the Committee on Foreign Affairs without debate.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The question is first on the point of order raised by me that this is not a privileged resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Upon that point of order I desire to address the Chair. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance not only with the usage and the rules of the House of Representatives, but under the express provisions of the Constitution of the United States, this resolution involves a question of the very highest privilege that can be submitted to this House. It is not a question of personal privilege, as has been erroneously stated. It is a question of the privileges of the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of the Government of the United States.

The resolution sets forth the fact that the functions and privileges of this House have been invaded by the executive branch of this Government; and I hold, Mr. Speaker, that excepting alone a resolution of impeachment of the President of the United States, no question can come before this House of so high a privilege as a resolution of the character of that which I have presented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see how imminent the demand is for action upon the part of this House. It is a matter of public notoriety and the President at last has formally revealed the fact that the Hawaiian situation has become flagrant and liable at any moment to ripen into a condition which may involve this country in war with a friendly power. On the face of the documents read at this desk yesterday, without resorting to any implications or any strained construction—on the very face of those documents, embracing the statements made by the President of the United States and by his Secretary of State for him, there has been precipitated in a friendly country such a situation, under the Executive instructions now in possession of the minister of the United States, that if certain conditions of an unlawful negotiation shall be complied with at any time, or if they have been complied with during the period since we last had direct communication from that country, that minister may take or may already have taken such procedure as to constitute acts of war upon the established Government of Hawaii; and for all we know, under the instructions that have been read to this House, the armed forces of the United States may to-day have their bayonets at the throat of a friendly government, with which, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country overwhelmingly sympathize to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, Mr. Speaker, here was an American minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary, commissioned under the Constitution of the United States by the nomination of the President and the confirmation of the Senate, going to a friendly power, recognized by this Government, recognized by all the other great governments of the earth and having its accredited minister in full recognition at the capital of the United States, and yet while that American minister's public instructions were to present to the President of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands the assurances of the good will and sympathy of the President, the people, and the Government of the United States, we find that he had secret instructions to report first of all—to whom? To "the Queen!" From beginning to end in that executive communication the President of the United States——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Persists in recognizing that deposed and discredited functionary as "the Queen"——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will suspend.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And this minister was secretly instructed to report first to her and to assure her that the President of the United States intended to restore her——

The SPEAKER. The rules require that a gentleman called to order must suspend his remarks.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I suspend as the rule requires.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I made the point of order that the resolution of the gentleman from Maine was not a question of privilege; but the gentleman is now discussing the merits of the whole question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ought to be allowed to make my statement before the gentleman from Kentucky makes a counter-statement.

The SPEAKER. The point which the gentleman from Ken-

tucky makes is the question pending—whether the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine is privileged.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is exactly, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am arguing.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that the gentleman from Maine does not confine himself to the question of privilege presented.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have endeavored, Mr. Speaker, to confine myself strictly within the rule. It was necessary to cite certain facts in order to substantiate the question of privilege that I present. But I will endeavor to proceed under the admonition of the Chair, and try to confine myself absolutely and solely to the question.

I hold, sir, that the resolution presents a question of the highest privilege, because it is the imperative duty of the Congress of the United States, whose authority in such questions is paramount—whose paramount authority has been officially, but reluctantly, recognized by the Executive—I hold that it is our bounden duty at the earliest practicable moment to disavow and discredit and reprobate a public policy, unconstitutional in its inception, unpatriotic in its spirit, of gravest danger to the public interest, and calculated to bring the United States into discredit with the rest of the civilized world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I say that for the House of Representatives to fail to exercise its constitutional prerogatives in this regard, that for the House to fail to recognize this as a question of the highest privilege, involving a duty of prompt and decided action upon the part of the House, is to abdicate its constitutional functions and bring the legislative department of the Government not only under the disrespect of our own people, but into the contempt of civilized mankind. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ENLOE. I make the point of order——

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). I care not, sir, whence this invasion of the authority of the Congress emanates——

Mr. ENLOE. I have called the gentleman to order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I care not from what political party such Executive offense may come. I care not whether this shameful policy was originated by a renegade Republican or a Democratic usurper. It makes no difference to me.

Mr. ENLOE. The gentleman is certainly not discussing a question of privilege now.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I claim that the constitutional rights, the dignity, and the most sacred privileges of this House have been invaded, and that an exigency is presented in which, without prompt action on our part, we may be plunged into war with a foreign government, to avoid which——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has been called to order.

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). We should adopt the resolution declaring here the voice and sentiment of the American people which has been heard through all the land, from one end of it to the other, in condemnation of the conspiracy to overthrow a friendly Government and reëstablish a deposed and degraded monarchy.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ENLOE. What about the question of order?

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). I deny that the press of the country have "misrepresented" or "exaggerated" the sentiments of the American people on this subject, as charged by the President in his extraordinary message.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will desist. The gentleman from Tennessee renews the point of order that the gentleman does not confine himself to the question of privilege presented.

The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Maine to the fact that the simple question presented here is whether this resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That is the simple, naked question with which the House has to deal.

Of course it is difficult for the Chair to decide exactly when a gentleman is transgressing the rules in the discussion of such a question. That must be left largely to the good sense and the spirit of right and justice of the member himself. If members of the House do not themselves resolve to support and maintain the dignity of the House and observe its rules it is difficult for the Chair to do so.

The gentleman from Maine, the Chair thinks, should confine himself, in the discussion of this matter, strictly to the question that has been raised, that is to say, whether this resolution presents a question of privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Chair permit me to ask him this question: Whether it would be a question of privilege if, for instance, a member rose in his place and presented a resolution for the impeachment of the President?

The SPEAKER. It would be.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then will the Speaker kindly inform me wherein a resolution of impeachment can be a question of privilege, and this resolution, expressing the views of the House in regard to the invasion of its constitutional prerogatives by the Executive, can come under any other classification than that of a question of high privilege?

Mr. MOSES. What prerogative of the House has the Executive invaded?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have endeavored to state that I think——

Mr. MOSES. The gentleman has not stated it.

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). To the comprehension of almost all the intelligent members of the House. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order. The Chair is not entirely clear on the subject——

Mr. BOUTELLE. If the Chair will permit me one moment——

The SPEAKER (continuing). But the Chair will resolve the doubt in favor of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], and will hold that this is a question of privilege, and refer it, under the point made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY], to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker—— [Cries of "Regular order!" on the Democratic side.] I desire to ask a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to ask the Chair if a resolution involving a question of high privilege must be sent to a committee? I call it up for present consideration, as a question of high privilege, for the immediate consideration of the House. And before the Chair rules I desire to call his attention to the fact that in the history of this House there are repeated instances where resolutions of this character have been presented and have been immediately acted upon by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state——

Mr. BOUTELLE. It will manifestly defeat the whole object of the resolution if it is referred and smothered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman from Maine——

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. It will not be smothered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee will report very soon; but there will not be that haste which was used last January in relation to annexation proceedings connected with Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] of course will understand that business must be transacted in the House in accordance with the rules adopted for its transaction. A question may be privileged, and yet, if there is an express rule of the House which provides that it must be referred to one of the committees of the House, the present occupant of the chair is of the opinion that where the point is made it must go to the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. But, Mr. Speaker, is that the case when it is determined to be a question of privilege?

The SPEAKER. This is a resolution concerning——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, bear with me one moment——

The SPEAKER (continuing). Concerning the relations of this Government with foreign governments.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Speaker bear with me for one moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would prefer to complete his statement.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to present——

The SPEAKER. This is not an open question. The Chair will cite a former decision, if the gentleman will give him an opportunity.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I make the point that the question has been decided.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The very essence of these resolutions is to call for immediate action, based upon a plain and universally recognized public exigency. It seems to me that reference to a committee will defeat the primary object of the resolutions themselves.

The SPEAKER. Oh, no. Why, this is not a new resolution. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] has pending a similar resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs several days ago.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That resolution, which disappeared into the Committee on Foreign Affairs some two weeks ago, is not the same resolution which I have presented. [Cries of "Regular order!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. If the House will permit the Chair to discharge the duties which the rules impose upon him he will do so. The Chair declines to hear any gentleman until he has discharged the duty that the rules impose upon him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will resume their seats—all gentlemen. Business can not be transacted except in an orderly way. The Chair will state again that, although a question may be privileged, yet if there is a provision of the rules requiring its reference to a committee, it must be so referred.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is there any rule requiring a privileged motion——

The SPEAKER. The Chair appeals to the gentleman to permit the decision to be made, and then any gentleman dissatisfied with it has his right of appeal to the House. Although the question is privileged, yet if the rules provide for its reference it must be referred. There is no question of higher privilege than the right of a member to his seat, yet the rules provide that all matters touching the right of a member to his seat shall be referred to the Committee on Elections.

Now, it has been held expressly that where a matter is called up in the House, not having been referred to the Committee on Elections, touching the right of a member to his seat, that when the point is made it must be referred to the Committee on Elections. The Chair is aware of one decision in conflict with this, but the Chair thinks that a moment's reflection will satisfy gentlemen that it is within the power of the House to make rules for its own government, to make rules for the transaction of business, to make the rules which will cover privileged questions as well as questions not privileged.

The House has determined by its rules that as to certain matters they shall be referred to certain committees. Now, if a privileged matter should arise in the House or be presented to the House and there was nothing in the rules providing for its reference to any committee, then the Chair is of the opinion it would be in order to consider it, or be in order to move to refer it to some committee, thereby giving the committee jurisdiction of the subject-matter. Such questions frequently arise where there is no express direction in the rules as to the reference of the matter to a specific committee. The resolution, however, of the gentleman from Maine relates to our foreign relations, and there is a distinct provision in the rules that all matters referring to our foreign relations shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and the gentleman from Kentucky made the point that this matter should be so referred.

Now, that the House may understand that this determination of the Chair is not governed by any political consideration, the Chair desires to call the attention of the House to a decision made by the present occupant of the chair during the extra session, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEADOCK] presented papers relating to the seat of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LINTON] and some gentleman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] perhaps, made the point that those papers must be referred to the Committee on Elections. The present occupant of the chair held that, although it was a question of the very highest privilege, and that the Constitution of the United States provided that this House must determine the right of a member to his seat, and that every member had a right to a speedy determination of his membership, that the rules provided that such matters should be referred; and the Chair directed that the matter be referred to the Committee on Elections. The Clerk will read the ruliug of the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Speaker kindly state for what reason he proposes to refer this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the decision.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under the rules of the House all memorials, petitions, and private bills may be introduced and referred to the various committees by handing them to the Clerk. If it be a public bill, it is introduced by handing it to the Speaker or to the Clerk at the Speaker's table. Any memorial or resolution relating to the right of a member to his seat is a privileged matter. Any matter that is privileged may be presented or called up when no matter of a higher privilege is before the House. For instance, a committee not authorized to report at any time can only report when the committees are called for reports. A committee authorized to report at any time need not necessarily report when the committees are called for reports, but it may make its report, as was done by the gentleman from Maine this morning, by presenting it at any time as a privileged matter.

Now, the Chair is of the opinion that any matter relating to the right of a member to his seat is privileged. It has always been so held. Therefore the Chair does not think it is necessary to present a memorial of that character through the Clerk. The question raised here, the one presented by the pending proposition, is whether it is in the power of the House, on objection being made, to proceed to consider the resolution, or whether, the point being made, the whole matter must be referred to the Committee on Elections under the rules.

The Chair believes, when a matter of this sort is presented and the point of order is made against it that it should be referred to the committee having jurisdiction of the matter under the rules of the House, it must be so referred. There is a decision made by the immediate predecessor of the present occupant of the chair which is in conflict with that opinion—the Arkansas case, in the Fifty-first Congress. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] presented a resolution relating to the investigation of the election in Arkansas, and called it up for consideration.

The present occupant of the chair objected, and made the point that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Elections, because, under the rules of the House (although the entire rules had not been adopted and there had been adopted a part of the rules relating to the committees and their jurisdiction) the question presented relating to the right of a member to his seat it must be referred to the Committee on Elections, which had jurisdiction of such questions. It was held by the then presiding officer—I have the decision before me—that as it related to the privileges of the House it need not be referred to the committee, and the House adopted the resolution.

The present occupant of the chair thinks that the provision of the rule is the wiser one, which requires that all matters relating to the right of a member to his seat should be referred to the Committee on Elections.

Any member has a right to present such a memorial as a privileged matter, but when the point is made it must be referred to the Committee on Elections.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Speaker be kind enough to allow me to call his attention to a precedent?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will be very glad to have it go in here. In 1862, during the war, at the time of the battle of Ball's Bluff, when great disaster overtook the Union army, a resolution of inquiry was adopted in the House and sent to the Secretary of War, asking for information as to the circumstances and the responsibility for that disaster. The answer of Secretary Cameron contained a statement that he had referred this matter to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Gen. Thomas, and that he had replied that a compliance with the resolution at that time would, in the opinion of the General-in-Chief, be injurious to the public service.

On the 6th of January, 1862, the Hon. Roscoe Conkling, of New York, rose in his place and stated that he proposed to present a question of privilege. He recited the circumstances in connection with the facts, and then went on to say and to argue at length, that the question was so important and so interwoven with the privileges of the House, the House and the Senate being called upon to vote men and money to carry on the war, that it was absolutely necessary for the House to have this information and other information of a cognate character to enable it to legislate intelligently. He therefore presented a resolution, which recited the inquiry of the House, the answer of the Secretary of War and the Adjutant-General, and declared—

That the said answer is not responsive nor satisfactory to the House, and the Secretary be directed to return further answer.

The matter was taken up immediately, was decided by a vote of the House to be a question of high privilege; it was discussed to the exclusion of all other business until it was adopted by the House on the same day.

The SPEAKER. Was the point made that the resolution must be referred?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not know whether that point was made or not. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But the Speaker is not acting upon a point of order; he states that he is acting under the rules; he states that he is referring it because the rules require him to do so. Now, I beg the Speaker's attention to this further consideration——

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not hear further argument. The gentleman stated that he had a precedent to submit. The Chair has decided the question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But I want to call attention to the principle that is involved in this precedent, which is that the matter brought up on that occasion did not pertain to any particular committee of the House, just as the matter brought up in this resolution does not pertain to any particular committee. The resolution of Mr. Conkling did not pertain to the Committee on Military Affairs; the question was one of the constitutional rights of the House of Representatives. So this question does not pertain to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; it is a question whether the Constitution of the United States has been violated and the privilege of the House invaded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided the question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not understand that the Chair has decided the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What was the decision? [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I understood the Chair to cause some precedents to be read, but what did he decide?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided that the recitals of this resolution constitute a question of privilege, and, the point being made that, as the resolution pertains to our foreign relations, it should be referred under the rules to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Chair holds that it must be so referred.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. DOCKERY, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, and Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky simultaneously moved to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine appeals from the decision of the Chair, and the gentleman from Kentucky moves to lay the appeal upon the table. The question is upon the latter motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have no desire to debate this matter, Mr. Speaker, but only to test the sense of the House on the question whether the Committee on Foreign Affairs has any jurisdiction over this resolution involving the privileges of the House, and whether such a question of high privilege must be referred to any committee without action by the House.

The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 155, noes 64.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HULL (pending the call of the roll). Mr. Speaker, I was not in when the resolution was presented, and I would like to have it read before voting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be again read.

Mr. HATCH and others objected.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 91, not voting 91; as follows:

YEAS—171.

Alderson,	Cooper, Fla.	Hooker, Miss.	Pearson,
Alexander,	Cooper, Ind.	Houk, Ohio	Pendleton, Tex.
Allen,	Cooper, Tex.	Hudson,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Arnold,	Cornish,	Hunter,	Pigott,
Bailey,	Cox,	Hutcheson,	Price,
Baldwin,	Crain,	Ikirt,	Rayner,
Bankhead,	Crawford,	Johnson, Ohio	Reilly,
Barnes,	Culberson,	Kilgore,	Richards, Ohio
Bartlett,	Cummings,	Kribbs,	Richardson, Tenn.
Barwig,	De Armond,	Kyle,	Ritchie,
Bell, Tex.	Denson,	Lane,	Robbins,
Beltzhoover,	Dinsmore,	Latimer,	Robertson, La.
Berry,	Dockery,	Layton,	Russell, Ga.
Black, Ga.	Donovan,	Lester,	Ryan,
Black, Ill.	Dunn,	Livingston,	Sayers,
Blanchard,	Dunphy,	Lynch,	Sibley,
Bland,	English,	Maddox,	Snodgrass,
Bower, N. C.	Enloe,	Magner,	Sperry,
Branch,	Epes,	Mallory,	Springer,
Brawley,	Erdman,	Marshall,	Stallings,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Everett,	Martin, Ind.	Stockdale,
Bretz,	Fellows,	McAleer,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Fielder,	McCreary, Ky.	Strait,
Brookshire,	Forman,	McCulloch,	Talbert, S. C.
Brown,	Fyan,	McDannold,	Talbott, Md.
Bryan,	Geary,	McDearmon,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Geissenhainer,	McEttrick,	Tate,
Bynum,	Goodnight,	McKaig,	Taylor, Ind
Cabaniss,	Gorman,	McLaurin,	Terry,
Cadmus,	Grady,	McMillin,	Tracey,
Campbell,	Grimn,	McNagny,	Turner,
Cannon, Cal.	Haines,	McRae,	Turpin,
Caruth,	Hall, Minn.	Money,	Warner,
Catchings,	Hall, Mo.	Montgomery,	Weadock,
Causey,	Hammond,	Morgan,	Wells,
Clancy,	Hare,	Moses,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clark, Mo.	Harris,	Mutchler,	Whiting,
Clarke, Ala.	Harter,	Oates,	Williams, Miss.
Cobb, Ala.	Hatch,	O'Neil,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cockran,	Hayes,	Outhwaite,	Wise,
Cockrell,	Heard,	Paschal,	Wolverton,
Coffeen,	Henderson, N. C.	Patterson,	Woodard.
Coombs,	Holman,	Paynter,	

NAYS—91.

Adams,	Dingley,	Linton,	Shaw,
Aitken,	Dolliver,	Loud,	Simpson,
Aldrich,	Doolittle,	Loudenslager,	Stephenson,
Avery,	Draper,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Babcock,	Ellis, Oregon	Mahon,	Stone, W. A.
Baker, N. H.	Fletcher,	Marsh,	Storer,
Bartholdt,	Funk,	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Bingham,	Gardner,	McCall,	Sweet,
Blair,	Gear,	McCleary, Minn.	Tawney,
Boen,	Harmer,	Meiklejohn,	Thomas,
Boutelle,	Hartman,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Bowers, Cal.	Heiner,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Brosius,	Henderson, Ill.	Northway,	Wadsworth,
Burrows,	Hermann,	Payne,	Walker,
Caldwell,	Hicks,	Pence,	Wanger,
Cannon, Ill.	Hilborn,	Phillips,	Waugh,
Childs,	Hopkins, Pa.	Pickler,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cogswell,	Hull,	Post,	Wilson, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.	Johnson, Ind.	Powers,	Wilson, Wash.
Cousins,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Randall,	Woomer,
Curtis, Kans.	Kiefer,	Reed,	Wright, Mass.
Curtis, N. Y.	Lacey,	Reyburn,	Wright, Pa.
Dalzell,	Lefever,	Robinson, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—91.

Abbott,	Burnes,	Davis,	Goldzier,
Apsley,	Caminetti,	De Forest,	Graham,
Baker, Kans.	Capehart,	Durborow,	Gresham,
Belden,	Chickering,	Edmunds,	Grosvenor,
Bell, Colo.	Cobb, Mo.	Ellis, Ky.	Grout,
Boatner,	Compton,	Fitch,	Hager,
Brattan,	Conn,	Fithian,	Hainer,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Covert,	Funston,	Haugen,
Broderick,	Daniels,	Gillet, N. Y.	Henderson, Iowa
Bundy,	Davey,	Gillett, Mass.	Hendrix,
Hepburn,	Lockwood,	Page,	Smith,
Hines,	Maguire,	Perkins,	Somers,
Hitt,	McDowell,	Ray,	Stevens,
Hooker, N. Y.	McGann,	Richardson, Mich.	Swanson,
Hopkins, Ill.	McKeighan,	Rusk,	Taylor, Tenn.
Houk, Tenn.	Meredith,	Russell, Conn.	Tucker,
Hulick,	Meyer,	Schermerhorn,	Tyler,
Jones,	Milliken,	Scranton,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Joy,	Morse,	Settle,	Washington,
Kem,	Murray,	Shell,	Wever,
Lapham,	Neill,	Sherman,	White,
Lawson,	Newlands,	Sickles,	Williams, Ill.
Lisle,	O'Ferrall,	Sipe,	

So the appeal from the decision of the Chair was laid on the table.

Before the result of the vote was announced,

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois said: I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. HITT] is absent on account of the serious illness of a member of his family.

Mr. MORSE. I think I was in the House; but I do not remember hearing my name called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House and did he fail to hear his name called?

Mr. MORSE. I can not so state positively; I think I was.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must determine the question for himself.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may record my vote. I think I was in the House.

The SPEAKER. The rule declares that the Chair shall not ask unanimous consent in a case of this kind. If the gentleman claims that he was in the Hall of the House and failed to hear his name, of course he has the right to vote.

Mr. MORSE. I can not positively make that statement.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. ANDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

For this day:

Mr. NEILL with Mr. HITT.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. CHICKERING.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. HOOKER of New York.

Mr. WASHINGTON with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. TYLER with Mr. HAGER.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. COBB of Missouri with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. CAPEHART with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, until the 9th of January, 1894.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

ANNEXATION OF HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. BLAIR. I desire unanimous consent to present a resolution, which I ask to have read for information; and then I wish to ask immediate action upon it by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That this House is in favor of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, and others, objected.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JOY, for the remainder of the day.

To Mr. SHELL, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate still further insists upon its amendment No. 6 to the bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, further disagreed to by the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 2668) authorizing the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General to approve postmasters' bonds.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 165) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Bridger abandoned military reservation in the State of Wyoming; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice to the House that just as soon as the pending deficiency bill has been disposed of, I will call up for consideration the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill, which has been pending between the two Houses since the adjournment of the extraordinary session of Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month; when the Speaker signed the same.

BUSINESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to-day to sit during the sessions of the House.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

FORTIFICATION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER proceeded to call the committees for reports.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 4858) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

INDEBTEDNESS OF SALT LAKE CITY.

Mr. GOODNIGHT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4449) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. WISE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 70) to appoint a joint committee to examine and report upon the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

CHATTANOOGA WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GEARY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (S. 339) to authorize the Chattanooga Western Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Chattanooga; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS FROM PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 338) for the relief of certain settlers within what was formerly the Fort Dodge military reservation, in Ford County, Kans., and to confirm entries of public lands erroneously allowed thereon;

A bill (H. R. 2364) to provide for the disposal of Fort Hartsuff, Fort Sheridan, and Fort McPherson military reservations, in the State of Nebraska, to actual settlers under the provisions of the homestead laws;

A bill (H. R. 4341) to provide for the disposal of Fort Hartsuff, Fort Sheridan, and Fort McPherson military reservations, in the State of Nebraska, to actual settlers under the provisions of the homestead laws;

A bill (H. R. 3375) to open certain parts of the Fort Jupiter military reservation, in the State of Florida, to entry under the homestead laws: and

A bill (H. R. 2684) to restore the lands embraced in the Fort Lewis military reservation, in the State of Colorado, to the public domain.

ABANDONED MILITARY RESERVATIONS.

Mr. McRAE, also from the Committee on Public Lands, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 4667) to provide for the opening of certain abandoned military reservations, and for other purposes; which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to be printed and recommitted.

LAND ENTRIES, OKLAHOMA.

Mr. LATIMER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported as a substitute for House bill 284 a bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HATCH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills. The committee resumes consideration of the urgency deficiency bill.

When the committee rose on yesterday the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to offer an amendment to the pending bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] indicated his purpose of offering an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I will withhold the amendment for the present, Mr. Chairman, and ask to introduce it as an amendment to the bill after this matter has been acted upon.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Let the pending section of the bill and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pension Office: For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, $200,000.

Mr. HOLMAN'S amendment was read, as follows:

On page 4, after the word "dollars," in line 23, insert the following:

"*Provided, however*, That the clerks and other persons who shall be paid per diem and expenses under this appropriation shall be employed exclusively in the investigation of original pension claims and claims for increase of pension."

Mr. WAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all that part of the bill appropriating $200,000 for per diem and traveling expenses of special examiners and other persons, being all that part of the bill from line 15 down to and including line 23 on page 4, and insert:

"That in all cases where written charges or information have been, or may hereafter be, made by letter or otherwise tending to defeat the granting of a pension, or to the continuation of a pension already granted upon any grounds whatever which are deemed sufficient by the Pension Bureau to warrant an investigation, the Commissioner of Pensions shall in all such cases before the investigation is made of such charges or information furnish to the applicant or pensioner, as the case may be, a copy of such charges or information, together with the names of the person or persons making the same; and such applicant or pensioner shall be given an opportunity to be heard respecting such charges or information, and that no charges or information tending to defeat the granting of or the continuation of a pension already granted, whether made by an officer or employé of Government or private citizen, shall be considered, unless in writing and signed by the person or persons making the same."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I make the point of order that this is new legislation and not germane to the pending proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana to the fact that this is a motion to strike out and insert, and can not be considered as an amendment until the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana has been disposed of.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I make the point of order that it is not germane at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will reserve the decision on that point until the amendment can be offered in the proper time.

Mr. WAUGH. Then I will move to amend the pending amendments by striking out the words "and other persons."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I make the same point against that amendment. It is not germane. It is not an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana, the Chair thinks, is clearly in order. The amendment is simply to strike out in line 18 the words "or other persons."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But the question before the House is the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, which is to strike out that paragraph of the bill and insert something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offered this as an amendment to the amendment, and the Chair thinks it is in order.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the committee will indulge me a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has just been read to the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by inserting the words "special examiners," instead of persons. I find I have not used the exact language of the text. I suppose I have the right to make the modification.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right, and the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be read by the Clerk as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after the word "dollars," in line 23, insert:
"*Provided, however*, That the special examiners and other persons who shall be paid per diem and expenses, under this appropriation shall be employed exclusively in the investigation of original pension claims and claims for increase of pension."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAUGH] moves to strike out from this amendment the words "and other persons."

Mr. WAUGH. And on that, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I think this House does not understand the purpose and object of this legislation. The bill itself—with the report of the Commissioner of Pensions and the exhibit of the law clerk of that department which accompanies his report, and which he approves—informs us of the real object of this legislation. We are told in this discussion that the object of this measure is to assist the special examiners' department of the Bureau in aiding pensioners to discover evidence for the establishment of their claims. I desire to call attention to the language of the bill itself and the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, as a verification of the truth of the assertions that I am making:

For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners—

and other persons.

We have been told that this entire appropriation applies to the special examiners. But the bill says, for special examiners and

"or other persons" employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau.

Now what does the Commissioner of Pensions tell us in his annual report to the Secretary of the Interior? He tells us—

It would be well to have a force of secret agents selected from among the special examiners or—

"Elsewhere." This bill provides that special examiners "or other persons" may be detailed. Who compose the detail? Special examiners? No, sir; special examiners and "other persons."

The Commissioner further says in his report:

It would be well to select from among the special examiners and elsewhere persons whose duties it would be to investigate all pension cases involving crimes and offenses against the United States. These men should receive as liberal compensation as the secret agents of other departments, and the aid of Congress should be invoked for that purpose. When persons are steadily employed in a certain kind of work greater skill is developed. The creation of this force would be of great benefit to the Pension Office.

Mr. Chairman, the whole object and purpose of this legislation is patent—and I am surprised that any Republican can support it—is to pay the spies, the secret agents to be put upon the track of the old soldier, to shadow him in his outgoing and his incoming; and in case he should eat a hearty meal or draw a full breath, he does it under the penalty of suspension of his pension. Why, I was pleased the other day when the evidence of this House was taken on the proposition or assertion by the Executive that thousands of communities all over this country have their well-known pension frauds.

Why, sir, Mr. Chairman, when the 356 members of this House were put upon the stand, and the question was put to them by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] as to the truth of that proposition, we every one of us sat as dumb as a sheep before her shearers, and opened not our mouths, excepting the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]; and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the squad of soldiers that would be left after the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] had gone through and separated all those that he considered to be frauds. There would not be a corporal's guard left, and they, under the estimation of the gentleman, would be under suspicion. I protest, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of every soldier in Indiana against this legislation as an outrage against common fairness and decency.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAUGH] has misapprehended the effect of his motion. If I understand him correctly—in the confusion it is almost impossible to hear what my friend has said—if I understand him correctly, he proposes to strike out the words "or other persons" as contained in the amendment. I wish my friend to state whether that is correct or not.

Mr. WAUGH. My amendment is to strike out the words "or other persons."

Mr. HOLMAN. From the amendment?

Mr. WAUGH. No; from the original bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. From the original text. Oh, well, I see the case is somewhat different from what I thought. Of course it is clear that if those words "or other persons," are retained in the original text, they should be retained also in the proposed amendment. But my friend misapprehends this matter entirely.

Under existing law, 400 persons may be employed by the Commissioner of Pensions in the field, 150 special examiners, and details of clerks to the number of 250, making altogether 400; that is my recollection; so that my friend's amendment would leave out 250 persons who could receive this per diem and expenses in the field for the purposes of which he complains. My amendment confines the expenditure of this $200,000 to the investigation of original pension claims and claims for increase of pensions, instead of a general overhauling of the pension roll.

Mr. WAUGH. If my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] will permit me, I will say that the object of the motion is to prevent the detailing of other persons. I understand the words "other persons" to mean detectives and spies.

Mr. HOLMAN. "Other persons," as used in the text of the bill, means clerks in the Pension Bureau who, under the law, may be detailed by the Pension Office to operate in the field.

Mr. WAUGH. Special examiners and "other persons."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If the gentleman will look at the text of the bill, it says:

For special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions.

Mr. HOLMAN. My friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is using my time. My friend, Mr. WAUGH, does not understand, I presume, that these words "other persons" refer to persons who may be detailed under existing law from the Pension Office; and he certainly wants the same restrictions imposed upon them as are imposed upon special examiners, does he not?

Mr. WAUGH. I do not understand.

Mr. HOLMAN. You understand of course that under my amendment all the persons who are to be paid a per diem and expenses out of the $200,000 shall be employed only in the examination of pension claims now pending and claims for increase. You understand that?

Mr. WAUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is right. It is "the other persons," the clerks who may be detailed from the Pension Office, as well as the special examiners, to whom my amendment applies. I wish all persons paid out of this $200,000 to be employed in the investigation of original pension claims or claims for increase, and not in a general raid on the pension roll.

Mr. WAUGH. I take it that this legislation is in keeping with the recommendation of the Pension Office, and the recommendation of the Pension Office is to have a lot of detectives.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman entirely misapprehends the effect of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted on this amendment, and the Chair can not recognize any other gentleman.

Mr. PICKLER. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to recognize any gentleman unless he wants to speak to this amendment or to offer a substantial amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. I offer an amendment. I move to strike out the last word.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana on the right is a good one. I believe that this money ought to be expended only by officers of the Government—special examiners. And I desire for a moment to call the attention of the House, as it appears to my mind, to the insincerity of the men who are the enemies of pensions upon this floor, and who have made arguments in this debate. It is the province of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], and I have not a word of criticism if they desire to take that position. If it is their desire to antagonize the pensions of this country, it is their privilege, it is their right. But what I am opposed to is this: that under the guise and pretense of being in favor of pensions, of purging the pension roll of fraudulent pensions, they are seeking, and that is the very object, to bring the whole pension roll into disrepute. It is the whole roll that the gentleman from Georgia is seeking to attack.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia in the last Congress led

that forlorn hope from the Committee on Appropriations in the five or six iniquitous amendments against the old soldiers that were offered to that bill; and he was so ignominiously defeated even by his own side, that he went back South singing dolefully "I am going back to Dixie." So he comes up again, and is persistent in the matter of again opposing pensions. The gentleman says himself in the Congressional Directory, and that is evidence that it must be true, because he says it, he "has been prominent in all political struggles in his State for many years." [Laughter.] You must accept that, because the gentleman himself says so. I invite him to add another sentence to his biography, and say "That he is also prominent in opposition to pensions for Union soldiers."

It is, however, evident that the gentleman was not half so vigorous, courageous, and energetic after the Yankee soldiers in 1861 to 1865 as he is now, otherwise he would have been a brigadier-general of the Confederacy in less than six months; but I find that for four years he was a private in the Confederate army. [Laughter.] I say if he had been half as vigorous, half as courageous and energetic after live Yankees in 1861 to 1865 he would have been a brigadier-general in less than six months. [Laughter.]

I want to say, further, to the gentleman, that neither epithets, braggadocio, words that are improper to be used on this floor, nor bullying, or anything in that line, will, in my opinion, deter the members upon this side of the House from standing by the Union soldier and by his just claims, and while I say that, I want to render praise to a good many gentlemen on that side of the House who are the true friends of the soldier. But the gentleman from Georgia is the enemy of the soldier and the soldier's pension; and not only of the dishonest, but he is the enemy of the whole roll of pensioners.

I understand there will be offered an amendment to this proposition to prevent pensions from being suspended without notice to the soldier. I heartily favor this proposition. I introduced in the extra session of this Congress a bill to that effect, the first bill, I believe, introduced to this effect in this House. There are a great many worthy pensioners whose claims have been suspended of late, and many without notice. I believe every soldier should be heard before his pension is suspended.

I send to the Clerk's desk, Mr. Speaker, a letter of an old soldier whose claim was lately suspended without notice, and as the writer of the letter supposed, the Pension Bureau made the order of suspension on the recommendation and representations of the local examiner; and there is no doubt in this and similar cases if the soldier had first had a hearing his pension would not have been suspended. The letter is as follows:

FAULKTON, S. DAK., *November 15, 1893.*

We arrived here this a. m. with Aaron Flyte, Company G, Sixty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. His pension certificate is No. 184167, and suspended July 12, 1893. On July 12, and now, was and is utterly helpless. Not able to dress himself for two years. Could not be moved in wagon of any sort. Carried him to train on a stretcher, and from train before examining board in this place. He can neither sit nor stand. Affidavits of leading Democrats and citizens were sent to Washington for appointment of special examiner to go to Gettysburg to examine him, as it was and is unsafe to move him, but still order was peremptory that he must go to Faulkton. Hence our post detailed four ex-soldiers to bring him here and take him back. Some in Gettysburg think suspension the result of spite work of one of our doctors, because Flyte employed another physician. Can you find out whether this is true?

S. M. HOWARD.

Hon. J. A. PICKLER, *M. C.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. The Republican party made its reputation by hoisting the flag, and not by hauling it down and we stand there yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not recognize gentlemen out of order.

Mr. PICKLER. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. ENLOE. I renew it.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason I desire to say anything at the present time is to call attention to the character of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana as amended by his colleague [Mr. WAUGH]. This appropriation is for the purpose of supplying special examiners to perform the usual duties that have been heretofore performed by special examiners of the Pension Office. It does not propose to change the law in any particular, and it is a remarkable spectacle to see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], who enjoys the soubriquet of the "watch-dog of the Treasury," offer an amendment on the floor of this House which proposes to prevent that force from investigating the frauds that are being perpetrated on the public Treasury.

It seems strange, too, Mr. Chairman, that another gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAUGH] should say that the Government shall not have the power to send out its agents to investigate frauds on the Government, even when information is furnished to the Commissioner that fraud is being perpetrated. I have seen demagogy rise to great heights in this House, but I have never seen it rise so high as it has risen in this debate, when gentlemen here, under the pretense of patriotism and love for the soldier, get up and defend fraud, and say that the Government shall not have agents to investigate charges of fraud.

Mr. WAUGH. The gentleman on the other side denies squarely that there is such fraud. He believes that there is only asserted fraud.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There was a conviction for perjury in the Federal court in my district about three weeks ago.

Mr. WAUGH. There was one Benedict Arnold.

Mr. ENLOE. The gentleman does not know anything of what he is talking if he asserts that there is no fraud, or else he does not care what he asserts; because the records of the courts of this country show that there have been 137 arrests, 241 indictments, and 105 convictions for pension frauds since this Administration came into power. It is the business of the Pension Bureau to bring these matters to the attention of the courts, and that is one of the functions of a special examiner or an officer detailed from the Bureau for such work. Mr. Chairman, I say that it ill becomes any man representing any constituency, I do not care where he resides or what kind of a constituency he represents, to rise on this floor and say that the Government shall be disarmed and shall not be authorized or enabled to investigate and prosecute notorious frauds.

Mr. PICKLER. So say we all.

Mr. ENLOE. Why do you fight it then?

Mr. PICKLER. We do not fight it.

Mr. ENLOE. That is exactly what you are doing. You are doing everything in your power to prevent the Government from exposing these fraudulent pensioners, who are no better than thieves; for I say that a man who gets upon the pension roll by perjury is no better than a thief.

Mr. PICKLER. We all say that.

Mr. ENLOE. Then why do you defend those men?

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, you are attacking a man of straw. Nobody is defending fraud.

Mr. ENLOE. I refer to your own language. You advocate this amendment, which provides that these examiners shall not do anything but work upon original claims, and that means that a special examiner shall not investigate a case of fraud even in the neighborhood where he is working, though it may be brought to his attention. You also advocate the proposition that the other agents of the Bureau shall not have that power. What does that mean? It simply means that you are not willing to let this Government have the power to investigate these frauds.

I am just now in receipt of a telegram from the Commissioner of Pensions stating that the Federal grand jury at Dubuque, Iowa, has just returned thirty-one indictments against Van Leuven, a pension attorney, for pension frauds, and thirteen against Dr. Kessel and some others, which makes the total number of indictments to-day 241 since this Administration came into power. The adoption of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana would absolutely destroy the power of the Bureau to hunt down and punish those who are defrauding the Government in pension cases.

Several MEMBERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, there has been only one speech made on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ENLOE. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I renew it.

Mr. Chairman, I am in nowise advised as to the actual necessity for the appropriation as provided in the bill, and I think I can safely say that the tendency of the general discussion was not such as to throw any great light upon it, but that it was conducted rather from a political standpoint. The whole history of pension legislation and discussion in this country ever since the civil war has been in the same line, and no subject of legislation has ever been so much in the rut of political prostitution as this one, and no subject should in fact be as far removed from it. No party should be permitted to take money out of the public Treasury, and in the name of pensions and professed love for the soldier trade it for votes.

Now, all men agree, so far as the mere statement of principle goes, that fair, liberal pensions should be given to the soldiers of the country for actual injuries and complaints incident to actual service in the Army and Navy, and that all frauds upon the pension roll should be exposed and eliminated; but still our friends upon the other side as a whole, and a part upon this side, as a matter of fact and in the face of these protestations seek to make political capital out of any efforts in the direction of purifying the rolls and oppose any means proposed in this direction.

This leads me to the point I desire to make, and this is that we ought to have by law a complete, uniform, and just pension system, so guarded as to give full and ample pensions to deserving soldiers and sailors, and to give the fullest protection against fraud, so hedged about that no party can have even the temptation to make political capital out of it; and this can only be accomplished, in my judgment, by a constitutional provision. In the Fifty-second Congress I introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment to this end, and reintroduced it in this Congress, House Resolution No. 17, and which is as follows:

No pension, nor any pay or emolument that does not cease with actual service, shall hereafter be granted, allowed, or paid to or on account of any soldier or sailor, except under the provisions of law existing at time of enlistment, nor unless claimed within two years from time right to the same accrues under the law.

The suggestions contained in this proposition are at most only tentative, but to my mind cover the troubles that have been met in making a fair, just, and liberal pension system. If we had now such a system, under the law we would be relieved at least from such acrimonious discussion and disgraceful vituperation as we have witnessed upon this discussion.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto be ended in fifteen minutes. We have already discussed this section two days.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I will not object to the request of the gentleman if I can have an opportunity to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto shall be limited to fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

Several members objected.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that that be done. The committee has the power, under the new rules, to limit the debate.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, if that motion is confined to amendments now pending there will be no objection to it.

A MEMBER. That is all that it covers.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It applies to all amendments that may be offered to this section, and I desire to offer one.

Mr. HICKS. So do I.

Mr. HUDSON. I want to offer an amendment. I have no objection to the limitation of the debate, if I can offer my amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Gentlemen should bear in mind that the House desires to adjourn for the holiday recess on Thursday or Friday next, and in the meantime this bill ought to be passed and sent to the Senate. This is the third day we have discussed this question, and I think I have shown a disposition to be extremely liberal as to debate.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I shall occupy only a few moments with my amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments be closed in ten minutes.

Several MEMBERS. That is all right.

Mr. HUDSON. I will make no objection, provided I can be allowed afterwards to submit my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to gentlemen that there will be no limit to the offering of amendments. The committee can limit debate, but it can not limit the right to offer amendments.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE (to Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky). Make it five minutes instead of ten.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr WAUGH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The amendment to the amendment was read, as follows:

In line 2 of the amendment strike out the words "and claims for increase of pension."

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. WAUGH to the amendment of Mr. HOLMAN, it was rejected, there being—ayes 49, noes 68.

Mr. WAUGH. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I presume that in Committee of the Whole we are not entitled to the yeas and nays.

The CHAIRMAN. The yeas and nays can not be called in the Committee of the Whole. The question is now on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], which will be again read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, further, That the special examiners and other persons who shall be paid a per diem and expenses under this appropriation shall be employed exclusively in the investigation of original claims and claims for increase of pension.

The question being put,

The CHAIRMAN. The noes seem to have it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for a division.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 60, noes 75.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon this question the ayes are 60, the noes 75. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE was recognized.

Mr. HOLMAN. No quorum has voted; and I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is too late. The Chair had announced the result and had recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

Mr. HOLMAN. I misunderstood the announcement of the Chair. I was on my feet to call for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the statement of the gentleman his point of "no quorum" will be entertained.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 78, noes 86.

Mr. HOLMAN. To avoid consumption of time, I simply give notice that I will not insist now on a quorum, but at the proper time I will move to recommit this bill for the purpose of making this amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Of course the gentleman will have the right to do that.

Mr. HOLMAN. I simply give this notice so that there may be a full expression of the sentiment of the House on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 78, the noes 86. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 23, on page 4, insert the following:
"*Provided*, That no pension shall be suspended or stopped except after full hearing, of which the pensioner shall have previous reasonable notice, with opportunity to submit testimony in support of his or her pension and in reply to that affecting his or her right to receive a pension."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I raise a point of order on this amendment. It is not germane to this section of the bill; and it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] on his point of order, if he desires to submit any argument or precedent in support of it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I submit the point to the Chair without discussion. I presume the Chair appreciates the purport of the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that gentlemen on the other side of the House can hardly afford to vote down this amendment. In the first place it is fair and right. If there is any one thing about which complaint has been made throughout the country it is that the soldiers who have been drawing pensions have not had an opportunity to be heard in these investigations.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. With pleasure.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Suppose such a case as that which I put yesterday to the gentleman from South Dakota. Or suppose that within a week or so before the time for the quarterly payment of pensions it is discovered that a man who has been drawing pension on the ground of ninety days' service has, in fact, served only thirty days; or suppose that he has been placed on the roll by forgery or by perjury, as in the case of the Virginia frauds or the New Mexico frauds. Does the gentleman believe that in such a case the quarterly pension ought to be paid to the pensioner and then an examination be had; or does he believe that the best way to do is simply to suspend payment and give the pensioner a chance to be heard. That is the whole contention between the gentleman and myself.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I undertake to say that after a pension has once been adjudicated it is a vested right——

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. And no government, no officer of the government has any more right to strike that pension down without a full hearing of the case and an opportunity on the part of the pensioner to be heard in his own behalf than it would have to open a judgment without notice to the party concerned. These cases having been adjudicated by lawful authority are in the nature of judgments; they are vested rights on the part of the pensioners. If any case has been wrongfully adjudicated let it be regularly reopened, and after due hearing let the

pension be stopped; but for God's sake give the soldier an opportunity to have his day in court—to be heard in his own defense.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Undoubtedly; but what is his "day in court?"

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Notice of the complaint or allegation, and knowledge of the testimony supposed to affect his rights.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. And an opportunity to answer it if he can.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Undoubtedly; we agree on that. Now, the only point, and I submit it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as a lawyer and a man of candor, is, pending that, a day of payment comes, and the Government has discovered that the individual has either by fraud or perjury obtained his standing on the roll and has given him notice of that fact——

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. On *ex parte* testimony.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky (continuing). And the case has not yet been adjudicated. Now should the payment about to become due be made to the man under such circumstances, or should it be withheld until this question has been determined? That is the whole of it and I submit it to the gentleman for his consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Now, the gentleman from Kentucky says the Government "has discovered." How can it be fairly said to have discovered a fraud until it hears the pensioner and what he has to say in his defense? It may be that there is no foundation for the allegation.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. And on the other hand it may be a matter of record of the highest kind.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Oh, but that is not a judicial discovery. It is not a discovery in the legal sense until the pensioner has been heard in response to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if I can be recognized I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania my time. But before that, in response to his question, I put the case to him that I suggested on yesterday, or the two cases in the remarks I had the honor to submit to the committee, where the records of the Department in one case showed that the pensioner had been dishonorably discharged, and in the other case that the pensioner had not served for thirty years. These are sample cases. Do I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to mean that he thinks the payment of the pension ought to be made to these soldiers pending an investigation? That is the sample case that I commend to the gentleman's consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. In the first place there are not, and can hardly be, any such sample cases as that.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. There they are. The gentleman can examine them himself.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Unless, I was going on to say, they are exceedingly limited in number. There must be, in the nature of things, very few such cases. And then it will be still a question of construction. But even as you put it, it would be a question whether the soldier has not certain rights which have been conferred upon him by the granting of his pension.

Now, we are to presume that the Commissioner of Pensions and the officials who examined the case and granted the pension had authority to do it on competent testimony. We are to presume that that testimony was examined and the question adjudicated upon the testimony. We are not to presume that this is a fraud, without a hearing. Why not let this class of cases take the same course with all others? If a judgment has been rendered, I do not care if it had been an interlocutory judgment, no court would open it up until the defendant had had his day in court.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The ordinary practice where I reside is that the court will grant an interlocutory or temporary injunction to prevent the collection of the execution until the plaintiff can come in. The way you begin is to stop payment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That, of course, is in questions of great or unprecedented emergency. But there is no such tendency here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no one thing that will put this pension question at rest so much as the adoption of this provision. You must give the soldiers an opportunity to be heard in defense of their pensions before being suspended. And perhaps if there had not been so many suspended cases the community would not be in the condition we find it that all over the country an impression has gone up that this Administration is disposed to strike pensions down, regardless of the rights of the soldier and without giving him an opportunity to be heard. I want to correct that impression and you want to correct it.

Let the soldier be in the same category as any other man who prosecutes successfully a claim against the Government. Treat his case as an adjudicated question, and allow his claim to be recognized as valid until there shall be evidence forthcoming to the contrary. Let him have an opportunity to be heard before the case is suspended. Certainly you can afford to do that much for the soldier. All these cases suspended summarily have been practically reinstated. It only turns on a handful of cases. You can afford to at least put this in your bill, and when it is done you have taken a step to restore confidence in the Administration further than any other you can possibly take in this regard, and I appeal to you therefore to let this come in and be a part of the bill.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I endeavored to obtain some time in which to engage in the general discussion of this bill, and especially that part of it now being considered; but owing to the limited time allowed for general debate, I was unable to do so, and therefore embrace this opportunity, under the five-minute rule to say a few words in regard to the suspension of pensions and the proposition to make this appropriation, hoping to be able later in the session to obtain time to express more fully my views on this subject.

I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that I intend to vote for the appropriation, believing as I do that it is in the interest of the speedy adjustment of the 18,000 claims of old soldiers now pending under the old law; but, sir, I do not want that vote to be construed into an indorsement of the indiscriminate suspension of pensions indulged in by the Pension Bureau. That action is not now, never was, and never will be approved by me, by the people whom I have the honor to represent, or by the people of my State. The election in Ohio in November last demonstrated fully that the people of that State do not approve of that action.

And let me say to gentlemen on this floor that the action of the Pension Bureau in the matter of the suspension of the pensions of Union soldiers had more to do with giving to Governor McKinley his majority of 80,000 than anything else and all else combined; and, Mr. Chairman, without any intention or desire to reflect upon anyone, I want to say that no party need hope to reduce that majority in Ohio by unjustly interfering with that sacred roll containing the names of the men and those dependent upon them whose blood cemented the union of these States. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That no pension allowed shall be revoked or suspended, excepting those obtained by fraud or perjury.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HUDSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided always, That before any of the aforesaid $200,000 shall be drawn upon by the Bureau of Pensions all pensions heretofore suspended on the charge of fraud in procuring said pensions without due notice and a full and fair hearing shall be restored to the pension rolls and paid to the pensioners until after due notice and a full and fair hearing and determination such pensions are found to be fraudulent; and

Provided further, That in all cases where fraud is charged against pensioners in the procuring of pensions such pensioner shall be furnished a copy of all such charges by the Pension Bureau, including the names of the parties making such charges, and shall be furnished a copy of all evidence in support of such charges free of cost to such pensioner.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HICKS] who offered the amendment to the amendment. He is first entitled to the floor. The substitute of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HUDSON] can not be presented to the House until after the amendment to the amendment is voted upon.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to place myself upon record against this part of the bill now pending, unless the amendment of my friend and colleague [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] prevails. The amendment, with the addition suggested by myself, is eminently fair, and will place beyond question the right of the soldier to enjoy his pension unless it is stopped in a legal and proper way.

The time was, Mr. Chairman, when the men who enjoyed the honor of being examiners of the Pension Department assisted these old veterans and their widows and orphans in preparing and presenting their claims to this Government, but I take it, from the methods that have prevailed under the present Administration, that instead of their being special examiners for the Pension Department, that is a misnomer, and they should be called special detectives; for instead of carrying out the wishes of the people of this great Government, to help these old men and their widows and orphans, these special examiners are spies upon their track, and instead of maintaining the pension roll as

one of honor these examiners, so called, are attempting to make it one of dishonor, and are endeavoring to create the impression that the entire pension list is honeycombed with fraud.

Where is the evidence of fraud and the foundation for this hue and cry raised against the veterans of the country by the Pension Department and the enemies of the men who wore the blue? With this great army of detectives in the field, with the enemies of the veteran in command of the situation, with the public mind prepared by unfriendly newspapers and poisoned against the honest pensioners of the country, the Secretary of the Interior directed to be taken from the files of the Department of Pensions by one stroke of his pen several thousand adjudicated and legally granted pensions, and sent to as many homes in this country the fact that the Government that had promised to protect and defend the old soldier in his declining years, instead of being his friend as heretofore, was now his enemy; and in addition to the personal knowledge of this fact being brought home to the pensioner and his family of the suspicion and unfriendliness of his Government, he was further humiliated by being held up before his community and neighbors as a man who had committed a fraud upon his country and had been receiving a pension to which he was not entitled, thus securing for the man who had heretofore been looked upon in his neighborhood as a patriot and lover of his country, a character for fraud, and as one who obtained from the Government he had helped to save and upbuild unjust and dishonest money.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that out of the many thousand men thus branded and held up to the public as dishonest men over three-fourths of them have already been reinstated, thus proving that even the unfriendly Department was mistaken in their charge of wholesale fraud against the men who wore the blue. Even the President himself, who has never been accused of an overflowing love for the Union veteran, joins in this unjust hue and cry, and in his annual message to this body he uses this unjustifiable language:

"The discovery having been made that many names had been put upon the pension roll by means of wholesale and gigantic frauds, the Commissioner suspended payment upon a number of pensions which seemed to be fraudulent."

Why, Mr. Chairman, did they seem fraudulent? Where are the facts authorizing the President to make this sweeping statement? Where is the evidence on which the President based his communication to Congress and the country? He owes it, sir, to this House, to the country, and above all does he owe it to the gallant men who stood between this country and its everlasting destruction in the days of its greatest trial, the evidence on which this wholesale charge of fraud is based. In this same message, Mr. Chairman, I read this language:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds.

Where is the evidence of these thousands of neighborhoods that have their fraudulent pensioners and of these appalling conspiracies? Why has not the Commissioner or the learned and distinguished Secretary of the Interior given this House and the country the facts that permit the President of this great country to utter in his annual message the language above quoted that is read by all the English-speaking world and is quoted to the great discredit of my gallant comrades of the Army? On the part of these gallant veterans, both dead and living, I deny these statements and demand the proof of these unjust charges, and until the proof is furnished I appeal to the loyalty and fairness of the good people of this land to suspend judgment on these gallant men whom the President so severely condemns. Until the proof is adduced and furnished, thank God it is the unwritten law of this country, that every man is innocent until he is proven guilty, and this unwritten law has its place in the hearts of the great American people, and notwithstanding the charges made by the President against these old veterans of the war, the people have responded in answer to that charge the verdict of not guilty.

I was very much interested in the defense made upon the floor of this House yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN] of the present Commissioner of Pensions. The record of Judge Lochren as a soldier can not be assailed, but his record as the Commissioner of Pensions is one that does him great injury, and one that reflects very seriously upon his gallant bearing during the days when this country had to struggle for its existence. I regret, sir, that circumstances are such that Judge Lochren has to be apologized for upon the floor of this House, and that his action should need such an apology. I rejoice in the fact that up to this time there has never before been a Commissioner of Pensions whose actions needed apology upon the floor of this House.

Mr. HAYES. How about Raum?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They had to investigate him.

Mr. HICKS. Yes; and that committee failed to besmirch him. He stands preëminent as a man who was fair and just in his treatment of Union soldiers, and in his treatment of their claims. We had no right to expect that Secretary Smith would do differently than he has done, but we had a right to expect that Judge Lochren, one with whom we had touched elbows, would at least grant to the old soldier the right to a hearing before he would undertake to cut off from him the small pittance allowed to him by the Government which he helped to save.

The amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], and further amended by myself, will place the pensions of these gallant men beyond the reach of an unfriendly hand, or at least will place them in such a position that their pensions can not be stopped until they have the right that is granted to every other citizen of the Republic—to have a hearing before a sentence of condemnation is passed upon them.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe the time will soon come again, in the history of this country, when the friend and not the enemy of the Union veteran will occupy the high places within the gift of this great and generous people, and if this measure passes, as reported in the bill under consideration, without amendment, it is adding additional humiliation to the men who wore the blue, and unless so amended I shall feel constrained to vote against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish, for the information of gentlemen, to have read at the Clerk's desk Order No. 240, which is now enforced in the Pension Office, from which it will appear that no pensioner is being suspended without notice.

Mr. HICKS. Not now. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. No, not now, since the present Commissioner has reorganized that Bureau. I ask to have this read, and ask the gentleman who has just taken his seat to give it his attention and "Mark now how plain a tale shall put you down."

Mr. HICKS. They were first suspended, and the order referred to by the gentleman was issued after the mischief and injustice had been done.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, August 26, 1893.

[Order No. 240.]

In the reëxamination of all cases allowed under section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, the practice of the Bureau is hereby changed and modified as follows:

First. Where it appears, prima facie on the face of the papers, that the pensioner was not entitled to any rating, the payment of the pension shall be at once suspended, and the pensioner notified that he will be dropped from the rolls after sixty days from such notice, unless he shall in the mean time file competent evidence showing his right to pension.

Second. Where, on the face of the papers, it appears that the pensioner is entitled to a less rate than he is now receiving, he shall be notified that his pension will be reduced to such less rate, unless within sixty days from such notice he shall file competent evidence of his right to a higher rating.

Third. Where it appears on the face of the papers that the pensioner had been allowed a pension under a prior law, and that he is not entitled under the act of June 27, 1890, to any higher rate of pension than was so allowed under such prior law, he shall be notified that his pension under the act of June 27, 1890, will be dropped and his pension under such prior law restored, unless within sixty days from such notice he shall file competent evidence that he is entitled to a higher rate than was granted by his pension under such prior law.

Fourth. Every notice shall inform the pensioner that upon his application to the Commissioner he will be immediately ordered for examination by a local medical board, to enable him to obtain the necessary evidence to show his right to pension.

Fifth. When any pensioner shall have complied with the requirement of such notice, and furnished evidence tending to support his claim to be continued on the rolls, the case shall at once be a "special case," and be promptly adjudicated. (There will be no preliminary suspension in any case hereafter, except as provided in the first subdivision of this order.)

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Approved.
HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

Mr. PICKLER. What is the date of that?

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. August 26, 1893.

Objection is made that prior to that time suspensions were made without notice. I wish to state that it has been the uniform practice since the organization of the Pension Office. That is, suspensions were made during all the Administrations without notice, and it is the excellent Commissioner of Pensions now in the office who for the first time deviated from the time-honored practice, if it can be an honored practice to suspend pensions without notice. I have no objection to putting into law what the Commissioner of Pensions has put into practice; but I do not like to see him misrepresented. He was himself a brave soldier, and is very much more in sympathy with his comrades than those who seem determined to misrepresent and malign him. I am for the amendment, but I only wished to show that the Commissioner has inaugurated this practice, and that he is in no wise justly amenable to such criticism as we have just heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of

the committee to a suggestion of several gentlemen upon the floor, and will ask to have read one of the rules of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nor shall any other person smoke upon the floor of the House at any time; and the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Chair admonishes the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Doorkeeper of this House that this rule must be observed. The Chair will look to the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Doorkeeper to strictly enforce the rules. [Applause.]

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HUDSON].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I rise for the purpose of limiting debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments thereto shall be closed at half past 2, which is ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kentucky that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] had asked the Chair to recognize him next to the gentleman from Kansas, and also the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN], and the Chair has stated that he would do so.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Then I will increase the time to fifteen minutes, so as to include the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from New Hampshire, and the gentleman from Indiana. That will give ten minutes to gentlemen on the other side and five minutes to a gentleman on this side.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who yielded the floor to his colleague.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I simply want to protest against this, for the reason that I desire to have some more time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that all general debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in twenty minutes.

Mr. WELLS. I object.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in twenty minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas for five minutes.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I am not moved by any disposition to make capital out of the present unfortunate situation. I am honestly impressed with the idea that the Secretary of the Interior has made a serious mistake in authorizing the suspension of pensions on a secret charge of fraud, without notice to the pensioner and a fair and honest hearing. It is admitted by all parties upon this floor that the pension roll is one of honor and in no sense a charity, that all pensions that have been granted have been so allowed in strict accordance with the laws governing the Pension Bureau, and consequently on their face all pensions are legal and valid, and the pensioner has a vested right in his pension, which can only be set aside on charges of fraud or mistake, and of such charges he is entitled to notice and a full, fair, and open hearing. He is entitled to know who the witnesses are who are called against him, and entitled to a fair opportunity to controvert such charges before judgment is rendered against him. He certainly is entitled to as much consideration at the hands of this Government as the criminal who has been guilty of a vicious crime.

I deny the power of the Secretary of the Interior or of the President of the United States or any man or set of men to take away from the soldier his pension at his or their own will, and I charge such acts as grossly arbitrary and in violation of every rule or principle of law known to civilized jurisprudence. I think it the duty of Congress in voting this allowance for investigation to at the same time say to the Department you must not in the slightest degree do an old pensioner an injustice. This Government is too great to do an un air act, and great as it is it can not afford to trample upon the rights of one of the humblest defenders of its flag.

I know that it will be claimed that the Department ought not to be required to give the pensioner the names of those who have furnished evidence against him or them, but here again I must beg leave to differ from such a position. The pensioner must go into the open sunlight of public gaze to get his testimony. The burden is upon him to furnish all the testimony to show his right to such pension, and I repudiate with scorn the proposition that this Government, in order to place itself upon a level with the pensioner, must indulge in secret and underhand methods. As I have already said, the Secretary of the Interior has made a mistake in this matter, and he and his friends ought to admit it. I do not agree with honorable gentlemen upon this floor who are trying to make political capital out of this mistake and stir up strife and bitterness throughout the country. Such action is unworthy of the honorable gentlemen engaged in it, if such is their intention. To err is human; not to err is a divine attribute.

No Administration has been wholly free from errors, and it will probably be several generations before we have one that will be free from mistakes. The suspending of pensions during the hearing of charges of fraud made against the pensioner will bring distress to a great many humble but honest homes throughout the land, and I submit to this House that on the near approach of the Christmas holidays it is not only proper, but important that every old soldier throughout the land and his family should be made to feel that their country has not forgotten and appreciates their loyal and patriotic devotion to her cause. It is better that ninety and nine fraudulent pensions should be paid than that one honest pensioner should be deprived of the bounty that is so justly due him. If this or some similar amendment is not allowed, I feel it my duty to vote against this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the subject presented by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] is one which is covered by a bill introduced by myself, which has been referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and which is now being considered by that committee, with, I hope, a fair prospect of a favorable report in the near future. Since, however, this matter is brought before this committee by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I feel entirely absolved on the ground of courtesy to the committee of which I am chairman, and I desire at the proper moment to offer an amendment as a substitute, being section 1 of the bill to which I referred on yesterday and which appears in to-day's RECORD.

Now, I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, upon this subject that since 1803 a practice has prevailed in the Pension Office of suspending pensions without notice, pending investigation. This practice is one that was indulged in by the present administration, and I understand by every administration of the Pension Office since 1803, not only without law, but in the face of express existing statutes. I desire to say now to the members of this committee that, without making an attack upon any officer and making no attack upon any Administration, there is no law to-day existing upon the statute books of the United States that authorizes the Commissioner of Pensions, nor has there ever been any such in the last ninety years, to make suspension of a pension without giving notice to the pensioner.

I desire now to express my concurrence in what my colleague from Indiana [Mr. COOPER] has said here to-day, that the order made by the present Commissioner of Pensions in last August was a modification of the custom or practice which has long existed in that Bureau, and this modification is a step in the direction of recognizing the just claims of the soldier. Mr. Chairman, the square question is simply this, does any man, does any member of this House, desire to disturb an existing right without giving due notice?

Mr. DINGLEY. Due notice and hearing.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Due notice in the first place, and in the next place due hearing. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appeal to you, is it not right, is it not the whole trend of the laws of this country, of the laws of every State in the Union, that before you lay your hand upon an existing right you must give notice to the parties interested?

I will offer my amendment at the proper time, and hope it will pass.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I wish first to say a word in regard to the charge that the pension roll is a roll of dishonor. Thank God, it comes from very few persons, but they make a great deal of noise. It comes from the few unreconstructed rebels from the South and the surviving copperheads of the North, the two classes but for whom there would have been no pension roll at all. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] Of the former I have yet great hope. For those of our countrymen generally who were engaged in the rebellion I have the highest respect, because they are patriots to-day; but for the surviving copperhead there is no hope. He is too much like the original creature for whom he was so appropriately named. [Laughter.]

The pension roll a roll of dishonor! Every year the scrutiny of the rolls of the churches of this country develop more of shame and of dishonor than you have ever developed or that you ever can develop in the pension roll of the United States. [Applause.] Even in the olden time among the Disciples there was one reprobate, there was one copperhead. [Laughter.] God grant that in our time it may not prove to be true that the man who held the bag then is the man who holds the bag to-day. [Laughter.] No, Mr. Chairman, the pension roll is a roll of honor, and it is in the keeping of men of honor from the North and I

believe from the South also. You may purge that roll with your utmost endeavors and you will find that there never has been a list of men who have stood so high and so deservedly high in the estimation of their countrymen as do the Union pensioners of this land. The pension roll is but a proper continuation of the Revolutionary roll of honor, and as such it will stand, an honor to this country for all time.

But, Mr. Chairman, I rose mainly to appeal for a generous administration of the existing pension laws of the country. This law of June 27, 1890, is one in which I have a right to feel an interest, for I was identified with its origin fully ten years ago, and I know that that bill was brought forward in the interests of economy—of economy as well as justice, gentlemen. There was a very strong feeling that there ought to be a service pension given to those who had survived the war of the rebellion. Our friends on the other side were pressing for a service pension for those who had been engaged in the Mexican war, a very large proportion of whom had been later identified, as is generally known, with the military service of the rebellion.

A strong effort was made to prevent the passage of that bill, and an intense opposition was developed to it unless the soldiers who had fought to preserve the Union could be provided for by an amendment to the same bill. I tried to have both classes provided for, upon the principle of need, so that any man who had fought for the country even in the Mexican war, though he might have been in the rebellion afterwards, should be provided for as well as the Union soldier, so far as his necessity was concerned. Finally we gave way, and the Mexican service-pension bill was passed, applying to all who had been engaged in the Mexican war.

The other bill under various forms was pressed in successive Congresses, and at last it passed in the form in which it stands on the statute book to-day, and it was passed to avoid the tremendous drain upon the Treasury that would be entailed by a general service law. Now, I think the present Administration has developed a disposition to administer this particular law in such a way as practically to nullify it, and I trust that will not be done, for I assure you, gentlemen, that there is a rising feeling at the North which will remedy that by demanding the enactment of a general service law if there is no other way of providing for the veterans of the Union. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I represent a Bourbon Democratic constituency. In my Congressional district there is perhaps not a single Federal pensioner, except a few negro teamsters and cooks. But I also represent a constituency which has a great love of justice in the abstract, and, representing that sort of a constituency, I stand here to-day in favor of two things, which it would appear from the present debate are irreconcilable, but which in my mind are very reconcilable. The one is the purging the pension roll, making of it a roll of honor, and the other is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

Representing a Bourbon Democratic constitutency with no Federal pensioners, I am yet in favor of both these propositions. We take some pride down our way in the pension roll, not because any of us are on it, but because our people did something to make it. [Laughter.] Taking that sort of pride in the pension roll, it occurs to me that as a matter of justice—and I believe in doing justice though the heavens fall—the fact that a man is on the pension roll is a *prima facie* something in his favor. He stands in a position where evidence ought to be offered to change the status which he occupies. I think that being on the pension roll is a *prima facie* reason, though not a conclusive one, for supposing that the man deserves a pension. [Applause.]

I do not believe, therefore, that it would be good policy on the part of the Democratic party (because nothing is good policy which is unjust) to defeat a proposition which simply asks that notice and an opportunity to be heard shall be given before a man's name is taken off that pension roll after it has once been put upon it.

Now, my friends, as a Democrat, as a Southern man, interested in purging the pension roll, I say that the thing of all things which we must not do is to excite sympathy with fraud. I believe that the pension roll is "honeycombed with fraud;" and above all things in the world, I do not want to excite sympathy with that fraud. I do not want to put our enemies in a position where they can go to the country upon a false issue, an issue which is not the true and the right issue, but unreal, and demanding a sort of maudlin sympathy.

I believe that we should purge the pension roll, and that there is but one way to do it thoroughly and successfully—to get the common sense and the common conscience of the American people behind the frauds that are on the pension roll. And in order to obtain that we have to be very careful to excite no sympathy with fraud itself, permitting it to commingle and mix itself with patriotism and other things which in themselves are praiseworthy. I think it is of the utmost importance that in attaining a right end we antgonize no right feeling; and I think that we would antagonize a right feeling if we should announce generally that a man who has been placed upon the pension roll can be taken from it without at least having notice given him and an opportunity to be heard.

I simply wanted to say this much in justice to the young Democracy and the Southern Democracy, in reply to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR]: for I come just about as near being what he calls an "unreconstructed rebel" as any man on this floor, who was not old enough to have fought in either army during the "late unpleasantness."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order made by the committee, all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto is now closed.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have only five minutes to present some views on this question. Yesterday I spoke to the Chairman, and he assured me I should have the opportunity to offer an amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman, but he yielded his time to another gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to speak for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I desire to offer reads as follows:

On page 4, after line 23, add the following:

"And in furtherance of the policy expressed in resolutions passed by Congress March 3, 1865, those charged with the duty of appointing or detailing men to perform the services and receive the money above mentioned shall give preference to persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States who are capable of performing such duty."

Mr. Chairman, I have desired to offer an amendment to the pending bill. I was assured by the Chairman that I would have an opportunity to do so. But the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky limiting the time deprives me of the opportunity.

I now ask the unanimous consent of the Committee of the Whole House to allow this amendment to be offered. The amendment is not offered in factious opposition to the bill, but with a sincere desire to secure fair treatment of those whose claims for pensions are incomplete. My amendment reads as follows:

At the end of line 23, page 4, add:

"And in furtherence of the policy expressed in resolutions of Congress passed March 3, 1865, those who are charged with the duty of appointing and detailing men to perform the services and receive the money above mentioned shall give preference to those honorably discharged from the military and naval service of the United States who are capable of performing such duties."

I believe that there is a prevalent opinion throughout the entire country that the present Administration, from the President down to the Commissioner of Pensions, is hostile to the pension system of former Administrations. This opinion may not be well founded, but I believe that if this amendment is put into the bill it will tend to create greater confidence in the sincerity of the Commissioner of Pensions when he states that these special examinations are made in the interest of those whose claims require additional evidence to complete them.

The old veterans are inclined to believe that the purpose is to antagonize their claims rather than to aid and support them, and that there is an effort being made to deprive them of their just rights. If this is not so, there is no better way to disprove it than by placing the matter in the hands of their friends. There is no doubt in my mind that if this course should be pursued it would tend to dispel the shadow of distrust now hovering over the Pension Bureau. It would facilitate the settlement of all just claims.

It may be said that the old comrades would be partial toward each other. I think not to the extent of favoring dishonest claims. There is no class of men in this country who can be depended upon to resist fraudulent pensions more than the old soldiers themselves. They do not ask favors, but they demand fairness. They do not want a lot of young men, many of whom were born since the war and some of whom are unfriendly to the pension system, going about the country consulting with those who are unfriendly to pensioners, or who have some petty malice against some particular pension claimant.

I believe it would be both wise and just to send out men to investigate pension claims in a spirit of friendliness, rather than in search of some shadowy statements of persons who have not the manliness to face an open investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment should be offered; and I hope the gentleman from Kentucky, who has charge of the bill, will allow me to offer it notwithstanding the limitation of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Ohio that the order adopted by the Committee of the Whole does not preclude any gentleman from the privilege of offering amendments. It simply limits the debate. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio at the proper time to offer his amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Then I will not trespass further upon the time of the committee just now, but at a later stage will embrace the opportunity to submit this amendment, which I trust will receive the favorable action of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is first upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HICKS] to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

The amendment of Mr. HICKS was read, as follows:

Provided further, That no pension allowed shall be revoked or suspended excepting those obtained by fraud or perjury.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is there not a substitute pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is a substitute pending, offered by the gentleman from Kansas; but that can not be voted on until these amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I would like to amend the amendment last read by adding the words "or mistake," so as to read, "excepting those obtained by fraud, perjury, or mistake." I suppose that if any person has been placed on the pension roll by clear mistake, no gentleman would desire that such pension should be continued.

Mr. HICKS. I accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky as a modification of my amendment.

The amendment as modified was read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on this amendment as modified.

Mr. HICKS. I will withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. I offer the amendment that I send to the desk to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the work "*Provided*," in the pending amendment, and insert:

"That any pension heretofore or that may hereafter be granted to any applicant therefor under any law of the United States authorizing the granting and payment of pensions, on application made and adjudicated upon, shall be deemed and held by all officers of the United States to be a vested right in the grantee to that extent that payment thereof shall not be withheld or suspended until, after due notice to the grantee of not less than thirty days, the Commissioner of Pensions, after hearing all the evidence, shall decide to annul, vacate, modify, or set aside the decision upon which such pension was granted. Such notice to grantee must contain a full and true statement of any charges or allegations upon which such decision granting such pension shall be sought to be in any manner disturbed or modified."

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he will not be willing to accept this as an amendment to his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think not. I am afraid if I do, the amendment may not be adopted. I believe mine will go through on that side of the House.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MARTIN of Indiana, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 101, noes 45.

So the amendment to the amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs now on the amendment as amended.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to ask if this amendment was not offered as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The amendment just adopted struck out the preceding amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], and the question now is on the adoption of that amendment as amended.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Let the amendment now before the House be reported.

The amendment of Mr. MARTIN of Indiana was again read.

Mr. DOCKERY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I have just come into the Hall from the committee room, and do not understand the parliamentary situation. I wish to know if the proposition is in such shape that we may get a separate vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment just adopted strikes out the larger part of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and inserts something else, and the question now is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky) there were—ayes 123, noes 46.

So the amendment as amended was adopted.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I desire to give notice that I will move in the House for a yea-and-nay vote on that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HUDSON], which the Clerk will read.

The amendment of Mr. HUDSON was again reported.

Mr. HUDSON. I desire to say that as I understand it the amendment, or Mr. MARTIN'S substitute, is in accord with the one offered by myself, and with the consent of the committee, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a right to do it.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I now offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after line 28, add:

"And in furtherance of the policy expressed in resolutions passed by Congress March 3, 1865, those charged with the duty of appointing or detailing men to perform the services and receive the money above mentioned preference shall be given to persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States, who are capable of performing such duties."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I make the point of order on that amendment. It changes the law or is in accordance with existing law. In either case we have no right to legislate on the deficiency bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken unless the gentleman from Ohio is prepared to show to the contrary.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If it reaffirms the existing law it is obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. The amendment simply provides how the money appropriated shall be expended, and I think is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. But the point of order is made that this is legislation upon an appropriation bill, by providing how the officers appointed under this law shall be paid, or how they shall be selected. There is no such restriction in the existing law.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. On the question of order I desire to be heard briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I think it would expedite matters to state that under the present rules the officers of the Pension Department are selected under the civil service examination. It is a change in that respect.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, no; these special examiners are not appointed under civil service rules.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky and Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. But it is under some special examination of the office. It is not by an examination of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. All of the details are.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes; but not the special examiners.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But this amendment applies to all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILSON] briefly on the point of order. The gentleman wishes to read the existing law.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the following is the joint resolution which is referred to in the amendment:

Resolved, etc., That persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service by reason of disability resulting from wounds or sickness incurred in line of duty should be preferred for appointment to civil offices, provided they shall be found to possess the business capacity necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of such office.—*Revised Statutes*, section 1754.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not make it obligatory upon the officer appointing, and especially it can not be effective where those officers are appointed under the civil service law by examination. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For the following expenses of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia, namely: For compensation of crier from May 25, 1893, to June 30, 1894, inclusive, $1,383.33; for messenger from May 1, 1893, to June 30, 1894, $340; for clerical assistance and necessary expenditures in the conduct of the clerk's office, $1,000; in all, $3,223.33, one-half of which sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I offer an amendment to correct the text of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, in lines 7 and 8, strike out "$83.33," and insert "$20.58;" and in lines 12 and 13 strike out "$223.33," and insert "$162.58."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

To pay all session employés of the House of Representatives authorized by the act making appropriation for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1893, to the end of the present session of Congress, $13,278.68.

Mr. HAYES. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, after line 14, insert:

"For mileage of Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories, $130,000, for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress.

"For mileage of Senators for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, $65,000.

"For stationery for Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories for the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, $45,000.

"For stationery for Senators for the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, $7,000."

Mr. WELLS. I rise to a point of order. That is adding to the appropriation, and it is not in order to do so.

Mr. HAYES. That is not a good point of order.

Mr. LYNCH. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LYNCH. It is, that this is new legislation, not authorized by existing law, that it is not in furtherance of any existing statute, and that it increases the amount of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LYNCH] on his point of order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin allow me to interrupt him with an amendment to the point of order? I make the point of order against the last two clauses, providing for stationery for members and so forth.

Mr. HOLMAN. One point of order will cover the whole, anyway.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I think the point of order as to the first two items is not well taken, and I do not want to lose the point of order as to the items for stationery.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LYNCH] on his point of order. The Chair hopes that gentlemen will maintain order, so that what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LYNCH] has to say can be heard.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the rule under which I make this point of order is familiar to all the old members of the House at least, but for the benefit of those who have paid no attention to it I will read so much of it as applies to the point of order I have made. The rule is:

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order except such as, being germane to the subject-matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject-matter of such amendment, which amendment, being germane to the subject-matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, when this Congress came into office on the 4th of last March the law allowed 20 cents a mile for travel, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled going to and returning from each regular session of Congress, and the word "regular" is found in that act of 1866 for the first time. Prior to that the law read that each Delegate and Member shall receive his mileage on the first day of each session, and the first day of each subsequent session; which shows very clearly that when the act of 1866 was passed it was intended to limit the mileage to one regular session, and no more. That law has been construed by both Houses of Congress since its enactment in 1866, as I will show.

The Forty-fifth Congress met in extra session in 1877, in October of that year, and Mr. Ellsworth, a gentleman from Michigan, in the House introduced a bill allowing mileage for the extra session.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I ask the gentleman this question? Is not this the "regular session?"

Mr. LYNCH. I will come to that. We all know it is, and that we received our mileage for this session in August.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do you not know that we have the Attorney-General's opinion that we are entitled to mileage for this session under the existing law?

Mr. LYNCH. I do not, but do not care if you have.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Mileage, and by that committee was reported back on the 15th day of November, 1877, with a report as follows:

The Committee on Mileage, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 650) providing for the payment of mileage to members of Congress for attendance upon the extra or called session, has had the same under consideration, and directed me to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do not pass. And the committee has further directed me to report to the House that in the opinion of the committee there is no law in force giving members of Congress mileage for attendance upon an extra or called session. Report made by Cobb of Indiana.

Mr. BLANCHARD. But this is for this session.

Mr. LYNCH. But we have already had the mileage for this session. That same question was up the next year in the Senate at the extra session of Congress, and the discussion will be interesting. It is very brief, and I will call attention to the remarks made on that point. When the judicial, executive, and legislative appropriation bill was before the Senate at that time Senator Plumb, of Kansas, offered the following amendment:

For mileage of Senators at the extra session, $36,000.

For mileage of Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories at the extra session, $100,000.

There was a discussion on the construction of this law by the Senators which I have no doubt members who desire to follow the law would like to hear, and those that do not desire to appropriate money that does not belong to them. In that debate Senator Wallace said:

But, sir, the Senator from Kansas says that the amendment he proposes is a measure that ought to be passed now. We have had the subject under consideration in committee, and we think it ought not to be done now. On the contrary, we think the statute which provides for the payment of mileage only for regular sessions, and under which the Representatives and Senators have been paid only for regular sessions, should continue to be held to be the law. It is true that for extra sessions of the Senate mileage has been appropriated to the new Senators who came to those extra sessions; but the law does not cover cases in which there has been an extra session of Congress called, because the statute of 1856, which is now the law, provides that mileage shall only be paid for each regular session. This is certainly not a regular session. The proposition, then, is to repeal the statute as it stands to-day, and under which mileage has always heretofore been paid, and to add to the expenses of the Government $136,000. But upon the other ground, that the amendment is clearly not in order, I think the Senate ought to refuse to pass it.

Mr. BAYARD. If I rightly comprehend the amendment of the honorable Senator from Kansas, it is to give two mileages this one year to the entire Senate and House. Is not that the effect?

Mr. PLUMB. The effect of the amendment is to give mileage to every member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives for the extra session of Congress.

Mr. BAYARD. Very well. I am willing that all the gentlemen who came to Congress and took their seats here on the 18th of March should receive the same mileage as if they had been in their seats here on the first Monday of last December. In other words, that the single mileage provided by law should be received by them as it has been by those persons who were here during the last session, but not more. I do not propose to vote in favor of doubling my own mileage, but I am willing to vote in favor of their receiving a single mileage as we have done.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can not agree with the view favored by those who sustained the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. The members who came here on the 18th of March will receive during this Congress for the two regular sessions the same mileage that the rest of us get. I am not willing to discriminate and say that Mr. A, a member of the Senate, shall have three mileages and Mr. B shall only have two. I think we had better vote down the whole proposition. We are paid annually for our services, in the estimation of some gentlemen very liberally, in the estimation of others not enough, but the law is that we shall get $5,000 a year and mileage. Perhaps the country thinks it is much more than we earn. In my judgment we had better vote down this whole proposition.

Mr. HILL of Georgia. I hope the Senate will vote down this whole amendment. I think it is all wrong. Members of Congress get $5,000 a year and mileage for one regular session. I do not propose to accumulate the expenses because of extra sessions. I know that some noise is sometimes made that an extra session of Congress costs the Government so much. I think when members of Congress are paid by the year, if the interests of the country require that they should attend here a dozen times, they ought to attend upon their regular salary and not be increasing their pay on account of the number of extra sessions. I do not think anybody ought to have anything extra. This is my judgment about it. Half the year we are getting pay without service, anyway. That ought to be satisfactory. I hope this amendment will be voted down, and that everybody will be content with his regular salary and not ask for extra allowance because of extra sessions.

Mr. WALLACE. The Committee on Appropriations considered this subject, as I have already stated, and rejected the proposition. Heretofore when there were extra sessions of the Senate called, commencing on the 4th or 5th of March, in perhaps three cases there was money voted to pay the mileage of Senators who came in anew to the Senate. That is the only basis upon which this proposition can hang. Here is an entirely different proposition. Here is a proposition now to vote mileage to Senators and members of the past Senate and of the present and past House who are now in the House and Senate for the extra session, when the law provides that mileage shall be given only for one regular session. This proposition gives mileage for two sessions this year, and of course it increases largely the expenditures of the Government and we think it ought not to prevail.

Mr. PLUMB. Let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question. Is it not really a violation of the law to give two mileages to a man whose term happened to commence on the 4th or 5th of March, as to a Senator whose term commenced two years or four years ago?

Mr. WALLACE. Two wrongs never made one right, and if a past Congress gave to Senators under those circumstances mileage it is no reason why those who did not come here should get additional pay, or why we should extend over the wide field of the whole of the House this provision to give them an additional mileage. The law is that we shall have mileage for each regular session. This proposition is to repeal the law and to give mileage for two sessions this year.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I hope it will be my fortune to spend one Congress in public life without having the members of either branch engaged in a discussion about their own pay. Congress, from the necessity of the case, is intrusted with the power o fixing its own compensation. No other public officer is intrusted with that power. If it were possible to help it, Congress would not be, I suppose. The discussion is always a disagreeable one. It is disagreeable to the public. It involves the charge upon the members of each branch of being governed by low personal motives in their action in regard to a public question, and it seems to me the only wise policy is when the matter has once got fixed by a general law, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has so well said this has, to let it pass into ancient history and not to touch it.

The public mind is reasonably content with the present compensation which is established by law. If we undertake to disturb it in any particular it will be disturbed and discussed in other particulars, and we shall have a repetition of, I will not say the scandals, but the disagreeable and unfortunate discussion and public excitement which attended the bill known as the back-pay bill a few years ago. Congress has fixed the rule of one mileage a year and a stated salary. The public has acquiesced in it, and I hope we shall pass from that question and that it will not be touched again for a hundred years in this country.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Plumb].
The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LYNCH. Certainly.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman calls attention to the fact that it would be interesting to the members to hear this discussion as it was had in the Senate. Now, the fact is, is it not, that the discussion that you are reading from was a discussion as to the rules?

Mr. LYNCH. Not at all, sir. A point of order was involved in the discussion, but that is wholly immaterial in the consideration of the question pending now.

Mr. HAYES. Yes, sir; and it was then held that it was within the rules; but when they voted upon the measure they defeated the amendment. If you would enforce this argument, which you are using as an argument, you ought to know as a matter of fact that it was determined that it was within the rule, but that when they came to vote for the amendment, they defeated it.

Mr. LYNCH. The point of order was raised whether it could be offered as an amendment to that bill under the rules of the Senate, which are different from ours.

Mr. HAYES. Exactly.

Mr. LYNCH. That was discussed. Now, I have not read the discussion upon the point of order. I have only read so much of it as applies directly to this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question. The Chair understands the gentleman is reading a discussion held in the Senate as to the propriety of paying Members and Senators mileage for an extra session, or a regular session?

Mr. LYNCH. A regular session and an extra session—the discussion covered both. This is for the regular session.

The CHAIRMAN. But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES] is to pay the members of this House and Senators their mileage for this session of Congress. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin upon that point.

Mr. LYNCH. The language of the resolution passed by this House on the 4th day of last August, was as follows:

Resolved, That the appropriation for mileage for Senators and members of the House and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1894, approved March 3, 1893, be, and the same is hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress.

Does anybody claim that it was not the money that was payable at this time that was used at that time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The words "in lieu of" were in the original resolution, but were stricken out.

Mr. LYNCH. I know that, but the resolution itself shows that this money was appropriated by the appropriation act approved March 3, 1893, for this regular session, and makes it available at the extra session instead of this. It simply gave us the money in August instead of December.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If that was the intention, why were those words stricken out?

Mr. LYNCH. It is immaterial why they were stricken out. We can not take advantage of our own act. We used the money at that time which was appropriated for this session, and any attempt to get another mileage is simply another attempt to get back pay, as was done in 1873. The law is very plain and very distinct. We took the mileage that had been appropriated for this session and used it then, so that a new and additional appropriation will be necessary to make good the amount that was used at that time. I am aware that this is a very unpopular doctrine to advocate. [Laughter.] I can see that gentlemen are all anxious to get a chance to vote this appropriation to themselves, but there will be a day of reckoning. I warn you, gentlemen, there will be a day of reckoning if you vote to pay yourselves two mileages in one year when the law gives you only one. There will be an accounting. This is not the time for extras, but rather for economy.

A MEMBER. Will you take it if it is voted?

Mr. LYNCH. I will determine that at the proper time.

This appropriation can not be justified under the law nor by any precedent in Congress. Two extra sessions have been held since the enactment of 1868, under which we entered upon the duties of our office. At one session the House attempted to appropriate extra mileage, and at another the Senate. Both Houses emphatically declared against the legality and propriety of so doing, and it remains for this House to establish the precedent now.

Practically, it is the same as if we voted a double salary for this year, and no attempt to construe the resolution of August 14 so as to permit this appropriation can satisfy the people that we are not voting to ourselves double mileage for this year. When we came here in August there was no provision of law nor precedent of any former Congress under which we could claim the mileage for this year. It appeared that the mileage due in December could be made available at that time, and a resolution for that purpose was passed. The discussion that took place at the time of the consideration could not affect the law as it stood, nor our duty as members.

By practically an unanimous vote, the money due us in December was made available in August, hence the appropriation to pay mileage was exhausted, and nothing remained for the regular session. Now it is claimed that the resolution of August 14 was practically an appropriation of that amount of money, when on its face it simply provided for paying the money in August that was payable in December, at the regular session. No mere play upon words will satisfy the scrutinizing public that this is not an attempt to vote ourselves extra mileage.

Had it been intimated during the consideration of the resolution in August that it was intended to be a separate appropriation as mileage for the extra session, a different discussion would have taken place at that time. I certainly understood, and I believe others did, that we were simply authorizing the Sergeant-at-Arms to pay us the mileage due in December, at that time. I had reason to believe that to be the case, because it was the law.

This measure, if proper at all, should be by bill referred to committee and come up for consideration on its merits and not be hitched onto a bill which we all know must pass. Coming up as it does for consideration as an amendment to an important deficiency bill it can not and will not be considered on its merits.

At the outset we were given to understand that this Congress would be one of retrenchment and economy. Much had already been accomplished in that way and appropriations in many instances reduced, perhaps unjustly. I submit to all the members the questionable propriety of making the first extravagant appropriation for the benefit of the members of the House. The passage of this amendment will contrast very favorably or unfavorably, as you may choose to consider it, with the action of the House at the last Congress whereby sixteen committee clerks, that had been regularly employed by each successive Congress for ten years or more, had been dropped in order to save the magnificent sum of $12,000. It was a saving of that sum at that session, and this is an appropriation of $175,000 to members for this. But it will be done by an overwhelming majority, and the Democratic party will have to bear the responsibility.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, a consideration of the present law in relation to the mileage of members, and a very little of the history of legislation on that subject will, I think, be convincing in regard to this point of order, and will show that this is not new legislation, and that this proposition is in nowise making a law upon which to put an appropriation, but that it simply provides for an appropriation under existing law. In 1866 Congress passed a law in regard to the pay of members of Congress, and in regard to mileage, which is the law under which we are acting to-day. In 1873 Congress repealed that law and passed a new one, which has been commonly called the salary-grab law, in which the mileage was changed from so much per mile to reimbursement upon the member's statement of the sum actually expended for travel.

In 1874 that law was repealed, and in express terms the law as it existed previous to that time was reënacted. In other words, the law of 1866 was reaffirmed and thus reënacted, and as I said a while ago, that is the law under which we are acting to-day. Now that law provides that members shall be entitled to $5,000 a year compensation, and for mileage 20 cents per mile each way, going and coming, at "each regular session." The whole question consequently turns upon the meaning of the word "regular" in the expression "regular session" as contained in that law. To my mind there is no question about it, and I think a mere statement of the case will convince any one that the word "regular" is used merely with reference to a session of Congress reckoned from the time it commences until it adjourns without day to distinguish it from the daily session, or from a recess for any given number of days.

Mr. SAYERS. Can the gentleman point to any instance in the history of this Government where mileage has been allowed both for an extraordinary and for a succeeding regular session.

Mr. HOLMAN. Of course not.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman that question, and in the light of precedents thus established I ask him, does not the word "regular" rather mean that they shall receive mileage only once a year, as there can be but one regular session in the year.

Mr. HAYES. I think the statement I am about to make will fully answer that question. As I have said, the question turns upon the meaning of the word "regular" in the statute. I have

stated what I deem to be the meaning of the word "regular" in that statute. In common parlance and even in the Senate debates we have heard different expressions used to describe the called session as "extra session," "special session," and others but there is no warrant in the laws or in the Constitution for those words or those expressions as applied to any session of Congress.

The Constitution provides three ways of convening Congress. One is by the provision of the Constitution itself, without the passage of any law to carry it into effect. Another is by the passage of a law as authorized by that provision of the Constitution, fixing some other or different day for the meeting. Then, third, the President upon extraordinary occasions is authorized to convene Congress; not to call an "extra session," or a "special session," but to "convene Congress;" and when Congress is convened in any one of these three ways, either under the Constitution, or under the law passed in pursuance of the Constitution, or by the President by proclamation, it is a regular session of Congress and there is no warrant whatever in law or in the Constitution for calling it an "extra" session or a "special" session, or anything of that kind. That, I repeat, has no warrant in the Constitution or the law.

As suggested by the gentleman from Georgia at my left [Mr. LIVINGSTON], if it was not a regular session no business could have been carried on except that which was incident to the purpose for which it was called. Such being the fact, this is a regular session of Congress, and the last session, or first session of the Fifty-third Congress, was a regular session. The law provides a certain amount of compensation and mileage for a regular session; and so far as the standpoint of the law is concerned, so far as our rules are concerned, there is no question about it.

This is not new legislation, or anything of that nature. Of course, back of all this there is a question of expediency—whether this proposition should be adopted or not. That is the simple question which was before the Senate at the time of the discussion which has been referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The Senate first discussed the question whether under the rules the proposition was to be regarded as new legislation or was in order. They decided that it was not new legislation and in order, that it was a proper matter to be considered under the rules; and then having made that decision, they defeated the proposition on its merits. So here this proposition is not subject to a question of order under the rules; it is a question to be voted upon on its merits when that question is reached, and just as the Senate so held.

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman allow me to read further on this very point from the debates in the Senate?

Mr. HAYES. There is one thing I had almost forgotten. This matter has been submitted to the First Comptroller of the Treasury, and he has rendered a decision in relation to the question. Perhaps it might have been sufficient to have had his decision read, although he did not give any reason for it, and consequently did not give the true reason, which, it seemed to me, it was proper to state in order to put this matter rightly before the House and the country. I ask that the correspondence which I send to the desk be read.

Mr. CRAIN. Has the Attorney-General passed on this question?

Mr. HAYES. No, sir; not within my knowledge. The letter which I send to the desk is from the First Comptroller of the Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1893.

SIR: I beg to call your attention to the fact there are no funds available to pay the mileage of Members of Congress and Delegates for the first regular session of the present Congress, and that an appropriation will be necessary to provide for the deficiency.

I submit herewith correspondence with the First Comptroller of the Treasury on this subject.

Respectfully submitted,

H. W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES.
Washington, D. C., November 27, 1893.

SIR: Your decision is requested as to whether I will be authorized under the inclosed resolution, in paying mileage to the Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, Fifty-third Congress, without further resolution of the House authorizing it.

Respectfully,

H. W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

Hon. R. B. BOWLER,
First Comptroller.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

[Public resolution—No. 3.]

Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1894, approved March 3, 1893, be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress.

Approved, August 21, 1893.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, FIRST COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1893.

SIR: I am in receipt of yours of the 27th instant, asking whether you will be authorized in paying mileage to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, Fifty-third Congress, for their attendance at the approaching regular session without further action of Congress.

In reply thereto I would say that by section 17 of the act of July 28, 1866, which is the law governing mileage to be paid to members of Congress, they are to be allowed "20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session." As the approaching session is the regular session authorized by law, under the provisions of said section Representatives and Delegates are entitled to receive their usual mileage.

The resolution approved August 21, 1893, making immediately available the appropriation for the payment of mileage for the fiscal year 1894 and authorizing such payment to be made for attendance upon the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, did not impliedly repeal this provision, but simply authorized the payment of mileage for attendance upon the late extraordinary session.

As no new appropriation has been made for mileage, the amount of $130,000 appropriated in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 3, 1893, can not be exceeded. You will, therefore, have to govern yourself accordingly.

Respectfully yours,

R. B. BOWLER, *Comptroller.*

The Hon. HERMAN W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLMAN obtained the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair requests the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to confine his remarks to the point of order bearing on the question of payment of mileage at a regular session.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand that the question of order is the only question now before the committee. I trust, sir, that gentlemen will listen to this discussion for a few moments. The question assumes a great deal more interest and importance from the fact that this is a measure which concerns ourselves. It is not a case where we are acting impartially in a matter of general legislation; it is a case affecting our own interest—concerning us and nobody else, except the taxpayers of the country. I sincerely hope, therefore, that this question will be seriously considered.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the traveling opinion of the First Comptroller of the Treasury, an opinion unauthorized by law, an opinion given by him with no case before him, can have no weight whatever in this matter. Yet, so far as it goes, it is in direct conflict with the position taken by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HAYES]. His position is that all sessions of Congress are regular.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to hear any discussion upon the merits of this amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not saying a word except on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to hear what the gentleman may have to say upon the point of order.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is all I am undertaking to discuss. I am not saying one word about the merits. I hope there will be enough order in the Committee of the Whole to allow the Chair to hear what I am saying, for this is a question for the Chair.

The gentleman from Ohio assumes that all sessions of Congress are regular sessions—sessions called by Executive order as well as those provided for by law. The Comptroller knocks the bottom out of that position very effectually; for he speaks about the appropriation made for the "regular session."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not entering upon the merits of this proposition when I discuss this question as to what constitutes a regular session. The question has been before Congress over and over again. It is an adjudicated question. There have been twelve special sessions of Congress called by Presidents of the United States. Since I have had the honor of a seat on this floor there have been four special sessions of Congress. And not until the present hour have I ever heard the suggestion that there was not a broad distinction between an extraordinary session of Congress, called by the President of the United States, and a session of Congress authorized by law.

And when the language "regular session of Congress" is used in the statute, certainly the Chair must understand that language as meaning a session of Congress authorized by law—not such a session as the President of the United States is author-

ized to call. Such, for instance, as the first session of this Congress.

Mr. HAYES. They are all authorized by law.

Mr. HOLMAN. Those called by the President have from the foundation of the Government been called extra sessions, extraordinary sessions, or called sessions. The appropriation for mileage for the present year is simply in the following terms, under the head of "House of Representatives:"

For mileage, $130,000.

Simply that. Nothing more was required, for the law of 1866 fixed this question; determined when the mileage should be paid; it was to be paid at regular sessions of Congress. In view of the broad distinction between a regular session and an extraordinary session, does any gentleman claim that that appropriation was intended to be applicable at the first session of this Congress? If that session was a regular session within the meaning of the law, how then did it become necessary that a joint resolution should be passed to make that appropriation available for the payment of mileage for the extra session beginning on the 7th day of last August? As the Chair must see, as every gentleman must see, there was no necessity at all for the passage of that joint resolution if the position now taken by the gentleman from Iowa is correct.

I again call attention to the terms of the appropriation on this subject. The appropriation of mileage for the last session of the last Congress was in these simple terms:

For mileage, $130,000.

Can the Chair, then, have any doubt that appropriations made in pursuance of this act of 1866, in the words which have already been read during this discussion, namely, providing mileage "for each regular session of Congress," and fixing the rate at 20 cents per mile—can the Chair, I say, in view of the language of that statute, "each regular session," assume for an instant that a proposition for the payment of this mileage for three sessions in place of two is in order?

Now, the Chair must take it for granted that the appropriation of money made by the appropriation bill of the last session of the last Congress was for the regular session of Congress which began according to law on the first Monday of the present month of December. There could be no possible mistake about that. It was an appropriation of money in conformity with the act of 1866 to be paid to the members as mileage for the first regular session of this Congress. What is the effect of this joint resolution? I brought it before the House:

That the appropriation for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1893 be, and the same is hereby, made available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress.

The effect of that resolution was to pay in advance the money which was appropriated for the mileage at the regular session. Now, to come right to the point, the appropriation was made under the act of 1866 in general terms, and under that act would apply only to the regular session. But an extraordinary session of Congress was called, and determined that instead of this mileage being paid at the regular session it should be paid in advance at an earlier time. That is the whole of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that the Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The Chair has endeavored to give as much time to the discussion as the present condition of public business would justify.

Mr. HOLMAN. But the Chair, if I may be permitted to suggest it, will take cognizance of the fact that this is rather a delicate question, affecting, as it does, ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will indulge the gentleman as long as he confines himself to the point of order.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have not said a word outside of it. It is probable that in the midst of the confusion prevailing on the floor the Chair did not understand what I said; but I have not said a word outside of the question of order—not one.

I might call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the appropriation referred to was made under the provisions of the act of 1866. Does any gentleman deny that? Does the gentleman from Iowa deny it?

That act, if the Chair will permit me to refer to it again, provides mileage for the regular sessions of Congress only. That means sessions of Congress held under the law, and mileage during the Congress, which means two terms. The appropriation is made then for the first regular session of this Congress in the last year's appropriation bill, and the House of Representatives meeting earlier than the regular session makes it applicable at an earlier day. Can any lawyer say in view of the facts—taking into consideration the act of 1866 and the appropriation act of the last session of the last Congress—that if Congress makes the appropriation applicable at an earlier date it changes the act of 1866?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana, even admitting the force of all the gentleman has stated, why the Chair should not entertain the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa and submit it to the House?

Mr. HOLMAN. Why, because there is no law authorizing the appropriation and the rule of the House forbids it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin why should the Chair refuse to submit the question to the House? Under what rule is it inadmissible?

Mr. HOLMAN. For the manifest reason assigned in the rule read by the gentleman from Wisconsin, that the appropriation can not be made unless in pursuance of law.

Now we have made the appropriation in pursuance of law. Can any gentleman deny that? And gentlemen have received their mileage in advance under that appropriation. Does any gentleman deny that? We have made it by the legislative act of the last session of the last Congress, providing $130,000 for that purpose. We have made it then in pursuance of law, but at an earlier date than the regular meeting of Congress—Congress being then in session—this appropriation was made applicable.

Does that change the case at all? Why, this is an appropriation for the regular session. We simply authorize its payment in advance of the regular session. Does that create a new law? I repeat, the appropriations are made in pursuance of the act of 1866, which has not been modified or changed, and Congress only authorized its payment at an earlier date. As a legal proposition it is too clear for discussion. Under the rules of the House and the act of 1866, as well as the appropriation made by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill of the last session of the last Congress, it is clear that we have simply expedited the receipt of the money appropriated by that Congress for this purpose. I repeat, it is too clear for discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order. The Chair desires the Clerk to read the clause of the act of 1866 to which reference has been made.

The Clerk read as follows:

By the 17th section of the act of July 28, 1866, it is provided that mileage at the rate of 20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session of Congress, shall be allowed to each Representative and Delegate the accounts thereof to be certified by the Speaker. (Stat., vol. 14, page 323.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, neither the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LYNCH], nor the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], nor any gentleman on the floor has raised the point that this is not a regular session of Congress.

Mr. HOLMAN. This is a regular session of Congress, but——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make his own statement, and will hear the gentleman afterward. This is a regular session of the Fifty-third Congress of the United States. Now, it is true that a session known as a called, or extra, session of the Fifty-third Congress met and adjourned, and pending that session of Congress certain proceedings bearing upon this question took place. The Chair will ask the Clerk to read the proceedings relating to a resolution offered early in that session by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and the action of the House upon that resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILEAGE OF SENATORS, REPRESENTATIVES, AND DELEGATES.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Joint resolution (S. R. 3) making immediately available the appropriation for mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the appropriation for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1894, approved March 3, 1893, be, and the same is hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress: *Provided*, That payments hereunder shall be in lieu of mileage authorized by law for attendance at the first regular or the next session of the Fifty-third Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] objects.

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe it is in order anyhow, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The only reason why the Chair asked unanimous consent was, that an order was adopted by the House in relation to the pending bill which seems to assign all the time to its consideration until the period when the vote should be taken. Therefore the Chair did not feel that, without consent, he could interrupt or take away any part of the time which had been agreed upon for debate.

Mr. HOLMAN. This resolution simply makes available now the appropriation which was made for the next session.

Mr. POWERS. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will demand the previous question.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Suppose this called session should not continue very long, as the country hopes it will not. Suppose, for instance, having acted upon the finan-

cial question, having repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman bill, and having given the banks the right to issue circulation up to the par value of their bonds; suppose we should get away by the 1st of October, does the gentleman's joint resolution propose that we shall not have mileage for coming to this extra session, to which we have been called properly by the President of the United States, and not by any act of ours?

Mr. HOLMAN. This measure does not prejudge that subject. It leaves it all open.

[Laughter.]

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. It appears to me that it does prejudge it. I think the gentleman should have offered a joint resolution giving us our mileage and also allowing us the usual amount for stationery.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is provided for already.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. For the extra session?

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, this may not be an extra session. We can not positively answer as to how long we will be in session.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. It was called as an extra session. Now, I do not know but we may desire to have stationery, and we ought to be allowed to have a settlement for that, if we should sit here for a couple of months.

Mr. COOMBS. You can get the stationery allowance now.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I have seen the same thing done before at a called session, and I simply rise to say that in my opinion the joint resolution ought to refer only to the extra session, and not apply in any way to the regular session in December, for the country wants us to get out of this session as soon as we can—to adjourn long before the first Monday of December.

Mr. HOLMAN. If I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that any objection was to be raised, I would not have offered the resolution. The question to which my friend has referred will come before the House for consideration at a later time. For the present this seems to be the safer course to pursue.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman consent to amend by striking out the words "in lieu of?"

Mr. HOLMAN. I would not like to do that at present.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. And let the resolution read without that proviso concerning the regular session?

Mr. HOLMAN. That comes up later.

Mr. REED. It always comes up later.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand the previous question.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. As the question has been brought up, we might as well settle it here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the previous question.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the words "in lieu of."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the previous question.

Mr. HOLMAN. I must insist on the resolution in its present form.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. You can not call the previous question when I have the floor.

Mr. HOLMAN. The resolution gives satisfaction to those gentlemen who have examined it.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I insist on the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Rather than consume the time of proper debate I prefer to withdraw the measure.

Mr. REED. Withdraw it, then.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that striking out the three words "in lieu of" would not accomplish the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I want to strike out all the words necessary to make this really apply to the session that might unfortunately continue until December.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please present his amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I had called the previous question, I think.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has, however, been recognized and understood that he had the floor.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman from Indiana had better let this lie over until to-morrow.

Mr. HOLMAN. I submit the resolution to whatever action the House deems proper.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Then I move to strike out the words which by implication extends this to the December session.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman please indicate those words?

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the words "in lieu of" and the words following.

The SPEAKER. That does not accomplish the purpose sought. The gentleman will please look at the resolution.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Let the resolution be reported again.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can examine the resolution.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the proviso.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution, so that the House may understand what it is.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the proviso.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for the previous question on the resolution and amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to strike out the proviso.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 91, noes 28.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and, being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, it is evident from the action of the House upon the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] that the mileage that had been provided for in the last appropriation bill was paid to members for the first session of the Fifty-third Congress. As a matter of fact that money was, as appropriated, paid to each member, according to what he was entitled to under the law. And the question raised by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES] is simply to pay the mileage of members for this, the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, which is, according to the interpretation given to it by some gentlemen, the first regular session. But the Chair, in determining this point of order, has nothing to do with the proposition as to whether the first session of this Congress was a regular or an extraordinary session. The House is confronted with the fact that by the action of the House itself the appropriation made to pay the mileage of members was paid to them for their attendance on the first session of this Congress; and the fact remains that no appropriation exists at this time to pay mileage for the attendance of members upon this session, which all gentlemen concede to be a regular session of Congress. The Chair overrules the point of order, and will submit the amendment to the House.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have a word to say about this question of mileage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman——

Mr. BLAND. I am not appealing, but I understand the proposition is now before the committee for its adoption or rejection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] to suspend for a moment to allow the committee to rise informally to receive a message from the Senate.

The committee rose informally.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the board of Capitol police be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to appoint twelve additional policemen at an annual salary of $1,100 each, one-half to be paid by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, out of the appropriation for miscellaneous items of the respective Houses until otherwise provided for.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The committee having risen informally, merely for the purpose of receiving a message from the Senate, it will require unanimous consent.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on Ways and Means. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman to submit his report.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The bill was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I wish to say that at the earliest practicable moment——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, the minority of the committee on Ways and Means desire to ask time to file their views.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that leave will be granted.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Will the gentleman indicate within what time they will file their report?

Mr. BURROWS. I think within two days.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the minority of the committee will be permitted to file their views, and when filed they will be printed.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Within two days.

The SPEAKER. Within two days.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask permission to state to the House that I shall ask the House at the earliest practicable day——

Mr. GEAR. It ought not to be made an order, it strikes me, that the views of the minority must be filed absolutely within two days.

Mr. DALZELL. That is no part of the leave.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I understand that to be a part of the permission, of course.

Mr. BURROWS. There is no trouble about that here.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to state to the House that I shall ask the House, at the earliest practicable day, to proceed to the consideration of this bill, of which time I shall give notice beforehand.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, what was the proposition?

The SPEAKER. There was no proposition.

Mr. REED. What is the proposition in regard to the filing of the views of the minority?

The SPEAKER. The minority has two days in which to file their views.

Mr. REED. I think there is no reason why the minority should be limited to two days.

The SPEAKER. That was at the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. GEAR. It was "possibly two days."

Mr. REED. I suggest that the minority have leave in general to file their views. They expect to file them within that period.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asked that the majority, without limit, be allowed to file their views.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I supposed the understanding between the majority and the minority was that the minority would file their report within two days. It was expected that they would be ready to-day.

Mr. REED. I presume there will be no objection to having the order made general.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask that the minority file their views within two days.

Mr. REED. Does the gentleman insist upon that?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Yes. (After a pause.) That was the proposition made by the minority of the committee.

Mr. REED. It was not a proposition made. It was stated that we expected to do that. That was all, as I understand it. It was an expression of opinion. That was all we meant to say. We have no idea of delaying beyond the earliest possible moment to file the report, but would not like to agree that there should be a limit of two days imposed.

Mr. BURROWS. What occurred is within the knowledge of every member of the House.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I will not insist upon that being a part of the agreement. I shall ask that our friends do file their report within two days. That was a part of their proposition.

Mr. BURROWS. I simply stated that I asked consent or leave that the minority may file their views. The gentleman from West Virginia then inquired within what time, to which I replied probably within a couple of days.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, then, leave will be extended to the minority to file their views; and when filed they will be printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCRAE. That does not imply that the printing of the report shall be delayed until the filing of the views of the minority?

The SPEAKER. Not at all.

FURTHER URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

The committee then resumed its session, Mr. HATCH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky made a separate point of order to the two paragraphs embraced in this amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I do not care to press the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order. The amendment is now before the committee for its action.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of taking exception to the ruling, because I think the Chair has ruled according to the situation. But, Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the law itself authorizes the payment of only one mileage; and that is for the regular session. After the House had met in August last, after we saw proper to anticipate that mileage and draw it for that session, I suppose that is all you can construe it to be; we might do so, but that is all that ought to be done.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I have attended three extra sessions of Congress, and I have never known a single Congress that has drawn its mileage for an extra session. We have always confined ourselves, so far as my memory goes, to one mileage, and that was for the regular session. Are we, Mr. Chairman—a party that has come here pledged to retrenchment and the reduction of taxation, a reduction of expenditures, when the whole country is in financial difficulties, probably much of it owing to the action of the extra session of Congress in depriving the people of this country in part at least of the means by which to pay their taxes—are we, in view of this fact, now determined to do this which, so far as my memory goes, for the last twenty years has never been done by Congress, that is, to pay two mileages in one year?

This House, Mr. Chairman, is pledged to a reduction of taxation; to a reduction of expenditures, wherever we can, all along the line of the President's message, in that regard which insists that we must reduce them wherever they can be reduced, withholding appropriations where it can be done without crippling the public service.

Are we to come here and, simply because we can put mileage in our pockets, are we to loot the public Treasury? It will be a disgrace upon this House if we should do so. Gentlemen need not suppose that the country which has sent us here to reduce taxation will not condemn every man who votes to put in his pocket the hard-earned money of the people that does not belong to him. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this side of the House can not afford to proceed in this way. The Republican party, when it was in power, never undertook to do it, and yet we have charged them with extravagance. The records will show that for the last twenty or twenty-five years, although we have had extra sessions, we have not drawn mileage for one of the extra sessions.

[Here the hammer fell.] [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close at half past 4. That will give us twenty minutes more. We want to pass the bill this afternoon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is $175,000 for ourselves involved in this bill, and I insist upon reasonable debate. I insist upon at least an hour.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in half an hour from this time.

Several MEMBERS. Make it twenty minutes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Twenty minutes, then.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the gentleman from Kentucky is making a great mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments be closed in twenty minutes——

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. One moment, Mr. Chairman. I want to hear what the venerable gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] desires to say.

Mr. HOLMAN. I simply wish to say to my venerable friend from Kentucky [laughter] that I hope he will act with his customary fairness and coolness in this matter.

While Mr. HOLMAN was still on the floor,

The CHAIRMAN *pro tempore* put the question upon the motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky to close debate in twenty minutes and declared it carried. [Laughter and confusion in the Hall.]

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to a question of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HATCH). The Chair can not recognize any gentleman in such confusion. [After a pause.] By order of the committee all debate upon the pending paragraphs and amendments thereto will close in twenty minutes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say there was some misunderstanding. I had moved to make the time thirty minutes, and I think that, with the consent of the committee, under the circumstances it would be well to let the debate run for that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that debate upon this paragraph and amendments thereto close in thirty minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish at the outset to enter my protest against the discourtesy just shown to members of the House by the gentleman who occupied the Chair a few moments ago. I wish to enter my protest against it, sir, as especially unbecoming when we are legislating for ourselves, for the benefit of our own pockets, legislation in sharp antagonism with the principles which have controlled Congress for a century, except on two occasions, and the Democrats when in the control of Congress in all our history except in one instance.

Can we afford, gentlemen, in the midst of such a tumult as this, to vote to ourselves, out of the hard earnings of our people this extra mileage of $130,000, and extra stationery to the amount of $45,000, and arbitrarily limit debate to thirty minutes? Will our people tolerate such a raid on their Treasury by their Representatives?

I saw just such a scene as this as far back as 1862, and again in 1873, when the retroactive-salary law was passed. There was a called session of the Congress on the 4th of July, 1861, at the opening of the late war, the most important extra session of Congress ever held in this country. At the next session, the regular session, this same mileage question came up, and I wish to bring

to your attention, gentlemen, the conduct of the men who preceded you in this Hall nearly a generation ago. When the proposition was brought forward at the regular session, as now, to pay mileage for the first session of the Thirty-seventh Congress, the famous war session, which had not been paid, the House became so indignant at the attempt to violate all the precedents of the past as to mileage that they not only refused to vote the mileage, but they passed a bill to abolish the mileage of members of Congress altogether. You will find that record in the proceedings of the first regular session of the Thirty-seventh Congress, July 15, 1862.

Mr. HAYES. Was that in 1866?

Mr. HOLMAN. No; it was in July, 1862, during the first regular session of the Thirty-seventh Congress. By reference to the record, I find that such men as Charles Wickliffe of Kentucky, and Roscoe Conkling of New York, with eighty-six other members of that House, voted to abolish mileage entirely, so indignant were they at the pretensions of some gentlemen who, in violation of all the precedents, were demanding mileage for the extra session as well as for the regular session. There is scarcely a man who was conspicuous in your legislative history thirty years ago who is not found on the list of those voting in favor of abolishing mileage. The measure did not pass the Senate, but the record was no less honorable to the House.

I find in the record with great satisfaction that I then voted to abolish mileage for members of the House and Senate. In the first place, gentlemen, we are doing here what no Congress has ever done before. There have been twelve called sessions of Congress in our history, and during President Johnson's Administration there were several adjourned sessions of Congress; but never has a dollar been paid to members for mileage except for a regular session.

In the last session of the last Congress you appropriated the necessary amount of money for mileage for this session, I think $175,000. I brought into the House at the beginning of the called session of this Congress a joint resolution providing that this money should be paid to the Senators and Members in advance. That resolution passed both Houses unanimously. We received the money in advance, and now gentlemen insist that they shall be paid their mileage again. This has never been done in our history. I hope a Democratic House will not sanction this new departure from the path of economy and justice to our people. This is a personal matter. Can we afford to set this example? Will our constituents approve of such action? We all know that the mileage at 20 cents a mile is more than three times as much as we expend in coming and going with our families to and from this capital. Gentleman say this money paid for mileage at the called session was not for the regular session.

Every one of you know it was appropriated for the regular session—this session—and that you simply by joint resolution anticipated the payment at the special session—nothing more.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Democratic party has any one element of strength among the people above all others it is the general belief indulged in through all the years of the past from the days of Jefferson that it is a party of economy, who mindful that every dollar in the Treasury is placed there by the labor of our people, a party that frowns down and denounces mercenary motives in the action of a Government and especially of the great legislative body of our country. Yet within two years, if you will pass this bill, you will have added to the pay of members of Congress sums of money beyond any example in our history except in the case of the salary act of March 3, 1873. You remember the fate of that measure. Have you considered that, gentlemen?

Within two years we have provided clerks for members, not chairmen of committees, at a cost of about $360,000 a Congress, and now extra mileage $130,000, and extra stationery $45,000 as proposed by this amendment. See, gentlemen, what a record we are making.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire the attention of the House for only a moment or two; I will not occupy five minutes. I agree with the position taken by those who favor this amendment, that, strictly and technically speaking, the members of this House are entitled to mileage under the law as it now exists. I believe that is so. I shall therefore speak as to the policy of making the appropriation. If I have not been misinformed, ever since the organization of this Government, since the meeting of the very first Congress, at no time and under no circumstances did members of Congress receive mileage both for an extraordinary session and for the regular session next succeeding. That is my understanding of the history of this matter from the very organization of the Government. I do not think that we should at this date break the precedent so long and so uniformly regarded.

Now, it is well known to every one here that, with the exception of members residing within from 50 to 100 miles of this city, the allowance of 40 cents a mile—20 cents coming and 20 cents returning—is largely more than sufficient to pay the traveling expenses of any member. It does occur to me that, in view of this large allowance of mileage, members of the House ought to be content with receiving mileage once a year. I shall therefore vote against the appropriation.

Mr. NORTHWAY. How will the newly elected member from Ohio [Mr. BUNDY] get his mileage if it be not voted now? And how will the successors of Mr. O'Neill and Gen. Lilly, of Pennsylvania, and Judge Chipman, of Detroit, obtain their mileage?

Mr. SAYERS. There are exceptions to all rules. Those gentlemen have not received mileage heretofore, and they are justly entitled to mileage.

Mr. CRAIN. Their predecessors have received mileage.

Mr. SAYERS. But they do not stand exactly in the shoes of their predecessors.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I came to Congress, and especially before I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I frequently heard the phrase "the old flag and an appropriation." It occurs to me that this order has been reversed: that now the "appropriation" comes first and the "old flag" afterward. I am aware that nothing I may say on this occasion will prevent a vote in favor of this appropriation. [Laughter.] I leave the question with the House, and shall vote against the amendment providing for mileage.

Mr. BLAND addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] for five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, we understand full well the condition of the public Treasury to-day. We are told—I do not know whether it is true or not—that propositions will be made to issue bonds for the purpose of getting money to meet the ordinary expenditures of this Government. Now, I want to know whether there is a member of this House who, knowing as I know that the law contemplates the payment of mileage only once a year and at a regular session and that we appropriated our mileage at the extra session, intends to put a bonded indebtedness upon the people of this country, with the burden of taxation necessary to meet those bonds, in order to put into his own pocket money that does not belong to him?

We remember the "salary grab" of the Republican party which almost swept it out of existence in the elections which followed. Here is a "salary grab"—not quite so large, but as infamous—and the man who votes for it or takes it after it is voted ought to be defeated as the "salary grabbers" were.

I do not believe, with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SAYERS], that this House is going to commit such an infamy as to adopt this proposition. I can not believe it. It is not proper for anyone to suppose that this House, in the present condition of the Treasury and with the long line of precedents in the past, is going to commit a deed that will damn it, if it is not already damned. I am afraid probably it is damned anyhow. [Laughter.]

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the spirit manifested by members in the consideration of such a measure as this, particularly a measure concerning the members and their pockets only. This is the first time since I have been a member that I have seen the attempt made to stifle debate upon a proposition carrying an appropriation of $175,000 payable to the members individually; a proposition contrary to law and contrary to the precedents of the House for more than a hundred years. Yet in the face of positive law under which we all came here, it is proposed to shut off debate and to heap ridicule upon the attempt to confine ourselves to the law under which we entered upon the duties of our offices. I say that the situation is astonishing. The ruling of the Chair was astonishing. [Laughter.]

More so than anything else; and particularly the conclusion, where the Chair bases its decision upon the resolution of August 14, as taking the money appropriated for this regular session and appropriating it for that, when the language of the resolution distinctly states that the money due for mileage under the act of March 3, 1893, was payable at the regular session, and the resolution of August 14 simply made that money available in August instead of December. The language of that resolution is clear and unequivocal. It neither made an appropriation nor implied that another appropriation might or should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LYNCH] that in accordance with the rules of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin must be regarded as having acquiesced in and affirmed the ruling of the Chair; otherwise he would have taken an appeal from the decision. The Chair will say further to the gentleman that his remarks are not only not in order, but are unbecoming a member on the floor

when he knows that the Chair is bound by the rules of the House, and is endeavoring to observe them. I know how futile would be any attempt by appeal to change the ruling.

Mr. LYNCH. I know that the members of this House are going to vote this appropriation; I can see it from the spirit manifested on both sides, and particularly on the Republican side. [Laughter.] Well, gentlemen, you may laugh: now is the time to laugh: later on you may find it to be no laughing matter. He laughs best who laughs last. I do not question the power of the House to make this appropriation. You can appropriate to each member a thousand dollars apiece as well as you can appropriate this sum. There is no limit in that respect; the House has the power to make this appropriation if it wants to exercise it. But the haste and zeal with which they seek to do it is astonishing to say the least of it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. There is so much confusion on the floor that we can not hear the gentleman. If we are going to steal this money let us do it in order and with decency. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has appealed to the House to preserve order and will endeavor to enforce it.

Mr. COGSWELL (to Mr. SIMPSON). Are you in favor of the steal? [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. No, I am not.

Mr. COGSWELL. But you are going to take it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, if you insist upon it. The Populists believe in putting money in circulation. [Laughter.]

Mr. LYNCH. I can not but refer to the support which was intended to press this matter on the House, as an opinion of the Attorney-General——

Mr. HAYES. No; of the Comptroller.

Mr. LYNCH. I understand so now, but I understood at first it was the report of the Attorney-General. It turned out to be simply a paper, a statement accompanying a reply to a letter written by some gentleman to the Attorney-General; but that gentleman was too good a lawyer to commit himself on the proposition of law involved, but substituted a letter from the Comptroller.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair will state that he recognized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LYNCH] on one side of this proposition, and they have consumed eighteen of the thirty minutes allowed by the committee. The Chair thinks it is only fair to recognize some gentleman on the floor who desires to support the amendment. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin again if no other gentleman desires to take the floor.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, this question should be determined by the existing law. This Congress, or this House, at the present time is not engaged in passing a law determining that its members shall have another mileage. The pending proposition is one appropriating money to pay the mileage for the present session to which members are entitled under existing law.

Mr. COGSWELL. That is right.

Mr. BOWERS of California. This is the point exactly.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the proposition were different, if it were an effort on our part to enact a law giving us another mileage when the existing law denied it to us, I would be the last man to raise my voice in support of it or to give it my vote. But that is not the proposition.

The members of this House were not responsible for the exercise of the constitutional power on the part of the President calling them in extra session in August last. He did call us in extra session and we came here in obedience to that call. That session lasted three months and adjourned a month before the regular session of Congress was to be held. Many of the members of this House, including myself, went to their homes during the period of adjournment. Then the time came for returning to Washington to attend the regular session. We came. It was the second trip to Washington to attend to the public business, and under existing law we are entitled to mileage for this second trip. There can be no question of that. The proper law officer—the First Comptroller of the Treasury—so decides. If this be true, let us have the manliness to vote the amount of money necessary to pay it and then take it like men. [Applause.]

You gentlemen who do not believe that you are entitled to the mileage will vote, of course, against the proposition. Now be consistent, and do not take it after it is appropriated by the votes of those of us who believe otherwise. [Laughter.]

All this talk, Mr. Chairman, about the condition of the Treasury and the impropriety of members being paid mileage to which they are entitled by existing law is buncombe. There is no trouble about finding money in the Treasury to meet the just obligations of the Government. Nor do I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the generous people of this country will find fault with their representatives for voting themselves money in the form of mileage, to which existing law, made before this Congress was elected, entitles them.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the honorable gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], admitted in his remarks, if I understood him correctly, that under the law as it stands we are entitled to the mileage now due. That is to say, that we are entitled to mileage for each session of Congress, and that it is only a question of policy whether we should now vote it or not. If the law entitles us to it, that law existed when we were elected, and our election to the present Congress carried with it all the emoluments and privileges appertaining to the position by the law existing at the date of our election. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SICKLES. I wish to ask if it be in order to ascertain by a rising vote the gentlemen who propose to refuse the acceptance of this mileage, in order that the amount of the appropriation might be reduced to that extent. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAND. I rise to say to the gentleman that I never will take a dollar of it, and I believe that the men who do take it, whether they vote for it or not, will be put in the same position as those men who voted an increase of salary in times past.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I do not fear that for one.

Mr. BLAND. We go upon the stump and come here and talk about the depleted Treasury, about reducing taxes, and say there is no money in the Treasury, and yet we come in now and loot that Treasury for our own pockets.

Mr. WELLS. It strikes me as a little peculiar that at this time, of all others, when there is an appropriation with no flag attachment, we hear nothing from the other side except cheers for the men who denounce those who are attempting to prevent a steal and a plundering of the Government. When the appropriation that has just been passed was before the House, we listened here with a great deal of consideration to the heavy artillery from Illinois, to the pyrotechnics of Iowa, and to the firecrackers from the sunrise district of Massachusetts, but we do not hear any of these gentlemen lift up their voices against this appropriation.

Mr. COGSWELL. Well, you will see us vote for it.

Mr. WELLS. Gentlemen, there is no use in talking, the American people are not in a humor to be plundered by this House, and a Democratic House at that. The law provides specifically that at every regular session each member is entitled to mileage, and that mileage covers more than the expense of four trips of any man from his place of abode to Washington. It is simply an outrage that it stands upon the statute books to-day, and that each of us is permitted by way of mileage to take of the hard earnings of the people of the United States that for which their children are suffering, and for which the people are starving in every large center of the country to-day. Those are the conditions that will confront gentlemen when they return to their constituents.

I remember, sir, that in the seventies, I have forgotten the year, gentlemen voted themselves upon the floor of this House an appropriation for back pay. Schuyler Colfax was amongst them. There were a number of Republicans amongst them; and it is of history, sir, that all of the Republicans who voted that back pay to themselves on this floor were returned and honored by their constituencies; but Democracy, ever honest, relegated to the shades of private life every man who took the back pay. And by the Eternal, if we take this we should be relegated to the shades of private life too. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe that amendment is divisible. I believe there are two different propositions, and I call for a separate vote on each.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] calls for a division. The Clerk will read the first part of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, after line 14, insert:

For mileage of members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories, $130,000, for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress.

For mileage of Senators for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, $45,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will first be taken on this portion of the amendment.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HOLMAN) there were—ayes 143, noes 49.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the remaining portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For stationery for members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories for the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, $45,000.

For stationery for Senators for the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For miscellaneous items and expenses of special and select committees, $20,000.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on page 8, in line 22, I move to strike out the word "twenty" and insert the words "twenty-eight." In support of that amendment I submit the following letter from the Clerk's office:

CLERK'S OFFICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1893.

DEAR SIR: To pay the salaries of employés, made payable out of the contingent fund by resolutions of the House, from December 7, 1893, to June 30, 1894, the following amounts will be required:

Resolutions of December 7, 1893:		
E. L. Currier, $100 per month	$680.62	
George Jenison, $100 per month	680.62	
		$1,361.24
2 laborers, Clerk's office, $720 per annum		817.72
8 folders, Doorkeeper's office, $75 per month		4,083.76
1 messenger, post-office, $100 per month	680.62	
1 laborer, post-office, $75 per month	510.47	
		1,191.09
		7,453.81
Resolution of December 8, 1893:		
Bert W. Kennedy, $900 per annum		508.68
Total		7,962.49

There is not a sufficient amount, unexpended, in the miscellaneous items out of which to pay any part of these salaries, and this item was not included in the $20,000 asked for by you for the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund.

Very respectfully,

J. F. SNYDER,
Disbursing Clerk.

Hon. JAMES KERR,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, in line 22, strike out the word "twenty" and insert the words "twenty-eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. At this point I wish to offer an amendment in behalf of the committee, to be inserted immediately after the amendment we have just agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, after the amendment last adopted, insert:

"To pay W. Tyler Page, for clerical services under the Clerk of the House in the month of October and November, 1893, $250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas now offers an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House borne on the annual and session rolls on the 3d day of November, 1893, including the Capitol police and the Official Reporters of the Senate and House, for extra services during the Fifty-third Congress a sum equal to one month's pay at the compensation then paid them by law, the same to be immediately available.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I make a point of order upon that.

Mr. HOLMAN. I make the point of order upon that. There is no law authorizing that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kansas on the point of order. The point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Indiana is that it changes existing law, and there is no existing law under which the appropriations can be made. The Chair understands the point.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a similar resolution to this has been passed by the Forty-seventh, the Forty-eighth, the Fiftieth, the Fifty-first, and the Fifty-second Congresses, and also a resolution similar to this was passed at the extra session of the Forty-sixth Congress.

It is no more than right that the clerks and officers should be paid this amount, and paid now. They have no mileage out of which to pay their expenses here when they are brought here. Another point; whenever the question was made and the point of order was raised, I am advised by members who have been here that it was always submitted by the Chair to the House. I suggest that this be done in this proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I suppose there is no doubt that this is obnoxious to the point of order. There is no law permitting it. The usage of the House has never been to do it until the close of the session. After the House has been in session a good long while it has been the rule of the House to give an extra month's pay, under the idea that the employés would have it for traveling expenses home and back. Otherwise most of the employés of the House would be confined to the District of Columbia or immediately around the city of Washington; but it has never been done in the middle of a session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the Clerk to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1891, a very full and explicit decision of a certain Speaker of the House that no Democrat upon this floor will question, and that is Mr. Carlisle himself. The Clerk will read the small type. The Chair hopes the committee will be in order and listen to the decision.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hitherto on more than one occasion an amendment precisely similar or having the same purpose in view has been submitted to the House, and the most recent decision was that of the Speaker himself, who held the amendment to be in order. The Chair happens to have that decision before him and will ask the Clerk to read certain paragraphs from it.

The Clerk read as follows:

"The SPEAKER. The Chair finds upon an examination of the records that on two occasions heretofore an amendment similar to this—the Chair thinks in precisely the same language—has been offered and a point of order made against it, and in both instances the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, by a very large vote, held the provision to be in order.

"Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir; but does that action of the Committee of the Whole establish a rule for the control of the House? It must be apparent, Mr. Speaker, there is no law authorizing this item.

"The SPEAKER. Of course the Chair is not absolutely bound by any decision of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, although such decision is certainly entitled to very great respect when the question has been discussed and decided by that committee, consisting as it does of the same members that compose the House itself. In order to preserve uniformity in the rulings upon this question the Chair thinks he ought to admit the amendment and allow the House to vote upon it.

"Mr. HOLMAN. And hold that there is a law authorizing this appropriation: that it comes within the third section of the twenty-first rule?

"The SPEAKER. The provision seems to have been held in order heretofore upon the ground that it had been included in an appropriation bill, and was the law at least for that year."

The CHAIRMAN. In pursuance of this decision of the former Speaker of the House, in ruling upon this identical question, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I would be glad to have the amendment read again, because there was such confusion I could not hear it.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has the right to the floor. The Chair recognized the gentleman on the point of order, and he is now entitled to be recognized on the merits of the proposition.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I do not desire the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, why should the Capitol police and the annual employés be paid this sum? Now, it may be possible that there is a sort of justice in paying the session employés, who were kept here for the three months and then there was an adjournment and near a month of recess until the regular session. They were therefore placed in the dilemma of paying their expenses, of going home and coming back, or their boarding expenses here; but that does not apply to the annual roll.

It does not apply to those who get an annual salary. They had made arrangements. They had obtained pay for the entire year, and that does not put them on an equality with the session employés, but actually gives them an extra month's pay during one-half of the year during which they have performed services. I therefore think that if the committee should see fit to give the session employés an extra month's pay, they should not give it to the annual employés. I therefore move that amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to offer a substitute, if the gentleman will allow me, and have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers the following substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kansas, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 23, 24, and 25, on page 8, and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, on page 9, and insert the following:

"To pay the session employés of the House of Representatives from November 4 to December 3, 1893, both days inclusive—

33 pages, $2.50 per diem each, $75	$2,475.00
21 committee clerks, $8 per diem each, $180	5,780.00
2 assistant committee clerks, $6 per diem each, $180	360.00
1 assistant index clerk, $6 per day	180.00
3 messengers, post-office, $900 per session each, $114.81	344.43
4 messengers, post-office, $100 per month each, $99.67	398.68
3 folders, Doorkeeper's office, $70 per month each, $69.77	209.31
2 messengers, Doorkeeper's office, $70 per month each, $69.77	139.54
10 laborers, $60 per month each, $59.80	598.00
Total	8,484.96"

Mr. AITKEN. Will the gentleman tell us who are left out of this substitute?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if I can get order, I will undertake to explain this resolution. I offer it as a substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kansas. It provides for the pay of session clerks and officers and employés of the House during the recess—that is, from the 4th day of November until the 4th day of December. The bill itself provides for certain legislation in the line of my amendment, proposing to pay certain of these session employés.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But, if the gentleman will permit me to explain, they are men who actually did service, and the bill simply proposes to pay them for that service.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes; the committee selects certain session employés and puts them in this bill. Now, I am here to assert that I know that other employés who are included in the amendment which I propose rendered just as efficient and continuous service as the gentlemen provided for in this bill. One of them, I am prepared to say, is the clerk of the Committee on Printing. He remained here, 900 miles from home, during the entire session, and did the work of that committee during the recess, and he is just as much entitled to pay as any of those included in the bill by the Committee on Appropriations. I agree that the employés included in this bill ought to be paid, that they were here doing service, but I insist that others are equally entitled to be paid.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman has misrepresented the committee and used a word which is possibly susceptible of an offensive construction. He says that the committee "selected" certain persons. Now, the fact is that the committee had nothing whatever to do with selecting them. The Doorkeeper and other officers of the House selected them without the knowledge of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I will not quarrel with my friend from Kentucky on that point——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. We do not know and do not care who they are.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I know you do not, nor do I know the names of all that are covered by my resolution; but I know that they are session employés who were kept here during the month of November.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But the gentleman's language seemed to imply that the committee had been partial in making selections.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I withdraw that. Now, I want to say that this amendment which I propose simply provides to pay the session employés who were kept here and did efficient work. Many of them I know, and it seems to me that they are just as much entitled to a month's pay as the parties who are included in this bill by the officers of the House whose suggestions were adopted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. AITKEN. Whom do you leave out that were included in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I leave out the Capitol police. They get pay for the month of November. I leave out all the annual employés of this House who get pay for the month of November. I do not propose to adopt an amendment which provides for paying them twice for the month of November, as the resolution of the gentleman from Kansas does.

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just a word. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] has given utterance to a statement which he probably would not have made if he had been acquainted with the facts. The employés for whom the Committee on Appropriations have recommended compensation are persons who were daily engaged in taking care of this Capitol. They were constantly employed every day in the week, except Sundays, in scrubbing the floors and corridors, in taking care of this Hall, and in other work, and the Committee on Appropriations thought it would not be improper to recommend the payment of those people who were so actively and continuously engaged in the service of Congress while Congress was not in session. The gentleman from Tennessee speaks as to his Committee on Printing, but was that committee in session during the recess?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No, it was not; but the clerk was in session doing the committee's work. Was the House in session when your scrubbers were working?

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman was not here during the recess, and he does not know and can not tell how many hours a day his clerk worked.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Can you tell how many hours the session folders were employed, or the scrubbers and other employés?

Mr. SAYERS. Every day, except Sundays.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Can you tell how much of the time the messengers and employés were employed?

Mr. SAYERS. We had the report from the Doorkeeper of the House that every day——

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I make the report in this case as chairman of the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAYERS. But you do not report that your clerk was at work every day.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I report that the room of the Committee on Printing was open every day——

Mr. SAYERS. That may have been.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. And the clerk was at his desk performing his duties.

Mr. SAYERS. What did he do?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. He did all that the clerk of that committee had to do.

Mr. SAYERS. What had he to do while Congress was in vacation? Please state that, if you can.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will, when you get through.

Mr. SAYERS. All that the Committee on Appropriations have done in this matter was simply this: The Doorkeeper was found to have had certain employés engaged in daily labor here during the vacation, and so was the Postmaster of the House. When they represented to the Committee on Appropriations that these employés had been engaged here every day except Sunday in manual labor, the committee thought it was only proper that we should recommend their payment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as I said when I offered this amendment, I am a new member, but I have been informed that it has been customary to adopt a proposition of this kind, and it has been done at the different sessions of Congress which have been named. These gentlemen borne upon the annual pay roll were brought here to attend the extra session. During the month intervening between that and the regular session they were either kept here, away from their homes, or returning to their homes, they were obliged to pay their way there and back.

These men having been kept here during that month, or compelled to go to their homes and return at their own expense, it seems to me it is not right to refuse them this month's extra pay. Certainly if it has been the custom of the House to grant this allowance at previous sessions of Congress, I think it ought to be done at this session. I simply submit the question, asking members to vote upon it as they think best. I believe that all the officers included in the amendment which I have submitted ought to have this extra month's pay. I hope we shall vote down the substitute.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the last extra session of Congress prior to the one called last August was the first session of the Forty-sixth Congress; and I wish to state that during the time I have been here it has been customary at the conclusion of a session, or sometime during the session, to vote an extra month's allowance to the employés of the House—the annual as well as the session employés. I know no class of men who are harder worked than are the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives. I know of no men who render to the Government service so difficult, so arduous, so straining upon the mind, so taxing upon the nervous system as that rendered by the intelligent corps of official reporters in this House and in the other.

I think, therefore, that if the House now intends to do an act of generosity toward any of its employés, it ought to do it in the large, liberal, broad spirit in which members have just voted to themselves compensation for traveling to and from Washington to attend upon the session of Congress. I do not speak in criticism of that action of the House, because I think that when an extra session is called the members and employés who come here in consequence of the exercise of this constitutional authority on the part of the President, are here in regular session with all the powers, duties, obligations, and emoluments belonging to a regular session.

It has not been unusual for Congress to pursue the course now proposed, and I wish to refer to some of the precedents on this subject. I do not see any reason why we should exclude from this provision the annual employés of the House any more than we should have excluded from the mileage provision just adopted the regular members of the House.

The last extra session of Congress, as I have stated, was the first session of the Forty-sixth Congress. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-sixth Congress, first session, page 2473, gives the following account of the unanimous passage of a resolution giv-

ing the employés on the annual roll of the House one month's extra compensation for their services in the extra session:

EXTRA PAY TO HOUSE EMPLOYES.

Mr. SINGLETON of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent to offer for present consideration a joint resolution to pay the employés of the House of Representatives borne on the annual roll one month's extra pay; and I wish to say just one word in explanation of it.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the employés of the House borne on the annual roll one month's extra pay at the same compensation as now paid them by law, and an amount sufficient to pay the same is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SINGLETON of Mississippi. I wish to say just one word in explanation.

Many MEMBERS. No objection; let it pass.

There was no objection, and the joint resolution (H. R. 119) was read three times and passed.

That resolution went to the Senate, and was adopted unanimously also by that body. This is all I care to say, Mr. Chairman, on the pending proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Upon examination of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas I find that it relates to different matters from those embraced in my amendment. I therefore withdraw my proposition in order that the vote may first be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas, after which I propose to renew my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee being withdrawn, the question is now upon the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment of Mr. CURTIS of Kansas was again read.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, there were, on a division (called for by Mr. HOLMAN)—ayes 139, noes 48.

So the amendment of Mr. CURTIS of Kansas was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the following employés who were necessarily employed by the Doorkeeper during the period from November 4 to December 3, 1893, namely: Two session folders, at $69.66 each; ten laborers, at $59.79 each; one riding page, $75, and one page in the folding room, $75; in all, $887.22.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word.

My amendment, suggested a few moments ago, was to strike out this item in the bill which provides for certain employés, session employés, and that they should be paid during the recess. The amendment which I offered strikes out that section and includes all the session employés of the House, and gives them pay for November; but, inasmuch as the committee has just adopted an amendment which will pay the session employés for the month of November at least once, I will not press the amendment, but withdraw it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move to strike out the paragraph just read, because since the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas these persons to whom the committee gave a month's pay for work done will get a month's pay under that resolution. Therefore there is no need for this provision in the bill.

The motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay Joel Grayson for services rendered in the document room since December 4, 1893, and to continue him in said service until and including December 31, 1894, at $75 per month, $963.59.

To pay the following employés who were necessarily employed by the Postmaster during the period from November 4 to December 3, 1893, namely: Three messengers at $114.60 each, and four messengers at $99.67 cents each; in all, $742.48.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out from the bill the paragraph beginning with line 12 down to and including line 18, for the same reason that the former paragraph was stricken out a few moments ago, these employés being provided for in the amendment adopted a short time ago.

The motion to strike out was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the committee rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HATCH reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4763, had directed him to report the same favorably to the House with sundry amendments, and as so amended that it do pass.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments?

Mr. BLAND. I demand a separate vote on the extra mileage and stationery amendment.

The SPEAKER. To what amendment does the gentleman refer?

Mr. HOLMAN. It is the amendment in regard to mileage.

Mr. LYNCH. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES].

The SPEAKER. That will be reserved for a separate vote.

Mr. WAUGH. I would like a separate vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] as to the pay of special examiners.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I understand that two separate votes are demanded, then, one on the mileage and one on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. WAUGH. I withdraw that.

Mr. BLAND. A separate vote is demanded on the whole amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is also desired to have a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] providing extra pay for annual employés.

Mr. EVERETT. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the vote for the mileage and stationery were on separate amendments.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It was the same amendment, but we simply divided it.

The SPEAKER. That is correct. A separate vote will be had on the entire amendment of the gentleman from Iowa and on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. There being no other separate votes demanded, I ask a vote on the remaining amendments.

The remaining amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES].

The amendment was again read.

Mr. WELLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

On the demand for the yeas and nays there were ayes 31.

Mr. HOLMAN. The other side.

The negative vote was taken.

The SPEAKER. On the demand for the yeas and nays the ayes are 31 and the noes 183.

Mr. BLAND. I demand tellers on the yeas and nays, and pending that I move when the House adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is a dilatory motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] demands tellers on the yeas and nays, and pending that he moves that when the House adjourns to-day, it be to meet on Thursday next.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLAND) there were—ayes 8, noes 215.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House take a recess for one hour.

The question being taken, there were no votes in the affirmative.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. I renew my motion that when the House adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next. That is in order, because we have voted on the other motion since.

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest to the House that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] and all other gentlemen are willing to proceed, provided they can have a yea-and-nay vote, and I think they are entitled to that. The House will save time by according them a roll call.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] that we are paying $60 an hour for gas for such silliness as this.

Mr. BLAND. I have taken my stand against this, and I will not permit it to pass if I can help it, unless we can have the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. What is the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. BLAND. I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I raise the point of order that that motion has just been voted upon.

Mr. HAYES. I am advised by the opponents of this measure that they will vote upon a yea-and-nay vote, so that it will not be used for the purpose of breaking a quorum. In view of that, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be taken upon this proposition.

Several members objected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLAND) there were—ayes 6, noes 186.

Mr. BLAND. I demand tellers.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of very grave importance that we should pass this bill as early as possible, and I for one do not desire to have any Committee on Rules to bring in a motion; and I am very willing to make a proposition, if the House will agree to it. It is stated that there will be no filibustering on it hereafter, and I am willing to make a proposition that a yea-and-nay vote shall be had on this proposition.

Mr. BLAND. On this and on the bill.

Mr. REED. Regular order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If the House will give me its attention for a moment I will make this proposition. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] wants a yea-and-nay vote on the mileage proposition——

A MEMBER. That has been settled by the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Then notice has been given by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] that he intends to move to recommit this bill, and I suppose he will want a yea-and-nay vote on that. Now that means an hour or two hours more this afternoon.

Mr. BLAND. Let us adjourn and take it up to-morrow.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. That is impossible, in view of the necessities of the public service.

Mr. BLAND. This bill shall not be run through here if I can help it without the yeas and nays. You may bring in a rule and gag it through if you want to.

Mr. REED. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] if it does not require one-fifth to get the yeas and nays under the Constitution?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Undoubtedly.

Mr. REED. Is any less number competent to obtain the yeas and nays?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I do not think less than one-fifth can force the House to that when objection is made; but this is a very important matter. I will say that the somewhat brusque manner of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] does not irritate me at all, because I know at the bottom he is brave and honest and wants to do what is right, although he may be a little scant in his manners.

Mr. BLAND. I intend to use every means in my command to defeat this bill unless I can have a yea-and-nay vote upon that proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I am perfectly willing to make any arrangement that will be satisfactory. I am willing to have a yea-and-nay vote upon the final passage of the bill and upon this proposition; but I do not wish to be confronted with filibustering on this proposition and again on the proposition to pay the clerks an extra month and again on the part of the gentleman from Indiana on his proposition. I will agree that there shall be a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment and a yea-and-nay vote on the final passage of the bill; and if that is agreeable to everybody, the gentleman from Indiana as well as the gentleman from Missouri, that is the proposition I want to submit.

Mr. BLAND. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is not important to have a yea-and-nay vote upon the final passage of the bill, but I would like to be able to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to recommit on the pension question. That only makes two.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. That makes three.

Mr. HOLMAN. But I will not filibuster.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of public business and in the expedition of business and keeping open the public bureaus, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, and if that be agreed to I shall ask for the yeas and nays upon agreeing to the amendment and upon the final passage of the bill, the understanding being that there is to be no filibustering if that agreement is reached.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not think the gentleman need to ask the yeas and nays upon the final passage of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. There are a great many gentlemen who say they want to have the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman from Missouri stated that he desired to have the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill; and the gentleman generally knows what he wants.

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall ask for the yeas and nays on a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the order refusing the yeas and nays be reconsidered, and that the yeas and nays be considered as ordered upon the pending amendment.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a great majority have voted against ordering the yeas and nays, and I do not suppose that the action of the majority should be overruled by the minority.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a great many members, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from New York objects also. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Division.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, immediately preceding the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to adjourn he submitted a demand for tellers, but tellers did not take their places on the demand for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had made that demand for tellers, but they had not been ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. And he had waived that by the other motions he made.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws his motion, and that allows the question to recur on the demand for tellers, and the question is whether the yeas and nays shall be ordered on a vote by tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri rose and said he demanded tellers, but before the Chair submitted that question there was some colloquy with a view to settlement.

Mr. BLAND. I had made the motion that the House adjourn. I withdrew this motion and the demand for tellers, in order to arrange with the gentleman from Kentucky that we reconsider the vote by which the House refused the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The motion to reconsider is in order. The question is upon the motion to reconsider the vote by which the House refused the yeas and nays, and a division is demanded on that question.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 50, noes 154.

So the House refused to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BLAND. I demand tellers on that.

The question was taken on ordering tellers.

The SPEAKER. Sixteen gentlemen have arisen; not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

Mr. BLAND. I renew my motion that when the House adjourns to-day, it be to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Speaker announced that the noes had it, and the House refused to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused. I understand that proposition was agreed to. The yeas and nays are refused, tellers are refused, and the amendment is agreed to; as I understand that, the House has voted to agree to this amendment. I make that point. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question was pending on agreeing to the amendment when the majority voted in favor of it.

Mr. BLAND. The motion was simply to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused. The motion now is upon the motion to agree to the amendment. Now, I demand tellers on the motion to agree to the amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to correct my statement, Mr. Speaker. I stated that the question had been put on all the propositions. The gentleman from Wisconsin demanded a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is correct. No vote was taken. The gentleman from Wisconsin demanded the yeas and nays, so that the vote has not been taken on agreeing to the amendment. The question is now upon the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Pending that, I move that when House adjourns to-day, it be to meet on Thursday next.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 196.

Mr. BLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays; when, on a division, there were—ayes 9, noes 185.

So the House refused to order the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 180.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. BLAND. I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken, and two members rose in support of the demand: not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House take a recess until 7 o'clock.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. BLAND, and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 204; so the motion to take a recess until 7 o'clock was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until half past 6 o'clock.

The question was taken, and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 200.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I present a report from the Committee on Rules, and demand the previous question upon its adoption.

The report was read, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the vote shall be taken on the amendments now pending to the bill H. R. 4763 and on the final passage of the said bill, and no other motion shall be entertained by the Speaker until said bill is disposed of, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] has the floor. [Applause.]

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that it is a matter of importance——

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. I understand the rule to be that pending a report of the Committee on Rules one dilatory motion is in order. The gentleman has offered his resolution and demanded the previous question upon it. Now, pending that I have a right under the rule to move that the House adjourn.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have not yielded the floor, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. "One motion to adjourn" is the language of the rule.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have not yielded the floor, though.

Mr. BLAND. I do not understand that the rule limits the time for adjournment.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. That is your misfortune. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The language of the rule is "one motion to adjourn." A motion to adjourn, and a motion to adjourn to a day certain, are entirely distinct under the rules. One would require a quorum; the other would not.

Mr. BLAND. Then I can make the motion afterwards.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that it is a matter of great importance that this matter shall be speedily disposed of by the House. It is quite evident that it is not the temper of the House to have a yea-and-nay vote on these amendments. The intention of the House has been repeatedly manifested. It is also evident that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] does not intend that we shall be allowed to come to a vote except upon his own terms. Therefore it has been deemed proper to bring in this rule, so that if the House does wish to come to a vote and dispose of this bill it shall have an opportunity to do so. Having said this, I move the previous question.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, after the previous question is ordered will there not be time for debate?

The SPEAKER. There will not.

Mr. BLAND. Then do I understand that the gentleman from Mississippi has made this statement simply to cut off debate? [Laughter, and cries of "Regular order!"]

The question was taken on ordering the previous question, and the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 198, noes 16.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. SNODGRASS called for the yeas and nays on ordering the previous question.

The question being taken on ordering the previous question, there were—ayes 13, noes 198.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, there were, on a division (called for by Mr. BLAND)—ayes 7, noes 162.

So the House refused to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules.

The question being taken, there were, on a division (called for by Mr. BLAND)—ayes 187, noes 13.

So the resolution was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The vote will now be taken on the amendment, which has already been reported by the Clerk, but which will be again read.

The Clerk again read the amendment in regard to mileage and stationery for Senators and Representatives.

The question being taken,

The SPEAKER. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. BLAND. I call for a division.

The question being again taken; there were—ayes 179, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been refused.

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a question of order. We have been proceeding to vote under a resolution from the Committee on Rules. Before the reporting of that resolution the question just put by the Chair had already been voted upon, as it has been voted upon just now.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Wisconsin demanded the yeas and nays before any vote had been taken.

Mr. BLAND. The report of the Committee on Rules is that we proceed to vote upon these amendments. How are we to vote except under the rules of the House, which secure us the right to the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER. We are to vote under the rules; but under the rules and the Constitution the yeas and nays had been refused.

Mr. BLAND. Not under the special rule under which we are now operating. The special rule reported by the Committee on Rules provides that at a certain time we shall proceed to vote on this amendment. Now, how are we to vote? If we have a right to vote by a standing vote, or by tellers, we certainly have a right to vote by yeas and nays. We are not proceeding under the regular rules of the House, but under a special rule, which orders a vote on this question, and that special rule supersedes all that has passed.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAND. It takes this matter out of the operation of the rules under which we were operating before. How can the Speaker put the question to a vote at all unless under the special rule reported by the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, the House was proceeding with the consideration of the pending bill, and had agreed to all the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole except two. In the progress of the consideration of these amendments the gentleman from Missouri, exercising his undoubted right under the general rules of the House, was making motions to adjourn and to fix a day to which the House should adjourn—motions which the rules recognize. The report from the Committee on Rules was not designed, as the Chair understands, to change in any way whatever the method of voting; its only purpose was to limit the motions that may be made.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. BLAND. The Speaker will pardon me for saying that the report of the Committee on Rules itself provides that at a certain time a vote shall be taken on these amendments. Now, certainly a vote means a vote under the rules of the House and under the Constitution, which may be a rising vote, or a vote by tellers, or a vote by yeas and nays. This resolution reported by the Committee on Rules has displaced the prior proceeding, and we are now proceeding under a special rule reported by the Committee on Rules. If we have a right to vote upon the question at all, we certainly have a right to a constitutional vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the stage of proceeding where the yeas and nays might be demanded on this particular amendment is passed, because the gentleman from Missouri or some other gentleman asked for the yeas and nays and the House refused them, and it subsequently refused to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays had been refused. So that the question before the House prior to the report of the Committee on Rules was upon agreeing to this amendment. The

status of the question was, that the yeas and nays had been demanded and refused; a motion had been made to reconsider the vote upon ordering the yeas and nays, and that had been determined in the negative; so that the pending question upon the bill was, Shall the amendment be agreed to?

But the House could not reach a vote upon that question because of intervening motions—motions to adjourn, motions for a recess, etc., which are recognized by the rules. The only purpose or scope of this report from the Committee on Rules, as the Chair understands, is that the House shall proceed under the rules, in view of what has passed, to vote without the intervention of motions which under the general rules would be permissible.

Mr. BLAND rose. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLAND. I do not wish to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, but I do wish to protest against bringing in a rule that cuts off debate and also the yeas and nays, forcing the House to act upon this bill under a gag law. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remaining amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House, borne on the annual and session rolls on the 3d day of November, 1893, including the Capitol police and Official Reporters of the Senate and House of Representatives for extra services during the Fifty-third Congress, a sum equal to one month's pay at the compensation then paid them by law, the same to be immediately available.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment,

The SPEAKER. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SAYERS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered, only 25 voting in favor thereof.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was then ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is now, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BLAND. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to recommit the bill with the instructions which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to add the following provision to the clause in relation to the Pension Office, on page 4 of the bill:

Provided, however, That the special agents and other persons who shall be paid per diem and expenses under the foregoing appropriation of $200,000 shall be employed exclusively on the investigation of original pension claims and claims for increase of pension.

The question being taken on the motion to recommit, it was rejected, there being on a division (called for by Mr. HOLMAN)—ayes 4, noes 209.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs, Shall the bill pass? on which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] demands the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays; there were—ayes 25, noes 184.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand tellers on the yeas and nays.

Tellers were refused, 17 members only voting in favor thereof.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNODGRASS. As we have been denied the right to record our votes on this bill, would it be in order for me to say that I am against it?

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order. The yeas and nays have been refused.

The question recurred on the passage of the bill.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 198, noes 25.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid upon the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT, DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a conference report pending on an urgency deficiency bill, which it is important should be acted upon at all events not later than to-morrow. If the House prefers I will call it up now.

Several MEMBERS. Call it up.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up for present consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and ask that the Clerk read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, to the bill H. R. 4177, have been unable to agree on said amendment.

The committee of conference recommend that Senate amendment numbered 2, which was agreed to on a report of a former committee of conference, be stricken from the bill and omitted in the enrollment made thereof, as that provision has since been enacted on a joint resolution.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,
JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. M. COCKRELL,
A. P. GORMAN,
S. M. CULLOM,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, there is one proposition involved in this report which was not strictly within the jurisdiction of the conference committee. That proposition embraces a clause which was put upon the urgent deficiency bill by the Senate, providing for the issuance of diplomas to certain exhibitors at the late World's Fair in Chicago.

At the close of the recent extraordinary session of Congress a resolution was passed by the House, and also by the Senate, and is now the law making provision for the same purpose, and inasmuch as the Senate amendment has been already agreed to by both Houses, the conference committee thought it was the proper thing to call the attention of the House to it, and ask the House to direct the enrolling clerk to leave the Senate amendment out of the bill when it finally passes both Houses.

The other proposition—that on which we have been unable to agree—refers to the amendment of the Senate which provides an appropriation for Senators' clerks during the vacation of Congress in the year 1890. The conferees on the part of the House have been unable to agree to that amendment; and we have therefore brought the bill back to the House for the purpose of taking its further sense in that regard.

Mr. COOMBS. I move that the House recede from its disagreement.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on agreeing to the report.

The report of the conference committee was agreed to.

Mr. SAYERS. I now move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. COOMBS. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and agree to the same, and on that I desire to be heard briefly.

Mr. SAYERS. I shall not detain the House but a few moments, Mr. Speaker. I ask that the amendment on which the conferees have been unable to agree be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, after line 12, insert:

"To pay clerks to Senators, and per diem clerks, and those retained in the service of the Senate during the recess of the Fifty-first Congress, on the resolution of the Senate of September 30, 1890, $22,088."

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, that the House may thoroughly understand the proposition involved in this amendment of the Senate, I will call your attention to the fact that during the Fifty-first Congress, for the intermission between the first and second sessions of that Congress, the Senate had passed a resolution continuing the clerks of Senators from the date of adjournment of the first session to the beginning of the next session. When Congress convened in the second session of the Fifty-first Congress, and the deficiency bill went over to the Senate, the Senate placed an amendment upon the bill providing for the payment of these clerks. The conferees on the part of the House in that Congress objected, and brought the question to this body for its consideration. The House declined to recede from its position and insisted upon the objection. The Senate receded, and the bill was passed without this provision. The same thing occurred at the first session of the Fifty-second Congress and also at the second session. It has also occurred, so far as concerns the action of the House, on three occasions, I believe, two at least, during the extraordinary session of the present Congress.

In view of these circumstances, your conferees believed that it was but right that this matter should be again brought to the attention of the House for its ultimate decision.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will ask, first, whether this is to pay the Senate clerks for the month or two that there was between the first and second sessions of the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Secondly, whether since that time appropriations have not been made to make these Senate employés annual?

Mr. SAYERS. They have been.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And if this appropriation is made, or if the House recedes, it simply pays the Senate clerks for the month or two specified, and gives them for that year what they now get by appropriation?

Mr. SAYERS. It does.

Mr. AITKEN. What does the committee think about receding from its opposition?

Mr. SAYERS. Well, I will state to the gentleman very frankly that I am personally opposed to receding. I do not think these gentlemen ought to be paid.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is there any appropriation in this bill for the payment of members' clerks for the month of November?

Mr. SAYERS. No, sir; but there is for the remainder of the present session. I wish to further call the attention of the committee to this fact: that there is a provision upon this bill for the payment of members' clerks from December until the close of this session, but not for the recess.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is there any provision for the payment of members' clerks for the month of November, 1893, while the House was not in session?

Mr. SAYERS. There is no provision of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Would it be proper to insert such a provision?

Mr. SAYERS. I am opposed to such appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. My question is, whether it is possible to provide it?

Mr. McMILLIN. There is no law authorizing their employment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I am aware of that, but it is not impossible to make a law.

Mr. McMILLIN. But not on an appropriation bill, if the rules are complied with.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. From the parliamentary standpoint, I think it is fair to say to the gentleman that this is a motion to recede, and that motion is amendable. We could recede with an amendment to pay for clerical assistance in the House for the month of November, or such portion of it as the House was not in session.

Mr. HOLMAN. That would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not think so.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is no law authorizing it. I think it is clear.

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] for a couple of minutes.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I have fully sustained and supported the committee in its disagreement to this amendment of the Senate heretofore; but it is well known that this bill failed during the last session of Congress because the Senate refused to recede from this amendment. They have taken the responsibility of making this appropriation; and while I think that this House ought not to be required to endorse the action of the Senate, yet I think the House has sufficiently emphasized its position, and that we have stood out as long as we ought to; and I, for one, am in favor of agreeing to this amendment, and of letting the responsibility rest where it belongs, with the Senate.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield to my colleague [Mr. HUTCHESON].

Mr. HUTCHESON. I very much wish that my colleague [Mr. SAYERS] would consent that the matter go over until to-morrow. I would not interpose any obstructive measures if there was a free, open opportunity for discussion. But I do not think that it is the proper time now to consider it. I think it is at least due to me that I should have an opportunity to present my views upon it, because of the situation in which I was placed before this honorable body in the closing hours of the last session. Unless such opportunity is given, I shall feel disposed to be obstructive this evening, and I do not desire to be.

Mr. SAYERS. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have as much as ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HUTCHESON. The House is in no temper to hear me now, and may not be in the morning, but I think we ought to give this matter some little discussion. I think it is due to me, if anything is due to me from this House. I do not know that it is, but I would like to have an opportunity to discuss this matter in the morning, and, therefore, I hope the gentleman will consent to an adjournment. I hate to move to adjourn.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, and the fact that a quorum is not present, I move that the House do now adjourn, with the understanding that the report will come up first thing in the morning.

The SPEAKER. It is a matter of privilege.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. WASHINGTON, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SMITH of Illinois, for this day, on account of sickness.

The motion to adjourn was then agreed to.

And accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. McLAURIN, from the Committee on War Claims, reported the bill (H. R. 2714) for the relief of the Newberry College; which, with the accompanying report, No. 233, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4860) to amend "An act for the erection of an appraiser's warehouse in the city of New York, and for other puposes," approved September 14, 1888—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRETZ: A bill (H. R. 4861) to provide for the levying of an income tax to pay pensions—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN: A bill (H. R. 4862) to authorize the withdrawal from settlement or sale of gold and silver bearing lands within the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 4863) to prevent the adulteration and misbranding of foods and drugs, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 4896) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present ratio and upon equal terms—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 102) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan the Columbian caravals to "The American National Red Cross," incorporated—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: A resolution fixing the time for the consideration of House bill 286—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of West Virginia: A resolution that there be printed for the use of the House 5,000 copies of the bill (H. R. 4864) entitled a bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and the report thereon (No. 234)—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of Levander Jenkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 4866) for the relief of the heirs of William Freeman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4867) for the relief of David C. Dane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Sylvanus F. Tullis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) for the relief of Robert Spaugh—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) to pension James O. Lawlis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) for the relief of Mary Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) for the relief of A. J. Abbot—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) for the relief of William J. Alexander—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the relief of Susan Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Reep—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) for the relief of John Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also a bill (H. R. 4877) to increase the pension of Charles H. Twomey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4878) for the relief of John Gibson—to Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4879) for the relief of Pay Inspector John H. Stevenson, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 4880) to amend an act of Congress, approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Tellesse W. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4882) for the relief of Gustavus A. Balzer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 4883) granting a pension to Caroline Loper, formerly Caroline Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONEY: A bill (H. R. 4884) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to Thomas P. Allen, late of Company D, Fourteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 4885) granting a pension to Julia Roberts Oldbert, of Manchester, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 4886) for the relief of F. F. White—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4887) for the relief of Mrs. Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Joseph Watts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4889) making appropriation for improving the harbor at St. Joseph, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) for the improvement of St. Joseph River, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) making appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of South Haven, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4892) to authorize the appointment of a commission to draft a code of laws for Alaska, and other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) for relief of the heirs of Andrew J. Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4894) to grant a pension to Louis C. Schilling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4895) to grant a pension to Mrs. Helena Lynde Dent—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Protest of the officers and employés of the Southwork Foundry and Machine Company of Philadelphia, without regard to previous political differences, against the passage of the Wilson bill by the House of Representatives, to the end that by the continuance of the present tariff prosperity may be again restored to them and to the whole country—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Papers to accompany House bill 4841—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, indorsing House bill 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection of animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Art Students' League of New York, in favor of free art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union, No. 2, against the incorporation into the tariff law of a certain provision relating to the importation of scientific books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Remonstrance of operatives of Singleton Worsted Mills, of Franklin, Mass., against woolen and worsted schedules of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of employés of Merchants' Woolen Company, of Dedham, Mass, against passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of employés of Boston Tread and Twine Company, of Jamaica Plain, Mass., against reduction of duty on manufactures of flax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of Hand Manufacturing Company, of Oregon, protesting against the reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, of the Willamette Steam Mill and Manufacturing Company, of Portland, Oregon, protesting against the reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Remonstrance of dealers in playing cards, citizens of Minneapolis, against the proposed increase of tax on playing cards, as proposed in the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEIFER: Petition of merchants, jobbers, and dealers in playing cards of St. Paul, Minn., against putting a tariff on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Papers to accompany House bill 4850—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LE FEVER: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Papers to accompany House bill 4717—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany House bill 4852—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of 135 hatters of Yonkers, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of citizens of Lacrosse County, Wis., farmers and dealers in barley, against the reduction of the duty and the change from specific to ad valorem proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Remonstrance of 180 citizens of the northwestern part of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Memorial of citizens of Allegheny, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAWNEY (by request): Amendment to bill (H. R. 3247) to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: Resolution of Guernsey Lodge, No. 47, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Ohio, protesting against any reduction in the tariff duty on sheet iron and steel—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Petition for the relief of Richard Compton, of Winston County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINANCE REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the year 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RENT OF BASEMENT OF UNION BUILDING.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate by the Postmaster-General for the appropriation of $2,000 for rent of part of basement of the Union Building, on G street, in the city of Washington, used for the purpose of storing the accumulated files and papers removed on the 1st of July last from the Busch Building, on E street, to secure the safety of that building; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting in response to a resolution of the 18th instant, a list of the judgments of the Court of Claims rendered since March, 1893; which (on motion of Mr. CHANDLER) was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of ten cigar manufacturers, citizens of Ohio, praying for the imposition of a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent on all unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Morgan and Putnam Counties, Ohio, praying for an investi-

gation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HILL presented the petition of Mrs. Eugenia R. Sweeny, of New York, widow of Gen. Thomas W. Sweeney, praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WHITE of California presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the removal of obstructions in the harbor of San Francisco, Cal.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of W. E. Alden and 4 other citizens of Auburn, Me., manufacturers and makers of cigars, praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of 256 hat makers of Danbury, Conn., praying that the present duty on fur felt hats be retained; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of Jane T. Smith, of Los Angeles, Cal., praying that she be granted a pension. The petition is accompanied with the affidavit of J. T. Easley, of Missouri. I move that the petition and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. I present the memorial of William H. Lynch and 267 other citizens of Danbury, Conn., engaged in the manufacture of hats, remonstrating against certain proposed changes in the tariff on imported hats and hat material. They are workingmen, and are supposed to represent all persons engaged in this branch.

Mr. HOAR. Are they workingmen at work now?

Mr. HAWLEY. Five-sixths of them are not at work now, I am sorry to say. More than two thousand are idle. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of John Goodrow and 10 other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF ROADS.

Mr. HOAR. I present the petition of about 150,000 citizens of the United States, praying for the establishment of a department of roads as a department of executive administration of the National Government.

I desire to state that these petitioners have caused a very thorough investigation to be made, and they have ascertained that most enormous savings may be realized in the transaction of our domestic and interstate commerce, and in the transaction of almost every business by an improvement in the character of our roads, which in many parts of the country, indeed, in all parts of the country, are very far behind the roads which exist in foreign countries, especially on the continent of Europe and in England.

This matter has from a small beginning grown in the public estimation so that now this request is made by nearly 150,000, among them the best and most intelligent citizens of the country. The petition is indorsed by about a thousand newspapers. Attached to the petition are the names of seventeen governors of American States, many State officers, many judges of State courts, and, speaking now for my own State, it has the indorsement of the State Legislature and the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

I respectfully request that the petition be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which seems to me to be the most appropriate committee for its consideration, and that the petition, without the signatures, be printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, a word only supplemental to the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, with the consent of the Senate.

I am somewhat familiar with the petition. Copies were scattered throughout the country for signature I think early in the last Congress. The reading of the petitions will evidence the fact that certainly from a year to a year and a half ago they were started on their mission to obtain signatures. The prayer is for the establishment of a department of roads, similar to the Department of Agriculture. I doubt very much whether the petitioners have weighed fully exactly the full import and extent of that prayer. While the subject of good roads is one that commends itself to everyone, while that cause has no greater or firmer friend than myself, I certainly would not favor the establishment of another Cabinet officer and a department akin to that of the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of taking charge of this question.

Largely because of the action and work of the newspapers in this direction there was appropriated in the last Congress, my recollection is, $10,000, for the purpose of establishing in the Department of Agriculture a bureau or division that should investigate the subject and give to the public such information concerning the practical making of roads as would be advisable. I think that perhaps answers to a very large extent the desire of these petitioners. I doubt very much whether, when they come to fully consider the matter, they would desire to go further except to maintain that bureau, which is now doing very effective work under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HOAR. The petition which has been presented asks the Senate to consider this question and to hear the views of the petitioners, and it comes from persons whose words do not fall to the ground and who are not accustomed lightly or without reflection to make such a request. I am a little surprised that my honored and intelligent friend from Nebraska takes the attitude of saying that he would never do such a thing before he has heard the petitioners; but I am inclined to think that when he has heard the petition and the petitioners he will do what takes place in other like cases.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single observation on this subject. While I am quite as anxious as the Senator who has presented the petition to do anything that Congress can consistently do to improve the roads of the country, I wish to call attention to the fact that the promoter of this matter, as it has come to my knowledge, is the leading manufacturer of bicycles in the United States, and I venture the suggestion that I trust if Congress does act favorably in any direction upon the question presented in the petition, the gentleman who has sent out the petitions and spent a great deal of money to produce what is now before the Senate may be influenced in some way to take into consideration the propriety of reducing the exorbitant prices that he asks for his bicycles, in the interests of the small boys of the country.

Mr. COCKRELL. The suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire is exceedingly pertinent.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent, as the petition is very short, that it be either read or printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE. Not the names?

Mr. MANDERSON. Not the names, simply the body of the petition. It is very short. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does the Senator mean a picture of the whole thing, and the contents? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANDERSON. Oh, no; the body of the petition.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the petition will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOAR. As the extraordinary course is pursued of undertaking to discuss a respectful petition before it is heard, I wish to say that I do not know who has promoted this petition or what the business is of anyone who has promoted it, but if it be true that the representative of the interests of the bicycle has an interest in it and has promoted it, I do not think that is any cause either for taunt, or for condemnation, or for sneers.

The bicycle is the poor man's chariot. Its invention and perfection within the last twenty or twenty-five years have made it possible for poor men to live at a distance from their places of work instead of living in the crowded and unhealthy parts of cities. Poor men who can not afford to keep a carriage get innocent, healthy, and harmless recreation and enjoyment, and exercise from it. It comes with very ill grace from Senators who peer out of their luxurious carriage windows drawn by elegant spans of horses to sneer at the man who finds his recreation in the bicycle.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single further observation in reply to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I think he entirely misapprehended what I said. I certainly want the boys and poor men of the country to have a better chance to use this carriage than they have at the present time. It is a fact well known to everybody who has made the slightest investigation of the matter that the bicycles which to-day are selling for $150 apiece do not cost 25 per cent of the money that is charged to the poor men the Senator alludes to who are using them. My contention is that if the prayer of this petition is to be granted some concession should be made by the chief petitioner in the direction of a proper reduction in price of the article he manufactures.

Mr. President, I know from knowledge who has promoted this scheme, and while it may be meritorious in itself I do not think that the Senator from Massachusetts ought to take offense at the suggestion I made in behalf of the poor men and poor boys of the country. I did not sneer at the matter at all. I believe in good roads as sincerely as the Senator from Massachusetts does, or as Mr. Albert A. Pope, of Boston, does, whose name appears on the petition as the promoter of this scheme. If the heading

to the petition is read it will appear that I stated the exact truth when I said this matter had been promoted and a great deal of money had been spent in securing the petitions by the leading manufacturer of bicycles in the United States. That is all I care to say about it.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, one word further. My honorable friend, if I mistake not, is a doctor by profession, and as he has stated, without I think knowing much about it, what is the motive of the gentleman who makes bicycles, I suppose it is equally proper for me to suggest that perhaps unconsciously to himself he may have a professional desire to have men cease to purchase the health-giving bicycle and save up their money to buy his pills. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is right in the suggestion that I at one time was a doctor. I will simply add the suggestion that if I could persuade myself that by any professional prescription I could bring the Senator from Massachusetts to permit other Senators, without unjust criticism on his part, the privileges of the Senate to the extent that he himself claims them, I should be very glad to give him a gratuitous prescription for that purpose. [Laughter.]

The petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed as a document, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, hereby most respectfully petition that there be founded in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, a road department, similar to the Agricultural Department, for the purpose of promoting knowledge in the art of constructing and maintaining roads; and we ask that in such department provision be made for teaching students so that they may become skilled road engineers.

In connection with this road department, we request that there be established a permanent exhibit in which shall be shown sections of roads illustrating various methods of construction and also the best road materials and machinery.

We further petition that Congress appropriate funds sufficient to erect a building at the World's Columbian Exposition for the purpose of a comprehensive road exhibit.

NOTE.—When this sheet is filled with names please attach other sheets and secure as many signatures as possible. When this is done please forward it before January 1, 1893, to the address given below. Copies of this petition have been sent to various parts of the country, and it is hoped that at least a million signatures will be secured.

All petitions sent in before January 1 will be united in one great petition, which will be presented to Congress and the result will be, no doubt, the establishment of a road department, an institute of road engineering, and a permanent road exhibit in the city of Washington, and a comprehensive exhibit of the construction and maintenance of roads at the World's Columbian Exposition.

ALBERT A. POPE.

P. O. Box B, Boston, Mass.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VOORHEES, from the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 913) for the relief of Louis L. Williams, reported it without amendment.

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 12) for the restoration of the books of the Beaufort Library Society, of Beaufort, S. C., reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 15) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 266) providing for the erection of an equestrian statue of Gen. Francis Marion, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 14) providing for the purchase of historical manuscripts relating to the District of Columbia, and to the public buildings, public institutions, and memorial works of art in said District, reported adversely thereon, and the joint resolution was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 2) authorizing the issue of duplicate medals where the originals have been lost or destroyed, reported adversely thereon, and the joint resolution was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 180) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to purchase "Townsend's Library of National, State, and Individual Records, comprising a collection of historical records concerning the origin, progress, and consequences of the late civil war," reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 574) for the relief of Dwight Hall, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 348) for the relief of John H. Russell, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1342) granting an increase of pension to Louis C. Schilling; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1343) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Joseph G. Utter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. By request I introduce a bill to secure aërial navigation. If that can be done it will dispense with the necessity of so many good roads. I think the bill should go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 1344) to secure aërial navigation was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WHITE of California introduced a bill (S. 1345) for the relief of Dr. James L. Ord, late acting assistant surgeon United States Army, at Fort Grant, Ariz.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1346) for the relief of James S. Crawford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1347) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for irrigating canals or ditches across Indian reservations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1348) for the relief of Frederick Carlisle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 1349) authorizing the purchase of a portrait of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a bill (S. 1350) for the relief of the heirs of Abel Walker, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1351) for the relief of Thomas H. Cristmas, administrator of James R. West, deceased, of Holmes County, Miss.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1352) for the relief of Eleam W. Pullen; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 1353) to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of benevolent and fraternal societies and orders and institutions of learning, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1354) granting a pension to Marrilla Parsons, of Detroit, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

TREASURY ACCOUNTS.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to cause the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to reëxamine the following Treasury settlements heretofore certified to Congress for appropriations, and numbered 7206, 152, 175, 700, of the year 1883, and 2463, 2464, of the year 1884, amounting in all to the sum of $35,791.67; and to submit the reasons for said certification and a detailed statement of the facts upon which said claims originated.

TARIFF POLICY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution and ask that it lie on the table. I desire to give notice that at an early day after the holiday recess I shall call up the resolution for the purpose of submitting some remarks on the general subject of the tariff.

The resolution was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That in view of the widespread industrial depression existing in our land, bringing disaster to the manufacturing interest and loss of employment and suffering to the wage-earning classes, it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that it is unwise to attempt any change in the tariff laws now on the statute books during the present Administration, believing as we do that the announcement that the protection to American industries and American labor secured by the McKinley tariff law is to be continued will reopen the factories and workshops of the country, giving remunerative employment to the hundreds of thousands of operatives now in enforced idleness, thus doing away with the suffering and destitution which prevail to a greater extent than ever before in the history of the United States.

LAND IN PORTLAND, OREGON.

Mr. DOLPH submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all papers and correspondence relating to the claim of the city of Portland, Oregon, for a special assessment against

lots 1, 2, 7, 8 in block 172 in said city, being the block upon which the United States public building is situated, for the improvement of Morrison street, in said city, adjacent to said lots.

USE OF FORD'S THEATER BUILDING.

Mr. VOORHEES submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Ford Theater Disaster:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that the survivors of the Ford's Theater disaster are to be returned to said building for their official work: *Be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it would be unwise, cruel, and unsafe to ever again occupy said building with employés of the Government for clerical purposes; that in view of the dreadful disasters which have taken place within its walls, and which have filled it for all time to come with the most shocking and painful associations, said building should be used by the Government as a museum devoted to scientific purposes, or torn down and totally demolished.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have leave to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to call up the concurrent resolution that was yesterday reported back from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BRAZILIAN CABLE LINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 19th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State inform the Senate whether permission has been granted to any foreign cable telegraph company to land its line on the coast of the United States since the 1st day of March, 1893; and whether permission had been refused such company prior to that date. Also, what reasons now exist for granting such permission, if it was granted, that did not pertain when it was previously refused.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a local bill which will take but a moment.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have a resolution coming over from yesterday called up, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. The bill to which I refer will take but a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business has closed, and the resolution coming over from yesterday, referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, will be read.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to inquire what is the present state of the resolution to which I called attention a moment ago? The resolution was offered in the Senate in relation to the appointment of a joint committee to examine into and report upon the present condition of the maritime canal of Nicaragua, and went to the Committee on Contingent Expenses. That committee reported it back favorably. I desire to know whether I have not the right or the privilege of calling that resolution up in the morning hour?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the resolution to which the Senator from Alabama refers is on the Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN. It is so marked, Mr. President, but I do not quite see why a resolution should lose its privilege of consideration because it is necessary to refer it to a committee. When the committee report comes back it seems to me that the resolution ought to occupy its place in the morning business.

Mr. COCKRELL. Being a concurrent resolution, it is the same as a bill.

Mr. MORGAN. No; it is not the same as a bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Precisely. If passed, it becomes a law.

Mr. MORGAN. Not at all. If it was a joint resolution, it would become a law if passed.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, I will ask unanimous consent that the resolution referred to by him be laid before the Senate for consideration, to avoid any trouble.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. HARRIS. Nor do I.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to exclude such matters as Senators desire to bring up. As I understand, this is a subject that will take no time. I understand the Senator to allude to the matter that was under discussion yesterday afternoon, the report of the departmental commission.

Mr. MORGAN. No: it is in relation to authorizing a committee to investigate the Nicaraguan Canal.

Mr. HOAR. That is another thing altogether.

Mr. HARRIS. I intended to add that I think the resolution of the Senator from Alabama properly goes to the Calendar, but it is subject to the request or the motion of the Senator to take it up at any time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands. The resolution is subject to the request of the Senator for unanimous consent for consideration, or to a motion.

Mr. HOAR. What is the purpose of the Senator about the resolution?

Mr. MORGAN. I merely wanted to know if I had the privilege of having the resolution considered as morning business.

Mr. HOAR. When the resolution is considered, does the Senator desire to address the Senate upon it?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no; but I shall defer any action upon the resolution till the Senator from Massachusetts gets through with his remarks. I shall not make any motion about it now.

ALLEYS IN SQUARE 751, IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to yield the floor to me for about five minutes. I have a couple of bills pending here from the Committee on the District of Columbia, which have been reported unanimously, and which are matters of very great concern to the public interest here as well as to certain benevolent and private interests. I shall be glad if the Senator will give way and allow me to ask unanimous consent of the Senate for their present consideration. I do not think the consideration of the two bills will occupy more than five minutes.

Mr. HOAR. If the bills do not take more than the time indicated by the Senator I shall make no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask unanimous consent, first, for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C., be closed and the land contained therein revert to the owners of the abutting property: *Provided*, That any conveyance of title in this act contained shall be operative only so long as the land is used for charitable purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg to state for the information of the Senate that square 751 in the city of Washington is owned almost exclusively by the benevolent association known as the Society of Little Sisters of the Poor, and that no persons can be affected by the vacation of these alleys except their owners.

In addition to that, the bill has been referred to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and they have reported in favor of it. A number of property owners are also in favor of it, and no property owner in the block can be adversely affected. The committee have reported unanimously in favor of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. MARTIN. The other bill for which I ask consideration is Senate bill 1267, authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations in the discharge of their official duties. It has been examined by the committee and reported favorably unanimously; it has been referred to the district attorney, who asks that it be passed, and requests that it be done immediately, in order that he may avail himself of it at the beginning of the new year in the discharge of his official duties. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the measure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know whether to object to the bill or not, but if I caught the reading of it correctly it makes a very material alteration in the law in relation to perjury. The law in relation to perjury, as it has been understood in this country for many years and all the time, required that in order that a false oath should be perjury it must be confined to material

matter. Immaterial matters are not considered as the basis or foundation of perjury. I discover, if I have not misunderstood the reading of the bill, that there is no qualification of that character. If the bill really does make that very material alteration in the crime of perjury it ought not to pass.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that he strike out the definition of perjury. It is very difficult to define perjury, and it ought to be done only by the Judiciary Committee, after full examination.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that he let the matter pass over for the present, and at a later hour to-day, or to-morrow morning, we may look at the question. I am not sure but that provision of the bill needs some qualification. If so, we may provide a qualification which will be satisfactory to every one.

Mr. MARTIN. I have no objection to the bill being passed over for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS subsequently said: There was a bill called up and read this morning at the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MARTIN]. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] raised the question as to whether it changed the law in respect to perjury. Since that time the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Kansas, and myself have scrutinized it, and we are all satisfied that we were mistaken. The reading of the bill at the desk made the same impression on my mind that it did on the mind of the Senator from Mississippi, but upon an examination we are satisfied that the bill is a proper one. It will not take two minutes to finish its consideration.

I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate very briefly at this time. I do not proposes to take up or deal with what is known as the Hawaiian question. The President's message and all previous information which has come to us on that subject have gone to the proper committee. When that committee has ascertained the facts in such a way as it shall think best, and has reported its own conclusions, we shall be ready to deal with it here. I wish to speak to a purely American question, a question affecting constitutional rights of the American people, and the constitutional power, duty, and responsibility of the various departments of the Government as established for a hundred years.

It appears that before the 4th of March, 1893, official information had come to the then Executive, which he had sent promptly and without disguise to the Senate, to the effect that in the foreign country of Hawaii there had been an attempt by the reigning Queen on her own authority to abrogate the constitution, to deprive a large number of persons who had the right of suffrage of that right, and by her own authority to declare a new constitution, new qualifications for suffrage, and new relations as to citizenship of the people dwelling in and governing that island. Her ministers protested, but in spite of their protests she went on and made her proclamation of the new constitution. Then there was a revolution. The people took up arms, as the English people took up arms against Charles I and James II, and as the American people took up arms against George III and established a new Government. Thereupon the men who had established the new Government declared that they intended to hold power until their islands could be annexed to the United States or the question of such annexation settled. The deposed Queen on her part claimed that she had yielded to a display of the force of the United States, and that she referred her rights to the justice of the United States.

It will be noticed that nobody suggested a purpose of referring that great and interesting question to Mr. Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana, or to Mr. Grover Cleveland, of New York, and that nobody there suggested the purpose of referring the question to any executive officer of the United States, whether the President or the Secretary of State or the Attorney-General or the general of the Army or the admiral of the Navy, or anybody else. It was the United States to whose justice and sense of national honor and opinion as to international law this great controversy was proposed to be submitted.

Mr. President, that being the condition of things, the established Government recognized by every power on earth which had occasion to deal with it, and the deposed Government asking for a particular arbitrator on whose justice the dethroned Queen relied, to wit, the United States, there took place a certain transaction which suggests the American question, who is the United States of America; who represents in great national or international affairs its purpose, its honor, its policy as to foreign relations?

That transaction was this: The present President of the United States was inaugurated on Saturday, the 4th of March. The next day was Sunday. On Monday, the 6th of March, the names of a proposed Cabinet were sent to the Senate and were approved, and on the 7th, amid all the exciting and important questions with which an incoming Administration must deal, Hon. Mr. Blount, departed on a mission, on a secret mission, on a mission of which neither the people of the United States nor the House of Representatives of the United States nor the Senate of the United States have had any official information until Monday of the present week. His instructions followed him on the 11th, but they must have been determined on the 7th, when he took his departure; they must have been determined upon before the 7th, unless he accepted this grave and important duty on five minutes' notice, or at any rate in a single day.

So I do not think that any intelligent man can doubt that the purpose to do this thing was formed before either the President or the Secretary of State came into office, and before either of them had official access to the archives of the State Department. But that is an unimportant consideration.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senate to inquire as to the lawfulness of this proceeding under the American Constitution, and under the established and existing rules of international law. Mr. Blount was sent with instructions, which are familiar to us, to repair to Hawaii, and to take and report evidence as to a past transaction in its history, and as to the lawfulness of the existing and recognized government there.

Something more than that took place. He was authorized expressly to exercise, and be paramount in exercising, all the functions of the minister resident in Hawaii. He was to command the Navy, so far as any portion of it was in the port of Honolulu, and the admiral there was to obey his instructions. He was to recognize or to refuse to recognize the existing government, and was to recognize or refuse to recognize the deposed government, at his discretion. He was to have supreme and instant access to the archives. He was accredited and presented, as all foreign ministers are accredited and presented, to that government. He had a letter of credence, which he carried with him, and of which we have a copy, and the consul and the minister were alike enjoined to treat him as their official and controlling superior, and to facilitate the exercise of his paramount powers in every way they could, the minister being informed that he was not for the present to be disturbed in the exercise of his ordinary functions.

Mr. President, the question of the legality of that proceeding is a question which it is the duty of an American Senator, and of every American Senator, to understand and to deal with. But before I come to that let me add one word in regard to the other question.

This was done, as I have said, secretly; it was concealed from the people and officially concealed from us; it was done in response to an invitation addressed to the United States, that in a supreme question in which its honor, its dignity, its justice were concerned, the United States should decide. The President, when he undertook to decide that question and to withhold from the people of the United States what he was doing until it was settled one way or the other past help, seems to have supposed that he was the United States of America, and whatever that phrase meant it was but a synonym for him.

The President of the United States has three powers, with which alone we are concerned in this discussion:

First. He may appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls. This power can only be exercised by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. If there be a vacancy in such an office, he may fill it during a recess of the Senate by granting a commission which shall expire at the end of the next session. That is the first power, and it is the only power existing under our form of government to appoint public ministers, of whom, by the act of Congress I cited the other day, commissioners to go abroad to foreign governments are expressly declared to be one class. It is further declared by act of Congress, in the section which enumerates envoys, ambassadors, commissioners, ministers, and consuls, that there shall be no other public ministers.

Second. The President may appoint inferior officers. But in all these cases the office must have been created, and the power of appointment vested in him by Congress.

Third. He may, to aid him in the performance and exercise of his executive powers, if convenient, appoint a mere agent as a messenger, or spy, or a person to gather or convey information. But such a person, so appointed, could be in no sense an officer of the United States, would take no oath of office, could exercise

no official function, and could do no act whatever which could have any binding force on the United States, or any of the people, merely because he has done it.

Of these powers, the first two are unquestionable; and the third, I have no disposition to question now.

If the appointment of Mr. Blount falls within either of the first two classes I have enumerated, I suppose there will be no Senator so hardy as to defend his appointment. If he was appointed to exercise an inferior office, the power to fill such office has never been vested in the President. If he were a public minister his appointment was void, because the Senate was in session when it was made, and it was never consented to.

Now, it seems to my mind a proposition that never can be questioned, except under the excitement and stress of partisan emergency, that this gentleman was appointed as a public minister. He was understood by the President, who appointed him, to be a public minister. He understood himself to be a public minister. The powers with which he was clothed were, in substance, the powers of a public minister of the amplest character. He was received as a public minister by the Government to which he was accredited. No power or function of a public minister was denied him. No definition of the term public minister could be made in which he would not have been included.

That person is, as it seems to me, clearly a public officer whose acts are binding on other persons by virtue of the authority he is exercising, when such acts originate in his own discretion or judgment, and he is not merely an agent conveying the mandate of another.

Jacobs, in his law dictionary, says:

> It is the rule that where a man hath to do with another's affairs against his will and without his leave, that this is an office, and he who is in it is an officer.

In United States *vs.* Hartwell, 6 Wallace, 386, the question was whether the defendant, a clerk in the office of the assistant treasurer of the United States, was a public officer. He was appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Justice Swayne says:

> An office is a public station or employment conferred by the appointment of government. The employment of the defendant was in the public service of the United States. He was appointed pursuant to law, and his compensation was fixed by law. Vacating the office of his superior would not have affected the tenure of his place. His duties were continuing and permanent, not occasional and temporary. They were to be such as his superior in office should prescribe.

In United States *vs.* Germaine, 99 U. S., 508, it was held that—

> Civil surgeons, appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions, under section 4777 of the Revised Statutes, are not officers of the United States. They are the agents of the Commissioner, appointed by him and removable by him at his pleasure, to procure information needed to aid in the performance of his own official duties.

These cases illustrate the principle on which some of the former Administrations have proceeded in employing private agents, in a few cases, to negotiate treaties, or to learn by private inquiry the disposition of the people of foreign countries toward this Government, or to communicate to private or official persons information which may tend to influence public opinion abroad. Such persons perform no official act whatever. The President can not delegate the treaty-making power, or any part of it, and has never undertaken to do so. The officer who negotiates a treaty merely makes known to the representative of the foreign government with whom he deals what he is authorized to say the President of the United States is willing to do. But nothing of the slightest binding force has happened until the treaty is ratified by the President and until it is confirmed by the Senate.

There is one decisive test, as it seems to me, of the character which the President undertook to confer upon this agent. The public minister is not liable to be arrested or held personally responsible for acts done by his superior's order. The private citizen has no exemption from full responsibility to all the laws of the country where he happens to be. Will it be pretended that the government of Hawaii might have arrested Blount for treasonable plotting with the Queen, if he had offered to restore her, under any circumstances? They could have done it, unless he were a minister of the United States. Will it be doubted that the investigation of the circumstances which led to the establishment of an existing government, with a view to its possible overthrow, is not an act which would warrant the instant expulsion from its territory of any person engaged in it, other than the representative of a foreign government? Is there any doubt that such action, under the law of nations, would warrant the instant arrest and imprisonment of such an offender?

Now, Mr. President, these questions are not to be answered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] by reviling me; nor by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] by reviling the Puritans of New England. They are vital questions, affecting the dignity and authority of the Senate in relation to one of its most important constitutional functions, and affecting the great question of all questions, whether the people of the United States are living under a Constitution or under a dictator. They are not to be whistled down the wind. No President of the United States, in his wildest dreams, ever thought that such a power as this belonged to the Executive before the 4th of March, 1893.

But we are told that there are some precedents affecting this matter, and a list of some three hundred or four hundred cases has been produced in the Senate in which the President of the United States has appointed certain public officers, or other agents, to negotiate treaties, or, in one or two instances, to go abroad in a purely private character with a view to ascertaining from private intercourse the friendly or unfriendly disposition of the people of another country. Not one of these precedents has the slightest relation whatever to the case we are now talking about. They were collected at the time of the fishery treaty, when it was objected that the President had no authority to associate with the Secretary of State two eminent gentlemen from private life to meet the representatives of Great Britain and discuss the details of an arrangement which was first to be submitted to him, and thereafter to the Senate, and which could have no validity or binding force whatever not given to it by the official action of the Executive and the Senate.

Even in that case the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate thought the appointment unauthorized, and on an examination of the precedents it turned out that of the four hundred cases cited there were but four or five, and those were of the most insignificant character, in which the function had not been conferred on an existing diplomatic officer of the United States, or the appointment submitted to the Senate for its approval, or, if the appointment were made in vacation, the function expired before the end of the next session. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] analyzed at the time the report of the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has been cited in the present discussion. I have myself gone over it again with care. I have also looked at the few additional cases produced by the Senator from Delaware. This is the result:

Of these cases, all but twelve are cases where the regular diplomatic officer of the United States, duly appointed according to law, usually the accredited minister to the country, though in a few instances the Secretary of State or his assistant, where the treaty was made in Washington, have been authorized to negotiate a treaty. It is the familiar case of a direction by the Executive to a lawful officer to perform a duty germane to his office. It is well settled that such a direction may be given. It has been held that where Congress by law imposes a new duty upon an existing officer, it is not necessary that there should be a new appointment. Our friends on the other side are driven to such desperate shifts to support this unconstitutional assumption of power by the Executive, that they gravely parade in the face of the country four hundred cases, or thereabouts, of a direction by the President to the minister representing us in a foreign country, or to the Secretary of State, as a precedent for the appointment by the President of the United States of a new diplomatic officer, without the authority of law and without the consent of the Senate, although the Senate was in session, in defiance not merely of the statute but of the Constitution itself.

There are five or six cases of barbarous or semibarbarous nations where a like commission of agency, to ransom our subjects held in bondage, and to ascertain the terms on which a treaty of peace might be made, has been committed to officers of the Navy. In one or two instances justices of the Supreme Court, with the consent of the Senate, have exercised a like function.

Five of the twelve cases cited were submitted to the Senate, and I think in one or two others the appointment was made when the Senate was not in session, and the function expired before the end of the session.

But there are five cases in all, other than those which have taken place in the present Administration, and one or two others which occurred in President Cleveland's former Administration—notably the case of Mr. Putnam and Mr. Angell, who were associated with the Secretary of State in negotiating the fishery treaty—where the names were not submitted to the Senate.

In that class of cases the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations held the proceeding invalid and unconstitutional. But in those cases, as I have said before, the person was a mere agency to communicate to the representatives of a foreign government what it was thought the President of the United States would be willing to do, and to report to our President what it was supposed the foreign government would be willing to do, nothing of an official character having happened, nothing of a binding character having happened, until the President himself had acted, and until in the case of a treaty the Senate had consented.

Now, when this officer makes his report of a treaty, signed or unsigned, no single step has been taken toward its validity.

The projected treaty must be ratified by the President, and must have the assent of the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, before it can possess any validity. When he reports it, signed or unsigned, no single step has taken place toward its validity. So the precedents which our friends on the other side clutch in their desperation have no bearing on the case, and do not in the least help President Cleveland. These five insignificant precedents, and the one or two others not so insignificant, which have occurred during the Administration of the present Executive, have not the least relation or resemblance to the present case.

The person engaged to negotiate a treaty is but a mere agent, when his powers are analyzed, to ascertain and report facts. He is clothed with no official authority. He can perform no official act. His function is the same in essence as that of the messenger who should bear dispatches, or a statistician who should collect facts. He can only converse with a like person appointed by a foreign government, make known to that person what he thinks his government will consent to, and report to his own government what he thinks the foreign government will consent to. When he has agreed upon, signed, and brought home the draft of a treaty, nothing whatever has happened except that the President of the United States has received some information for his own guidance.

Will anybody pretend that Mr. Stevens, the minister resident at Honolulu, could have been appointed to his office while the Senate was in session, or could have continued to hold it, if appointed in vacation if there had been a subsequent session of the Senate, which had ended? I do not suppose the most capacious gullet of any defender of the President would swallow such a proposition, or the most capacious stomach of any such person would digest it, unless possibly some editor of a New York newspaper, of foreign birth, not supposed to have much understanding either of the spirit or letter of the Constitution of the United States.

Now, if that be true, will anybody stand here and claim that the appointment of a person authorized to exercise every function committed to Mr. Stevens, and more—paramount to him in official authority and duty in every respect—accredited to the same government, the archives of the legation open to him, the power to command a naval vessel of the United States expressly intrusted to him and, in the language of Mr. Blount's instructions, "Your [his] authority in all matters touching the relations of this Government to the existing or other government of the islands, and the protection of our citizens therein, being [is] paramount and in him [you] alone * * * being [is] vested full discretion and power to determine when such naval forces should be landed or withdrawn," may be appointed to a new office without the advice and consent of the Senate.

Just carry this extraordinary doctrine of assumption into all other departments of executive power. May the President, who can not appoint the Director of the Mint without the consent of the Senate, send an officer to take possession of the Mint and instruct him that in all matters of its direction his authority is to be paramount, to control the coin and the coinage and the bullion there awaiting coinage? Can he put such an official, under the pretense of getting information, or with the honest purpose of getting information, into the Treasury of the United States and say, "You are to repair to the Treasury of the United States and bring information as to how that is conducted, and while you are there your power over the entire concern and function of that Department is paramount, and its whole official direction is committed to you; without a bond and without official character you are to control two or three hundred million of treasure, to sign bonds and bank notes, and issue them and receive them, and perform every official function of that great office you are to exercise"?

The President can not appoint, when the Senate is in session, a commodore of the Navy, or a major-general in the Army, without the consent and advice of the Senate. But he may, unquestionably, employ a private agent, who would not be an officer of the United States, to collect for his personal use information as to the condition of the Army. He might send such a person, in the case of a foreign war, under a flag of truce, to inquire of the general of the opposing forces upon what terms a truce or armistice or a safe conduct might be agreed upon. But will anybody pretend that because he has a right to do that, he might direct such person to take command of the Army, and say to him that his authority in all matters touching the conduct of the war should be paramount, and that in him alone should be vested full discretion and power to command, direct, and govern the Army, and determine whether the military forces of the United States should be advanced or withdrawn.

He may send a private agent of his on board a ship, or fleet, to inspect and report. He may, if he pleased, send such person on board a ship, or fleet, of another country, as a spy in time of war, or to gather information in time of peace. But I should not think the sending such spy to observe and report upon the conduct of high military and naval officers of this country should be encouraged. I do not think that if such a thing had been done by George Washington, or Andrew Jackson, or General Grant, or President Harrison, either of them would maintain the place in the respect of his country that he now holds. But there can, I suppose, be no doubt of the constitutional power. But will it be claimed that such a person might be sent on board a man-of-war, with the direction that his authority to command the ship, or govern the fleet, should be paramount; and that the commodore, though left to his ordinary duties, was only to render him such assistance as might be in his power? Can the President put such a private agent into the Mint, or into the Treasury, and subject the money or coin or bullion which is the property of the United States to his unchecked and irresponsible control?

If he can send Mr. Blount lawfully and constitutionally with the powers which are set forth in that letter of instructions (and which Mr. Gresham in alluding to them in his instructions to Mr. Willis expressly says are his official powers), he may continue him there during his entire four years in the same power. He may put a like officer in the legation to Great Britain, to France, to Germany, and every other foreign government.

Mr. President, one or the other of these alternatives may take place. If, the Senate being in session, he had a right to confer these powers upon Mr. Blount in addition to the duty of gathering information for him, the whole diplomatic service and the whole foreign policy of the United States is a question purely of executive power and the President shares it with no other department of the Government.

Mr. President, the treasure of the United States is in the keeping of the Treasurer. The precious metal, uncoined or in process of coinage, may pass into the control of the keeper of the mint. But the people of the United States would be struck with horror at an attempt to subject them to the irresponsible authority of a private agent of the Executive. But the honor, the character, and good faith, the estimation—in the eyes of foreign nations and of all the civilized world—of the United States of America, more precious than silver or gold, are committed to the keeping of its diplomatic representatives abroad. They are officials expressly enumerated in the Constitution. They are officials whose title and character are defined by the ancient legislation of the country. They carry with them the United States of America wherever they go. Their dwelling place, wherever in the civilized world they may be, is for the time being the soil of their country, and is exempted from all other jurisdiction whatever. They can be clothed with this exalted and august character, except for brief intervals, only by the authority of this body.

If we submit to this astounding and unheard-of pretension, the authority of the Senate itself, over a large part of its constitutional domain, is abandoned and gone. One of the framers of the Constitution, who had more to do than any other man with the conception and creation of the Senate, declared soon after the Constitution was adopted, that he esteemed—

> the provision made for appointments to office to be a matter of very great importance, on which the liberties and safety of the people depended nearly as much as on legislation. If that was vested in the President alone he might render himself despotic. It was a saying of one of the Kings of England, "that while the King could appoint the bishops and judges, he might have what religion and laws he pleased." To give that observation its full effect, they must hold their offices—

As Mr. Blount held his—

> during his pleasure; by such appointments, without control, a power might be gradually established that would be more formidable than a standing army.

If the present claim be allowed, it is of no consequence that the Constitution vests in Congress the power to make war or peace. President Cleveland may have what foreign policy he pleases, either in war or peace.

Mr. President, I repeat that the appointment of this officer under the circumstances is an attempt on the part of the Executive to bring the whole foreign diplomatic policies of the United States under his unshared control; and the question whether it shall be met, resisted, and overthrown at the threshold is a question of far more importance than whatever may happen in the interesting commonwealth of Hawaii.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], who I regret not to see in his place, declared the other day that in all foreign matters he always left partisanship behind him. I have heard that Senator's speeches on the questions relating to foreign affairs. But I have never heard a like tribute to his exalted character, in that respect, from any other lips than his own. Such is my respect for that Senator, however, that I am willing to take his testimony, even in his own behalf, without other corroboration. But it occurs to me that there are some domestic questions in regard to which it might be hoped and expected a Senator of the

United States might lay aside that extreme partisanship that until now had been commonly imputed to my honorable friend from Delaware. It would occur to me that in a question of Executive usurpation—a question whether the President of the United States is to take upon himself to control all the foreign policies of this country, to the exclusion of all rightful participation in that great subject—an American Senator might be expected, at least, to see that the privileges, the authority, and the dignity of the body of which he was a member are not sacrificed.

If President Cleveland could have done what he did on the 7th day of March, 1893, in the case of Hawaii, he could have continued the diplomatic agencies, so established, throughout his entire Presidential term. He could have established a like diplomatic agency and authority in every civilized country on the face of the globe. What he could do in Hawaii he could do in Great Britain. Can he at this moment send Mr. Blount to Great Britain to-morrow morning with precisely the same power that he committed to him on the 7th of March, to take possession of the archives, to be paramount in all questions touching our relations with Great Britain, and to inquire into the lawfulness of the existing government there and the disposition of the English people toward it?

Now, Mr. President, I should like to ask our nonpartisan friends on the other side if they think the President has dealt quite frankly and ingenuously with the American people or the Senate, or with either party in Hawaii. What occasion has there been for this secrecy and mystery? Mr. Blount, as I have said, left on the 7th of March and his instructions followed him four days after.

The President must have meditated and devised this attack on the Administration of his predecessor before he entered upon his office and before the archives of the Department of State had become open to his inspection. The Senate was in session more than forty days in the spring. There was abundant opportunity to lay his doubts before this body, to obtain its assent to the appointment of this foreign minister, with his extraordinary powers. Andrew Jackson declared, on one of the most important occasions in our history, whatever might be the strictness of constitutional right, that it was most becoming and proper, where it was a question of recognizing a foreign government, the consent of Congress should be obtained if it were practicable. But can any Senator give a reason, an excuse, a decent pretext for concealing these transactions till the knowledge of them was wrung from a hesitating and reluctant Executive by public indignation and the demands of both Houses of Congress? Was there any reason that the American people should not know, from March to December, what was the errand of Mr. Blount, what was his instruction, and the limitation of his authority? If Mr. Willis went out instructed to reinstate the old Government, absolutely or upon conditions, could little Hawaii help herself, if the American people had been behind the act?

No, Mr. President, this Administration has been hurried into this transaction, not by any sense of justice to Hawaii, not by any desire to vindicate the national honor, but for the sake of making what has turned out to be a weak, impotent attack on its predecessor. The great name and fame of Benjamin Harrison are a source of envy and discontent in some bosoms.

Place for a moment side by side the message by Minister Willis to Mr. Dole, and the message he was instructed, at the same time—on the same day—to convey to the Queen. The Queen, that she may be brought more easily to submit to the President's terms, is reminded that no action can be had without the consent of Congress. But no such message is sent to Dole. He is to be led to believe that the physical power of the United States is to be used for his overthrow.

Will it be claimed by the defenders of the President that when he sent Mr. Willis to Honolulu with orders to tell his great and good friend, President Dole, that the existing Government should abandon its functions and restore the Queen, and that he should go to the extent of his authority to compel compliance with that request, that he only meant to convey to President Dole an expression of his opinion in the matter, and expected Dole to understand that he neither possessed nor claimed any power in the premises? President Cleveland either intended to use the forces of our Navy for that purpose, and has abandoned the scheme because of the indignant remonstrance of the American people, or having no such power, he meant to intimidate President Dole by leading him to think that he had. Any other suggestion implies that the President of the United States, representing the dignity and authority of 65,000,000 Americans, by design and of purpose made a demand supposing that the authorities of whom he made it knew he neither had nor claimed any authority to enforce it. There is but one precedent for the instructions to Mr. Willis, if this be its explanation. I do not know whether the President had read Shakespeare, but Shakespeare—if that be true—had read the President. The instruction to Mr. Willis and the more recent attempt to keep it secret find their only parallel and example in Dogberry's instruction to the Watch:

> DOGBERRY. You are thought here to be the most senseless and fit man for the constable of the watch: therefore bear you the lantern. This is your charge: You shall comprehend all vagrom men; you are to bid any man stand, in the Prince's name.
> SECOND WATCH. How if a' will not stand?
> DOGBERRY. Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go;—

[Laughter]—

> and presently call the [Cabinet] together, and thank God you are rid of a knave.
> VERGES. If he will not stand when he is bidden, he is none of the Prince's subjects.
> DOGBERRY. True, and they are to meddle with none but the Prince's subjects. * * *
> DOGBERRY. Well, masters, good night; an there be any matter of weight chances, call up me: keep your fellows' counsels and your own, and good night.

[Laughter.]

I am not at this moment dealing with the conduct of the existing Government of Hawaii, or of the men who established it. Whatever they have done they have done in the face of day as became the lineage of which they were sprung. I do not see how any man can claim that the conduct of the Queen was not an act of abdication. Her powers were derived from a written constitution. When on her own unsupported authority she undertook to overthrow that constitution and to deprive the people of Hawaii of the share in the Government which it conferred, it was an act of abdication—an act of abdication according to every historic precedent in the story of liberty. How the President tries to slur that over in his message! If anything were wanting to destroy the entire authority of that document, as a trustworthy, unbiased, and impartial narration of facts, you would need but to compare the narrative of the message with the known and undisputed actuality of the transaction. Was he dealing ingenuously with us or with the people of the United States? Was he dealing ingenuously with the Senate or the House of Representatives when he said in his message:

> On Saturday, January 14, 1893, the Queen of Hawaii, who had been contemplating the proclamation of a new constitution, had, in deference to the wishes and remonstrances of her cabinet, renounced the project for the present at least.

And when he left the narrative there he knew that the Queen had proclaimed the constitution; he knew that she had proclaimed it after the cabinet had remonstrated, after part of them had left her presence for fear of their lives if they remained to witness it; and he knew that she had given up the attempt to enforce it, only because of her fear of the popular resistance.

The President has not a word of disapprobation for the private or for the public profligacy on the part of the Queen. The passage of the shameless lottery bill, the corrupt setting on sale of her constitutional functions, the attempt to disfranchise a large class of the voters of Hawaii and to proclaim a new government in spite of the remonstrances in her cabinet, the fact that the Queen yielded not to remonstrances of the cabinet but to the rising indignation of the people, are all suppressed, as well as the implied but clear announcement of her determination to renew the attempt if a better opportunity were to come. All this is slurred over in the message which has been addressed to us; and the President only says, "The Queen of Hawaii, who had been contemplating the proclamation of a new constitution, had, in deference to the wishes and remonstrances of her cabinet, renounced the project for the present at least."

Mr. President, I say that act of the Queen, on the admitted facts, was an act of abdication as much as the abandonment of the throne by Louis Philippe or by James II. It was impossible, after such an act of abdication not provided for in the constitution, to establish a new government except as was done by the concerted action of the men of influence and character and property and intelligence who were near the seat of government. It was impossible to submit it to a popular vote. There never was a revolution on earth which was brought about by the action of the ruling power itself, followed by the establishment of a government any other way.

At the outbreak of our own Revolution the executive government of Massachusetts was vested in a committee of safety, and all the commissions to officers, civil and military, were issued for several years, I believe, in their name.

The action of the Provisional Government in Hawaii, whatever may be the fate of that commonwealth, will have an honorable place in the history of human liberty. The United States forces have been withdrawn, certainly since Mr. Blount pulled down the flag, and there is no report of a life lost, a human being injured, or a single act of disorder. The Government has been recognized by all foreign powers, and its functions have proceeded peaceably and in order. It has received with dignity the

representatives of the great nations of the earth, and has sent its own to other countries.

I have heard that Mr. Thurston, the minister of the Hawaiian Republic here, is just now absent from his post. I do not know the cause of his absence and I have no official information where he has gone. I can only conjecture what may have been his last confidential conversation with Secretary Gresham. But I remember to have read somewhere of a memorable interview between John, Duke of Argyll, and Queen Caroline, shortly after the famous Porteous mob of Edinburgh. The angry Queen told the old Scotch nobleman that she would make a hunting ground of Scotland. "In that case, your majesty," said the duke, "I must go back to Inverary and get my hounds ready." I suspect Minister Thurston—from what I hear of him, and from what I hear of the men who are standing with him—may have infused a little of the same spirit into his reply to the diplomatic agent of his modern American majesty.

Mr. President, I think these questions which have nothing to do with the conduct of a past Administration, but have something to do with the pretensions of one that is present, have also a little interest for the liberty-loving, order-loving, Constitution-loving people of the United States. If they have not, if the Constitution is to be disregarded, and "an unconstitutional desire to meddle with the existing affairs of a foreign people not our own ought to regulate our conduct, I have entirely misapprehended the mission and the character of our Government and the behavior which the conscience of the people demands of our public servants."

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to inquire whether there is any matter before the Senate at this time having reference to the affairs of Hawaii. Is there any motion now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LINDSAY in the chair). The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the message of the President of the United States transmitted in answer to the resolution of the Senate of the 6th instant be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to offer a resolution by way of amendment to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations shall inquire and report whether any, and, if so, what irregularities have occurred in the diplomatic or other intercourse between the United States and Hawaii in relation to the recent political revolution in Hawaii, and to this end said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to submit this resolution in connection with the motion to print.

Mr. DOLPH. Will not the investigation require the employment of a stenographer?

Mr. MORGAN. No; it will not require that.

Mr. HOAR. I have no objection to having the motion to refer and print go with the resolution to the committee of which the Senator from Alabama is chairman, and also I have nothing to say about the resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom another message of the President on the same subject was referred, have expressed, informally of course, a desire to do their whole duty in respect of this question, and to do it impartially. With reference to the attitude of the United States Government towards Hawaii, the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts and other remarks that have been made on the floor of the Senate bring up the question whether irregularities have occurred in out diplomatic and other relations with Hawaii. I think it is the duty of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of course with the consent of the Senate, to bring before the country all the evidence that bears legitimately and properly upon an inquiry of that character.

Our relations with Hawaii to-day are simply those of a republic which has recognized through its diplomatic agencies a government existing in the Hawaiian Islands, to which there appears to be no objection at all on the part of the Secretary of State or the President or any one else, but on the contrary a recognition, a firm recognition, that leaves the relations between the United States and Hawaii at this moment unaffected by what has occurred heretofore. I speak now of the relations between the two governments.

The other questions which lie behind that relate to the conduct of the two Presidents who have occupied the chief executive office in the United States in reaching the result which is now an accomplished fact, which stands before the world, to define the attitude between the United States and the Government of Hawaii. That in itself is a domestic question. It is one that now concerns us and nobody else. It is one that touches simply the matter of the regularity and propriety of the action which has occurred on the part of either or both of the Presidents of the United States in their dealing with this subject.

My purpose in bringing the matter before the Senate and getting this authority for the committee to act is to enable that committee, if it can do so, to satisfy the American mind in respect of the conduct of all its executive officers and their agents. That is the whole scope and purpose of the resolution, and I think it meets the approbation of the committee. I do not pretend to say that it has received the formal assent of the committee.

Mr. WASHBURN. I should like to hear the resolution read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution at this time? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the same.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have read in some of the papers circulated in the Southern States statements by correspondents to the effect that it is understood here that I am opposed to the President's Hawaiian policy, and that I am one of the Senators who are expected to express their dissatisfaction with it. I wish to state that I regard the President's message as a singularly able and a very clear statement of the case, and that so far as my judgment is concerned I approve it entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HOAR. Is not the first question on referring and printing the message? That is the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the resolution to be offered as an amendment, in the nature of instructions, to the motion to print and refer.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that it is an independent resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. It can go as an independent resolution. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. HOAR. I will accept it in any form that the Senator from Alabama chooses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question, then, is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, that the message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it be read again.

The resolution was again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DONATION OF OBSOLETE GUN CARRIAGES.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senate to consider the bill (S. 1045) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate four obsolete gun-carriages to the city of Marshalltown, Iowa.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM A. STARKWEATHER.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. 121) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to William A. Starkweather, of Oregon, $2,170, being the amount paid out by him to Owen Wade for clerk hire in the United States land office at Oregon City while register of the land office.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDNANCE STORES FOR NEBRASKA.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it now consider the bill (S. 464) for the issue of ordnance stores and supplies to the State of Nebraska to replace similar stores destroyed by fire.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEN. NAPOLEON J. T. DANA.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 104) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana, late assistant quartermaster of the United States Army, to the position of assistant quartermaster, with the rank of captain of cavalry, and to place him on the retired list of the Army with that rank and pay, the retired list being thereby increased in number to that extent; and all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are suspended for this purpose only: *Provided*, That from and after the passage of this act no pension shall be paid to the said Napoleon J. T. Dana.

Mr. FRYE. Is there a report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, if there be one.

Mr. DAVIS. The bill was favorably reported at a previous Congress and passed by the Senate. The services were most meritorious.

Mr. HARRIS. We can not hear the Senator from Minnesota on this side.

Mr. FRYE. I do not care to have the report read. I understand from the Senator from Minnesota that the bill was reported favorably at a former Congress, and the report was read, and the bill passed without any objection.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill seems from the reading at the desk to increase the number of retired officers. Is that the object and purpose of it?

Mr. DAVIS. It is not the object and purpose of it, but in all these cases, except those which are peculiar in their character, where provision is made for cases of this kind, the list is necessarily increased for that purpose, and no further.

Mr. TELLER. It is increased to the amount of one.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, to the amount of one. It is done very often.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall not interfere with the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT JUPITER MILITARY RESERVATION LANDS.

Mr. PASCO. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 653) to open certain parts of Fort Jupiter military reservation, in the State of Florida, to entry under the homestead laws, be taken up for present action.

The bill was read.

Mr. CALL. I should like to inquire of my colleague if adequate protection is given in the bill to persons who have gone upon the reservation and made improvements, but who are not entitled under the homestead laws, either because of having entered at some former time or for any other reason? I understand there are a large number of persons upon that reservation who have gone upon it and made valuable improvements, and that some provision for their relief should be contained in the bill.

Mr. PASCO. I will state that, in accordance with the suggestions from the General Land Office, the privilege is confined to those who are entitled to homesteads under the general homestead laws, and it is not extended beyond that.

Mr. CALL. It is my purpose to move an amendment; and it should not be done hastily, so that those persons who have gone upon the reservation and made valuable improvements there may be protected. I ask my colleague to allow the bill to go over and to add an amendment of that kind to it.

Mr. PASCO. I will state that the bill as originally framed, introduced in the last Congress by my colleague, did contain such a provision, but in accordance with the recommendation of the Interior Department that feature of the bill was stricken out and the bill presented in its present shape. If my colleague objects now to the consideration of the bill it can be passed over.

Mr. CALL. Let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

EXTENSION OF NORTH CAPITOL STREET.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 146.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to make a statement in connection with a request to be submitted to the Senate.

House bill 4763, making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes, has been sent to the Senate and has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The committee have given it consideration.

It is generally quite well understood that as soon as this bill is passed, the order to adjourn for the holiday recess will be fixed for to-morrow, and will be sent to us from the other House. It is well known to most Senators that in some other legislative body, which may have to act upon this bill in the event of any amendment being made to it, it would probably be impossible to secure a quorum for the consideration of such amendment. Many Senators desire to know exactly when the time of adjournment will take place, so that they can make their arrangements accordingly.

The Committee on Appropriations have, therefore, instructed me to report the bill back without amendment, to recommend its passage, and to request the Senate to give it immediate consideration. We do this not because all the provisions of the bill are satisfactory to or are approved by the committee. There are changes which might be made, additions which might be made, and substractions which might be made, but there are appropriations in the bill which are absolutely necessary for carrying on the Public Printing Office and other branches of the public service, and great injury and loss will occur if the bill is not passed before our holiday recess, and we shall suffer the inconvenience of it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CULLOM in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiences in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to inquire whether, during the first reading, it would be proper to offer an amendment, or to wait until the reading of the bill is completed?

Mr. HARRIS. The bill should be first read.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well, let the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now being read as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. For amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be open to amendment after it shall have been read.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

Mr. PEFFER. I move to strike out all of the items referring to the mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the items which the Senator from Kansas moves to strike out.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, it is proposed to strike out from line 15 to line 19, inclusive, as follows:

For mileage of Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories, $130,000, for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress.

For mileage of Senators for the second session of the Fifty third Congress, $45,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress—I refer to the extraordinary session—a joint resolution was presented to this body proposing to make available the funds which had already been appropriated for the mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives for the regular session of this year.

It was my understanding then, as it is now, that the law allows to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives mileage but once a year. When the joint resolution was before the Senate at that time I objected to it on several grounds, one of which was that we were not entitled at that time to the use of funds which had been appropriated for use at another time. Another ground of objection was that we did not deserve it, that in the then condition of the country, with industries depressed, with the energies of a large portion of our people paralyzed, with thousands upon thousands of our fellow-citizens out of employment and clamoring for the bare necessities of life, that we as members of their National Legislature ought not to propose to take to ourselves money which at least doubtfully belonged to us; and now, Mr. President, I submit that the conditions are a hundredfold, yes a thousandfold worse than they were at that time.

I submit, further, that it is out of order—using the word "order" in that relation—for us to take any additional compensation, for that is what this provision means.

Our mileage is twice as much as it ought to be. The intention of the law doubtless was that actual expenses, and nothing else, should be allowed. The mileage that we are now allowed, 20 cents each way, is more than twice enough to pay all the expenses which the most fastidious person ought to incur in traveling here.

While I do not wish to detain the Senate, I do, in all candor and frankness, submit that in the face of the existing condition of affairs among the people, it is with bad grace, to say the least, that this proposition is submitted to us, and I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment striking it out.

Mr. DOLPH. This is the first time that my attention has been directed to the provision in the pending bill in regard to mileage. I wish to remind the Senator from Kansas of something which probably has escaped his attention, and that is, that no one is obliged to take the mileage. If this bill should be passed, and he or any other Senator has any compunctions of conscience about it, he can simply leave the money in the Treasury.

Mr. PEFFER. I understand very well, Mr. President, that no one is obliged to take the money. I do not wish, however, to put before the members of Congress the temptation to take it. Composed of honorable men, as this body is—I dare say I am the poorest man here—I do not like to see us going before the country at this time asking money to which the law of the land does not entitle us.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas ought to prevail. As the law now stands, we are not entitled to the proposed mileage. So the effect of this vote, if mileage is allowed, is to put into our pockets out of the public Treasury a sum which represents our mileage.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he has scrutinized the question? I have not very carefully looked at it, but my understanding of the exact state of the question now is that by a joint resolution passed during the extra session mileage was paid for that session, leaving the law as it now stands, entitling every Representative and every Senator to mileage for the regular session.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. HARRIS. If that be true, the statement with which the Senator from Mississippi starts out is an inaccuracy of statement, and I beg that he correct it if I am right about it.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Tennessee is not correct about it. The resolution which was passed at the extra session, as I understood it as read from the desk, was simply to make available for that time the mileage which was due at the regular session. I hope some Senator will get the statute and see if I am correct. I know without having made any particular examination on this subject——

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator shall have the benefit of the statute before we come to a vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; I want the benefit of it and I want the country to have the benefit of it.

Mr. HARRIS. They shall have it.

Mr. GEORGE. I have never made any particular investigation into this matter. I am very apt, however, as most men are, to claim all the legal rights to which I am entitled, and I remember to have attended sessions of the Senate three times before I was entitled to mileage once. I attended the extra session of the Senate on the 4th of March, 1881. I was informed that I was not entitled to mileage, and I acquiesced. I attended the extra session of the Senate in October, 1881. I was also informed that I was not entitled to mileage then, and I acquiesced. I drew my mileage for the first time in December, 1881. So I am pretty well satisfied that the law is the way I have stated it. If I am not correct about it, I think it is due to the people of this country that the statute be produced and our right to mileage shown, for I regard this as a gratuity voted by members of Congress to themselves out of the public Treasury.

I shall read, for I have it before me now, the resolution which was passed at the extra session. I shall read it for the benefit of the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who desire to be enlightened on this subject:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1894, approved March 3, 1893, be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress.

So it appears I was right about it. The resolution merely had the effect to anticipate, to hasten, the payment of the mileage, of what would be paid to us at this regular session.

One more remark, and then I shall take my seat. This is a gratuity which we vote to ourselves out of the public Treasury without having any lawful warrant or claim to it. I do not think that the condition of the Treasury, it being threatened with a deficit, and that the condition of the taxpayers of this country, distressed as they are, warrant us in making this gratuitous donation to ourselves.

For that reason I shall vote for the proposition to strike out so much of the bill as makes an appropriation for mileage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER].

Mr. GEORGE. I call for the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOAR. What is the form of the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas, striking out certain provisions of the bill relating to mileage.

Mr. HARRIS. Before the roll call proceeds—I was out for a moment—I wish to ask, has the explanation been made that the original resolution contained the language that the mileage allowed for the extra session should be in lieu of regular mileage, and that upon motion that language was stricken out by a vote of the House of Representatives? I want the Senate to understand that fact, which, if it means anything, means that it was intended to leave the statute as it stood with regard to regular mileage exactly as the statute provided.

Mr. COCKRELL. And this is only to comply with existing law.

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely.

Mr. GORMAN. I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Kansas proposing to strike out the provision for mileage which comes here in the bill. My colleague and myself are probably the only members of this body who have no earthly interest in the question of mileage, with the exception, probably, of the Senators from West Virginia, the Senators from Virginia, and perhaps the Senators from one or two other States.

Unquestionably the intention in framing the law in regard to mileage by a coördinate branch of the Government was to provide only for two mileages for one Congress, beginning at each regular session. It was undoubtedly framed, and as I think unjustly framed, to prohibit mileage to Senators who are called together in extra session.

I do not agree that the measure of compensation for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, fixed, as it is, at $5,000 per annum with mileage, is a just, proper, or adequate compensation for the service rendered.

The matter of mileage operates unjustly in giving a larger compensation to some than to others who perform the same service, except in so far as the amount of travel may be greater, which is not now inconvenient to any extent. Such is the law.

It is framed in that way, and it is too late now to talk about changing it. It does not operate justly at all times upon the members of the Senate, and I am glad that the extraordinary session of Congress has brought the attention of both Houses of Congress to the fact that the law ought to be remodeled. If mileage is proper to be allowed, provision should be made hereafter to allow it for every extraordinary session, whether it embraces the Senate alone or both Houses.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is within the power of Congress to provide for it.

Mr. GORMAN. I understand, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says, that it is in the power of Congress to make provision for it. I only desire to express my opinion about the unjust manner in which it has operated heretofore upon the members of this body, and I trust that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will see to it hereafter that a law shall be so framed that so long as compensation is to be allowed in the shape of mileage, provision shall be made for its payment at every session of Congress which assembles, including the special sessions of the Senate.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I concur with the Senator from Maryland that this ought to be the law, but I do not think it is the law. The idea which I have about it is, that when we voted for this appropriation at the last extra session it was done in anticipation of and to make immediately available that which would belong to us at the regular session. I believe that now, and therefore I do not think that we are entitled to the sum proposed. I shall vote to sustain the motion of the Senator from Kansas. I regret that it is not the law. I believe that we should have mileage at every session as well as we should at the regular sessions, but I do not think that it is the law now, and do not propose to try to correct the evil in this way.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the general law as it appears in the Revised Statutes was perhaps wise and proper when passed to remedy what was then a possible and not infrequently an actual evil. Under the old law, as it existed prior to that time, when the President convened the Senate in extra session on the 5th day of March, when the regular session of Congress had closed on the 4th, it was within the option of every Senator to claim his mileage for that extra session, though it only involved the travel from his Washington residence to the Capitol or not, as he chose. To remedy that evil, the act was passed allowing mileage for regular sessions only; but I do not suppose that any Senator or Representative who voted for that law really intended to require a member of either House of Congress to leave his home, however remote from the capital, and travel to Washington to meet in an extra session of Congress without compensating him for the expenses and time of that trip. There is, in my judgment, nothing unreasonable, nothing unjust in that.

As to mere constructive mileage, when I am here on the 4th of March as a Senator, and I am notified to be here on the 5th or 6th or 7th, which only involves travel from my Washington residence to this Chamber, it would be an outrage for me, in my judgment, to demand or raise the question of mileage. There is no mileage in it, but if I am at my remote home and I am called to leave it at an unusual time and under unusual and extraordinary circumstances to come to the Senate Chamber, if there is reason in allowing me mileage for any trip to Washington there is as much reason for allowing it then as at any other time.

As to the resolution under which the mileage for the extra session convened by the proclamation of the President is concerned, the original draft of that resolution was that the mileage should be paid to Representatives and Senators in lieu of the mileage for the regular session, and upon motion in the House of Representatives—if I am permitted to refer to that body—a vote struck it out and allowed the mileage simply for that session, the inevitable result of which, as it seems to me, as a legal conclusion is that it leaves the general law standing, and every Representative, every Delegate, and every Senator is entitled to his mileage for the regular session.

Mr. President, I am not afraid to do justice to myself as well as to the entire constituency which I have the honor to represent on this floor. If I am called from my private engagements and my home at an unusual and extraordinary time, and have to travel from that point to this and spend whatever time may be necessary in the discharge of these public functions, if I can not justify the mileage charge, I am willing to take the consequences; I fear not the result.

I shall vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. President, it appears to me that this proposition is quite a plain one. The resolution which was passed at the special session did not repeal any part of the statutes of the United States. It simply made available for present use an appropriation theretofore made. There has been no repeal of any law providing for the payment of mileage. The law stands and is in force, and the attempt now to overturn it by the process suggested by the Senator who has offered the amendment is, in effect, to say that, although that law is upon the statute book, although it has never been repealed, it shall be suspended for the immediate occasion. It is not proposed, as the Senator from Kansas has said, to vote money into our pockets which is not provided by law.

There is no gratuity about this provision unless Senators remain in the city of Washington or unless they travel without paying the expenses which ought to be due to the carrier transporting them. For myself, I have crossed the continent seven times since I came here last March, and I have been in the habit of paying my own fare. I have not learned how to travel without expense, nor have I as yet ascertained any mode of obtaining revenue from the United States Government with the exception of that which comes to me as my own personal salary. I see no objection whatever to taking this money as mileage which the law says belongs to us. It is provided upon the theory that we expend money in coming here and in traveling from various parts of this great country. As the law has not been repealed, and as there has been no method adopted heretofore for its abrogation, I do not propose to suspend it.

I think that the small amount of money which the bill proposes to give to a Senator is little enough under all the circumstances; but whether that be so or not, I have not fixed that law, I have had no part or parcel in arranging it. It is the law that I find here.

If there is any point in the remarks made in this Chamber in reference to the donation of money from the Treasury they apply to the antecedent joint resolution which has been passed. The money has been paid under that measure. Those remarks are not at all pertinent to the present occasion when we simply propose to take that money which is provided for us by the Federal statute.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, the joint resolution passed at the extra session of Congress with reference to the payment of mileage was understood by me to be simply an anticipation of the mileage of the regular session. I believe that was generally understood to be the fact. I have been in the Senate for some seventeen years. There have been numerous extra convocations of Congress. I have known more than one attempt to collect double mileage for a session of Congress. I have never known one to be successful.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Texas allow me?

Mr. COKE. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. What does he mean by "double mileage for a session of Congress"?

Mr. COKE. I mean an attempt to collect more than one mileage for the regular session; that is, an attempt to collect it for a preceding extra session.

Mr. HARRIS. Double mileage for a session of Congress is one thing and mileage for separate sessions of Congress is quite another thing. I beg to call the attention of the Senator to the distinction.

Mr. COKE. I will accept the Senator's amendment of my remark. I have never known more than one mileage to be paid during one session of Congress, and I have known repeated efforts to collect mileage on account of the meeting of an extra session of Congress. I remember two occasions at least when a bill similar to the pending proposition was before the Senate and was voted down. No Congress has ever yet passed any such bill or any such clause to a bill.

I submit that in the present condition of the country this is a bad time to start out to establish such a precedent. I shall vote against retaining the provision in the bill, because I do not believe Congress should pass it. I believe it has been generally understood that a member of Congress who comes to Washington will get mileage once, and then as many times as may be necessary for him to come in order to attend extra sessions he must come without additional mileage. That has been my understanding. That is the way the members of Congress have been treated heretofore, and I see no reason why we should make an exception in this instance.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, if I felt as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] has expressed himself, that this is a gratuity we are voting to ourselves, I certainly would take the position he assumes in reference to the proposition to strike out the clauses under consideration. We have no right to give gratuities of this character. If we have the right to appropriate funds that under existing law we are fairly entitled to, the condition of the Treasury, whether it is plethoric or lean, has nothing to do with the question.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] says that in seventeen

years of service here he has attended several extra sessions. In my eleven years of service here I have attended several extra sessions of the Senate, but no extra session of Congress. The last extra session of Congress that was called was in 1879, and the reason for it will probably be recollected by those who are familiar with the history of Congressional legislation about that time. The Army appropriation bill failed at the regular session, and immediately upon the expiration of the Congress, on the 4th day of March, the Executive issued a proclamation convening Congress in extraordinary session, and it met in the same same month of March. I doubt whether but few of those who lived any distance from the capital went to their homes. There was no equity in their being paid mileage for their attendance at that extra session, just as there is no equity in the proposition that when the Senate of the United States is called in extraordinary session, as it usually is after the 4th of March, at which a President is inaugurated, there should be mileage paid to the Senators of the United States who are in attendance at that session.

But the case before us is very different. Congress adjourned on the 4th day of March, and on the 7th day of August, after all had gone to their homes and were engaged, perhaps, in that private business which receives so much neglect and is so much a matter of incidental loss to the holding of a position in Congress, we were called again to come here. I submit that the equities are with us who say that for that coming and going back to our homes after Congress adjourned early in November mileage is fairly due.

I am not one of those who believe that the compensations in the way of mileage, and in the way of allowance yearly to members of Congress for stationery, postage, etc., is the best way of paying members of Congress. I think the better plan would be, if $5,000 per annum is not sufficient, to make the sum larger and cut off the $125 a year that is allowed for postage, and let members of Congress pay their postage and their stationery out of the amount that is given to them as a lump sum for their compensation.

We came here, as I said, in August, 1893, and we returned to our homes early in November. Why should we not in equity receive the compensation that is allowed by law for that going and coming? It seems to me that is very small compensation to those of us who were deprived during the last summer of the opportunity of a vacation, if we desired to spend the time in recreation, or the opportunity to attend to our private business, if necessity compelled that that should be done.

But not only is the equity with us, but the law is with the proposition that comes from the House of Representatives. It has been well construed by the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE], who calls attention to the language of the act, that the sum was made available to pay Senators, Members, and Delegates for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, and that was the extra session. This, on our record, on our Calendar, and on all the books at the Secretary's desk, is the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, and it is the regular session that is provided for by the law.

The First Comptroller of the Treasury is usually believed to be a pretty sound lawyer. I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Mr. Bowler, who now fills that position, but I take it he is a man well fitted to decide upon questions that arise between claimants and the Government of the United States, and that he applies to statutes that are appropriating in their character that strict construction which must come to laws that regulate payments from the Government to the individual—a strict construction that favors the Government and is adverse to the individual. I find that he has written to the Sergeant-at-Arms of another body a letter dated the 28th of November, 1893, where he construes the existing law providing that mileage shall be paid for a regular session of Congress and that section of the appropriation act of last year which has been referred to. His letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, FIRST COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1893.

SIR: I am in receipt of yours of the 27th instant, asking whether you will be authorized in paying mileage to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, Fifty-third Congress, for their attendance at the approaching regular session without further action of Congress.

In reply thereto I would say that by section 17 of the act of July 28, 1866, which is the law governing mileage to be paid to members of Congress, they are to be allowed "20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session." As the approaching session is the regular session authorized by law, under the provisions of said section, Representatives and Delegates are entitled to receive their usual mileage.

The resolution approved August 21, 1893, making immediately available the appropriation for the payment of mileage for the fiscal year 1894 and authorizing such payment to be made for attendance upon the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, did not impliedly repeal this provision, but simply authorized the payment of mileage for attendance upon the late extraordinary session.

As no new appropriation has been made for mileage, the amount of $130,000 appropriated in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 3, 1893, can not be exceeded. You will, therefore, have to govern yourself accordingly.

Respectfully yours,

R. B. BOWLER, *Comptroller.*

Hon. HERMAN W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

So we have there the decision of one of the law officers of the Government specially charged with the consideration of questions of this character, and he so construes the law. It seems to me that we can very safely stand upon his construction of it.

Mr. President, I have very little sympathy with the constant appeal that we hear to the dear people. I am one of the dear people, I hope. I believe that I feel as fully the obligation that is upon me to protect their interests as any of my associates here; but I confess I grow very tired at times of this constant threat that we shall hear from the people if we do not do so and so. I am willing to trust myself to the people. I do not believe they want a service here that is self-sacrificing. I do not believe they desire that the men whom they send to either House of Congress shall give the force of their talent and their ability and their whole strength without a fair and reasonable compensation.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, when the joint resolution passed the Senate near the close of the extra session I did not misunderstand it then nor do I misunderstand its reading now. It is clearly within the terms of the joint resolution that the appropriations made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act were to cover the mileage of Senators and Members during the fiscal year 1894; and according to the terms of the joint resolution that money, for reasons obvious to everybody, was made immediately available. As I understood the legislation at the time it was that the mileage for the regular session of 1894 was advanced for the convenience of Senators.

I do not care whether a Senator is overpaid or underpaid: that has nothing to do with the question. The question before the Senate now is, has there been since the organization of the Federal Government a mileage paid to members of this body or of the other House for an extra session of Congress? I think you will look in vain——

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, I will cite him to a very recent precedent.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should be glad to hear it.

Mr. HARRIS. At an extra session of Congress convened recently there was a joint resolution passed to pay the mileage of Members and Senators for that extra session, leaving the general law to pay for regular sessions just as it is found on the statute book.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Is it the particular measure that was read by the Senator from Mississippi to which the Senator from Tennessee alludes?

Mr. HARRIS. I take it for granted it is; but I beg to remind the Senator of the explanation I have already twice made on the floor that originally, when it was introduced, it contained a proviso.

Mr. COCKRELL. Here is the proviso, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to read it.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Missouri will read the proviso.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is as follows:

Provided, That payments hereunder shall be in lieu of mileage authorized by law for attendance at the first regular or the next session of the Fifty-third Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. On motion that proviso was stricken out, which means unmistakably that the mileage provided for by that joint resolution was for the extra session, leaving the general law standing upon the statute book just as it stood before, allowing mileage for the regular session when that session should convene.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for calling my attention to the action of the Senate with respect to the joint resolution as it was originally introduced. I was not aware of that fact. Certainly I knew of no such proceeding; and that action would probably give the Senator the right to say that the joint resolution did authorize the payment of mileage for the present session.

Mr. HARRIS. Unmistakably.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now, let me read it as it came into the Senate as an original measure, and see what impression every Senator would gain from the joint resolution:

That the appropriation for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1894 * * * be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available.

I think few Senators understood that joint resolution to mean anything else except to advance the money due to us under the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for 1894.

I want to say that I think this is a very poor time indeed for Congress to begin to appropriate money out of the public Treasury and make a new rule and precedent for their action. That consideration will control my vote.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I do not propose to delay the Senate, but I wish to say that this is a very clear proposition to my mind. What is the provision for mileage intended for? Why is it distinct from the general compensation paid to a Senator? Evidently it is that every member of Congress shall have the means of coming to the place where the public business is to be transacted. That is the only object of it; and why compensation for this purpose should be provided at one time and not at another is a question which those who object to this provision in the bill must answer. The public money, the public business, and the interests of the people (if this Government is worth anything and those matters are to be considered) require that every member of Congress appointed to the duty of legislation shall have the means of coming here to represent the people and protect their interests, and it is just as obligatory at one time as at another that the means shall be provided by which the representatives of the people are enabled to be here. That is the object of the law. If they are required to come here ten times in a year, and there are amongst them men who are too poor to come, their expenses ought to be paid as the only way of certainly securing their presence here.

Now, in regard to this being a bad time for such an appropriation, let me say that the people of the United States who are suffering and who need relief, and great relief, and great expenditures on the part of the Government, will not be injured one penny by the appropriation. Indeed their benefit and the advancement of their interests lie in paying the expenses of Senators and Representatives in coming here and in Congress adopting broad measures for the relief of the people who are suffering now by the hundreds of thousands throughout the country.

Mr. President, I am in favor of paying mileage at every session of Congress. If that has not been the law it ought to be the law.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I find the statute which the joint resolution passed at the extraordinary session seems to amend quoted in the rules of this body, on page 287, and I read that portion which I believe pertains to the question now under consideration:

> The compensation of each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress shall be $5,000 per annum; and, in addition thereto mileage at the rate of 20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session: *Provided*, That hereafter, mileage accounts of Senators shall be certified by the President of the Senate, and those of Representatives and Delegates by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
>
> Mileage for two sessions only, to be paid in the following manner, to wit: On the first day of each regular session, each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall receive his mileage for one session; and at the beginning of the second regular session of the Congress, each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall receive his mileage for such second session.

Clearly in the provisions of this statute the only mileage that members of the House or Senators are entitled to is the mileage that is to be paid at the two regular sessions of Congress provided for by the Constitution.

When the joint resolution was passed at the extraordinary session it was simply a measure anticipating the payment of the mileage which would have fallen due to Senators at this time. Under the law as it existed at that time we were not entitled to any mileage until the first regular session of Congress—that is, on the first Monday of December. Now, to anticipate the payments that would be due at this time the following joint resolution was passed:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1894, approved March 3, 1893, be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories for attendance on the first session of the Fifty-third Congress.

The statute, if it means anything, means simply that in lieu of the date of payment for the regular session, which would be this month, we permitted its payment in advance of the time fixed by general statute; and whenever we took compensation under this joint resolution passed at the extraordinary session we took the compensation that was provided for by general statute relating to the question of mileage.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator is entirely mistaken in his premises. I imagine that he is the only Senator on this floor who did not fully understand that the mileage which was voted the last time was not in lieu of the mileage which we were to receive at the present session. Here is the debate in the other House at the last session which was used there yesterday. Mr. HOLMAN, at the last session, offered an amendment to the joint resolution, as follows:

> *Provided*, That payments hereunder shall be in lieu of mileage authorized by law for attendance at the first regular or the next session of the Fifty-third Congress.

That was stricken out. Mr. O'Neill, since deceased, who was combating Mr. HOLMAN'S proviso, said what I will read:

> I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Suppose this called session should not continue very long, as the country hopes it will not. Suppose, for instance, having acted upon the financial question, having repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman bill, and having given the banks the right to issue circulation up to the par value of their bonds; suppose we should get away by the 1st of October, does the gentleman's joint resolution propose that we shall not have mileage for coming to this extra session, to which we have been called properly by the President of the United States, and not by any act of ours?

Mr. HOLMAN replied:

> This measure does not prejudge that subject. It leaves it all open.

And the result of that debate was that they struck out the words "in lieu of mileage for the next session." We understood it in the Senate. The House debated it and passed the provision for mileage at the last session with the understanding that we were to get the mileage at this session. The Senator from Nebraska is laboring under a misapprehension as to the fact.

Mr. ALLEN. With all deference to the Senator from Idaho, I will say that I am not laboring under any misapprehension as to the language of the joint resolution making available the appropriation passed at the extra session. If the joint resolution means anything, and I take it from the language it contains, it means simply to make available the appropriation which would not have been due until this month. The language of the joint resolution is that it shall be made immediately available; that is, implying that under the general statute it would not be available until the regular session which convened the first Monday of the present month.

Under my construction of the statute we are powerless to touch any more of the money of the people without some express act appropriating it. The joint resolution makes it as express as it is possible for the English language to express a thing, that we were simply tolling the statute in advance, which would have given us compensation now instead of giving it to us in August or September. According to my view of the matter we have no right under this bill to put our hands into the pockets of the people of this country and take money from them that there is no statute in existence authorizing. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Kansas will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] to strike out the clauses on page 9 of the bill from line 15 to line 19, inclusive, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAREY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY]. If he were present I should vote nay.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. Were he present I should vote nay.

Mr. HARRIS (when his named was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. I do not see him in the Chamber. I am informed by his colleague [Mr. PROCTOR] that the senior Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" if present. I record my vote "nay."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and I withhold my vote. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON], but I am advised that if present he would vote "nay." I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE (when Mr. WALTHALL'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. WALTHALL] has been unavoidably detained from the Senate for several days. He is paired generally with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON]. I have had no conference with my colleague on the subject and I do not know how he would vote if he were here.

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT]. I am informed that if present he would vote "nay." I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] on political

questions. I have consulted with his colleague, and I am permitted to vote in this instance. I will let my vote stand.

Mr. CULLOM (after having voted in the negative). I am reminded that I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]; but I have been informed that I am at liberty to vote on this question.

The vote was recapitulated by the Secretary.

Mr. ALLISON. Under the circumstances, not knowing how the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] would vote if present, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DUBOIS. I was requested by the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER], who has no colleague in the Senate, to announce his pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. My colleague [Mr. SHOUP] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. WHITE].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 41; as follows:

YEAS—12.

Allen,	Chandler,	Hill,	Mills,
Bate,	Coke,	Lindsay,	Peffer,
Berry,	George,	McPherson,	Platt.

NAYS—41.

Brice,	Gordon,	Martin,	Stewart,
Butler,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Oregon	Stockbridge,
Call,	Hale,	Mitchell, Wis.	Teller,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Davis,	Hoar,	Pasco,	Washburn,
Dolph,	Hunton,	Perkins,	White, Cal.
Dubois,	Jones, Ark.	Proctor,	Wilson.
Faulkner,	Jones, Nev.	Pugh,	
Frye,	Kyle,	Ransom,	
Gallinger,	Lodge,	Sherman,	

NOT VOTING—32.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	Manderson,	Smith,
Allison,	Dixon,	Morrill,	Squire,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Palmer,	Vance,
Caffery,	Gray,	Pettigrew,	Vest,
Camden,	Hansbrough,	Power,	Vilas,
Cameron,	Higgins,	Quay,	Walthall,
Carey,	Irby,	Roach,	White, La.
Colquitt,	McMillan,	Shoup,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARITIME CANAL OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senate to take up the concurrent resolution I submitted on the 18th instant, to appoint a joint committee to consider the subject of the Nicaraguan Canal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution, reported yesterday from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee, to consist of three Senators (to be appointed by the President of the Senate) and three members of the House of Representatives (to be appointed by the Speaker) be raised, whose duty it shall be to examine into and report upon the present condition of the Maritime Canal of Nicaragua, now being constructed under a charter granted by the Congress of the United States and under concessions granted by the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and the prospect of the completion of said work under the control and with means to be raised by the said Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, and such other matters connected with the construction and control of said canal as may better enable Congress to determine what legislation, if any, is proper and necessary for the promotion of the general welfare of the people and Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. That said committee may hold its sessions during the session of Congress at any place in the United States, and may proceed to Nicaragua and Costa Rica and there conduct the examinations required by these resolutions; and the expenses of said committee incurred on the part of the Senate shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and the expenses incurred on the part of the House of Representatives shall be paid out of the contingent fund of said House.

SEC. 3. The said joint committee shall choose its chairman and appoint a clerk and stenographer and a sergeant-at-arms, who shall have, respectively, an allowance of $6 per diem while in the service of the committee. And said committee shall report upon the matters committed to them by these resolutions.

SEC. 4. That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to detail one engineer officer of the Army or Navy to accompany said committee and assist in its labors.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that a resolution, whether Senate or concurrent, that makes a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate must go by law to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I will inform the Senator from Tennessee that this resolution was referred to that committee and has been unanimously reported favorably.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg pardon of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. I suggest to the Senator from Alabama, whether in the last clause of the resolution it would not be better to leave out the word "engineer," and to leave it in the discretion of the President to detail one or more. There are several officers in the Army and Navy who have had experience in connection with the canal, but who are not engineer officers.

Mr. MORGAN. I will move to amend the resolution in that particular.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama moves to amend the last clause of the resolution. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Amend section 4 of the resolution, so as to read:

SEC. 4. That the President of the United States is requested to detail one or more officers of the Army or Navy to attend said committee and assist in its labors.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I move to strike out of the resolution the words that the committee "shall choose its chairman." I hope the Senator from Alabama will make no objection to this amendment. As I understand the proceeding in joint committees of the two Houses, each committee maintains its own authority and autonomy, and each has a chairman of its own. This would seem to proceed on the ground, if there shall be one chairman of the whole committee that it is a single body, in which perhaps four members of the House and one Sena or might vote down two Senators, or a majority of the committee of the Senate. I do not mean that any such thing will occur, but I merely make the suggestion for the purpose of having the precedents kept as I think they should be. I suppose it will make no practical difference here.

Mr. MORGAN. I was in doubt as to what the precedent is on the subject. I will modify that part of the resolution. I move to strike out the words in regard to choosing a chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, line 1, after the word "shall," strike out the words "choose its chairman and;" so as to read:

That said joint committee shall appoint a clerk and stenographer, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

ANTONIO MAXIMO MORA.

Mr. DOLPH. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not in his opinion incompatible with the public interests, to communicate to the Senate the diplomatic correspondence since June 16, 1892, together with such views of his own as he may think proper to express, in regard to the failure of the Spanish Government to pay the indemnity agreed to be paid by that Government in the year 1886 to the United States Government for the benefit of Antonio Maximo Mora, a citizen of the United States.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that the request to the President to communicate his own views is a very extraordinary provision in a resolution. I have no objection to requesting the President to communicate the facts in the case, but I object to requesting the President to communicate his own views to Congress about the matter. I suggest that that clause ought to be stricken out.

Mr. DOLPH. It is all left to the discretion of the President. I do not think there can be any objection to the resolution, but I do not care about insisting on that part of it.

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest to the Senator to modify it in that respect.

Mr. DOLPH. I will strike out that portion of the resolution.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if the information asked for by the resolution is not obtainable by making a request of the State Department. What is the necessity to pass resolutions day after day calling on the President for information when the fact is ascertainable at the Department?

Mr. DOLPH. All the previous correspondence has been printed and this is a request for an official document, which is accessible. There is a resolution pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations directing action by this Government to secure the collection of the claim, and action upon the resolution has been suspended on account of the correspondence between the State Department and the Spanish Government. The object of the resolution is to call for this recent correspondence in order that the committee may have the whole matter before it. I have no objection to striking out that portion of the resolution objected to by the Senator from Maryland. I will modify the resolution in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After "1892," in the third line, strike out

the words "together with such views of his own as he may think proper to express;" so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not in his opinion incompatible with the public interests, to communicate to the Senate the diplomatic correspondence since June 16, 1892, in regard to the failure of the Spanish Government, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress from Thursday, the 21st day of December present, to Monday, the 3d day of January, 1894; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. HOAR. I ask that the resolution which has just been received from the House of Representatives be read at the desk for the information of the Senate. I think there is a mistake in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, the 21st day of December present, they stand adjourned until Monday, the 3d day of January, 1894.

Mr. HOAR. There is some mistake in the resolution. It was probably made in the engrossment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was just going to make a suggestion in regard to the matter. I ask unanimous consent to take up the resolution for consideration, and amend it by striking out "Monday" and inserting "Wednesday."

Mr. HALE. That would not change the date?

Mr. COCKRELL. It would not change the date, but simply the day. Then we can send back the resolution to the other House for concurrence in our amendment and we shall be done with it. I hope unanimous consent will be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out "Monday" and to insert "Wednesday," so as to read, "Wednesday, the 3d day of January, 1894."

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

HUDSON RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend, to their respective House as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, and agree to same.

That the Senate recede from so much of amendment numbered 9 as is contained in lines 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, page 2, and that the House recede from its disagreement to so much of amendment numbered 9 as is contained in lines 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, page 2, and agree to same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 11, line 7, page 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, inserting after the word act a colon and the words: "*Provided further*, That if such company, under this authority, shall build a pier in said river outside of the pier-head lines on either side thereof, then all of the subdivisions of this act, except subdivision 'First,' shall apply to said company;" so that the whole will read as follows:

"Eighth. The right to amend, alter, modify, or repeal this act is hereby reserved, and the provisions of subdivision 3 of this act shall be extended to any other bridge company, heretofore authorized by Congress to bridge said river at New York City: *Provided*, That such company shall submit plans and location of its bridge, pursuant thereto, to the Secretary of War within one year after the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That if such company, under this authority, shall build a pier in said river outside of the pier-head lines on either side thereof, then all of the provisions of all the subdivisions of this act, except subdivision 'First,' shall apply to said company."

A. P. GORMAN,
G. G. VEST,
WILLIAM P. FRYE,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

T. J. GEARY,
L. FLETCHER,
Conferees on the part of the House of Representatives.

The report was concurred in.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KYLE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes, p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 21, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 20, 1893.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

William H. Brawley, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the district of South Carolina, vice Charles H. Simonton, appointed United States circuit judge for the fourth judicial circuit.

SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

William N. Hailmann, of La Porte, Ind., to be superintendent of Indian schools, vice Daniel Dorchester, resigned, to take effect January 16, 1893.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John Russell, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi, to succeed William Davis, resigned.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Abraham Boynton, of Elk Point, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Mitchell, S. Dak., vice Reuben N. Kratz, to be removed.

John M. Davis, of Huron, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Huron, S. Dak., vice James McDowell, whose term of office will expire January 2, 1894.

John W. Ferguson, of Minden, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Lincoln, Nebr., vice William H. Clark, to be removed.

William A. Hocker, of Evanston, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo., vice George C. L. Goodman, to be removed.

Ephraim S. Johnston, of Cheyenne, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Cheyenne, Wyo., vice Edward P. Champlin, whose term of office will expire December 29, 1893.

Joseph Patterson, of Grayling, Mich., to be register of the land office at Grayling, Mich., vice Oscar Palmer, to be removed.

Mark W. Sheafe, of Watertown, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Watertown, S. Dak., vice Franklin P. Phillips, to be removed.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

C. Boyd Barrett, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Aberdeen, S. Dak., vice Charles J. Macleod, resigned.

Rush Culver, of L'Anse, Mich., to be receiver of public moneys at Marquette, Mich., vice Thomas D. Meads, to be removed.

John B. Hanten, of Watertown, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Watertown, S. Dak., vice Robert E. Carpenter, whose term of office will expire January 2, 1894.

Austin D. Hill, of Miller, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Huron, S. Dak., vice Orrin W. Bair, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

Cyrus D. Kelley, of Cheyenne, Wyo., to be receiver of public moneys at Cheyenne, Wyo., vice Leroy Grant, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

Frank Mills, of Hilliard, Wyo., to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo., vice Frank M. Foote, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

William T. Skelton, of Akron, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Akron, Colo., vice George C. Reed, to be removed.

Richard D. Welch, of Mitchell, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Mitchell, S. Dak., vice Ralph W. Wheelock, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

POSTMASTERS.

James J. Brown, to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the county of Perry and State of Alabama, in the place of Mary Pittillo, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Joseph T. McGehee, to be postmaster at Huntsville, in the county of Madison and State of Alabama, in the place of Bernard T. Ludwig, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Leslie M. Dennis, to be postmaster at Redding, in the county of Shasta and State of California, in the place of Chauncey C. Bush, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

August F. Domine, to be postmaster at Cloverdale, in the county of Sonoma and State of California, in the place of William T. Brush, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Austin Hawkins, to be postmaster at Yreka, in the county of Siskiyou and State of California, in the place of Alonzo E. Raynes, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

William J. Miller, to be postmaster at San Rafael, in the county of Marin and State of California, in the place of Simon F. Barstow, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Francis E. Fitzpatrick, to be postmaster at Stafford Springs, in the county of Tolland and State of Connecticut, in the place of Marcia G. Whiton, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Marshall P. Ryder, to be postmaster at Plainville, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut, in the place of Edwin F. Tomlinson, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

William F. Lee, to be postmaster at Pensacola, in the county of Escambia and State of Florida, in the place of Frederick C. Humphreys, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Martin Collins, to be postmaster at Cartersville, in the county of Bartow and State of Georgia, in the place of Walter Akerman, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

J. B. M. Winburn, to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Hall and State of Georgia, in the place of William A. Wood, resigned.

B. C. Allensworth, to be postmaster at Pekin, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois, in the place of Richard D. Smith, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Charles F. Ballweg, to be postmaster at Edwardsville, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois, in the place of Thomas M. Crossman, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

F. Charles Donohue, to be postmaster at Freeport, in the county of Stephenson and State of Illinois, in the place of Smith D. Atkins, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Edmund B. McClanahan, to be postmaster at Waukegan, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois, in the place of Clarence A. Murray, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Lewis McCoy, to be postmaster at Golconda, in the county of Pope and State of Illinois, in the place of John M. Boicount, deceased.

Pinkney L. McNabb, to be postmaster at McLeansboro, in the county of Hamilton and State of Illinois, in the place of Charles M. Lyon, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

John H. Schulte, to be postmaster at Havana, in the county of Mason and State of Illinois, in the place of Edward J. Krampff, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Charles N. Smith, to be postmaster at Belvidere, in the county of Boone and State of Illinois, in the place of R. G. Whitman, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Frank G. Wood, to be postmaster at Gerard, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois, in the place of M. V. Kitzmiller, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Eugene Lewis, to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Hancock and State of Indiana, in the place of Isaac Davis, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

Charles Spinney, to be postmaster at Goodland, in the county of Newton, and State of Indiana, in the place of Henry H. Downing, whose commission expires December 19, 1893.

William H O Connell, to be postmaster at Audubon, in the county of Audubon and State of Iowa, in the place of E. B. Cousins, resigned.

Charles N. Berner, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Washington and State of Kansas, in the place of William Murdock, resigned.

Abbie E. Libby, to be postmaster at Marysville, in the county of Marshall and State of Kansas, in the place of Leroy W. Libby, deceased.

John B. Powell, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Boyd and State of Kentucky, in the place of James S. Ogden, whose commission expired December 10, 1893.

William P. Walker, to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Anderson and State of Kentucky, in the place of Thomas J. Ballard, resigned.

W. O. Braden, to be postmaster at Grayling, in the county of Crawford and State of Michigan, in the place of J. M. Jones, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Herbert A. Burch, to be postmaster at Dowagiac, in the county of Cass and State of Michigan, in the place of J. O. Becraft, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

H. A. Scott, to be postmaster at Ludington, in the county of Mason and State of Michigan, in the place of W. H. Hudson, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

William V. Berry, to be postmaster at Fulton, in the county of Callaway and State of Missouri, in the place of John F. Craigo, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

John D. Tolson, to be postmaster at Fayette, in the county of Howard and State of Missouri, in the place of George C. Eaton, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

M. Y. Rusk, to be postmaster at Brookfield, in the county of Linn and State of Missouri, in the place of Warren D. Crandall, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Sherman M. Smith, to be postmaster at Chillicothe, in the county of Livingston and State of Missouri, in the place of John W. Toppass, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

George A. Herzog, to be postmaster at Harvard, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, in the place of George W. Martin, resigned.

Frank P. Hobbs, to be postmaster at Wolfhairboro, in the county of Carroll and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Forest W. Peavey, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Frank M. Parker, to be postmaster at Hillsboro Bridge, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire, in the place of De Witt C. Newman, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

A. G. Foogman, to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Traill and State of North Dakota, in the place of Olins Anderson, resigned.

Joseph W. Falknor, to be postmaster at Covington, in the county of Miami and State of Ohio, in the place of John S. Dollinger, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Flavius A. Hart, to be postmaster at Oberlin, in the county of Lorain and State of Ohio, in the place of John W. Steel, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Benjamin F. Sonnenstine, to be postmaster at Wadsworth, in the county of Medina and State of Ohio, in the place of Eli Overholt, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Joseph B. Kershaw, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Kershaw and State of South Carolina, in the place of George G. Alexander, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Cy H. Lyle, to be postmaster at Johnson City, in the county of Washington and State of Tennessee, in the place of J. M. Martin, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Nathaniel J. Mills, to be postmaster at Corsicana, in the county of Navarro and State of Texas, in the place of Adolph Zadek, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Joseph M. Burke, to be postmaster at Middlebury, in the county of Addison and State of Vermont, in the place of John H. Stewart, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Alfred Ferguson, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Frederick and State of Virginia, in the place of Richard E. Griffith, removed.

William J. Cutteridge, to be postmaster at Lake Geneva, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin, in the place of George S. Reed, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

John A. Jacobs, to be postmaster at Washburn, in the county of Bayfield and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Herman J. Finstad, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

William H. Rohr, to be postmaster at Watertown, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Justus T. Moak, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

Charles Sorenson, to be postmaster at Rock Springs, in the county of Sweetwater and State of Wyoming, in the place of Herman F. Menough, whose commission expires December 20, 1893.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20, 1893.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Wayne MacVeagh, of Pennsylvania, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Italy.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

John B. Riley, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Ottawa, Canada.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Cavalry arm.

First Lieut. Eben Swift, Fifth Cavalry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. J. Y. Mason Blunt, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. George W. Gatchell, Fourth Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

Ordnance Department.

Second Lieut. Colden L'H. Ruggles, Third Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Palmer G. Wood, regimental quartermaster Twelfth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. Odon Gurovits, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Signal Corps.

First Lieut. William A. Glassford, to be captain.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

James H. Forney, of Idaho, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Idaho.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Louis W. Pratt, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Isaac Coombs, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Knox and State of Maine.

Giles Devier, to be postmaster at Harrisonburg, in the county of Rockingham and State of Virginia.

H. W. Kinzer, to be postmaster at Front Royal, in the county of Warren and State of Virginia.

John O. Perkins, to be postmaster at Jefferson, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin.

Rufus F. Ingalls, to be postmaster at Gorham, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire.

James Gillen, jr., to be postmaster at Houlton, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine.

Calvin Clendenin, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

Jeremiah G. Shaw, to be postmaster at Biddeford, in the county of York and State of Maine.

R. J. Bouchelle, to be postmaster at Columbia, in the county of Boone and State of Missouri.

Edward C. Morrissey, to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Jackson and State of Michigan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PURE-FOOD BILL.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask to refer the bill H. R. 4863 to the Committee on Agriculture. I suppose strictly under the rule it would go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4863) to prevent the adulteration and misbranding of food and drugs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH], under clause 3 of Rule XXII, moves that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. The Clerk will report that clause of the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clause 3, Rule XXII:

All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may in like manner be delivered, indorsed with the names of members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and reference thereof, and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules, shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, and in accordance with Rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, let us have the bill read, in order that we may know the nature of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands from the gentleman from Missouri that the Committee on Agriculture claims jurisdiction of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. The Committee on Agriculture claims jurisdiction of the bill, and it had jurisdiction during the last Congress.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The question is not debatable.

Mr. WISE. I would like to state that I have no objection to the reference requested, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. KILGORE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the bill just now been introduced?

The SPEAKER. The bill was introduced on yesterday and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and this morning the gentleman from Missouri, from the Committee on Agriculture, moves to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the further consideration of the bill and to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DINGLEY. I hope the bill will be read.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, as it is asked. The gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Maine ask for its reading; and it will be read so that the House may intelligently vote on the question of reference.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of this bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. TRACEY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 16.

Mr. COOMBS and Mr. WARNER. No quorum.

Mr. HATCH. I demand the yeas and nays. [After a pause.] In deference to the request of the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am willing that this matter rest just as it is, retaining its status before the House, and let the gentleman call up his conference report, rather than to consume the time now in demanding the yeas and nays and getting a quorum.

Mr. DOCKERY. There are two little matters to come up.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the question of ordering the yeas and nays upon the pending proposition will stand open until the Chair has cleared the table and the conference report has been disposed of.

Mr. DOCKERY. Another report has also to be submitted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to submit a report.

Mr. WARNER. I understand the question will stand in the present shape?

The SPEAKER. Exactly.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF TREASURY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the year ending 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Sixteenth Statistical Abstract, and requesting that it be printed as soon as practicable; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

INDIAN DEPREDATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a statement of all final judgments in claims arising from Indian depredations under the act approved March 3, 1891; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House communications from the Court of Claims, transmitting copy of findings in the cases of R. L. Kirby, deceased, against the United States; J. C. Brooks against the United States; and G. W. Carter against the United States; which were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditures of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of the Interior Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

FORT BRIDGER ABANDONED MILITARY RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a bill (S. 165) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Bridger abandoned military reservation in the State of Wyoming; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE OF CAPITOL POLICE FORCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following concurrent Senate resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the board of Capitol police be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to appoint twelve additional policemen at an annual salary of $1,100 each, one-half to be paid by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, out of the appropriations for miscellaneous items of the respective Houses, until otherwise provided for.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. COBB of Missouri, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for two days, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana asked leave to print in the RECORD remarks on the bill authorizing States and Territories to tax national-bank notes, greenbacks, etc.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, that bill has not been reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly I object to printing in the RECORD remarks on a bill that has not been reported.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. We all object.

TARIFF.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, from the Committee on Printing, submitted the following report:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the House 5,000 copies of the bill and the report thereon reported from the Committee on Ways and Means entitled "A bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," with an amendment. The amendment proposed by the committee is to strike out "5,000" and insert "4,000."

The committee have considered the House resolution introduced by Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, to print 5,000 copies of the bill, and the report thereon reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, entitled "A bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," and have directed me to report the same with the recommendation that it do pass, with an amendment reducing the number from 5,000 to 4,000. This amendment is made necessary for the reason that, under the law, the House can not, by a simple resolution, order printing in excess of $500.

The estimated cost of 4,000 copies is a little less than $500.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, there ought to be a provision for the printing of a like number of the views of the minority.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The resolution as introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia did not call for the printing of the views of the minority. The House can not, by a single resolution, order the printing of more than 4,000 copies of the report itself and keep within the limit. If the minority wish to have 4,000 copies of their views printed that will have to be provided for by a separate resolution; and if any gentleman will introduce a resolution to print the views of the minority I undertake to say that the Committee on Printing will report it immediately.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the proper way would be to reduce the number of copies of the report to be printed by this order, and provide for an equal number of the report and of the views of the minority, so that the two might go forth together.

The amendment recommended by the Committee on Printing, reducing the number from 5,000 to 4,000, was agreed to.

The report as amended was then adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee moved to reconsider the vote by which the report as amended was adopted, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that a like number of copies of the views of the minority be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection an additional order will be made that 4,000 copies of the views of the minority be printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

A MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.

FURTHER URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes. Will the Chair please state how much time was consumed on the report last evening.

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes. The gentleman has fifty minutes remaining.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield fifteen minutes to my colleague, Mr. HUTCHESON.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] moves that the House recede. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, after line 12, insert:

"To pay clerks to Senators, and per diem clerks, and those retained in the service of the Senate during the recess of the Fifty-first Congress, on the resolution of the Senate of September 30, 1890, $22,088."

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of this House while I seek to illustrate the old adage that a man lives to learn. When it was my pleasure to live within the ranks of the Democratic party, not participating in its leadership, I worshiped it as a child worships its mother. When I made my canvass, aspiring to the honors of this House, I looked over the field of my country and felt as Moses felt when he stood upon Mount Pisgah, that the land of Canaan was to be restored to the righteous and taken from the hand of the infidel and the robber.

During that canvass, Mr. Speaker, I gave utterance to sentiments for which I now wish to apolgize to the Republican party. I feel that it is due to both the Democratic and the Republican parties that the views which I then entertained of the two organizations should be stated here in order that my apology may be distinctly understood. I see that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] smiles. I propose hereafter to pay my compliments to his party and to show him what a change has taken place in my estimation of that party, for he stood in this House yesterday as its sole embodiment on the vote on mileage, "the boy upon the burning deck, whence all but him had fled," and yet the flames of battle did not shine upon the dead, but the bright eyes of his living companions looked into his face and smiled at his solitude. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, on the memorable occasion to which I have referred, I, as a Democrat, said of the Republican party what I now propose to retract and to apologize for. In what I say now I mean simply to repeat what I then said, to set down naught in malice and naught extenuate. Looking over the political field I used this language:

The Republican party is effete with plunder, drunk with power. To defeat them is to emancipate this great country from sectionalism, from oppression, from plunder, from the embers of hate, and from the passions of avarice. I believe that the Democratic party is the party of the people, seeking to elevate them, seeking to make them sovereign over all combinations and usurpations of power, seeking their greatest good; and whatever may be its faults, and however it may have blundered, its aspirations are to make this Government one of pure and simple democracy, uncorrupted by the greed of avarice, uncontaminated by the lust of power, and that when they shall come into control their chief plea, their chief boast, will be the boast of economy, and their pride will be the pride of simplicity.

Mr. Speaker, those were my honest sentiments, and I came here expecting to see them manifested by this body.

On the 3d day of November, 1893, I saw this House perpetrate what I conceived to be an outrage upon all the sentiments thus expressed. I changed my view to this extent: I said the Democratic party of the South is all a good party; the Republican party of the South and North is all a bad party; only that portion of the Democratic party which is North is corrupt; the South is pure and the Populists are spotless and immaculate.

But, Mr. Speaker, what transpired in this House yesterday has changed my sentiments again. I turn the tide of sentiment from my first view and my second view, to my third view. I stand here to-day to say that between the three parties I had rather be a Republican than a Democrat before my country on this measure, so help me God. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why do I say that?

Mr. POWERS. In behalf of the Republican party, I would remind the gentleman that "while the lamp holds out to burn" we are willing to take him in.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Yes; but your party is already overflowing with sinners.

Allow me to say that the sentiment which prevails in this House is a great astonishment to me. I say it in kindness; but when I saw the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]—honest, as every man knows him to be—stand before this House and appeal to its sentiment of right, I saw this House mock a sentiment of justice and deride a contention for economy—Democrats, Republicans, and Populists—I stood amazed. You had the right to differ with him; but the manner in which you breasted the storm and avalanche of justice showed the contempt which you had for the principles which he advocated, and announced that in your heart of hearts you do not esteem and venerate them.

The Republican party makes no pretensions to economy. [Laughter.] It stands here and confesses that it wants to rob the people; for it thereby builds up a system of protective tariff. I thank you, gentlemen [addressing the Republican side of the House], for the courage of your expression and for the maintenance of your principles. But the Democratic party says with holy, uplifted hands, "We do not intend to take a dollar from the people except it be in the administration of economic government;" yet gentlemen here pocket, and perhaps I myself will pocket, $700 in the teeth of economy. [Laughter, and cries of "Oh, no!"] Yes, gentlemen, permit me to say to you that I tried to save the Government from this extravagance; but if you undertake to deplete it, I am not going to allow you to get all that is in there. [Laughter.] I do not deny that the provision is lawful, but it is extravagant; and were I President I would speedily veto it.

Mr. Speaker, what is it that produced this sentiment in this

House? I do not mean to hurt any man's sensibilities. If with unbridled lip and an uncircumcised tongue I offend, God knows, I beg pardon. In order that I might not be misconceived and might not trespass beyond the limits of propriety, I have written down deliberately what I feel on this subject, expressing my view as to how it comes about that in the great House of Commons of America the sentiment of economy is derided and the sentiment of simplicity is scorned. Let me read this to you.

What is it that has constructed this empire of opinion in this House? I can understand why the great men, the leaders of this House, should scorn economy—I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY] will excuse me for alluding to him [laughter]—should not descend to economy, for great men scorn so small a thing. They hold the proud man's contumely for so contemptible a plea; they rise in their greatness and they can not descend to things so low; and conscious mediocrity (I do not think there are any such men here) likes always to stand within the shadow of greatness. That accounts for two elements of this House.

But what is it, Mr. Speaker, that makes the plain man, the common citizen who when he is in his canvass at home dresses as a plain man and talks as a plain man—what is it that has corrupted his sentiment or makes him depart from his convictions of what is modest economy and just propriety? Let me tell you. It is the great men (so-called leaders) of this House. Let me read again, so that I may give no offense.

Why, Mr. Speaker, those leaders with curled lip send through this Hall the contemptuous epithet of demagogue, and feel that they have damned the underling—Economy—and crushed its contemptible votaries by that epithet. They rain down the storm of detraction; they shoot out their darts of contumely; and with these combined arts they drive the sense and the spirit of economy from this House. No man desires to be called a demagogue; every man flinches from that epithet; and men here dare not stand up under the expression of ill-concealed contempt that is hurled at them when they dare advocate on this floor the principles of economy which they preach at home.

These men fly from and surrender their convictions rather than wear the epithet. Thus there is created a sentiment which cries shame to virtue, calls reverence mockery, friendship a sham, platform promises claptrap and false pretenses to catch votes, as the leader of Tammany proclaimed in this Hall.

Mr. MORSE. That is what some of them are.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Well, sir, I am glad the gentleman recognizes one fact which I have stated as true. I hope he will cultivate a few more of these sentiments, they will elevate him. [Laughter.]

In this way this House has become infected with the sentiment that a man who dare rise here and advocate economy is an infernal demagogue, a false pretender, a mean, low, base hypocrite, who dare not face this great and grand House with his base pretensions.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, the force of the sentiment created by that epithet hurled into this House. I know its power. It is the Krupp gun, the dynamite shell that drives the timid and fearful from the field disconcerted. But let its thunders roar and let its lightnings descend athwart this House: I pray God that some may stand undismayed until wrong gives way to right and justice sits enthroned where now sits Plunder's god and Craft's despoiler. [Applause.] I pray God that economy may again be restored as it existed in the days of Thomas Jefferson, when plain men were the nation's lords. [Applause.]

If, Mr. Speaker, to believe that economy is right and that extravagance is plunder, that modest simplicity is grander and more glorious than gaudy plunder, constitute a man a demagogue, then I hail the epithet as a proud distinction and will wear its colors as a badge of honor. [Loud applause.]

So much, then, for the sentiment. Let us come now to the work that is before us, and let me once more renew my appeal to this House for a return to economy, especially in this particular instance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that his time be continued.

Mr. SAYERS. I have control of the time, and will yield my colleague five minutes longer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended. Is there objection?

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield ten minutes more to my colleague, as he desires the time.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had to make this apology, because I feel ashamed to come before this House advocating economy which this House so condemns. I never like to feel that I am in contempt, and I wish to state why, with the simplicity of my original feelings, I came here with some expectation that there might be such a thing as economy practiced in this Government. But it seems to me that that is impossible. The precedents are all against me, and those feelings are gone now like a schoolboy's tale, or like the fleeting shadow of a dream. I only want it understood, before I part from the question, that I have still hopes that the traditions and views of the Democratic party will bring us back to a recognition of the fact that this should be an economic government, administered for the people.

The Republican party has departed so long and so far from that principle that, like Macbeth, they have stepped so far from the shore that it is easier to keep on than to turn back. I do not give the exact language. I scorn literal quotations [laughter]; but they will never return to the shore. The Populist party I had hoped would stand with us, but only one stood by us on yesterday. I have hopes still of the Democratic party, the silver wing of the Democratic party, because of the 48 votes yesterday against that measure I believe 47 were silver-wing Democrats, and let us hope that they will inspire the House with a better sentiment by the spotless purity of their white wings.

I am glad to say that with the 47 stood most of my colleagues from Texas. These constitute the leaven that will leaven the whole lump, and yet save this country from absolute destruction and the Treasury from being absolutely looted.

Now, I pass to the question before the House. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this measure ought to pass, for a number of reasons.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HUTCHESON. Yes.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. The gentleman stated that there was but one Populist who voted against this yesterday. I do not know how many did, but I know that I did, and I know of two others.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I am glad to accept the correction. I would not misrepresent the gentleman for the world. I understand there were two others, two more converts to righteousness, Mr. Speaker, and I want them to go upon record; but as a party they blasted my hopes and disappointed my expectations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give the reasons why I do not believe this bill ought to pass: First and foremost, the conditions have changed since this measure came to this House. You bestowed upon the Senators of this country yesterday a bounty that they did not know of. I came down with one of them this morning, and he was surprised to know that you had given him mileage. For God's sake, give him an opportunity of saying that he would have paid his clerk out of that mileage if he had known he was going to get it. Let him understand that new legislation has been enacted, and that, if he was not personally able to pay his clerk yesterday, this House has given him a fund out of the Treasury wherewith he can do it; and he may do it.

Mr. HOLMAN. And more than enough.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Yes, more. I will give another reason, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a final appeal to a sentiment which I trust this House has not lost. If it has lost the sentiment of economy, I trust it has not lost the sentiment of self-respect. Let me appeal for a moment to that sentiment and see if it, too, has taken the wings of the morning and flown to the uttermost part of the earth. If this measure ought to be passed at all, it ought not to be passed as it is now presented. It is an insult upon this House to insist upon it in this form.

And here permit me to answer a statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] yesterday. He said that the House had rebuked this measure and had performed its duty, and now could afford to pass it. The light of history contradicts him. The House got down upon its knees and stood ready to deliver this thing on the 3d of November, 1893, and would have delivered it, and they have encouraged the Senate by their position then, ready to deliver what was sought, by this same process, which was defeated only by filibustering; and the attitude of the House then has provoked this new assault.

Mr. HOLMAN. What gentleman from Indiana does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. HUTCHESON. I mean the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BYNUM. I beg the gentleman's pardon for mentioning his name.

Mr. BYNUM. The gentleman will agree that the House, before that, had refused to concur.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is true.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Yes, but the House since then had withdrawn its refusal, and indicated to the Senate that it stood ready to concur in the proposition.

Mr. BYNUM. After the Senate had refused to recede.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Yes; but, Mr. Speaker, I differ with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] in that respect. It is not the object of a legislator simply to make a record. It ought to be his object not only to make a record, but to defeat vicious legislation, record or no record. If we mean to pass this measure,

let us send a prviate messenger to the Senate and tell the Senate that we intend to pass it as a separate and independent bill; that we do not need to be knocked down and dragged out to do it. Let them save themselves and save us from the discredit of dragging this measure through upon this bill.

[Here the time expired.]

Mr. Speaker, I beg the pardon of the House for having trespassed on its time. I trust that the right will still prevail.

Mr. HAYES. It will.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Such methods, Mr. Speaker, have looted our Treasury, driven our people from affluence to indigence, from indigence to famine, and their audacity has grown with their impunity. But the time will come. I trust in God, when the people will come to gather their own. The vacant throne of justice will once again be claimed by the rightful heir, and that democracy which scorns the trappings of display and splendor will be the restored priestess to a desecrated and dismantled altar.

CORRECTION.

During the delivery of Mr. HUTCHESON'S remarks the following proceedings took place:

Mr. BLAIR. I rise to ask a correction of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON] has asked unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes longer.

Mr. BLAIR. I object, with this reservation: I have been all the morning endeavoring to get the floor to ask a correction of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. That could not be done pending the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. BLAIR. I thought I might ask unanimous consent to make the correction at this time as a matter of great personal convenience to myself, and then withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. If the Chair had known the purpose of the gentleman he would have recognized him earlier in the day.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I would like to have a few minutes longer.

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield to the gentleman ten minutes more time.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the gentleman from New Hampshire will submit a correction of the RECORD at this time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday morning it may be remembered at the close of the remarks on the Hawaiian business I offered a resolution expressing the sense of the House in favor of the annexation of the islands to the United States. Unfortunately the House objected to it, owing to some misapprehension I must believe. [Laughter.] Now, by some means, perhaps in the paralysis caused by the general disappointment that the resolution was not at once considered, the clerks have failed to make a note of the fact that the House referred the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BLAIR. The fact is not stated in the Journal. I ask that the correction be made so as to show the proper reference of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution was referred as indicated by the gentleman, and the correction will be made in accordance with his suggestion.

Mr. BLAIR. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that we must have those islands and they must have us, and we may as well go about the matter considerately.

Mr. HUTCHESON then resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS].

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Speaker, I shall probably not take ten minutes. I shall not attempt to controvert the ideas of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON] in relation to economy. I think that in the business before us the House has certainly vindicated its ideas of economy in this special matter. It relates to an expenditure authorized and made by the Senate. It was attached to a deficiency bill, and has been before the House certainly three times during the Fifty-third Congress; and, as I understand, three or four times in previous Congresses. By our disagreement we have relieved ourselves of responsibility, if any existed. We must admit, Mr. Speaker, that each House must be the judge of the morality, honesty, and wisdom of its own expenditures. It is true that each House passes upon the expenditures of the other, and that practice serves as a sort of a drag upon our expenditures; but having made our criticism, as we have in this case five or six times, we must retire from it if we would preserve the cordiality which should exist between the two branches of the legislative department of the Government.

If the Senate made a similar demand upon us we would not permit them to override us; and I can not possibly conceive of the dignified body at the other end of the Capitol retiring from its position. I am sure that if I were a member of that body I would not do so. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without any criticism of, or without any attempted justification of the expenditure, but simply on the question of policy and practice, I persist in my motion that we recede from our disagreement.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question upon the two motions.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question will first be taken on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS], that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. SAYERS. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 93, noes 42.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BLAND. No quorum.

Mr. SAYERS. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there—were yeas 141, nays 90, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—141.

Alderson,	Coombs,	Hilborn,	Phillips,
Aldrich,	Cousins,	Hines,	Price,
Apsley,	Covert,	Hooker, Miss.	Randall,
Avery,	Cummings,	Houk, Ohio	Reyburn,
Babcock,	Curtis, Kans.	Hulick,	Richards, Ohio
Baker, N. H.	Curtis, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Ritchie,
Baldwin,	Daniels,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Robbins,
Bankhead,	De Forest,	Kiefer,	Robertson, La.
Barwig,	Denson,	Layton,	Robinson, Pa.
Beltzhoover,	Donovan,	Lisle,	Ryan,
Berry,	Doolittle,	Livingston,	Schermerhorn,
Bingham,	Draper,	Loudenslager,	Settle,
Black, Ill.	Ellis, Oregon	Lucas,	Shaw,
Boutelle,	English,	Lynch,	Sibley,
Bowers, Cal.	Everett,	Maguire,	Sperry,
Brawley,	Fellows,	Mahon,	Stephenson,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Funk,	Marsh,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Funston,	Martin, Ind.	Stone, W. A.
Brosius,	Gardner,	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Brown,	Geary,	McCleary, Minn.	Sweet,
Bryan,	Geissenhainer,	McCreary, Ky.	Talbott, Md.
Bundy,	Goodnight,	McDannold,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Griffin,	McEttrick,	Tawney,
Burrows,	Hainer,	Meiklejohn,	Thomas,
Bynum,	Hall, Mo.	Mercer,	Tracey,
Cadmus,	Hammond,	Money,	Turpin,
Caldwell,	Harmer,	Moon,	Updegraff,
Campbell,	Harter,	Morse,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Cannon, Cal.	Hartman,	Northway,	Wadsworth,
Cannon, Ill.	Hatch,	Outhwaite,	Washington,
Caruth,	Hayes,	Patterson,	Whiting,
Catchings,	Heiner,	Payne,	Wise.
Causey,	Henderson, Ill.	Paynter,	Wright, Pa.
Childs,	Hepburn,	Pearson,	
Clarke, Ala.	Hermann.	Pence,	
Cogswell,	Hicks,	Pendleton, W. Va.	

NAYS—90.

Adams,	Cooper, Ind.	Lacey,	Richardson, Tenn.
Alexander,	Cox,	Lane,	Sayers,
Arnold,	Crawford,	Latimer,	Shell,
Bailey,	Davis,	Lefever,	Simpson,
Baker, Kans.	De Armond,	Lester,	Springer,
Barnes,	Dinsmore,	Maddox,	Stallings,
Bartholdt,	Dockery,	Mallory,	Strait,
Bartlett,	Epes,	Marshall,	Talbert, S. C.
Bell, Colo.	Fithian,	McCulloch,	Tate,
Bell, Tex.	Fyan,	McDearmon,	Taylor, Ind.
Black, Ga.	Gorman,	McKaig,	Terry,
Bland,	Grady,	McLaurin,	Turner,
Boen,	Harris,	McMillin,	Wanger,
Bower, N. C.	Heard,	McNagny,	Warner,
Branch,	Henderson, N. C.	McRae,	Weadock,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Holman,	Morgan,	Wells,
Bretz,	Hudson,	Moses,	Wheeler, Ala.
Brookshire,	Hunter,	O'Neil,	Williams, Miss.
Cabaniss,	Hutcheson,	Paschal,	Woodard,
Clark, Mo.	Ikirt,	Pendleton, Tex.	Woomer,
Cobb, Ala.	Kilgore.	Powers,	Wright, Mass.
Coffeen,	Kribbs.	Rayner,	
Conn,	Kyle,	Reed,	

NOT VOTING—122.

Abbott,	Clancy,	Dingley,	Gear,
Aitken,	Cobb, Mo.	Dolliver,	Gillet, N. Y.
Allen,	Cockran,	Dunn,	Gillett, Mass.
Belden,	Cockrell,	Dunphy,	Goldzier,
Blair,	Compton,	Durborow,	Graham,
Blanchard,	Cooper, Fla.	Edmunds,	Gresham,
Boatner,	Cooper, Tex.	Ellis, Ky.	Grosvenor,
Brattan,	Cooper, Wis.	Enloe,	Grout,
Broderick,	Cornish,	Erdman,	Hager,
Burnes,	Crain,	Fielder,	Haines,
Caminetti,	Culberson,	Fitch,	Hall, Minn.
Capehart,	Dalzell,	Fletcher,	Hare,
Chickering,	Davey,	Forman,	Haugen,

Henderson, Iowa	McAleer,	Pigott,	Storer,
Hendrix,	McCall,	Post,	Swanson,
Hitt,	McDowell,	Ray,	Taylor, Tenn.
Hooker, N. Y.	McGann,	Reilly,	Tucker,
Hopkins, Ill.	McKeighan,	Richardson, Mich.	Tyler,
Hopkins, Pa.	Meredith,	Rusk,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Houk, Tenn.	Meyer,	Russell, Conn.	Walker,
Hull,	Milliken,	Russell, Ga.	Waugh,
Johnson, Ohio	Montgomery,	Scranton,	Wever,
Jones,	Murray,	Sherman,	Wheeler, Ill.
Joy,	Mutchler,	Sickles,	White,
Kem,	Neill,	Sipe,	Williams, Ill.
Lapham,	Newlands,	Smith,	Wilson, Ohio
Lawson,	Oates,	Snodgrass,	Wilson, Wash.
Linton,	O'Ferrall,	Somers,	Wilson, W. Va.
Lockwood,	Page,	Stevens,	Wolverton.
Loud,	Perkins,	Stockdale,	
Magner,	Pickler,	Stone, C. W.	

So the motion to recede was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] excused. I am satisfied that he is detained on account of sickness in his family.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague [Mr. LOCKWOOD]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I vote "yea."

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my colleague [Mr. COCKRELL] excused. He is quite sick.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. My colleague [Mr. SNODGRASS] is detained at his room on account of illness.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. HALL of Missouri with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, until the 9th of January.

For this day:

Mr. PAGE with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. TYLER with Mr. HAGER.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. CAPEHART with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. STOCKDALE with Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois with Mr. CHICKERING.

Mr. ENLOE with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. HOOKER of New York.

Mr. NEIL with Mr. HITT.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. COBB of Missouri with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. GILLET of New York.

Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. HERMANN.

Mr. REILLY with Mr. HULL.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The yeas have it, and the House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agrees to the same.

On motion of Mr. COOMBS, a motion to reconsider the vote last taken was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. There is no other question at issue on the report. That disposes of the report. The bill will be disposed of on notification being given to the Senate that the House has receded from its disagreement.

RELIEF OF EMPLOYÉS OF RECORD AND PENSION DIVISION, WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McMILLIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. What becomes of the vote that was to be taken on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to refer a bill to his committee. That was to come up immediately after the conference report was disposed of.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, several members have asked me to withdraw my motion for the day, that they may have a chance to read the bill, which has just been printed, and has been brought to the House this morning. Without objection, I will withdraw it for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the motion made to correct a reference this morning, and it will be submitted at a later day.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That those employés of the Record and Pension Office of the War Department who were injured by the falling of the floors in the Ford's Theater building on the 9th day of June, 1893, be, and they are hereby, exempted from the operation of so much of the act approved March 3, 1893, making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, as limits the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments; and that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to said employés such portions of their salaries as have been withheld because of absence on account of injuries received in the Ford's Theater disaster.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

After the word "exempted," in line 7, insert the following words "during the fiscal year 1894, in the discretion of the Secretary of War."

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask consent that this joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that this joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, the existing law governing leaves of absence is found in the provisos to section 5 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the current fiscal year, and is as follows:

SEC. 5. That on and after July 1, 1893, it shall be the duty of the heads of the several Executive Departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employés, of whatever grade or class, in their respective Departments, not less than seven hours of labor each day, except Sundays and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order: *Provided*, That the heads of the Department may, by special order, stating the reason, further extend or limit the hours of service of any clerk or employé in their Departments, respectively; but in case of an extension it shall be without additional compensation: *And provided further*, That the head of any Department may grant thirty days' annual and thirty days' sick leave, with pay, in any one year to each clerk or employé, the sick leave to be allowed in cases of personal illness only, or where some member of the immediate family is afflicted with a contagious disease and requires the care and attendance of such employé, or where his or her presence in the Department would jeopardize the health of fellow-clerks: *And be it further provided*, That in exceptional and meritorious cases, where to limit such sick leave would work peculiar hardship, it may be extended, in the discretion of the head of the Department, with pay, not exceeding sixty days in any one case or in any one calendar year.

The first clause of the pending bill suspends the law in reference to leaves of absence in so far as it relates to employés injured at the accident in Ford's Theater on the 9th of June last. The second clause of the bill provides for the payment of the salaries that have been withheld. Eighty persons were injured by that accident, in addition to the twenty-two who were killed. Of the eighty persons injured, seventy-six returned to duty on the 16th of October last. Four have not yet returned, and of that four two are seriously injured. The amount carried by the bill on account of the salaries of the seventy-six employés who returned to duty on the 16th of October last aggregates $2,044.88.

The amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations limits the leave of absence to the present fiscal year in the discretion of the Secretary of War; so that it is estimated the entire liability involved by the provisions of the bill will not exceed $3,500. I may state also in this connection that in addition to the merits of this case, not now necessary to recite, there are several precedents for the proposed action on the part of Congress. I will cite one. On the 19th day of July, 1876, Congress passed an act for the relief of one employé of the Senate who was injured in an accident in this building, and for the relief of the family of another who was killed in the same accident. That act is found on page 455 of volume 19 of the Statutes at Large, and is as follows:

CHAPTER 215.—An act for the relief of the family of the late John T. King and of L. B. Cutler.

Whereas John T. King, lately employed as a carpenter and cabinet-maker about the Capitol, while in the discharge of his duties, was killed by an explosion of gas in the closet under the eastern stairway of the Senate, leaving a wife, three children, two grandchildren, and a mother-in-law without any means of support; and,

Whereas L. B. Cutler, principal assistant in the folding room of the Senate, was so injured at the same time and under the same circumstances as to be disabled for life, leaving a wife without means of support and a mother to whose support he has partly contributed: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of $3,000 for the aid and support of the family of the late John T. King, and the further sum of $3,000 for the aid and support of L. B. Cutler, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid to the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the above-mentioned purposes, who may, at his discretion, pay the same to the respective parties in annual installments, or all in one payment, or invest the same for their use and benefit, as he may think most expedient.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the gen-

tleman whether any provision is made in this bill for the families of those who were killed in the disaster at Ford's Theater?

Mr. DOCKERY. No, sir; this bill simply deals with the question of sick leave and of salaries.

Mr. HOLMAN. The other question is intended to be postponed for the present?

Mr. DOCKERY. It is.

Mr. HOLMAN. But it will be considered hereafter?

Mr. DOCKERY. That question will come up for consideration later.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether the committee have had before them at all the question of provision for the families of the killed?

Mr. DOCKERY. That question has not been presented to the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. Has the question been considered of the War Department sending those clerks back to that building?

Mr. DOCKERY. This bill does not deal with that question. The gentleman will remember that at the beginning of the extraordinary session $6,000 was appropriated by an urgent deficiency bill to repair the Ford's Theater building, and providing, according to my recollection, that it should be occupied only when the Architect of the Capitol should have certified that it was absolutely safe. But, as I have said, the question of the occupancy of the building is not raised by any provision of this bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. It may be proper to add, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has stated, that the maximum carried by this bill will be only somewhat over $3,000, that that statement is made on the assumption that the Secretary of War, in his discretion, will extend the privileges of this bill only to those who have not yet returned to duty. If any of the seventy-six should, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be given any leave of absence under the provisions of this bill, the amount will be increased.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am glad that the gentleman from Maine has called attention to that point, as his statement supplements my own and makes the case complete. In my statement a moment ago I contemplated that the Secretary of War, in the exercise of his discretion, would grant this additional leave only to the four persons who are still absent from their desks.

Mr. DINGLEY. Only two of those four are understood to be seriously injured.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is true. Only two of the four are thought to be injured. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The previous question was ordered. The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee was not ordered printed and I ask that that order be made, inasmuch as the report contains the testimony of the chief of the Record and Pension Division, upon which this bill was favorably reported.

The SPEAKER. The report will be ordered printed in the usual form.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOCKERY moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE HUDSON AT NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. GEARY submitted a conference report, which was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3289) "to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from so much of amendment numbered 9 as is contained in lines 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, page 2, and that the House recede from its disagreement to so much of amendment numbered 9 as is contained in lines 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, page 2, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 11, line 7, page 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, inserting after the word "act" a colon and the words: "*Provided further*, That if such company, under this authority, shall build a pier in said river outside of the pier-head lines on either side thereof, then all of the subdivisions of this act except subdivision 'First,' shall apply to said company;" so that the whole will read as follows:

"Eighth. The right to amend, alter, modify, or repeal this act is hereby reserved, and the provisions of subdivision 3 of this act shall be extended to any other bridge company heretofore authorized by Congress to bridge said river at New York City: *Provided*, That such company shall submit plans and location of its bridge, pursuant thereto, to the Secretary of War within one year after the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That if such company, under this authority, shall build a pier in said river outside of the pier-head lines on either side thereof, then all of the provisions of all the subdivisions of this act, except subdivision 'First,' shall apply to said company."

T. J. GEARY,
L. FLETCHER,
Managers on the part of the House.

A. P. GORMAN,
G. G. VEST,
WM. P. FRYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 are clerical changes substantially and make more definite and certain the language of the House bill.

Amendment numbered 9 of the Senate struck out of the House bill the provision giving to the city authorities of New York the right to locate the approaches of said bridge in the city of New York. From this amendment the Senate conferees receded, and the bill as now reported contains the substance of the provision as it passed the House.

Amendment numbered 11 provides that the rights conferred on the bridge company herein named shall be available to the other bridge company heretofore chartered, and if it avails itself of such provisions it shall also adopt and become subject to all the provisions of this bill.

Very respectfully,

T. J. GEARY,
L. FLETCHER,
House Conferees.

Mr. GEARY. I move that the House agree to this report. As this question is to give rise to some discussion, I suggest that debate be limited. I understand that an hour and a half, to be divided equally between the friends and opponents of the measure, will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that this is not a unanimous report of the conferees, and that it has been agreed between the members concurring in the report and those dissenting that the debate shall proceed for an hour and a half, the time to be equally divided, one-half under the control of the gentleman from from California [Mr. GEARY] in favor of the report, and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] in opposition. If there be no objection, that agreement will be regarded as approved by the House. [A pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GEARY. We reserve our time.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill now before the House.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman kindly inform us whether the bill as now reported will allow the free navigation of the river?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the very point; it does not. I shall endeavor to set forth the objections to the bill in a brief, concise manner——

Mr. HICKS. I am opposed to the bill unless it preserves the freedom of navigation.

Mr. BARTLETT. In the first place, I oppose this bill because into this charter of the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company there have been interpolated by the Senate new privileges to the earlier company—the North River Bridge Company.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that this matter is more than a "twice-told tale" to members of this House. I am aware that this charter and its merits have been told a thousand times in the corridors and the lobbies and other places in the city of Washington; and it is not unnatural that gentlemen of this House should feel at first some degree of impatience at a new discussion of the merits of the bill. But I ask you, one and all, on both sides of the House, to give me your attention for fifteen or twenty minutes in order that I may state clearly, plainly, concisely, certain reasons why this bill should not be allowed to become a law and why it is incumbent on every one of you who favor honest government and the freedom of navigation and the interests of commerce to vote against this charter.

Mr. DINGLEY. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is an exceedingly important matter; and we desire to hear the gentleman from New York. I ask that there be better order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, so that the gentleman from New York may be heard.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman from Maine for his kindly interposition, because I think it will aid me in showing clearly to the House that this bill should not pass.

I am aware that in urging my views now I may seem to be coming forward at a late hour; but however late the hour, when the interests of good government and of honesty are involved, the moment is never too late.

Now, gentlemen, what is the question before this House? And I wish to draw attention to my first point—that the bill which you are asked now hurriedly to pass without consideration, without adequate debate, at the behest of men who throng the corridors about this Chamber, is radically different from the bill

which was passed by this House some weeks ago. This is a bill which changes essentially in two important features the charter which this Congress granted on the 11th day of July, 1890, to the North River Bridge Company. That charter was granted on two conditions: One was that a single span should cross and span the entire river; the other that the mails of the United States should be transported free of toll.

Now, without notice in the title of this bill, with a title saying that it is a charter for the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company, we have a provision interpolated which changes a former charter to another corporation and takes away from the Government the right to the free transmission of its mails. Do we gain such privileges to throw them away lightly just because a compromise has been effected between contending corporations? New York stands there with her vesture and her raiment rent in twain by the contending suitors, while she is left bare and exposed to the cold.

Gentlemen, these are the two salient amendments; and by virtue of these two amendments this bill should never be passed. You have no right when you grant a charter to any corporation on consideration that there shall be no pier or tower of stone in the river at Twenty-third street, Tenth street, or lower down in the harbor of New York, to come here just before the Christmas holidays with a proposition that undertakes to wipe away every safeguard that has been established. You have no right to obstruct and despoil the greatest harbor of the United States and the third greatest commercial port in the world.

I know that you gentlemen have no direct responsibility, no responsibility which will come home to you from your constituents in this regard, for you live far away from these great navigable waters which flow around our island home. But I think there is one responsibility which rests upon Democrats and Republicans alike: you have the responsibility to cast your vote against any charter or license about which there may be the slightest atmosphere of doubt. There is in the constitution of the State of New York a salutary provision that when, in the title of a local act, the subject-matter be not embraced, the act is unconstitutional; and I think it would be a wholesome rule if applied to measures passed by the Federal Legislature, for it would have the effect of sounding a note of warning to tell men to be on the lookout for such measures; for if we had not been active and vigilant to-day this amendment referring to this bridge charter would have slipped through the House without comment or protest. It may be that, divided as the New York delegation is divided on this question, our protest will be unavailing——

Mr. OATES. If the gentleman will allow an interruption, he will recollect that the Federal Constitution has no provision regarding a disclosure in the title of a bill of the contents.

Mr. BARTLETT. Not at all. I understand that. In answer to the gentleman from Alabama, I wish to say that my statement was that the Federal Constitution differed in that respect from the constitution of the State of New York, but I thought it would be a good and salutary provision to have incorporated in the Federal Constitution.

Mr. OATES. There is such a provision in the constitution of my State, though it is not in the Federal Constitution.

Mr. NORTHWAY. It is in the constitutions of all the States.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is in the constitution of the State of New York, and I happen to have some familiarity with that constitution as well as with the Federal Constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this matter came up in the Senate originally and on Mr. MCPHERSON'S amendment, he, representing the great State of New Jersey, objected to any provision in the bill which would allow a pier or a tower to be erected in the river. He protested against any such provision, and when the bill passed the Senate it was passed by only 27 votes, there being 17 against it and 41 not voting at all. In the debate in the Senate Chamber on the 31st of October, 1893, on this bill it is apparent that there was a misunderstanding as to the true conception, object, and scope of the bill. Senator GRAY of Delaware asked the Senator from Missouri this question. He said:

> If I understand the Senator from Missouri, this bill is not a bill which attempts to charter a bridge company, but it is merely to remove any objection which the United States may have to the erection of a bridge by a corporation already authorized by the States of New Jersey and New York to make that construction.

That was a misconception of the law on the subject. Over the great navigable waters, the public rivers flowing into the sea, the paramount control of the bridging of such streams and the granting of charters for such purposes is a matter of authority in Congress, and, as the Supreme Court of the United States said in the case of The Bridge Company *vs.* United States, when Congress steps in her action is supreme and overrides all that the State may do. So I say upon you rests the responsibility for this legislation if it be wrong. You can not throw it upon the States. It is with Congress and upon Congress that the responsibility of this law must lie to-day and must lie forever.

It is true that when we have under consideration the bridging of the North River, flowing between different States, or have the bridging of the East River, flowing between the adjacent shores of the same State, being both great navigable arteries flowing out as the channels of commerce to the ocean and the sea, the concurrent legislation of the State and the United States is needed for the permission to bridge. The authority of the State is needed by virtue of its ownership and authority over the land under water, and the land on the shore, and its qualified sovereignty in the stream.

The authority of the Federal Legislature is necessary to act concurrently with the State by virtue of its power to regulate commerce, and when the Federal Legislature does act the act of the State Legislature becomes of lesser consequence: and I say in cases of this kind, where concurrent legislation is necessary, we should have some regard and some respect for the voice of the State Legislature. We should have some respect for the sovereign will of the people of the State of New York: and I call your attention to the fact that both the preamble and introductory section of this law are misleading, because they allege incorporation by the States of New Jersey and New York, whereas, as a matter of fact, the charter granted by the State of New Jersey lapsed twenty years ago. It became null and void in 1873, and it has never come into life or being since.

The charter from the State of New York, which was passed in 1890, was granted on one express condition, and that condition was that the bridge should span the whole waterway, and that there should be no pier or tower of stone in the river. Is it acting in good faith for the promoters of this scheme to come here asking a measure of legislation from us which violates the condition upon which they obtained their charter from the State of New York? Is that good faith? Is that common honesty? I say no, gentlemen, and I say anyone who seek such legislation should be regarded with suspicion.

Let me say one word about a single span. A single span covering the entire waterway is feasible and practicable. I will not enumerate now the names of the engineers who say so, but I will cite in support of my conclusion one document from the chief engineer of this very bridge corporation. I will read you a few words written by Mr. Thomas C. Clarke, the chief engineer of the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company, on the 15th day of March, 1892, when he announced that although he believed a pier in the river would be no obstruction, there was a great feeling in the States of New York and New Jersey against the pier, and he did not believe, for one, that the Board of Engineers would ever permit a pier to be placed in the river; and then he goes on to say:

> I am prepared to say that if they decide that there shall be no pier in the the river, I can build you a bridge on the combined suspension-cantilever plan that shall be strong enough and stiff enough to carry trains at 20 miles an hour, and at a cost that shall not be prohibitory.

Out of the mouth of their own witness comes conviction, and I claim that they are bound by this statement of Mr. Clarke, which was transmitted to the Senate of the United States by Mr. Andrew H. Green in 1892.

Now, whether a bridge without a pier be practicable at a very low cost or not, we will not discuss. I concede that it will cost more money. I concede that it may cost some millions more. I do not believe that it will cost any such sum as that stated by the promoters. But whatever it costs, I say that you have no right to destroy the harbor of New York by placing an obstruction which may and probably would exist for all time, and with each successive year be a further and growing impediment to navigation.

I know something about this water front. I represent the district covering the whole coast line of Staten Island and the water front running from Peck's Slip around the Battery up the North River to West Houston street. I represent the bodies interested in this great question of transportation and commerce. I am supported in this protest by the Chamber of Commerce, by the Maritime Association, by the canal committee of the Produce Exchange, and by every one interested in the great transshipment of freight by canal boats and tows in the harbor of New York. To be brief, I will state two objections: The first is that this pier must be some 250 or 300 feet square. That of itself will be a serious objection to the craft plying up and down the river and across the river, for you must remember that in the harbor of New York we have river navigation up and down, and harbor navigation across and diagonally.

All those interests will be dangerously affected, and in addition to that, as Senator GRAY pointed out in the Senate, the flow of the stream will be greatly impeded. The water flowing up and down will be injuriously affected, and gradually there

will form an island there, an accretion of mud and sand and various kinds of deposit, so that the usefulness of the harbor will be seriously interfered with at the point where the bridge is located.

Now, what did Senator GRAY say? He said that he trusted that safeguards would be introduced, so that the Secretary of War would have power to take care of these obstructions. But, gentlemen, the trouble is, according to the decisions of the United States courts, that when an obstruction has once been authorized no power can remove it except the Congress of the United States. The Secretary of War has no such power.

Judge Shiras decided, in the Keokuk bridge case, that power delegated by Congress to the Secretary of War to remove an obstruction was *ultra vires*, that it could not be delegated, that it remained alone in the Federal Legislature. So with your pier: once placed there in our harbor it can never be removed; it must remain for all time, and the Secretary of War will be powerless to act, whether any power be given him by statute or not.

Let me say one word in conclusion: There are no proper safeguards in this bill. The safeguard as to the approaches being subject to the approval of the commissioners of the sinking fund does not apply to the connections of the railways running down for 9 miles into our city. It only applies to the particular special point where the roadway of the bridge joins the highway. That is the meaning of the word "approach" according to the definition of the courts, and it can not be extended. There is no safeguard. The commissioners of the sinking fund, through a special committee, protested against this legislation in 1892 in the following language. They denounced it as "one of the most outrageous attempts at corporate aggrandizement which has ever been sought for at the expense of this municipality."

One spur has been cut off since——

Mr. DUNPHY. Was it in relation to the bill now before the House that that protest is made?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, sir. But the bill before this House has only been altered in this respect: It cuts off a spur running to the north, but does not cut off the spur which bisects the city and runs down Eleventh avenue to Forty-second street. The language used by this gentleman, Mr. Meyer, the present comptroller of the city of New York, who is to be succeeded by my colleague [Mr. FITCH], and by Mr. Thomas T. C. T. Crain, the then chamberlain, is as follows:

> The bisection of this metropolis in the heart of one of its choicest and most valuable localities by a railway, which would serve as a connecting link between the great trunk system, over whose tracks there would pass by day and night a continuous procession of freight and passenger trains, would not fail to degrade that part of our city to the level of a railway junction and ruin a large portion of Manhattan Island, which now derives its chief value from its desirability for residential purposes.

I should like to know who in New York is in favor of this bill. It is true that some of our papers are in favor of the bill which passed this House some weeks ago. That bill permitted a pier, subject to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, at Seventieth street; but I challenge gentlemen on the other side to produce one newspaper outside of the city of Washington, or to produce one authority in the city of New York, that shall be bold enough to declare that he or it is in favor of any measure which will permit the placing of a stone pier or tower in the channel of the river at Twenty-third street or Tenth street, or on the spot where this North River Bridge Company has located it.

Mr. DUNPHY. I desire to say, if my colleague will permit, that I will hand him here extracts from three New York papers of this date approving specifically the conference report which we are now discussing.

Mr. BARTLETT. I decline to yield.

Mr. DUNPHY. They are the New York Herald, the New York World, and the New York Times.

Mr. BARTLETT. I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied twenty-three minutes, and he has twenty-two minutes left.

Mr. BARTLETT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Chairman, this matter of the New York bridge has been before Congress for the last four years, and at almost every session the bill has been amended to meet the objections of some members of the New York delegation. When this bill passed the House last October the supposition was that the bill in its then form was perfectly satisfactory to all the Representatives from the city of New York, and until this amendment was added in the Senate no person pretended to make objection to it.

Now, I do not like the form of this bill, and never have; because I do not believe that it is one of the functions of Congress to place any limitation upon the exercise of power of the States of New York and New Jersey, and that the matter of approaches and the character of them and their location are rights which those people may exercise within the States, and should be determined by the local Legislatures and local authorities, and are not matters that Congress has jurisdiction over at all. But if we are to permit one company to obtain permission to exercise these rights, then I think, in all fairness, that every other company wishing to engage in the same business should be permitted to exercise identically the same rights. That is the objection which is now being made to this bill.

Some eight years ago Congress chartered another bridge company, to build a bridge across the North River and to enter New York at Twenty-third street. That charter prohibited the construction of any pier in the river and compelled the company to build a bridge 3,100 feet in length, consisting of only one span, something which has never been done in any place or in any country, and a matter which engineers say is not practicable or feasible. The bill that passed this House remitted the entire question to the War Department, giving them authority to determine what length the span should be, but putting this limitation upon it, that under no circumstances should the span be less than 2,000 feet in length.

The purpose of the committee in preparing the bill in that way was to obtain the intelligent judgment of the War Department and its Corps of Engineers, who undoubtedly know more about the possibilities of bridge-building than the average Representative from the city of New York can possibly pretend to. This bill says that the question as to having the pier in that river and the length of the span shall be decided by the War Department, and by nobody else. The old company did not have that right. They have been unable, through eight years of existence, to take one step forward in the prosecution of their enterprise. I think if this matter, in the case of one company, is to be intrusted to the War Department for adjudication and investigation, then the other company should be placed upon the same equality. It is not for Congress to fix their rights or give them benefits or favors. Our duty in the matter of bridging navigable streams is merely to grant permission to such companies as may be incorporated for that purpose by the States and to leave the States to regulate what the terms and conditions shall be. This amendment was insisted upon by the Senate simply in a spirit of fairness to all, and I think this House ought to agree to the report and concur with the amendment of the Senate. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman sits down I desire to ask him how far down the river the bill as agreed upon by the conference report allows a bridge to be built?

Mr. GEARY. The original New York and New Jersey Bridge bill limits it to Sixty-sixth street. The other company, incorporated some eight years ago, had a right to locate its bridge at Twenty-third street; neither of the companies is permitted under any circumstances to build a pier on the New York side, but the Secretary of War may permit the erection of a pier on the New Jersey side.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the right still given to the other company to build its bridge as far down as Twenty-third street?

Mr. GEARY. That is where their charter located it.

Mr. DINGLEY. And no amendment has been made in that respect?

Mr. GEARY. No amendment whatever. This merely enables them to submit their plans to the Secretary of War, and if, after investigation, he is satisfied that a span is necessary, they are to stand upon an equality with the other company. I now yield control of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNPHY].

Mr. DUNPHY. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to argue as to the necessity for a bridge over the Hudson River between New York City and a point in New Jersey. I believe that such a structure, or such structures, over the Hudson River are really necessary, and I believe that an overwhelming majority of the people of New York and of the adjoining cities favor such structures. Favoring, as I do, the building of a bridge or bridges, I desire to see passed through the House a bill that will permit them to be built, and I do not desire to see passed through the House a bill intended to prevent their construction.

I think that Congress may as well leave this matter untouched as to put into the bill a provision that there must be but one span in the river. This bill does not provide that the bridge may have a pier; it provides that this matter shall be left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of War, and that he may have hearings, may call witnesses, may take testimony; and having, as he will have, the benefit of the advice and the skill and the experience of the best engineers in this country, attached to his own Department, it seems to me that that is the best kind of a provision to put in this bill.

Mr. NORTHWAY. If he should decide not to have a pier, would the bridge be built?

Mr. DUNPHY. If he should decide that it is possible to

build a suspension bridge and that a pier would interfere with the navigation, I suppose that then his decision would be that a suspension bridge must be constructed. But if the Secretary, after investigation, should come to the conclusion that it was an engineering impossibility to construct a suspension bridge over the Hudson at that point, then he might approve of plans that would permit a pier to be placed in the river at a point where it would interfere least with the navigation.

The longest suspension bridge in the world to-day is the New York and Brooklyn Bridge. The span of that bridge is 1,460 feet. The longest bridge in the world to-day is the bridge over the Forth River in Scotland. The longest span of that bridge is 1,760 feet. The narrowest point of the Hudson River at New York is 3,100 feet, and to put into the bill a provision such as that suggested by my colleague from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] means the building of a span twice as long as the longest now existing in the world, which would be, in my judgment, an absolute engineering impossibility. The Chief Engineer of the United States, Mr. Casey, when he appeared before the Senate committee, was asked whether it was possible to build a suspension bridge over the Hudson River. He said he did not care to give his opinion, because he was not a bridge expert, but if the committee insisted upon it he would state that his opinion was that such a thing was not possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we might as well authorize the construction of a bridge from here to the moon as pass a bill authorizing the building of a bridge over the Hudson with a single span, if such a bridge can not be built. That is why I am in favor of passing the bill in this form, because I think it provides sufficient protection to the public interests concerned by placing the whole matter finally in the discretion of the Department of War.

As to the question of interference with the navigation of the river, I desire to say this:

Within the past few months the Secretary of the Treasury has set aside in the Hudson River for an anchorage ground quite an extensive sheet of water. By setting aside this anchorage ground he, so to speak, takes so much area out of the regularly navigable waters.

Now, the proposed pier of the New York and New Jersey Bridge is to be well within that anchorage ground, well within the ground which by the order of the Secretary of the Treasury has been set aside as anchorage ground, and, as I have said, to that extent is taken out of the regularly navigable waters of the harbor.

Mr. WARNER. Will my colleague permit a question?

Mr. DUNPHY. Certainly.

Mr. WARNER. If that is the case, and that pier is to be built right in the anchorage ground, will not that destroy the value of the ground for anchorage purposes, the tide sweeping back and forth there as it does?

Mr. DUNPHY. Not at all. The anchorage ground is a very large sheet of water, and the pier will not in any considerable degree interfere with its use.

Mr. Speaker, I will take just a minute or two more for the purpose of explaining one other point with reference to the question of navigation. The passenger traffic of the Hudson River, up and down, is about five millions annually; the passenger traffic across the river is at least one hundred millions annually. The amount of freight carried up and down the river is 18,000,000 tons; the amount of freight carried across the river is 130,000,000.

Now, I hold that if one or the other must give way, the lesser navigation ought to give way to the overwhelmingly greater navigation. Besides, all the tugs and tows of canal boats that come down the Hudson River have to pass through three bridges before they come to New York. In the first and second of those bridges the spans are only 125 feet wide, but at Poughkeepsie they pass through spans 50 feet wide, and yet it is claimed that when they get to New York, where the span will be at least 2,100 feet wide, the navigation will be obstructed. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to my colleague, [Mr. WARNER.]

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Upon that committee there is a representative from the city and from the State of New York. He is also upon the subcommittee upon the subject of bridges. He was chosen, sir, not merely as representing the city and State of New York, as he well does, but, if I am not mistaken, somewhat also in view of the fact that his district lies upon both sides of New York harbor, and that within its precincts are the Maritime Exchange, the Produce Exchange, and the center of the great interests which are chiefly concerned in transportation to and from New York City.

Mr. DUNPHY. My colleague means the offices of those exchanges.

Mr. WARNER. I mean that the Chamber of Commerce has its meeting rooms there and that most of its members do business in that quarter. I mean that the Produce Exchange is there, and that half the produce of this great country that is exported goes abroad under the direction and through the agency of men who do business within the district which is represented by my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], who addressed the House a few moments ago. That gentleman, sir, is present. He has dissented from the proposed agreement to this conference report. He has spoken in behalf of the city of New York and of the great interests which he represents, not as merely expressing a personal opinion—as to which I have no question but that my other colleague who has just spoken [Mr. DUNPHY] is in as good faith as he is—but as representing in a responsible capacity in this House the opinion of the commercial interests of New York upon this question. He has spoken so forcibly, so convincingly, against this conference report that he has left little for me to say. But, sir, I may perhaps use a moment or two.

It is perhaps known that New York Harbor as we see it upon the map is rather a great gateway to the port of New York, and that the real port of New York, on both sides of which are the great lines of steamships that ply between this country and other countries—down which come the great fleets of canalboats which bring the products of the West for transshipment to Europe—across which is transported the enormous commerce that my friend from New York has described, consists of what is called the North River, being a tidal estuary 8 or 9 miles long and from one-half to three-quarters of a mile in width, swept twice a day by the rush backward and forward of the tide that surges northward and southward. On both sides of that so-called North River—really the essential port of the city of New York—are centering more and more every day, have centered more and more since the East River Bridge and the comparative narrowness of the stream drove them out of the East River, the great interests concerned in the transportation of New York City.

Two years and a half ago a bill was introduced in this House, of which this is, perhaps, the great-grandchild. That bill did not permit a pier to be built in the North River. And when our commercial interests looked over the bill introduced in this House, they concluded there was no particular reason why they should oppose the bill upon that ground, and not being acquainted either with the course of proceedings in Congress, and still less with the proceedings through which this bill has been put, they did not know until about six weeks ago that the bill had been so altered as to provide for a pier being put in the midst of the river a thousand feet out into the tide. The very moment they were informed of this the Chamber of Commerce called a meeting, and after considering the question at one meeting deemed the matter of such great importance that they held a special meeting a month later, and they sent here the leading men who are interested in the commerce of New York to protest against this pier being permitted in that river, even at Sixty-sixth street.

The Maritime Exchange, having in its care the shipping interests of the city of New York, sent its delegation to protest against the measure. The Produce Exchange, with three thousand members, carrying on the export trade in produce of this great country, sent its committee down here, represented by the firm which perhaps more than any other firm is interested in marketing American produce abroad.

All these delegations were sent here to protest against putting a bridge in the river even at Sixty-sixth street. The question was squarely asked these gentlemen, "You, if anybody, are interested in the transportation which this bridge purports to favor; there is a question as to whether there can be a bridge within a short time unless this privilege is granted; you gentlemen who have most to gain if transportation is facilitated, and most to lose if transportation is obstructed, would you, even if you knew there could not be any bridge at all unless this privilege were granted, would you still oppose the pier being put in the river?"

And the representatives of the Produce Exchange, the representatives of the Maritime Exchange, the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, the men who do the business that this bridge pretends to assist, answered that unless it could be built without the pier they would rather have no bridge there until all eternity. The very men upon whose ingenuity in cheapening the cost of handling goods coming to and past the city of New York and benefiting this country by thus facilitating export, the men upon whose ingenuity the prosperity of our great Western country so largely depends, took this ground.

And now, sir, after they have put in this protest against the pier at Sixty-sixth street we find that in order, not to help anyone who has dared to come and ask it, but in order to reconcile and compromise differences between warring corporations, there comes a conference committee into this House in defiance of the wishes and judgment of the one New York member who has the responsibility of speaking in that regard, and proposes to give

this company not merely the privilege of building a pier it Sixty-sixth street but also to give another company the privilege of putting a pier in the river down by Twenty-third street as well, at a part of the river crowded beyond comprehension of anyone who has not seen that teeming commerce.

It has been said that the amount of commerce crossing the river is infinitely greater than the commerce which comes down the river.

In one sense that is true, in another sense it is not; because a large proportion of the commerce, which is called commerce crossing the river, really starts above Twenty-third street—to some extent above Sixty-sixth street—and then comes down the river to the Jersey shore, or down by the Battery or rounds the Battery coming in the harbor and goes up the river to Wehauken and Fort Lee and other points above both these bridges, or reverses one or the other of these routes, and these will be obstructed by these proposed piers.

We are told that at Poughkeepsie there is no trouble with a smaller span. My colleague, who has already spoken, has given one of the reasons for this. There is not a tithe of the commerce going up and down the river near Poughkeepsie that there is going up and down, in the act of going across, the part of the river that I have described. There is another reason, however, and that is this: Poughkeepsie is 75 miles up the Hudson River; the location now in question is right down by New York Harbor. Through North River, at the place to which I am referring, the tide sweeps back and forth twice every day. A pier anywhere in that vicinity not merely destroys the anchorage where it stands, but makes it impossible for a boat with a long tow, in some cases half a mile long, such as we now find used to transport grain, to come within hundreds of feet of that pier without danger of damage which would ruin the profits of transportation.

Not to take up longer the time of this House, I will refer to only one other matter. I hear it insinuated about me that some of the newspapers favor this project. And I am bound to say that of all things hard to keep track of, have been the expressions, paid and unpaid, in regard to this matter, with which the newspapers, particularly of this city, Washington, have been filled whenever it was about to come up. But, sir, with all deference to the judgment of the great journals of New York (and they are great journals) it is proper to say, first, that the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, not merely the representative of the business interests of New York, but the great commercial paper of the continent, is opposed to this bill as it stands; and, second, that there is one body that knows better what the maritime interests of the port of New York demand than does any newspaper in New York; and that body is the Maritime Association of the Port of New York.

There is one body, sir, which knows better what is needed to facilitate the great foreign export business of the city of New York than any newspaper published in the city of New York, and that is the transportation committee of the Produce Exchange. There is one great body known all over this country for its enterprise, for its liberality, for its straight dealing, for its knowledge of what its interests are, who, if this were to be a benefit to anybody, if it would assist the transportation of manufactures or produce from and to the city of New York, would be the most benefited by it of any other class of persons, and that is the great Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, which is protesting against this bill.

And, Mr. Speaker, if there is any one man on whose judgment this House can more confidently rely than any other, who is more familiar with this business than any other, whose lead we can confidently follow, because he has been put upon the Committee of Commerce as the representative of the city of New York in this and other matters, on whose judgment we may safely rely, because he has shown that he has considered the matter and has given it impartial consideration as well, it is my colleague from the city of New York [Mr. BARTLETT], the representative of that city on the bridge committee of the Committee of Commerce, and who unites with me in protesting against the bill or rather whose lead in that protest I gladly follow.

Mr. BARTLETT. I reserve the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. DUNPHY. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, the Fifty-first Congress, on the 11th day July, 1890, passed a bill chartering the North River Bridge Company. This bill provides that they may construct a bridge across the Hudson River at Twenty-third street, with a proviso that such bridge shall contain one single span, and that there shall be no intermediate spans between the two piers of the bridge.

People living in my district in good faith invested their money in this enterprise, and some two or three hundred thousand dollars has been actually paid in cash in the preparation of the undertaking for the construction of this bridge. Now, in the Fifty-second Congress the present bill was first introduced, and when that bill came before the House my colleague, Mr. DALZELL, and myself asked that the same provision should be inserted in that bill that was contained in the former one to which I have referred, namely, that there should be but a single span, or else that if they were permitted to put piers in the Hudson River the same privilege should be extended to the company which had been chartered by the Fifty-first Congress.

That provision was withheld. The bill was reintroduced in this Congress and was passed by the House. It went over from this House at the extra session of Congress to the Senate, and there the Senate insisted on an amendment providing that the same privileges, with reference to the location of piers, should be given to the company theretofore chartered by the Fifty-first Congress.

The adoption of the conference report now before the House will give to the company chartered by the Fifty-first Congress precisely the same privileges in reference to the location of piers that is granted to the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company. I believe it is only fair and just, morally right and equitable, that we should have the same privileges. I do not object to another bridge. We never have objected to it, but we do object to granting a charter which will give to the bridge company now being chartered a great advantage over that authorized by the Fifty-first Congress.

Now, in reference to the objection made and to the allegation that has been urged during this debate that under this bill, if it passes as recommended by the conference committee, we will have a right to insist on unreasonable tolls and charges for carrying the United States mails, I beg to refer the House to the third section of the bill which passed the Fifty-first Congress and which provides:

> That the bridge, with its approaches and road thereon constructed under the provisions of this act, shall be a lawful structure and a military and post-road, and no toll charges shall be made for the transfer over the same of the mails of the United States or for the right of way for United States postal telegraph purposes.

That is the language of the section, and how can the North River Bridge Company charge the Government one cent to carry the mails over the bridge, or how can the company charge the Government for the right to suspend its wires for postal telegraph purposes under these provisions? I do not care what provisions are inserted in the amendment, they do not refer to this question, but only to the privileges granted to the company. This is a restriction granted in consideration of declaring the bridge to be a post route, and it can not be and is not by the amendment of the Senate altered in any degree. Therefore, I undertake to say that on a fair construction of the language no lawyer will successfully contend that the adoption of this amendment will enable this company to charge the Government for mail or postal facilities.

Let me say one word in reference to the objection that piers at Twenty-third street will largely or more largely obstruct the navigation of the river than at Seventy-second street. We are told that the Hudson river, especially at its mouth, is covered almost constantly during all hours with ferryboats, steamboats, sailing boats and vessels of all kinds. That necessitates the slowest kind of navigation, and vessels which have to move slowly and cautiously in order to keep out of each other's way will have no difficulty in avoiding the piers in the river.

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. DUNPHY. I yield ten minutes to my colleague [Mr. COVERT].

Mr. COVERT. Mr. Speaker, it will be conceded, even by the most earnest and vigorous opponent of this measure, that for very many years a demand has come up from the people of the two States of New York and New Jersey for the construction of a bridge across the North River. The people of these two sovereign States, speaking for themselves, whenever and wherever they could voice their sentiment upon this question, have asked for the construction of a bridge as a matter of imperative necessity; and yielding to the demands of the people of these two States, their State Legislatures severally enacted laws for the construction of this bridge.

I had the honor, sir, in the last Congress, to introduce in this Chamber the formal, customary bill, giving the grant so far as the people of the United States could give it, to this bridge company to carry out the work already authorized by the Legislatures of the two States.

I took the position in the former discussion, as I take the position now, that there is not on this floor on either side any fair-minded man who would want to intervene to prevent the passage of this bill, and in securing this desired boon to the people of two sovereign States, unless these honest, fair-minded members

of this House feared that the carrying out of the people's will in this direction might be regarded as an impediment to the navigation of the Hudson River.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I claim that this House should summarily dismiss very much that my esteemed friends and colleagues have said who have opposed this measure; this House should dismiss the appeal eloquently made by my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] in behalf of what he stated to be honesty and good government. I want to ask right here, in parenthesis, whom does my friend attack? Whom does he accuse, in connection with this measure, of a want of honesty? Whom does he accuse, among those who support this proposition, of any desire to do anything except to legislate in the interests of good government? Dismissing all these generalities, and worse than generalities, let us come to the sole and only question pending before this House in connection with this bill. That question is, will this proposed structure be an interference with the navigation of the Hudson River? If so, let us condemn this bill, let us vote it down; but if this measure, with the amendments that have been added to it on the Senate side, preserves the navigation of that stream, let us, "in the interest of honesty and good government," carry out the expressed wish and will of the people of New York and New Jersey.

Now, Mr. Speaker, will this be an impediment to navigation? Perhaps we who constitute the membership of this House, having very many matters that engage our attention from day to day and from week to week, can not go into all details of governmental affairs; but we and the people have duly constituted agents and authorities, whose duty it is to determine upon all matters coming before them officially. In this connection the Secretary of War is properly made the sole judge and arbiter. I ask my friends on this floor—I do not care upon which side of this Chamber they sit—to carefully examine the provisions of the pending bill, and the amendments that have been added to it in the Senate, and then to tell me whether any safeguard has been omitted in the original bill or amendments?

Before a single stone can be placed, before a single timber can be put in position, so far as the construction of this bridge is concerned, the Secretary of War, through the Engineer Corps, must pass upon the question as to whether the proposed improvement will or will not obstruct the navigation of the river. If he says yes, it will be an obstruction, that is the end to the building of this bridge under this bill. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is the only question pending before this body. My colleague [Mr. DUNPHY] has made the statement that the pier contemplated or permitted, but not specially directed in the bill, is to be placed upon the New Jersey side of the river.

The State of New Jersey, in the charter which it granted, expressly and in terms permitted the construction of a pier upon its side of the Hudson. My colleague has pointed out the fact that under existing conditions it can not be an impediment to navigation, but I submit again that all that is outside of this discussion so far as this House is concerned. We make the duly constituted authorities, the Secretary of War and his Bureau of Engineers, responsible. The Secretary stands as a guard, as a wall, to protect the interest sof the Chamber of Commerce, the Produce Exchange, or any other body of gentlemen who have appeared as protestants in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I may be permitted to say—and I do not want to discuss the merits of this matter—that over 80,000,000 people annually cross and recross the Hudson River between New York and New Jersey.

Mr. DUNPHY. One hundred millions.

Mr. COVERT. One hundred millions, I am told. One hundred and thirty million tons of freight are annually carried across that river, and this immense body of travel, this immense volume of freight, is subjected to delays at times by reason of fogs, during the winter season by obstructions of ice, and at all times by the number of craft in the river. These vexatious embarrassments and delays would be saved by the construction of this bridge, and the large interests involved would thereby be conserved and promoted.

Mr. Speaker, but one word and I shall close. I think I am correctly informed that up to the time of the passage of the Senate amendment, both of my colleagues, (Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. WARNER), who so vigorously oppose this bill, were in favor of its enactment.

Mr. WARNER. We are not in favor of its enactment, so far as I am concerned. And I am opposed to concurring in the Senate amendment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DUNPHY. I yield my colleague one minute more.

Mr. COVERT. My recollection was that my colleague [Mr. WARNER]——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DUNPHY. I allow him one minute more.

Mr. COVERT. My recollection is that my colleague [Mr. WARNER], after certain concessions had been made to him on the floor, expressed his concurrence in the bill.

Mr. WARNER. Not at all; I had some amendment made.

Mr. DUNPHY. You did not vote against the bill.

Mr. COVERT. However that may be, the empire State of New York is represented in the other branch of Congress by its two Senators, both of whom strenuously favor this bill. Let me say, in addition, that I understand the great objection comes to this measure from the fact that privileges are granted to another corporation upon its compliance with the provisions that guard the construction of this bridge; and the objection is made that this other bridge may be in some unknown way objectionable; that it may, perhaps, if built, at some future time prejudice some interest or interests now unknown or undetermined.

Why, Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely a river in this country of anything like the importance of the Hudson that has not four or five bridges over it at near points and constructed comparatively closely together. The people of New York and New Jersey think, and properly so, that the more bridges they have the better it will be for both those States, and the better it will be for the interests of the whole country.

Mr. DUNPHY. Mr. Speaker, I think the other side ought to consume the remainder of their time now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to make one statement in answer to the gentleman [Mr. COVERT]. I have never, at any time, been in favor of this bill. I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, as I have but a minute, I shall merely attempt to advance a single idea with reference to the bill under consideration. If nature had placed an obstruction in the harbor of New York City where it is proposed to permit a corporation under the terms of this bill to impede navigation, who can doubt that the Government of the United States would have been asked to spend millions of dollars, yes, tens of millions, if necessary, to remove such obstruction. And here it is proposed to give to a corporation permission to narrow the entrance, or rather the passageway, between the interior of the nation and the ocean through this imperial gateway which has contributed so much to the prosperity of the metropolis of America.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this House can safely rely on the unanimous testimony of all the great commercial bodies of the city of New York, whose interests, certainly, are those of the whole nation as well as of that city—such bodies as the Chamber of Commerce, the Maritime Association, the Boatmen's Association, the Pilots' Association, and others—and whose united protests are so ably voiced by the representatives of New York on the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I humbly submit, while uniting my protest with this formidable array, that this House should have some deference to the voices of the business and commercial bodies of the city chiefly interested in the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this body, I believe I came in a dual capacity; first as the agent of the General Government for my people, and then as their agent, to see that no injury should be inflicted upon their interests in the performance of my duty as their agent to the General Government. That is what I understand the position of a member of this House to be. When I see the members from some particular locality opposing a measure which threatens their interests, my sympathies are with them. I believe they are, or ought to be, the best judges of what their several localities want; and I think it comes with bad grace from gentlemen from other portions of the country to wield such a powerful force as has been developed in favor of this bill in the interest of a corporation and against the protest of the people to be affected by its passage. I want to know what interest the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], who spoke so vigorously for this corporation measure, has in advocating its passage against the protest of the authorities of the city of New York, and against the protest of its commercial life, and the protest of the Representatives of New York upon this floor.

Speaking for New Jersey, I know something of the black-horse cavalry force and the way they do their work at Trenton sometimes. I know and am somewhat familiar with the way the black horse does business around about Legislatures, because I have been there, and have helped to run them out. This is a matter in which the people of New Jersey are said by the gentlemen of New York to take great interest; I have heard of no

crying voice coming up from New Jersey, begging me to peddle away the interest of the people of New York and New Jersey to accommodate the corporation behind this measure; and from the best view I am able to take of it, this bill is purely a speculative measure pushed by interested parties to see how much they can make out of the charter. This is about the size of granting this corporation this franchise. I think it will be a gross insult to the rights and to the judgment of the men from New York who are most immediately and directly interested in it—an insult for gentlemen from other portions of this country to vote against their protest in favor of this corporation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know nor allege that there are sinister influences behind this bill or behind the bill which already has been passed by the House of Representatives giving a charter to a North River Bridge Company. But I want to call the attention of this House to the manner in which the other bill was passed. It was brought up here in the Fifty-first Congress sandwiched between bills granting charters for bridges over country streams. The House was entirely unaware of its importance. It was run in between insignificant bills and slipped over the ways of legislation unnoticed. It passed the House without one word being said either in its favor or against it. A word would have led to a discussion that might have defeated it. I know that the gentlemen who were back of that bill congratulated themselves on the trick that they had played upon the House, and possibly very justly. Their bill provided for a suspension bridge at Twenty-third street.

Now, I want to call attention to the way in which this bill under discussion was brought into the House. It was introduced on a Thursday and reported from the committee on a Monday; introduced by a gentleman not a member of the New York City delegation, and reported back to the House before any member of that delegation knew that it was in committee. By the action of the united New York delegation the bill was sent from the House back to the committee to give the New York authorities a hearing. The mayor of the city of New York appeared before the committee by his private secretary, and the gentleman from New York [Col. FELLOWS] and myself appeared with the secretary and presented the case of the city against the bill. That bill contained a proviso which gave that company control of all the approaches to the bridge in the city of New York. It gave them power to lay tracks for 9 miles through the streets of the city. In accordance with our protest, the committee reported the bill to the House with that provision stricken out. The city authorities being satisfied, we withdrew our opposition to the bill, and it passed the House.

Mr. DUNPHY. And is not that provision now in the bill?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It is now in it. I supported the bill, I say, as it came from the committee. The Senate amended the proposition, so as to allow the other company the privilege of also placing a pier in the river. Now the bill has been put into conference, and the conference committee has not only reported the bill with a provision for a pier in the river at Sixty-sixth street, but has ingrafted upon it a proposition for a pier in the river at Twenty-third street. Under the original charter in the first bill two piers were to be built, each at the pier line, with a suspension bridge between. Now this other corporation is brought in and given all the privileges of the new one.

After this bill went to a conference committee, no wonder that the Chamber of Commerce of New York awoke. No wonder that the Maritime Association awoke, and that the Produce Exchange sprang from its lethargy. The commerce of the city was threatened. They sent down here delegations to protest against the passage of the amended bill. The Hon. J. Edward Simmons, president of the Board of Commerce, and as righteous a Democrat as the Lord ever made, appeared at the head of one of these committees. These gentlemen have entered their protest. They have asked the members from the city of New York to vote against the passage of this bill. In obedience to that request, I intend to record my vote against it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DUNPHY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. CUMMINGS. My time is out.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask that my colleague [Mr. CUMMINGS] may have ten minutes more in which to conclude his remarks.

Mr DUNPHY. If they will agree that we may have ten minutes more, I will have no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is to be added to the time already given for debate.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. OUTHWAITE). That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. DUNPHY. I object, unless our side be allowed ten minutes additional.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will agree to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objections, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] will proceed.

Mr. DUNPHY. Now, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CUMMINGS. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. DUNPHY. The gentleman stated to the House a moment ago that the head of the committee which came down here from the Produce Exchange was Mr. J. Edward Simmons.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNPHY. Does the gentleman know that Mr. Simmons signed the petition addressed to this Congress favoring the construction of the New York and New Jersey bridge over the Hudson River with a pier in the river?

Mr. CUMMINGS. "The gentleman knows" that Mr. J. Edward Simmons appeared before the New York delegation here at the head of a delegation from the Chamber of Commerce and pleaded with them to vote against this bill, saying that the people of New York would rather have no bridge at all than have the river filled with these piers. That is what "the gentleman from New York" knows. He knows nothing about any signatures and cares less.

Mr. DUNPHY. The gentleman's colleague [Mr. FELLOWS], who sits alongside of him, has the petition.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNPHY] will not deny that Mr. J. Edward Simmons is against this bill as it comes from the conference committee.

Mr. DUNPHY. I do not deny it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is said that the building of these piers in the Hudson River will not interfere with the navigation of the river or the commerce of the port of New York. Last Friday night I went to New York. We arrived at Jersey City at 9 o'clock and had to wait one hour for a boat, owing to a fog. When the boat reached the slip her guards had been torn off in a collision. It was only an instance of the danger of river travel. Hundreds of vessels are plying between New York and the New Jersey shore hourly, day and night. If these piers are built they will increase the dangers. They will lie in the path of ferryboats running from New York to New Jersey and back. Not only this, but every day there are thousands of cars of every kind loaded with freight taken upon scows from the larger piers across the river in New York to the piers in New York, where the contents are transshipped to European vessels. These cars will never run over your bridge, because it would cost more for the cartage from the New Jersey terminus to the piers where the European steamers lie than it does to take them on the floats from the New Jersey side directly to their docks. You endanger this traffic by your piers. You endanger all traffic.

But I want to call your attention to another fact. The city of New York and the city of Brooklyn built the Brooklyn bridge. The city of New York and the cities in New Jersey are fully as able to build the proposed bridge. But private companies come in and seize the privilege, and here we have two of them, one owning a franchise and the other seeking one. Grant it, and you may find them consolidated afterwards, and their privileges sold to foreign corporations as a speculation. The commerce of the city is thus to be endangered to secure privileges for a grasping corporation, unwilling to spend the money necessary for a suspension bridge. The talk about engineers being unable to build such a bridge is twaddle. The charter granted in the Fifty-first Congress was satisfactory to the persons concerned. It granted a right to build a suspension bridge based upon the report of a competent engineer that the construction of such a bridge was feasible.

Such, Mr. Speaker, are some of my objections to the bill now under consideration. They were presented and urged by the gentlemen who came down from the city of New York to protest against the enactment of this bill. Another point to which I wish to call attention is the fact that it is denied upon this floor that these piers would interfere with the anchorage of vessels in the North River. Does any gentleman know how vessels swing when at anchor? When the tide turns she swings with it. You can anchor a vessel, and with every change in the wind she swings.

The piers would always be in the way. These piers, 100 feet square, would be a constant menace to commerce, and destroy the value of one of the greatest harbors in the world. The river to-day is so filled with craft of all kinds that collisions are of almost daily occurrence. With these piers as an added obstruction, the long strings of canal boats brought down from Albany by tugboats, as well as the innumerable other features of commerce displayed in the North River, will be menaced if not destroyed by the proposed legislation. The piers will endanger and not benefit the interests of the city of New York.

I will yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, [Gen. SICKLES.]

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, this measure has in it some-

thing more than a mere local interest. It would appear from the course of debate that it is only a local question. I think I may say that whatever affects the commerce of the great city of New York and its harbor—the port of New York—is a subject of general if not of national interest.

I am not opposed to a bridge properly constructed to facilitate that kind of commerce that is transported over railways; but I am opposed to any sort of structure that interferes substantially or seriously with navigation; and my impression is, and I think it is the better one in New York of those who have given most attention to the subject and are best informed, that in the present state of the matter as presented by this bill its passage would be received with much regret by the class of men to whom I refer and who are perhaps more directly interested in it than any others.

I have understood from my constituents that in the original form in which the bill was passed by this House it was substantially satisfactory; but the modifications it has undergone in the conference committee and elsewhere are not satisfactory; and I shall feel constrained, in the discharge of my duty and in the expression of the better opinion to which I have referred in our city, to vote against the report.

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. BARTLETT. How much time have I left?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There is no time remaining to the side represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. DUNPHY. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. How much time is there remaining?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. According to the original agreement there are fourteen minutes.

Mr. FELLOWS. And there were ten minutes added to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, ten minutes more will be allowed.

Mr. FELLOWS. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that in the observations it will be my pleasure to address to the House, the last words I shall speak upon any subject pending before it, they may not be tinged with passion or at all affected or colored by local prejudices.

The question is far broader than that which represents the desire of a district, or even of two great States. The question is one that directly and personally affects every citizen of the United States who travels, and every producer in the United States who has anything to contribute to our common civilization.

The railroads that have their termini at Jersey City bring there in twelve months eighty millions and more of people who are seeking ingress into New York City. More than one hundred millions of people cross that river from Jersey City to New York, of whom eighty millions are brought there by the railroads. They are subjected to the possible inconveniences and delays of our present ferry system.

Everyone knows that during the inclement season now beginning that stream is filled with ice, at times hindering the passage across it for hours. It is, therefore, altogether desirable, in the interests of those who seek ingress to or outlet from the city of New York, that there should be swift, ample, ready means of conveyance, unhindered by storm, unobstructed by difficulties.

But there come by the railroads that terminate at Jersey City 135,000,000 tons of freight, the products of the workers of the soil and those who labor in the manufactures of this country. It comes to that great point of distribution, to that center of traffic, from which all this material is distributed throughout the earth.

Mr. GEAR. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. FELLOWS. If it is simply for a question.

Mr. GEAR. It is only for a question. Is not a large amount of the produce that comes to that point from the West landed on the Jersey side, and there loaded into vessels?

Mr. FELLOWS. Some of it.

Mr. GEAR. Into outgoing steamers?

Mr. FELLOWS. Some of it.

Several MEMBERS. All of it.

Mr. FELLOWS. Oh, no. Gentlemen should not attempt to befog this question with any utterances calculated to mislead the House. Some of this freight is loaded into outgoing steamers on the Jersey side.

Mr. GEAR. I only want to ask a proper question. I am not trying to befog the question.

Mr. FELLOWS. Oh, no. I was referring to the comments that were made by my colleagues here that all of that outgoing freight was loaded on the Jersey side. The greater lines of ships that ply between our port and Europe have their docks upon the New York side. Those that carry by far the most passengers and freight are on the New York side. I do not know how much of this traffic stays upon the New Jersey side by reason of the fact that the difficulty which we are seeking to overcome exists in the way of proper facilities for reaching our city.

I know that the point of destination when it starts is New York. I know that the interests represented are owned in New York. If, for the purpose of transacting their business, they have to go to other States, if we are deprived of just so much of commerce to which we are fairly entitled by our location, by our enterprise, by our capital, it seems a little strange that the Representatives of the city of New York should be found opposing that additional benefit to the great metropolis.

I can readily understand why objections should be made to this measure by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DUNN]. Out of all this vast production, which seeks New York as the point of destination, New Jersey acquires a certain part by reason of the hindrances which nature has interposed between us and the rest of the world. Build this bridge, and the traffic of the West, like the traffic of the North and the East, would find its natural point of distribution at New York City.

Mr. DUNN. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. FELLOWS. If it is a question. I have but twenty-four minutes.

Mr. DUNN. I ask the gentleman if a law was passed in New Jersey favoring the bridge bill; and does he know how it was passed? If he does not, there are people here who can tell him.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think it quite likely. I am not acquainted with the mysteries of New Jersey politics. I do not know how far the black-horse cavalry may intervene in pushing measures through the Legislature or in sending members to Congress. [Laughter.] And I do not care. Let New Jersey transact her politics in her own way. I think that the recorded sentiment of New Jersey is the best expression of New Jersey's judgment. When I find the gentleman from New Jersey representing a New Jersey district upon this floor, I take it it is because New Jersey wants him. And when New Jersey passes a bill through her Legislature by a large majority, I take it it is because New Jersey wants the bill passed.

Mr. DUNN. New Jersey had not in contemplation the passage of such a bill as this.

Mr. FELLOWS. New Jersey passed a bill which confirms the construction of the bridge proposed by this bill. That brings me right down to the consideration of the question, which I apprehend should control the action of this House as to whether there is a necessity for such a construction or not. There are statements made here, and unchallenged, as to the number of people who seek access to the city of New York by a bridge from the New Jersey shore.

Then there is the vast amount of freight which seeks to find the point from which it may be distributed to the inhabitants of the world, which I think furnishes an adequate reason why every citizen of the United States has felt the importance of a structure which would enable him more easily and more cheaply to reach the city of New York, and with less delay in time.

I think that every citizen of New York and Brooklyn, and that mighty tide of population which flows into those two cities, almost 6,000,000 in extent, the homes of which can be seen from the domes of our buildings in New York City, have felt a sense of humiliation from the fact that the great metropolis of the country had not in the years gone by, in the strides of enterprise and civilization, linked herself in closer union with her sister States of the Republic. Certainly no one will deny that there is a great necessity for the construction of a bridge which will unite New York with the rest of the Republic, which will give her unhindered and unchallenged intercourse with her sister States.

But I am met here with the statement that, although necessary, it will be an obstruction in the river. There is force in that objection. There is a great deal of sound sense in the argument made upon that point. There would seem to be a great deal of force presented by the gentleman from Westchester, who states that if this obstruction were put in the river by nature the Government would have spent tens of millions of dollars for the purpose of removing it. If the Government had built a monument of solid granite at the place where it is proposed to construct this shaft, which is called the west pier of that bridge, I apprehend that there is no man upon the floor of the House of Representatives who would ever vote one dollar for its removal, because I assert, and I challenge contradiction on the part of anybody who is familiar with the river at the place where this bridge is sought to be located, that it would not be in any sense nor could it be made a hindrance to navigation. No navigation goes where that pier is proposed to be placed.

Sir, I am as familiar with the upper part of the city of New York as any gentleman upon this floor. I have made it my home for a great many years. I have spent hours and days upon the river there, and I know the course of the channel Day after

day and night after night I have seen the great steamers come up and down the river. I know the course they pursue, and I know that in passing Seventy-sixth street they do not come within a thousand feet of the western pier of this bridge. The pier is 2,100 feet away from the New York side. On the New Jersey side a thousand feet or a little less has been reserved, as you have heard, as an anchorage ground, not in the immediate vicinity of this contemplated pier alone, but for 2 or 3 miles up and down. I imagine that my distinguished colleague, my very esteemed friend from New York, although chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, will have to acquire much more of nautical experience before he can find seamen upon the river who, having 4 miles of leeway, will be so stupid in the navigation of a vessel as to swing it against the piers of this bridge. [Laughter.]

Mr. CUMMINGS. Let me answer that remark. Does not my friend know that there are four ferries inside of those 4 miles plying their traffic over those "flats?" I suppose the gentleman thinks there is nothing but dew on them, but the fishermen stick shad poles down there in 20 feet of water.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to answer the question of my colleague [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. I can not yield to an interruption now.

Mr. WARNER. Well, let me say that we are ready to contradict your statement if you give us an opportunity. Why, the river is 40 feet deep at the place where this pier must be. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not, and I do not care whether it is 400 feet deep. My statement is still true, that vessels do not generally go in that part of the river.

Mr. WARNER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FELLOWS. The line of navigation is far east of that, in toward the New York shore. Everybody who lives in New York and has observed the navigation of that river knows that this is the case. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, the navigation of that part of the Hudson River is comparatively an exceedingly scanty and limited navigation. That stream is not an estuary, as my colleague [Mr. WARNER] has imagined it to be.

The Hudson or North River rises to a dignity far above that. It is not an estuary, it is not a mere overflow of the ocean or bay. It is river, a majestic river, a broad river, having its sources up close to the Canada line, and flowing through almost the entire extent of our State to the ocean. But the East River is an estuary. At Fort Schuyler, but a few miles from the city of New York, what is known as Long Island Sound, ceases, and the "East River" begins; in other words, the sound narrows down to a stream that we have called the East River. The East River is nothing else than the southerly extremity of Long Island Sound. There is the rush of the ocean currents upon the eastern portion of that sound; there is the resistless sweep of the tides; there is the commotion created by its junction with Spuyten Duyvil Creek and the Harlem River, constituting what is known as Hell Gate, the removal of which has been found so difficult.

All this makes the East River between New York and Brooklyn a turbulent, rapid, forceful stream, dangerous to navigate. Besides, it is very narrow as compared with the Hudson River; it is not a third of the width of the Hudson. Yet we put a bridge across that stream. Four times as many boats ply across the East River as ply upon the Hudson—yes, five times as many The East River between New York and Brooklyn is the busiest water scene on all this earth, except the Thames in the vicinity of London. It has no equal elsewhere. The traffic along the Hudson River is, comparatively, scant in the extreme.

In the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year but 18,000,000 tons of freight pass up and down that river, which is a very inconsiderable portion; and, although the Hudson is the tideway along which the stream of pleasure travel flows to its summer resorts and its summer homes, but 5,000,000 of people go up and down that river in the course of a year. Now, what is the transportation upon the East River? There there is a constant shuttle of ferryboats, crossing each other's course to and fro at every angle. They run up as high as the northern extremity of Manhattan Island. There is no part of the East River almost to its junction with the Sound that is not crossed by ferryboats. All the mighty tide of Sound steamers flows out each night and comes in each morning through that channel.

Stand on the Brooklyn Bridge for fifteen minutes from this hour in the day, or after 6 o'clock in the morning, and you will see such a tide of water commerce and traffic as can be witnessed in but two places in this world beside, one being the strait at the city of Detroit and the other the Thames at London. And yet that Brooklyn Bridge has proved no obstruction. Fourteen hundred and sixty feet only of waterway is allowed there. With 2,100 feet allowed for the little traffic of the Hudson with the channel upon the east side of the river so large, it would be utterly impossible for collisions to occur.

Difficulties at that point, therefore, should wait upon navigation. There can be no objection upon the ground that this bridge will be a hindrance to navigation.

But, sir, Administrations come and go; there are changes in our policy; as American citizens we are taught to believe that whoever may be the representatives in power in this or other branches of the Government, or whatever their differences upon questions of policy, they are all animated by the one desire of doing that which shall best contribute to the prosperity and general happiness of our country. So we may safely trust this matter of the protection of the navigation of the stream to the control of the United States Government—to the Secretary of War, in whose discretion it is placed by this bill. If, when he has consulted the engineers of the Government, uninfluenced by politics and unswayed by local prejudice or control, they decide that this would be an impediment to navigation, the bridge will not be built.

But, you say, "We will strike out this provision and compel you to make a single-pier bridge." That would be telling us, gentlemen, that we shall have no bridge at all. There is no engineer that dare pledge his reputation to-day to the construction of a single span 3,100 feet in length. It is so much in excess of anything ever attempted that science stands appalled at a contemplation even of its possibility. Will not the experience but a few years ago with the upper suspension bridge in that gulf at Niagara, a narrow one over which you can throw a stone; will not the awful calamity the other day with the span in the Ohio River; will not that catastrophe which filled the world with the sound of mourning at the Frith of Forth a few years ago, teach us that we may not too far trespass upon well-established natural laws?

We can not go on extending these spans indefinitely and crowding on them the tremendous weight that the traffic of eight railroad tracks, as contemplated in this bill, would bring, without exposing to danger and disaster every person who might ride across the bridge. Why is it that this lower bridge company that obtained this right some years ago has not exercised it? Simply because they could not build a single span. It is out of the power of man to do it. You deny us a bridge if you deny us this bill. We assure you, and you will have the additional guarantee of the Secretary of War, that the bridge will be no hindrance to navgation.

Now let me call your attention to one other fact and I am done. I have said that I shall speak no words of passion. I want my parting hours in this House to be as pleasant with my associates as all of my stay here has been. I want to experience, when I go, that keen bitterness of regret which I have experienced ever since I knew I had to go, over the fact that I am being separated from a companionship which without any respect of politics has been the most delightful of my public life. Therefore my colleague from the Seventh district of New York will believe that I speak in no disparaging way of him when I say, in answer to the statement protested with so much vehemence by my other colleague [Mr. WARNER], that he alone should speak for New York because he represents the district where all these great commercial interests are located, that it was my privilege in the Fifty-second Congress to represent the same district.

As between us, I represented it longer than he. I believe that I know its sentiment, its feelings, and the desires of its people as well as he. I represent another district now; but I feel as competent to speak for that district as does the gentleman who now, as its Representative, graces this Hall with his presence. I know that the interests of New York require and demand this bridge. I know that it is wanted only under such guaranties as will insure to every citizen of the country and to every pound of freight the highest privileges which this great structure is designed to confer.

I know that those who desire this bridge are too patriotic to wish it under any conditions which would impair the power of the United States to protect its navigable waters or would lay one single straw in the pathway of any citizen of our common Republic. But because we know that there is a universal pride in that great city, because it is one of the great products of our civilization, because all of the people of the United States first or last turn their faces toward New York for something that they want—for some pleasure they desire to gratify or something that they need for home comfort or luxury, or as the point of exchange and distribution from which their output goes to the rest of the world—I know that the people of the Union desire to see us brought into closer relation with the people of our sister States. Therefore we ask the passage of this bill.

My friend has told you of the products of the West that come down in canal boats. Does he not know that every single pound of that traffic passes under two bridges at Albany with a span between the piers of only 150 feet each, does he not know that every pound of it passes under the Poughkeepsie bridge with a span between its piers of only 500 feet, before it reaches the

mighty Hudson at New York, where it will have an open spaceway of 2,100 feet; and that this traffic has never found any hindrance or obstacle in its passage up and down the Hudson? I want to say that this 2,100 feet is considerably more than the average width of the Hudson River above New York. There is not as much waterway on the average all the way to Troy, where the navigation ceases, as will be given under the piers of this bridge. Still gentlemen talk about this being a hindrance to navigation.

Mr. WARNER. Has the gentleman forgotten the tides?

Mr. FELLOWS. I have not forgotten the tides.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[Mr. FELLOWS took his seat amid applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to this conference report.

The question being taken, there were, on a division, (called for by Mr. WARNER)—ayes 126, noes 47.

Mr. BARTLETT. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, there being ayes 34, noes 118—more than one-fifth voting in the affirmative.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 52, not voting 137; as follows:

YEAS—164.

Aitken,	Causey,	Houk, Ohio	Randall,
Alderson,	Cobb, Ala.	Hulick,	Rayner,
Aldrich,	Cogswell,	Hunter,	Reyburn,
Alexander,	Cooper, Ind.	Joy,	Richards, Ohio
Allen,	Cooper, Tex.	Kiefer,	Richardson, Mich.
Apsley,	Cooper, Wis.	Kilgore,	Richardson, Tenn.
Arnold,	Cornish,	Lane,	Robinson, Pa.
Avery,	Covert,	Latimer,	Sayers,
Baker, Kans.	Cox,	Lester,	Schermerhorn,
Baldwin,	Crain,	Linton,	Settle,
Bankhead,	Crawford,	Livingston,	Sperry,
Barnes,	Curtis, Kans.	Loudenslager,	Springer,
Bartholdt,	Davis,	Lucas,	Stevens,
Barwig,	De Forest,	Lynch,	Stockdale,
Black, Ga.	Dingley,	Maddox,	Stone, W. A.
Blair,	Dinsmore,	Mallory,	Stone, Ky.
Blanchard,	Dockery,	Marsh,	Strong,
Bland,	Doolittle,	Martin, Ind.	Sweet,
Boutelle,	Dunphy,	Marvin, N. Y.	Talbert, S. C.
Bower, N. C.	Ellis, Oregon	McCall,	Talbott, Md.
Bowers, Cal.	English,	McCleary, Minn.	Tate,
Brawley,	Epes,	McDannold,	Tawney,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Erdman,	McDearmon,	Taylor, Ind.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fellows,	McEttrick,	Terry,
Bretz,	Fithian,	McMillin,	Thomas,
Brickner,	Fletcher,	McNagny,	Tracey,
Broderick,	Fyan,	McRae,	Turner,
Brookshire,	Geary,	Money,	Turpin,
Brosius,	Geissenhainer,	Montgomery,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Bryan,	Gorman,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio,
Bundy,	Haines,	Morgan,	Washington,
Bunn,	Hall, Mo.	Morse,	Weadock,
Bynum,	Hare,	Mutchler,	Wells,
Cabaniss,	Harmer,	Oates,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cadmus,	Hartman,	O'Neil,	Whiting,
Caldwell,	Hatch,	Paschal,	Wilson, Ohio
Campbell,	Hayes,	Paynter,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cannon, Cal.	Heard,	Pearson,	Wise,
Cannon, Ill.	Henderson, N. C.	Pendleton, Tex.	Woodard,
Caruth,	Holman,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Woomer,
Catchings,	Hooker, Miss.	Pickler,	Wright, Pa.

NAYS—52.

Babcock,	Daniels,	Hutcheson,	Pence,
Bartlett,	De Armond,	Ikirt,	Pigott,
Bell, Tex.	Dunn,	Kribbs,	Ritchie,
Black, Ill.	Fielder,	Kyle,	Robertson, La.
Boen,	Funk,	Lacey,	Ryan,
Burrows,	Gear,	Loud,	Sickles,
Clark, Mo.	Grady,	Maguire,	Simpson,
Clarke, Ala.	Hainer,	Marshall,	Stone, C. W.
Coffeen,	Hall, Minn.	McKaig,	Storer,
Cooper, Fla.	Harris,	Meiklejohn,	Updegraff,
Cousins,	Harter,	Northway,	Wanger,
Culberson,	Hepburn,	Outhwaite,	Warner.
Cummings,	Hicks,	Payne,	Wright, Mass.

NOT VOTING—137.

Abbott,	Coombs,	Grosvenor,	Lapham,
Adams,	Curtis, N. Y.	Grout,	Lawson,
Bailey,	Dalzell,	Hager,	Layton,
Baker, N. H.	Davey,	Hammond,	Lefever,
Belden,	Denson,	Haugen,	Lisle,
Bell, Colo.	Dolliver,	Heiner,	Lockwood,
Beltzhoover,	Donovan,	Henderson, Ill.	Magner,
Berry,	Draper,	Henderson, Iowa	Mahon,
Bingham,	Durborow,	Hendrix,	McAleer,
Boatner,	Edmunds,	Hermann,	McCreary, Ky.
Branch,	Ellis, Ky.	Hilborn,	McCulloch,
Brattan,	Enloe,	Hines,	McDowell,
Brown,	Everett,	Hitt,	McGann,
Burnes,	Fitch,	Hooker, N. Y.	McKeighan,
Caminetti,	Forman,	Hopkins, Ill.	McLaurin,
Capehart,	Funston,	Hopkins, Pa.	Mercer,
Chickering,	Gardner,	Houk, Tenn.	Meredith,
Childs,	Gillet, N. Y.	Hudson,	Meyer,
Clancy,	Gillett, Mass.	Hull,	Milliken,
Cobb, Mo.	Goldzier,	Johnson, Ind.	Moses,
Cockran,	Goodnight,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Murray,
Cockrell,	Graham,	Johnson, Ohio	Neill,
Compton,	Gresham,	Jones,	Newlands,
Conn,	Griffin,	Kem,	O'Ferrall,
Page,	Rusk,	Somers,	Waugh,
Patterson,	Russell, Conn.	Stallings,	Wever,
Perkins,	Russell, Ga.	Stephenson,	Wheeler, Ill.
Phillips,	Scranton,	Strait,	White,
Post,	Shaw,	Swanson,	Williams, Ill.
Powers,	Shell,	Tarsney,	Williams, Miss.
Price,	Sherman,	Taylor, Tenn.	Wilson, Wash.
Ray,	Sibley,	Tucker,	Wolverton.
Reed,	Sipe,	Tyler,	
Reilly,	Smith,	Wadsworth,	
Robbins,	Snodgrass,	Walker,	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. CONN with Mr. CHILDS, until further notice.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia with Mr. MERCER, for this day.

Mr. BERRY with Mr. SHERMAN, on this vote.

Mr. FORMAN with Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota, on this bill.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GEARY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, the 21st day of December, present, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 3d day of January, 1894.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. OUTHWAITE, a motion to reconsider the vote last taken was laid on the table.

HOUSE RESTAURANT KITCHEN.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at this time.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report of Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, touching condition of House restaurant kitchen, based upon report of A. P. Garden, captain of United States Capitol police, and submitted with a letter from the Sergeant-at-Arms to the Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP, Speaker of the House.

Your committee have made an inspection of the kitchen and find its condition as cleanly as the circumstances and surroundings will admit. There have been no improvements or extension of kitchen space to the House restaurant from its establishment up to the present time. When first constructed the House restaurant consisted of a lunch room, which is now used for that purpose, the members' dining room and ladies' dining room having been since added. The kitchen room is wholly inadequate, and so overcrowded that it is utterly impossible to properly cook and serve the food. While the House of Representatives has grown to 360 members, the facilities of the House restaurant kitchen have not been improved in the least since its original establishment.

The fire alluded to was a small affair, of no consequence whatever, so far as the committee could judge. It originated from a small kettle which contained a small quantity of lard, which became ignited from a gas jet left burning under the bottom of kettle. The walls and floor of the kitchen are constructed of rough stone, and it is a physical impossibility to keep them clear of roaches and other insects that usually infest such places.

The elevator used for bringing up food is in bad condition, entirely too small, and should be repaired. Your committee summoned the Architect of the Capitol, who was present during the investigation, and he was called upon to make such suggestions as would most speedily relieve the crowded condition of the kitchen. After a full conference with the Architect your committee is of the opinion that the improvements absolutely necessary in order to make the House restaurant kitchen what it should be can not be made during a session of Congress.

We therefore submit the above and ask permission to make a further report at a later day in the session, at which time your committee will submit plans and estimate of costs for necessary improvements.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
Chairman of Committee.

The SPEAKER. The report will lie on the table for the present.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On December 7, 1893:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893.

On December 12, 1893:

An act (H. R. 3544) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes;" approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof.

On December 15, 1893:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 77) conferring diplomas upon designers, inventors, and expert artisans.

On December 19, 1893:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 96) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the Monument grounds and reservations or public spaces in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 31) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation in Minnesota.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the standing and select committees for reports.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of committees for reports, and that members having reports to present may have permission to hand them in at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. McRAE. I object.

The committees were called for reports; when bills of the following titles were severally presented, read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the calendars named below, and ordered to be printed.

SETTLEMENT WITH THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.

By Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 4903) to authorize a compromise and settlement with the State of Arkansas, as a substitute for the bill H. R. 117. The substitute (H. R. 4903) was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the original bill (H. R. 117) was ordered to lie on the table.

FORT LARAMIE MILITARY RESERVATION.

By Mr. MOON, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (S. 591) to donate to the county of Laramie, Wyo., certain bridges on the abandoned Fort Laramie military reservation, and for other purposes—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIMBER-CULTURE LAWS.

By Mr. LATIMER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, a bill (H. R. 4458) to amend section 7 of "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the House Calendar.

ADMISSION OF OKLAHOMA.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, from the Committee on the Territories, a bill (H. R. 4857) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

AMENDMENT TO REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. KRIBBS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4185) to repeal the twelfth subdivision of section 4288 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC LANDS IN ALABAMA.

Mr. KRIBBS, also from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 195) to amend an act entitled "An act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands," approved March 3, 1883; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRODERICK, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at twenty minutes past 4 oclock p. m.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move to dispense with the second morning hour.

The SPEAKER. It requires unanimous consent for the second morning hour to be dispensed with.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that it be dispensed with.

Mr. CULBERSON. There is a little bill on the Calendar that I would like to pass first.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Then I will waive my request out of respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

The SPEAKER. The call rests with the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Chair will call the committees for the presentation of bills for consideration.

The Committee on the Judiciary was called.

CHARLES IVERSON GRAVES.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill on the Calendar to remove the political disabilities of Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, in the State of Georgia, which I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to call up.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1141) to remove the political disabilities of Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, in the State of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all political disabilities imposed by the third section of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States be, and the same are hereby, removed from Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, State of Georgia.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask for the reading of the report.

The report (by Mr. LAYTON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1141) to remove the political disabilities of Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, Ga., submitted the following report:

As shown by the application of Mr. Graves, the beneficiary of this bill, he graduated at the United States Naval Academy in the year 1857; after graduation and prior to the war of the rebellion, he served in the United States Navy as midshipman, passed midshipman, master, and lieutenant, respectively. That after the secession of Georgia, his native State, he entered the military service of the Confederate States, where he remained until the close of the war. He is now a legal citizen of the United States, residing at Rome, Ga., of good character and standing.

There are very numerous precedents for granting relief in cases of this kind, hence your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed.

Mr. HOLMAN. The bill has not been read.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been read; but it can be read again, if the gentleman desires it. The Clerk will again report the title of the bill.

The title of the bill was again reported.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. OUTHWAITE (when the Committee on Military Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Committee on Military Affairs be passed over, with the privilege of recurring to it again on the call.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

HENRY JAMES.

Mr. McRAE (when the Committee on the Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Henry James, residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas, and I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MOON].

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. McRAE. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let the bill be first reported.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Henry James shall have the right to enter and pay for within ninety days next after the passage of this act, at the appraisement made and reported by the United States Commissioners for the Hot Springs Reservation under act of Congress approved March 3, 1877, the following lot, as designated by the survey and map made by said Commissioners, which lot the said Henry James has improved or resided upon, and he shall pay to the receiver of public moneys at the land office in Little Rock, Ark., the appraisement aforesaid for said lot and shall receive a patent therefor as follows: Henry James, lot 4 in block 102.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That Henry James, who has improved and resides upon lot 4 in block 102, as designated by the survey and map made by the United States Commissioners for the Hot Springs Reservation, shall have the right to enter and pay for said lot at the land office in Little Rock, Ark., within ninety days next after the passage of this act, at and for the sum of $1,240, which is the value thereof as ascertained by an appraisement made under the act approved March 3, 1891."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the reading of this bill was not

distinctly heard, and I hope my friend will not insist upon its passage until there has been some explanation of it.

Mr. McRAE. I have yielded the floor to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MOON], who reported the bill. The report might be read. It will fully explain the nature of the bill.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, who introduced the bill originally.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this is a small bill, to carry into effect what has been the general policy of the Government, and the exception arose from no fault of the claimant. In being allowed to purchase this Government lot, on which the claimant has a home and other improvements, the Department suggested that the present value of the lot be required in payment; and that is provided for in the bill. As I stated at first, this is the general policy of the Government. There happened to be a suspension, that threw this case into an excepted state. I believe this is not the first time we have allowed homes to be preserved in that manner; and I would refer to the report for any details in the matter. The Department approves the bill, and there is no question about it.

The report (by Mr. MOON) was read as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2896) "for the relief of Henry James, residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas," have had the same under consideration and report it back with the recommendation that the following substitute in the nature of an amendment be passed:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That Henry James, who has improved and resides upon lot 4, in block 102, as designated by the survey and map made by the United States commissioners for the Hot Springs Reservation, shall have the right to enter and pay for said lot at the land office in Little Rock, Ark., within ninety days next after the passage of this act, at and for the sum of $1,200, which is the value thereof as ascertained by an appraisement made under the act approved March 3, 1891."

The records in the Interior Department show that the said lot was appraised by the Hot Springs commissioners on the 12th day of December, 1879, at $60. Messrs. Raleigh and Gibbs, the registrar and receiver of the land office at Little Rock, Ark., were appointed by Secretary Noble as commissioners to appraise the unsold lots in the reservation under the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat., 841), and on the 16th day of November, 1891, appraised this lot at $1,200. Property in the city of Hot Springs has very materially enhanced in value during the last fifteen years, and while the committee believe that Mr. James should have the right to purchase the lot upon which he resides and has improved, they think he should be required to pay the present value and should not be allowed to purchase at the value in 1879.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF SETTLERS ON IOWA RESERVATION, OKLAHOMA, TERRITORY.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I now call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa reservation, Oklahoma Territory.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every homestead settler on the public lands on the left bank of the Deep Fork River in the former Iowa Reservation, in the Territory of Oklahoma, restricted to less than 160 acres of land, may enter, under the homestead laws, other lands adjoining the land embraced in his original entry when such additional lands become subject to entry, which additional entry shall not, with the lands originally entered, exceed in the aggregate 160 acres: *Provided*, That where such adjoining entry is made residence shall not be required upon the lands so entered, but the residence and cultivation by the settler upon and of the land embraced in his original entry shall be considered residence and cultivation for the same length of time upon the land embraced in his additional entry; but such lands so entered shall be paid for, conformable to the terms of the act acquiring the same and opening it to homestead entry.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. McRAE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REED. Why not consider it in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. McRAE. It will take the time of going in and out of committee.

Mr. REED. What is it for?

Mr. McRAE. For the relief of certain settlers in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, then, the bill will be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McRAE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER], who reported the bill.

Mr. LATIMER. I ask that the report be read.

The report (by Mr. LATIMER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 284) "For the relief of those settlers who made homestead entry of less than 160 acres of land in Oklahoma Territory," have had the same under consideration and report it back, with the recommendation that it be laid upon the table and the accompanying substitute therefor be passed.

The boundary line between the former Iowa Reservation and the Kickapoo Reservation is the Deep Fork River. When the lands in the Iowa Reservation were thrown open to settlers and entry, said stream had not been meandered, and settlers on the left bank thereof could not accurately determine how much land was embraced in the tracts upon which they settled. Although the Deep Fork River is a narrow, nonnavigable stream, not of the class which is subject to being meandered under the rules of the Land Office it was found necessary to survey the meander lines of said river in order to accurately determine the quantity of land embraced in each entry along the left bank thereof.

Upon the completion of the survey it was found upon examination that the entries made for the lands on the left bank of the Deep Fork River embraced areas varying in quantity from 8 acres upward. The Commissioner of the General Land Office, who recommends the substitute, has informed the committee that many letters from settlers on the left bank of said river have been received at the Land Office, from which it appears that it was the general belief of said settlers that as the surveys as originally made subdivided the lands crossed by said river in the regular manner into quarter sections that they would be entitled when the Kickapoo lands were opened to settlement and entry to include the portions of the quarter sections on the right bank of said river in the entries made by them for the portions of the same quarter sections on the left bank of the river.

As the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat., 577), provides for the disposal of the Kickapoo lands, and it is probable that they will be opened to settlement and entry, the bill is intended to afford relief to the parties referred to by allowing them to enter an additional quantity of adjoining lands.

Mr. LATIMER. I now yield the floor to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN].

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, when the Iowa Reservation was originally opened up in Oklahoma Territory there were settlers who settled upon the west side of it, on what is now known as the left bank of Deep Fork. There were some fractions of land that were located along there that the Government has since ascertained were lands of the Kickapoo Reservation, which they have since purchased. They ordered this stream, which is about 20 or 30 feet wide, to be meandered in making that survey. The settlers who had certain fractional pieces of the land have had their quantities largely reduced. Many of them have exhausted their homestead rights in that settlement, and they are brought down to about 6 or 8 acres. This bill permits these parties, when these other lands come in, to fill out a quarter section from the adjacent land. That is all there is in it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McRAE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SELECTIONS FROM PUBLIC LANDS, MONTANA.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 83) authorizing the State of Montana to make selections from certain public lands.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for the State of Montana to select as a part of the lands granted the said State under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the division of Dakota into two States, and to enable the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to form constitutions and State governments, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to make donations of public lands to such States," approved February 22, 1889, and an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated for other purposes," approved February 28, 1891, any of the lands in the Bitter Root Valley lying above the Lo Lo Fork of the Bitter Root River, mentioned and described in an act entitled "An act to provide for the removal of the Flathead and other Indians from the Bitter Root Valley in the Territory of Montana," approved June 5, 1872: *Provided, however*, That no existing rights to any of the said lands initiated under any of the laws of the United States shall be invalidated by this act.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the report will be read.

The report (by Mr. LATIMER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 83) authorizing the State of Montana to make selections from certain public lands, have had the same under consideration and report it back with the recommendation that it pass.

The necessity for the passage of the bill is clearly set out in the following report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior, which is made a part of this report:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"*Washington, October 14, 1893.*

"SIR: On the 26th ultimo you transmitted a copy of H. R. bill 83, 'authorizing the State of Montana to make selections from certain public lands,' with request for the views of the Department thereon. I inclose herewith copy of report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office upon the same, and concur in his conclusion that no objection appears to its becoming a law.

"Very respectfully,
"HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

"Hon. T. C. McRAE,
"*Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,*
House of Representatives."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 10, 1893.

SIR: I am in receipt, by reference from you under date of the 28th ultimo, for report thereon of House bill No. 83, entitled "A bill authorizing the State of Montana to make selections from certain public lands," submitted with letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives, dated the 26th ultimo.

The bill provides that it shall be lawful for the State of Montana to select as part of the lands granted to said State under the provisions of the act of February 22, 1889 (25 U. S. Stats., 676), and sections 2275 and 2276 of the Re-

vised Statutes, as amended by the act of February 28, 1891 (26 U. S. Stats., 796), any of the lands in the Bitter Root Valley lying above the Lo Lo Fork of the Bitter Root River, mentioned and described in the act entitled "An act to provide for the removal of the Flathead and other Indians from the Bitter Root Valley, in the Territory of Montana," approved June 5, 1872.

These lands, the Indian title to which has been extinguished under the provisions of the act of June 5, 1872 (17 U. S. Stats., 226), are not, under existing laws, subject to selection by the State.

The act of June 5, 1872, above mentioned, provided that after survey the said lands should be open to settlement and be sold in legal subdivisions to actual settlers (settlements under the provisions of the homestead and preemption laws being prohibited) in quantities not exceeding 160 acres to any one person, at the price of $1.25 per acre. It also provided for entries of said lands under the town-site laws. The act of February 11, 1874 (18 U. S. Stats., 15), extended the benefits of the homestead law over the said lands.

The above constitutes all the legislation had on the subject of these lands up to the present time.

This bill, as I understand it, simply proposes to remove the restriction placed upon the disposal of the lands by former acts, and to make them subject to selection by the State in the same manner and to the same extent as are other public lands of the United States. The bill does not increase the amount which has heretofore been granted to the State of Montana under the act of February 22, 1889, but simply removes the restriction heretofore placed upon the disposal of the land, and puts the State on an equality with individuals in regard to the right of acquiring title to the land.

This being the case, and existing rights to the lands being protected by the provisions of the bill, I can see no objection to the proposed measure becoming a law.

The copy of the bill and letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands are herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is simply to give the State of Montana the privilege of going into the Bitter Root Valley and selecting a certain portion of the public lands there for school purposes. The letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office which has just been read in the report explains this fully. He says:

This bill, as I understand it, simply proposes to remove the restriction placed upon the disposal of the lands by former acts, and to make them subject to selection by the State in the same manner and to the same extent as are other public lands of the United States. The bill does not increase the amount which has heretofore been granted to the State of Montana under the act of February 22, 1889, but simply removes the restriction heretofore placed upon the disposal of the land, and puts the State on an equality with individuals in regard to the right of acquiring title to the land.

I ask for the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I desire to say just a word. This bill was prepared under instructions of the State board of land commissioners of the State of Montana. Under the existing law we are authorized to select the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections as school lands, but the existing law does not authorize us to select lands from the particular body of land which this bill will permit us to select from. The bill comes with the unanimous recommendation of the board of land commissioners, and it seems to be indorsed also by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior, and I presume there will be no objection to its passage.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. These lands, as I understand, were formerly an Indian reservation?

Mr. HARTMAN. Yes, sir; the Lo Lo Indian Reservation.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. And when that reservation was opened up for settlement the law provided only for homestead entries, and as the State could not make homestead entries it could not go in there under the law.

Mr. HARTMAN. That is a correct statement of the case. The Indians were removed from that reservation and the lands were opened to settlement, but under existing laws the State has no right to select any lands in that valley which formerly belonged to the Indian reservation.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to in any way or manner put in jeopardy the passage of this bill, but I wish to say a few words on the subject to which it relates. In the second session of the Fifty-second Congress an amendment was put upon the sundry civil appropriation bill, granting to North and South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington the preference right for sixty days after the filing of any township plat in any local land office to select lands that had been granted to the State for educational purposes; not, however, as against any bona fide homestead or preëmption settler who might be on the land at the time of the filing of the plat. Now, when the State comes to put that law into operation it generally finds that it is not quick enough to secure its rights, and I think there ought to be an extension of the time to about four months.

In Western Washington, for example, we have a great body of valuable timber land which, under the act of June 3, 1878, can be taken up at $2.50 an acre where it is chiefly valuable for timber. But the mill-owners and other individuals are quicker than the State, and when we come to select our lands we find that they have gotten people upon those timber lands, and so the State is cut out of its right to make selections from those valuable lands. I had intended to offer an amendment to this bill, but the gentleman from Arkansas said he had no time to consider it, and I call attention to the subject now in the hope that when the sundry civil appropriation bill comes before this House we may take up this question and try to give the new States a fair opportunity to select the lands that have been donated to them by Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. Can the gentleman state whether the privilege given under this bill to the State of Montana is the same that has been given to other States?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The privilege given is this: When the lands were granted to Montana and the other new States there was found to be a valuable body of land located in what is known as the Bitter Root Valley, formerly an Indian reservation, and when Congress passed a law throwing that reservation open to settlement, it provided that it should be open to homestead settlement only.

Now, there is no way by which a State can make a homestead entry, and consequently those States could not select any of their lands from the reservation. In this case the land is surveyed. I should have attempted to put an amendment to this bill giving the same privilege to the other new States if we had any large body of surveyed lands; but unfortunately, in my State, all of the surveyed lands have been segregated from the public domain, and I am unable to designate any large body of surveyed public lands from which the State could select. The only thing we can do in North and South Dakota, Washington, Montana, and the other new States, is to reserve the land after it has been surveyed, the reservation not to operate against the bona fide settler who is on the land at the time of the filing of the plat.

This time ought to be extended. The State with its machinery and its official force can not get around as fast as individuals or corporations. We want to protect these lands, and give the State an opportunity to select the best lands; for most of these States have a provision in their constitutions that none of the lands granted them by Congress shall be sold for less than $10 an acre. Now, if mill-owners or other individuals or corporations can acquire valuable timber lands at $2.50 an acre, every man must recognize that they are going to do it. I hope that at a proper opportunity we shall be able to take up this subject and adopt such legislation as may enable our States to go forward and select these lands for our various educational institutions.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I think the purpose of this bill has been clearly stated, but I will say one word. It does not enlarge the school grant to Montana, but only allows that State to make good the grant already made in part out of a former Indian reservation which is now a part of the public domain and open to settlement under the homestead law. The bill only permits the State to deal with this land as Congress has allowed it to deal with other public lands in the State, or, in other words, to select it as school lands.

As to the proposition of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WILSON], I am not prepared to say what the committee will do. I am inclined to think it right, but I have not considered it fully, and I shall object to introducing upon this bill any new proposition. We have considered this matter; we have not considered that. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon any amendments. I move the previous question on the third reading and passage of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. If the gentleman will withhold the demand for the previous question a moment I wish to remind him that I have already said I would not in any manner jeopardize the passage of this bill. I have not intimated any intention to move any amendment. But the gentleman is mistaken when he says he has not considered this question. He has considered it once at least, if he ever considers the appropriation bills in the House of Representatives, because a provision on this subject was upon one of those bills.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman will allow me to say that the very worst place in the world to pass land legislation is on an appropriation bill. More ill-considered land laws have been passed since I have been in Congress by tacking them upon appropriation bills than in any other way. I will add that my attention was not called to the provision in the sundry civil bill of last Congress, and perhaps I did not give it much consideration then. I do not think it was discussed then. I will consider it referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I am going to bring this question up again, if I can, when we reach the sundry civil bill; and I hope the gentleman will join me in the endeavor to have the question considered.

Mr. McRAE. I will not make the gentleman any promise to assist in putting this legislation upon the sundry civil bill.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I simply was asking that the gentleman join me in having the question considered.

Mr. McRAE. I move the previous question on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LATIMER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 2668) authorizing the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General to approve postmasters' bonds; when the Speaker signed the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. COX, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home; and

A bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, the 21st day of December, present, they stand adjourned until Monday, the 3d day of January, 1894.

With an amendment as follows:

Strike out "Monday" and insert "Wednesday."

ERRONEOUS ENROLLMENT OF ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the House to the fact that in enrolling the resolution adopted by the House in relation to the holiday adjournment the enrolling clerk made an error. The resolution as passed provided for an adjournment of the two Houses until Wednesday, the 3d day of January, but this was erroneously enrolled as "Monday, the 3d day of January." It was simply an error in copying. The resolution as thus copied was transmitted to the Senate, and that body has adopted an amendment striking out "Monday" and inserting "Wednesday." But inasmuch as the resolution in the form actually passed by the House provided for an adjournment until Wednesday the 3d, the House, can not of course, concur in this amendment, because it would imply that there was some occasion for change in the action taken by the House. The Chair will therefore direct the Clerk to transmit to the Senate a correct copy of the resolution as adopted by the House, with the statement that the copy previously sent and upon which the Senate based its amendment, was erroneous.

Mr. REED. In that case, Mr. Speaker, the Senate would act upon the resolution again?

The SPEAKER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask the gentleman to withdraw that motion one moment. I simply want to ask the House to go into Committee of the Whole on the bill for the admission of New Mexico, so that by unanimous consent general debate may be closed and we may commence the reading of the bill by paragraphs. I think all will concur that I have been patient in submitting to the delays caused by the interjection of appropriation bills and other privileged measures.

Mr. REED. Regular order.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I can not consent to the request of the gentleman from Alabama. It is late enough now.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. OUTHWAITE to adjourn, it was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4897) to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of benevolent and pastoral societies and orders and institutions of learning, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4898) for raising revenue, and other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4899) to incorporate the East Washington Heights Traction Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4900) to amend the act giving the approval and sanction of Congress to the route and termini of the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLACK of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4901) to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBBINS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4902) to authorize the acquisition of certain real estate in the city of Washington for Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COVERT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 103) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay Members and Delegates the amount paid or agreed to be paid for clerk hire from November 4 to December 3, 1893, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FITCH: A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to suspend all further action in respect to admitting land claims under the laws of the United States on the island of Anastasia, Fla., during the sessions of the Fifty-third Congress, unless Congressional action on the subject shall have been taken meantime—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. STRAIT: A resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for certain information regarding the appointment of naval cadets—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDERSON: A bill (H. R. 4904) granting a pension to James A. Milan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) to pension Bryant T. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4906) for the relief of Amos D. LeFevre, surviving partner—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4907) to correct the military record of Lieut. Anthony Roeslein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: A bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of Edward Markle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of Katharine Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 4910) granting a pension to L. W. Barton, widow of R. P. Barton, late a private of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 4911) for the relief of William L. Peeple—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) for the relief of Safrona Heskett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) for the relief of Rachel Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4914) for the relief of John M. Lindsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 4915) to correct the military record of Thomas F. Quigley, alias F. W. Howard, late a private in Company F, Eighteenth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4916) to increase the pension of William Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4917) granting a pension to John W. Turpin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4918) to provide additional artillery for the National Guard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WAUGH: A bill (H. R. 4919) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) granting relief to Robert P. Horn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Sentman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) to grant a pension to Margaret O'Donnell, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) granting a pension to Ambrose D. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDERSON: Petition of James A. Milan, for pension, to be considered with bill to pension him—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: Petition of citizens of Hanover, Pa., in favor of the reduction of the taxes on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Harrisburg, Pa., in favor of the reduction of the taxes on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNDY: Petition of Charles Kurtz and others, of Ironton, Ohio, for a uniform duty on unstemmed tobacco of 35 cents in the interest of the cigar manufacturers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition for the relief of Susan R. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAUSEY: Protest of employés of McCullough Iron Company, of Wilmington, Del., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition to improve Broadkiln River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition from the Illinois Humane Society, in favor of House bill 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, on temperance—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of citizens of Arkansas, asking relief for survivors of the Mountain Meadows massacre—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Petition of John Merz and others, for a uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Remonstrance of farmers and dealers in barley, citizens of the State of Minnesota, against the reduction of the duty on barley and the change of such duty from a specific to an ad valorem plan as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the employés of the John Kuestner Belmont Carpet Mills, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of the manufacturing establishment of Messrs. Speight & Robertson, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the employés and other workingmen of the Scottdale Iron and Steel Company, limited, of Scottdale, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial from the board of trustees of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., to the Congress of the United States, requesting attention to the danger to navigation lying inside the bay and harbor of San Francisco and in the approaches thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of Caroline Day and 21 other citizens and property owners of Delaware avenue, praying that the bill compelling the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad to enter the city on elevated tracks be not passed—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: Petition of the citizens of Hartford, Ohio County, Ky., for the improvement of Rough River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Protest of residents of Ellsworth, Minn., against the change in the tariff on barley proposed in the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of residents of Grand Prairie, Minn., against the proposed change in the tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McETTRICK: Petition of Foss & Co., protesting against the removal of duty upon woolen rags—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Petition of H. Stoeherl and 95 others, of Fort Wayne, Ind., employés of the Wayne Knitting Mills, protesting against a reduction of tariff duties on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE: Remonstrance of 200 employés of Brokaw Brothers, manufacturers of clothing, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Typographical Union, No. 2, of Philadelphia, against the free-book clause of the proposed tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial and protest of citizens, workingmen, wage-earners, and bread-winners of Wyebrook, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Petition of Daniel Kaylor to refer bill to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of R. H. Woodward, administrator, to refer bill to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Jacob Mann for reference of bill to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John I. Lowry to refer bill to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Margaret I. Gillispie, widow, to refer bill to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: Papers to accompany the bill for the relief of the executors of Joseph Watts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Papers to accompany House bill 3711 for the relief of William S. Grant—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of I. N. Carvalho and others, of Norristown, Pa., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of I. N. Carvalho, manufacturer, and M. S. Nace and 19 others, makers of cigars, of Norristown, Pa., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAUGH: Petition of Lithographers' Association of Indianapolis, Ind., for an increase of tariff duties on lithograph plates and work—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lockwood & Berryhill and other citizens of Boone County, Ind., for a uniform duty on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cyrus J. Long Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Boone County, Ind., for a settlement of all pension claims by December 1, 1894—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Papers in the claim of Elisabeth Horton, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in the claim of Allen Sanford, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 21, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

Mr. T. O. TOWLES, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared at the bar of the Senate, and delivered the following message:

I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that there was an error of engrossment in the concurrent resolution transmitted to the Senate yesterday providing for a recess of Congress, in that the resolution as it was engrossed provided for a recess from Thursday, the 21st day of December, 1893, to Monday, the 3d day of January, 1894, when the same should have been from Thursday, the 21st day of December, 1893, to Wednesday, January 3, 1894. I am further directed to present to the Senate the following resolution as a correct and true copy of the action of the House December 20, 1893, and to request the concurrence of the Senate therein:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 20, 1893.*

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, the 21st day of December, present they stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 3d day of January, 1894.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a petition numerously signed by citizens of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington, representing that they are wool-growers, merchants, and business men of the North Pacific, and that, regardless of party, they state that as a result of the belief that wool is to be placed on the free list, the price of wool has fallen within the last twelve months from 15 cents to 6 cents per pound, and the value of their sheep has fallen from $2.50 to $1 per head.

The petitioners represent that under a free schedule foreign wools of the character competing with those grown in that section can be laid down in Boston to-day for 30 cents per scoured pound. They further represent that, allowing 70 per cent for shrinkage, their wools in the same market would be worth 9 cents per pound in the grease, and deducting scouring and marketing charges it would leave to the grower a net value of but 5 cents per pound, which they say is at least 5 cents per pound below the cost of the most economical production. They state their belief that if wool is placed upon the free list there will be no advance in the values they have above submitted. They further represent that wool-growing is one of the most prominent industries west of the Rocky Mountains, and that the continuance of the present range of values for their main products which may be fairly looked for under free wool will bring ruin to the sheep industry of the North Pacific and widespread loss and disaster to the mercantile and other interests dependent upon its prosperity. They also state that there are thousands of people in the North Pacific almost directly dependent upon the wool industry——

Mr. HARRIS. I beg to inquire of the Senator from Oregon if he is reading a memorial or making the brief statement of a memorial which the rule requires?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am not reading a memorial, but I am making a brief statement, according to the rule, of the subject matter of the petition.

Mr. HARRIS. I simply desired to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the rule of the Senate requires a brief statement of a petition or memorial.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly: I understand the rule, and I do not wish to violate it. I am simply making a brief statement of the contents of the petition.

The petitioners further represent that with free wool one-half of these people will be obliged to seek a living and occupation elsewhere. Therefore they pray that wool be not placed on the free list. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I present the memorial of T. W. Ranskoll and 13 other citizens of Massachusetts, workers in the manufacture of gold and silver leaf, remonstrating against the reduction of duty on this product, as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill, which they say will destroy their industry, or reduce their wages 50 per cent, and also remonstrating against making the duty on the articles referred to ad valorem. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Michael W. Lynch and 10 other citizens of Boston, Mass., manufacturers and makers of cigars, praying for the imposition of a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of P. W. Cloran and 10 other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the imposition of a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 11 cigar manufacturers, of Germantown, Ohio, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented sundry petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Monroe, Scioto, and Coshocton Counties, in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of W. E. Alden and other citizens of Auburn, Me., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of G. W. Pettingill, of Haverhill, Mass., and the petition of E. Walpole and 3 other citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of George W. Davis and 14 other citizens of Boston, Mass., workers in the manufacture of gold and silver leaf, remonstrating against any change in the present existing specific duty on gold, silver, aluminum, and metal leaf; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the harbor at San Francisco, Cal.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of cigar manufacturers of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the imposition of a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of employés of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Bag Company, praying that the import duty on bags be 10 per cent in excess of the duty on burlaps; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the memorial of F. H. Silvernail and 40 other citizens of Lakeville, Conn., employed in the manufacture of cutlery, remonstrating against a reduction of the duties on cutlery; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the memorial of William H. Elliott, W. H. Buckley, H. A. Wood, and 40 others, employés of the Great Falls Woolen Company, Great Falls, N. H., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill. The memorialists state that the passage of the bill would have a most disastrous effect; that if foreign-made goods were admitted to this country at such a rate of duty as the Wilson bill would fix, it would have the effect of either throwing them out of work entirely, or else cutting down their wages to about the same rate that is paid in Europe; and they desire Congress shall understand that if they are obliged to work for reduced wages they will hold responsible those members of Congress who vote for the passage of the bill. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of A. C. Clark and 10 others, citizens and business men of Sumter County, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for holding a term of the United States circuit and district courts at Ocala, Marion County, Fla.; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 425) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 41) relative to the erection of a penitentiary in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1355) granting a pension to Mrs. Nicolas Henrich; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1356) for the relief of Garret L. Joice; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 1357) for the relief of Emile M. Blum, late commissioner-general, and James M. Seymour, jr., late assistant commissioner to the Barcelona Exposition; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1358) to annex the Territory of Utah to the State of Nevada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1359) to amend an act approved July 15, 1882, entitled "An act to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1360) for the relief of the estate of John R. Bigelow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1361) for the relief of Benjamin Peter Bailey, treasurer of the Missouri State Lunatic Asylum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1362) for the relief of Piromis H. Bell, administrator of Marcus A. Bell and others; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HUNTON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1363) for the relief of Francis Scala; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN WAR CLAIMS OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. WHITE of California. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate any and all matters not heretofore reported relative to the Indian war claims of the State of California, referred to and

recited in the resolution of the Senate adopted December 19, 1889, and in so doing he shall report the amount of money the State of California claims to be yet due her by the United States as a full indemnity for all moneys by her expended and for all liability by her assumed under her laws not fully reimbursed by the United States, in any matters growing out of her efforts to suppress Indian depredations in said State, and upon the borders thereof, and to aid the United States in maintaining the "common defense."

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. President, I will state the object of the resolution. Executive Document No. 122 of the Fifty-first Congress contains a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury prepared in pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Senate on the 19th of December, 1889. There are certain matters of a supplemental character now in the possession of the Department which we desire to have presented to the Senate, and which we are informed at the Department can only be presented as the result of the adoption of such a resolution as I have proposed.

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home;

A bill (H. R. 2668) authorizing the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General to approve postmasters' bonds;

A bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

PROPOSED BANKRUPTCY LAW.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, at the second session of the Fifty-first Congress I presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oregon, relative to the Torrey bankruptcy bill as a just and wise measure and demanding its early enactment. The Senate at that time, September 29, 1890, ordered the memorial printed. It is very brief, covering but two pages, and the copies are exhausted. I ask unanimous consent at this time that there be a reprint of the usual number, as it is a very important memorial.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in reference to this matter. Owing to action recently taken elsewhere an impression seems to have gone abroad in the country that all hope of securing favorable legislation on the subject of a general bankruptcy act at this session of Congress is gone. This impression is not by any means justified by the facts. There are to-day pending in both Houses of Congress five bills on the subject of bankruptcy, and there seems to be a general disposition, if I may state it, upon the part of both Houses and the members generally of both Houses, that there should be some kind of legislation on this subject at the present session of Congress, the difference in sentiment and opinion being as to the character of the bill which should be enacted, many insisting that it should be a general bill covering both voluntary and involuntary bankruptcy, while upon the other hand it is claimed by others the bill should be confined simply to the subject of voluntary bankruptcy.

I myself introduced early in the last session what is known as the Torrey bill, and a similar bill or perhaps the same was introduced later on by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. Both bills are now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and I simply desire to state that as one member of the Senate and a member of that committee I shall at the appropriate time, at an early day, do everything in my power to secure consideration of that bill in the committee, and, if possible, favorable action.

I may state further, if permitted, that if there ever has been a time in the history of this country when evidence was presented in a most emphatic form in favor of the establishment of a general system of bankruptcy in this country, it has been during the past summer. I believe there is a general desire throughout the country, not only upon the part of the debtor class but upon the part of the creditor class, for a fair law on this subject, and for this reason I shall do all I can to bring it to consideration at as early a date as possible.

SILVER COINAGE—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege. In a speech which I delivered on the 5th of September last I made a misquotation. I quoted what I am about to read as having been said by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], whereas it was said by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOGY]. In the hurry of the debate I did not observe in the print that the speakers were changed. In looking over the speech of the Senator from Ohio I did not observe that I had reached the end of his remarks and I quoted the passage from Mr. Bogy as coming from him. I wish to correct this error. The passage from Mr. Bogy, which I ascribed to the Senator from Ohio, is as follows:

> Our coinage act came into operation on the 1st of April, 1873, and constituted the gold one-dollar piece the sole unit of value, while it restricted the legal tender of the new silver trade dollar and the half dollar and subdivisions to an amount not exceeding $5 in one payment. Thus the double standard previously existing was finally abolished, and the United States as usual was influenced by Great Britain in making gold coin the only standard. This suits England, but does not suit us. I think with our large silver-producing capacity we should return to the double standard, at least in part, and this will constitute one of the means by which we will be enabled to resume specie payments.

This speech was delivered on the 5th of September last and I make the correction and will prepare it for the Reporter.

In this connection I would say that the honorable Senator from Ohio delivered a speech on the 12th of August, 1876, at Marietta, Ohio, which was reported at length, with subheadings, in the Cincinnati Gazette of August 14, 1876, in which he said:

> I do not now, fellow-citizens, enter fully upon the great question of the restoration of the old silver dollar, as the money of account, for it has not yet assumed a party aspect. I have given the subject the most careful consideration, and was the first to propose the recoining of the old silver dollar.

Again, in the same speech, the Senator is reported to have said:

> I was a member of the conference committee of the two Houses on the silver bill. I am not at liberty to state what occurred, except as is shown by the action of the two Houses. Both Houses were in favor of issuing the old dollar—the dollar in legal existence since 1792, containing 412.8 grains, and only demonetized in 1873, when it was worth 2 per cent more than the gold dollar. It was then, and for twenty years had been, only issued for export, and was not in circulation. Still, it was a legal standard of value, as well as gold, always had been, and it was the right of any debtor to pay in silver dollars as well as gold dollars. It was his legal option.
>
> The relative value of the two metals had often varied before, and still the right remained to the debtor to pay in either dollar, and, therefore, in a cheaper dollar. The mere disuse of the coinage of the silver dollar could not, and ought not to affect preëxisting contracts. And now, when all our domestic contracts have been based upon depreciated paper money, made a legal tender for all debts, public and private, except customs and duties and interest of the public debt, it would seem not only legal, but right, in the broadest sense of the term, that we should avail ourselves of the rapid and remarkable fall of silver bullion to recoin the old silver coins, including the old silver dollar, the oldest of our coins, and with them pay our depreciated notes, and thus restore the old coin standard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty-four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed with an amendment the joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 83) authorizing the State of Montana to make selections from certain public lands;

A bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Henry James, residing in the original Hot Springs reservation, in the State of Arkansas; and

A bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma Territory.

SUFFERERS IN FORD'S THEATER DISASTER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments; which was, after the word "exempted," in line 7, to insert "during the fiscal year 1894, in the discretion of the Secretary of War."

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives, which simply limits the operation of the joint resolution to the fiscal year 1894.

The motion was agreed to.

SCHOONER HENRY R. TILTON.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that

Order of Business 114, being the bill (S. 901) for the relief of the owners of the schooner Henry R. Tilton, and of personal effects thereon, may be taken up for present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there a report in the case?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a report, the Chair is advised.

Mr. PEFFER. I will state, for the information of the Senator from Missouri and other Senators, that this bill was very carefully considered at the last session of the last Congress, that it was reported unanimously, and passed the Senate, went to the House of Representatives, and was reported favorably in that body, but by reason of the excessive amount of business pending it was not taken up. It has been again before the Committee on Claims of the Senate at the present session and unanimously reported, the committee adopting the report which was filed during the last Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think there ought to be an amendment in line 11 of the bill, where it reads:

And he shall, in like manner, ascertain what was the reasonable value of the personal effects of each of the several officers and sailors on the said schooner at the time of her sinking.

While we have a general law which authorizes the payment to army officers for certain losses sustained by them without carelessness or negligence on their part, yet we confine the compensation to the value of such articles as are necessary and proper for such officers at the time in the line of duty. This would pay for gold watches; it would pay for pianos, and for personal effects of any kind which the officers might have on board the vessel. We have never gone that far.

Mr. McPHERSON. Would not that be right?

Mr. COCKRELL. It would not be right, because when on duty sailors are entitled to certain things under the law, and they are not entitled to have other things on board.

Mr. McPHERSON. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose that this vessel had been loaded with sugar or with salt, when she sunk of course the cargo would be lost, and would it not be right and proper and would not the Government be in duty bound to pay for the cargo as well as for the ship? If so, why should the bill not apply to the personal effects of the captain and the crew?

The rule which applies to army and navy officers in such cases, certainly would not apply to a vessel which was lost by reason of the careless firing at the proving ground at Sandy Hook.

Mr. PEFFER. If the Senator from Missouri will refer to lines 24 and 25 of the bill, he will see that a limitation is there made.

Mr. COCKRELL. I had not read the bill at the time I made the suggestion. I think the provision referred to by the Senator from Kansas will cover the ground.

Mr. MILLS. How came the vessel within the line of fire?

Mr. COCKRELL. She was not within the line of fire.

Mr. PEFFER. The vessel was not within the line of fire at all.

Mr. MILLS. I should like to have the facts stated.

Mr. PEFFER. The ordnance officers were exercising their guns, if I may use the expression, firing in a certain direction, as they usually do, and it seems that when the ball struck a sand bank, which within a very recent period had assumed a peculiar formation, there was a glance or a deflection of the shot away out of the line of fire, no one expecting or anticipating anything of the kind. The officers have set forth all the facts very clearly and fully before the committee, with diagrams with written statements, and with verbal explanations, and everything was made perfectly clear. While firing in this direction [indicating], the ship was passing along in that [indicating], and there was a deflection entirely out of the ordinary line of such things. It was purely an accident, which was unexpected and unprovided for.

Mr. PASCO. By reference to page 3 of the report will be seen a letter from Capt. Heath, which will serve as a reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas. Capt. Heath says:

A careful consideration of the circumstances connected with this unfortunate accident indicates that at the time of the firing the vessel was so far from the gun and from the line of fire as to render it reasonably certain that it could not be hit by any deviations from the line of fire that experience had shown were at all likely to occur, and that the accident was due to a combination of unexpected events growing out of the position of the gun when fired and the peculiar and unusual formation of the sand at the point which this shot happened to strike.

I think that fully replies to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MILLS. That covers the point of my inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of War to ascertain what was the reasonable value of the schooner Henry R. Tilton and the proportion thereof belonging to each of her several owners at the time she was sunk by a deflected projectile from a gun on the United States proving grounds at Sandy Hook on or about the 9th day of July, 1892; what was the reasonable value of the personal effects of each of the several officers and sailors, and to report to the Secretary of the Treasury the several amounts so ascertained, such amounts to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, the aggregate amount not to exceed $10,000, less the amount of the net proceeds of the sale of the schooner. The Secretary of the Treasury is also directed to pay to the officers and crew the several sums ascertained to have been the value of their personal effects lost, but the aggregate of the several sums shall not exceed $1,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a House concurrent resolution which is on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, the 21st day of December, present, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 3d day of January, 1894.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the resolution of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was concurred in.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills received from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 83) authorizing the State of Montana to make selections for certain public lands;

A bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Henry James, residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Alabama; and

A bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma Territory.

RECESS.

Mr. GORMAN (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.). I move that the Senate take a recess until half past 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and at the expiration of the recess (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled.

TRANSACTIONS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the resolution heretofore submitted by me, which is Order of Business 33 on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator from Kansas will not insist upon the immediate consideration of that resolution.

Mr. PEFFER. I will state to the Senator from Missouri that there is a motion pending to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance. I simply wish to make that disposition of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Ah, that is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, submitted by Mr. PEFFER September 8, 1893, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether at any time or times, and when and how long, within three months last past, the national banks, or any of them, in the cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, failed to keep and maintain their bank reserves as required by law.

Second. In case it appears that said banks, or any of them, did so fail, during the time above-mentioned, to keep and maintain their lawful reserves, what was the amount of reserves on hand in the banks severally, and what was the amount required by law in each case to be kept on the days following—namely: July 31, August 10, August 20, August 31, and September 8.

Third. Whether at any time or times, and when and how long, within said period of three months, the said banks, or any of them, failed or refused to pay checks or drafts of their depositors on demand in currency.

Fourth. In case it appears that such checks and drafts of depositors were not promptly paid in currency, what disposition was made of them.

Fifth. In case it appears that said checks and drafts were passed through bank clearing houses and paid in clearing-house certificates, whether said banks, or any of them, had asked or received authority from the Treasury Department for making such payments of checks and drafts in clearing-house certificates, or by what authority of law it was done or permitted.

Sixth. Whether the Treasury Department or any and what officer thereof is officially connected with the New York bank clearing house, and if such connection does exist, what is the object and purpose thereof, and by what authority of law or regulation of the Department was such connection made and is maintained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance. If there be no objection such will be the order. The Chair hears no objection.

INTERRUPTION OF INTERSTATE RAILWAY TRAFFIC.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution introduced by me, which is Order of Business 37½ on the Calendar, in order that it may be disposed of in a similar manner. It is a resolution proposing an inquiry into interruption of interstate railway traffic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, submitted by Mr. PEFFER September 16, 1893, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be instructed to inquire whether and what legislation is necessary to prevent interruption of interstate railway traffic by lawless and unauthorized persons, and to punish persons guilty of robbery and murder committed on interstate railway trains.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], to strike out "Interstate Commerce" and insert "the Judiciary," so as to read:

That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed, etc.

Mr. GORMAN. I rather think that this is a matter which ought to go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PEFFER. That is what I thought in the first place, and I do not know but that this is a very good time to insist upon the original language. The question being on the motion to amend I withdraw my acceptance of it.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the amendment will not be agreed to. The Interstate Commerce Committee is the proper committee to consider this matter, and really it has in a general way the subject under investigation now. I trust the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose for the purpose of saying exactly what the Senator from Maryland has said. I think the Interstate Commerce Committee is the only appropriate committee to consider the question.

Mr. PEFFER. That is the view I entertained upon the matter in the first place. I agree with the Senators from Maryland and Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to strike out "Interstate Commerce" and insert "the Judiciary."

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

LANDING OF FOREIGN CABLES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair) laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of State, which was read:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of the 20th instant, in the following words:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State inform the Senate whether permission has been granted to any foreign cable telegraph company to land its line on the coast of the United States since the 1st day of March, 1893, and whether permission had been refused such company prior to that date. Also, what reasons now exist for granting such permission, if it was granted, that did not pertain when it was previously refused"—

I have the honor to state that no permission has been granted by this Department since March 1, 1893, to any foreign cable company to land its line on the coast of the United States; that several times prior to that date such permission was refused unless accepted on prescribed conditions; that the Secretary of State knows of no reason for granting such permission since March 1, 1893, that did not exist prior to that date; and that since March 1, 1893, he has not granted such permission either conditionally or unconditionally, knowing of no law of Congress authorizing him or any other executive officer to do so.

Copies of an application and argument for such permission, with the Department's reply thereto, are herewith transmitted.

Respectfully submitted.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 21, 1893.

Mr. FRYE. I should like to have the communication lie on the table. I desire to call the attention of Congress to some matters connected with it and do not wish to do so until after the holiday recess.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be printed, with the accompanying documents.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the communication, with the accompanying documents, lie on the table and be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SIOUX INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. KYLE submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Whereas by Article XII of the treaty between the United States of America and different tribes of Sioux Indians, concluded April 29 *et seq.*, 1868, and proclaimed February 24, 1869, it was provided that "no treaty for the cession of any portion or part of the reservation herein described which may be held in common shall be of any validity or force as against the said Indians, unless executed and signed by at least three-fourths of all the adult male Indians occupying or interested in same;" and

Whereas the report made by the commission formed and acting under the two separate acts of Congress, both dated March 2, 1889, entitled "An act to divide a portion of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," and the other, the appropriation bill approved March 2, 1889, shows upon its face that it was signed by a number of adult Indians of the whole blood less in number than the three-fourths as provided in the said treaty proclaimed February 24, 1869, and that in order to obtain the necessary three-fourths aforesaid divers mixed bloods were solicited to, and were permitted to, and did sign such treaty made by the commission on the part of the United States, acting under said acts of Congress dated, as aforesaid, March 2, 1889; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States has decided, as it is claimed, that divers of the mixed bloods who signed as aforesaid such treaty made with said commission are not Indians in contemplation of law, and that they and their families are not entitled to any rights or privileges whatever in the land embraced in the cession to said commission, nor to any privileges whatsoever as Indians, and is about to cause them to be rejected from the so-called Indian reservations: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate forthwith copies of all orders, opinions, and directions that he has given in respect to the said mixed bloods or either of them, or to their families or any member thereof, together with copies of all reports, letters, documents, and written papers pertaining thereto.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to have the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. It had better be printed and lie over, I think. I object to its present consideration. It contains a number of the recitals of fact, which I presume are true, but I prefer that as it pertains to a very important subject-matter it should go over and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska objects to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KYLE. If the Senator from Nebraska objects, of course it must go over.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that he strike out the word "forthwith." I think it is hardly respectful to the head of the Department to direct him to communicate forthwith.

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes, let that word be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution, under the objection of the Senator from Nebraska, has gone over under the rule.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest that modification.

Mr. MANDERSON. I withdraw the objection that the resolution may be modified. I think it should be done.

Mr. KYLE. I will modify the resolution by striking out the word "forthwith."

Mr. MANDERSON. I understand the Senator from South Dakota has so modified it.

Mr. BERRY. The chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs is not here, and I desire to have the resolution go over until he is present.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have objected to its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes over, under the rule, on objection.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, until Wednesday, January 3, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 21, 1893.

POSTMASTERS.

J. T. Hight, to be postmaster at Fayetteville, in the county of Washington and State of Arkansas, in the place of Thomas J. Hunt, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

William F. Housley, to be postmaster at Hot Springs, in the county of Garland and State of Arkansas, in the place of Flora H. Hawes, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Mamie B. Watkins, to be postmaster at Eureka Springs, in

the county of Carroll and State of Arkansas, in the place of John W. True, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

John W. F. King, to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida, in the place of James Bell, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Yoel G. Rust, to be postmaster at Albany, in the county of Dougherty and State of Georgia, in the place of Benjamin F. Brimberry, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

William H. Harry, to be postmaster at Watseka, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, in the place of Abraham Andrew, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

John Johnson, jr., to be postmaster at Bedford, in the county of Lawrence and State of Indiana, in the place of William Erwin, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Abram J. Howe, to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of Mills and State of Iowa, in the place of Charles A. King, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Albert F. Nash, to be postmaster at Sioux City, in the county of Woodbury and State of Iowa, in the place of Edwin R. Kirk, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

John S. Sidey, to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Adair and State of Iowa, in the place of C. B. Hunt, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Jonas Rosenthal, to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Rapides and State of Louisiana, in the place of Edward J. Barrett, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Henry J. Connell, to be postmaster at Belding, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan, in the place of Albert L. Spencer, resigned.

Eugene E Douvelle, to be postmaster at Manistee, in the county of Manistee and State of Michigan, in the place of C. B. Lewis, resigned.

Arthur F. Watson, to be postmaster at Cheboygan, in the county of Cheboygan and State of Michigan, in the place of George P. Stumphrey, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

M. A. Vardaman, to be postmaster at Greenwood, in the county of Le Flore and State of Mississippi, in the place of Mrs. M. N. Parish, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Jenifer Moulton, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Eri Oakes, whose commission expired December 16, 1893.

James Fisher, to be postmaster at Hackettstown, in the county of Warren and State of New Jersey, in the place of L. B. Gibbs, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Robert W. Belo, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Forsyth and State of North Carolina, in the place of Henry L. Shore, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

George L. Morton, to be postmaster at Wilmington, in the county of New Hanover and State of North Carolina, in the place of George Z. French, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Edgar H. Wilson, to be postmaster at Winston, in the county of Forsyth and State of North Carolina, in the place of William H. Wheeler, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Oliver A. Clauss, to be postmaster at Lehighton, in the county of Carbon and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of A. W. Raudenbush, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Jonas F. Moyer, to be postmaster at Catasauqua, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Edmund Randall, whose commission expires December 21, 1893.

Frank P. Sharkey, to be postmaster at Mauch Chunk, in the county of Carbon and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Julius A. Remmel, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John Wolf, to be postmaster at Bangor, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of William A. Winsboro, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Philip P. Gaillard, to be postmaster at Sumter, in the county of Sumter and State of South Carolina, in the place of George W. Reardon, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

George A. Gibbs, to be postmaster at Union City, in the county of Obion and State of Tennessee, in the place of C. B. Rowland, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

William W. Wood, to be postmaster at Rockport, in the county of Aransas and State of Texas, in the place of Lee N. McCaughan, resigned.

E. H. Taylor, to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Haywood and State of Tennessee, in the place of John Clinton, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21, 1893.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

John P. Irish, of California, to be naval officer of customs in the district of San Francisco, in the State of California.

CONSUL.

H. Clay Armstrong, jr., of Alabama, to be consul of the United States at Grenoble, France.

COMMISSIONER OF ALASKA.

Henry W. Mellen, of Bonville, Ind., to be a commissioner in and for the district of Alaska.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John Russell, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Richard D. Welch, of Mitchell, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Mitchell, S. Dak.

William T. Skelton, of Akron, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Akron, Colo.

Austin D. Hill, of Miller, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Huron, S. Dak.

John B. Hanten, of Watertown, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Watertown, S. Dak.

Rush Culver, of L'Anse, Mich., to be receiver of public moneys at Marquette, Mich.

C. Boyd Barrett, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Aberdeen, S. Dak.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Mark W. Sheafe, of Watertown, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Watertown, S. Dak.

Joseph Patterson, of Grayling, Mich., to be register of the land office at Grayling, Mich.

John M. Davis, of Huron, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Huron, S. Dak.

Abraham Boynton, of Elk Point, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Mitchell, S. Dak.

POSTMASTERS.

Edward J. Doneen, to be postmaster at Oakesdale, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington.

William H. Brunk, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon.

Dorin G. McConnell, to be postmaster at Holden, in the county of Johnson and State of Missouri.

George G. McNamara, to be postmaster at Port Townsend, in the county of Jefferson and State of Washington.

Thomas F. Meagher, to be postmaster at Sprague, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington.

John Horwege, to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington.

Bernard Wilkinson, to be postmaster at North Yakima, in the county of Yakima and State of Washington.

J. A. Jamison, jr., to be postmaster at Ukiah, in the county of Mendocina and State of California.

George H. Watrous, to be postmaster at Fairhaven, in the county of Whatcom and State of Washington.

Joseph T. McGehee, to be postmaster at Huntsville, in the county of Madison and State of Alabama.

James J. Brown, to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the county of Perry and State of Alabama.

E. B. Brundage, to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, in the county of Wood and State of Wisconsin.

William J. Miller, to be postmaster at San Rafael, in the county of Marin and State of California.

Austin Hawkins, to be postmaster at Yreka, in the county of Siskiyou and State of California.

August F. Domine, to be postmaster at Cloverdale, in the county of Sonoma and State of California.

William F. Lee, to be postmaster at Pensacola, in the county of Escambia and State of Florida.

Marshall P. Ryder, to be postmaster at Plainville, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Francis E. Fitzpatrick, to be postmaster at Stafford Springs, in the county of Tolland and State of Connecticut.

Pinkney L. McNabb, to be postmaster at McLeansboro, in the county of Hamilton and State of Illinois.

J. B. M. Winburnto, to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Hall and State of Georgia.

Martin Collins, to be postmaster at Cartersville, in the county of Bartow and State of Georgia.

W. O. Braden, to be postmaster at Grayling, in the county of Crawford and State of Michigan.

William P. Walker, to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Anderson and State of Kentucky.

John B. Powell, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Boyd and State of Kentucky.

William V. Berry, to be postmaster at Fulton, in the county of Callaway and State of Missouri.

H. A. Scott, to be postmaster at Ludington, in the county of Mason and State of Michigan.

Herbert A. Burch, to be postmaster at Dowagiac, in the county of Cass and State of Michigan.

George A. Herzog, to be postmaster at Harvard, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska.

Sherman M. Smith, to be postmaster at Chillicothe, in the county of Livingston and State of Missouri.

John D. Tolson, to be postmaster at Fayette, in the county of Howard and State of Missouri.

Nathaniel J. Mills, to be postmaster at Corsicana, in the county of Navarro and State of Texas.

Joseph B. Kershaw, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Kershaw and State of South Carolina.

A. G. Foogman, to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Traill and State of North Dakota.

William J. Cutteridge, to be postmaster at Lake Geneva, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

Alfred Ferguson, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Frederick and State of Virginia.

Joseph M. Burke, to be postmaster at Middlebury, in the county of Addison and State of Vermont.

Charles Sorenson, to be postmaster at Rock Springs, in the county of Sweetwater and State of Wyoming.

William H. Rohr, to be postmaster at Watertown, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin.

John A. Jacobs, to be postmaster at Washburn, in the county of Bayfield and State of Wisconsin.

John H. Schulte, to be postmaster at Havana, in the county of Mason and State of Illinois.

B. C. Allensworth, to be postmaster at Pekin, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois.

J. T. Hight, to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Ark.

William F. Housley, to be postmaster at Hot Springs, Ark.

Mamie B. Watkins, to be postmaster at Eureka Springs, Ark.

M. A. Vandaman, to be postmaster at Greenwood, Miss.

Robert W. Below, to be postmaster at Salem, N. C.

George L. Morton, to be postmaster at Wilmington, N. C.

Edgar H. Wilson, to be postmaster at Winston, N. C.

Philip P. Gaillard, to be postmaster at Sumter, S. C.

George A. Gibbs, to be postmaster at Union City, Tenn.

William W. Wood, to be postmaster at Rockport, Tex.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 21, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. E. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

W. W. NEELY, DECEASED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting copy of the findings of the court in the case of W. W. Neely, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WELLS, for this day.

ELIZABETH VOSS.

Mr. HAYES. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 855) to amend chapter 243 of the Laws of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 243 of the Laws of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress, entitled "An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Voss," be, and is hereby, amended by striking out the word "Imann" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Mann;" and that said act shall have the same force and effect as if said word had been therein originally.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommend the adoption of the following amendment:

That the act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Voss," be, and hereby is, amended as follows: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth Voss, formerly the widow of Jacob Mann, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Infantry, to take effect from date of said former act."

Mr. HAYES. I would like to make a word of explanation, which I think will be all that is necessary, in relation to this matter.

Mr. KILGORE. I suppose unanimous consent has not yet been given.

The SPEAKER. It has not; but without objection the gentleman can explain the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HAYES. This was a pension bill, an entirely meritorious case, which was reported in the last Congress and passed without objection or question. By reason of my own miserable writing the name of the soldier was spelled "Imann" in place of "Mann;" consequently the Pension Office has not been able to locate him, and of course the pension can not be granted. It was an error simply in printing the bill, and it was not discovered at the time.

Mr. KILGORE. The Pension Office can not find the man for whose relief the bill was passed, and now they want to find somebody on whom they can confer this pension?

Mr. HAYES. Not at all. This is an entirely meritorious case, and they simply want to have the proper name of the person who is entitled to receive the pension.

Mr. KILGORE. There was nobody lost in the shuffle, I suppose. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYES. Not at all.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAYES, a motion to reconsider the vote last taken was laid on the table.

USE OF NAVAL FORCES—HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk and ask the immediate consideration of a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears by certain papers transmitted by the President in response to a resolution of the House that the Secretary of the Navy, on the 11th day of March, 1893, issued instructions to the admiral commanding the naval forces of the United States at the Hawaiian Islands to hold and employ such armed naval forces subject to the orders of one James H. Blount, said instructions containing the following words:

"You will consult freely with Mr. Blount and will obey any instructions you may receive from him regarding the course to be pursued at said islands by the force under your command;"

And whereas it appears by the same papers that said Blount did assume to exercise military command over such armed naval forces of the United States on the 31st day of March, 1893, by issuing the following orders to "haul down the United States ensign" and "to embark the troops" of the United States, to wit:

"HONOLULU, *March 31, 1893.*

"SIR: You are directed to haul down the United States ensign from the Government building and to embark the troops now on shore to the ships to which they belong.

"This will be executed at 11 o'clock on the 1st day of April.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"JAMES H. BLOUNT,
"*Special Commissioner of the United States.*

"Rear-Admiral J. S. SKERRETT,
"*Commanding Pacific Squadron.*"

And whereas it appears by the papers referred to that the said admiral commanding the United States naval forces on the Pacific Station, acting under said instructions, did obey the military orders of said Blount by lowering the United States ensign and moving the armed forces of the United States "in obedience" to his (said Blount's) "directions," as is shown by the following official communication:

"U. S. S. MOHICAN, FLAGSHIP OF THE PACIFIC STATION,
"*Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, April 1, 1893.*

"SIR: I have the honor to inform Special Commissioner Blount that in obedience to his directions the United States ensign over the Government building was lowered at 11 a. m. of this date and the force withdrawn from the building and the place designated as Camp Boston at the same hour. I learn that quite a number of people congregated about the Government building at the time. The force of marines stationed there were relieved by a force of the Provisional Government. There was no demonstration made by the populace present; no cheering, nor any other signs of either joy or grief.

"I went on shore this afternoon and saw quite an access in numbers of those who were wearing the annexation club badge. There has been no evidence shown of unruly or riotous characters. Absolutely there appears to be peace and quiet.

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"J. S. SKERRETT,
"*Rear-Admiral, United States Navy,*
"*Commanding United States Naval Forces, Pacific Station.*"

And whereas it does not appear that said Blount, at the time of the issuance of said instructions by the Secretary of the Navy, or at the time of said Blount's issuance of said military orders to the commander of the armed naval forces of the United States to "haul down the United States ensign" and to "embark the troops" of the United States, or at the time of the execution of such orders, held any military rank or authority as an officer of the Navy of the United States, or that he held any constitutional authority by appointment or commission "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," by virtue of which he could lawfully assume command of the armed forces of the United States or order its "ensign hauled down" from the place where it had been raised "for the protection of the United States legation and the United States consulate and to secure the safety of American life and property:" Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the House of Representatives by what authority instructions were issued placing the armed naval forces of the United States and the use of its ensign under the orders and control of said Blount, and that the Secretary of the Navy is further directed to furnish the House of Representatives with copies of all orders, directions, instructions, or official suggestions issued by him or any officer of the Navy Department or of the Navy since the 4th day of March, 1893, concerning the use or movements of the armed naval forces of the United States at the Hawaiian Islands.

The SPEAKER. This is not a privileged resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It calls for information from the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. It must be referred.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I move its reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to refer it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have not objected to its reference.

The SPEAKER. But it can not be read, except by unanimous consent. The method of introducing such resolutions is to hand them in at the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The rules make this a privileged resolution, and the committee must report it back.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The rule is very plain. Such resolutions must be introduced through the Speaker.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I asked unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman stated that it was a privileged resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And I asked for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that it is not a privileged resolution.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I move its reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask for its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky and Mr. RAYNER objected.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is exactly why I asked unanimous consent, so that the gentleman could object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman presented it as a privileged resolution. It will be referred to the Committee on Naval Afairs.

REIMPORTATION OF AMERICAN CATTLE FROM MEXICO.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Ways and Means to favorably report the joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle transporting them into Mexico to reimport the same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes; and I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas a drought has existed in Southwest and Northwest Texas for a period of several years so severe as to practically destroy the grass upon the ranges therein, and causing so great a scarcity of grass and water that the stock in said vast region of Texas are and have been for months suffering and dying in large numbers; and

Whereas both sufficient water and grass exist on the south side of the Rio Grande, in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas said Republic has expressed a willingness to enter into reciprocal relations with this Government with a view to relieving the stock interests of Texas for a fixed period of time by permitting the importation of stock into Mexico for grazing purposes only; therefore, in view of the premises, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered to permit the owners of cattle in Texas who shall hereafter transport their cattle and horses into the Republic of Mexico to reimport or retransport the same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed for the protection of the revenue of the Government of the United States; and he is also authorized to make such rules and regulations with the Government of Mexico as will protect the revenue of the Government of the United States should a similar privilege for a similar period of time be asked by said Republic of Mexico for any of its citizens under like conditions as exist in the section of Texas before mentioned: Therefore

Resolved, etc., That any owner or owners of cattle in the United States be, and they are hereby, authorized to remove their herds across the Rio Grande into Mexico, for the purpose of grazing, and reintroduce them into the United States without charge for import duties, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

SEC. 2. That the same privilege above given to citizens of the United States is hereby granted to citizens of Mexico who may desire to introduce their cattle into the United States for like purpose.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall expire within twelve months from the date of its passage.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the letter.

The letter was read, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1893.

SIR: Referring to your letter of the 18th instant, with copy of H. Res. 93, "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle transporting them into Mexico to reimport same," etc., I have to state that I have examined the bill and that proper regulations can be issued by this Department to enforce the same if it shall be enacted into law.

I have to call your attention to the fact that although horses are mentioned in the first line of page 2, they do not appear to be provided for in the proposed law.

Respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

Hon. T. M. PASCHAL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. McMILLIN. This resolution, as it shows on its face, provides for the transportation temporarily, and reimportation, of cattle across the Rio Grande into Mexico from that portion of Texas where the cattle are famishing in consequence of a severe drought. The Secretary of the Treasury has reported that it is possible for him to adopt regulations by which any fraud or irregularity against the revenues can be prevented. The Committee on Ways and Means were unanimously of the opinion that it was not only humane, but wise and just to adopt the resolution. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PASCHAL] such time as he desires.

Mr. BURROWS. Before the gentleman from Tennessee takes his seat I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. McMILLIN. With pleasure.

Mr. BURROWS. I understood from the reading of the resolution that this right was to extend until the 1st day of May next; but in the closing portion of the resolution it is declared that it shall be in force for one year. I did not know but that was an oversight.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think that comes in this way, that for one year the Government of Mexico would like to have similar privileges under similar circumstances, if such calamities as occasionally overtake stock-raisers on the border should afflict them. The Secretary of the Treasury was of the opinion that that was not improper.

Mr. BURROWS. While the right on our part would expire on the 1st day of May, the right on the part of Mexico would continue for one year.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will state to my friend that the necessity for it, so far as we are concerned, will have been exhausted by the 1st of May, for the new crop of grass comes then.

Mr. BURROWS. But the necessity would not cease, so far as the Mexican Government is concerned?

Mr. McMILLIN. I would state to my friend from Michigan that the trouble can not possibly overtake the Mexicans this year, but it might possibly next year. So we give them the privilege next year that we ask of them, temporarily, for this year.

Mr. REED. As I understand it, in order to obtain this privilege from Mexico it is necessary for us to put ourselves under reciprocal obligations, and that must apply to some future time so far as Mexico is concerned, because the necessity does not now exist in Mexico?

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes, because it appears that in an extensive territory south of the Rio Grande there is ample pasture this winter, and that will continue during this season; but it is possible that it might not be the situation next year, but that the circumstances might be reversed. It was thought best to make this neighborly arrangement with them. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PASCHAL] whose district is interested in this measure.

Mr. PASCHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add other than has already been presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN]. I only wish to say to the House that in order to appreciate the extent and the character of this drought, it will be remembered that an area of country represented by something like one hundred and odd counties has been afflicted for the past three years with a drought which even in that section of country has been unprecedented; that the winter rains have come too late to do any good so far as the pasturage is concerned; and our cattle, the chief industry of that section of Texas, are dying at the rate of thousands every week. I doubt very much whether the relief now proposed to be offered will be in time sufficient to obviate an immense loss to the people of Texas; nevertheless, it will be some relief, and save tens of thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of cattle from starvation during the present winter.

I will say, further, that the Mexican minister, upon whom I called in relation to this matter, has been pleased to extend every courtesy toward us in facilitating the carrying out of this act. He has been duly apprised of the condition of affairs in that section of Texas, and has declared that the Mexican Government will do everything in its power to enable our people to get relief under the act. I believe that no gentleman will object to the consideration of the measure at this time, because if it is deferred it will amount to the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to our people.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be no objection on this side of the House.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, there are amendments offered to the resolution so as to include horses. The insertion of the words "and horses" is recommended in the report, in the preamble, the resolution, and the title.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended in accordance with the recommendation of the committee.

On motion of Mr. McMILLIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed, was laid on the table.

HAWAII.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution looking to the investigation of questions of fact connected with the late Hawaiian revolution. I ask that it be read for information and for immediate action by the House.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to present a resolution and ask for its consideration, and the gentleman from Maryland objects.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I demand that it be referred to the proper committee, under the rules.

Mr. BLAIR. I hope the gentleman will not object to the resolution being read for information. It calls simply for an investigation of facts.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Let it be introduced and go to the proper committee.

Mr. BLAIR. It is simply to ascertain the truth, and if the House is not disposed to consider it, that is for the House. I do not desire to make any remarks upon it.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Let it go to the proper committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland objects.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, without reading, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. REED. The gentlemen are rather shy on the Hawaiian question all the way through.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. We shall not be shy when the proper time comes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not hear what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] says, but I always object to the printing of resolutions in the RECORD.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that it be read for information. It is a resolution for the investigation of a question of fact that is important.

Several members objected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1589) for the relief of Louis Pelham.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I desire that the resolution may be returned to me.

The SPEAKER. It will be referred through the desk.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Speaker permit me to ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The resolution must be referred through the desk.

Mr. BLAIR. I shall not object, because of the discourtesy that has been shown, but I ask for the reference of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution under the rules must be referred through the desk, and the Speaker will look at it and see to which committee it should be referred.

Mr. BLAIR. Does any gentleman object to its being referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to its introduction, except under the rules.

Mr. BLAIR. Well, then, if it may be returned to me I will introduce it under the rules. At the suggestion of a gentleman on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member (and it is a matter I have mentioned to others), I ask again for the reading of the resolution for information, and then I will ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any objection to its being read.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT] objects.

Mr. RAYNER. But the gentleman from New Hampshire renews his request.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I withdraw objection to the reading of the resolution; but I object to its present consideration.

Mr. RAYNER. It is not to be up for present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I object.

LOUIS PELHAM.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1589) for the relief of Louis Pelham.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, has this bill been reported from any committee?

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. It has; and I ask to have the report read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill, and also asks consent that the report be read. Is there objection?

Mr. LOUD. What committee reported this bill, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BLAIR. I object.

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. I ask the gentleman to withdraw his objection so that I may make a statement explaining the bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I hope the gentleman from Texas will withdraw his objection. It is unseemly and obstructs public business. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to hear the statement, but I do not know that it will change my mind.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. I am willing that the gentleman shall object, if he desires to, after I make my statement.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I have objected, but I withdraw the objection. I do this with the distinct understanding that I, too, shall have an opportunity to speak. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. So far as I am concerned the gentleman is at perfect liberty to speak.

Mr. McMILLIN. No contract can be made with the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to refund money wrongfully paid out by Louis Pelham, and illegally collected from him, under certain confiscation proceedings against the property of Henry Pelham in the district court of the United States, in the State of Indiana, the sum of $3,000 having been illegally taken and collected from him by the marshal of the United States for said district court of Indiana upon the sale of a certain promissory note for $7,000, executed on the 1st day of March, 1862, due four years after date, executed by Louis Pelham to the said Henry Pelham, and sold upon a *venditioni exponas* under a libel of information in said district court to the said Louis Pelham, when in fact the marshal of said district had not under the mandate of the writ of monition attached the said note, nor had he seized the same, nor had it ever been in his custody from the commencement to the end of the proceedings thereon.

The said note had not been at any time within the jurisdiction of said district court, and the said note was not at the time of the sale of the same, nor at the time of paying the said sum of money to the said marshal as the purchaser thereof by the said Louis Pelham, nor at any time thereafter by the marshal of said district court delivered to him, nor did he acquire any title whatsoever to said note under said proceedings, and the said promissory note was never in the territorial limits of the said State of Indiana, but, on the contrary, was during all that time in the possession of Henry Pelham, in the State of Kentucky, where the said Henry Pelham resided.

The United States, in 1863, filed a libel of information in the district court for the district of Indiana "against the following described credits and effects of Henry Pelham, that is to say, one promissory note, dated March 1, 1862, for the sum of $7,000, and due four years after date, executed by Louis Pelham to Henry Pelham." Louis Pelham was still in Indiana and within the jurisdiction of the marshal; but Henry Pelham was in Kentucky, outside of the marshal's jurisdiction, and had the note with him there. The libel, after reciting the act of July 17, 1862, and making other proper recitals, alleged that, "by force of the said statute and the public warning of the President of the United States, the said estate, credits, and effects of him, the said Henry Pelham, so described as aforesaid, became and were forfeited to the United States; and that the same were liable to be condemned as enemy's property."

The writ of monition stated a libel had been filed by the district attorney against "one promissory note," and commanded the marshal "to attach the note and to detain the same in your custody until the further order of the court concerning the same," and "to give due notice to all persons claiming the same," etc.

The marshal made return, on the back of the writ, as follows:

MAY 2, 1863.

In obedience to the within warrant I have arrested the property within mentioned and have cited all persons having or pretending to have any right, title, or interest therein, as by the said warrant I am commanded to do.

D. G. ROSE, *Marshal.*

A summons was at the same time issued against Louis Pelham, the maker of the note, which was served on him by the marshal, and he appeared and answered, admitting the facts alleged in the libel.

The fact of a publication of notice to all other parties in interest was proven, and a decree of condemnation was made, and a writ of *venditioni exponas* issued to the marshal, who returned that he had offered for sale the promissory note and sold it to Louis Pelham for $3,000.

When the war was over Henry Pelham sued the sureties of the marshal (he being dead in the district court for the district of Kentucky, for damages alleged to have accrued by the marshal's false return in the case. The declaration alleged a false return "to a writ of monition in a libel by the United States against the described credits and effects of Henry Pelham: * * * that is to say, one promissory note for $7,000, executed by Louis Pelham to the said Henry."

It was an admitted fact in the case that the note was, from the issuing of the monition in the proceedings for confiscation till and at the time of the return to the monition by the marshal that he had arrested the same, outside the jurisdiction of the said district court and not within the territorial limits of the State of Indiana; but, on the contrary, was, during all that time, in the possession of the said plaintiff in the State of Kentucky, where he resided.

The plaintiff requested the court to instruct the jury as follows:

If the jury find, from the evidence, that the allegations of the declaration are true, they will find for the plaintiff and assess his damages in the amount of the note, with the interest thereon from maturity.

The court refused to give this instruction and charged that, under the conceded facts in the case, the plaintiff was entitled to no more than nominal damages.

A verdict was rendered accordingly, and the refusal to charge as requested and the charge as given were then assigned to the Supreme Court of the United States for error. The Supreme Court held that to effect its seizure it was necessay for the marshal to take the note into his actual control and custody, and consequently the debt was not confiscated. (15 Wallace, page 196; 9 Wallace, page 103.)

Every principle of equity and justice, then, requires that the Government should refund the money received without consideration and for property which it did not control and had no right to sell; for "a vendor," says the Supreme Court of the United States, "is bound to know that he actually has that which he professes to sell." (Allen *vs.* Hammond 11. Pet., 72.)

"A court of equity," said Chief Justice Marshall, in Garnett *vs.* Macon, 2 Brock., 185, "considers a vendor responsible for the title he sells, and is bound to inform himself of its defects," and to make the same known to the purchaser, as the latter has a right, if no liens or incumbrances are made known to him by the vendor, to suppose himself as purchasing an estate free from incumbrance.

Where a vendor intends to sell and the vendee to purchase a subsisting title, but which in fact does not exist, a payment of the purchase money, says the Supreme Court of the United States, "would be a payment without the shadow of consideration, and no court of equity is believed ever to have sanctioned such a principle."

Claimant is, therefore, on the score of precedent as well as authority, justly and honestly entitled to a return of his money.

The proof accompanying the bill shows that Louis Pelham was an extremely loyal person.

Mr. RAYNER (interposing). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order; what is this statement about?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is making a statement in connection with a bill which he desires to have considered.

Mr. RAYNER. Has he had unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. RAYNER. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The Clerk proceeded with the call. When the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called,

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report, with the recommendation that it pass, a resolution in lieu of a resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and of a resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT].

The Clerk read the title of the report, as follows:

House resolution relative to intervention by United States Government, its representatives, and armed forces in the affairs of the Hawaiian Government.

The SPEAKER. This resolution will be printed and referred to the House Calendar, and the original resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is there a report, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. There is a report.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to have it read.

The SPEAKER. It would not be in order to read the report at this time. This is merely the reporting of a resolution.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded the floor.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Maine inquired whether there was a report, and, under the rules, there must be a report.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs——

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I desire simply to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. A statement is not in order at this time. This is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I supposed the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] was always in order.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to make a personal statement.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I trust that consent will be given, and I ask the same courtesy for myself, the privilege of making known the contents of the resolution that I presented awhile ago.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McMILLIN. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I desire to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. No statement is in order pending the call of committees for reports. The Clerk will resume the call.

The Clerk resumed the call.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. No question of order can be raised pending the call of committes.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have made a report, and I desire to ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. There can be no consent given during this call.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Then what is the proper time to ask consent that the minority may have leave to submit their views?

The SPEAKER. This is the call of committees for reports, and it can not be interrupted.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. But the minority desire to submit their views.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the views of the minority may be filed and printed.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BLAIR. I object to everything——[Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will resume the call.

The Clerk resumed the call of committees, which was continued until the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was reached.

Mr. REED. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I tried to get the Chair's attention to a great mistake that has been made here. My privileges have been invaded. This is a privileged resolution; and the Speaker has sent it to the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. No debate is in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Surely the Speaker will not send this privileged resolution to the Calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request the gentleman from Maine to take his seat. The gentleman will resume his seat.

Mr. REED. The point I desire——

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen will resume their seats. [A pause.] The rules require that the Chair shall call the committees for reports; and during that call no debate is in order of any kind or character.

Mr. REED. I do not propose to debate——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. REED. I simply desire to know as a parliamentary question whether the reference of this report to the Calendar causes it to lose its privilege; and if it does, I desire to make the point of order that it can not be referred to the Calendar in such a way that it will lose its privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is exactly the point to which I tried to call the attention of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. That question may arise at a later period. The gentleman from Maine, of course, is well acquainted with the rule or the practice that the reporting of a resolution during the call of committees for reports and its reference to the Calendar, ordinarily takes away its privilege. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. REED. I do not so understand it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Where is the privilege, Mr. Speaker? The Speaker ruled that this was a privileged question.

The SPEAKER. The rule is very plain. Even a privileged matter may lose its privilege by being reported during the call of committees for reports; and that merely emphasizes the propriety of the rule, that during the call of committees for reports no debate is in order and no suggestion is in order as to debate.

Mr. REED. I do not desire to make any suggestion or indulge in any debate. I simply desire to have this thing proceed, as I consider it, in order. I can not believe it to be possible that a privileged question, which concerns the House, can be deprived of its privilege by a committee choosing to report it during the hour for reports of committees; and either this reference of the resolution to the Calendar must leave it there with its privilege and its right to be called up, or else it can not be sent there. A question of privilege in its very nature is one which the House stops all other proceedings to consider. That is what makes it a question of privilege. All other business is stopped, because the question of privilege concerns the very existence of the House—its privileges and its right to proceed with business. That is what makes a question of privilege.

Now, the House can not be deprived of its privilege to examine this thing at once by any action on the part of any one of its committees. The House may refer it to the Calendar after it has been reported; but the matter can not be referred arbitrarily—I did not mean to use the word "arbitrarily" in any offensive sense, but it can not be referred to the Calendar except by the action of the House, because it is a question of privilege. That is my view of the matter.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair will recall that he ruled specifically that this was a question of privilege; and by the action of the Chair (if the Speaker will permit me) this was taken out of the possession of the House and referred to a committee.

Now, the Speaker will kindly permit me to offer this suggestion: If the present action is correct, he will readily see that it will be absolutely impossible for any privilege of the House to be exercised if the Speaker in his own person should see fit to prevent it; for even if a resolution of impeachment were brought before the House, the Speaker could refer that question of privilege to a committee; and if the committee, by exercising some technical right of reporting at a certain hour of the day, can send the resolution to the Calendar, where it can never be reached, the privilege is absolutely gone, and the power of the Speaker is absolutely interposed between the Constitution of the United States and the rights of this body in the exercise of its highest prerogative, that of impeaching the President. It can not be possible, it seems to me, that the Chair is correct in the position he has taken.

The SPEAKER (referring to the Digest). The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to the rule in one moment.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have no desire, of course, to embarrass the Chair.

The SPEAKER. There is no embarrassment about it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And I hope the Chair will take ample time to examine the matter, so that there may be no mistake.

The SPEAKER. This matter has been decided so often that there is no question about it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I only want to reserve my rights.

The SPEAKER. At the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, as will be seen by reference to the RECORD, page 7641, it was held that—

A privileged proposition, if reported during the morning hour for reports, loses its privilege and takes its place on the Calendar.

That has been the uniform ruling in the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I objected to that procedure for the very reason that it should not jeopardize the privileged character of this resolution because it was reported at such a time.

Mr. REED. That is not a loss of the privileges, however, of the House. It manifestly refers to the fact that the committee may lose its privilege in making the report in that way, but not the House.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The committees were being called for reports at the time this was filed.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair will see, I trust, that under the ruling none of my rights are lost, this being a question of privilege, as the Chair himself has heretofore held.

The SPEAKER. But undoubtedly the Committee on Foreign Affairs had the right to make the report; and what the effect may be will be determined when an effort is made to call the matter up.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I only desire to leave the matter in such way that my rights and privileges can not be foreclosed.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman loses no rights, for he has none now.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, I understood the Speaker to rule specifically that my resolution was privileged. That being the case——

The SPEAKER. The Chair so held.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That being the case, it certainly carries with it some right.

The SPEAKER. What right has the minority of a committee to object to the filing of a report by the committee?

Mr. BOUTELLE. But it is the right of this House to determine whether it is a privileged question or not.

The SPEAKER. That comes up when the matter is called up for consideration.

The Clerk will resume the call of committees for reports.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. CADMUS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back the House resolution of October 2, 1893, directing an inquiry as to the public buildings and grounds in New York City; which was referred to the House Calendar.

The remainder of the committees were called, there being no further reports.

GEN. GEORGE S. GREENE.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at ten minutes before 1 o'clock, and the call rests with the Committee on Military Affairs, which was passed over on the Calendar yesterday with the privilege of returning to it to-day.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4416) for the relief of Bvt. Maj. Gen. George S. Greene.

The SPEAKER. This bill is in Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAIR. I object.

Mr. BOUTELLE (to Mr. BLAIR). I would not object to that.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand there is objection to the consideration of this bill in the House.

Mr. BLAIR. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the report will be read before consent is given.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made.

Mr. BLAIR. That has been withdrawn.

Mr. KILGORE. Let it be considered in the committee in the proper way.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill the title of which has just been read.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. OATES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the long and faithful services of Bvt. Maj. Gen. George S. Greene, United States Army, before and during the late war, and of severe wounds received by him in battle, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint George S. Greene, late brigadier and brevet major general United States Volunteers, to the rank of first lieutenant of artillery in the Army of the United States, and to place him on the retired list of the Army as of that grade, the retired list being thereby increased in number to that extent; and all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are suspended for this purpose only: *Provided*, That from and after the passage of this act no pension shall be paid to the said George S. Greene, but this proviso shall be no bar to any claims for pension that the widow or children or other heirs of said George S. Greene may have after his decease.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that the beneficiary thereof shall be placed upon the retired list as a first lieutenant of artillery.

Maj. Gen. Greene is entitled to this consideration from the American Congress for his long and distinguished services in behalf of his country. He entered the Military Academy in 1819, and is now 92 years of age. His services were continuous in the Army until June 30, 1836, when he resigned after a gallant and meritorious career. In January, 1862, he reëntered the service of his country as a colonel of volunteers. He was subsequently a brigadier general, and was appointed major general (by brevet) in 1865 for gallant and meritorious services, and honorably discharged April 30, 1866.

It appears by the military record that at the time of the breaking out of the civil war he was 60 years of age, and notwithstanding that fact, he abandoned a lucrative position to take up arms in the defense of his country, and served with honor and distinction continuously, for a period of more than five years, until after the close of the rebellion.

I have nothing further to say

Mr. BLAIR. I ask the gentleman to allow me five minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Before the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] concludes, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. Do I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] to say that the beneficiary of this bill was disabled in the service of the Government?

Mr. COGSWELL. He was severely wounded.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I can not say he was wholly disabled, but he was severely wounded in the service.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] if a common soldier who happened to have been wounded, but who was not disabled, would be entitled to even $12 a month under similar circumstances?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He certainly would be, and as to the common soldier who at 60 years of age, far beyond the period when he could have been required by law to enter into the service, who had entered into the Army under such circumstances as Gen. Greene did, giving up a lucrative business, losing his all, I should feel like doing something more for him than is done for the common soldier ordinarily.

Mr. BAILEY. But the question is this: As I understand, the proposition is to put this man on the retired list under conditions such as would not justify the granting of a pension under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Oh, no; I stated that he was wounded——

Mr. BAILEY. But he must be disabled.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He must be disabled to a certain degree.

Mr. BAILEY. And the gentleman does not say the beneficiary of the bill is disabled from the wound he received in the service of the Government.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Is he drawing a pension now?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He is drawing a pension.

Mr. BLANCHARD. How much?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Thirty dollars a month.

Mr. McMILLIN. Do you propose to put him on the retired list in addition to that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; he loses his pension.

Mr. HOLMAN. At what do you place him on the retired list?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. As a lieutenant. He was a major-general, and it is proposed to put him on the retired list as a first lieutenant, at the advanced age of 92 years. It is possible he may live a year or two longer.

Mr. McMILLIN. The principle is the same whether he lives one year or ten.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, the principle is not the same. Besides, it would make a great deal of difference as to the amount of expenditure, as to the pay, between a man of 40 years of age and a man 92 years of age, as this gentleman is now.

Mr. McMILLIN. You comment upon the amount involved.

Mr. BLANCHARD. You say he will lose his pension?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He will yield up his pension.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Does the bill so provide.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The general law says so, and——

Mr. BLAND. The bill says so.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, this bill says so.

Mr. BRYAN. What has this man been doing since 1866?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He has been trying to make a living in various ways.

Mr. BRYAN. What are the precedents? Are we in the habit of restoring men to the rolls after twenty or thirty years' absence?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Very few instances of that kind occur. In every Congress for some years past some gentlemen have been restored to the Army and put upon the retired list, where there were peculiar circumstances of merit and distinction, and perhaps distress, accompanying their cases.

Mr. BRYAN. I had a man in Nebraska ask me to have that very same thing done, and I wanted to know whether there were any precedents for putting a man back on the roll after thirty years.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. There are plenty of precedents. Gen. Averill was placed upon the retired list.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Every Congress has passed some bills.

Mr. HOLMAN. What will be the increased pay which this officer will receive?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Three-fourths of the full pay of a first lieutenant.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] has presented the statement of the distinguished services of this beneficiary, already a recipient of the Government's bounty, and has mentioned his great age. Does he not think it a safer rule to increase the pension in meritorious cases, and put it on the ground of disability, than to take a man from private life, after having spent years in trying to better his condition, out of his country's service, when he gets too old to work on the outside, and in that way make up a special list of governmental beneficiaries, by which we will ultimately have two classes, one of taxpayers and the other of tax-eaters?

Now, does not the gentleman think that the line of the pension system we have adopted had better be pursued than that this retired list be enormously increased?

Mr. COOMBS. I call attention to the fact that this additional expense of the Government because of pension would naturally succeed to his wife.

Mr. McMILLIN. The widow does not succeed to Congressional pensions. The gentleman is in error in that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. In answer to one of the questions of the gentleman from Tennessee, I will state that I am not on the Committee on Pensions. This bill was sent to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee have considered it and reported it unanimously. The second question by the gentleman from Tennessee is whether it would not be better to curtail our long line of pensioners, and so forth.

Mr. McMILLIN. Our long line of retired officers in private life.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs has been extremely guarded in such cases. Perhaps seventy or eighty bills were referred to that committee during the last Congress. I do not think a dozen of them were reported. I recollect but two of them passing the House.

I appeal to the patriotism of this House; I appeal to its high sense of justice to give this bill favorable action. Gen. Greene served his country more years than the average years of the membership of this House. He was, in one sense of the words, forty-six years in the service of his country. He served it through the last great war. He quit at a time when it was difficult for a man of his character and ability to find employment at a salary commensurate with that which he would have received if he had remained in the Army. He did not quit for his own benefit simply. He left the Army because he felt that his services were no longer needed, and that, if he remained in it, he would be to some extent, though still a tolerably hale man for 66 years of age, a pensioner upon the country. He has now come here through his Representative in Congress and asks what seems to me to be a very slight recognition of his services—that he be put upon the retired list as a lieutenant.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Would his widow be entitled to a higher pension as widow of a lieutenant than now, if he should die?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I believe his widow might be entitled to a higher pension as the widow of a lieutenant, but can not say positively.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I do not think so. I know she would not.

Mr. BINGHAM. She would not.

A MEMBER. Would not his widow have a right to a pension?

Mr. BINGHAM. Not where it is a special act.

Mr. McMILLIN. Not where Congress has granted a pension.

Mr. BINGHAM. If it is a special act, the pension dies with the beneficiary.

Mr. BLANCHARD. What is the pay of a first lieutenant?

Mr. BINGHAM. About $1,800 a year.

Mr. BLANCHARD. And he would get two-thirds of that?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He is 92 years of age. He could not get that more than a year or two.

Mr. BLANCHARD. But the principle is the thing to be considered.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. There are certainly some exceptions to all principles.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It would be a great deal better to increase his pension.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS].

Mr. COOMBS. I only want to say, gentlemen of the House, that I have been waited upon in relation to this case for two or three years. Maj. Gen. Slocum, who is thoroughly acquainted with this case, is very much interested in seeing that this man receives this benefit from Congress. He knows the whole circumstances of the case. He came on to Washington in relation to it. He thinks that this is a case which should be made an exception from the general rule; and for one I shall vote most heartily in favor of it.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I will now move that the committee rise.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to be heard on this bill.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BAILEY. Only a few minutes.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield the gentleman whatever time he needs.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed on principle to all legislation of this kind. I believe now, as I have always believed, that when any man becomes disabled in the service of the Government, it ought to make a fair and reasonable provision for him. In order to do that there has existed from the foundation of the Government a pension roll, and all men who in our service have become less able to serve themselves and their families have very properly found a place on that pension roll. I heartily concur in the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], that if there is a peculiar merit in the

claim of this applicant, the pension roll, on which he now finds a place, is the proper method to extend whatever relief Congress may see fit to grant him.

This retired list is an outgrowth of the war. For over seventy years this Government existed without such a list. It fought three foreign wars. It fought the war of the Revolution, it fought and won the war of 1812, it fought the Indian wars, and then it fought the war with Mexico, in which it added a splendid empire to the Republic; and in all that more than seventy years it never entered the brain of any living man to establish a privileged class of idlers to eat up the taxes which other men had earned.

But during the civil war this retired list was established. It was inaugurated originally to meet a peculiar condition. At the beginning of the war there were many men engaged in the military service who by reason of their age were unsuitable for their commands, and this law was intended to retire them. Since that time the system has been developed and developed and exception after exception ingrafted upon it, until to-day the people of the United States are paying more than three millions annually for the support of those who are better able to support their neighbors than their neighbors are to support them.

Why, Mr. Chairman, they not only retire the officer and give him 75 per cent of the salary to which he would be entitled if in active service, but then they have a provision under which they add a longevity fee of 10 per cent for each five years that he has served, and that longevity fee may reach as much as 40 per cent. Therefore when the officer first begins his work he receives a dollar, and when he plays he receives $1.15!

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman forgets that that longevity increase is provided for officers on the active list, and that they receive it while on the active list.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It does not apply to this case at all.

Mr. BAILEY. It is added to their pay when in active service, and then they are retired with it as a part of their retired pay. This Government ought to pay to every man in its service every dollar that his services are worth, and having so paid him it is under no further obligation to him. Our army and navy officers are the only men in this country that the Government educates and pays them for the privilege of educating them, pays them for every day which they serve it, and then allows them to retire and continue to draw money from the public Treasury.

Their current salary is a fair equivalent for their service, and they ought to be required to exercise the prudence that other men are compelled to exercise, and save something while they work, or pay the penalty of their improvidence. The taxpayer himself, the most useful man in all the country, for it is his labor that supports all others, if he does not save something out of his earnings, is compelled to suffer the consequences of his folly. But the army or navy officer who is educated at a Government institution and paid for every day he serves, can waste like a spendthrift and feel that when his money is all gone the Government will take care of him in his old age.

I have introduced a bill to repeal the law establishing the retired list. That bill has gone to the committee of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] is chairman. If he would report it back or even amend the law so that no man could go upon the retired list unless he were disabled and indigent, then he might successfully appeal to the sense of justice, always residing in this House, to do a benefaction in a worthy case. But so long as the retired list continues to be a receptacle for men who have been educated by the Government, who have been paid for their work, and who are permitted to go upon that list, though rich and in perfect health, so long I shall protest with all the power that I possess against adding another name to it.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If this man had remained in the Army but a few years longer he would have been retired as a major-general with an income of $5,500.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why did not he remain?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Because the war had ended, and he thought there was no longer any pressing necessity for his service.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, that simply illustrates how this kind of legislation debauches public sentiment. This man retired at that time, but no man in this day thinks of retiring. They continue to draw the money of the Government because they have been taught that it is right.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel called upon at this time to enter upon a discussion of the general question of the retired list.

If there were no retired list I should feel just as zealous in favor of the passage of this bill as I do now. Upon such a question as this I do not consider whether there is a retired list or not. There were days in which republics thought they were doing themselves honor to take liberal action for the benefit of their heroes; and I am surprised that in an American Congress there should be any hesitation in recognizing patriotic services such as those of Gen. Greene. [Applause.]

I am surprised that gentlemen should cavil over the pittance that it is proposed to give this distinguished man—a man who, when he had passed the age at which men could be compelled to enter military service, returned voluntarily to the field at 60 years of age, and continued there until he believed that his country had no longer any pressing need for his services; and then went out into the world to engage in its struggles, unfitted in some degree by the hardships of military life for competing with others in vocations of civil life. Broken in health and fortune now, at the advanced age—not of three score and ten, but of four score and ten and two—this proposition is made in his behalf to grant him the honor of dying in the Army with rank and pay of a lieutenant, and I must appeal to members of the American Congress to do themselves the honor of voting for the passage of such a bill. [Applause.]

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the impassioned appeal made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] in behalf——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas rise for the purpose of opposing this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I do.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILGORE. I suppose I would have the right to speak upon the question——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly; but I would prefer the gentleman should speak in my time, if he has no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, sir, I do not make any demand on the gentleman from Ohio——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not consider that the gentleman is making any demand on me: but I cheerfully yield him such time as he may desire, only trusting that he will not occupy so much as to prevent a vote upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, the impassioned appeal which the gentleman from Ohio has made in behalf of the beneficiary in this bill might have been somewhat modified if he had stated that Gen. Greene is already receiving the bounty of the Government in the way of a pension at the rate of $30 per month, and I would not be unwilling, if it is found upon investigation that $30 a month is insufficient for his purposes, to see the amount increased by enlarging his pension.

But I am opposed to an enlargement of the retired list. Mr. Chairman, the law has fixed the limit to that list; and every time Congress passes a special bill to put some one on the retired list the law now in force upon that subject must be amended and the retired list enlarged. I am opposed to that. I do not think such a proposition ought to be urged. It has been stated, I believe, by every gentleman who has opposed this proposition that he would be willing to see this old gentleman taken care of by giving him a proper pension.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, $30 a month is not a sum to be "sneezed at." In our country it is regarded as a very fair salary. Many of our people earn only $10 or $12 a month: and numbers of them went into the late war and fought it through. It is true they were on the "off side" in that war, and now they enjoy the privilege of paying their share of the expenses incurred by just such legislation as this bill proposes. They think they are doing very well if they earn $10, $12, or $15 a month. Now this gentleman can not have much of a family on his hands; because if he is as old as they say he can not have accumulated any family to have amounted to anything since the war: and it would seem that he would be abundantly able to take care of himself on the $30 a month which the Government now allows him.

But, Mr. Chairman, pretermitting all such considerations, I say if this is a meritorious case considered with reference to an increase of pension, and if $30 a month is not sufficient to provide for this old man in the last days he is to spend on earth, let his pension be enlarged in a proper way. But let us not come in here and violate the principle which has fixed a limit upon the retired list; let us not pass, almost every day Congress is in session, these special acts the purpose of which is to enlarge that list. I can not concur in any such proposition. The gentleman from Ohio came very near seducing me into an agreement not to obstruct the passage of this bill; but the more I think of it, and the more I talk about it, and the more I hear about it on both sides of the question, the more I am inclined to obstruct the passage of this measure, or at least to use it for the profitable purpose of consuming the morning hour.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, Gen. George S. Greene, whom the bill under consideration proposes to place on the retired list, graduated at the Military Academy in 1821. He

remained in the Army until 1836, when Congress made provision for the resignation of army officers who might see fit to leave the service because of the superabundance of officers. Acting upon that suggestion of Congress Gen. Greene tendered his resignation and went into civil life.

When the war of 1861 broke out he was occupying a position on the public works in the city of New York, which he had long held, and in which position he had a higher salary than was subsequently paid him as colonel of the regiment of which he took command. That regiment was organized in my own county, and I introduced this bill because of the relationship which we in St. Lawrence County hold toward this distinguished officer. He remained in the Army till the close of the war, having been twice promoted for distinguished services.

The House listened with very great interest the other day to the gentleman from Alabama, now occupying the chair, when he described a contest that he had witnessed where a prominent part was taken by a very distinguished citizen by adoption of the State of Illinois (Gen. Shields). I believe the same gentleman was present on another occasion, and he may or may not have known who it was that, with one brigade, held Culp's Hill at Gettysburg during one of the most important periods in that great battle. It was Gen. Greene. When the line was denuded of men to occupy some other threatened point Gen. Greene held this position, though constantly engaged, until the end of the conflict.

He was seriously wounded and has suffered ever since from the injury there received; and while he is a man of great physical vigor and robust constitution—indeed he must be to have gone through the hardship he has endured and be alive; his ninety-second birthday occurred last May—he is not able to earn a livelihood in his profession, a civil engineer, and $360 a year, the pension he now receives, is not ample for the support of himself and wife. This appeal is made to the justice and generosity of Congress to do for Gen. Greene what it has done for other venerable and highly distinguished officers since the adoption of the system of placing them upon the retired list. We ask to put Gen. Greene on that list. It will increase the expenditures not more than ten or twelve hundred dollars a year above what is now paid.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let me ask the gentleman what arm of the service Gen. Greene served in?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I think he was in the Engineer Corps.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why, then, do you propose to give him the rank of a lieutenant of artillery rather than a lieutenant of engineers?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. When the bill was under discussion amongst his friends it was first proposed to give Gen. Greene the rank of lieutenant of engineers, but it was suggested that the artillery is the branch of the service in which these retired officers are usually placed, and although his pay would be less in the artillery service than in that of the engineers, in order to comply with the uniform custom heretofore adopted by Congress it was deemed advisable to place Gen. Greene on the retired list as first lieutenant of artillery.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move that the committee rise and report the bill favorably.

The question was taken, and on a division, demanded by Mr. BAILEY, there were—ayes 80, noes 21.

Mr. BAILEY. No quorum.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It is evident that there is no quorum present. If the gentleman insists on defeating the bill in this way I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

There being no objection, the bill was withdrawn.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OATES reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4416, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MARSHALL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution relative to providing for a joint committee, to be composed of three Senators and three Members of the House of Representatives, to examine into and report as to the condition of the Nicaragua Maritime Canal to Congress; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home.

A bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia.

A bill (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes.

A bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiences in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

BOARD OF REVIEW, WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 199) to authorize the Secretary of War to appoint a board of review in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BAILEY. I object.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to appoint a board of review, to consist of three members and a recorder, from officers of the Army on the active or retired list, to review the proceedings, findings, and sentence of any court-martial for the trial of a commissioned officer or enlisted man, either of the regular Army or volunteer forces, where the accused has been dishonorably discharged from the military service of the United States, or to review the proceedings, findings, and decision of a retiring board, when an officer has been wholly retired from the Army.

SEC. 2. That the said board of review shall have jurisdiction of all such cases as shall be ordered before it by the Secretary of War, and its members shall serve without compensation, except such as they are now receiving, and may be relieved from time to time as the exigencies of the service may require: *Provided*, That when officers of the retired list serve upon such board they shall receive the same pay as officers of their grade upon the active list.

SEC. 3. That it shall be lawful for said board of review to hear and consider any additional evidence in each case as may properly be brought before it, under such rules and regulations as may be established by the Secretary of War, and it is hereby authorized to subpœna witnesses and to administer oaths when necessary; and the proceedings and findings, with the recommendations of said board, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of War for his consideration and action: *Provided*, That the Government shall be put to no expense on account of witnesses summoned on the part of the applicant.

SEC. 4. That the board shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to make them testify, and punish for contempt.

SEC. 5. That the recorder shall act as judge-advocate and be empowered to introduce witnesses to contradict the evidence of the applicant.

SEC. 6. That in case of disagreement of the board the views may be expressed in both majority and minority reports.

SEC. 7. That in all cases where the relief prayed for is recommended by the said board of review, in whole or in part, and approved by the Secretary of War, it shall be his duty to refer to Congress, for such action as it may deem proper, the findings of the board of review, together with the evidence upon which the findings are based, and he shall also report to Congress what action by Congress is deemed by him as necessary in order that justice may be done in the case: *Provided*, That no right to any pay or allowances shall accrue or be revived from such amendment of the records in any case.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this bill is precisely the same bill which passed this House during the last Congress. Its purpose is to do justice to officers who have been dismissed from the Army pursuant to the proceedings of courts-martial, in which the records prove that these officers have been unjustly dealt with by the court.

The history of this and of all governments has shown that in times of war—in times of excitement, great wrong and gross injustice have too frequently been done to very brave and meritorious men. The purpose of this bill is to create a court to which such persons may appeal, and have their cases reviewed with calm and proper consideration. A military court is the only court in the civilized world of original jurisdiction of a penal nature from which the person tried has no appeal to a higher tribunal to correct errors which have been inflicted upon him by what may have been a partisan or prejudiced court.

Mr. CULBERSON. Has he not an appeal to the President?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. An appeal to the President or to the ruling power in any country has been shown not to attain the purpose, because in very many instances the court is ordered by the ruling power and packed to do the very wrong and injustice to which I have referred and which the court proposed by this bill can correct. Mr. Cleveland, in one of his messages said:

If some of the proceedings of courts-martial which I have had occasion to examine present the ideas of justice which generally prevail in these tribunals, I am satisfied that they should be much reformed if the honor and honesty of the Army and Navy are by their instrumentality to be vindicated and protected.

My friend from Texas, whom I very highly esteem, will recall that we found it necessary in the Forty-seventh Congress to pass a law allowing the reference of claims to the Court of Claims, because committees of Congress had those claims presented to them on *ex parte* evidence, and they therefore found themselves sometimes acting favorably upon claims that were unjust and neglecting to favorably report on claims which should have received their favorable consideration. Now, the purpose of this bill is to create a court to attain the same end. I have had the honor to be upon the Military Committee of the House for a number of years. We have had a great many bills referred to us to correct supposed unjust findings of military courts. We were compelled to act upon the evidence placed before us, and in some cases we have afterward ascertained that injustice had been done either by favorably reporting cases which were not meritorious, or by reporting unfavorably on cases which upon further investigation appeared to have merit.

This bill provides that no expense or very little expense shall be incurred by the Government. It simply gives an honorable man, who has been the victim of disgrace by a partisan or mistaken court, the right to have the record reviewed, and have a report on the case sent to the Secretary of War, so that he may transmit it to Congress and give this body an opportunity to adjudicate the case, according to right and justice.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will my friend permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Yes; most certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman says this will put the Government to no expense. I would suggest to him that the bill provides that whereas Army officers receive three-fourths pay when they are on the retired list ordinarily, yet when they perform services on this board, they are increased to their full pay.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I would be willing to have the gentleman move to strike that out.

Mr. McMILLIN. In addition to that I find that, whereas the Government is not responsible or liable for the fees of witnesses of the party who seeks the relief, yet, suppose the Government desires to rebut that testimony, then the Government would have to pay its own witnesses.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. But they would probably be military officers, and would not subject the Government to expense.

Mr. McMILLIN. Not necessarily. Any witness might be called. Then, instead of this being a board of appeals, it tries the case *de novo*. You are entitled to bring new evidence before it. It seems to me that the proceedings will be interminable. It is not really a board of review, it is a board of retrial.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is what it is.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. We can hardly say that the proposed proceeding is a retrial. The proposed board of review does not render a verdict. It only reviews the case and reports the facts to the Secretary of War; but where an injustice has been done, should there not be a new trial?

Mr. McMILLIN. Then, if it is a board of retrial, call it that; but do not call it a board of review.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It is immaterial what you call it. The only purpose is to do justice, and to protect the Government from being imposed upon as it has been by cases being brought before Congress and acted upon favorably when the reverse action should have been taken. This will protect the Government in such cases, and will save ten times the amount that it will possibly cost, as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

Mr. CULBERSON. Has the gentleman in mind any case in which a court-martial and the President have done injustice?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I will cite a case, and call the gentleman to testify to it, the Madison Cutts case.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Yes, and also the case of Fitz John Porter.

Mr. CULBERSON. That has been corrected.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. In that case the matter was acted upon fifteen years afterwards. We propose by this means to give an opportunity to have justice done to others who have been treated in the same unjust manner. I regret to say that I have examined records which show very gross acts of injustice, and in many cases unquestioned proof has developed that officers have been improperly tried and condemned by methods which are not disclosed by the record.

One case I recall in which an officer was tried at a time and place when the court knew he could not have the benefit of evidence which was essential and possibly conclusive.

I recall another case which occurred soon after the war where the accused was not present at the pretended trial, and this fact was not disclosed by the record.

Mr. Cleveland has examined a variety of cases where injustice has been done, and there is always danger of injustice when courts of original jurisdiction are exempt from review by appellate tribunals.

The experience of the world has developed that appellate courts have had a very salutary effect over inferior courts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss the matter any further. This is in the line of economy and in the line of justice. It imposes upon the Government the very first and most important duty, to protect the honor of men who have risked their lives in its defense.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman from Alabama indicate how it economizes anything? He says that it is in the line of economy.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. If the gentleman had been on the Committee on Military Affairs as long as I have he would understand it.

Mr. BAILEY. I am asking you for information.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. As the chairman said, some hundred cases were referred to that committee last Congress. It required a vast amount of investigation by that committee, and that committee will be relieved if these cases are referred to a court of this character. Its time can then be devoted to other important matters.

Mr. BAILEY. Does it cost the Government anything for that committee to investigate them?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. It costs the Government a great deal, and takes up time that ought to be devoted to other business. Under this bill nothing will be considered by that committee until the Secretary of War has ordered a case before the court and this court has reported favorably or unfavorably to the Secretary of War.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand it may save time to the committee, but do not see how it will save any money.

Mr. McMILLIN. And then my friend from Alabama drifts into one error concerning it. Congress will have power over these matters. Members may introduce bills concerning them, have them referred to the committee, and ask for action upon them, notwithstanding this board, independently of it, and above and beyond it.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. With this board Congress never would act upon a case until it had been referred to that board, and it had come back with the stamp of the Secretary of War and the report of this board.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] speaks about cost. It costs money to consider the hundreds of cases which are referred to the committees of the House and Senate, and it costs honor, which is of more value than money for the Government to adhere to a system which often does injustice to its servants.

The commander of the Army, Gen. Schofield, says that—

> the principal objection urged by the Judge-Advocate-General constitutes the strongest reason why such a measure should be adopted, namely, the present well-established principle "that a sentence of court-martial once duly executed can not be revised, reopened, set aside, or otherwise nullified." It is necessary, in my judgment, to make some legislative modification of this rule of action. It is, I believe, universally admitted that in our past history great injustice has sometimes been done through the operation of this "summary system of discipline which has governed the Army in distinction from the civil state."
>
> For the purposes of discipline, especially in time of war, it is undoubtedly requisite that military punishment shall be certain, military orders conclusive and effectual, at least for the time being, but it does not follow that the interests of the military service forbid that when the military necessity has passed, wrongs that may have been hastily done under the necessity of war shall be righted. On the contrary, I think the best interests of the military service, as well as all other considerations, demand that when it becomes possible all such wrongs shall be righted as far as may be practicable. It may not be necessary, or at all events as necessary, that such measure shall be applicable to courts-martial that have been held in time of peace; yet there are many instances in which Congress has thought it necessary, after a long and patient investigation, to reverse, or in some way amend the action of such courts, and I presume this measure is intended, in part at least, to relieve committees of Congress from the performance of that difficult and onerous duty, and to provide for its performance in a more satisfactory manner.
>
> But the more important purpose of this measure, as I understand, is to provide for such correction as may remain possible of errors hastily committed in time of war, when passion is raised to the highest pitch, when time is precious, and when full evidence is often unobtainable, in which cases great injustice may be done to meritorious soldiers.

Thus it will be seen that the Commanding General of the Army fully commends the bill. The Secretary of War in a letter says:

> If the action of courts-martial are to be reviewed and reversed or confirmed, it would be better, doubtless, on general principles and in practice that it should be done by a court of appellate jurisdiction. But it is understood that the object of the bill is to relieve Congress of numerous investigations involving the action of courts-martial. It is possible that a board, such as the bill contemplates, can better hear the testimony and examine into all the facts than a committee of either House of Congress, especially as such a board can meet at any convenient time and place. It is not understood that the design of the bill is to give the board authority to modify the sentences of courts-martial, but that its duty will be simply to examine into and report the facts and make recommendations to the Secretary of War, and that the acts of the Secretary of War will be confined simply to an approval or disapproval of the report of the board and a recommendation to Congress.
>
> In this view of the objects of the bill there does not seem to be any very serious objection, except it imposes upon the War Department additional duties, but it may be better for the service in that Congress will be better advised and can act more intelligently upon cases of this nature.

Referring to the remarks of the Major-General Commanding the Army, the recommendation that the board be ordered by the President, instead of by the Secretary of War, is not concurred in. The distinction is quite unnecessary, inasmuch as all boards as well as courts-martial are actually ordered by the Secretary of War, whether they are said to be done by direction of the President or not. But if done by direction of the President, precedent will require that the reports and recommendations be referred to him for his action. This will unnecessarily impose upon him additional and onerous duties and require the President in advance to recommend or not recommend to Congress the passage of laws relieving the individuals whose cases have been investigated. Should Congress afterwards pass bills of relief, the whole subject will come before the President on the question of approving the bills, so that no sentence of a court-martial can be changed or modified without the ultimate approval of the President. Congress may perhaps justly relieve itself by placing the burden of investigation upon the War Department, but it ought not to relieve itself by imposing additional burdens upon the President.

Now, I do hope, in the line of economy, in the line of justice, in the line of good military administration, and in the line of propriety, that this bill will pass.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, I supported this bill in committee and I propose to support it in the House upon some of the grounds advanced by the gentleman from Alabama, chiefly, however, upon the ground that the time of the Committee on Military Affairs will be economized. Now, we members on that committee are of the opinion that our time is valuable, and think that we could devote it to something more important to the Government than hearings upon private bills. We could devote it to the consideration of the expenditures of the Army, to its welfare and reorganization, and perhaps the reduction of the cost of the Army, as well as to the general purposes for which money is expended for military purposes. But as it is, each time the committee meets it is presented with a number of private bills.

The committee does not seek them nor desire them to be sent to it. Gentlemen who claimed to have been wronged by courts-martial and retiring boards approach Congress through their representatives and otherwise, and present these bills. They come up on a presentation which upon its face very often shows no cause for consideration; but the papers must be examined to reach that conclusion. They come, again, very often showing some of the most startling and astounding transactions and sometimes showing that the grossest injustice has been done. Now, that is the first presentation. Shall we take the *ex parte* presentation made on behalf of the beneficiary, or shall we attempt to investigate in some way the whole case? You can readily see if we attempt to investigate so as to do justice to the claimant and also protect the Government, we must devote a considerable portion of our time.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Three or four weeks in one case.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. This committee sits as nearly continuously as any other committee of the House, except the general Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand this is a proposition to organize a court or commission, and to give the people who are to have the benefits of its investigation a cause of action in that court?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman is mistaken if he understands that. The first proposition is that anyone seeking admission to this court must first lay his case before the Secretary of War. Now, why is that proposition inserted? Because it is found, in the claims of these officers or soldiers or enlisted men, they insist that the greatest injustice has been done them; that it passed through the War Department perfunctorily; that an indorsement was made by the Secretary of War on the investigation, relying upon some clerk; that it passed on to the President, and perhaps the President simply indorsed the indorsement of the Secretary of War; so the sentence of a court-martial, arbitrary and cruel, is indorsed, and the officer is made to suffer. Then the officer comes to Congress, and one-half of the time of the two Committees on Military Affairs is taken up in the investigation of such cases as this.

To do justice to a citizen is not a small thing. A citizen complains that his Government has outraged him. He goes to the representatives of the people and says, "Let me have an investigation. You are the only power to which I can appeal." There is no power in the law authorizing the President; there is no power in the law authorizing the General of the Army; there is no power in the law authorizing the Secretary of War to review this matter. Injustice has been done. Now, let him go to the Secretary of War and present his case anew; and if he sees that he can sustain his position to such an extent that a reinvestigation should be had, then he will order a court composed of officers of the Army, so that the expense is not material, except the loss of time to those officers from the other duties which they might perform.

This court investigates it, this court calls his witnesses, whom he must bring before it at his own expense. When his side of the case is investigated the court takes up the Government side of the case, and that court is able to get testimony that this committee is never able to reach.

Mr. KILGORE. At last, then, the purpose is to create a court in which a man who deems himself wronged by the judgment of a court-martial can have the matter reviewed?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes; and what objection is there to that, there being no such court in existence?

Mr. KILGORE. And it requires the preliminary action of the Secretary of War to let him in?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It does.

Mr. KILGORE. Now, everybody against whom a court-martial pronounces judgment feels that he has been outraged, does he not?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, sir; not everybody.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, most men.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; I do not think the gentleman is correct in saying "most men," but a fair proportion of them do. After this court has investigated it makes its report and sends that report to Congress, with all the proceedings spread out before us, so that the Committee on Military Affairs need not further investigate the matter. My chief object in urging this bill is to avoid the continual pressure for time and opportunity to be heard before the Committee on Military Affairs upon these special bills.

Mr. BAILEY. I think there is a good deal of force in that suggestion. I ask the gentleman if he will agree to strike out of the bill that part of it which relates to reviewing the findings of the retiring board?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Let me say that that is the most important part of the bill, because the retiring board is a star-chamber, where the officer has no opportunity to present his case.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I will state to the gentleman from Texas, who may not be as familiar as I am with this subject—I certainly did not understand it until I had occasion to investigate it—that officers often complain when they are retired wholly, and this is intended to provide for a review of the action of the retiring board. Sometimes officers are retired without desiring to be retired; sometimes they are retired to make places for other officers——

Mr. BAILEY. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. And they do not want to be retired in that way without an opportunity to have their cases investigated.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will this bill correct that?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. To a great extent it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The morning hour has expired.

On motion the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill H. R. 199 and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill (H. R. 353) for the admission of New Mexico as a State.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, before that question is put, I desire to ask the gentleman a question. I want to see if we can not come to an agreement. I will ask the gentleman if there is any objection to including Oklahoma at the same time, as I understand that his committee has proposed to do?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. This proceeding is pursuant to a special order of the House, which can not be amended except by being referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. REED. It can be amended by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

A division was called for.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 4.

Mr. HICKS. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. One moment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable. The point is made that no quorum has voted, and the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, pending this vote I ask unanimous consent that the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] be agreed to, and that, as soon as that bill is disposed of, the House take up and consider the bill on the Calendar for the admission of Oklahoma.

Mr. HICKS. I object to that.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman object to Oklahoma coming in?

Mr. HICKS. No, sir; I am in favor of the admission of Oklahoma, and also of New Mexico.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit another request for unanimous consent. I ask consent that the motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the New Mexico bill be now agreed to, and that the bill for the admission of Oklahoma be included in the present special order as in the first instance.

Mr. DINGLEY. So that the Oklahoma bill shall be a continuing order under the same restrictions as the New Mexico bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; and that as soon as this New Mexico bill is disposed of the special order under which we are operating shall apply to the Oklahoma bill as well.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. It should be understood that any arrangement which may be made with reference to these bills is not to interfere with revenue bills.

Mr. SPRINGER. The proposed arrangement would not do so; but if the gentleman wants a reservation of that kind——

Mr. HICKS. I still insist on my objection.

Mr. BURROWS. I think there would be no objection if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] would modify his request so that the Oklahoma bill shall be considered first.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the bill for the admission of New Mexico is already pending and has been partially considered.

Mr. BURROWS. That will make no difference.

Mr. SPRINGER. It can be finished in a very few minutes, if gentlemen do not desire to speak further.

Mr. BURROWS. We can take up the Oklahoma bill and finish that, and afterward resume the consideration of the New Mexico bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think gentlemen ought not to ask that.

Mr. BURROWS. I simply made the suggestion that in this way the objection could be avoided.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think gentlemen are unduly sensitive about Oklahoma. There are more than 500,000 people in that Territory, and Congress will not at this session neglect its duty in regard to those people.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made; and the House is dividing.

TARIFF BILL.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. While the House is dividing, I ask unanimous consent to say that immediately after the reading of the Journal on the first day of the session after the new year begins I shall ask the House to take up for consideration the tariff bill which has been reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

HAWAII.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. And in pursuance of an agreement I wish also to give notice that within ten days after our meeting subsequent to the holidays, as I have been assured, the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be allowed two days in which to call up the resolution reported by me this morning in regard to Hawaiian affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to give notice that immediately after the reconvening of Congress I shall call up the privileged resolution which I introduced, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and which I understand the Speaker does not hold to have lost its privilege by any action of the committee.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not understand that the Speaker has adopted the view which the gentleman from Maine intimates.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. He can do so when the question arises.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was undertaking to state the understanding of "the gentleman from Maine." I did not undertake to state what the gentleman from Ohio might or might not understand. That would be too difficult a task.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I thought the gentleman was undertaking to state the view of some one besides himself; if he had confined his statement to his own view of the matter there would have been no objection.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. SPRINGER. In view of the fact that the time for the consideration of the Territorial bills is limited to this afternoon, unless they be postponed to a late period of the session by reason of other matters which must come up, I ask unanimous consent that we immediately go into Committee of the Whole and consider first the New Mexico bill, then the Oklahoma bill, and that the Committee of the Whole shall not rise until both bills are ready to be reported.

Mr. LOUD. I think the tariff bill can wait a day or two if these matters are of such pressing importance. The House shall not pass these bills to-day.

Mr. HICKS. I desire to object to the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Will not the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HICKS] indicate something to which he will not object?

Mr. HICKS. If it is agreed that the Oklahoma bill shall be considered first, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That will never be consented to on this side of the House.

Mr. HARTER. I object to that arrangement.

Mr. REED. There is the trouble with the Democratic party: it never can be reasonable.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Did you ever hear of a proposition that a pending bill be withdrawn in order to give preference to another no more meritorious?

Mr. REED. I admit that such a proposition may be a little hard on you; but I think you might have accepted it if you had been really well-disposed. [Laughter.]

[The count by tellers continued for some time.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

Before the count by tellers was concluded a message from the Senate, by Mr. COX, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 104) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana;

A bill (S. 121) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 464) for the issue of ordnance stores and supplies to the State of Nebraska, to replace similar stores destroyed by fire.

A bill (S. 1045) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate four obsolete gun-carriages to the city of Marshalltown, Iowa; and

A bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, the 21st day of December, present, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 3d day of January, 1894.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] will withdraw his motion, the House is now ready to adjourn.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I withdraw the motion.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, a reprint will be ordered of the bill (H. R. 4854) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the "Bowman act." It appears that the copies of this bill already printed have been exhausted.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] asks leave on behalf of a minority of the Committee on the Judiciary to file and have printed during the recess of the House their views on the bill (H. R. 4609) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, referring to the privilege to print the minority views, I also desire to ask that the majority have leave to file its report. I did not understand that there would be a minority report submitted, and hence the majority report is simply a recommendation that the bill pass.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, leave will be granted to both the majority and the minority of the committee to file their views during the vacation.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On December 21, 1893:

An act (H. R. 4177) to provide for further urgent deficiencies

in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 2668) authorizing the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General to approve postmasters' bonds;

An act (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C.; and

An act (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home.

MINORITY REPORT ON TARIFF BILL.

Mr. REED, in pursuance of previous leave, presented the views of a minority of the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; which were ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 3, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOEN: A bill (H. R. 4925) providing for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4926) to regulate assessments of real estate in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 4927) to facilitate the collection of State, county, and municipal taxes assessed against railroads and railroad property in the hands of receivers, and to limit the application of the word "citizen" as occurring in the Judiciary act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 4928) to amend chapter 70, Supplement to Revised Statutes, granting pensions to Mexican soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STORER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 104) to reopen negotiations with Nicaragua and Costa Rica—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: A resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for certain information concerning the landing of and use of naval troops at the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAIR: A resolution instructing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate the Hawaiian Island controversy, and report same to House by resolution or otherwise—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 4929) for the relief of Francis Scala—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 4930) for the relief of Medical Director Francis M. Gunnell—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: A bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of John Calvert, of Sullivan County, Ind.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 4932) for the relief of Benjamin Peter Bailey, treasurer of the Missouri State Lunatic Asylum—to the Committee on War Claims

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4933) for the relief of the estate of John G. Sammis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Indiana: A bill (4934) to correct military record of Charles G. Douglass—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4935) granting a pension to Louisa C. Conwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (4936) granting a pension to Adam King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 4937) for the relief of Cynthia Baker, of Benton County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) for the relief of John N. Hays, of Benton County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) for the relief of William R. Clark, administrator of James W. Clark, deceased, of Benton County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) for the relief of Edward A. Scott, of Crawford County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOODNIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4941) for the relief of Don Carlos Buell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 4942) to pension Sadie M. Jungerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4943) for the relief of Rufus M. Carden—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 4944) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Tucker, late of Lafourche Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) for the relief of the estate of John P. Walter, late of Lafourche Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) for the relief of the estate of Edmund Rose—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4947) for the relief of Malinda McLendon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) to refer claim of Benjamin Jolly to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 4949) for the relief of Thomas W. Russell, Clarke County, Va., for supplies and stores taken or furnished to the military forces of the United States for their use in said county during the war for the suppression of the rebellion, as found due by the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: Petition of the Sayse Metal Company, of Bradford County, Pa., against the reduction of the duty on gold and other metal leafs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of McSherrystown, Pa., in favor of the reduction of the duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CADMUS: Petition of James Davidson and 57 other citizens of Paterson N. J., against reducing the duty on imported yarn—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of W. O. Fayerweather and 567 other employés of the Passaic Rolling Mill, of Paterson, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

Also, protest of James Hagan and 75 other citizens of Guttenburg, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of S. S. Evans, jr., and 540 other citizens of Paterson, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the employés of the Passaic (N. J.) Rolling Mill Company, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Kuhl and 131 other employés of S. Klaber & Co. Marble Works, Carlstadt, Bergen County, N. J., to arrest any lowering of duties on marble and bronze work—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anton Ehman and 7 others, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial signed by R. C. Koerber, of New York City, about the injustice of import duties on nuts in shell, and of almonds in shell and shelled almonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of the board of directors of the Westchester Free Hospital, of New York City, in favor of House bill 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the employés of the Sayse Metal Company, of Sayse, Bradford County, Pa., against the enactment of certain rates of duties named in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of labor, workingmen, and other

citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of certain merchants, jobbers, and dealers in playing cards, relative to the imposition of an internal-revenue tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINSMORE (by request): Petition for the relief of C. L. Lynch—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of the Bridal Veil Lumbering Company, of Oregon, protesting against any reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the officers and employés of the Tacony Chemical Works, of the city of Philadelphia, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTER: Papers in the pension claim of Andrew B. Kieth, of Company F, One hundred and twentieth Ohio Volunteen Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 400 workingmen, of Blairsville, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 600 workingmen of Leechburg, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolution of the Board of State Viticultural Commissioners of California, opposing reduction of tariff on raisins—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Board of State Viticultural Commissioners of California, protesting against the reduction of duties on wines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., urging the United States to construct a sewer through the military reservation in San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of J. H. Tobey and others, of Albia, Iowa, praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents a pound on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: Petition of Col. F. M. Work and 49 other ex-soldiers or sailors of the Union Veteran Legion, citizens of Grant County, Ind., for the enactment of the "per diem pension bill"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of a committee of the flax workers employed by the Boston Thread and Twine Company of Jamacia Plain, Mass., against the proposed reduction of the duty on flax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George F. Aufort and other cigar manufacturers of Cambridge, Mass., for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. W. Eunson and 234 men, employés of the American Net and Twine Company of East Cambridge, Mass., against any reduction of the duty on netting—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of 50 citizens of Bradley, S. Dak., protesting against the provision of the Wilson bill reducing the tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS: Petition of 1,143 working people of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 109 employés of the Stirling Mills, located at Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Memorial of citizens of Allegheny, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of citizens of Albany, N. Y., praying that a uniform duty of 35 cents a pound be levied on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the employés of the Tonawanda Iron and Steel Company, of Tonawanda, N. Y., protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Memorial of the employés of the Glasgo Iron Works, Pottstown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAUGH: Papers to accompany House bill 4919 for an honorable discharge of Charles W. Reinhardt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of J. L. Butler and others, in favor of a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of the Sayse Metal Company against the reduction of duty on gold and other metal leafs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of L. B. Moore and 57 others, of Tyringham, Berkshire County, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 3, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

MATTHEW S. QUAY, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 21, 1893, was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented the credentials of EPPA HUNTON, elected by the Legislature of Virginia a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 3, 1895, occasioned by the death of John S. Barbour.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will please come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. HUNTON was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. BLACKBURN, and, the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

LAND IN PORTLAND, OREGON.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of December 20, 1893, copies of all papers and correspondence on file relative to the claim of the city of Portland, Oregon, for a special assessment against certain lots in that city; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I have been quite actively engaged for some time in the preparation of a report with which I am charged by the Senate, and expected to have completed it during the holiday recess, but had not sufficient time nor strength to do so. I ask the consent of the Senate that I may be excused a portion of each day from attendance upon the sessions until the report is completed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARRIS. I did not hear the request.

Mr. PEFFER. The request is that I may be excused a part of each day from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate——

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. PEFFER. In order that I may complete a report.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not care to hear further explanation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Kansas is excused.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PEFFER presented petitions of Joseph Triollet and 2 other citizens of Great Bend; of John E. Semple and 2 other manufacturers of cigars of Beman; of 8 manufacturers of cigars of Lyons and Wichita, and of 4 manufacturers of cigars of Humboldt, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILSON presented petitions of Frederick J. Scott and 17 other cigar manufacturers; of M. W. Klotz and 6 other cigar manufacturers, of Columbus City, and of John Tauchert, cigar manufacturer, of Mount Pleasant, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented petitions of C. R. Robinson and others, of Grand Rapids; of Joseph Kirster and others, of Manistee; of Rybold Clausen and others, of Cadillac; of John Smith and others, of Bay City; and of Alfred W. Johnson and others, of Traverse City, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the board of supervisors of Marquette County, Mich., praying for the retention of the present duty upon iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Typographical Union of Lansing, Mich., praying for the purchase and control of the telegraph service by the Government of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MANDERSON. I present sundry petitions numerously signed by cigar manufacturers of Lincoln, Omaha, Seward, Hastings, Tecumseh, Osceola, and Hooper, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the Rutland (Vt.) Medical Club, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1153, to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. DAVIS. I present a large number of petitions of cigar manufacturers of Minnesota, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

A petition of Kasper Bros., of Faribault;
A petition of J. A. Sankup and others, of New Prague;
A petition of George Paul and others, of Granite Falls;
A petition of James P. Danby and others, of St. Peter;
A petition of Gotlieb Hansing, of Wells;
A petition of Jeff McClarney and others, of Wabasha;
A petition of Moiller & Co. and others, of St. Paul and Minneapolis;
A petition of William F. C. Gadan and others, of Cloquet;
A petition of Edwin Snodgrass and others, of St. Paul;
A petition of Charles Selling and others, of Albert Lea;
A petition of John Doeren and others, of St. Paul;
A petition of W. A. Foote & Co. and others, of Duluth; and
A petition of Spang & Walters and others, of St. Peter.

Mr. DAVIS presented the petition of William M. Davis and 18 other citizens, of Minnesota, soldiers of the late war, praying for a pension of 1 per cent per diem of service, in addition to allowances for wounds, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade and Stock Exchange of Duluth, Minn., praying for the retention of the present duty on iron ore; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against any change in the present import duty on barley and flaxseed; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Association of Libraries of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the public printing bill; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. ALLEN presented petitions of cigar manufacturers of Omaha, South Omaha, Fremont, Beatrice, McCook, O'Neill, Falls City, Plattsmouth, Fairfield, Holdrege, and Superior, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the overseers and operatives in L. L. Shaw & Co.'s cotton mill at Yarmouth, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS presented petitions of Humo, Hinxthal & Co., and other cigar manufacturers of Knoxville and Memphis, in the State of Tennessee, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a communication from the Carpenters 'Council, indorsing an appropriation of public money for the furnishing of employment to the deserving poor of the District of Columbia, and recommending the appointment of five additional building inspectors in the District of Columbia, to be selected from the ranks of practical mechanics; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of National Brotherhood Electrical Workers of America, Local Union No. 5, Nashville, Tenn., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition numerously signed by members of the Massachusetts Medical Society and also by prominent citizens of the county of Worcester, Mass., praying for the establishment of a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I also present a very large number of memorials signed by working men and women of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, and also in some instances against the special provisions of that bill. I move that the memorials be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The memorials were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

A memorial of 4 citizens of Bardwell's Ferry;
A memorial of 50 dealers and manufacturers of granite, of Quincy;
A memorial of the Central Labor Union of Lowell;
A memorial of sundry citizens of Attleboro;
A memorial of S. Schendel & Co. and 14 other citizens, of Boston;
A memorial of J. W. Connor & Co. and 5 employés, of Maynard;
A memorial of Ransom, Stimson & Co. and 21 employés, of Worcester; and
A memorial of S. B. Puffer, treasurer, and 51 employés of the Criterion Knitting Company, of Lowell.

Mr. VEST presented petitions of F. R. Rice and other dealers in cigars and tobacco, of Missouri, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of H. C. Schmidt, of New Haven, Conn., and a petition of five citizens of Bethel, Conn., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petition of Chester M. Fairbanks and 4 other cigar manufacturers of Nashua, N. H., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 18) for the protection of those parties who have heretofore been allowed to make entries for lands within the former Mille Lac Indian Reservation, in Minnesota, to report it back and recommend that it be indefinitely postponed, a House bill of the same character having already passed the Senate.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHIPMAN.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. J. Logan Chipman, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, 8,000 copies; of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Michigan, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco to be delivered to the family of the deceased, and of those remaining 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said J. Logan Chipman to accompany the said eulogies.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MUTCHLER.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. William Mutchler, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, 8,000 copies; of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco to be delivered to the family of the deceased, and of those remaining 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said William Mutchler to accompany the said eulogies.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1364) for the relief of F. F. White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 1365) to refund illegal internal-revenue tax collected of the late Alexander W. Baldwin as United States district judge for the district of Nevada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1366) for the relief of William J. Murtagh, late proprietor of the National Republican, of Wash-

ington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1367) to fix the rank, pay, and emoluments of the commander of the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1368) for the relief of the estate of M. H. Battle;

A bill (S. 1369) for the relief of Henry M. Green, of Fayette County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1370) for the relief of J. and J. Steal, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883;

A bill (S. 1371) for the relief of Charles O. Spencer, of Tippah County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1372) for the relief of estate of Jamerson W. Rice; and

A bill (S. 1373) for the relief of James Warr estate.

Mr. MANDERSON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1374) to encourage the study of elementary military science and tactics at institutions of learning in the United States; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1375) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah F. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1376) to limit the effect of the regulations of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOAR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain duties illegally exacted; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, pending the investigation ordered by resolution of December 21, directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into our relations with Hawaii, there should be no interference on the part of this Government, by moral influence or physical force, for the restoration of Liliuokalani, or the maintenance of the Provisional Government in the Hawaiian Islands, and that our naval forces should be used in said islands only for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens.

Mr. FRYE. I ask that the resolution may for the present lie on the table, and by and by I shall simply move to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and, on motion of Mr. COKE, referred to the Committee on Finance.

SIOUX INDIAN LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. KYLE December 21, 1893, as follows:

Whereas by Article XII of the treaty between the United States of America and different tribes of Sioux Indians, concluded April 29 *et seq.*, 1868, and proclaimed February 24, 1869, it was provided that "no treaty for the cession of any portion or part of the reservation herein described which may be held in common shall be of any validity or force as against the said Indians, unless executed and signed by at least three-fourths of all the adult male Indians occupying or interested in same;" and

Whereas the report made by the commission formed and acting under the two separate acts of Congress, both dated March 2, 1889, entitled "An act to divide a portion of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," and the other, the appropriation bill approved March 2, 1889, shows upon its face that it was signed by a number of adult Indians of the whole blood less in number than the three-fourths as provided in the said treaty proclaimed February 24, 1869, and that in order to obtain the necessary three-fourths aforesaid divers mixed bloods were solicited to, and were permitted to, and did sign such treaty made by the commission on the part of the United States, acting under said acts of Congress dated, as aforesaid, March 2, 1889; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States has decided, as it is claimed, that divers of the mixed bloods who signed as aforesaid such treaty made with said commission are not Indians in contemplation of law, and that they and their families are not entitled to any rights or privileges whatever in the land embraced in the cession to said commission, nor to any privileges whatsoever as Indians, and is about to cause them to be ejected from the so-called Indian reservations: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all orders, opinions, and directions that he has given in respect to the said mixed bloods or either of them, or to their families or any member thereof, together with copies of all reports, letters, documents, and written papers pertaining thereto.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, I wish to modify the resolution by striking out the preliminary statement contained in the preamble. I shall ask merely for the adoption of the resolution itself.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified.

Mr. KYLE. I believe the resolution was modified at the last meeting of the Senate by striking out the word "forthwith."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That modification has been made.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution as modified be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all orders, opinions, and directions that he has given in respect to the said mixed-bloods or either of them, or to their families or any member thereof, together with copies of all reports, letters, documents, and written papers pertaining thereto.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

DAVID B. GOTTWALS.

Mr. PUGH. I ask the Senate to take up for consideration a private bill, which will lead to no discussion and take but little time. It is Senate bill 439.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals.

Mr. PUGH. The object of the bill is to relieve a resident of the District from the operation of the law limiting the ownership of real estate in the Territories and the District of Columbia exclusively to American citizens. Similar bills which have been reported from the Judiciary Committee have passed the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 6, after the word "from," to insert "all forfeitures heretofore incurred by;" at the beginning of line 7, before the words "of an act," to strike out "operations" and insert "operation;" and in line 10, after the date "1887," to strike out "and all forfeitures incurred by the force of said act, in respect of such real estate, hereby remitted."

Mr. PLATT. Now, let the bill be read as it will read if the amendments shall be adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read as proposed to be amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all real estate lying in the District of Columbia, heretofore purchased by and conveyed to David B. Gottwals, of said District, prior to the passage of this act, be relieved and exempted from all forfeitures heretofore incurred by the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," approved March 3, 1887.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama why he does not provide for repealing the act which prohibits ownership in the District of Columbia of real estate by persons other than citizens of the United States? This is the second or third bill for the special relief of aliens who have invested large amounts of money in real estate in this District. Neither House of Congress has ever hesitated to grant such relief. Why should we be called upon from week to week and year to year to pass special bills giving relief in certain cases? I think the whole theory of the act as it now stands, to which the Senator proposes to make an exception, is wrong in principle. Why not modify the pending bill so as to repeal the former act, relieving, of course, from forfeitures which have been already incurred?

Mr. COCKRELL. I regret exceedingly to differ with the suggestion of my friend from Tennessee in the latitude of his expression. I, for one, hope that there will not be, without full discussion, any provision made which will authorize anybody in any place in the world to come to the District of Columbia and own real estate here. I am opposed to that policy.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to retard the passage of this bill, but I think the bill does not go far enough.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Gottwals is now a citizen of the United States. This bill is a copy of two or three like it, which, as the Senator from Tennessee says, neither House has ever hesitated to pass. I suppose that a general act, such as the Senator from Tennessee desires to substitute in the place of a special law, would re-

lieve everyone from the operation of the act, whether he was a citizen or alien. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. I think these bills ought to be passed in the interest of those who have become citizens of the United States since their investment. I do not suppose that in such a case Congress would hesitate to relieve the applicant.

Mr. HARRIS. Perhaps my statement was broader than I myself intended. This is what I mean: I chance to remember one case, of which I had charge, of a couple of gentlemen reared here in the city of Washington. They came here with their father when they were infants; they were active business men, who had invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in real estate in the District of Columbia; but when an abstract office was called upon for an abstract of title to certain real estate, which had come to them regularly by conveyance, it was ascertained that the father, with whom they came to this country as infants, had never been naturalized, and that therefore they were aliens technically, though they had been reared right here, identified with this community from their early boyhood, living here, and engaged in large business in the District. Whilst I would not open the door to aliens universally, I think some general law ought to provide for the case of actual residents who are engaged in business here and whose homes are here, whether or not they had been technically citizens of the United States. To that extent I do suggest that this bill ought to go.

Mr. PUGH. I understand the Senator does not object to the passage of the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. By no means.

Mr. PUGH. That is all I am after at this time. Any bill of the character the Senator speaks of will receive due consideration if introduced and referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS RELATING TO POSTMASTERS' ACCOUNTS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill (S. 1260) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, be taken from the Calendar and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department be taken from the Calendar and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKERELL. I move that the bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, be taken from the Calendar and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 4, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 3, 1894.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 21, 1893, was read and approved.

INDIAN RESERVATION, WYOMING.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, relating to the reopening of negotiations with the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians for the surrender of certain portions of their reservations in Wyoming; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting copy of the findings of the court in the following cases against the United States, namely: James W. Hill, Eliza Green, Thomas W. Russell, Malinda Stone, J. G. Phelan, and J. M. Patrick; which were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House bills of the Senate of the following titles; which were severally referred as indicated, namely:

A bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1045) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate four obsolete gun carriages to the city of Marshalltown, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 464) for the issuance of ordnance stores and supplies to the State of Nebraska, to replace similar stores destroyed by fire—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 121) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 104) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for a joint committee of three Senators and three members of the House of Representatives to examine into and report as to the condition of the Nicaragua Maritime Canal to Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CREDENTIALS OF A MEMBER-ELECT.

The SPEAKER. The credentials of Mr. Adams, of Pennsylvania, elected as the successor of the late Mr. O'Neill, have been received, but the Chair is informed that the gentleman is not present. The credentials therefore will lie on the table to be called up and read whenever the gentleman desires to be sworn in.

RESIGNATIONS OF REPRESENTATIVES FITCH AND FELLOWS, OF NEW YORK.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications; which were read, and ordered to lie upon the table:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 26, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: I beg to call your attention to my resignation as a Representative of the State of New York in the Congress of the United States, expressed in writing to the secretary of state, and a copy of which is inclosed. The resignation has been placed on file with the secretary of state of the State of New York.

I am, with great respect, yours, sincerely,

ASHBEL P. FITCH.

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 22, 1893.*

SIR: Having been elected district attorney for the county of New York to fill a term of office beginning the 1st proximo, I have transmitted to the governor of the State of New York my resignation as a Representative in Congress from the Fourteenth district of that State, to take effect on the 31st instant.

Very respectfully, yours,

JOHN R. FELLOWS.

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FITHIAN for ten days, on account of important business, and to Mr. BARNES for one week, on account of important business.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an arrangement this morning by which Friday and Saturday next will be set apart for the consideration of the Hawaiian resolution reported by the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and such amendments as may be offered thereto.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why not let it go over until we get some information from the Senate? I understand they are investigating the matter.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The Senate can take care of the matter as it chooses.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We have not had time to look into it in the House.

Mr. HITT. I can only say on behalf of those gentlemen with whom I have been able to confer, of the minority of the committee and others, that the substantial thing we desire being included in the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky—that is, a time being fixed for debate without further postponement—we are willing to have that arrangement or that understanding entered into.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the question of privilege submitted by me to this House before the recess——

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair was indulging gentlemen to see if they could make an agreement. If the gentleman calls for the regular order of course that cuts this off.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call up the question of privilege——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the regular order.

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). Being the resolution introduced by myself, setting forth that the rights and dignity of the House had been invaded by the Executive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will indicate the resolution.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, is not the regular order the bill to admit New Mexico, which was under consideration before the recess, pursuant to the special order of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] states that he calls up a privileged resolution. The special order referred to by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] is after the second morning hour. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] will indicate the resolution to which he refers.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The resolution introduced by me December 19, setting forth the fact that Executive communications to this House, accompanying the message of the President, disclose the fact that the rights and dignity of the House had been invaded by the executive department. I believe it is now numbered Miscellaneous Document 43.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration against this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order. The Chair was trying to find the resolution indicated. The Chair finds a report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of a resolution in lieu of Miscellaneous Documents 42 and 43. The Chair has not found out exactly which of these——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair please, I am not calling up anything from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I am calling up a resolution of record introduced by myself, recognized by the Speaker as involving a question of high privilege, and from which, of course, the privilege can not possibly be divested, except by action of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BOUTELLE. That resolution is in the possession of the House, and I now exercise my right, as I believe, of calling it up for consideration.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise the question of consideration, so that the House may finish the consideration of the bill to admit New Mexico.

Mr. MCMILLIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] will state it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Is it in order to raise the question of consideration, in order to go on with the tariff bill?

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly, the question of consideration can be raised; but the Chair was only seeking to determine exactly what the status of the resolution was.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, is this the resolution which the Chair referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The resolution was referred, but was reported back by the committee, the Chair thinks, with the recommendation that it lie upon the table, and with a resolution in lieu of it.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, that resolution has not, as I understand it, been reported back from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought it had.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported a resolution in lieu of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and in lieu of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], and the Speaker directed that the resolution of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] lie upon the table; and the resolution reported by the committee was put upon the Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, it makes no difference what the Committee on Foreign Affairs or any other committee of this House have attempted to do with that resolution. It is a resolution of privilege, and I have the right to call it up.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. Just as soon as the Chair can ascertain the status of the resolution the Chair will state the question. The Chair understands that the resolution referred to by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] was introduced by him and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; that the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported back that resolution with the recommendation that it lie upon the table, and reported in lieu of it a resolution which is on the Calendar.

Mr. TURNER. But, Mr. Speaker, in defining the parliamentary status of the resolution, is it not necessary to consider the question as to whether the Committee on Foreign Affairs had the power to report a substitute for two resolutions; and is it not true that the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs is an original resolution proposed by that committee, and that it is not technically a substitute for either of the other resolutions? And again, Mr. Speaker, I ask further, if the Chair will indulge me, whether the question as to its being a privileged resolution is concluded by the action of the Chair on a former occasion? If it is, I bow, of course, without dissent at this time.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the resolution was reported back on the call of committees for reports, and, being reported on the call of committees, it lost its privilege, and was so held by the Speaker when reported.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly impossible that it should lose its privilege on account of the action of a committee in reporting it or the time when it was reported. The decisions are uniform and numerous that a question of a privileged character can not be divested of its privilege except by action of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report from the committee, so that the Chair and House may understand what it is.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call attention to the fact that I am not calling it up on the ground of its having been reported by any committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is trying to ascertain whether the gentleman has the right to call it up. Certainly the gentleman does not understand he can call it back from the committee?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, certainly, that is exactly what I claim. I desire to call it up.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report of the committee.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report made by the committee on the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution introduced by Hon. ROBERT R. HITT, relating to intervention of United States Government in affairs of a foreign friendly government, and the resolution on same subject introduced by Hon. C. A. BOUTELLE, have considered the same and recommend that the accompanying resolution be reported in lieu thereof and the resolutions of Mr. HITT and Mr. BOUTELLE lie on the table, and that said accompanying resolution pass.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will permit the Chair to state the question, the gentleman need not have any apprehension that he will lose any right. There is no necessity for any haste.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I beg pardon of the Chair, but it seems to me that the Chair is entirely ignoring the form in which I am making my demand.

The SPEAKER. Not at all.

Mr. BOUTELLE. If the Chair please, the Speaker has just made the statement that this resolution, having been referred to a committee, can not be called up unless reported. Now, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to distinct rulings of the Speakers of this House that the fact that a privileged measure might be pending in a committee by order of the House could not impair the right of any member to call it up for disposition by the House.

The SPEAKER. That is not the question. If the gentleman will simply possess himself and let the Chair state the question——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I understood the Chair to state that that was the question.

The SPEAKER. The resolution of the gentleman from Maine was held by the Chair to be a privileged resolution. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Committee on Foreign Affairs have reported back the resolution with the recommendation that it lie on the table, and have reported a resolution in lieu of that, and recommend that the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], and the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] lie on the table. Now, the gentleman from Maine calls up from the Speaker's table, as a privileged question, the resolution submitted by him.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I understood it to be reported by the committee with a "recommendation that it lie on the table," but the House has never acted upon that recommendation.

Mr. TURNER. It is subject to the objection that it is not privileged at this time under the status which the Speaker has just defined.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on that.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, without going back to the question as to whether this was in the outset a privileged resolution, which the Chair seems to have decided and to which I

bow, and without in any wise challenging that decision, which was made, of course, in the haste of the moment, but accepting it as *res adjudicata*, the question is whether, after the resolution which the Chair had decided to be privileged had been reported, it retains its privilege when on the Calendar? I insist that, in the practice of the House and under a decision of the Chair on a former occasion, in this condition when the report was made it lost its privileged character and can not be called up in this way. I therefore make the point of order, and insist that it had lost its privilege on being referred to one of the Calendars of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to hear the gentleman on this point.

The question is not entirely free from doubt. There have been previous rulings, and the Chair does not design or intend to overrule them at all, that when a committee has the privilege of reporting at any time, and the committee exercises the privilege by reporting during the call of committees for reports, the privilege of calling up afterwards the resolution for consideration as a question of privilege is waived or lost.

But the Chair is inclined to think that the privilege that is thus lost is that privilege only which is given to the committee. In the case of a resolution which is itself privileged without any regard to what committee it might be referred, a case where the privilege attached not to the committee, nor even to the committee and the resolution together, but to the resolution itself, the Chair does not think it loses its privilege because reported during the call; because if it did, then a committee, by exercising its right to report a privileged resolution during the call of committees, could deprive the House of the right to consider it as a privileged matter.

A contested-election case is regarded as matter of the highest privilege, involving the right of a member to his seat. Such a case is referred, under the rule, to the Committee on Elections and that committee make a report upon it. They may make the report during the call of committees if they desire to doso—there is nothing to prevent it—or they may make the report at any other time. But whenever a contested-election case is put upon the Calendar it may be called up by any member of the House.

It is not necessarily called up by the committee, for it has been repeatedly held that any member of the House may at any time call it up as a privileged question, unless some question of higher privilege is pending, and that the House will then proceed to consider it unless the question of consideration is raised and the House determines that it will not consider it. Therefore, inasmuch as the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has been decided to be privileged, has been referred to a committee, and has been reported back from that committee with the recommendation that it lie upon the table, and is now in the House and not in the committee, the Chair thinks the gentleman has a right to call it up as a question of privilege. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] calls up the resolution and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] raises the question of consideration against it.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I also raise the question of consideration, and give notice that I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 353) for the admission of New Mexico.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I know the Chair will indulge me in a semireply to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER]. I desire to remind him that in the Forty-eighth Congress Mr. TURNER of Georgia——

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe debate is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I simply wish to remind the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] that in the Forty-ninth Congress, on his own motion, Mr. Speaker Carlisle ruled that even a contested-election case could be called up as a matter of privilege while it was in the hands of the Committee on Elections, and the Rhode Island case was so called up.

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order. The Clerk will report the resolution called up by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And I hold in my hands numerous other precedents in the same line.

The resolution was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 19, 1893.*

Mr. BOUTELLE submitted the following, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Whereas the executive communications just read to this House clearly disclose that the rights and dignity of the House of Representatives, as a coördinate branch of the Congress of the United States, have been invaded by the executive department, in furnishing secret instructions to a minister plenipotentiary of the United States to conspire with the representatives of a deposed and discredited monarchy for the subversion and overthrow of the established republican government to which he was accredited, and to which his public instructions pledged the good faith and sympathy of the President, the Government, and the people of the United States: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that any intervention by the Executive of the United States, its civil or military representatives, without authority of Congress, in the internal affairs of a friendly recognized government, to disturb or overthrow it, and to aid or abet the substitution or restoration of a monarchy therefor, is contrary to the policy and traditions of the Republic and the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and can not be too promptly or emphatically reprobated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] calls up the resolution just read, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] raises the question of consideration.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand that any gentleman on that side of the House raises the question of consideration on this resolution?

Mr. MCMILLIN. I raise the question of consideration, Mr. Speaker; my object being to go on with the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Are you afraid to meet this question?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I raise the question of consideration, and give notice to the House that I desire to call up the bill for the admission of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order so that the Chair may state the question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] will withdraw the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine is not in order.

Mr. MCMILLIN. We are not afraid to meet this question; but I will say to the gentleman from Maine that there are other more important questions pending before the House.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] raises the question of consideration, with a view to taking up the tariff bill. I would like to know now if we can agree to devote Friday and Saturday of this week to the consideration of the Hawaiian resolutions. I want to show the gentleman from Maine that we are ready to take up that question on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for me to say a word, as it seems to be always in order for the gentleman from Kentucky to speak—I do not know that it is in order for me to say a word; I hope it is—I simply wish to say to him that he does not raise the same question that I do. I have brought in here a distinctive proposition upon which I want the judgment of this House, and I hold in my hand a large number of precedents, all of which set forth the doctrine that when a question of privilege of this kind is raised it is the right of the House and the right of the member to have it decided by the House.

Now, the gentleman from Kentucky has seen fit to evolve from the Committee on Foreign Affairs some procedure with which I have nothing to do. The matter he has brought in here is not even privileged. The resolution reported by the majority of that committee is simply a declaration and not of a privileged nature, while the resolution recommended by the minority in lieu of mine is not based upon a violation of the privileges of this House, but sets forth that it is the sense of the House that the rights of Congress have been interfered with. I supposed that the gentlemen on that committee might be aware of the fact that the parliamentary privileges of Congress appertain to each of the respective Houses, and not to Congress as a whole.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

Mr. BLAND. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] demands the regular order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire a square vote.

The SPEAKER. This demand cuts off all debate.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want a square vote on my proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine calls up for consideration the resolution which has just been read; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] raises the question of consideration. The question is, Will the House proceed to consider the resolution?

Mr. BOUTELLE. On that question I call for a division.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 57, noes 126.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I demand tellers.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 3, nays 135, not voting 212; as follows:

YEAS—3.

Apsley,	Baker, Kans.	Davis.

NAYS—135.

Abbott,	Bailey,	Bell, Tex.	Blanchard,
Alderson,	Baldwin,	Beltzhoover,	Bland,
Alexander,	Barwig,	Black, Ga.	Brawley,
Arnold,	Bell, Colo.	Black, Ill.	Breckinridge, Ark.

Bretz,	Dockery,	Lisle,	Pearson,
Brickner,	Donovan,	Livingston,	Pigott,
Brookshire,	English,	Lynch,	Rayner,
Bryan,	Enloe,	Maddox,	Richards, Ohio
Bynum,	Everett,	Maguire,	Richardson, Mich.
Cannon, Cal.	Fyan,	Mallory,	Richardson, Tenn.
Capehart,	Geary,	Martin, Ind.	Robbins,
Caruth,	Grady,	McAleer,	Rusk,
Catchings,	Gresham,	McCreary, Ky.	Russell, Ga.
Causey	Griffin,	McCulloch,	Ryan,
Clarke, Ala.	Haines,	McDannold,	Sayers,
Cobb, Mo.	Hall, Mo.	McDearmon,	Sickles,
Cockran,	Hammond,	McEttrick,	Simpson,
Cockrell,	Hare.	McGann,	Snodgrass,
Coffeen,	Heard,	McKaig,	Springer,
Compton,	Henderson, N. C.	McKeighan,	Stevens,
Coombs,	Holman,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Cooper, Fla.	Hooker, Miss.	McRae,	Talbott, Md.
Cooper, Ind.	Houk, Ohio	Meredith,	Tarsney,
Cornish,	Hunter,	Money,	Tate.
Covert,	Hutcheson,	Montgomery,	Taylor, Ind
Cox,	Ikirt,	Morgan,	Terry,
Crain,	Johnson, Ohio	Mutchler,	Tracey,
Crawford,	Kilgore,	Neill,	Turner,
Culberson,	Kribbs,	Oates,	Warner,
Cummings,	Kyle,	O'Neil,	Weadock,
De Armond,	Lane,	Outhwaite,	Wheeler, Ala.
De Forest,	Latimer,	Paschal,	Whiting,
Denson,	Layton,	Patterson,	Wilson, W. Va.
Dinsmore,	Lester,	Paynter,	

NOT VOTING—212.

Adams,	Doolittle,	Hull,	Robertson, La.
Aitken,	Draper,	Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Pa.
Aldrich,	Dunn,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Russell, Conn.
Allen,	Dunphy,	Jones,	Schermerhorn,
Avery,	Durborow,	Joy,	Scranton,
Babcock,	Edmunds,	Kem,	Settle,
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Ky.	Kiefer,	Shaw,
Bankhead,	Ellis, Oregon	Lacey,	Shell,
Barnes,	Epes,	Lapham,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Erdman,	Lawson,	Sibley,
Bartlett,	Fielder,	Lefever,	Sipe,
Belden,	Fithian,	Linton,	Smith,
Berry,	Fletcher,	Lockwood,	Somers,
Bingham,	Forman,	Loud,	Sperry,
Blair,	Funk,	Loudenslager,	Stallings,
Boatner,	Funston,	Lucas,	Stephenson,
Boen,	Gardner,	Maguer,	Stockdale,
Boutelle,	Gear,	Mahon,	Stone, C. W.
Bower, N. C.	Geissenhainer,	Marsh,	Stone, W. A.
Bowers, Cal.	Gillet, N. Y.	Marshall,	Stone, Ky.
Branch,	Gillett, Mass.	Marvin, N. Y.	Storer,
Brattan,	Goldzier,	McCall,	Strait,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Goodnight,	McCleary, Minn.	Strong,
Broderick,	Gorman,	McDowell,	Sweet,
Brosius,	Graham,	McLaurin,	Talbert, S. C.
Brown,	Grosvenor,	McNagny,	Tawney,
Bundy,	Grout,	Meiklejohn,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bunn,	Hager,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Burnes,	Hainer,	Meyer,	Tucker,
Burrows,	Hall, Minn.	Milliken,	Turpin,
Cabaniss,	Harmer,	Moon,	Tyler,
Cadmus,	Harris,	Morse,	Updegraff,
Caldwell,	Harter,	Moses,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Caminetti,	Hartman,	Murray,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Campbell,	Hatch,	Newlands,	Wadsworth,
Cannon, Ill.	Haugen,	Northway,	Walker,
Chickering,	Hayes,	Page,	Wanger,
Childs,	Heiner,	Payne,	Washington,
Clancy,	Henderson, Ill.	Pence,	Waugh,
Clark, Mo.	Henderson, Iowa	Pendleton, Tex.	Wells,
Cobb, Ala.	Hendrix,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wever,
Cogswell,	Hepburn,	Perkins,	Wheeler, Ill.
Conn,	Hermann,	Phillips,	White,
Cooper, Tex.	Hicks,	Pickler,	Williams, Ill.
Cooper, Wis.	Hilborn,	Post,	Williams, Miss.
Cousins,	Hines,	Powers,	Wilson, Ohio
Curtis, Kans.	Hitt,	Price,	Wilson, Wash.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hooker, N. Y.	Randall,	Wise,
Dalzell	Hopkins, Ill.	Ray,	Wolverton,
Daniels,	Hopkins, Pa.	Reed,	Woodard,
Davey,	Houk, Tenn.	Reilly,	Woomer,
Dingley,	Hudson,	Reyburn,	Wright, Mass.
Doliiver,	Hulick,	Ritchie,	Wright, Pa.

No quorum voting.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. FORMAN with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

For this day:

Mr. GEISSENHAINER with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. STEPHENSON.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. POST.

Mr. TYLER with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. MONEY with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri with Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WISE with Mr. CURTIS of New York.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. HULL.

Mr. WELLS with Mr. HEPBURN.

Mr. REILLY with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. SOMERS with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. GOLDZIER with Mr. GILLET of New York.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois with Mr. CHICKERING.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. HOOKER of New York.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. BERRY with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, until the 9th instant.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 3, the nays 135.

Mr. BOUTELLE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. No quorum has voted.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll; when the following-named members failed to answer:

Allen,	Dunphy,	Joy,	Scranton,
Apsley,	Durborow,	Kem,	Settle,
Avery,	Edmunds,	Lacey,	Shaw,
Babcock,	Epes,	Lapham,	Shell,
Bankhead,	Erdman,	Lawson,	Sherman,
Barnes,	Fielder,	Lefever,	Sibley,
Bartholdt,	Fithian,	Lockwood,	Sipe,
Bartlett,	Forman,	Loudenslager,	Somers,
Belden,	Gardner,	Magner,	Stallings,
Berry,	Gear,	Mahon,	Stephenson,
Bingham,	Geissenhainer,	Marshall,	Stockdale,
Boatner,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, Ky.
Bower, N. C.	Gillett, Mass.	McAleer,	Strait,
Branch,	Goldzier,	McDowell,	Talbert, S. C.
Brattan,	Goodnight,	McLaurin,	Talbott, Md.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gorman,	McNagny,	Tawney,
Broderick,	Graham,	Meyer,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brown,	Grout,	Moon,	Tucker,
Bundy,	Hager,	Morse,	Turpin,
Burnes,	Hall, Minn.	Moses,	Tyler,
Cabaniss,	Hall, Mo.	Murray,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Caldwell,	Harris,	Newlands,	Walker,
Caminetti,	Harter,	Page,	Wanger,
Chickering,	Hatch,	Pendleton, Tex.	Washington,
Childs,	Heiner,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wells,
Clancy,	Henderson, Iowa	Perkins,	White,
Clark, Mo.	Hendrix,	Post,	Whiting,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Powers,	Williams, Ill.
Cogswell,	Hicks,	Price,	Williams, Miss.
Compton,	Hines,	Randall,	Wise,
Conn,	Hooker, N. Y.	Ray,	Wolverton,
Cooper, Tex.	Hopkins, Ill.	Reilly,	Woodard,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Ritchie,	Woomer,
Daniels,	Houk, Tenn.	Robbins,	Wright, Pa.
Davey,	Hull,	Robinson, Pa.	
Donovan,	Johnson, Ind.	Russell, Conn.	
Dunn,	Jones,	Schermerhorn,	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and five members have answered to their names.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That all leaves of absence are hereby revoked; that the Sergeant-at-Arms notify absent members by telegram that public business is suspended by reason of the absence of members and request their immediate attendance.

Mr. HEARD. I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee to permit a modification of the resolution so as to exclude from its operation those members who are absent by leave of the House on account of sickness. There are some gentlemen who are absent from that cause.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I think there will be no rigor exercised in carrying into effect the order of the House. It is very important that members should be here. We are anxious to get on with the public business. If the gentleman has any special case in view it might be excepted.

Mr. HEARD. I have not. I only desired that this resolution should conform to the usual language employed in such resolutions. I cordially agree with the gentleman in the purpose he has in view.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I think, as I have said, that there will be no rigor in executing the order of the House.

The question being taken, the House, on demand of Mr. BOUTELLE, divided; and there were—ayes 119, noes 28.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE and Mr. MCMILLIN were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 89, noes 4.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 1, not voting 199; as follows:

YEAS—151.

Abbott,	Bailey,	Bell, Tex.	Boutelle,
Alderson,	Baker, Kans.	Black, Ga.	Brawley,
Alexander,	Barwig,	Blanchard,	Bretz,
Arnold,	Bell, Colo.	Boen,	Brickner,

Brookshire,	Everett,	Lynch,	Richardson, Mich.
Bundy,	Fletcher,	Maddox,	Richardson, Tenn.
Burrows,	Fyan,	Maguire,	Robbins,
Bynum,	Geary,	Mallory,	Russell, Ga.
Campbell,	Grady,	Martin, Ind.	Ryan,
Cannon, Cal.	Griffin,	McAleer,	Sayers,
Capehart,	Hammond,	McCreary, Ky.	Settle,
Caruth,	Hare,	McCulloch,	Sickles,
Clarke, Ala.	Hayes,	McDannold,	Simpson,
Cobb, Mo.	Heard,	McDearmon,	Sipe,
Cockran,	Henderson, N. C.	McEttrick,	Smith,
Cockrell,	Hermann,	McGann,	Snodgrass,
Coffeen,	Hilborn,	McKaig,	Somers,
Compton,	Holman,	McKeighan,	Sperry,
Coombs,	Hooker, Miss.	McMillin,	Springer,
Cooper, Fla.	Hopkins, Ill.	McRae,	Stone, W. A.
Cooper, Ind.	Houk, Ohio	Meredith,	Strong,
Cornish,	Hulick,	Money,	Swanson,
Cox,	Hunter,	Montgomery,	Talbott, Md.
Crain,	Hutcheson,	Morgan,	Tarsney,
Crawford,	Ikirt,	Mutchler,	Tate,
Culberson,	Johnson, Ind.	Neill,	Taylor, Ind.
Cummings,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Oates,	Terry,
Davis,	Johnson, Ohio	O'Neil,	Tracey,
De Armond,	Kiefer,	Outhwaite,	Turner,
De Forest,	Kilgore,	Page,	Warner,
Denson,	Kribbs,	Patterson,	Weadock,
Dingley,	Kyle,	Paynter,	Wheeler, Ala.
Dockery,	Lane,	Pearson,	Whiting,
Donovan,	Latimer,	Pence,	Wilson, Ohio
Ellis, Ky.	Layton,	Pigott,	Wilson, Wash.
Ellis, Oregon	Linton,	Price,	Wilson, W. Va.
English,	Lisle,	Rayner,	Wright, Mass.
Enloe,	Livingston,	Richards, Ohio	

NAYS—1.

Bowers, Cal.

NOT VOTING—199.

Adams, Ky.	Covert,	Hines,	Reed,
Adams, Pa.	Curtis, Kans.	Hitt,	Reilly,
Aitken,	Curtis, N. Y.	Hooker, N. Y.	Reyburn,
Aldrich,	Dalzell,	Hopkins, Pa.	Ritchie,
Allen,	Daniels,	Houk, Tenn.	Robertson, La.
Apsley,	Davey,	Hudson,	Robinson, Pa.
Avery,	Dinsmore,	Hull,	Rusk,
Babcock,	Dolliver,	Jones,	Russell, Conn.
Baker, N. H.	Doolittle,	Joy,	Schermerhorn,
Baldwin,	Draper,	Kem,	Scranton,
Bankhead,	Dunn,	Lacey,	Shaw,
Barnes,	Dunphy,	Lapham,	Shell,
Bartholdt,	Durborow,	Lawson,	Sherman,
Bartlett,	Edmunds,	Lefever,	Sibley,
Belden,	Epes,	Lester,	Stallings,
Belzhoover,	Erdman,	Lockwood,	Stephenson,
Berry,	Fielder,	Loud,	Stevens,
Bingham,	Fithian,	Loudenslager,	Stockdale,
Black, Ill.	Forman,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Blair,	Funk,	Magner,	Stone, Ky.
Bland,	Funston,	Mahon,	Storer,
Boatner,	Gardner,	Marsh,	Strait,
Bower, N. C.	Gear,	Marshall,	Sweet,
Branch,	Geissenhainer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Talbert, S. C.
Brattan,	Gillet, N. Y.	McCall,	Tawney,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Gillett, Mass.	McCleary, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Goldzier,	McDowell,	Thomas,
Broderick,	Goodnight,	McLaurin,	Tucker,
Brosius,	Gorman,	McNagny,	Turpin,
Brown,	Graham,	Meiklejohn,	Tyler,
Bryan,	Gresham,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Bunn,	Grosvenor,	Meyer,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Burnes,	Grout,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Cabaniss,	Hager,	Moon,	Wadsworth,
Cadmus,	Hainer,	Morse,	Walker,
Caldwell,	Haines,	Moses,	Wanger,
Caminetti,	Hall, Minn.	Murray,	Washington,
Cannon, Ill.	Hall, Mo.	Newlands,	Waugh,
Caschings,	Harmer,	Northway,	Wells,
Causey,	Harris,	Paschal,	Wever,
Chickering,	Harter,	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Childs,	Hartman,	Pendleton, Tex.	White,
Clancy,	Hatch,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Williams, Ill.
Clark, Mo.	Haugen,	Perkins,	Williams, Miss.
Cobb, Ala.	Heiner,	Phillips,	Wise,
Cogswell,	Henderson, Ill.	Pickler,	Wolverton,
Conn,	Henderson, Iowa	Post,	Woodard,
Cooper, Tex.	Hendrix,	Powers,	Woomer,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Randall,	Wright, Pa.
Cousins,	Hicks,	Ray,	

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

During the roll call the following proceedings took place:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will suspend the call for a moment, and if there be no objection the Chair will administer the oath to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Adams] elected to fill the vacancy from the Second district of the State of Pennsylvania, caused by the death of the late Mr. O'Neill.

There being no objection, the credentials were read, and Mr. Adams, having appeared at the bar of the House, was duly qualified, taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

The roll call was then resumed and concluded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. HALL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported the bill (H. R. 4419) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to issue a patent for Mace Clements's survey, No. 386, in the Virginia military district of Ohio; which, with the accompanying report (No. 246), was delivered to the Clerk, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a resolution of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 4950) to amend section 553 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 4951) to extend the limits and laws of the Territory of Oklahoma, and to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4953) to provide for the command of combined forces of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4954) relative to recognizances, stipulations, bonds, and undertakings, and to allow certain corporations to be accepted as surety thereon—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (by request): A bill (H. R. 4955) to provide revenue for the support of the Government by a tax upon incomes from invested wealth—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 4956) directing the coinage of the silver bullion held in the Treasury, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4957) providing for a Territorial library for Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi (by request): A bill (H. R. 4958) making an appropriation for the Anacostia statue of George Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 4959) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in suppression of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A bill (H. R. 4960) to provide a national currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GEARY: A bill (H. R. 4961) granting certain rights over Lime Point military reservation, in the State of California—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 105) exempting pumping boats from keeping licensed engineers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 4962) to restore to the pension roll Sarah Beck, widow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) for the relief of Benjamin F. Poteet—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 4964) for the relief of the estate of A. Underwood, late of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 4965) to increase the pension of James W. McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEARMON: A bill (H. R. 4966) for the relief of William Crews, of Gibson County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1883—to Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A bill (H. R. 4967) granting a pension to Alice K. Potter, widow of Gen. Joseph H. Potter, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 4968) for relief of the heirs at law of William H. Muse—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4969) for the relief of Leonard G. Faxon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of Mary E. Wiles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4971) for the relief of Mary E. Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) for the relief of C. M. Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) for the relief of William Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) for the relief of Houston L. Bell, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) for the relief of T. C. Greenhill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) for the relief of Mrs. S. Elizabeth Lauderdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) for the relief of T. W. Townsend and wife—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel M. Weaver, administrator of the estate of George W. Yackley, deceased—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN: Petition of citizens of Duluth, Minn., requesting no reduction in import duties on barley and its products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of farmers of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, protesting against the reduction of import duties on foreign-grown barley and flaxseed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar manufacturers, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Duluth Board of Trade, protesting against placing iron ore on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Duluth Stock Exchange, against reduction of duty on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Petition of the employés of the Mascoma Flannel Company, of Lebanon, N. H., protesting against the passage of House bill 4864, called the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of C. M. Fairbanks and others, cigar manufacturers of Nashua, N. H., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Pueblo and Bessemer, Colo., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAIR: Remonstrance of John H. Mate and 290 others, employés in Sawyer's Woolen Mills, Dover, N. H., comprising all but 7 now at work, the mills running at about one-half capacity, who protest against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, because it will throw them out of work or reduce their wages to the level of those in Europe—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of I. M. Clark and P. H. Hughes and 155 others, employés of the Gilmarton (hosiery) Mills, of Belmont, N. H., praying for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Charles W. Rogers and 533 others, citizens of the town of New Market, N. H., who believe that their interests are closely connected with the prosperity of their cotton-manufacturing industry, against any reduction of the duty on manufactured cotton goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of 630 persons engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel at Joliet, Ill., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Petition of the employés of the Bound Brook Woolen Mills, Bound Brook, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the employés of the E. R. Artman Treechler Carpet Company of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of McIlvaine Brothers, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and others, recommending new section as a substitute for section 468 in the free-list schedule of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of manufacturers of gold, silver, aluminum, and metal leaf, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any change in the specific duty now protecting the industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of employés of George Prince, manufacturer of worsted coating and cloaking, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of E. Sutro's Richmond Hosiery Mills and Indelible Dye Works, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of Thomas Potter Jones & Co., oilcloth manufacturers, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of Messrs. Swire & Scott, of Philadelphia, Pa., carpet manufacturers, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of Benjamin W. Greer, Bellevue Worsted Mills, of Germantown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of Woodcock, Hall & Co., of Germantown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the employés of W. B. Threapleton, hosiery manufacturers, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTMAN (by request): Resolutions relating to Union Pacific and Southern Pacific Railroads—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. HARTER: Papers in the pension case of Andrew B. Keith, of Company F, One hundred and twentieth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Papers from Messrs. John T. Hancock & Sons, Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper from George W. Miller, Waterloo, Iowa, antagonizing the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of A. F. Foll and 75 other citizens of Lena, Ill., protesting against any reduction in the import duty on barley and its products; also against any ad valorem duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John P. Dixon and others, of Pecatonica, Ill., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Walton and 115 others, employés of the Rockford Mitten and Hosiery Company, of Rockford, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of 125 citizens of Muncie, Delaware County, Ind., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 145 citizens of New Castle, Henry County, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By LACEY: Petition of M. A. Mantz and others, of Iowa, for revision of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Francis Fritz and others, for uniform duty of 35 cents a pound on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. Stork and other makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of merchants, jobbers, and dealers in playing cards, against revenue tax of 10 cents per pack on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest against the extension of time of the Pacific Short Line Bridge Company of Dakota County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Remonstrances of C. F. Rochester and others against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Kane & Stuber and others, of Gardiner, Me., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Petition of John A. Miller Post, No. 592, Gahanna, Ohio, urging an investigation of the administration of the Pension Bureau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of Victor I. Wuest, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and 48 others, manufacturers and makers of cigars, asking for a uniform rate of 35 cents duty per pound upon all unstemmed leaf-tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Iroquoise Post, No. 89, Grand Army of the

Republic, Iroquoise, S. Dak., asking for the enactment of a law that will enable the Commissioner of Pensions to examine all claims for pensions by the 31st day of December, 1894—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of employés of William Woods & Co., Pequea Mills, Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of Hastings & Co., Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of Messrs. Powell & Bro., manufacturers of seamless hosiery, Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of Richard Hoy & Son, manufacturers, Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Protest of 65 citizens and employés of the Port Chester (N. Y.) Nut and Bolt Works against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of a mass meeting in Yonkers, N. Y., praying for an increased duty on carpets and on hats and caps over that proposed in the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the employés of Vernon Woolen Company, of Vernon, Conn., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hop River Webbing Mills against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New Britain Knitting Company, of New Britain, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Atlenaugan and Ballou Mills against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers of East Windsor, Hartford County, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers of Granby, Hartford County, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of the Hopewell Woolen Mills, of Hopewell, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the overseers and operators of the L. W. Carroll Mill, Griswold, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, five petitions of farmers, growers of cigar-leaf tobacco, of Wethersfield, Hartford County, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the overseers and operators of the Briggs Manufacturing Company, of Voluntown, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 45 farmers, growers of leaf tobacco, citizens of Hartford County, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of 23 farmers, growers of leaf tobacco, of Windsor, Hartford County, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Health Underwear Company, of Poquonock, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of cigar-makers of Bradford, Pa., in favor of a uniform duty of 35 cents per pound on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of F. H. Steber & Co., of Warren, Pa., in favor of a tax of $1 per pound on Sumatra and other imported leaf tobacco for wrapper purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Memorial of citizens of Pennsylvania against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial signed by 1,200 citizens of Natrona, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of the brewers and maltsters of Albany, N. Y., asking that the rates on barley and malt as fixed in the Wilson bill become law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAUGH: Petition of James M. Stewart and 5 other citizens of Frankfort, Ind., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 4, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

W. L. HARDY AND OTHERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State, submitted in compliance with the resolution of October 17 last, in the matter of the claim of certain persons against the Government of Spain for illegal arrest off the coast of Yucatan in the year 1850 and subsequent imprisonment.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 4, 1894.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, recommending an amendment to the bill (H. R. 4292) regarding the purchase of supplies for the Departments in Washington; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the commission negotiating with the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians for surrender of certain portions of their reservation in Wyoming; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, calling attention to the large sums due the United States from Utah for support of United States convicts in that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present the memorial of a large number of employés of the A. P. Olzendam Hosiery Company, of Manchester, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Wilson tariff bill. The memorialists state that if the "bill should become a law it would have a most disastrous effect upon the industry which gives them employment. Those among us who have worked in Europe know that the prices paid for labor in Europe are so much lower than the prices paid for the same labor in this country, that if foreign-made goods were admitted to this country at such a rate of duty as the Wilson bill would give them, it would have the effect of either throwing us out of work entirely, or else of cutting down our wages to about the same rate as is paid in Europe."

The memorialists further desire to inform Congress "that if we are thus deprived of our means of earning a livelihood, or if we are obliged to work for reduced wages, we will hold those responsible who vote for the bill; and we hereby assert most positively that, irrespective of former party affiliations, we will vote and work against the election of any member who will favor a bill that will cause such distress to the laboring classes."

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of F. P. Mills and 218 other citizens of Ishpeming, Mich., representing both political parties, praying that iron ore be not placed on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Edward L. Parker and 64 other employés of the Clinton (Mich.) Woolen Mills, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of Salliotte & Chittenden; of Ecorse & Evart; of the Detroit Stave and Heading Works; of Force & Dickinson, of Detroit; of J. H. Burrell & Co., of Wyandotte; of V. L. Parsons, of St. Charles; of E. H. Doyle, of Wyandotte; of the Grand Rapids Stave Company; of the Lowell Manufacturing Company, of Reed City; of the Vanlandeghem Stave Company, of Mount Clemens; of Shelley & Robertson, of Wyandotte; of A. B. Perkins & Co., of New Baltimore; of Calkins & Co., of Coldwater; of A. W. Dickerson, of Bannister; of C. E. Fenton, of Evart; of Liken, Brown & Co., of Wheeler; of A. M. Prouty, of South Haven; of A. J. Sager, of Climax, and of P. P. Bergen, of Portland, all in the State of Michigan; and also of Smith, Claggett & Co., and South Haven Hoop and Stave Company, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against placing staves and hoops on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Lansing (Mich.) Typographical Union, praying for governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Marquette County (Mich.) Board of Supervisors, remonstrating against the placing of iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the following petitions of tobacco manufacturers of Michigan, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

A petition of Alex. Herman and others, of Alpena;
A petition of J. M. Nagel and 4 others, of Cadillac;
A petition of Michael Carey and 3 others, of Iron Mountain;
A petition of William Strassburg and 2 others, of Detroit;
A petition of Isaac Cole and others, of St. Louis;
A petition of W. H. Mumby and others, of Corunna;
A petition of Henry Kapsdrinsky and 6 others, of Detroit; and
A petition of Theodore Pollins, of Detroit.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mariposa County, Cal., praying for a curtailment of the boundaries of the Yosemite National Park; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HALE presented memorials of John Houston, of Guilford; of the Carleton Mills Company, of Sangerville, and of the Walker's Woolen Mills, of Pittsfield, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of wool-growers of Nevada, Eastern Oregon, and Idaho, held at the court-house in Reno, Nev., September 20, 1893, remonstrating against any change in the tariff on wools and woolen goods; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented petitions of manufacturers of leaf tobacco of Merrill, Marshfield, Milwaukee, Kiel, Ahnapee, Oconto, Ashland, Rhinelander, Fond-du-Lac, Cedarsburg, Two Rivers, Wausau, and River Falls, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the John Pritzlaff Hardware Company, and other importers of tin and terne plates, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against any change from specific to ad valorem duty as proposed by the so-called Wilson bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Duluth (Minn.) Stock Exchange, remonstrating against any reduction of the existing duty on iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of cloak and clothing manufacturers of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cloaks and ready-made clothing; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of citizens of Manitowoc and Waterloo, Wis., praying for the enactment of certain tariff legislation regarding the pearl-button industry in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHITE of California presented memorials numerously signed by citizens of Santa Cruz County, Cal., and the memorial of E. R. Doyle and numerous other citizens of Monterey County, Cal., remonstrating against the repeal of the present bounty of 2 cents per pound upon sugar produced from beets, sorghum, or sugar cane within the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HILL presented the petition of Dr. O. W. Peck and other physicians of Otsego County, N. Y., praying for the establishment of a health bureau within the Treasury Department of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented a petition numerously signed by farmers of Suffolk County, N. Y., praying for the retention of the existing specific duty of 25 cents per bushel on potatoes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented memorials numerously signed, irrespective of party, by citizens of Eugene, Sparta, Sanger, Keating, Siuslaw, Scappoose, Prairie City, Aurora, Barlow, Heppner, Sherwood, Silverton, Perrydale, and Junction City, all in the State of Oregon, and of sundry citizens of Yreka, in the State of California, remonstrating against any change in the wool schedule; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Eugene, Oregon, remonstrating against any reduction of the existing tariff on wool, lumber, prunes, hops, and other agricultural products; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of William Hendershott, of Butteville, Oregon, praying for relief in the matter of his claim to certain lands in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Eugene, Oregon, praying that an appropriation of $25,000 be made for the improvement of the Willamette River in the State of Oregon, between Harrisburg and Eugene in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the memorial of Robert Brown and other citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., employés of the Farist Steel Company, remonstrating against any change in the present tariff laws; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Bridgeport (Conn.) Typographical Union, No. 252, praying for governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 758) extending the time allowed the Umatilla Irrigation Company for the construction of its ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, reported it without amendment.

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1349) authorizing the purchase of a portrait of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1055) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Edward N. Fish and others, for supplies furnished the Indian Service, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1377) for the relief of William Hendershott, of Butteville, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COKE introduced a bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 1379) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Arkansas River, at or near Van Buren, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHITE of California introduced a bill (S. 1380) for the relief of Matthew McGuirk, of Los Angeles, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1381) to provide for the restoration to the Society of the Twenty-second Michigan Infantry Volunteers two flags now in the War Department; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROCEEDINGS OF PAN-AMERICAN MEDICAL CONGRESS.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth of the proceedings of the Pan-American Medical Congress, held in Washington City, in September, 1893, under the authority of a joint resolution of Congress approved July 18, 1892, 10,000 copies; of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 4,000 for distribution by the Department of State.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate manuscript copies of the proceedings of the Pan-American Medical Congress, held in Washington City in September, 1893, under the authority of a joint resolution of Congress, approved July 18, 1892.

PAYMENTS TO COMMISSIONER BLOUNT.

Mr. HOAR. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be adopted.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate what sums have been paid from the Treasury to the Hon. James H. Blount for salary, services, or other expenses, as a special commissioner to Hawaii, together with copies of all orders, vouchers, or receipts for such payment.

And also to inform the Senate from what fund and under or by virtue of what appropriation or law the same have been paid.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution lie over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That 300 additional copies each of House Executive Documents Nos. 47 and 48, House Report No. 243, parts 1 and 2; and Senate Executive

Document No. 13, of the Fifty-third Congress, second session, embracing the Hawaiian correspondence, etc., be printed in pamphlet form to supply a present deficiency in the document room of the Senate.

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN ENROLLMENT.

Mr. GORMAN. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America (the House of Representatives concurring therein). That line 22, on page 2 of the bill (H. R. No. 3289) entitled "An act to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey," as enrolled by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, consisting of the following words, viz, "*And provided further*, That nothing in this act," which words were included in said bill by error in the conference report, be, and the same are hereby, stricken from said bill, and said bill is directed to be enrolled without said line and words.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator from Maryland if the bill has gone to the President.

Mr. GORMAN. It has not. It is still in the possession of the House of Representatives, and the object of the resolution is simply to correct a clerical error made in the conference, and to have the bill properly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 855) to amend an act granting a pension to Elizabeth Voss; and

A bill (H. R. 1141) to remove the political disabilities of Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, in the State of Georgia.

SIOUX INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. KYLE. I ask unanimous consent to move a reconsideration of the resolution passed yesterday touching the mixed-blood Indians, in order that I may make an amendment by the change of one word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the resolution was adopted will be reconsidered. The resolution is before the Senate and will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (as amended yesterday by striking out the preamble), as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate, copies of all orders, opinions, and directions that he has given in respect to the said mixed-bloods or either of them, or to their families or any member thereof, together with copies of all reports, letters, documents, and written papers pertaining thereto.

Mr. KYLE. I move to strike out the words "said mixed bloods" and insert "Sioux mixed-blood Indians."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the modification suggested by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LAND OFFICE HEARINGS.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That no register or receiver shall receive evidence in, hear or determine any cause pending in any district land office in which cause he is interested directly or indirectly, or has been of counsel, or where he is related to any of the parties in interest by consanguinity or affinity within the fourth degree, computing by the rules adopted by the common law.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of every register or receiver so disqualified to report the fact of his disqualification to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, as soon as he shall ascertain it, and before the hearing of such cause, who thereupon, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall designate some other register, receiver, or special agent of the Land Department to act in the place of the disqualified officer, and the same authority is conferred on the officer so designated which such register or receiver would otherwise have possessed to act in such case.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BERRY. The bill (S. 903) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification, is the same bill, and I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 855) to amend an act granting a pension to Elizabeth Voss was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1141) to remove the political disabilities of Charles Iverson Graves, of Rome, in the State of Georgia, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN W. LEWIS.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 71) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to John W. Lewis, register of the land office at The Dalles, Oregon, $521.97, being the amount of his maximum compensation in addition to his salary from April 17, 1890, to July 7, 1890.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. GRAY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Delaware whether his object in moving to take up the bill at this time is to allow some Senator to speak upon it, or to proceed to the consideration of it?

Mr. GRAY. My motion was to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Only for the purpose of allowing some Senator to speak?

Mr. GRAY. For the general purpose of consideration.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator that the views of the minority are not prepared, and will not be ready for some days yet; and therefore I did not expect the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill unless to accommodate some Senator who desired to speak upon it. In that view, of course, there will be no objection to the bill being taken up.

Mr. GRAY. I will say to the Senator that the understanding I had was that the views of the minority might be submitted at their convenience, and I had supposed that they would be submitted immediately after the holidays, or as soon thereafter as would be convenient to the members of the minority who wished to participate in that report; but I do not know that that is any reason why we should not proceed to the consideration of an important public measure, which may possibly take some time in its consideration.

It seems to me that it will be in the interest of the public business to proceed to the consideration of the bill at the present time. There is no objection, as I understand, to filing the views of the minority at any time when they are prepared.

Mr. CHANDLER. I know very well the majority of the committee make no objection to the filing of the views of the minority, and it is not material whether they are filed now or a week from now; but there are some Senators on this side of the Chamber who desire to debate the bill at considerable length.

Mr. GRAY. No doubt.

Mr. CHANDLER. And I wanted to ascertain from the Senator what was his object in seeking to have the bill taken up at this time.

Mr. GRAY. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I supposed there would be considerable debate on both sides of the Chamber, and that was the reason why I desired to have the bill taken up at this early day. My understanding was that the views of the minority would be prepared during the holiday recess and presented soon after our convening. There has been no majority report submitted with the bill, but the House bill has been merely favorably reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is mistaken about that. The chairman of the committee submitted a majority report, which consisted of the House report.

Mr. GRAY. No such report was made. The House report exists, of course, in print, and is accessible.

Mr. CHANDLER. I beg the Senator's pardon. The bill was reported by the chairman of the committee, the House report

adopted as a Senate report, and the bill was placed upon the Calendar.

Mr. GRAY. The House report has been in print for a number of months and has been, of course, accessible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. While I always wish to concede the greatest latitude to the minority of the committee of which I am a member, I do not see that there is any objection on the part of the majority and those having charge of the bill to proceeding now, with the understanding that the views of the minority may be filed hereafter. It is not a new matter at all; it is one which has been discussed in the other House and discussed in this Chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I do not ask for delay on account of the views of the minority.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator suggest a day that will be satisfactory for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. I was about to suggest to the Senator that, unless there is some Senator who desires to speak on the bill to-day, he defer his motion until Monday, when there will be no objection to taking up the bill.

Mr. GRAY. I will consent to that suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, and give notice that I shall move the consideration of the bill after the conclusion of the morning business on Monday next.

Mr. HOAR. I was about to suggest to the Senator from Delaware—it is not of much consequence on which day the bill is taken up—that I think perhaps it will be a little more convenient to some Senators on this side, or it would be to me if I am to take part in the debate, to have the bill stand until Tuesday, for a special reason. Monday is a day, especially after the Senate has already voted to adjourn over until Monday, which is pretty apt to be taken up by an accumulation of matters.

Mr. GRAY. Perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts might have some religious scruples about attending to business on Jackson day. Monday will be the 8th of January.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have kept before the country the example of that distinguished Democrat, both in the matter of submitting to the laws of the country in all parts of the Union, and also his very wise and admirable views on protection. Perhaps, therefore, the influences of Monday would be very good on everybody if we should take up the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. GRAY. It is to be hoped so.

Mr. HOAR. If it makes no difference to the Senator——

Mr. GRAY. Not at all.

Mr. HOAR. It would be a little more agreeable if he would defer his motion until Tuesday.

Mr. GRAY. So far as I am concerned, I will consent to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, and now give notice that on Tuesday next, immediately after the morning business, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes, being the bill which came from the House of Representatives, and which has been reported by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I shall then ask that the Senate proceed to its consideration and continue that consideration until a conclusion is reached.

DISTRICT WATER MAINS AND SEWERS.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 4571.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to hear a word of explanation in relation to that bill. I ask the Senator to explain its operation and what effect it will have.

Mr. PROCTOR. The purpose of the bill is to avoid the continual cutting up and repair of the concrete in extending service connections to houses. The bill will perhaps be best explained by the very brief report of the District Commissioners on Senate bill 872, which is identical with the pending bill from the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire the report read?

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to have the report read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. PROCTOR on the 3d instant:

The Committee on the District of Columbia have had this bill under consideration and recommend its passage. It is identical with Senate bill No. 872, and reference is made to the report on that bill, and also to the report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in favor of its passage.

[Senate Report No. 90, Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 872) "To make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia," report:

Your committee have considered the same and recommend the passage of the accompanying substitute bill. The substitute does not change the purpose of the original bill, but only the means of carrying it into execution. The reasons for the changes in the details of the bill are sufficiently stated in the report of the Commissioners, which is herewith submitted.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, September 29, 1893.

SIR: Senate bill 872, Fifty-third Congress, first session, referred to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for examination and report, requires modification in order to secure the result desired. There is no such thing as a "compulsory permit system for laying water mains," and the bill contains no provision for paying for the proposed connections, and no provision for crediting the assessments collected so as to reimburse the appropriations.

An amended form of the bill covering these points is herewith submitted.

The Commissioners strongly recommend the amended bill for favorable consideration. The object sought to be obtained by it is a worthy and a necessary one. For many years the law has required (paragraph 19, section 5, of the act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia, approved June 11, 1878) that the Commissioners shall require connections to be made with sewers and water mains before the pavements are laid; but the act furnished no means for carrying this provision into effect. It has consequently been a dead letter; the most the Commissioners could do was to notify property-owners that the pavement was about to be laid, and request them to make connection with the sewers and water mains, but in the general case this request has not been complied with, and new asphalt pavements have frequently been cut into and patched for sewer and water connections almost as soon as they have been laid.

If the bill becomes a law it will be a benefit to the District in preserving the pavements and macadam, and a saving to the property-owner of the expense of cutting and repairing the pavement or macadam.

It will also go far to obviate a difficulty, which is of frequent occurrence, growing out of the poor quality of the work often done in connecting with water mains; the service pipes frequently leak and the escaping water travels long distances under the pavement before reaching the surface, so that the pavement has to be mutilated in many places in order to trace the leak to its source. While the expense of these repairs falls on the property-owner, a patched pavement is never the equivalent of a new pavement. If the connections were put in by the District the work could be done with the same care that water mains are laid, and leaks in service pipes would be as rare as they now are in the mains.

Very respectfully,

MYRON M. PARKER,
Acting President Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN
of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GORMAN. Do I understand that the work to be done is to be paid for out of the general appropriations for the District, and then afterwards recouped by assessing the property-owners?

Mr. PROCTOR. That is the effect.

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to ask the Senator whether there is an appropriation sufficient for that purpose? Will the passage of the bill not necessitate an increase in the general appropriations for the support of the District?

Mr. PROCTOR. I did not hear the Senator's query.

Mr. GORMAN. The question I asked the Senator from Vermont was whether, under the provisions of this bill, the Commissioners would proceed to make the connections with the water mains running into side lots, and then assess hereafter for the improvement? I understand that is the provision of the bill. In the mean time I inquire what provision has been made for this work? Will it require an additional appropriation by the Government?

Mr. PROCTOR. I understand not. The assessment will be made immediately, and the payment by the property-owner will be put to the credit of the appropriation.

Mr. ALLISON. My attention has just been called to the bill. I do not see very well how the proposed improvements can be paid for out of the current appropriations, because there are no current appropriations which can be made applicable, unless other work on sewers is stopped. It seems to me that the bill might be amended in some form so as to carry an appropriation, or by providing that it shall not take effect until proper appropriations shall be made.

Mr. PROCTOR. The District Commissioners and the committee were of the opinion that the connections might be made properly and more cheaply while the work on the mains was going on, without additional appropriations; that in fact money would be saved and the expenditure recouped at once by the payment by the owner of the lot, which payment would go to the credit of the appropriation.

Mr. GORMAN. With the object the Senator has in view I am in entire sympathy, provided proper provision be made for carrying it out; but the suggestion I make to the Senator—I have not read the bill carefully—is that it would require an expenditure from some general appropriation already made, that there is no general appropriation available, and the passage of the bill would probably involve an increased appropriation at the present session. I hardly think that it is feasible, in the present condition of our affairs, to have an increase. Therefore I suggest to the Senator that he let the bill go over until Monday

next so that he may look into the matter and provide that the improvements shall be made, but that the money shall be levied upon the property-holders and paid into the Treasury, so as to meet the expense without looking to Congress for a further appropriation. With such safeguards I think the bill is wise.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator has stated the purpose of the bill and I think it is covered, but I think the suggestion of the Senator a proper one that the bill go over so as to give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to examine it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

STATUE OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN STARK.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 15) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BERRY. Let the bill go over. I object to its consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the bill goes over, I simply desire to say to the Senator from Arkansas that a similar bill appropriating $50,000 has passed the Senate three times I think. The proposition now is to reduce the amount to $40,000. It seems to me the Senator ought not to object.

Mr. BERRY. It is true that such a bill has passed the Senate the number of times stated by the Senator from New Hampshire. It is also true that I have opposed it every time it has been pressed. I do not believe in appropriating money in this way for statues in the States, or anywhere else in the country. I think at the present time, in view of the condition of the Treasury and the situation in the country, it is not well to appropriate money for such purposes. I am therefore opposed to the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator insist upon his objection?

Mr. BERRY. Yes; I should rather have it go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill goes over under objection.

UMATILLA IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. DOLPH. This morning the Committee on Indian Affairs reported a little bill to extend for two or three years the time for the construction of a ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The work has been delayed on account of the difficulty of obtaining money and the business disturbance. It is merely a local matter to which no one can have any objection. I ask that it be acted upon this morning, as there is urgency about the matter.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 15) extending the time allowed the Umatilla Irrigation Company for the construction of its ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time prescribed by the act of Congress of February 10, 1891, for the completion of the irrigating ditch or canal of the Umatilla Irrigation Company across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, is hereby extended for three years from said date

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. VOORHEES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 8, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1894.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONER.

John W. Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, reappointment, his term of office having expired September 9, 1893.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Perry T. Cumberson, of New Jersey, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, in place of Robert E. Bowne, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Tully Brown, of Tennessee, to be attorney of the United States for the middle district of Tennessee, vice John Ruhm, resigned.

ASSISTANT SURGEON IN THE NAVY.

Frank Clarendon Cook, a resident of the District of Columbia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, from December 22, 1893.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles F. Rankin, to be postmaster at Brewton, in the county of Escambia and State of Alabama, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Frisby B. Logan, to be postmaster at Yuma, in the county of Yuma and Territory of Arizona, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Thomas J. Davis, to be postmaster at Springdale, in the county of Washington and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Frank Bucholtz, to be postmaster at Fort Bragg, in the county of Mendocino and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

S. M. Dodson, to be postmaster at Santa Clara, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California, in the place of Benjamin Fish, deceased.

Fannie Ingram, to be postmaster at Monterey, in the county of Monterey and State of California, in the place of Jacob R. Leese, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

S. J. Mayock, to be postmaster at Gilroy, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California, in the place of Victor Bassigano, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

George E. Sawyers, to be postmaster at Santa Barbara, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California, in the place of Edward M. Hoit, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

George H. Clarke, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Summit and State of Colorado, in the place of George Baker, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Dan Flisher, to be postmaster at Silverton, in the county of San Juan and State of Colorado, in the place of Jacob M. Buzzard, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Marcus Leahy, to be postmaster at Central City, in the county of Gilpin and State of Colorado, in the place of Ambrose Bray, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

T. J. York, to be postmaster at Ouray, in the county of Ouray and State of Colorado, in the place of John F. Rice, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Leonard W. Chambers, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Morgan and State of Illinois, in the place of Cyrus W. Matthews, whose commission expires January 7, 1894.

Allen G. Clampitt, to be postmaster at Highwood, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

John Culbertson, to be postmaster at Delavan, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois, in the place of Roland J. Beatty, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

William Lee, to be postmaster at Casey, in the county of Clark and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Ephriam A. Ray, to be postmaster at Oregon, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois, in the place of Thomas A. Jewett, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

James F. Robertson, to be postmaster at Camp Point, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Samuel W. Taliaferro, to be postmaster at Roseville, in the county of Warren and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Ossian H. Cook, to be postmaster at Pendleton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Adam R. Ebert, to be postmaster at Hammond, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana, in the place of Marcus M. Towle, whose commission expires January 8, 1894.

David A. Fawcett, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lagrange and State of Indiana, in the place of John H. Rerick, removed.

Edgar A. Smith, to be postmaster at Converse, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster

for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

William D. Covington, to be postmaster at Lehigh, in the county of Choctaw, Ind. T., in the place of Mary E. Pettes, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

W. I. Branagan, to be postmaster at Emmetsburg, in the county of Palo Alto and State of Iowa, in the place of Almond W. Utter, resigned.

Joseph M. Bishop, to be postmaster at State Center, in the county of Marshall and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

John F. Kent, to be postmaster at Dows, in the county of Wright and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

James Parden, to be postmaster at Rock Valley, in the county of Sioux and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

W. C. Scrimgeour, to be postmaster at Belle Plaine, in the county of Benton and State of Iowa, in the place of William A. Hunter, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Martin G. Stiger, to be postmaster at Toledo, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa, in the place of Sidney C. Leland, resigned.

Arnold Smouse, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa, in the place of William G. Power, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Anthony Thoma, to be postmaster at Le Mars, in the county of Plymouth and State of Iowa, in the place of Arthur P. Brown, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Thomas M. Bixby, to be postmaster at Herington, in the county of Dickinson and State of Kansas, in the place of Charles N. Hull, whose commission expires January 9, 1894.

Clyde McManigal, to be postmaster at Horton, in the county of Brown and State of Kansas, in the place of Lucian H. Smyth, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Samuel B. Holmes, to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Franklin and State of Kentucky, in the place of James M. Saffell, resigned.

John W. Rout, to be postmaster at Stanford, in the county of Lincoln and State of Kentucky, in the place of Mrs. Pokie T. Courts, whose commission will expire January 9, 1894.

Charles P. Weaver, to be postmaster at Louisville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Kentucky, in the place of John Barrett, removed.

Thomas J. Lynch, to be postmaster at Augusta, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine, in the place of Walter D. Stinson, removed.

John A. Flannery, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Prince George's and State of Maryland, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Charles S. Ashley, to be postmaster at New Bedford, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Charles H. Gifford, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John E. Brown, to be postmaster at East Pepperell, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of George G. Tarbell, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Frederick L. Churchill, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Winslow W. Avery, whose commission expired March 26, 1893.

Ellis O. Drake, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Henry B. Story, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Michael J. Griffin, to be postmaster at Holyoke, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Charles B. Prescott, whose commission expired March 27, 1893.

Miss Louise Imogen Guiney, to be postmaster at Auburndale, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Carrie L. Bourne, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Ellen A. Meehan, to be postmaster at Brookfield, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Charles H. Giffin, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Merton Z. Woodward, to be postmaster at Shelburne Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Charles L. Merriam, whose commission expired March 26, 1893.

Jacob Baar, to be postmaster at Grand Haven, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan, in the place of Thomas A. Parish, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

George M. Deady, to be postmaster at Bad Axe, in the county of Huron and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Charles A. Downer, to be postmaster at Northville, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan, in the place of E. S. Horton, whose commission expires January 8, 1894.

John Fanning, to be postmaster at Albion, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan, in the place of Fred F. Hoaglin, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Arthur A. Henderson, to be postmaster at Newberry, in the county of Luce and State of Michigan, in the place of J. Stafford, removed.

John H. Hicok, to be postmaster at Flint, in the county of Genesee and State of Michigan, in the place of Geo. E. Newall, removed.

George S. Stout, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Missaukee and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Arthur J. Flynn, to be postmaster at Caledonia, in the county of Houston and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

John C. Edwards, to be postmaster at Yazoo City, in the county of Yazoo and State of Mississippi, in the place of J. E. Everett, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Ella Harris, to be postmaster at Hazlehurst, in the county of Copiah and State of Mississippi, in the place of C. C. Mathews, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Abner K. Northrop, to be postmaster at Pass Christian, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi, in the place of Mary Simpson, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Charles E. Hill, to be postmaster at Malden, in the county of Dunklin and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Edward W. Renkin, to be postmaster at Hooper, in the county of Dodge and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Charles T. Alverson, to be postmaster at Deposit, in the county of Broome and State of New York, in the place of Joseph White, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

George W. Apgar, to be postmaster at Ithaca, in the county of Tompkins and State of New York, in the place of Edmund E. Robinson, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Robert S. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Cuba, in the county of Allegany and State of New York, in the place of William J. Glenn, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

James C. Brophy, to be postmaster at Shortsville, in the county of Ontario and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1893.

Emerson S. Crandall, to be postmaster at Warrensburg, in the county of Warren and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

James Elliott, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Columbia and State of New York, in the place of George H. Shufelt, whose commission expired March 23, 1893.

Ernest T. Fletcher, to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, in the county of Franklin and State of New York, in the place of Edgar E. Burkley, resigned.

Melville Griggs, to be postmaster at Worcester, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1893.

Thomas P. Hefferman, to be postmaster at Dunkirk, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York, in the place of Clarence M. Reed, whose commission expired March 27, 1893.

John J. Hallohan, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Orange and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1893.

John J. Kane, to be postmaster at Sing Sing, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of John F. Jenkins, removed.

Treadwell B. Kellum, to be postmaster at Babylon, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, in the place of A. E. Hawkins, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

George Kirkland, to be postmaster at Onconta, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in the place of Charles F. Shelland, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

James A. McDonald, to be postmaster at Mamaroneck, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of William A. Boyd, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

John A. Rasbach, to be postmaster at Ilion, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York, in the place of Seth G. Heacock, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Camillus P. Rogers, to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, in the place of Philip Pearsall, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

John H. Warden, to be postmaster at Portville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1893.

John Whaling, to be postmaster at Carthage, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in the place of A. B. Westcott, deceased.

Rowan C. Charles, to be postmaster at High Point, in the county of Guilford and State of North Carolina, in the place of Edwin L. Ragan, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

William Bleckner, to be postmaster at Oak Harbor, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Allen T. Cowen, to be postmaster at Batavia, in the county of Clermont and State of Ohio, in the place of Edward B. Scott, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Charles E. Critchfield, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio, in the place of James Israel, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

James E. Montgomery, to be postmaster at Van Wert, in the county of Van Wert and State of Ohio, in the place of Amos T. Dailey, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Proctor E. Seas, to be postmaster at Orrville, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio, in the place of James W. Hostetter, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Charles A. Wyckoff, to be postmaster at Celina, in the county of Mercer and State of Ohio, in the place of John W. McKee, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Edward M. Young, to be postmaster at Gambier, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

John E. Malone, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Ellwood Griest, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

George B. Nye, to be postmaster at Ellwood City, in the county of Lawrence and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

John H. Stauffer, to be postmaster at Millersville, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

W. P. Walsh, to be postmaster at Smethport, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Ervin M. Kerns, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Albertis E. Parmenter, to be postmaster at Scotland, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota, in the place of William B. Robinson, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John M. Carroll, to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hill and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

William H. Dickson, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Red River and State of Texas, in the place of Thomas W. Gaines, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Dollie F. Thompson, to be postmaster at Pittsburg, in the county of Camp and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Emmett M. Morrison, to be postmaster at Smithfield, in the county of Isle of Wight and State of Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

John G. White, to be postmaster at Abingdon, in the county of Washington and State of Virginia, in the place of Lewis P. Summers, removed.

William P. Campbell, to be postmaster at Wellsburg, in the county of Brooke and State of West Virginia, in the place of James M. Jones, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Milford M. Smith, to be postmaster at Elkins, in the county of Randolph and State of West Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

J. H. Marcum, to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Cabell and State of West Virginia, in the place of Hamilton M. Adams, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Nelson H. Biddlecom, to be postmaster at Menekaunee, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Henry G. Ellsworth, to be postmaster at Barron, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Fred Myers, to be postmaster at Prentice, in the county of Price and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21, 1893.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles F. Ballweg, to be postmaster at Edwardsville, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

John Culbertson, to be postmaster at Delavan, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 4, 1894.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read, corrected, and approved.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. As my colleague, Mr. CONN, is reported as having been absent on yesterday, I desire to state that he was detained from the House in consequence of sickness.

EXPENSES REVENUE COLLECTIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriations for defraying the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FOND DU LAC INDIANS, MINNESOTA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Interior for the Fond du Lac Indians in the State of Minnesota; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

BUILDINGS, LOWER BRULÉ AGENCY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Interior to pay J. K. White for drawings for buildings at the site of the Lower Brulé Agency in South Dakota; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MILITARY SCHOOL, FORT RILEY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Interior for the artillery and cavalry school at Fort Riley, Kans., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HEATING MARINE BARRACKS, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Navy for heating the marine barracks at the navy-yards in Boston and Maine; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SAMUEL CASE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting papers in the claim of Samuel Case for costs in the case of J. H. Loftus, in the United States circuit court for the district of Oregon; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

HARBOR OF NEW YORK.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers relating to the act of Congress entitled "An act to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City;" which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

JUDGMENTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a report of the judgments ren-

dered against the Government by the circuit and district courts of the United States, received since February 28, 1893; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. LAWSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. TRACEY, for two days, to attend the funeral of a friend.

To Mr. SHELL, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. WOLVERTON, for three days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HARRIS, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. BRATTAN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report a telegram received by the Sergeant-at-Arms from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BRATTAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Say to the House I am too sick to leave my room. Impossible for me to go therefore. R. F. BRATTAN.

REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments: To fill the vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, occasioned by the expiration of the terms of Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, and Mr. HITT. The Speaker appoints Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, and Mr. HITT.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. J. Logan Chipman, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, 8,000 copies, of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Michigan, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco to be delivered to the family of the deceased; and of those remaining, 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said J. Logan Chipman to accompany the said eulogies.

Also:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. William Mutchler, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, 8,000 copies, of which number 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, which shall include 50 copies to be bound in full morocco to be delivered to the family of the deceased; and of those remaining, 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to have engraved and printed a portrait of the said William Mutchler to accompany the said eulogies.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That line 22 on page 2 of the bill (H. R. 3289) entitled "An act to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey," as enrolled by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, consisting of the following words, viz: "*And provided further*, That nothing in this act," which words were included in said bill by error in the conference report, be, and the same are hereby, stricken from said bill, and said bill is directed to be enrolled without said line and words.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask whether the privileged resolution that was before the House yesterday is not now pending, no action having been taken upon it?

The SPEAKER. It has not been called up this morning.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does it not come over from yesterday?

The SPEAKER. It does not. The proceeding fell with the adjournment.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution again for consideration, and I desire the House to make some disposition of it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I make the point of order that the call of committees having been commenced, and one committee having been called, that order can not be interfered with until it is exhausted.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, the call had not been commenced.

Mr. McMILLIN. It had been commenced. The Clerk had called one name.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] immediately after the call of committees for reports is concluded.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It makes no difference.

Mr. McMILLIN. It makes a difference as to the orderly procedure of the House.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees for reports. No reports of a public character were presented.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees for reports.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the resolution that was pending yesterday on a question of consideration. I desire that the House may take some action upon it, and dispose of it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I raise the question of consideration against the bill, in order to consider revenue bills.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I raise the question of consideration in order to call up the bill for the admission of New Mexico.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is it in order for a member to raise the question of consideration in favor of something else? Is not the proper motion simply to raise the question of consideration?

The SPEAKER. Any gentleman can raise the question of consideration. Of course the House can determine whether it will proceed to consider the question or not.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have been candid with the gentleman, and have stated to him what my object was.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order for a member to raise the question of consideration for a certain stated purpose.

Mr. McMILLIN. Oh, if we get down to infinitesimal points, I might make the point of order against the remarks of the gentleman in speaking upon a question which is not debatable.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] was entitled to raise the question of consideration simply: but he went beyond that, and I call him to order. He ought to set a good example.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], which he desires to call up.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that any intervention by the Executive of the United States, its civil or military representatives, without authority of Congress in the internal affairs of a friendly recognized government, to disturb or overthrow it, and to aid or abet the substitution or restoration of a monarchy therefor, is contrary to the policy and traditions of the Republic and the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and can not be too promptly or emphatically reprobated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] calls up this resolution for consideration, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] raises the question of consideration upon it. The question is, Will the House proceed to consider the resolution?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the House will take this matter up and dispose of it. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. BOUTELLE, there were—ayes 58, noes 124.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McMILLIN. To save time, I will ask the yeas and nays.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I make the point of order that it is not in order for a gentleman in making a motion to say "to save time I will make such a motion." [Laughter.] I call the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] to order.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 0, nays 150, not voting 201; as follows:

YEAS—0.

NAYS—150.

Abbott,	Bryan,	Cummings,	Haines,
Alderson,	Bynum,	Davis,	Hammond,
Alexander,	Cabaniss,	De Armond,	Hare,
Arnold,	Cadmus,	De Forest,	Harter,
Bailey,	Cannon, Cal.	Denson,	Heard,
Baldwin,	Capehart,	Dinsmore,	Henderson, N. C.
Bankhead,	Caruth,	Dockery,	Hines,
Bartlett,	Catchings,	Ellis, Ky.	Hooker, Miss.
Barwig,	Causey,	English,	Houk, Ohio
Bell, Colo.	Clarke, Ala.	Enloe,	Hudson,
Beltzhoover,	Cobb, Mo.	Epes,	Hunter,
Black, Ga.	Cockrell,	Erdman,	Hutcheson,
Black, Ill.	Compton,	Everett,	Johnson, Ohio
Blanchard,	Coombs,	Forman,	Jones,
Bland,	Cooper, Fla.	Fyan,	Kem,
Brawley,	Cooper, Ind.	Geary,	Kilgore,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Covert,	Gorman,	Kribbs,
Bretz,	Cox,	Grady,	Kyle,
Brickner,	Crawford,	Gresham,	Lane,
Brookshire,	Culberson,	Griffin,	Latimer,

Layton,	McMillin,	Pigott,	Talbott, Md.
Lester,	McNagny,	Rayner,	Tarsney,
Lisle,	McRae,	Reilly,	Tate,
Livingston,	Meredith,	Richards, Ohio	Taylor, Ind.
Lynch,	Money,	Richardson, Mich.	Terry,
Maddox,	Montgomery,	Richardson, Tenn.	Tracey,
Maguire,	Morgan,	Robbins,	Tucker,
Marshall,	Moses,	Russell, Ga.	Turner,
Martin, Ind.	Mutchler,	Ryan,	Tyler,
McAleer,	Neill,	Sayers,	Warner,
McCreary, Ky.	Oates,	Sickles,	Weadock,
McCulloch,	O'Neil,	Simpson,	Wells,
McDannold,	Outhwaite,	Snodgrass,	Wheeler, Ala.
McDearmon,	Paschal,	Springer,	Whiting,
McEttrick,	Patterson,	Stallings,	Williams, Miss.
McGann,	Paynter,	Stevens,	Wilson, W. Va.
McKaig,	Pearson,	Stone, Ky.	
McKeighan,	Pendleton, Tex.	Swanson,	

NOT VOTING—201.

Adams, Ky.	Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Robertson, La.
Adams, Pa.	Dalzell,	Houk, Tenn.	Robinson, Pa.
Aitken,	Daniels,	Hulick,	Rusk,
Aldrich,	Davey,	Hull,	Russell, Conn.
Allen,	Dingley,	Ikirt,	Schermerhorn,
Apsley,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Scranton,
Avery,	Donovan,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Settle,
Babcock,	Doolittle,	Joy,	Shaw,
Baker, Kans.	Draper,	Kiefer,	Shell,
Baker, N. H.	Dunn,	Lacey,	Sherman,
Barnes,	Dunphy,	Lapham,	Sibley,
Bartholdt,	Durborow,	Lawson,	Sipe,
Belden,	Edmunds,	Lefever,	Smith,
Bell, Tex.	Ellis, Oregon	Linton,	Somers,
Berry,	Fielder,	Lockwood,	Sperry,
Bingham,	Fithian,	Loud,	Stephenson,
Blair,	Fletcher,	Loudenslager,	Stockdale,
Boatner,	Funk,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Boen,	Funston,	Magner,	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Gardner,	Mahon,	Storer,
Bower, N. C.	Gear,	Mallory,	Strait,
Bowers, Cal.	Geissenhainer,	Marsh,	Strong,
Branch,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marvin, N. Y.	Sweet,
Brattan,	Gillett, Mass.	McCall,	Talbert, S.C.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Goldzier,	McCleary, Minn.	Tawney,
Broderick,	Goodnight,	McDowell,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brosius,	Graham,	McLaurin,	Thomas,
Brown,	Grosvenor,	Meiklejohn,	Turpin,
Bundy,	Grout,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Bunn,	Hager,	Meyer,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Burnes,	Hainer,	Milliken,	VanVoorhis, Ohio
Burrows,	Hall, Minn.	Moon,	Wadsworth,
Caldwell,	Hall, Mo.	Morse,	Walker,
Caminetti,	Harmer,	Murray,	Wanger,
Campbell,	Harris,	Newlands,	Washington,
Cannon, Ill.	Hartman,	Northway,	Waugh,
Chickering,	Hatch,	Page,	Wever,
Childs,	Haugen,	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Clancy,	Hayes,	Pence,	White,
Clark, Mo.	Heiner,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Williams, Ill.
Cobb, Ala.	Henderson, Ill.	Perkins,	Wilson, Ohio
Cockran,	Henderson, Iowa	Phillips,	Wilson, Wash.
Coffeen,	Hendrix,	Pickler,	Wise.
Cogswell,	Hepburn,	Post,	Wolverton,
Conn,	Hermann,	Powers,	Woodard,
Cooper, Tex.	Hicks,	Price,	Woomer,
Cooper, Wis.	Hilborn,	Randall,	Wright, Mass.
Cornish,	Hitt,	Ray,	Wright, Pa.
Cousins,	Holman,	Reed,	
Crain,	Hooker, N. Y.	Reyburn,	
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Ill.	Ritchie,	

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HATCH with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. WASHINGTON with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. FORMAN with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

For this day:

Mr. GEISSENHAINER with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. STEPHENSON.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. POST.

Mr. WELLS with Mr. HEPBURN.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. SOMERS with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. GOLDZIER with Mr. GILLET of New York.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois with Mr. CHICKERING.

Mr. CAMPBELL with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. LACEY.

Mr. BERRY with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. WISE with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. SETTLE, on this vote.

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, until 9th of January.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are none and the nays are 150. No quorum has voted.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The roll was called; when the following-named members failed to respond:

Adams, Ky.	Cooper, Fla.	Ikirt,	Russell, Conn.
Allen,	Cooper, Tex.	Johnson, Ind.	Schermerhorn,
Apsley,	Cornish,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Babcock,	Davey,	Lapham,	Shell,
Baker, Kans.	Dunn,	Lawson,	Sherman,
Barnes,	Dunphy,	Lefever,	Sibley,
Belden,	Durborow,	Lockwood,	Sipe,
Berry,	Edmunds,	Magner,	Somers,
Boatner,	Fielder,	Mahon,	Stephenson,
Bower, N. C.	Fithian,	Mallory,	Stockdale,
Branch,	Fletcher,	McLaurin,	Storer,
Brattan,	Gear,	Meyer,	Strait,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Geissenhainer,	Milliken,	Talbert, S. C.
Brickner,	Gillett, Mass.	Moon,	Taylor, Tenn.
Broderick,	Goldzier,	Murray,	Turpin,
Brown,	Goodnight,	Newlands,	Wadsworth,
Bunn,	Graham,	Page,	Washington,
Burnes,	Grout,	Pendleton, W.Va.	Wever,
Caminetti,	Hager,	Perkins,	Wheeler, Ill.
Campbell,	Hall, Minn.	Post,	White,
Chickering,	Harris,	Randall,	Williams, Ill.
Childs,	Hatch,	Ray,	Wilson, Wash.
Clancy,	Hayes,	Reyburn,	Wise,
Clark, Mo.	Hendrix,	Ritchie,	Wolverton,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Robertson, La.	Woodard,
Cockran,	Hicks,	Robinson, Pa.	Wright, Pa.
Conn,	Hopkins, Ill.	Rusk,	

The SPEAKER. The doors will now be closed; the Clerk will call the names of the members who have not answered, and on this call excuses will be in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana (when the name of Mr. CONN was called). Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. CONN] is absent on account of sickness. His absence yesterday was for the same reason. I therefore ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HEARD (when the name of Mr. HATCH was called). Mr. Speaker, I am advised by a constituent of Mr. HATCH that he is now sick and confined to his house at Hannibal, Mo. I therefore ask to have him excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HITT (when the name of Mr. STORER was called). Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STORER] was called away from the committee room this morning by indisposition. I therefore ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-three gentlemen have answered to their names.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs upon the motion of the gentleman from Maine, to proceed with the consideration of the resolution called up. The question is, Will the House proceed to the consideration of that resolution? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BOUTELLE. To ask whether the question does not come up on the question of consideration raised by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what the Chair has stated, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 4, nays 151, not voting 196; as follows:

YEAS—4.

Adams, Pa.	Boen,	McCall,	Pence.

NAYS—151.

Abbott,	Capehart,	Enloe,	Hutcheson,
Alderson,	Caruth,	Epes,	Ikirt,
Alexander,	Causey,	Erdman,	Johnson, Ohio
Arnold,	Clarke, Ala.	Everett,	Jones,
Bailey,	Cobb, Mo.	Fyan,	Kilgore,
Baldwin,	Cockrell,	Geary,	Kribbs,
Bankhead,	Coffeen,	Gorman,	Kyle,
Bartlett,	Coombs,	Grady,	Lane,
Barwig,	Cooper, Ind.	Gresham,	Latimer,
Bell, Colo.	Covert,	Griffin,	Layton,
Bell, Tex.	Cox,	Haines,	Lester,
Beltzhoover,	Crain,	Hall, Mo.	Lisle,
Black, Ga.	Crawford,	Hammond,	Livingston,
Black, Ill.	Culberson,	Hare,	Lynch,
Blanchard,	Cummings,	Harter,	Maddox,
Bland,	Davis,	Hayes,	Maguire,
Brawley,	De Armond,	Heard,	Marshall,
Breckinridge, Ark.	De Forest,	Henderson, N. C.	Martin, Ind.
Bretz,	Denson,	Hines,	McAleer,
Brickner,	Dinsmore,	Holman,	McCreary, Ky.
Brookshire,	Dockery,	Hooker, Miss.	McCulloch,
Bryan,	Donovan,	Houk, Ohio	McDannold,
Cabaniss,	Ellis, Ky.	Hudson,	McDearmon,
Cannon, Cal.	English,	Hunter	McEttrick

McGann,	Outhwaite,	Russell, Ga.	Taylor, Ind.
McKaig,	Paschal,	Ryan,	Terry,
McMillin,	Patterson,	Sayers,	Tracey,
McNagny,	Paynter,	Sickles,	Tucker,
McRae,	Pearson,	Simpson,	Turner,
Meredith,	Pendleton, Tex.	Sipe,	Tyler,
Money,	Pigott,	Snodgrass,	Warner,
Montgomery,	Rayner,	Springer,	Weadock,
Morgan,	Reilly,	Stallings,	Wells,
Moses,	Richards, Ohio	Stone, Ky.	Wheeler, Ala.
Mutchler,	Richardson, Mich.	Swanson,	Whiting,
Neill,	Richardson, Tenn.	Talbott, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Oates,	Robbins,	Tarsney,	Wilson, W. Va.
O'Neil,	Rusk,	Tate,	

NOT VOTING—196.

Adams, Ky.	Cousins,	Hopkins, Ill.	Reyburn,
Aitken,	Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Pa.	Ritchie,
Aldrich,	Curtis, N. Y.	Houk, Tenn.	Robertson, La.
Allen,	Daizell,	Hulick,	Robinson, Pa.
Apsley,	Daniels,	Hull,	Russell, Conn.
Avery,	Davey,	Johnson, Ind.	Schermerhorn,
Babcock,	Dingley,	Johnson, N Dak.	Scranton,
Baker, Kans.	Dolliver,	Joy,	Settle,
Baker, N. H.	Doolittle,	Kem,	Shaw,
Barnes,	Draper,	Kiefer,	Shell,
Bartholdt,	Dunn,	Lacey,	Sherman,
Belden,	Dunphy,	Lapham,	Sibley,
Berry,	Durborow,	Lawson,	Smith,
Bingham,	Edmunds,	Lefever,	Somers,
Blair,	Ellis, Oregon	Linton,	Sperry,
Boatner,	Fielder,	Lockwood,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Fithian,	Loud,	Stevens,
Bower, N. C.	Fletcher,	Loudenslager,	Stockdale,
Bowers, Cal.	Forman,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Branch,	Funk,	Magner,	Stone, W. A.
Brattan,	Funston,	Mahon,	Storer,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gardner,	Mallory,	Strait,
Broderick,	Gear,	Marsh,	Strong,
Brosius,	Geissenhainer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Sweet,
Brown,	Gillet, N. Y.	McCleary, Minn.	Talbert, S. C.
Bundy,	Gillett, Mass.	McDowell,	Tawney,
Bunn,	Goldzier,	McKeighan,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burnes,	Goodnight,	McLaurin,	Thomas,
Burrows,	Graham,	Meiklejohn,	Turpin,
Bynum,	Grosvenor,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Cadmus,	Grout,	Meyer,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Caldwell,	Hager,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Caminetti,	Hainer,	Moon,	Wadsworth,
Campbell,	Hall, Minn.	Morse,	Walker,
Cannon, Ill.	Harmer,	Murray,	Wanger,
Catchings,	Harris,	Newlands,	Washington,
Chickering,	Hartman,	Northway,	Waugh,
Childs,	Hatch,	Page,	Wever,
Clancy,	Haugen,	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Clark, Mo.	Heiner,	Pendleton, W. Va.	White,
Cobb, Ala.	Henderson, Ill.	Perkins,	Williams, Ill.
Cockran,	Henderson, Iowa	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Cogswell,	Hendrix,	Pickler,	Wilson, Wash.
Compton,	Hepburn,	Post,	Wise,
Conn,	Hermann,	Powers,	Wolverton,
Cooper, Fla.	Hicks,	Price,	Woodard,
Cooper, Tex.	Hilborn,	Randall,	Woomer,
Cooper, Wis.	Hitt,	Ray,	Wright, Mass.
Cornish,	Hooker, N. Y.	Reed,	Wright, Pa.

No quorum voting.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

And then, on motion of Mr. WILSON of West Virginia (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4979) to promote the efficiency of the naval militia—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) to commission passed assistant surgeons in the United States Navy, and to provide for their examination preliminary to their promotion to the grade of surgeon—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4981) providing a service pension to all honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) to regulate the granting of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) to define and fix the status of pensioners under the laws of the United States, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) providing a general per diem pension for all honorably discharged soldiers, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 4985) to repeal tax on State banks and bank associations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4986) authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Pensions, upon rejection of a pension claim, to explain fully upon what evidence and for what reason said claim, was rejected, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 4987) to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River between Connors Point, in the State of Wisconsin, and Rices Point, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 4988) to provide for the coinage of the silver bullion now owned by the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4989) to set apart certain lands, now known as Pacific forest reserve, as a public park, to be known as the Washington National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5010) to establish a postal telegraph system and to enlarge the postal facilities of the people of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. O'NEIL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 106) to refund duties illegally exacted March 3, 1867, on merchandise of steamer Asia—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEARMOND: A resolution to appoint a committee of thirteen members of the House to inquire into the advisability of establishing a permanent seat of government somewhere in the Mississippi Valley—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4990) granting a pension to Lorenzo D. Bowlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 4991) to provide for the payment to E. W. Atchley, deceased, of the amount found due by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of California: A bill (H. R. 4992) for the relief of Matthew McGuirk, of Los Angeles, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 4993) for the relief of James C. Brooke—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of James P. Catterson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) to pension John Brisben—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Hiram P. Pauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDER: A bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of Catherine French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) for the relief of Bernard F. McCormack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCNAGNY: A bill (H. R. 4999) to pension William Watson, of Garrett, Ind., late a member of the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, unassigned—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Samuel Tanner, deceased, late of Lafourche Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SICKLES: A bill (H. R. 5001) for the relief of William J. McKay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WAUGH: A bill (H. R. 5002) granting a pension to William W. Ballenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5004) to provide for the payment to Hugh G. Kirby, administrator of the estate of R. L. Kirby, deceased, of the amount found due by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5005) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Albin, late of Company D, Thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: A bill (H. R. 5006) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCETTRICK: A bill (H. R. 5007) for the benefit of Lucy A. Buttrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A bill (H. R. 5008) to increase the pension of Anna M. Allen—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5009) for the relief of Mathias Pedersen—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Protest of the Trades League of Philadelphia, against the adoption of the ad valorem feature of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition and papers of L. D. Bolen, for special act of Congress for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Petition of the employés of the Haile & Frost Manufacturing Company, of Hinsdale, N. H., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: Protest from the Nineteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRICKNER: Petition of L. Rosenheimer and 45 barley-growers of the town of Kewaskum, Washington County, Wis., protesting against any change of duty on barley and barley malt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of 30 employés of the Danville Woolen Mills, Danville, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of F. R. Garlock, M. D., and other citizens of Racine County, Wis., for creation of a bureau of public health—to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Pittsburg, and Allegheny, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the officers and employés of the Slatington Rolling Mill Company, of Slatington, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of McKees Rock, Allegheny County, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Protest of employés of Richard T. Sullivan, of Newton Lower Falls, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of H. T. Hayward, of Franklin, Mass., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of W. S. and F. Cordingly, of Newton Lower Falls, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of Nonantoun Worsted Company, of Newton, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of Franklin Knitting Company, of Franklin, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of Charles P. Lauriat, gold leaf manufacturer of Medford, Mass., against a change in the specific duty on manufactures of gold, silver, aluminum, and metal leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of Glover & Wilcomb, of Hyde Park, Mass., against taking the tax off curled hair—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT (by request): Petition of James Rothwell and 119 others, overseers and operatives of the Conanicut Mills, Fall River, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of cigar-makers of Logansport, Cass County, Ind., in favor of a uniform duty of 35 cents per pound on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a petition of cigar-makers of Crown Point, Ind., in favor of a uniform duty of 35 cents per pound on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTER: Papers relating to claim of William M. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 600 workingmen of the Ford City Glass Company, of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 100 iron-workers, of Apollo, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar-makers, of Reynoldsville, Pa., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Hope Lodge, No. 17, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Apollo, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIEFER: Petition of cigar-manufacturers of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRIBBS: Petitions of A. J. Cruse and 14 others of Bellefonte, Pa., and of J. W. Selker and 12 others of Clarion, Pa., in favor of a uniform rate of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Frank H. Randall and 51 others of Camden, N. J., against the reduction of duty on oil-cloth—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William T. Walker and 75 others of Camden, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William. J. Jordan and 81 other employés, workingmen, and others of Camden, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of John R. Bentley, Alfred Patchett, and 441 other citizens of Camden, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of William J. Luther and 651 other citizens of Attleboro, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Patrick Barry and 40 other citizens of Mount Hope, Mass., protesting against the passage of the proposed Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. N. S. Eaton and 134 other citizens of Plymouth, Mass., protesting against the passage of the proposed Wilson tariff bill—to the committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George S. Cutler and 95 other citizens of Stoughton, Mass., protesting against the passage of the proposed Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of Rybold & Claussen and 13 other manufacturers and makers of cigars, of Cadillac, Mich., asking for a uniform tax of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph Kirsten and 6 other manufacturers and makers of cigars, of Manistee, Mich., asking for a uniform tax of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John G. Drurch and 4 other manufacturers and makers of cigars, of Cadillac, Mich., asking for a uniform tax of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of employés of Charles P. Lauriat, of Medford, Mass., against the proposed ad valorem duty on manufactured gold leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Petition of Kessler Bros. and 12 others, of Auburn, Ind., praying for the reduction of duties on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Conrad Bayer and 8 others, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the reduction of duties on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. C. Eckert and 13 others, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for a reduction of duties on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McRAE: Resolutions adopted by the Little Rock Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 59, protesting against the discriminations made by the International Typographical Union against the International Printing Pressmen's Union—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution of the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of a bill to grant the Fort Smith and Van Buren Electric Railway Company the privilege of building a bridge across the Arkansas River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONEY: Petition of James D. Lynch, for compensation for writing the poem "Columbia Saluting the Nations"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McDANNOLD: Petition of Charles A. Meisner and 12 others, manufacturers of cigars at Carrollton, Ill., asking for imposition of 35 per cent on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of druggists of Quincy, Ill., against a stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Saloon-Keepers' Protective Association of

Quincy, Ill., against increase of tax on malt or spirituous liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEIL: Senate Miscellaneous Documents 91 and 94, to accompany House joint resolution, 106—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of G. H. Ferguson and 30 others, of Bryant, Hamilton County, S. Dak., against the reduction of the tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Ness and 20 others, of Naples, Clark County, S. Dak., against the reduction of tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Adolph Schoenheim and 7 others, manufacturers and makers of cigars, of Huron, S. Dak., asking for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents upon unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAWLINS: Petition that laws be amended so as to admit to the mails as second-class matter publications of benevolent or fraternal associations—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of W. L. Wilcox and others, of Tolland County, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Patzold and others, of Tolland, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. C. Grant and others, of Tolland, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James Breen and others, of Rockville, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry S. Woodward and others, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. M. Dean and others, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James H. Prior and others, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Elbert M. Cushman and others, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. H. House and others, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. S. Chapman and others, employés of the Crosby Manufacturing Company, Connecticut, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. Haskins and others, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, their employés, and others interested in the cultivation of that product in Suffield (southern district), Bloomfield, and East Granby, all of Connecticut, protesting against any change in the present duty on leaf tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Memorial of the cigar manufacturers of Jacksonville, Ill., praying for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS: Petitions of Joseph St. George and 50 other employés of the Warren Thread Company Mills, of Ashland, Mass.; also, of George E. Cotter and 55 other employés of the Whittier Cotton Mills, of Lowell, Mass.; also, of Howell F. Wilson and 69 other employés of the Bullardvale Mills; also, of A. W. Stearns, treasurer, and 116 employés of Lawrence, Mass.; also, of Warren C. Hamblet, president, and 52 employés of the Criterion Knitting Company, of Lowell, Mass.; and also, of Wm. E. Walsh and 14 other employés of the Park Worsted Mills, of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jacob Quish and 17 other manufacturers and makers of cigars, of Lowell, Mass., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG: Two petitions of J. Hessnoner and 9 others, of Delaware, Ohio, and of J. Bartholomew and others, in favor of uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Third National Bank and others, of Findlay, Ohio, against the reduction of the duty on glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. Milton Johnson and 16 others, of Urbana, Ohio, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of the employés of the Continental Knitting Mills, Cohoes, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of O. J. Babcock and other citizens of the town of McIntire, Mitchell County, Iowa, for retention of the present duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. W. Stacy and other citizens of Mitchell County for the same purpose—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. Fitzsimmons & Bro. and other citizens of Cerro Gordo County, Iowa, manufacturers and makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rufus Kinsley and others, of Monona Township, Clayton County, Iowa, for retention of the present duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Kinsley and other citizens of Clayton County, Iowa, for the same purpose—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Memorial of the president and 201 employés of the Alan Wood Company, of Conshohocken, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of L. A. Lukens, John Pugh, Evan D. Jones & Co., and 58 others, employers of labor, workingmen, and others, of Conshohocken, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 86 employés of the Ellis and Lessig Steel and Iron Co., of Pottstown, Pa., protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also two memorials of 643 employés of A. and P. Roberts & Co., Pencoyd Iron Works; also one from 277 workingmen, employés of the Pottstown Iron Co., and other citizens; also one from 180 employés of C. Appleton, T. B. Harkins Foundry Co., and others, citizens of Bristol, Pa., all protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Petition of Fannie Lowe, asking that the claim of Benjamin Jolly be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Protest of Frank Douks and 121 other citizens of Piqua, Miami County, Ohio, against the passage of House bill 4864—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOMER: Protest of Thomas Evans and 120 citizens of Lebanon, Pa., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from the drug millers of New York, suggesting certain changes in the free list schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Dauphin, Pa., urging the creation of a bureau of public health—to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of George Bastow and 171 others, employés of the L. L. & T. D. Peck Manufacturing Company, of Pittsfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of S. Taylor and 90 others, employés of Beebe, Webber & Co., of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of James Daley and 59 others, employés of the Pontoosuc Woolen Manufacturing Company, of Pittsfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of John W. Milnes and 55 others, employés of the Chadwick Plush Company, of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of so-called Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of William M. Chapin and 408 others against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Jas. McCormick and 56 other employés of the Maple Grove Warp Mills at Adams, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of A. A. Leop and 120 other employés of Wilson & Harton, woolen manufacturers of Pitsfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Carl Vetter and 144 other employés of the Germania Mills at Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Terry Rondo and 59 other employés of the North Adams Manufacturing Company, Massachusetts, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 5, 1894.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] is recognized.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the privileged question that was pending yesterday when the House adjourned.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] desires to present a report from the Committee on Rules, which is a matter of higher privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I make the point of order that the question of privilege was pending when the House adjourned yesterday. The House adjourned pending a decision as to whether the question of privilege should be considered or not, and I make the point that it must come up again this morning.

The SPEAKER. The matter is very plain, if the gentleman will reflect on it for a moment. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] called up yesterday a certain resolution. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] raised the question of consideration; the House proceeded to vote upon that question, and upon that vote no quorum was developed. The vote related solely to the business of that day.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The question of consideration related to the business of that day, but the privileged question, if the Speaker please, was placed before the House for disposal, and the House has not disposed of it.

The SPEAKER. It was not before the House. The gentleman from Maine called it up and the question of consideration was raised against it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I called up the privileged resolution and the Speaker caused it to be read.

The SPEAKER. And the question of consideration was raised, and upon that question no quorum voted.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Speaker caused the privileged resolution to be read.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker caused it to be read.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And the question was what would the House do with it. The House proceeded to vote upon that question, but failed to determine whether it would take it up or not.

The SPEAKER. That is a proceeding that may be renewed each day.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Where is the privileged resolution, then?

The SPEAKER. Exactly where it was.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But where is it, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk began to read the resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker——

[Confusion in the Hall.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The Clerk will report the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen will take their seats, and business will be suspended until members comply with the order of the Chair. [A pause.] The Clerk will report the resolution.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to reserve all points of order against the report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I think I am entitled to an answer from the Chair. I ask the Chair where my resolution is?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS].

Mr. BOUTELLE. I know; but the Chair has not stated where that resolution is which he says is before the House. Where is the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution presented from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That after the passage of this resolution the House shall meet each legislative day at 11 o'clock a. m.; that, beginning to-day, without intervening motion, except conference reports and reports from the Committee on Rules, the Journal shall be read, business under clause 1, Rule XXIV, shall be disposed of, the Speaker shall call the committees for reports, and then the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4864, "a bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes;" that general debate on said bill shall be limited to the hour of adjournment on Wednesday, the 10th of January; that on Thursday, the 11th of January, present, said bill shall be read through, and shall from day to day be open to amendment in any part thereof; that on Thursday, the 25th of January, at the hour of 12 o'clock m., said bill, with all amendments recommended by or that may be pending in Committee of the Whole, shall be reported to the House; that the previous question shall then be considered ordered upon pending amendments and the bill to its passage. That, without other motion, the vote shall then be taken on the pending amendments, on the engrossment and third reading, on a motion to recommit with or without instructions, should such motion be made, on the final passage of the bill, and on a motion to reconsider and lay on the table. That, beginning on Monday next, at the hour of 5:30 o'clock each day, the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock; the evening session to be devoted to general debate on said bill only. General leave to print remarks on said bill is hereby granted.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided heretofore—and such decision was appealed from and the judgment of the Chair sustained by the House—that the question of consideration can not be raised against a report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CATCHINGS. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, I appeal from that ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to entertain the appeal. The gentleman from Mississippi demands the previous question.

Mr. BURROWS. On the point of order which I reserve I would like to be heard. I will first inquire of the gentleman from Mississippi whether this proposition was introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Rules, or whether it originated in the committee?

Mr. CATCHINGS. The proposition originated with the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BURROWS. Then, Mr. Speaker, while I am aware the Chair has held that the Committee on Rules has the power to originate propositions, yet that ruling was made some time ago; and I am in hopes the Chair has upon further examination found that ruling to be erroneous, for it is perfectly——

Mr. MCMILLIN. I rise to a point of order. There is so much confusion that we can not hear a word of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] is saying.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, so that the gentleman occupying the floor may be heard.

Mr. BURROWS. In Rule XI, as the Chair is aware, provision is made for the disposition of all propositions introduced in the House of Representatives, directing to what committees they shall be referred. I need not enumerate these various provisions, but will only say that so far as regards the Committee on Rules it is provided by clause 51 of this rule that—

All propositions touching the rules and joint rules and order of business shall be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Now, here is a proposition which not only relates to the order of business, but involves a change of the rules of the House, among them that rule in particular which provides for daily sessions of the House at 12 o'clock, and the practice, which has grown into a rule, that no speeches can be printed in the RECORD unless they are delivered on the floor of the House.

The proposition now offered by the committee goes beyond a change of the "order of business" and proposes to change a rule of the House; and that being so, I submit that any such proposition relating to the rules, or the joint rules, or the order of business, must have its inception in the House and be referred to the Committee on Rules, in order to give that committee jurisdiction. It being conceded that this has not been done, I submit that the committee on its own motion can not bring into the House a proposition to change the rules or fix an order of business; that it has no more jurisdiction to do this than any other committee of this House. I maintain that the rule requiring all such propositions to be referred to the Committee on Rules presupposes that any such proposition must originate in the House; and there having been no such action in this case, I submit that the committee is powerless to make this report.

As I said in the beginning, I am aware the Chair has ruled to the contrary on the position I am now maintaining; but I am confident in my own mind the ruling was erroneous, and that such a proposition must have its inception in the House and be referred to the committee in order to clothe that committee with power to act.

Mr. CATCHINGS. The question has been decided, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was merely trying to ascertain whether the decision heretofore made by the Chair on this question was appealed from and the judgment of the Chair sustained by the House. The Chair has not yet been able to turn to the record on the subject.

Mr. BURROWS. I will say to the Chair that according to my recollection an appeal was taken, and the ruling of the Chair was sustained by the House.

The SPEAKER. The mind of the Chair was not clear on that question.

Mr. BURROWS. But that decision, I think, related simply to an order of business and not to a change of the rules.

The SPEAKER. In the Fifty-second Congress it was decided that the Committee on Rules was authorized to report on the rules or order of business notwithstanding the proposed rule or order had not been specially referred to that committee. Now, whether that ruling was appealed from the Chair does not know. He will ascertain the fact in a moment.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not remember.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recollect whether the House reviewed that decision or not.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it did.

Mr. BURROWS. If the Chair will pardon me, I think in that case the report provided only for an order of business, without changing the hour of meeting of the House, which is a change of rule, and also without providing that members of the House might be permitted to print anything they may desire in the RECORD, which is a change of a custom so long established that it has grown into law.

The SPEAKER. Of course the gentleman will understand that almost any order fixing a time for the consideration of a measure is, *pro tanto* at least, a change of the rules.

Mr. BURROWS. It is not a change of the rule only as to the consideration of the proposition. For instance, any matter reported from a committee is assigned to its regular place on the Calendar, where it remains to be taken up in its order unless some rule is interposed to change that order. If this resolution is held to be in order, providing as it does for a change of the practice or custom or rule of the House, the committee might go further, and report a change of its own volition all of the standing rules. Because, if you can change one standing rule, as to the meeting of the House, for instance, or the method of publishing the speeches of members, then the Committee on Rules on its own motion can change any or all of the rules and provide an entirely new code of procedure.

The rule provides for a mode of changing the order of business by taking a measure on the Calendar out of its regular order and bringing it before the House for immediate consideration, giving it precedence in consideration over other matters. The rule therefore simply relates to the order of business. It gives the committee authority only to take a measure out of its order on the Calendar, bring it before the House, and give it precedence in consideration. That I suppose to be the scope of the provision of the rule allowing the committee to fix the order of business. But manifestly it was not the intention of the rule to allow the committee to report of its own motion a complete modification of the rules or change the entire body of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read from the Journal a decision bearing upon this point during the last Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CATCHINGS submitted a report from the Committee on Rules recommending the adoption by the House of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this order the Speaker shall, in compliance with clause 2 of Rule XXIV, call the committees for reports; and reports then made shall be by the Speaker referred to the appropriate Calendars; and no motion shall be entertained or be in order until this order shall have been fully executed."

Mr. BURROWS objected to the reception of said report upon the ground that, as appeared from the Journal and the RECORD, no such resolution, or similar resolution, had been referred to the Committee on Rules, and that the committee therefore had no jurisdiction to report the proposed resolution, and that, pursuant to clause 51 of Rule XI, all proposed action touching the rules and order of business must in the first instance be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The Speaker overruled the objection, holding that under the provisions of clause 57 of Rule XI the Committee on Rules had authority to report at any time on the rules and order of business of the House, notwithstanding the proposed rule or order had not been specially referred to that committee.

Mr. BURROWS appealed from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. FITCH moved to lay the appeal on the table.

The question being put, it was decided in the affirmative; there being—yeas 173, nays 55, not voting 125.

Mr. BURROWS. I have only this suggestion to make: It will be observed the order there referred to did not embody a change in the rules of the House or any modification of the standing rules. It simply related to the order of business by directing the taking up and consideration of a certain measure out of its order.

The SPEAKER. The hour of meeting, the gentleman is aware, is not a matter of standing rule, but merely an order of the House.

Mr. BURROWS. It is a rule of the House, nevertheless.

I was simply wondering whether it would make any change, in the opinion of the Chair, as to the power of the committee to report a code of rules without having it first introduced in the House and referred to the committee in the proper way. Of course the decision is broad enough to permit the committee to bring in, of its own motion, a complete body of rules for the government of the House without having it first introduced in the House and referred under the rule to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The question seems to have been already decided.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Under what rule does the Chair decline to entertain my appeal?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Maine that the question now before the House is the demand for the previous question, and it is not the duty of the Chair, pending the demand, or on the request of the gentleman from Maine, to furnish him any information on that point. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. But it is the privilege of the gentleman from Maine to make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the demand for the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 138, noes 0.

Mr. REED. No quorum.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 1, not voting 181; as follows:

YEAS—169.

Abbott,	Covert,	Johnson, Ohio	Pearson,
Alderson,	Cox,	Jones,	Pendleton, Tex.
Alexander,	Crain,	Kilgore,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Arnold,	Crawford,	Kribbs,	Pigott,
Bailey,	Culberson,	Kyle,	Price,
Baldwin,	Cummings,	Lane,	Rayner,
Bankhead,	De Armond,	Lapham,	Reilly,
Bartlett,	De Forest,	Latimer,	Richards, Ohio
Barwig,	Denson,	Layton,	Richardson, Mich.
Bell, Tex.	Dinsmore,	Lester,	Richardson, Tenn.
Beltzhoover,	Dockery,	Lisle,	Ritchie,
Black, Ga.	Donovan,	Livingston,	Robbins,
Black, Ill.	Dunn,	Lynch,	Russell, Ga.
Blanchard,	Durborow,	Maddox,	Sayers,
Bland,	Ellis, Ky.	Maguire,	Sickles,
Branch,	English,	Mallory,	Snodgrass,
Brawley,	Enloe,	Marshall,	Somers,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Epes,	Martin, Ind.	Springer,
Bretz,	Erdman,	McAleer,	Stallings,
Brickner,	Everett,	McCreary, Ky.	Stevens,
Brookshire,	Forman,	McCulloch,	Stone, Ky.
Bryan,	Fyan,	McDannold,	Swanson,
Bynum,	Geary,	McDearmon,	Talbott, Md.
Cabaniss,	Goldzier,	McEttrick,	Tarsney,
Cadmus,	Gorman,	McGann,	Tate,
Caminetti,	Grady,	McKaig,	Taylor, Ind.
Campbell,	Gresham,	McKeighan,	Terry,
Cannon, Cal.	Griffin,	McMillin,	Tracey,
Capehart,	Hall, Minn.	McNagny,	Tucker,
Caruth,	Hall, Mo.	McRae,	Turner,
Catchings,	Hammond,	Meredith,	Tyler,
Causey,	Hare,	Money,	Warner,
Clarke, Ala.	Harter,	Montgomery,	Washington,
Cobb, Mo.	Hayes,	Morgan,	Weadock,
Cockran,	Heard,	Moses,	Wells,
Cockrell,	Henderson, N. C.	Mutchler,	Wheeler, Ala.
Coffeen,	Hendrix,	Neill,	Whiting,
Compton,	Holman,	Oates,	Williams, Miss.
Conn,	Hooker, Miss.	O'Neil,	Wilson, W. Va.
Coombs,	Houk, Ohio	Outhwaite,	Wise.
Cooper, Fla.	Hunter,	Paschal,	
Cooper, Ind.	Hutcheson,	Patterson,	
Cornish,	Ikirt,	Paynter,	

NAYS—1.

Bell, Colo.

NOT VOTING—181.

Adams, Ky.	Burrows,	Funston,	Hopkins, Pa.
Adams, Pa.	Caldwell,	Gardner,	Houk, Tenn.
Aitken,	Cannon, Ill.	Gear,	Hudson,
Aldrich,	Chickering,	Geissenhainer,	Hulick,
Allen,	Childs,	Gillet, N. Y.	Hull,
Apsley,	Clancy,	Gillett, Mass.	Johnson, N. Dak.
Avery,	Clark, Mo.	Goodnight,	Johnson, Ind.
Babcock,	Cobb, Ala.	Graham,	Joy,
Baker, Kans.	Cogswell,	Grosvenor,	Kem,
Baker, N. H.	Cooper, Tex.	Grout,	Kiefer,
Barnes,	Cooper, Wis.	Hager,	Lacey,
Bartholdt,	Cousins,	Hainer,	Lawson,
Belden,	Curtis, Kans.	Haines,	Lefever,
Berry,	Curtis, N. Y.	Harmer,	Linton,
Bingham,	Dalzell,	Harris,	Lockwood,
Blair,	Daniels,	Hartman,	Loud,
Boatner,	Davey,	Hatch,	Loudenslager,
Boen,	Davis,	Haugen,	Lucas,
Boutelle,	Dingley,	Heiner,	Magner,
Bower, N. C.	Dolliver,	Henderson, Ill.	Mahon,
Bowers, Cal.	Doolittle,	Henderson, Iowa	Marsh,
Brattan,	Draper,	Hepburn,	Marvin, N. Y.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Dunphy,	Hermann,	McCall,
Broderick,	Edmunds,	Hicks,	McCleary, Minn.
Brosius,	Ellis, Oregon	Hilborn,	McDowell,
Brown,	Fielder,	Hines,	McLaurin,
Bundy,	Fithian,	Hitt,	Meiklejohn,
Bunn,	Fletcher,	Hooker, N. Y.	Mercer,
Burnes,	Funk,	Hopkins, Ill.	Meyer,

Milliken,	Reyburn,	Stephenson,	Walker,
Moon,	Robertson, La.	Stockdale,	Wanger,
Morse,	Robinson, Pa.	Stone, C. W.	Waugh,
Murray,	Rusk,	Stone, W. A.	Wever,
Newlands,	Russell, Conn.	Storer,	Wheeler, Ill.
Northway,	Ryan,	Strait,	White,
Page,	Schermerhorn,	Strong,	Williams, Ill.
Payne,	Scranton,	Sweet,	Wilson, Ohio
Pence,	Settle,	Talbert, S. C.	Wilson, Wash.
Perkins,	Shaw,	Tawney,	Wolverton,
Phillips,	Shell,	Taylor, Tenn.	Wooda d.
Pickler,	Sherman,	Thomas,	Woomer,
Post,	Sibley,	Turpin,	Wright, Mass.
Powers,	Simpson,	Updegraff,	Wright, Pa.
Randall,	Sipe,	VanVoorhis, N. Y.	
Ray,	Smith,	VanVoorhis, Ohio	
Reed,	Sperry,	Wadsworth,	

No quorum voting.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SHELL with Mr. HEPBURN.

Mr. HATCH with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. FIELDER with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

For this day:

Mr. GEISSENHAINER with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. POST.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. LACEY.

Mr. BERRY with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. BUNN with Mr. PERKINS.

Until the 8th of January:

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will recapitulate the vote. The House will be in order, so that members can ascertain that they are correctly recorded.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of those voting.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that I am paired with my colleague [Mr. BELDEN] on all party questions, reserving the right to vote to make a quorum. I have voted on this question to help to make a quorum. Should there be a quorum, I would withdraw my vote. The reason I make this statement is that the New York papers published the statement this morning that on yesterday I failed to vote. The reason why I did not vote was on account of being paired with my colleague [Mr. BELDEN].

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. No quorum has voted.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following-named members failed to answer to their names:

Adams, Ky.	Doolittle,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Allen,	Draper,	Lawson,	Settle,
Barnes,	Dunphy,	Lefever,	Shell,
Belden,	Edmunds,	Lockwood,	Sherman,
Berry,	Fielder,	Loudenslager,	Sipe,
Bingham,	Fithian,	Magner,	Smith,
Boatner,	Fletcher,	McCleary, Minn.	Stockdale,
Bower, N. C.	Gear,	McLaurin,	Storer,
Brattan,	Geissenhainer,	Meyer,	Strait,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gillett, Mass.	Milliken,	Talbert, S. C.
Broderick,	Goodnight,	Moon,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brown,	Graham,	Newlands,	Thomas,
Bunn,	Grout,	Perkins,	Turpin,
Burnes,	Harris,	Pickler,	Wever,
Clancy,	Hatch,	Post,	Wheeler, Ill.
Clark, Mo.	Hepburn,	Randall,	White,
Cobb, Ala.	Hicks,	Ray,	Williams, Ill.
Cooper, Tex.	Houk, Tenn.	Rusk,	Wolverton,
Davey,	Johnson, Ind.	Schermerhorn,	Woodard.

The SPEAKER. The doors will now be closed, and the Clerk will call the names of those members who failed to respond on the first call. On this call the presentation of excuses is in order.

The Clerk called the names of those members who failed to respond on the first call.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask indefinite leave of absence for my colleague [Mr. DUNPHY], as he is very sick in New York.

There was no objection, and leave was granted.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask that my colleague [Mr. LAWSON] be excused on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. He was excused on yesterday.

The Clerk completed the call.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-three gentlemen, more than a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move that all further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED) there were—ayes 144, noes 49.

Mr. REED. I think we had better have tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Speaker appointed Mr. REED and Mr. CATCHINGS.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 135, noes 10.

Accordingly, all further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the demand of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] for the previous question upon the resolution reported by him from the Committee on Rules, and on that question the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 0, not voting 184; as follows:

YEAS—167.

Abbott,	Cox,	Jones,	Paynter,
Alderson,	Crawford,	Kilgore,	Pearson,
Alexander,	Culberson,	Kribbs,	Pendleton, Tex.
Arnold,	Cummings,	Kyle,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Bailey,	De Armond,	Lane,	Pigott,
Baldwin,	De Forest,	Lapham,	Price,
Bankhead,	Denson,	Latimer,	Rayner,
Bartlett,	Dinsmore,	Layton,	Reilly,
Barwig,	Dockery,	Lester,	Richards, Ohio
Bell, Tex.	Donovan,	Lisle,	Richardson, Mich.
Black, Ga.	Dunn,	Livingston,	Richardson, Tenn.
Black, Ill.	Durborow,	Lynch,	Ritchie,
Blanchard,	Ellis, Ky.	Maddox,	Robbins,
Bland,	English,	Maguire,	Russell, Ga.
Branch,	Enloe,	Mallory,	Ryan,
Brawley,	Epes,	Marshall,	Sayers,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Erdman,	Martin, Ind.	Snodgrass,
Bretz,	Everett,	McAleer,	Somers,
Brickner,	Forman,	McCreary, Ky.	Springer,
Brookshire,	Fyan,	McCulloch,	Stallings,
Bryan,	Geary,	McDannold,	Stevens,
Bynum,	Goldzier,	McDearmon,	Stone, Ky.
Cabaniss,	Gorman,	McEttrick,	Swanson,
Caminetti,	Grady,	McGann,	Talbott, Md.
Campbell,	Gresham,	McKaig,	Tarsney,
Cannon, Cal.	Griffin,	McKeighan,	Tate,
Capehart,	Hall, Minn.	McMillin,	Taylor, Ind.
Caruth,	Hall, Mo.	McNagny,	Terry,
Catchings,	Hammond,	McRae,	Tracey,
Causey,	Hare,	Meredith,	Tucker,
Clarke, Ala.	Harter,	Money,	Turner,
Cobb, Mo.	Hayes,	Montgomery,	Tyler,
Cockran,	Heard,	Morgan,	Warner,
Cockrell,	Henderson, N. C.	Moses,	Washington,
Coffeen,	Hendrix,	Mutchler,	Weadock,
Compton,	Holman,	Neill,	Wells,
Conn,	Hooker, Miss.	Oates,	Wheeler, Ala.
Coombs,	Houk, Ohio	O'Neil,	Whiting,
Cooper, Fla.	Hunter,	Outhwaite,	Williams, Miss.
Cooper, Ind.	Hutcheson,	Page,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cornish,	Ikirt,	Paschal,	Wise.
Covert,	Johnson, Ohio	Patterson,	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—184.

Adams, Ky.	Cobb, Ala.	Hatch,	Meiklejohn,
Adams, Pa.	Cogswell,	Haugen,	Mercer,
Aitken,	Cooper, Tex.	Heiner,	Meyer,
Aldrich,	Cooper, Wis.	Henderson, Ill.	Milliken,
Allen,	Cousins,	Henderson, Iowa	Moon,
Apsley,	Crain,	Hepburn,	Morse,
Avery,	Curtis, Kans.	Hermann,	Murray,
Babcock,	Curtis, N. Y.	Hicks,	Newlands,
Baker, Kans.	Dalzell,	Hilborn,	Northway,
Baker, N. H.	Daniels,	Hines,	Payne,
Barnes,	Davey,	Hitt,	Pence,
Bartholdt,	Davis,	Hooker, N. Y.	Perkins,
Belden,	Dingley,	Hopkins, Ill.	Phillips,
Bell, Colo.	Dolliver,	Hopkins, Pa.	Pickler,
Beltzhoover,	Doolittle,	Houk, Tenn.	Post,
Berry,	Draper,	Hudson,	Powers,
Bingham,	Dunphy,	Hulick,	Randall,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Hull,	Ray,
Boatner,	Ellis, Oregon	Johnson, Ind.	Reed,
Boen,	Fielder,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reyburn,
Boutelle,	Fithian,	Joy,	Robertson, La.
Bower, N. C.	Fletcher,	Kem,	Robinson, Pa.
Bowers, Cal.	Funk,	Kiefer,	Rusk,
Brattan,	Funston,	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gardner,	Lawson,	Schermerhorn,
Broderick,	Gear,	Lefever,	Scranton,
Brosius,	Geissenhainer,	Linton,	Settle,
Brown,	Gillet, N. Y.	Lockwood,	Shaw,
Bundy,	Gillett, Mass.	Loud,	Shell,
Bunn,	Goodnight,	Loudenslager,	Sherman,
Burnes,	Graham,	Lucas,	Sibley,
Burrows,	Grosvenor,	Magner,	Sickles,
Cadmus,	Grout,	Mahon,	Simpson,
Caldwell,	Hager,	Marsh,	Sipe,
Cannon, Ill.	Hainer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Smith,
Chickering,	Haines,	McCall,	Sperry,
Childs,	Harmer,	McCleary, Minn.	Stephenson,
Clancy,	Harris,	McDowell,	Stockdale,
Clark, Mo.	Hartman,	McLaurin,	Stone, C. W.

Stone, W. A.	Taylor, Tenn.	Walker,	Wilson, Ohio
Storer,	Thomas,	Wanger,	Wilson, Wash.
Strait,	Turpin,	Waugh,	Wolverton,
Strong,	Updegraff,	Wever,	Woodard,
Sweet,	Van Voorhis, N.Y.	Wheeler, Ill.	Woomer,
Talbert, S. C.	Van Voorhis, Ohio	White,	Wright, Mass.
Tawney,	Wadsworth,	Williams, Ill.	Wright, Pa.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. This is an important vote, and the House will be in order, so that gentlemen can hear whether they are properly recorded.

The vote was recapitulated.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 167; the nays none. No quorum.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. Division. There is no need of that; all we need is mathematics.

Mr. PAYNE. And that of the simplest kind.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 104, noes 31.

So a call of the House was ordered.

The roll was called; when the following named members failed to respond:

Adams, Ky.	Davey,	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.
Aldrich,	Doolittle,	Lawson,	Schermerhorn,
Allen,	Dunphy,	Lefever,	Scranton,
Babcock,	Edmunds,	Linton,	Shell,
Barnes,	Fielder,	Lockwood,	Sherman,
Belden.	Fithian,	Loudenslager,	Sibley,
Beltzhoover,	Gear,	Magner,	Sipe,
Bingham,	Geissenhainer,	Mahon,	Stockdale,
Boatner,	Gillett, Mass.	Marsh,	Stone, C. W.
Bower, N. C.	Goodnight,	McCleary, Minn.	Storer,
Bratton,	Graham,	McLaurin,	Strait,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Grosvenor,	Meyer,	Talbert, S. C.
Broderick,	Grout,	Milliken,	Tawney,
Brown,	Hager,	Moon,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bunn,	Harmer,	Newlands,	Turpin,
Burnes,	Harris,	Perkins,	Wadsworth,
Burrows,	Hatch,	Pickler,	Wever,
Cadmus,	Henderson, Iowa,	Post,	Wheeler, Ill.
Childs,	Hepburn,	Randall,	White,
Clancy,	Hermann,	Ray,	Williams, Ill.
Clark, Mo.	Hicks,	Reed,	Wolverton,
Cobb, Ala.	Hull,	Robinson, Pa.	Woodard,
Cooper, Tex.	Johnson, Ind.	Rusk,	Wright, Pa.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. COMPTON in the chair). The doors will now be closed, the Clerk will call the names of those gentlemen who failed to respond on the first call, and on this call excuses will be in order.

Mr. MCALEER (when the name of Mr. SIPE was called). I ask that Mr. SIPE be excused for the day, on account of sickness.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Two hundred and fifty-nine gentlemen have responded.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BURROWS. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes none.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs upon the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] on ordering the previous question. On that motion the yeas and nays have already been ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 0, not voting 183; as follows:

YEAS—168.

Abbott,	Capehart,	English,	Kirt,
Alderson,	Caruth,	Enloe,	Johnson, Ohio
Alexander,	Catchings,	Epes,	Jones,
Arnold,	Causey,	Erdman,	Kilgore,
Bailey,	Clarke, Ala.	Everett,	Kribbs,
Baldwin,	Cobb, Mo.	Forman,	Kyle,
Bartlett,	Cockran,	Fyan,	Lane,
Barwig,	Cockrell,	Geary,	Lapham,
Bell, Colo.	Coffeen,	Goldzier,	Latimer,
Bell, Tex.	Compton,	Gorman,	Layton,
Berry,	Conn.	Grady,	Lester,
Black, Ga.	Cooper, Fla.	Gresham,	Lisle,
Black, Ill.	Cooper, Ind.	Griffin.	Livingston,
Blanchard,	Cornish,	Hall, Minn.	Lynch,
Bland,	Covert,	Hall, Mo.	Maddox,
Branch,	Cox,	Hammond,	Maguire,
Brawley,	Crain,	Hare,	Mallory,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Crawford,	Harter,	Marshall,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Culberson.	Hayes	Martin, Ind.
Bretz,	Cummings,	Heard,	McAleer,
Brickner,	De Armond,	Henderson, N. C.	McCreary, Ky.
Brookshire,	De Forest,	Hendrix,	McCulloch,
Bryan,	Denson,	Holman,	McDannold,
Bynum,	Dinsmore,	Hooker, Miss.	McDearmon,
Cabaniss,	Dockery,	Houk, Ohio	McEttrick,
Caminetti,	Durborow,	Hunter,	McGann,
Cannon, Cal.	Ellis, Ky.	Hutcheson,	McKaig,
McKeighan,	Paschal,	Robertson, La.	Terry,
McMillin,	Patterson,	Russell, Ga.	Tracey,
McNagny,	Paynter,	Ryan.	Tucker,
McRae,	Pearson,	Sayers,	Turner,
Meredith,	Pendleton, Tex.	Snodgrass,	Tyler,
Money,	Pendleton, W. Va	Somers,	Warner,
Montgomery,	Pigott,	Springer,	Washington,
Morgan,	Price,	Stallings,	Weadock,
Moses,	Rayner,	Stevens,	Wells,
Mutchler,	Reilly,	Stone, Ky.	Wheeler, Ala.
Neill,	Richards, Ohio	Swanson,	Whiting,
Oates,	Richardson, Mich.	Talbott, Md.	Williams, Ill.
O'Neil,	Richardson, Tenn.	Tarsney,	Williams, Miss.
Outhwaite,	Ritchie,	Tate,	Wilson, W. Va.
Page,	Robbins,	Taylor, Ind.	Wise.

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—183.

Adams, Ky.	Dalzell,	Hopkins, Pa.	Robinson, Pa.
Adams, Pa.	Daniels,	Houk, Tenn.	Rusk.
Aitken,	Davey,	Hudson,	Russell, Conn.
Aldrich,	Davis,	Hulick,	Schermerhorn,
Allen,	Dingley,	Hull,	Scranton,
Apsley,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Settle,
Avery,	Donovan,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Shaw,
Babcock,	Doolittle,	Joy,	Shell,
Baker, Kans.	Draper,	Kem,	Sherman,
Baker, N. H.	Dunn,	Kiefer,	Sibley,
Bankhead,	Dunphy,	Lacey,	Sickles,
Barnes,	Edmunds,	Lawson,	Simpson,
Bartholdt,	Ellis, Oregon	Lefever,	Sipe,
Belden,	Fielder,	Linton,	Smith.
Beltzhoover,	Fithian,	Lockwood,	Sperry,
Bingham,	Fletcher,	Loud,	Stephenson,
Blair,	Funk,	Loudenslager,	Stockdale,
Boatner,	Funston,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Boen,	Gardner,	Magner,	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Gear,	Mahon,	Storer,
Bower, N. C.	Geissenhainer,	Marsh,	Strait,
Bowers, Cal.	Gillet, N. Y.	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Brattan,	Gillett, Mass.	McCall,	Sweet,
Broderick,	Goodnight,	McCleary, Minn.	Talbert, S. C.
Brosius,	Graham,	McDowell,	Tawney,
Brown,	Grosvenor,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bundy,	Grout,	Melklejohn,	Thomas,
Bunn,	Hager,	Mercer,	Turpin,
Burnes,	Hainer,	Meyer,	Updegraff.
Burrows,	Haines,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N.Y.
Ca mus,	Harmer,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Caldwell,	Harris,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Campbell,	Hartman,	Murray,	Walker,
Cannon, Ill.	Hatch,	Newlands,	Wanger,
Chickering,	Haugen,	Northway,	Waugh,
Childs,	Heiner,	Payne,	Wever,
Clancy,	Henderson, Ill.	Pence,	Wheeler, Ill.
Clark, Mo.	Henderson, Iowa	Perkins,	White,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Cogswell,	Hermann,	Pickler,	Wilson, Wash.
Coombs,	Hicks,	Post,	Wolverton,
Cooper, Tex.	Hilborn,	Powers,	Woodard,
Cooper, Wis.	Hines,	Randall,	Woomer,
Cousins.	Hitt,	Ray,	Wright, Mass.
Curtis, Kans.	Hooker, N. Y.	Reed,	Wright, Pa.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Ill.	Reyburn,	

Mr. KYLE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleague, Mr. ALLEN, is detained from the House by the serious illness of his wife, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. RUSK with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, for the rest of the day.

The SPEAKER. Upon this question the yeas are 168 and the nays are none. No quorum has voted.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move a call of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The motion was agreed to, and a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following-named members failed to answer:

Adams, Ky.	Davey,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Allen,	Doolittle,	Lawson,	Shell,
Apsley,	Dunphy,	Lefever,	Sherman,
Babcock,	Edmunds,	Linton,	Sipe,
Bankhead,	Fielder,	Lockwood,	Stockdale,
Barnes,	Fithian,	Loudenslager,	Storer,
Belden,	Gear,	Magner,	Strait,
Bingham,	Geissenhainer,	Maguire,	Swanson,
Boatner,	Goodnight,	McLaurin,	Talbert, S. C.
Bower, N. C.	Graham,	Meyer,	Tawney,
Brattan,	Grout,	Moon,	Taylor, Tenn.
Broderick,	Hager,	Murray,	Turpin,
Brown,	Harris,	Newlands,	Wever,
Bunn,	Hatch,	Perkins,	Wheeler, Ill.
Burnes,	Hayes,	Pickler,	White,
Causey,	Henderson, Iowa	Post,	Wolverton,
Childs,	Hepburn,	Randall,	Woodard,
Clancy,	Hicks,	Ray,	Woomer.
Clark, Mo.	Hitt,	Reyburn,	
Cobb, Ala.	Johnson, Ind.	Rusk,	
Cooper, Tex.	Kilgore,	Schermerhorn,	

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (upon the completion of the call). The doors will now be closed, and the Clerk will call the names of gentlemen who have not responded on the first call. Upon this call excuses are in order.

Mr. COGSWELL (when the name of Mr. APSLEY was called). Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. APSLEY, is absent on account of sickness, as I understand, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection; and it was so ordered.

Mr. COGSWELL (when the name of Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa was called). Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HENDERSON, was compelled to leave the Hall a few minutes ago; he was suffering too much to remain, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Upon this call 271 gentlemen have answered to their names; more than a quorum.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question now is on ordering the previous question. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 0, not voting 184; as follows:

YEAS—167.

Abbott,	Cornish,	Jones,	Pearson,
Alderson,	Cox,	Kilgore,	Pendleton, Tex.
Alexander,	Crain,	Kribbs,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Arnold,	Crawford,	Kyle,	Pigott,
Bailey,	Culberson,	Lane,	Price.
Baldwin,	Cummings,	Lapham,	Reilly,
Bartlett,	De Armond	Layton,	Richards, Ohio
Barwig,	De Forest,	Lester,	Richardson, Mich.
Bell, Colo.	Denson,	Lisle,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bell, Tex.	Dinsmore,	Livingston,	Ritchie,
Beltzhoover,	Dockery,	Lynch,	Robbins,
Berry,	Donovan,	Maddox,	Robertson, La.
Black, Ga.	Dunn,	Maguire,	Russell, Ga.
Black, Ill.	Durborow,	Mallory,	Ryan,
Blanchard,	Ellis, Ky.	Marshall,	Sayers,
Bland,	Enloe,	Martin, Ind.	Snodgrass,
Branch,	Epes,	McAleer,	Somers,
Brawley,	Erdman,	McCreary, Ky.	Springer,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Everett,	McCulloch.	Stallings,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Forman,	McDannold,	Stevens,
Bretz,	Fyan,	McDearmon,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Geary,	McEttrick,	Swanson,
Brookshire,	Goldzier,	McGann,	Talbott, Md.
Bryan,	Gorman,	McKaig,	Tarsney,
Bynum,	Grady,	McKeighan,	Tate,
Cabaniss,	Gresham,	McMillin,	Taylor, Ind.
Caminetti,	Griffin,	McNagny,	Terry,
Campbell,	Hall, Minn.	McRae,	Tracey,
Cannon, Cal.	Hall, Mo.	Meredith,	Tucker,
Capehart,	Hammond,	Money,	Turner,
Caruth.	Hare,	Montgomery,	Tyler,
Catchings,	Harter,	Morgan,	Warner,
Causey,	Heard,	Moses,	Washington,
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, N. C.	Mutchler,	Weadock,
Cobb, Mo.	Hendrix,	Neill,	Wells,
Cockran	Holman,	Oates,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cockrell,	Hooker, Miss.	O'Neil,	Whiting,
Coffeen,	Houk, Ohio	Outhwaite,	Williams, Ill.
Compton,	Hunter,	Page,	Williams, Miss.
Conn,	Hutcheson,	Paschal,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cooper, Fla.	Ikirt,	Patterson,	Wise.
Cooper, Ind.	Johnson, Ohio	Paynter,	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—184.

Adams, Ky.	Daniels,	Houk, Tenn.	Reyburn.
Adams, Pa.	Davey,	Hudson,	Robinson, Pa.
Aitken,	Davis,	Hulick,	Rusk.
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Hull,	Russell, Conn.
Allen,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Schermerhorn,
Apsley,	Doolittle,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scranton.
Avery,	Draper,	Joy,	Settle,
Babcock,	Dunphy,	Kem,	Shaw,
Baker, Kans.	Edmunds,	Kiefer,	Shell,
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Oregon	Lacey,	Sherman,
Bankhead,	English,	Latimer,	Sibley,
Barnes,	Fielder,	Lawson,	Sickles,
Bartholdt,	Fithian,	Lefever,	Simpson,
Belden,	Fletcher,	Linton,	Sipe.
Bingham,	Funk,	Lockwood,	Smith,
Blair,	Funston,	Loud,	Sperry,
Boatner,	Gardner,	Loudenslager,	Stephenson,
Boen,	Gear,	Lucas,	Stockdale,
Boutelle,	Geissenhainer,	Magner,	Stone, C. W.
Bower, N. C.	Gillet, N. Y.	Mahon,	Stone, W. A.
Bowers, Cal.	Gillett, Mass.	Marsh,	Storer,
Brattan,	Goodnight,	Marvin, N. Y.	Strait,
Broderick,	Graham,	McCall,	Strong,
Brosius,	Grosvenor,	McCleary, Minn.	Sweet,
Brown,	Grout,	McDowell,	Talbert, S. C.
Bundy,	Hager,	McLaurin,	Tawney,
Bunn,	Hainer,	Meiklejohn,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burnes,	Haines,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Burrows,	Harmer,	Meyer,	Turpin,
Cadmus,	Harris,	Milliken,	Updegraff,
Caldwell,	Hartman,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Cannon, Ill.	Hatch,	Morse,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Chickering,	Haugen,	Murray,	Wadsworth,
Childs,	Hayes,	Newlands,	Walker,
Clancy,	Heiner,	Northway,	Wanger,
Clark, Mo.	Henderson, Ill.	Payne,	Waugh,
Cobb, Ala.	Henderson, Iowa	Pence.	Wever,
Cogswell,	Hepburn,	Perkins.	Wheeler, Ill.
Coombs,	Hermann,	Phillips,	White,
Cooper, Tex.	Hicks,	Pickler,	Wilson, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.	Hilborn.	Post,	Wilson, Wash.
Cousins,	Hines,	Powers,	Wolverton,
Covert,	Hitt,	Randall,	Woodard.
Curtis, Kans.	Hooker, N. Y.	Ray,	Woomer,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Ill.	Rayner,	Wright, Mass.
Dalzell,	Hopkins, Pa.	Reed,	Wright, Pa.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the vote recapitulated.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of members voting.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 166 and the nays are none. No quorum has voted.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices and making provision in case of such disqualification; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 71) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon; and

A bill (S. 758) extending the time allowed the Umatilla Irrigation Company for the construction of its ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4999 to pension William Watson, of Garrett, Ind., late a member of the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, was signed, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PENDLETON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5011) for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5012) to further amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended March 2, 1889—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 5013) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COVERT: A bill (H. R. 5014) revising and amending the statutes relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A resolution requesting information of the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the emigration of certain Jews from Libau, Russia—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5015) for the relief of William Blissner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) to correct the military record of Jacob Weber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: A bill (H. R. 5017) for the relief of the estate of John A. Rea, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOWERS of California: A bill (H. R. 5018) for the relief of Philip Morris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: A bill (H. R. 5038) to correct the military record of Frederick Urban—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) granting a pension to Delaney R. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRETZ: A bill (H. R. 5020) granting a pension to Washington Hislop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 5021) for the relief of M. Robison, administrator of T. E. Robison, deceased, of Henderson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) for the relief of James S. Blaydes, deceased, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 5023) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Bellah—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5024) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim

against the United States by John Perdue, his heirs and assigns, by reason of the loss of certain lands in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5025) granting increase of rating of husband's pension to Ella E. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) granting accrued of pension of soldier to Martha Horber, widow of Martin Horber, late sergeant Company G, One hundred and seventh Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5027) granting an honorable discharge to William Kale—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5028) for the relief of Richard Mayse, of Brooklyn, N. Y., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 5029) for the relief of Mary A. Swift—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5030) for the relief of Mrs. Matilda W. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) for the relief of William Bushby—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5032) for the relief of Robert Burton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5033) granting a pension to Andrew J. Malder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5034) granting a pension to Elisha L. Elam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5035) granting a pension to Mrs. Adolphe W. Kroutinger, widow of Adolphe W. Kroutinger, late of Company ——, —— Regiment United States regular Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 5036) for the relief of Matilda Hennesey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) for the relief of Samuel G. Hunter—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARWIG: Petition of cigar manufacturers at Watertown, Wis., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAIR: Petition of Louis Hueber, John W. Miller, and 51 other employés of the Devonshire Woolen Mills, Goffs Falls, N. H., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND: Papers to accompany House bill 4932, claim of B. P. Barley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Papers to accompany House bill 2593, to correct the military record of Henry Sloff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 2599, to correct the military record of Henry Sloff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 2592, for the relief of William T. Golt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany petition of House bill 3831, for the relief of Mary A. Bridwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARUTH: Petition of cigar makers and dealers of Louisville, Ky., asking a reduction of duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco to 35 cents a pound—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of citizens of Waynesville, N. C., asking that the laws be amended so as to better protect the people against contagious and infectious pestilence—to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

Also, petition of citizens of Cherokee County, N. C., against putting iron ore, coal, and lumber on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Protests of 80 employés of Racine Woolen Mills, Blake & Co., of Racine, Wis., and of 37 employés of Rock River Woolen Mills, Janesville, Wis., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COVERT: Petition of J. F. Reeve and other citizens of Suffolk County, N. Y., relative to duty on potatoes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): Petition of Bayless Feezell and other citizens, for a pension for said Feezell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of 21 citizens of Oregon, protesting against reduction of duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Adams, W. R. Osborn, and T. C. Swain, wool-growers of Crook County, Oregon, protesting against any reduction of duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 21 wool-growers and citizens of Prineville, Oregon, protesting against any reduction of tariff on unmanufactured wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EPES: Remonstrance of the farmers and citizens of Mecklenburg County, Va., against the proposed reduction of duty on cigarettes by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Alfred Foster and 64 others, of Trenton, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial and evidence to support claim of the heirs of James W. Bellah, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAINES: Protest of the employés of C. H. & F. H. Stott, of Stottville, N. Y; also, protest of citizens of Troy and Albany, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Cigar-makers' Association of Troy, N. Y., against any interference with the tariff and internal-revenue laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Troy, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the operatives of James Thompson & Co.'s manufactory, Valley Falls, N. Y., against any decrease in duties on flax and hemp and cotton goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Lansingburg, N. Y., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 362 citizens and workingmen of Schaghticoke, N. Y., against tariff reduction upon woolen goods and other industries in that vicinity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. W. Kipp and others, of Schaghticoke, N. Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward Wilson and other citizens of Schaghticoke, N. Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGER: Suggestions for changing our system of taxation on basis of Prussian income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Protest of the Trades Leagues of the city of Philadelphia, composed of 1,500 leading business firms, against the ad valorem feature of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDRIX: Petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employés of the W. H. Kemp Company, of New York, against any reduction of the duties on gold, silver, and metal leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James McKion, president, and other employés of the E. M. Knox Hat Manufactory, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill in its present condition—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: Two petitions of the Oregon tobacco manufacturers and cigar-makers, for uniform duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest from E. K. Jones & Co., of Sellwood, Oregon, against change of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Two petitions of Petzold & Martung's employés, 15 in number, asking that tariff law on gold, silver, and metal leaf remain unchanged—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 38 farmers and residents of Chautauqua County, N. Y., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers and residents of Sinclairville, N. Y., asking to have duties on farm products remain as they now are—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 5 cigar manufacturers of Dunkirk, N. Y., for uniform rate of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 109 farmers of Cattaraugus County, N. Y.,

protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKIRT: Petition to annex telegraph to the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KRIBBS: Petition of prominent citizens of Brookville, Pa., in favor of private pension bill of George Van Vliet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARVIN of New York: Remonstrance of Alexander Kent and 477 other citizens of Waldron, Orange County, N. Y., against the reduction of existing tariff rates on articles of American production and manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Albert L. Decker and other citizens of Montgomery, Orange County, N. Y., against the reduction of tariff rates on articles of American production and manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of R. Kincaid and other citizens of Slatsburg, Orange County, N. Y., with 35 girl knitters, against the reduction of tariff rates on articles of American manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Protest of overseers and operatives of Thomas Henry & Sons, of Tioga Mills No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of New Castle Steel and Tinplate Company, together with 200 laborers, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Welk's Rolling Mill Company, Sharon, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of S. P. Wetherill Company, of Philadelphia, protesting against the placing of copperas on the free list as set forth in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of thread-workers of Newark, N. J., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Chenango Lodge, of Sharon, Pa., protesting against passage of Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Huntington and Broad Top Railroad Company, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 240 workingmen of Sharon, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sharon Steel Casting Company, together with the workingmen connected therewith, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stewart Iron Company, of Sharon, Pa., together with 100 workingmen, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sayer Metal Company, and workingmen connected therewith, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 400 workingmen, of Sharon, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition of The All Tobacco Cigarette Manufacturers' Association for a separate classification—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON: Protest of J. C. Ford, George W. Ayers, and 49 others, of Fruitport, Mich., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Protest of 30 operatives of the Plainville Mills of Mapleville, R. I.; of 33 employés of Lumson & Kirkaldy, of Woonsocket, R. I.; of 28 operatives of Sheffield Worsted Company, of Pascoag, R. I.; of 294 operatives of Valley Falls Company Mills, of Valley Falls, R. I.; of 212 operatives of E. Jencks Manufacturing Company, of Pawtucket, R. I.; of 42 operatives of Mapleville Mills, of Burrillville, R. I.; of 100 operatives of E. Jencks Manufacturing Company, of Pawtucket, R. I.; of 87 operatives of Glendale Manufacturing Company, of Glendale, R. I.; of 112 operatives of American Worsted Company, of Woonsocket, R. I., and of 234 operatives of Green & Daniels Manufacturing Company, of Pawtucket, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of John Marshall & Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., and of B. P. Clopp Ammonia Company, of Pawtucket, R. I., against certain provisions of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 2,500 operatives of the J. & P. Coats Thread Company, of Pawtucket, R. I., against the reduction of duty on spool cotton and fine cotton yarn as provided in the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 179 operatives of the Lippitt Woolen Company, of Woonsocket, R. I., against the provisions of the Wilson bill relating to woolen and worsted industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protests of 250 operatives of British Hosiery Company, of Thornron, R. I.; of 143 operatives of Woonsocket Worsted Mills, of Woonsocket, R. I.; and of 188 employés of Harris Woolen Company, of Woonsocket, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 73 operatives of Campbell Mills, Potter Hill, 88 operatives of Perseverance Worsted Company, 81 operatives of Belleville Manufacturing Company, Allentown, 35 employés of William Gregory Manufacturing Company, 64 operatives of Walker Woolen Mills, Westerly, 58 operatives of Stafford Manufacturing Company, Central Falls, 34 employés Henry C. White & Son, of Chepachet, all in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protests of 60 operatives of the Chemnitz Company, of Providence, R. I.; of 6 operatives of Saundersonville Mill, of Scituate; of 61 operatives of Carolina Mills Company; of 43 operatives of Ashland Mills, of Scituate; of 133 operatives of the E. Jencks Manufacturing Company, of Pawtucket; of 12 operatives of the Tremont Worsted Company, of Woonsocket; of 325 operatives of the Berkley Mills, of Berkley, and of 209 operatives of the Elizabeth Mills, of Hills Grove, all of Rhode Island, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Remonstrance of the Lincoln League, composed of 250 members, of Butler, Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 89 employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of New Castle, Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: Protest of producers of lime in Vermont against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 156 farmers, laborers, mechanics, and others of Pownal, Vt., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the employés of the National Horse Nail Company of Vergennes, Vt., against the reduction of duties upon horseshoe nails proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 13 manufacturers of cigars in Burlington, Vt., praying for uniform rate of 35 cents duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED: Petition of E. O. Williams and others, workers on gold and silver leaf, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wolfgang Petz and others, workers on gold and silver leaf, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIPE: Memorial of laborers and producers of oil of Oakdale, Pa., and of those of Shamokin, Smith's Ferry, Murdocksville, Coraopolis, McDonald, Taylorstown, and Crothers, all of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, which places oil on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the citizens and workingmen of McKeesport, and of those of Pittsburg, Cannonsburg, Pa., and from the State at large, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturers' Natural Gas Company, and of the Cannonsburg Iron and Steel Company, and of the Cannonsburg Light and Fuel Company, and the Budke Manufacturing Company, of Cannonsburg, Pa., and of the Keystone Lodge, No. 46, of the Amalgamated Association, of Demmler, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of the Pittsburg, Columbus, Cincinnati and St. Louis Railway, of Pittsburg, Pa., and of 12 manufacturers and makers of tobacco, of Brownsville, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of trustees of the Point Pleasant (W. Va.) Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for damages for injury to their church by United States troops—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Typographical Union, No. 160, of McKeesport, Pa., for the passage of a bill providing for the construction of a Government Printing Office, no part of which building shall

be constructed by contract, but all by day labor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of McKeesport Typographical Union, No. 160, of McKeesport, Pa., praying for the passage of a bill through Congress providing for the ownership and control by the Government of the various telegraph systems of the country—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of R. W. Cummins and 356 other producers and farmers owning producing farms, and laborers, of Washington County and Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against that provision of the Wilson tariff bill which places oil on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr SHAW: Petition of farmers and dealers in barley, citizens and residents of Trempealeau County, Wis., against reduction of the duty on barley as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers and dealers in barley, citizens and residents of Lacrosse County, Wis., protesting against the reduction of the duty on barley, as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of West & Woltersdorf, and 9 other manufacturers of cigars, residents of Eauclaire County, Wis., asking for a uniform duty of 35 cents per pound on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Julius Denge and 10 other manufacturers of cigars, residents of Eauclaire County, Wis., asking for a duty of 35 cents per pound on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the overseers and operatives of the Ponemah Mills, of Taftville, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial from 1,425 iron miners of Ishpeming, Mich., representing that great suffering will prevail among them if iron is placed upon the free list, and praying that the iron industry be not discriminated against—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of wool-growers of Idaho, protesting against placing wool on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOMER: Protest of P. Hiestand, superintendent of Juniata Furnace and Foundry Company, of Newport, Pa., and 75 employés and other citizens, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Petition of H. Browning Taylor, Vernon Brink, and Arthur Pratt, cigar-manufacturers of Le Raysville, Bradford County, Pa., in favor of a uniform duty of 35 cents a pound on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of gold-beaters and beaters of other metals, of Sayre, Bradford County, Pa., against the proposed reduction of duty on their products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Babcock and other tobacco-growers of Wells Township, Bradford County, Pa., against the proposed reduction of duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the president and employés of the Genesee Salt Company, protesting against the repeal of the present duty on salt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 777 employés of the American Optical Company, of Southbridge, Mass.; of 232 employés of the Harrington & Richardson Arms Company of Worcester, Mass., and memorial of H. Austin Putman, a citizen and workingman of Rutland, Mass., protesting against the proposed change in the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 27 employés of Auburn Mills Company; of 61 employés of Fox Mills, Worcester; of 53 of Worcester Woolen Mills; of 60 employés of W. E. Hayward & Co., East Douglas; of 27 employés of Comins & Co., Rochdale; of 13 employés of Lakeside Manufacturing Company; of 61 employés of Valley Woolen Mills, Cherry Valley; of 40 employés of Hopesville Manufacturing Company; of 170 employés of Edgeworth Woolen Mills, Worcester, all of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against proposed change in tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 47 employés of Rochdale Woolen Mills, Rochdale, Mass.; of 33 employés of Sutton Woolen Mills, Sutton, Mass.; of 34 employés of the Fisher Mills Company, Fisherville, Mass.; of 63 employés of the Aldrich Mill, Millbury, Mass.; of 48 employés of the J. R. Toney Razor Company, Worcester, Mass.; of 9 employés of J. S. Smith, Wilkinsonville, Mass.; of 16 employés of Rawson & Simpson, Worcester, Mass.; of 59 employés of S. F. Scott, Uxbridge, Mass.; and of 43 employés of Lakeville Woolen Company, Rutland, Mass., against the proposed change in the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 6, 1894.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BOUTELLE and Mr. CATCHINGS addressed the Chair.

Mr. CATCHINGS was recognized.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I call up the report of the Committee on Rules submitted to the House yesterday.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] calls up a question of the highest privilege, a report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I make the point of order that the question of privilege which I call up is of higher order than the matter which the gentleman from Mississippi calls up, as plainly disclosed in the rules. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the rules of this House make a very marked and clear distinction between a "question of privilege" and a "privileged question." I ask the Chair to have read the rule on the subject. I claim that the proposition of the gentleman from Mississippi is simply a "privileged question," relating to and affecting a matter of legislative procedure, and that the resolution which I hold to be before the House is before the House as a "question of privilege," which is clearly declared in the rules to be, in contradistinction to a "privileged question," a matter of the highest rank of precedence. On this point I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. REED. I hope the Chair will give this point some consideration, because it is important for the orderly conduct of business.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask the Chair to have read the rule on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The rules provide——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Chair please have read the rule on the subject?

The SPEAKER. Both the gentlemen from Maine will recognize that it is in order at any time to call up a report from the Committee on Rules, and that pending the consideration of such report no motion is in order except one motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. Will the Chair permit me to suggest——

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. REED. Unless my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] desires to say something——

Mr. BOUTELLE. If the Chair will permit. I desire to call attention to the distinct language of the rule. I did not make it; it is a part of the rules of this House. I read from page 426 of the Digest:

> Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of members individually in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to fix the day to which the House shall adjourn, to adjourn, and for a recess.

That is Rule IX verbatim. In the Digest it is stated:

> "Questions of privilege" are sometimes confounded with what are known as "privileged questions." The latter designation applies to motions, legislative propositions, or other questions, which take precedence in different degrees over each other and over the ordinary business of the House; while "questions of privilege," as defined by the rule, relate to the rights of the members officially and individually, and of the House collectively.

I hold, Mr. Speaker, that under the rule and practice of the House, as set forth in this language of the Manual, the question of privilege which was raised by me and placed before the House by the Speaker two days ago for the action of the House is now before the House, has been parliamentarily before the House from the time when the Speaker had the resolution read at the Clerk's desk, and thus presented for the action of the House as a question of high privilege. Up to this time the House has taken no action on that question. We have adjourned without a quorum; and there is no place known to parliamentary law where that resolution can now be except in the possession of the House, into whose possession it was given by the Speaker for action; and it can not be disposed of until the House takes some action upon it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires the attention of the House for one moment. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] seems to misapprehend the position of the resolution called up by him. The rules provide that when any matter is called up, the question of consideration shall not be put to the House unless some member demands it. The resolution of the gentleman from Maine has never been before the House in the sense of being

before it for consideration, because when it was called up by the gentleman from Maine the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] raised the question of consideration, whereupon it became a question for the House to determine, Will the House proceed to consider the resolution——

Mr. BOUTELLE. And that has never been determined.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would thank the gentleman from Maine if he would permit the Chair to conclude his statement.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I thought the Speaker had concluded.

The SPEAKER. Upon the question, "Will the House proceed to consider the resolution?" no quorum voted, and with the business in that position the House adjourned. That question of consideration might be raised each day. For instance, the House might refuse one day to consider the resolution, and yet the next day the gentleman might call it up again. The business of the House might be in such a condition on one day that the House would not consider the resolution, and on the next day business might be in such a condition that the House would consider the resolution.

Now then, the question of consideration having been raised, no quorum having voted, and adjournment having taken place, the Chair held that on the next legislative day the resolution was not before the House, but that the gentleman might call it up again; that the practical effect of the failure to obtain a quorum was when the adjournment took place the same as though the House had refused to consider the resolution, because the proceedings of that day were ended; and the only purpose of the question raised by the gentleman from Tennessee was that the House should determine whether that day it would consider that resolution.

Therefore the Chair held and holds that the resolution was not before the House, but that the resolution was just exactly where it was before the gentleman from Maine made his motion; that is to say, it had been reported back by the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the recommendation that it be laid on the table. It was laid on the table, not being thus finally disposed of by a vote of the House, but laid on the table temporarily until called up and acted upon by the House.

Now, on yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] called up the report from the Committee on Rules, which is pending. The question of consideration was raised against that report. The Chair held that the question of consideration could not be raised against the report of the committee, for it was a question which was *res adjudicata* in the House; that the Chair had previously so held, and on an appeal from that decision by the vote of a large majority of the House the appeal was laid on the table, which had the effect of sustaining the judgment of the Chair.

So the distinction between the case the gentleman from Maine presents and the present question—that is, the report of the Committee on Rules presented by the gentleman from Mississippi to the House on yesterday—is very clear; for in the one case—the resolution presented by the gentleman from Maine—the House had not determined to consider the resolution which he called up, whereas on the other hand the House had entered upon the consideration of the report from the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Mississippi had demanded the previous question on the report. The yeas and nays had been ordered on the demand for the previous question, so that the pending question before the House, the regular order of business would be the consideration of the report from the Committee on Rules when called up by the gentleman having it in charge.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Now, the Digest provides, if the gentleman from Maine will permit the Chair to proceed, that—

> It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and pending the consideration the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn.

Now this report from the Committee on Rules is before the House. The gentleman from Maine rises to a question of privilege, but the Chair is forbidden, under the rules, to entertain that question or any other question pending the consideration of the report.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. And the pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi for the previous question, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the Chair will reflect before making such a ruling——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has reflected——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to say a word upon it——

The SPEAKER. And any suggestion on the part of the gentleman that the Chair does not reflect upon a ruling of this character, the Chair understands to be a reflection on the part of the gentleman from Maine on the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I entirely disclaim any such intention, Mr. Speaker. But I only ask to be heard before the Chair rules upon this question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already ruled upon the question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do I understand the Chair to rule that the question of privilege that I have raised does not take precedence——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled upon the question, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I respectfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has exercised his right. The Chair has given the gentleman ample latitude. He raises the question every morning——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Chair has no right to speak about "latitude" as applied to my actions. I am standing here in my right as a Representative on this floor, and as a member of a minority, with a Speaker opposed to me, and with an enormous majority politically opposed to me. I am not asking any "latitude," but am asserting my representative rights.

[Cries of "Regular order."]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not permit that line of discussion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I only ask for my rights——

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER (continuing). And on that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE (speaking at the same time). I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. As many as favor ordering the previous question upon the resolution will, when their names are called, say aye, those opposed no, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BOUTELLE (speaking at the same time). Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair. I protest against this whole proceeding.

The Clerk began the calling of the roll.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. There is not any order here.

The SPEAKER. This roll call can not be interrupted.

Mr. BURROWS. But I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. That can not interrupt a roll call.

Mr. BURROWS. Suppose the House is in such confusion that tha Clerk can not be heard?

The SPEAKER. It would be proper to call attention to that.

Mr. BURROWS. That is my question of order.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order, so that gentlemen can be heard.

Mr. BURROWS. This is a very important roll call, and the Clerk may make some mistakes unless the House is in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, so that members may hear their names when called by the Clerk.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question; and there were—yeas 168, nays 0, not voting 183; as follows:

YEAS—168.

Abbott,	Cobb, Mo.	Hall, Minn.	McCreary, Ky.
Alderson,	Cockran,	Hall, Mo.	McCulloch,
Alexander,	Coffeen,	Hammond,	McDannold,
Arnold,	Compton,	Hare,	McDearmon,
Bailey,	Conn,	Harter,	McEttrick,
Baldwin,	Coombs,	Hayes,	McGann,
Bankhead,	Cooper, Fla.	Heard,	McKaig,
Bartlett,	Cooper, Ind.	Henderson, N. C.	McKeighan,
Barwig,	Covert,	Hendrix,	McNagny,
Bell, Tex.	Cox,	Hines,	McRae,
Berry,	Crain,	Holman,	Meredith,
Black, Ga.	Crawford,	Hooker, Miss.	Money,
Black, Ill.	Culberson,	Houk, Ohio	Montgomery,
Blanchard,	Cummings,	Hunter,	Morgan,
Bland,	De Armond,	Hutcheson,	Moses,
Bower, N. C.	De Forest,	Johnson, Ohio	Mutchler,
Branch,	Denson,	Jones,	Neill,
Brawley,	Dinsmore,	Kilgore,	Oates,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dockery,	Kribbs,	O'Neil,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Donovan,	Kyle,	Outhwaite,
Bretz,	Dunn,	Lane,	Page,
Brickner,	Durborow,	Lapham,	Paschal,
Brookshire,	Ellis, Ky.	Latimer,	Paynter,
Bryan,	Enloe,	Layton,	Pearson,
Bynum,	Epes,	Lester,	Pendleton, Tex.
Cabaniss	Erdman,	Lisle,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Caminetti,	Everett,	Livingston,	Pigott,
Cannon, Cal.	Forman,	Lynch,	Price,
Capehart,	Fyan,	Maddox,	Rayner,
Caruth,	Goldzier,	Maguire,	Reilly,
Catchings,	Gorman,	Mallory,	Richards, Ohio
Causey,	Grady,	Marshall,	Richardson, Mich.
Clark, Mo.	Gresham,	Martin, Ind.	Richardson, Tenn.
Clarke, Ala.	Haines,	McAleer.	Ritchie,

Robbins,	Somers,	Taylor, Ind.	Weadock,
Robertson, La.	Springer,	Terry,	Wells,
Rusk,	Stallings,	Tracey,	Wheeler, Ala.
Russell, Ga.	Stevens,	Tucker,	Whiting,
Ryan,	Stone, Ky.	Turner,	Williams, Ill.
Sayers,	Talbott, Md.	Tyler,	Williams, Miss.
Schermerhorn,	Tarsney,	Warner,	Wilson, W. Va.
Snodgrass,	Tate,	Washington,	Wise.

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—183.

Adams, Ky.	Daniels,	Hudson,	Reyburn,
Adams, Pa.	Davey,	Hulick,	Robinson, Pa.
Aitken,	Davis,	Hull,	Russell, Conn.
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Ikirt,	Scranton,
Allen,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Settle,
Apsley,	Doolittle,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Shaw,
Avery,	Draper,	Joy,	Shell,
Babcock,	Dunphy,	Kem,	Sherman,
Baker, Kans.	Edmunds,	Kiefer,	Sibley,
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Oregon	Lacey,	Sickles,
Barnes,	English,	Lawson,	Simpson,
Barthoidt,	Fielder,	Lefever,	Sipe,
Belden.	Fithian,	Linton,	Smith,
Bell, Colo.	Fletcher,	Lockwood,	Sperry,
Beltzhoover,	Funk,	Loud,	Stephenson,
Bingham,	Funston,	Loudenslager,	Stockdale,
Blair,	Gardner,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Boatner,	Gear,	Magner,	Stone, W. A.
Boen,	Geary,	Mahon,	Storer,
Boutelle,	Geissenhainer,	Marsh,	Strait,
Bowers, Cal.	Gillet, N. Y.	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Brattan,	Gillett, Mass.	McCall,	Swanson,
Broderick,	Goodnight,	McCleary, Minn.	Sweet,
Brosius,	Graham,	McDowell,	Talbert, S. C.
Brown,	Griffin.	McLaurin,	Tawney,
Bundy,	Grosvenor,	McMillin,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bunn,	Grout,	Meiklejohn,	Thomas,
Burnes,	Hager,	Mercer,	Turpin,
Burrows,	Hainer,	Meyer,	Updegraff,
Cadmus,	Harmer,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Caldwell,	Harris,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Campbell,	Hatch,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Cannon, Ill.	Hartman,	Murray,	Walker,
Chickering,	Haugen,	Newlands,	Wanger,
Childs,	Heiner,	Northway,	Waugh,
Clancy,	Henderson, Ill.	Patterson,	Wever,
Cobb, Ala.	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cockrell,	Hepburn,	Pence,	White,
Cogswell,	Hermann,	Perkins,	Wilson, Ohio
Cooper, Tex.	Hicks,	Phillips,	Wilson, Wash.
Cooper, Wis.	Hilborn,	Pickler,	Wolverton,
Cornish,	Hitt,	Post,	Woodard,
Cousins,	Hooker, N. Y.	Powers,	Woomer,
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Ill.	Randall,	Wright, Mass.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Ray,	Wright, Pa.
Dalzell,	Houk, Tenn.	Reed,	

No quorum voting.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. HATCH with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. SHELL with Mr. HEPBURN.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. FIELDER with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. CAMPBELL with Mr. BELDEN.

For this day:

Mr. GEISSENHAINER with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. POST.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. RAY.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. LACEY.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. BUNN with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. CORNISH with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. COCKRELL with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. CADMUS with Mr. SCRANTON.

Until the 9th of January:

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to change my vote. I vote aye.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE] desires to change his vote.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LANE.

Mr. LANE. I vote aye.

Mr. REED. Did the gentleman vote? Is he recorded in the negative?

Mr. LANE. I should have been so recorded, if I am not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states that he desires to change his vote, and to vote aye.

Mr. BURROWS. Was he recorded in the negative? is the question.

Mr. REED. I understand the Clerk to say that he was not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that he was not; but how is that important? The gentleman records his vote as aye.

Mr. BURROWS. He said he desired to change his vote, and there does not seem to be any vote recorded.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman stated that he had voted.

Mr. LANE. Yes; I voted no, and I wish to change that to aye.

The SPEAKER. The change will be made in accordance with the gentleman's request.

Mr DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. BURNES] is detained from the House on account of a recent affliction in his family.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS], is detained at home by the death of his wife. Otherwise he would be here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already obtained leave of absence.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. DUNPHY] is in New York sick in bed with pneumonia.

The SPEAKER. On this question the ayes are 168; the nays are none. No quorum has voted.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The roll was called, when the following-named members failed to respond:

Adams, Ky.	Davey,	Houk, Tenn.	Sherman,
Allen,	Dunphy,	Lacey,	Sickles,
Babcock,	Edmunds,	Lawson,	Sipe,
Barnes,	English,	Lefever,	Stockdale,
Belden,	Fielder,	Lockwood,	Storer,
Bingham,	Fithian,	Loudenslager,	Strait,
Boatner,	Gardner,	Magner,	Talbert, S. C.
Brattan,	Gear,	McLaurin,	Tawney,
Broderick,	Geary,	Meyer,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brown,	Geissenhainer,	Moon,	Turpin,
Bunn,	Gillet, Mass.	Newlands,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Burnes,	Goodnight,	Pence,	Wever,
Cadmus,	Graham,	Perkins,	White,
Campbell,	Grout,	Pickler,	Wolverton,
Clancy,	Hartman,	Post,	Woodard,
Cobb, Ala.	Hatch,	Ray,	Woomer.
Cockrell,	Henderson, Iowa	Reyburn,	
Cooper, Tex.	Hepburn,	Settle,	
Cornish,	Hilborn,	Shell,	

The SPEAKER. The doors will now be closed, and the Clerk will call the absentees, and on this call excuses will be in order.

The roll was again called.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. COCKRELL] be excused. His sister-in-law is said to be dying.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman from Texas will be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty gentlemen have answered to their names.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. MCALEER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. SIPE] be excused on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was excused on yesterday. The gentleman from West Virginia moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 123, noes 67.

Mr. REED. Tellers.

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

The House again divided; and tellers reported—ayes 129, noes 15.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and further proceedings under the call are dispensed with. The question now recurs on the demand for the previous question, and on that the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 0, not voting 183; as follows:

YEAS—168.

Abbott,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Cockran,	Donovan,
Alderson,	Breckinridge, Ky.	Coffeen,	Dunn,
Alexander,	Bretz,	Compton,	Durborow,
Arnold,	Brickner,	Conn,	Ellis, Ky.
Bailey,	Brookshire,	Coombs,	English,
Baldwin,	Bryan,	Cooper, Fla.	Enloe,
Bankhead,	Bynum,	Cooper, Ind.	Epes,
Bartlett,	Cabaniss,	Covert,	Erdman,
Barwig,	Caminetti,	Cox,	Everett,
Bell, Tex.	Campbell,	Crain,	Forman,
Berry,	Cannon, Cal.	Crawford,	Fyan,
Black, Ga.	Capehart,	Culberson,	Goldzier,
Blanchard,	Caruth,	Cummings,	Gorman,
Bland,	Catchings,	De Armond,	Grady,
Bower, N. C.	Clark, Mo.	De Forest,	Gresham,
Branch,	Clarke, Ala.	Dinsmore,	Griffin,
Brawley,	Cobb, Mo.	Dockery,	Hall, Minn.

Hall, Mo.
Hammond,
Hare,
Harter,
Hayes,
Heard,
Henderson, N. C.
Hendrix,
Hines,
Hooker, Miss.
Houk, Ohio
Hunter,
Hutcheson,
Ikirt,
Johnson, Ohio
Jones,
Kilgore,
Kribbs,
Kyle,
Lane,
Lapham,
Latimer,
Layton,
Lester,
Lisle,
Livingston,
Lynch,
Maddox,
Maguire,
Mallory,
Marshall,
Martin, Ind.
McAleer,
McCreary, Ky.
McCulloch,
McDannold,
McDearmon,
McEttrick,
McGann,
McKaig,
McKeighan,
McMillin,
McNagny,
McRae,
Meredith,
Money,
Montgomery,
Morgan,
Moses,
Mutchler,
Neill,
Oates,
O'Neil,
Outhwaite,
Paschal,
Patterson,
Paynter,
Pearson,
Pendleton, Tex.
Pendleton, W. Va.
Pigott,
Price,
Rayner,
Reilly,
Richards, Ohio
Richardson, Mich.
Richardson, Tenn.
Ritchie,
Robbins,
Robertson, La.
Rusk,
Russell, Ga.
Ryan,
Sayers,
Schermerhorn,
Snodgrass,
Somers,
Springer,
Stallings,
Stevens,
Stone, Ky.
Swanson,
Talbott, Md.
Tarsney,
Tate,
Taylor, Ind.
Terry,
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner,
Tyler,
Warner,
Weadock,
Wells,
Wheeler, Ala.
Whiting,
Williams, Ill.
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wise.

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—183.

Adams, Ky.
Adams, Pa.
Aitken,
Aldrich,
Allen,
Apsley,
Avery,
Babcock,
Baker, Kans.
Baker, N. H.
Barnes,
Bartholdt,
Belden,
Bell, Colo.
Beltzhoover,
Bingham,
Black, Ill.
Blair,
Boatner,
Boen,
Boutelle,
Bowers, Cal.
Brattan,
Broderick,
Brosius,
Brown,
Bundy,
Bunn,
Burnes,
Burrows,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Cannon, Ill.
Causey,
Chickering,
Childs,
Clancy,
Cobb, Ala.
Cockrell,
Cogswell,
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Cornish,
Cousins,
Curtis, Kans.
Curtis, N. Y.
Dalzell,
Daniels,
Davey,
Davis,
Denson,
Dingley,
Dolliver,
Doolittle,
Draper,
Dunphy,
Edmunds,
Ellis, Oregon
Fielder,
Fithian,
Fletcher,
Funk,
Funston,
Gardner,
Gear,
Geary,
Geissenhainer,
Gillet, N. Y.
Gillett, Mass.
Goodnight,
Graham,
Grosvenor,
Grout,
Hager,
Hainer,
Haines,
Harmer,
Harris,
Hartman,
Hatch,
Haugen,
Heiner,
Henderson, Ill.
Henderson, Iowa
Hepburn,
Hermann,
Hicks,
Hilborn,
Hitt,
Holman,
Hooker, N. Y.
Hopkins, Ill.
Hopkins, Pa.
Houk, Tenn.
Hudson,
Hulick,
Hull,
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, N. Dak.
Joy,
Kem,
Kiefer,
Lacey,
Lawson,
Lefever,
Linton,
Lockwood,
Loud,
Loudenslager,
Lucas,
Magner,
Mahon,
Marsh,
Marvin, N. Y.
McCall,
McCleary, Minn.
McDowell,
McLaurin,
Melklejohn,
Mercer,
Meyer,
Milliken,
Moon,
Morse,
Murray,
Newlands,
Northway,
Page,
Payne,
Pence,
Perkins,
Phillips,
Pickler,
Post,
Powers,
Randall,
Ray,
Reed,
Reyburn,
Robinson, Pa.
Russell, Conn.
Scranton,
Settle,
Shaw,
Shell,
Sherman,
Sibley,
Sickles,
Simpson,
Sipe,
Smith,
Sperry,
Stephenson,
Stockdale,
Stone, C. W.
Stone, W. A.
Storer,
Strait,
Strong,
Sweet,
Talbert, S. C.
Tawney,
Taylor, Tenn.
Thomas,
Turpin,
Updegraff,
Van Voorhis, N. Y
Van Voorhis, Ohio
Wadsworth,
Walker,
Wanger,
Washington,
Waugh,
Wever,
Wheeler, Ill.
White,
Wilson, Ohio
Wilson, Wash.
Wolverton,
Woodard,
Woomer,
Wright, Mass.
Wright, Pa.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 168 and the nays none. No quorum has voted.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BURROWS. Division.

The House divided: and there were—ayes 101, noes 34.

Mr. BURROWS. Tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

The House again divided: and tellers reported—ayes 105, noes 17.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 2, not voting 180; as follows:

YEAS—169.

Abbott,
Alderson,
Alexander,
Arnold,
Bailey,
Baker, Kans.
Baldwin,
Bankhead,
Bartlett,
Barwig,
Bell, Tex.
Beltzhoover,
Berry,
Black, Ga.
Black, Ill.
Blanchard,
Bland,
Bower, N. C.
Branch,
Brawley,
Breckinridge, Ark.
Breckinridge, Ky.
Bretz,
Brickner,
Brookshire.
Bryan,
Bynum,
Cabaniss,
Caminetti,
Campbell,
Cannon, Cal.
Capehart,
Caruth,
Catchings,
Causey,
Clark, Mo.
Clarke, Ala.
Cobb, Mo.
Cockran,
Coffeen,
Compton,
Conn,
Coombs,
Cooper, Fla.
Cooper, Ind.
Covert,
Cox,
Crain,
Cummings,
Davis,
De Armond,
De Forest,
Denson,
Dinsmore,
Dockery,
Donovan,
Dunn,
Durborow,
Ellis, Ky.
Enloe,
Epes,
Erdman,
Everett,
Forman,
Fyan,
Goldzier,
Gorman,
Grady,
Gresham,
Griffin,
Hall, Minn.
Hall, Mo.
Hammond,
Hare,
Harter,
Hayes,
Heard,
Henderson, N. C.
Hendrix,
Hines,
Holman,
Hooker, Miss.
Houk, Ohio
Hunter,
Hutcheson,
Ikirt,
Johnson, Ohio
Jones,
Kilgore,
Kribbs,
Kyle,
Lane,
Latimer,
Layton,
Lester,
Lisle,
Livingston,
Lynch,
Maddox,
Maguire,
Mallory,
Marshall,
Martin, Ind.
McAleer,
McCreary, Ky.
McCulloch,
McDannold,
McDearmon,
McEttrick,
McGann,
McKaig,
McKeighan,
McMillin,
McNagny,
McRae,
Meredith,
Money,
Montgomery,
Morgan,
Moses,
Mutchler,
Neill,
Oates,
O'Neil,
Outhwaite,
Paschal,
Patterson,
Paynter,
Pearson,
Pendleton, Tex.
Pendleton, W. Va.
Pigott,
Price,
Rayner,
Reilly,
Richards, Ohio
Richardson, Mich.
Richardson, Tenn.
Ritchie,
Robbins,
Robertson, La.
Russell, Ga.
Ryan,
Sayers,
Schermerhorn,
Snodgrass,
Somers,
Springer,
Stallings,
Stone, Ky.
Swanson,
Talbott, Md.
Tarsney,
Tate,
Taylor, Ind.
Terry,
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner,
Warner,
Washington,
Weadock,
Wells,
Wheeler, Ala.
Whiting,
Williams, Ill.
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wise.

NAYS—2.

Hull,
Payne.

NOT VOTING—180.

Adams, Ky.
Adams, Pa.
Aitken,
Aldrich,
Allen,
Apsley,
Avery,
Babcock,
Baker, N. H.
Barnes,
Bartholdt,
Belden,
Bell, Colo.
Bingham,
Blair,
Boatner,
Boen,
Boutelle,
Bowers, Cal.
Brattan,
Broderick,
Brosius,
Brown,
Bundy,
Bunn,
Burnes,
Burrows,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Cannon, Ill.
Chickering,
Childs,
Clancy,
Cobb, Ala.
Cockrell,
Cogswell,
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Cornish,
Cousins,
Crawford,
Culberson,
Curtis, Kans.
Curtis, N. Y.
Dalzell,
Daniels,
Davey,
Dingley,
Dolliver,
Doolittle,
Draper,
Dunphy,
Edmunds,
Ellis, Oregon
English,
Fielder,
Fithian,
Fletcher,
Funk,
Funston,
Gardner,
Gear,
Geissenhainer,
Gillet, N. Y.
Gillett, Mass.
Goodnight,
Graham,
Grosvenor,
Grout,
Hager,
Hainer,
Haines,
Harmer,
Harris,
Hartman,
Hatch,
Haugen,
Heiner,
Henderson, Ill.
Henderson, Iowa
Hepburn,
Hermann,
Hicks,
Hilborn,
Hitt,
Hooker, N. Y.
Hopkins, Ill.
Hopkins, Pa.
Houk, Tenn.
Hudson,
Hulick,
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, N. Dak.
Joy,
Kem,
Kiefer,
Lacey,
Lapham,
Lawson,
Lefever,
Linton,
Lockwood,
Loud,
Loudenslager,
Lucas,
Magner,
Mahon,
Marsh,
Marvin, N. Y.
McCall,
McCleary, Minn.
McDowell,
McLaurin,
Melklejohn,
Mercer,
Meyer,
Milliken,
Moon,
Morse,
Murray,
Newlands,
Northway,
Page,
Pence,
Perkins,
Phillips,
Pickler,
Post,
Powers,
Randall,
Ray,
Reed,
Reyburn,
Robinson, Pa.
Rusk,
Russell, Conn.
Scranton,
Settle,
Shaw,
Shell,
Sherman,
Sibley,
Sickles,
Simpson,
Sipe,
Smith,
Sperry,
Stephenson,
Stevens,
Stockdale,
Stone, C. W.
Stone, W. A.
Storer,
Strait,
Strong,
Sweet,
Talbert, S. C.
Tawney,
Taylor, Tenn.
Turpin,
Tyler,
Updegraff,
Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Van Voorhis, Ohio
Wadsworth,
Walker,
Wanger,
Waugh,
Wever,
Wheeler, Ill.
White,
Wilson, Ohio
Wilson, Wash.
Wolverton,
Woodard,
Woomer,
Wright, Mass.
Wright, Pa.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. CUMMINGS). On this question the yeas are 169 and the nays are 2. A call of the House is ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, when the following-named members failed to answer:

Adams, Ky.
Allen,
Barnes,
Belden,
Bingham,
Boatner,
Brattan,
Broderick,
Brown,
Bunn,
Burnes,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Childs,
Clancy,
Cobb, Ala.
Cockrell,
Cooper, Tex.
Cornish,
Davey,
Dunphy,
Fielder,
Fithian,
Gardner,
Gear,
Geissenhainer,
Gillett, Mass.
Goodnight,
Graham,
Grout,
Harris,
Hatch,
Heiner,
Henderson, Iowa
Hepburn,
Lacey,
Lawson,
Lefever,
Lockwood,
Loudenslager,
Magner,
McLaurin,
Meyer,
Moon,
Newlands,
Pickler,
Post,
Randall,
Ray,
Robinson, Pa.
Scranton,
Shell,
Sherman,
Sickles,
Sipe,
Stockdale,
Storer,
Strait,
Talbert, S. C.
Tawney,
Taylor, Tenn.
Turpin,
Wever,
White,
Wolverton,
Woodard,
Woomer.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The doors will now be closed. The Clerk will call the names of gentlemen who failed to respond on the first call, and on this call excuses will be in order.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HULL (when the name of Mr. GEAR was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. GEAR] be excused, as he is detained in Iowa by very important business.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky (when the name of Mr. GOODNIGHT was called). Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. GOODNIGHT] is detained from the House by illness, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. COOMBS (when the name of Mr. GRAHAM was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. GRAHAM] be excused on account of severe sickness. So far, he has been unable to attend any of the sessions of the House.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HULL (when the name of Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. HENDERSON] be excused on account of serious illness.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HULL (when the name of Mr. HEPBURN was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. HEPBURN], be excused, on account of important business.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HULL (when the name of Mr. LACEY was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. LACEY] be excused, as he is detained in Iowa by important business.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HULL (when the name of Mr. PERKINS was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. PERKINS], who is detained in Iowa by important business, be excused.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I object.

Mr. HULL. I move that he be excused.

The question was taken on the motion to excuse Mr. PERKINS; and there were—ayes 87, noes 30.

Mr. REED. I think we ought to have tellers on this, Mr. Speaker. That vote does not show a majority.

Tellers were ordered.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 84.

Mr. REED. It seems to me that we ought to have the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not interrupt the roll call.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. My point of order is that nothing is in order except to continue the prior roll call.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, and the Clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 117, not voting 101; as follows:

YEAS—133.

Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Kem,	Richardson, Tenn.
Apsley,	Doolittle,	Kiefer,	Robinson, Pa.
Avery,	Durborow,	Lane,	Russell, Conn.
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Oregon	Lapham,	Ryan,
Bartholdt,	Fletcher,	Linton,	Settle,
Bell, Colo.	Funk,	Livingston,	Shaw,
Beltzhoover,	Geary,	Loud,	Sibley,
Black, Ill.	Gillet, N. Y.	Lucas,	Simpson,
Blair,	Gresham,	Maguire,	Smith,
Blanchard,	Grosvenor,	Mahon,	Stephenson,
Boen,	Hager,	Marshall,	Stone, C. W.
Bowers, Cal.	Hainer,	Martin, Ind.	Stone, W. A.
Brickner,	Haines,	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Brosius,	Hall, Minn.	McCall,	Sweet,
Bryan,	Hall, Mo.	McCleary, Minn.	Talbott, Md.
Bundy,	Hare,	McDowell,	Tarsney,
Burrows,	Harter,	McGann,	Thomas,
Caldwell,	Hartman,	McKeighan,	Turner,
Cannon, Ill.	Hayes,	Meiklejohn,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Causey,	Heard,	Mercer,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Chickering,	Henderson, Ill.	Milliken,	Wadsworth,
Cockran,	Hendrix,	Money,	Walker,
Cogswell,	Hermann,	Morgan,	Wanger,
Compton,	Hilborn,	Morse,	Waugh,
Conn,	Hitt,	Northway,	Wever,
Coombs,	Hooker, N. Y.	Page,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cooper, Wis.	Hopkins, Ill.	Paschal,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cousins,	Hopkins, Pa.	Patterson,	Williams, Ill.
Curtis, Kans.	Houk, Ohio	Payne,	Wilson, Ohio
Curtis, N. Y.	Hulick,	Pence,	Wilson, Wash.
Dalzell,	Hull,	Phillips,	Wright, Pa.
Daniels,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Powers,	
Dingley,	Johnson, Ohio	Reed,	
Dockery,	Joy,	Reyburn,	

NAYS—117.

Abbott,	Branch,	Clarke, Ala.	Dinsmore,
Alderson,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Cobb, Mo.	Edmunds,
Alexander,	Breckinridge, Ky.	Coffeen,	Ellis, Ky.
Arnold,	Bretz,	Cooper, Fla.	Enloe,
Bailey,	Brookshire,	Cooper, Ind.	Epes,
Baldwin,	Bynum,	Covert,	Erdman,
Bankhead,	Cabaniss,	Cox,	Everett,
Barwig,	Caminetti,	Crain,	Forman,
Bell, Tex.	Campbell,	Crawford,	Fyan,
Berry,	Cannon, Cal.	Davis,	Goldzier,
Black, Ga.	Capehart,	De Armond,	Gorman,
Bland,	Caruth,	De Forest,	Grady,
Bower, N. C.	Clark, Mo.	Denson,	Griffin,
Hammond,	Mallory,	Pigott,	Tate,
Henderson, N. C.	McCreary, Ky.	Reilly,	Taylor, Ind.
Holman,	McCulloch,	Richards, Ohio	Terry,
Hooker, Miss.	McDannold,	Richardson, Mich.	Tucker,
Hunter,	McDearmon,	Ritchie,	Tyler,
Hutcheson,	McEttrick,	Robbins,	Updegraff,
Ikirt,	McKaig,	Robertson, La.	Warner,
Jones,	McNagny,	Russell, Ga.	Washington,
Kilgore,	McRae,	Sayers,	Weadock,
Kribbs,	Meredith,	Schermerhorn,	Wells,
Kyle,	Moses,	Snodgrass,	Whiting,
Latimer,	Mutchler,	Somers,	Williams, Miss.
Layton,	Neill,	Springer,	Wilson, W. Va.
Lester,	O'Neil,	Stallings,	Wise.
Lisle,	Pearson,	Stevens,	
Lynch,	Pendleton, Tex.	Stone, Ky.	
Maddox,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Swanson,	

NOT VOTING—101.

Adams, Ky.	Culberson,	Hines,	Randall,
Adams, Pa.	Cummings,	Houk, Tenn.	Ray,
Aitken,	Davey,	Hudson,	Rayner,
Allen,	Donovan,	Johnson, Ind.	Rusk,
Babcock,	Draper,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Baker, Kans.	Dunn,	Lawson,	Shell,
Barnes,	Dunphy,	Lefever,	Sherman,
Bartlett,	English,	Lockwood,	Sickles,
Belden,	Fielder,	Loudenslager,	Sipe,
Bingham,	Fithian,	Magner,	Sperry,
Boatner,	Funston,	Marsh,	Stockdale,
Boutelle,	Gardner,	McAleer,	Storer,
Brattan,	Gear,	McLaurin,	Strait,
Brawley,	Geissenhainer,	McMillin,	Talbert, S. C.
Broderick,	Gillett, Mass.	Meyer,	Tawney,
Brown,	Goodnight,	Montgomery,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bunn,	Graham,	Moon,	Tracey,
Burnes,	Grout,	Murray,	Turpin,
Cadmus,	Harmer,	Newlands,	White,
Catchings,	Harris,	Oates,	Wolverton,
Childs,	Hatch,	Outhwaite,	Woodard,
Clancy,	Haugen,	Paynter,	Woomer,
Cobb, Ala.	Heiner,	Perkins,	Wright, Mass.
Cockrell,	Henderson, Iowa	Pickler,	
Cooper, Tex.	Hepburn,	Post,	
Cornish,	Hicks,	Price,	

Mr. HULL (pending the announcement of the result). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. PERKINS, be excused.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS] has been excused by the vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That is in order.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Was there not an uncompleted roll call progressing when this vote was taken?

The SPEAKER. There was not. There seems to be some confusion as to what was going on. The rule provides that when a call of the House is ordered the roll shall be called, that the doors shall then be closed, and that the House may, by order, send for those members for whom no sufficient excuse is offered. As a matter of practice it has been the custom, instead of having a number of gentlemen rising at the same time to offer excuses, to call the roll for excuses; but that is not a call of the roll in any such sense as when the roll is called for a vote. When the name of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS] was reached, unanimous consent was asked that he be excused; that was objected to, and a motion to excuse him was made and submitted to the House, and that motion has been disposed of. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] now moves that the House adjourn. That motion, the Chair thinks, is in order pending a call of the roll for excuses. The question is on the motion that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Next Monday will be the 8th of January. On that day Governor McKinley will be reinaugurated by a majority of 81,000, and I desire to ask whether it would not be in order to adjourn until Monday and let the work of tariff reform begin on the same day? [Laughter.]

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, there were—ayes 82, noes 149.

Mr. REED. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed Mr. REED and Mr. CATCHINGS.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 68, noes 119.

So the House refused to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the call of members for excuses.

The call was continued and concluded, no further excuses being offered.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I send up a resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Sergeant-at-Arms take into custody and bring to the bar of the House such of its members as are absent without leave of the House. This order shall continue in force beyond the adjournment of the session of to-day and until the further order of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms is directed to employ a sufficient number of deputies to execute this order and to take into custody said absentees wherever they may be found.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I demand the previous question on the adoption of this resolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COGSWELL. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COGSWELL. After the adoption of this resolution, if it should be adopted, will it be in order for me to ask that my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT, who is sick, be excused from the operation of the order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT, will be excused on account of sickness. [A pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. If the order be adopted, I shall ask to have my colleague, Mr. HARRIS, excused.

The SPEAKER. He has been excused; he is absent by the leave of the House.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask that the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SHELL, whose daughter is very sick, be excused.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina has already been excused.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I ask that my colleague, Mr. POST, be excused.

Mr. DOCKERY. It is understood that this whole proceeding is by unanimous consent.

Mr. HENDRIX. I ask that my colleague, Mr. CLANCY, be excused.

The SPEAKER. On what ground?

Mr. HENDRIX. On account of sickness.

There being no objection, Mr. CLANCY was excused.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. These requests have only been entertained by unanimous consent. The regular order is called for, which is the demand for the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The question being taken, the previous question was ordered, there being ayes 141, noes 5; and under the operation thereof the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. CATCHINGS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. BURROWS. My colleague from Michigan, Mr. MOON, left the House a day or two ago very suddenly, and without obtaining leave of the House, saying that he was called home on pressing business.

Mr. THOMAS. No; on account of the sickness of his son.

Mr. BURROWS. As I now understand from my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] Mr. MOON left on account of the illness of his son. I ask that he be excused.

There being no objection, Mr. MOON was excused.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. My colleague, Mr. CHILDS, is detained from the House on account of important business. I ask that he be excused. [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KRIBBS. I ask that my colleague, Mr. SIPE, who is sick abed, be excused.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] has submitted a request. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. McMILLIN. What is it?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. My request is that my colleague, Mr. CHILDS, be excused. As gentlemen are aware, he is a member of the minority. He was engaged in the trial of a lawsuit in Chicago, and has been detained beyond what he expected—because he could not get away.

Mr. McMILLIN. I object to excusing any member on account of business merely.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes; members should attend to the public business.

The SPEAKER proceeded to put the question on the motion to adjourn.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a point of order. Is a motion to adjourn entertainable under the present order of proceedings?

The SPEAKER. There has been intervening business since the last motion to adjourn——

Mr. BOUTELLE. But I beg to call the attention of the Chair——

The SPEAKER. The action of the House on excusing a member is business.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But, if the Speaker please, we are proceeding, as the Chair informed us this morning, under the rule of the House providing for action on the report of the Committee on Rules; and under that rule only one motion to adjourn is in order pending the consideration of such report.

The SPEAKER again putting the question on the motion to adjourn, it was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Pensions, reported the bill (H. R. 3858) to pension Mrs. Eliza B. Pierce, widow of Charles Pierce, of New Bedford, Mass.; which, with the accompanying report (No. 247), was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3754) granting a pension to Anna S. Krause, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5039) to promote the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 5040) to maintain the solvency of the Treasury of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 5041) to extend the time authorizing the St. Louis and Birmingham Railroad to build a bridge across Tennessee River at Clifton—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PENCE: A bill (H. R. 5042) to provide that neither of the United States district land offices at Sterling or Akron, in the State of Colorado, shall be abolished or consolidated, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) to provide that neither of the United States district land offices at Montrose or Gunnison, in the State of Colorado, shall be abolished or consolidated, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 5044) for the appropriation of $260,000 for the construction of levee on the left bank of the Mississippi River between Hickman, Ky., and Tiptonville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. WARNER (by request): A bill (H. R. 5045) to amend section 3459 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, prescribing penalties for removing any liquors or wines under other than trade names—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5046) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 5047) amending section 3480, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HITT: A resolution requesting of the President all information touching recent reported events in Hawaii—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: A bill (H. R. 5048) for the relief of Henry M. Swann—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5049) to provide for the payment to Charles L. Pyles of the amount found due by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLANCHARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 5050) for the relief of the New Orleans Gaslight Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOWERS of California: A bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of the heirs of Moses Cox, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5052) for the relief of William M. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5053) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting a pension to Martin Seiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 5055) for the relief of John M. Giffin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDZIER: A bill (H. R. 5056) to authorize the Postmaster-General to credit account of James A. Sexton with amount of funds stolen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5057) for the relief of Edward S. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 5058) for the relief of E. W. and A. Cross, of Wakefield, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 5059) granting Gould P. Austin, of Phoebus, Va., to erect a building upon the Government reservation at Fortress Monroe, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 5060) for the relief of Jonathan T. Rorer, late captain Company I, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XX, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Petition of Kos. Berry and 376 other citizens of Bosque County, Tex., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALDRICH: Protest of O. Olson and others, employés of Kohn Bros. & Co., wholesale clothing merchants of Chicago, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. APSLEY: Petition of J. W. Conner & Co., and 6 other manufacturers and makers of cigars, of Maynard, Mass., and of John F. Keating, of Groton, Mass., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of James F. Craft and 7 other employés of C. W. and A. D. Gleason, of Rock Bottom; of 67 employés of the Leominster Worsted Mills, of Leominster; and of Edward F. Giffin and 50 other employés of the Clinton Worsted Company, of Clinton, all of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas S. Livingston and 7 other employés and operatives in the New Rock Mills, of Fitchburg, Mass., praying for no change in the tariff law, so far as it relates to textile manufacturing industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 434 operatives of the Lancaster Mills, of Clinton, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AVERY: Petition of A. W. Johnson, Charles H. Beckman, and others, of Travers City Mills, for uniform rate of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. W. Vost and others, against reduction of duties on German mirror plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph Reilly, William Monk, and 15 others, against lower duty on spool-cotton thread—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. S. Tucker, Amos S. Johnson, and others, of Big Rapids, Mich., against passage of Wilson bill—to Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: Protest from the Nineteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAIR: Remonstrance of Michael Flanagan and 1,080 others, operatives in the Great Falls Manufacturing Company's Mills, Somersworth, N. H., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, because it will greatly injure the textile manufacturing industry for protection against the poorly paid labor of foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND: Papers to accompany House bill 4991—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRAWLEY: Papers to accompany House bills 4621, 4624, and 3143—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petition of James Adams and 140 others, citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of cigar-makers and manufacturers of Champaign, Ill., favoring a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Two petitions from the manufacturers and makers of cigars of Topeka, Kans., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Protest of employés of Glenwood Mills, of Wrentham, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Resolution that the ad valorem duties of lithographic products be continued—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petitions of Potters' National Union of Trenton, N. J., protesting against revision of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Nicholas Snyder and 5 others, for uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed tobacco leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolution and memorial of Lithographers' International Protective and Insurance Association of the United States and Canada, opposing the passage of the Wilson bill as to their products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of James A. Hover and other citizens of Columbiaville, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of thread workers and spinners of Newark, N. J., against tariff reduction on spool cotton and fine yarns—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Harbor No. 1, A. A. of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, of New York, for restrictive laws applicable to steam vessels—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAGER: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for a uniform duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of merchants, jobbers, and dealers in playing cards, for a reduction of duty on their goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Memorial of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Superior, Wis., in favor of a Government telegraph system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of A. W. Flesher and other citizens of River Falls, Wis., in favor of a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Superior Tailors' Union, of Superior, Wis., in favor of the establishment of a Government telegraph system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENDRIX: Petition of masters and pilots of steam vessels of the port of New York, asking for law inspecting vessels propelled by naphtha, vapor, gasoline, electricity and other powers—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of Judge Josiah Given and 55 others, citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, asking the enactment of an equitable service pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Judge Josiah Given and 61 other members of the Grand Army of the Republic, asking the enactment of a law forbidding the suspension of pensions, except in case of fraud; also asking restoration by law of suspended pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, remonstrance of McFarlin Grain Company and others, protesting against the barley schedule of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition to establish a bureau of health, Treasury Department—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition to reduce postage to 1 cent—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of thread workers and spinners of fine cotton yarn, of Newark and Kearney, N. J., protesting against any reductions of the tariff on spool cotton and fine cotton yarn—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany House bill 5030, Mathilda W. Morton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of 43 employés of Erben, Search & Co., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Protest of citizens of Granite Falls, Minn., against the proposed changes in the cigar schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two protests of citizens of St. Peter, Minn., against the proposed changes in the cigar schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. K. Baxter and other citizens of Wells, Minn., against the proposed changes in the barley schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of D. W. Miller and others, citizens of Center Creek, Minn., against the proposed changes in the barley schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Harrison White and others, against the proposed changes in the barley schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Emil King and other citizens of Fulda, Minn., against change in barley schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McETTRICK: Petition of C. Von Hartz and 21 others, of New York City, for the establishment of a department of trade and commerce and for the appointment of a secretary thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Heller Manufacturing Company, of New York, that a department of trade and commerce be established, and for the appointment of a secretary thereof, who shall be a member of the President's Cabinet—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Campbell Glass and Paint Company and 27 others, of Kansas City, Mo., that a department of trade and commerce be established and that provision be made for the appointment of a secretary thereof, who shall be a member of the President's Cabinet—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Henry Werg and 20 others, of New York City, for the establishment of a department of trade and the appointment of a secretary thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chadwick Lead Works, Walworth Manufacturing Company, and Dana Hardware Company, and 15 others, of Boston, Mass., that a department of trade and commerce be established—to the Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce.

Also, petition of the citizens of Roxbury, Mass., and employés of various industries, against reduction on tariff duties of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition for reduction in cost of letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Petition and papers to accompany House bill 4999—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: Papers to accompany House bill 5034, application of Elisha L. Elam for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Joseph Rilley and 15 other citizens of Newark and Kearny, N. J., a committee representing the 4,500 employés of the Clark Thread Company, protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. Millard F. Johnson, a citizen of Middleboro, Mass., praying for legislation prohibiting the manufacture of alcoholic liquors, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Rev. Willard Johnson and citizens of Middleboro, Mass., protesting against the proposed Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUTCHLER (by request): Petition of citizens of South Bethlehem, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars of Nazareth, Pa., for a uniform tariff tax of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Chain Dam, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of H. B. Stem and H. W. Smith, of Bethlehem, Pa., for a uniform tariff of 35 cents on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Protest of 610 operatives of the Lorraine Manufacturing Company, of Pawtucket, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 12 citizens of South Kingston, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 7 operatives of the Reynolds' Manufacturing Company, Rhode Island, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIGOTT: Petition of citizens of Connecticut and New York, asking for an extension by Congress of the scheme for constructing breakwaters in Long Island Sound off the port of New Haven, Conn., and also for dredging the harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., requesting an appropriation of $500,000 for continuing the work of improving the harbor of New Haven, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of W. M. Walber and others, of Meriden, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Michigan: Petition of 17 cigar manufacturers of Grand Rapids, Mich., relative to duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Grand Rapids Lodge, No. 191, International Association of Machinists, on the subject of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, communication from and resolutions passed by Central Labor Union of Grand Rapids, Mich., relating to construction of Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the textile workers, of Chester, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the lithographers of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill in its present shape—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protests of 121 employés of Dayville Woolen Mills at Kellingly; of 98 of the Clinton Mills Company's Woolen Mill at Norwich; of 87 of the Yantic Woolen Mills at Norwich; of 62 of the C. D. & C. S. Chase's Woolen Mill at Elmville; of 58 of the Saylas & Washburn's Woolen Mill at Mechanicsville, town of Thompson; and of 71 of George T. Murdock & Son's Woolen Mill at New Boston, town of Thompson, all of Connecticut, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of over 1,100 residents and employés in Yonkers, N. Y., against reduction of duty on fur felt hats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Petitions of manufacturers of cigars at Sparta; of George Schneider and other manufacturers of cigars of Fountain City, Arcadia, and Alma, all of Wisconsin, for a uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by lumber manufacturers of Eauclaire and Chippewa Falls, Wis., protesting against the removal of the duty on lumber as proposed by the Wilson bill, and against the treatment of manufactured lumber as raw material—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Michael Reardon and others, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of I. B. Noble and others, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Hill and others, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS: Petition of 208 overseers and operatives of the Monument Mills of Housatonic, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 34 woolen spinners of Lowell, Mass., asking for an amendment to the Wilson tariff bill so far as it applies to the woolen industry of the country—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petition of James R. D. Morrison and William H. Morrison, executor and administrator, praying that their claim for quartermasters' stores and supplies be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, protest of South Side Board of Trade, Pittsburg, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: Protest of the officers of the independent military companies of Rochester, N. Y., against the passage of the Chandler bill disbanding all independent military companies in the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Preambles and resolutions unanimously adopted by the lithographers of the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, recommending the imposing of a specific duty on lithographic goods, in place of the existing or proposed ad valorem duty therefor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Petition of George M. Sullivan and 34 others of Piqua County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITING: Papers to accompany House bill 5037, for relief of Sam G. Hunter—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Protest of James H. Hawes Manufacturing Company, of Towanda, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 8, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Vice-President being absent, the President *pro tempore* took the chair.

RICHARD F. PETTIGREW, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 7, 1893, a report from the First Comptroller of the Treasury, containing two statements of the amounts paid to the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York from January 1, 1873, to October 31, 1893, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. JONES of Arkansas, was, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the claim of Hon. JOHN T. HEARD for services rendered the Western Cherokee Indians; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in compliance with the act of May 9, 1888, the claim of Dennis McIntyre, postmaster at Mackinac Island, Mich., for credit on his postal and money-order accounts by reason of losses resulting from the burglary of his office September 17, 1893, stating the amount of such losses and recommending that his accounts be credited with such amounts; which was, on motion of Mr. PLATT, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of December 11, 1893, statements of the number of indictments found for violations of election laws since 1870, etc.; which was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This communication is in answer to a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. What disposition does he desire made of it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the communication, with the accompanying papers, be printed, and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: What became of the letter of the Attorney-General which was just read?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of the Attorney-General was in answer to a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. It was ordered printed and goes to the table.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose it should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but I will let it lie on the table until the Senator comes in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair called the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to it, and he asked that it be printed and laid on the table.

Mr. HOAR. He is not in the Chamber at this moment.

PERMITS FOR OPENING STREETS AND ALLEYS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of November 1, 1893, certain information relative to the opening of streets and alleys, for laying or repairing water pipes, sewers, etc., since the 1st day of November, 1892; which, on motion of Mr. SHERMAN, was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Public Printer, which will be read.

Mr. HALE. Let it be referred.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter should be read and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HALE. I do not think it has been the practice to read communications from any except heads of Departments.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is immaterial. The communication is about five lines long.

Mr. CULLOM. We should like to know what the document is before it is referred.

Mr. HALE. If it is no longer than that I do not object. Generally heretofore, my recollection is, the time of the Senate has not been taken up even by reading communications of any length from the heads of Departments, but they have been printed and referred, with all accompanying papers, to the proper committees. The Senate will very clearly see, as the Presiding Officer will, that if all such communications are read the morning hour will stretch out indefinitely. Nobody listens to the communications. They are printed, and are reached in that way.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator from Maine will allow me, it seems to me the rule has been exactly the reverse. When we get a report from a Department the letter of the head of the Department is read, and then the documents accompanying it are ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair remembers no instance during the service of the Chair where the letter of the head of a Department has not been read.

Mr. MANDERSON. The letter of transmittal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of transmittal. The documents accompanying it are of course a totally different matter.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly; and therefore the letter of transmittal simply communicating the documents and indicating the subject-matter may be read, but my recollection is that the only communications of the kind read which are of length are from the President of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Or a State Legislature.

Mr. HALE. Or a State Legislature. And long letters even from the heads of Departments are not read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would hold that a letter from the head of any Department should be read, but the reading of an accompanying document depends upon the order of the Senate.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think a consultation of the RECORD in the morning will show that the communications which have been read at the Secretary's desk this morning have been simply the letters of transmittal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Always.

Mr. MANDERSON. So far as this particular document is concerned, I apprehend it is the annual report of the Public Printer.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That is true.

Mr. MANDERSON. The Public Printer is an official of the Congress of the United States, and he makes his report direct to Congress just as the head of one of the great Departments makes his report.

Mr. HALE. Then he comes under the rule applying to heads of Departments.

Mr. MANDERSON. Unquestionably. The letter of transmittal should be read, and if it is the annual report, it should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the letter of the Public Printer.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1894.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith to Congress a report of the condition and operations of this Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893.

Very respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. A. E. STEVENSON,
President of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of transmittal will be printed, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the annual report of the Public Printer be printed, without a reference of the question to the Committee on Printing, as that is the usual course, and it is important to have it speedily in the consideration of the general printing bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection; that is, the letter of transmittal and the document accompanying it will be printed and referred to the Committee on Printing.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall move to take from the table the resolution introduced on the 3d instant by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] respecting Hawaii, for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a memorial of the Legislature of Idaho; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, *Secretary's Office, State of Idaho.*

I, James F. Curtis, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial

No. 4, which was filed in this office the 4th day of March, A. D. 1893, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 23d day of March, A. D. 1893.

[SEAL.] J. F. CURTIS, *Secretary of State.*

House joint memorial No. 4. (By Crane.)

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent:

That the waters of Lake Cœur d'Alene near the mouths of the St. Marys and Coeur d'Alene Rivers, inlets of said lake, cover large areas of land to a depth of 5 feet and less.

That by reason of being so overflowed all of such land is rendered useless and valueless.

That the Spokane River, the outlet of said lake, at and near said lake, is very rapid and has an average fall of not less than 20 feet per mile.

That the dredging and clearing of the channel of said Spokane River at and near said lake to a depth of 5 feet below its present level would reclaim and render very valuable for agricultural purposes fully 50,000 acres of land now valueless because submerged.

That such dredging and clearing would not be expensive, but that the land reclaimed would be of a value of at least $500,000 so soon as such dredging and clearing should be done.

Wherefore your memorialists respectfully petition that an appropriation be made sufficient to defray the expense necessary to make surveys and estimates of the cost of lowering the mean level of said lake at least 5 feet.

The secretary of state is hereby requested to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of War, and to our representatives in Congress.

Approved March 3, 1893.

W. J. McCONNELL, *Governor.*

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of 450 farmers of Montgomery County, Ind.; of 126 citizens of Adams Township, Seneca County, Ohio; of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade; of 25 employés of Dormer Bros., in Cincinnati, Ohio; of 51 manufacturers of Anderson, Ind.; of 27 employés of the Joseph Turner and Sons Manufacturing Company of Cleveland, Ohio; of 26 citizens of Cardington, Ohio; of employés of Henry Fox & Co., of Urbana, Ohio, and of 264 citizens of the Fourth ward of Akron, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that the tariff question may be speedily settled; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Directors of the Louisville (Ky.) Silvering and Beveling Company, remonstrating against any change in the tariff on mirrors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of miners of lead ores in Southern Missouri and Southeast Kansas, remonstrating against a reduction of duty on lead ores; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of manufacturers of clothing and cloaks of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the duty on imported clothing and cloaks as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Cuyahoga Republican Club of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the annexation of Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Greenwich (Ohio) Farmers' Institute Association, praying that no appropriation be made by Congress for the irrigation of arid lands in the West; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation.

He also presented petitions of 8 cigar manufacturers of Cincinnati; of 24 cigar manufacturers of Springfield, and the petition of Vincene Woboril of Cleveland, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition numerously signed by soldiers and sailors of the late war, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of soldiers of the late war of Kyger, Pioneer, Wilkesville, Centerburg, North Georgetown, Coshocton County; Berlin Center, Mount Pleasant, Sullivan, Knox County, of Hocking County, of Piqua and Miami Counties, of Gahanna, Byhalia, Independence, Chesterville, and Defiance, and of Fairfield County, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Typographical Union No. 99; of Cigar-makers Local Union No. 173; of Mayflower Assembly No. 469, Knights of Labor, of Zanesville; of Cincinnati Typographical Union, No. 3 and of 107 citizens of Youngstown, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of 44 citizens of Port Royal, S. C., praying for the location of a custom-house at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented memorials of the Louisville (Ky.) Silvering and Beveling Company; of sundry citizens of Roxbury, Mass., and of John C. Tobin and 4 others, in behalf of 850 employés of the Roxbury (Mass.) Carpet Company, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Boston (Mass.) Lithographic Artists and Engravers' Association, praying for an amendment of the clause of the so-called Wilson tariff bill relating to lithographic work; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Fatuneh Farmers' Club of Massachusetts, remonstrating against any change in the present tariff rates as laid down in the so-called McKinley tariff act; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 270 manufacturers of firearms of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against any reduction of duty on firearms; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Typographical Union No. 13, and of the Wood Carvers' Association, of Boston, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WASHBURN presented petitions of cigar manufacturers of Northfield, Chaska, Minneapolis, and Glencoe, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ely, Minn., praying for the retention of the present duty on iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a memorial of citizens of Enterprise, S. Dak., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on barley and its products, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of citizens of Yankton and Huron, S. Dak., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the memorial of D. F. Bates and 65 other tobacco-growers of Canton, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present duty on leaf tobacco and cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of A. P. Whitehouse and 127 other employés of the Capewell Horse Nail Company, of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on horse nails; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Fur Hat Manufacturers, of South Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present duties on materials used in the hat manufacturing industry; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of cigar manufacturers of Monmouth, Champaign, and Keithsburg, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Charles F. Hawk and other citizens of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Joseph Capps & Sons, Limited, of Jacksonville, Ill., manufacturers of woolen goods, remonstrating against the proposed change of duty on such goods, and urging that the duty shall not be less than 50 per cent ad valorem; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chicago (Ill.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4182, for the establishment of an international conference for the better protection of animals in transit; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the miners of the Menominee iron district of Michigan, remonstrating against any change in the duty on iron ore, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar-makers' Union, No. 114, of Jacksonville, Ill., remonstrating against any increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against any change in the duty on shirts, cuffs, collars, and linen, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART presented a memorial of the California Jute

Mill Company, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on jute grain bags, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of miners of lead ore in Southwest Missouri and Kansas, remonstrating against the duty on lead ore, as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of 6 cigar manufacturers of Portland, Me., praying for the imposition of a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of C. A. Grinshaw and other cotton-mill operatives of Springfield, Vt., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of W. B. Fonda and W. I. Harwood, of St. Albans, Vt., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on lime, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 13 cigar manufacturers of Burlington, Vt., praying for a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of A. Jarvis and 68 other employés of the National Horse Nail Company, of Vergennes, Vt., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty upon horse nails; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of employés of the Devonshire Woolen Mills, of Goffe Falls, New Hampshire, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of Henry Frankenstein and other citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Andrew Gulgren and 128 other citizens of Iron River, Mich.; the memorial of Alfred Kidder and 88 other citizens of Palmer, Mich.; and the memorial of J. J. Anderson and 177 other citizens of Bessemer, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented memorials of lead ore and mining companies of Missouri, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Kansas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Colorado, California, and Montana; and the memorial of C. O. Frye and other miners of lead ores in Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, remonstrating against the duty on lead ore as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of F. O. Mills and 221 other citizens of Ishpeming, Mich., and the memorial of Andrew Gulgren and other citizens of Iron River, Mich., remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of G. F. Fand and 37 other citizens of Ionia, Mich.; and the petition of A. J. Pierce and 18 other citizens of Coldwater, Mich., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the memorial of John A. Buguey and 42 other employés of the Waumbek County Wilton Mills, New Hampshire, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented the memorial of 225 employés of hat manufacturers of Bethel, Conn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on fur felt hats, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Typographical Union No. 47, of New Haven, Conn., and of Typographical Union No. 252, of of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of 210 overseers and operatives in the Ashland Cotton Mills, of Jewett City, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Philip S. Wales, medical director United States Navy, praying that he be granted certain relief by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 870) authorizing the issue of a patent to the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions for certain lands on the Omaha Indian Reservation for school purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1305) to amend "An act relating to the incorporation of certain corporations within the District of Columbia," approved October 1, 1890, to report it with amendments, and to submit a report thereon. I am also directed by the committee to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for the immediate consideration of the bill. I ask that the bill and the report be read.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to know more about the bill before it is taken up, and would like to have it read at length.

Mr. MARTIN. I have asked to have the bill and the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. It seems to me that is a measure too important to be considered now. It involves a very large subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There being objection, the bill goes to the Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I understand the Senator from Ohio to object to the consideration of the bill at the present time?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the matter is too important to be acted upon without having it before us in print at least.

Mr. MARTIN. I think if the Senator from Ohio will listen to the reading of the report he will withdraw his objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will listen to it with pleasure. I will listen to the Senator in explanation of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to have the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the report prepared by the committee may be read. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The request is objected to. The report will be printed, and the bill goes to the Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to make an inquiry in regard to the bill which has just gone to the Calendar. Will the bill with the amendments be printed?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Necessarily.

Mr. BATE. And the report?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. And the report.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of the heirs of Martha A. Dealy, deceased, reported it without amendment.

WILLIAM HENDERSHOTT.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1377) for the relief of William Hendershott, of Butteville, Oregon, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill, as it is a local and a private matter.

Mr. MANDERSON. Let the bill be read for information.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed, on application of William Hendershott, of Marion County, Oregon, and on proof being made by the said Hendershott to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the land hereinafter described was, in November, 1854, filed upon at the Oregon City land office, in the State of Oregon, as a donation land claim under the act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, by Louis Forcier; that he resided upon and cultivated the same for four consective years; that he proffered final proof to said land office in 1858, and that such proof was rejected for the reason that he could not establish the fact that he was a citizen of the United States; and further, that he, William Hendershott, was a purchaser in good faith of said premises by mesne conveyances from said Louis Forcier, and that he is in possession of and has made valuable improvements thereon, to issue to him, the said William Hendershott, his heirs and assigns, a patent for the following-described pieces and parcels of land, to wit: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in section 21, township 4 south, of range 1 west of the Willamette meridian, containing 97 acres, in the Oregon City land district, in the county of Marion and State of Oregon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask that the petition of the claimant be inserted in the RECORD. It comprises less than two pages of written matter.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to inserting

in the RECORD the petition of the claimant? The Chair hears none.

The petition is as follows:

BUTTEVILLE, MARION COUNTY, OREGON, *December 11, 1893.*

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

I would most respectfully petition your honorable body for relief, as follows:

One Louis Forcier, who was born in Canada in the year 1801, and came to the Northwest Territory 1825, in employ of the Hudson Bay Company, in November, 1854, filed at the Oregon City land office a donation land claim upon the following-described parcel of land, to wit:

Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in section No. 21, township 4 south, of range 1 west of the Willamette meridian, containing 97 acres.

On November 1, 1858, the said Forcier appeared before the officers of the said Oregon City land office to make final proof, but failed because he could not establish proof of naturalization or citizenship.

Forcier resided in what is now county of Marion, State of Oregon, from 1842 until 1865, when he returned to Canada and has since died.

Since the organization of Oregon Territory there is no court record or any other evidence to show that Forcier has ever acquired naturalization papers or citizenship.

In the year of 1860 he, Forcier, transferred the above-described land by warranty deed to one Robie, and in 1863 Robie, by warranty deed, transferred to one Arquette, and in 1891 Arquette transferred by warranty to myself; all of said transfers being of record in this county and State.

The land cost me with improvements $1,200.

Improvements consist of one residence, storeroom, cellar, barn, all under fence, 13 acres under cultivation, 2 acres of which are in orchard.

There has never been a patent issued for the land as described, and I now pray your honorable body to grant relief.

Respectfully, yours,

WILLIAM HENDERSHOTT.

TIMBER AND STONE LAND PURCHASES.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands I report back without amendment the bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878. Until this morning I was under the impression that the bill had already passed the Senate at this session. It is an exact copy of a bill which passed both branches of Congress during the last session of the last Congress, and I supposed it was a law; but when the bill came from the other House I telegraphed to the Secretary of State and received a telegram which explains the condition of the bill of the last Congress. It is a very simple bill. It merely authorizes affidavits to be made before the proper officer in purchases of timber and stone lands.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to have the telegram read?

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to have the telegram read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *December 19, 1893.*

To Hon. J. N. DOLPH, *United States Senate:*

Senate bill 2275 was received here December 30, 1892, bearing a note in the following words:

"This bill was presented to me on the 15th day of December, 1892. Congress, pursuant to a concurrent resolution adopted on the 21st day of December, 1892, adjourned from the 22d day of December, 1892, to January 4, 1893. I have not approved the bill.

"BENJ. HARRISON.

"December 30, 1892."

W. Q. GRESHAM.

Mr. DOLPH. The former bill was not approved simply because there was a recess of the Senate. I think the bill is a law without the President's signature, but as that question can not be raised very well and the House of Representatives has sent us another bill, I report the bill favorably from the Senate committee and ask that it be acted upon.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the bill be read.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the bill be read. It is short. It will be seen there is nothing in it that will give rise to controversy.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that hereafter all necessary affidavits and proofs required by law of any purchaser of lands under the provisions of an act entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and Washington Territory," approved June 3, 1878, and the act amendatory thereof approved August 4, 1892, in order to perfect his title to the lands, may be made before any officer qualified to take proof in homestead cases.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1382) to secure the vested rights of soldiers of the Union and their heirs and legal representatives, and to remedy certain wrongs in the administration of the Interior Department; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1383) granting a pension to Russel N. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1384) granting an increase of pension to Solomon E. Homan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1385) to restore Mary E. Trickey and children of Hartwell M. Trickey to the pension rolls; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1386) to promote peace among nations and for the creation of a tribunal of international arbitration; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1387) for the relief of Laura B. Miller; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Select Committee on Ford Theater Disaster.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1388) increasing the circulating medium, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1389) for an act to provide pensions for freedmen released from involuntary servitude, and to afford aid and assistance for certain persons released, that they may be maintained in old age; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1390) providing an additional circuit judge in the eighth judicial circuit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1391) granting a pension to Mrs. Lovenia D. Athon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Walter S. Kimmel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS (by request, Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair), introduced a bill (S. 1393) for the relief of N. C. Perkins, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1394) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase a place of deposit for the records of the Executive Departments of the Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1395) for the relief of George P. Rowell & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF DIPLOMATIC AGENTS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and report to the Senate their opinion as to the cases in which the President may constitutionally send to foreign countries agents, representatives, or commissioners, without the advice and consent of the Senate, and whether or not there was constitutional authority for the appointment in March last, without the advice and consent of the Senate, of Hon. James H. Blount as commissioner to the Hawaiian Islands with the powers conferred upon him by his letter of appointment and such other instructions as were given to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GORMAN. I object. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the resolution goes over.

Mr. GORMAN. It goes over under the rule.

PAYMENTS TO COMMISSIONER BLOUNT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate what sums have been paid from the Treasury to the Hon. James H. Blount for salary, services, or other expenses, as a special commissioner to Hawaii, together with copies of all orders, vouchers, or receipts for such payment; and also to inform the Senate from what fund and under or by virtue of what appropriation or law the same have been paid.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution which has been read.

Mr. GORMAN. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator must have made that motion under a misunderstanding of the scope of the resolution. It is merely an inquiry as to how much money has been paid from the Treasury for a certain purpose, which is well known to the Senate by the message of the President, and from what fund it has been paid.

I have never known in my experience in the Senate that a committee could throw any light upon the question whether the Senate should know how money in the Treasury had been spent, and I never have heard of any delay or objection to such information. I hope the Senator will not press his motion to refer.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to insist on my motion. I submit to the Senator from Massachusetts and to the Senate that this is a very extraordinary inquiry as to the expenditure from a fund which has been placed at the disposal of the Department of State in the nature of a secret fund. It is a matter which ought not to be inquired into with great particularity. I know there are some precedents for it.

Mr. HOR. Does the Senat or understand this money has been paid from the secret fund?

Mr. GORMAN. I take it for granted that it has been.

Mr. HOAR. That is all I want to know.

Mr. GORMAN. I know nothing whatever about it, but I assume that it has been paid from that fund. I know that in the last Administration, and it has been so with all preceding Administrations, Congress, without the slightest hesitation, have placed at the disposal of the President of the United States a sufficient amount of money to conduct the business of the Department of State, and that that fund, being placed in his hands at his discretion, has always been expended without further inquiry—I will not say "always," for there have been probably a few exceptions; but the rule has been the other way.

Mr. HOAR. No. The statute settles that.

Mr. GORMAN. I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. Allow me to read the statute. I do not ask that the details of what money has been expended at the discretion of the President in the secret service shall be furnished to the Senate. All I ask is whether this particular sum has been paid from that fund or not. I will read the statute:

SEC. 291. Whenever any sum of money has been or shall be issued from the Treasury for the purposes of intercourse or treaty with foreign nations, in pursuance of any law, the President is authorized to cause the same to be duly settled annually with the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, by causing the same to be accounted for, specifically, if the expenditure may, in his judgment, be made public; and by making or causing the Secretary of State to make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify; and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

If the Senator will pardon me one word to explain my purpose, if the sum of money is one which the President thought the details of might be properly made public, then the ordinary vouchers are in the Treasury, and that will appear in answer to the resolution. If, on the other hand, it be a sum of money the expenditure of which the President thought it was not expedient to be made public, then there will be a simple voucher from the Secretary of State in the Treasury showing that. They are both public facts in the Treasury, which the Senate has a right to know, and which I suppose any Senator would have a right to go and ask for, and have shown to him as a matter of course. They are the ordinary public records of the country. All this resolution asks for—and I was surprised that the Senator asked to have it go over the other day—is that that statement may be furnished as part of the history of this transaction. That is all.

Mr. GORMAN. The question which has been before the Senate and which is attracting some attention in the country, which the Senator from Massachusetts himself has discussed, and which is being examined by the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body, ought to be settled and determined by this body without reference to the amount of money which has been expended during this Administration or the preceding Administration. It is too big a question, it is too great a question, to be brought down to the mere amount of the expenditure of money.

I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, as an American Senator, I should consider it a great misfortune, under the peculiar circumstances, if this body were to enter upon an inquiry as to the amount of money which either the last or the present Administration has expended in this matter. It was a question which two years ago rose above party. At the disposal of the President was placed a fund so that he might protect the interests of this great country. I have no doubt that President Harrison discharged conscientiously, and as he thought best, his duty for the interests of the entire country. No inquiry as to his action was attempted then or is attempted now, and if the attempt were made upon this side of the Chamber I should take the same position that I do about this resolution. That was a matter which the honor of the country required that we should not make inquiry about.

I say to the Senator that I thought when he introduced the resolution he did it without full thought and without having considered to where it would lead; that this was a matter, at least, which both sides of this Chamber would determine had better be left with the executive branch of the Government, and about which there should not be further inquiry on the part of the Senate of the United States. We can not enter upon any portion of this inquiry without extending it to the whole subject. I believe that the best interests of all require that at least this branch of the question should be passed over and not considered. Let us go on with the other question when we shall be ready and when all the facts are before us, and determine it in the interests of our country and in the interests of honor and of right.

But, Mr. President, if this particular fund, which has always been a large one since I have had the honor of being a member of this body, placed in the hands of the Secretary of State to be expended by the direction of the President of the United States, is to be inquired into, we shall hereafter, I think, embarrass the executive branch of the Government and prevent that activity in our affairs which has herefofore obtained.

As suggested by my friend on my right [Mr. VEST], the passage of a resolution of this character destroys the very object which Congress has in placing these large amounts at the disposal of the Executive.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland and the Senator whose suggestion he has quoted strangely misunderstand the object and effect of the pending resolution. The precedent is well settled from the time of the inquiry in the Administration succeeding President Tyler's, and it is this, that the fact that a certain amount has been placed at the discretion of the President is a public fact; it is contained in the appropriation bills from year to year.

The President is required to determine whether the expenditure is to be treated as confidential or to be treated as an ordinary expenditure, and its vouchers put upon the files of the Treasury Department; and that is a public fact.

I presume it will turn out—though I know nothing about it—that the vouchers for Mr. Blount's expenditures will be found in the Treasury Department in the ordinary way. If, however, for any reason the President desires not to disclose the details of an expenditure, he directs the Secretary of State to put on record a certificate that such a sum has been expended, the detail of which it is not expedient to make known, and if that is put upon the records it is a public fact, not the detail of the expenditure, but the fact that such an expenditure has been made, the details of which the President thinks it is not for the public interest to be made known. But it has been the universal practice, and there never was heard, I will venture to say, a suggestion of an objection to it that either House of Congress should know how much money has been expended. If it were expended without secrecy, the vouchers themselves are in the Treasury Department, and that should be known. All the resolution asks for is a statement of what appears on the public records of the Treasury, and not for a disclosure of the method by which the President has made the expenditure.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what object he has in view in asking for information in regard to the amount of money that this special commissioner sent out by the President has expended in defraying the ordinary and necessary expenses in the discharge of his duty?

Mr. HOAR. I will tell the Senator very frankly.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to know.

Mr. HOAR. I want to know, and I want the Senate to know, and I want the country to know whether this gentleman, whose mission was conferred upon him, who exercised his authority and reported his action without the consent or advice of the Senate, was treated in all other respects as a public minister of the United States; I want to throw light upon the question whether he was in fact a private agent of the President within the precedents which have been cited here, or whether he was treated as a public agent, and the question of the method in which his compensation was paid to him bears very strongly, as it seems to me, upon that subject. That is why I desire the information.

Mr. GRAY. I do not feel at all disposed on any occasion to throw anything in the way of obtaining light on all governmental functions and exposing to the most absolute publicity all the transactions of this Government. It is a government of the people, and they have a right to know just what is being done and how it is being done. But a government of the people, Mr. President, is a decent government. God forbid that it should be anything else. I believe that this resolution, unusual and

out of the ordinary course, without any precedent so far as I know, would be, if passed, a direct reflection upon the estimable and honorable gentleman who has filled to the best of his ability and conscientiously, whatever may be our judgment as to his conclusions, the trust which has been reposed in him by the President of the United States, and I have no doubt that there has not been one cent of public money expended by him and defrayed out of the Treasury that was not reasonably necessary and reasonably just and pertinent to the matter he had in hand.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I agree with him.

Mr. GRAY. I do not care to sit here in the Senate and add up the items of Mr. Blount's board bill, or how much hack hire he paid, or whether he stayed at a first-class hotel or a cheap boarding-house. I am willing to trust both the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and also Mr. Blount, to have acted within the bounds of propriety in that matter.

Mr. HOAR. So am I.

Mr. GRAY. And I do not believe that the Senate of the United States is at all curious in that regard. I do not believe the vouchers and items of these expenditures will throw light upon any side or phase of the great public question to which the Senator from Maryland has just alluded, which now occupies the Senate, and which the Senate has committed to one of its standing committees to investigate.

I do not feel inclined, and I do not believe the Senate feel inclined, to make a departure in this case from what seems to me to have been the proper and honorable usage of the Senate in this regard unless there is some foundation of suspicion or some allegation as to irregularity which will justify and demand investigation on the part of the Senate.

Mr. President, the pending resolution ought not to be so framed as to compel the President of the United States to say that this is a matter within his discretion as to the disbursement of this fund, which was put at his disposal. It ought not to be put upon him to decline a request of that kind unless there is some real ground for it. This request is:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate what sums have been paid from the Treasury to the Hon. James H. Blount for salary, services, or other expenses, as a special commissioner to Hawaii, together with copies of all orders, vouchers, or receipts for such payment; and also to inform the Senate from what fund and under or by virtue of what appropriation or law the same have been paid.

To the latter part of the resolution there might be no objection; but the resolution requires, if it is passed, that there should be produced here all the items of expense and of disbursement by Mr. Blount in the prosecution of that mission. I certainly should never have consented that a similar resolution should have been passed when Mr. Bate was sent to Samoa on a precisely similar errand without the consent of the Senate and without its advice being asked, or when Mr. Babcock was sent down to San Domingo, or when Mr. Trescot was sent to Peru, or when Mr. Trist years ago was sent to Mexico. I think we had something else to do then, and that we have something else to do now, unless there is some allegation of irregularity about this matter, than to sit here as an auditing committee upon the amount paid by Mr. Blount for board, hack hire, and possibly cigars.

I therefore move, if it has not already been done, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I am very much surprised both at the objection and at the argument which is made by the Senator from Delaware in its behalf. I do not think it ever was heard before, from the beginning of the Government down, that when there was a request for accounts which appeared on the public records of the Treasury there was an objection made, or that any Senators or the representatives of any political party were afraid of such an inquiry.

These accounts are all spread upon the public records of the Treasury, now open to any citizen who goes there and asks in a respectful manner to see them. They are provided by the statute to be put there in order that the two Houses of Congress who legislate and the people who wish to know may know what is going on and what the expenditures are.

I am very happy to say that it never occurred to me that there had been any irregularity in the expenditure. I suppose Mr. Blount is a person who could be trusted with five or ten thousand dollars. What I want to know is whether this fund was expended in the ordinary way, with vouchers, as a public transaction, and if so what is the record of it; or whether the other alternative set forth in the statutes of the United States was pursued, to wit, that it was expended on the voucher of the President.

If my friends on the other side are afraid to have the country know how this was done; if they are afraid to have any light thrown on the public character of Mr. Blount; if they are afraid that the public shall understand that while he was performing the duties of a foreign minister abroad of the highest character, he was not paid as are foreign ministers abroad, but was paid under a fund committed to the President to be expended in secret and on an emergency, I will not resist their attempt, but will let the resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and let the Committee on Foreign Relations tell us what they think of that proposition.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts is through——

Mr. HOAR. I was about to add that if I had any hostile purpose in this matter towards the Administration, or any political purpose in the matter, it has been ten thousand times more subserved by what has fallen from the lips of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Maryland than it would be by any answer to the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is not any expenditure made by this Administration to which the Democratic party is not content to have the greatest publicity given; but the Senator from Massachusetts, an experienced Senator in this body, knows perfectly well that the compensation allowed to this envoy or agent, appointed by the President of the United States, could not be paid out of any other fund except the secret-service fund of the State Department. He is aware that every dollar appropriated for ministers and other agents of the United States which are provided for by law is appropriated for specifically by Congress. He is also aware that in this very case the last Congress, without any objection on the part of the minority of this body and with the full concurrence of a Democratic House of Representatives, gave to the then President of the United States a very large sum of money to look after our interests to the south of us and in the Pacific Ocean. That Senator knows perfectly well that an inquiry as to the amount of the expenditure and the vouchers of Mr. Blount would necessarily lead to an inquiry as to the expenditure under a former Administration of bringing about results which some of the people of this country regret; but that is a matter entirely apart from this kind of an inquiry. As a member of the majority of this body, I should regard it as a most unfortunate thing if it were proposed here to investigate the action of a former President of the United States and taunt the Republicans and the Senators on the other side with the fact that they were afraid to have these matters exposed.

Mr. President, nobody is afraid of it; nobody doubts the integrity of ex-President Harrison in the expenditure of a large amount of money; nobody doubts the integrity of the present President of the United States; and no man, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, would be afraid to have it exposed to public view; but, like the consideration of the subject of a treaty, this is a matter which necessarily must be kept within the precincts of the State Department. Such an inquiry as is sought to be made now, though it has been attempted before, has always been rejected and resented, and the only response to such an inquiry that I have found, upon reaching the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States was the return, "I furnished so much money upon the order of the Secretary of State."

Mr. HOAR. That is all the information I ask for in this case.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, the Senator asks only for that in this case; but why does he ask it? His remark a few moments ago indicates what his object is, that it may go to the country that the Administration, or its friends upon this floor, are afraid to expose the details of a transaction which I regret to say has now become somewhat political, but which ought to be settled upon its merits and without regard to the aisle that divides this Chamber. I regret, in a case which is so important for the future interests of our country, where I believe the future commerce of the country so much depends upon its proper settlement, that it should have drifted down to a mere inquiry which, as the Senator from Massachusetts knew when he offered the resolution, was an attack upon the expenditure of a secret-service fund which has always been regarded sacred and to be disposed of by the President of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Maryland one question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. Has he any information or will he give the Senate any reason to think that this was made as a secret expenditure under the statute and not by the other alternative where the vouchers are put in the Treasury Department? Has he any reason to suppose that such was the case?

Mr. GORMAN. I know nothing more of the Administration and its conduct in this matter than the Senator from Massachusetts. I know of no information that has come to the members of this body except in a public way. If it has come I have not had it myself. But I do know, as the Senator from Massachusetts is himself aware of the fact, that every dollar expended for the ministers, consuls, and other diplomatic agents fixed by law is appropriated for annually by the Congress of the United

States; and in addition to that we place at times in the hands of the Secretary of State, under the control of the President of the United States, very large amounts of money, out of which he may employ agents and transact business which in its nature is secret; and out of those funds it has always been understood and known that in every Administration expenditures of this kind have been made. Now, from the law, and that is all I know, there can not be any other way in which this gentleman could have been compensated; and the mover of the pending resolution must have known it as well as I do.

Mr. HOAR. Then will the honorable Senator answer my question? Has he any reason to believe, and if so, will he state it, that it was a secret expenditure which was made by Mr. Blount? That is what I should like to have understood.

Mr. GORMAN. I have stated to the Senator from Massachusetts that of this transaction and every other connected with that branch of this subject I have no more knowledge than the Senator has, from the public documents and the statements which have been made in the public press.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator answer in this form, then? Does the Senator believe that it was a secret transaction?

Mr. GORMAN. As I said a moment ago, I have never known a case where any Secretary of State—the present Secretary of State, or a preceding one—could employ agents of this kind and compensate them in any other way except from the fund which Congress had given. There is no other way to do it—none known to the law.

I wish to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that it is not an unusual thing for the President of the United States to use the fund for such purposes and to employ whoever he sees proper. That practice is generally understood. We placed in the hands of President Harrison within the period of a year the large sum of $250,000. We placed in the hands of that President in the early part of his Administration $500,000. We did the same in Mr. Cleveland's former Administration. No inquiry has been made here of the expenditure, and none can properly be made. As I said to the Senator from Massachusetts a moment ago, it is not the purpose to conceal the amount that has been expended. If the resolution were to be followed, as it probably would be, by an inquiry as to what became of the fund placed in the hands of President Harrison, I as a Senator, with greater interest in the honor of my country and the promotion of its interests than I have in mere partisan advantage, would say that such an inquiry was wrong, and it ought not to be made.

Mr. President, I voted with great pleasure to give the former President of the United States all that he thought was necessary to care for our interests in the Pacific and south of us. If the present President were to say to Congress or to one of its committees, "I want a like amount," having as much faith in his integrity and honesty of purpose as I have had in his predecessor, I should vote to grant it again, and I would know when it was granted that if afterward I were to inquire into the detail of the expenditure it would be discrediting him and, as I believe, impairing the best interests of the country.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, in dealing with this question about Hawaii, which seems to produce a great deal of feeling and friction whenever it is touched upon in this body, I think the Senate ought to be consistent with itself and it ought to preserve its dignity in the examination and further conduct of its action in regard to the whole matter. The Senate has referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations an inquiry of a very broad character. It includes the whole subject of irregularities, if any have occurred, in the conduct of our diplomatic and other affairs with Hawaii, and the committee has organized a subcommittee, which has been industriously engaged in the investigation of the matter.

The point referred to in the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts raises the question of an irregularity in expenditure. That question, of course, depends upon two facts: First, whether the President of the United States had the right to appoint Mr. Blount as an agent, or as a diplomatic authority to Hawaii, I will call it; and, secondly, whether he has been paid, if paid at all, out of the contingent fund voted for the secret service of the State Department or under some other appropriation. The Committee on Foreign Relations, in the inquiry which has been addressed to it and which it is trying to execute, must necessarily ascertain and report to this body whether the President of the United States had authority to send Mr. Blount to Hawaii, and whether he had authority to commission him to the extent he was commissioned, and, therefore, whether his action in Hawaii was regular or irregular. That question carries with it necessarily the question of any expenditure made out of the Treasury of the United States, whether from the secret fund or any other appropriation, for the payment of his expenses while he was engaged in that service.

I think it is quite unnecessary, and it is an unhappy fact, too, that so much agitation is being produced in the Senate of the United States by this and various other resolutions which seem intended to anticipate the action of the committee. Either the subject ought to be withdrawn from the committee and taken up in the Senate and disposed of entirely here by direct action, or else the Senate ought to wait until the committee shall have discharged its duty and brought before this body and before the country all the facts relating to these questions.

I therefore think that the reference of this matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to be rather in the nature of an instruction to it, if the Senate wishes to take any action about it, that it should inquire and report what fund this gentleman has been paid from and whether that was regular or irregular. The whole subject of the inquiry, and every inquiry that is presented to this body now except the one offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], has been included in the instructions already given to that committee, and which, as I have observed, it is trying faithfully, and diligently also, to execute.

I do not desire to express any opinion upon what would be my judgment as to the irregularity of this expenditure, whether out of the secret-service fund or out of any other fund, inasmuch as the subject seems to be referred to a committee of which I am a member. I should rather withhold my judgment until I have had an opportunity to investigate that question. But I think all of this agitation in the Senate is premature and unnecessary, and that any inquiry touching this subject which Senators may deem it necessary to address to the Senate ought to be referred to that committee as an instruction to the committee to make inquiry and report.

I will not comment at all upon the motives which gentlemen may have for making these inquiries. At the same time I take the liberty to say that I think this proceeding is very unusual. It is hardly justified by anything we know or have heard of in respect to the conduct of the Administration in the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. HOAR. After the statement by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the ascertainment of these facts, so far as they may properly be made public under the statute, is within the scope of the duties of the committee, I consent that the resolution may go to the committee.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if that be the construction, I shall vote against the reference of the resolution to the committee. If the Senator from Massachusetts puts a proper construction upon what has been said by the Senator from Alabama then it gives away the entire question at issue. I should infinitely prefer for myself to put my vote on record against the resolution, because I have never been clearer as to any question in my life than that the Senate has no power at all to ask the President of the United States either as to the amount of the expenditure from the secret-service fund which we have put at his disposal or the purpose for which he has expended it.

We have a general provision in the statutes of the United States which makes it a penal offense for any officer of the Government to expend the money in the Treasury or that may be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury without an appropriation by Congress, except in this instance, where we have put under the discretion of the President a secret-service fund, to be used by him without accounting to Congress in regard either to the amount or the purposes. To admit that Congress has a right to call upon the President of the United States to give us an account of how he has expended that money is an absolute destruction of the idea of having any secret-service fund at all; and, as the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Delaware have properly stated, it is a reflection upon the people of the United States, who are represented by their President, not as an individual, but as an executive officer, to say that we are now unwilling to trust him either as to the amount or the purpose of the expenditure.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. What does he understand is the purpose of the statute, which says unless the President desire to keep it secret he shall cause the vouchers to be put in the Treasury? This is merely a request to the Secretary of the Treasury and not to the President for the vouchers which the President in his discretion may have put in the Treasury Department. That is all there is of it.

Mr. VEST. It is useless to fence about this matter. We understand what is the real purpose of the resolution, and every intelligent man in the United States will understand it. Here is a pending controversy in regard to the Hawaiian question.

The position of the Senator from Massachusetts is very well understood, or else the English language is a complete failure. He is opposed to the policy of the Administration. He is attacking it constantly and persistently; and he now seeks to obtain an advantage in this discussion either by forcing Senators upon this

side of the Chamber, as he has openly avowed here, to decline to take any action because they are afraid—to use his parliamentary expression—or he wants to force the President to give an account even as to the amount of this expenditure, in order that it may be used for the further purposes of his argument. That is the whole of it. I say the idea of a secret-service fund implies distinctly and logically and beyond question that the President is to dispose of it, as to the amount and the purpose, without any account to Congress at any time or in any way.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. TURPIE submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That from the facts and papers laid before us by the Executive and other sources it is unwise, inexpedient, and not in accordance with the character and dignity of the United States to consider further at this time either the treaty or project of annexation of the Hawaiian territory to this country; that the Provisional Government therein having been duly recognized, the highest international interests require that it shall pursue its own line of polity. Foreign intervention in the political affairs of these islands will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

Mr. TURPIE. I desire that the resolution may go over under the rule. I give notice that on next Thursday morning, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business of that day, I shall ask the courtesy of the Senate to submit some remarks upon the subject-matter of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be printed and lie upon the table for the present.

Mr. FRYE. A few days since I offered a resolution and requested that it might lie upon the table, giving information that my ultimate motion would be to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask that the resolution be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (submitted by Mr. FRYE January 3, 1894), as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, pending the investigation ordered by resolution of December 21, directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into our relations with Hawaii, there should be no interference on the part of this Government, by moral influence or physical force, for the restoration of Liliuokalani or the maintenance of the Provisional Government in the Hawaiian Islands, and that our naval forces should be used in said islands only for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens.

Mr. FRYE. In the light of the rumors of the last day or two it seems to me it becomes necessary (if not necessary, highly proper) that the Senate should give expression to its opinion, and I ask unanimous consent that a vote may now be taken on the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FRYE. I will ask unanimous consent for a vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that the resolution which has been reported be considered at this time.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution, but I understood the Senator from Maine to ask for a vote on it now.

Mr. FRYE. I do. I do not myself wish to make any remarks upon the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution, coming over from a former day, is now before the Senate. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, if the motion is in order, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That motion is in order.

Mr. FRYE. I do not desire to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations now. If it can not be considered I prefer that it should lie over until Wednesday morning, when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] will call it up for the purpose of submitting some remarks upon it.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no objection to that course, Mr. President.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it go over.

Mr. BUTLER. Let it go over then.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is so ordered, if there be no objection.

WILLIAM E. WOODBRIDGE.

Mr. GORMAN. Some days ago, when Senate bill 418, reported by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], from the Committee on Patents, was under consideration, I asked that the bill might go over for the time being. I have looked at it since. I have no earthly objection to the bill. As it was on my objection that the bill went over, I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up out of order.

Mr. PLATT. I should be glad to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair). The bill having been passed over informally and not having lost its place on the Calendar, it will be read as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill (S. 418) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, was read and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VEST. I should like to understand the nature of the bill. I could not catch it distinctly from the reading. The Senator who reported it may be able to explain it.

Mr. PLATT. A similar bill has passed the Senate twice, and I think three times heretofore on full explanation. Mr. Woodbridge claims to be the inventor of a shell, for use in rifled ordnance. His patent was ordered to issue, and, according to the rules of the Patent Office, it was then placed by him in the secret archives of the Patent Office subject to be issued at his order. Before he asked to have it issued the Patent Office changed its rules, and held that an application for issue must be made within six months; it would not issue it; and so he never obtained the patent. The present committee and former committees that have considered the matter, as well as the Senate in former Congresses, thought that the Government ought not take any advantage of that action. I have here the original letter of Mr. Ewbank, who was then the Commissioner of Patents, directed to Mr. Woodbridge, which is as follows:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE, *April 15, 1852*.

Your favor of the 13th instant is received. Your application for letters patent for rifled ordnance has been examined, and on the 25th March, ultimo, a patent was ordered to issue thereon, and in accordance with your request the papers were filed among the secret archives of the office subject to your direction as to the time of issuing the same

All there is in the question whether he is entitled to compensation is whether the Government ought to avail itself of the change of the rules of the Patent Office after having told him that the patent was subject to his direction as to the time of issue. There is a question about whether he was the first inventor. Other parties have claimed to be the first inventor. All that is left to the court to determine. As I said, this measure has received the sanction of the committees and of the Senate heretofore.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WHEELOCK SIMMONS AND WIFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first case on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 79) to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife, was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. VEST. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report, submitted by Mr. DOLPH September 4, 1893, and read as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred Senate bill 79, having considered the same, report the bill favorably and recommend its passage. The committee adopts the report of the committee on a similar bill at the last session of Congress as follows:

[Senate Report No. 1121, Fifty-Second Congress, second session.]

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred Senate bill 3382, having considered the same, report the bill favorably, with amendments, and recommend its passage.

The object of the bill is simply to correct a patent heretofore issued to Wheelock Simmons and wife for a donation claim in the State of Oregon.

The facts sufficiently appear in the correspondence attached and made a part of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1892.

SIR: I am in receipt, by reference from you, of Senate bill No. 3382 entitled "A bill to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife," with a request for an expression of the views of this Department thereon.

I herewith transmit a copy of the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office on said bill, together with the accompanying papers.

I see no objection to said bill, after it has been properly corrected, becoming a law.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary*.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH,
Chairman Committee on Public Lands, United States Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE.
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1892.

SIR: I am in receipt, by reference from the Department of the 13th instant, for report in duplicate, of S. 3382, Fifty-second Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife."

This bill was forwarded to you by Hon. J. N. DOLPH, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, United States Senate.

The facts in this case and the views of this office upon the legislation proposed by said bill are as follows:

Lucinda Simmons, the wife of Wheelock Simmons, was formerly the wife of a man by the name of Hill. Mr. Hill died before the passage of the donation act of Congress of September 27, 1850 (9 Stats., 496), and shortly after his death his widow married Simmons.

After the passage of said donation law Mrs. Simmons, as the late widow of Hill, attempted to claim a donation of land for the heirs of Hill, deceased. She applied for and got a survey of the land claimed. As Mrs. Simmons could not complete her claim to this land under the law, her husband, Wheelock Simmons, filed his notice therefor with a slight difference as to the exterior lines, and procured a survey of the same.

The surveyor-general in platting the claim made his plat from the field notes of the survey of the Hill claim, and the register and receiver, when they issued their certificate as the basis of a patent, evidently described the land to be patented according to the description given in the survey for the Hill heirs.

The patent issued did not agree with the lines of survey as stated in the certificate. One of the courses, south 25° west 19.98 chains, was inserted in the patent as having been run north 25° east 19.98 chains. This error removed all the remaining lines of the survey quite a distance away from the proper location and included some of the lands intended to be patented and did not include other tracts, and caused the patent to include lands belonging to other parties.

Plat No. 1, inclosed herein, has been prepared by this office to show what lands would be included in the existing patent according to the metes and bounds given therein. I also inclose herein Plat No. 2, constructed from the field notes of the survey of the claim of Simmons. I notice that the inclosed bill does not describe the second course according to the field notes of the Simmons survey.

The field notes give this second course as having been run south 59° west 24 chains, while the bill, in line 14, gives this course as south 39° west 24 chains.

The course in lines 21 and 22 of said bill gives the course as running west 39.98 chains, while the field notes give this course as running west 39.93 chains.

A copy of the record of the outstanding patent, dated April 20, 1866, is also inclosed herein.

The exterior lines of this donation as described in the outstanding patent (see Plat No. 1) include tracts of land in sections 6, 31, and 36, which do not belong to the Simmons donation.

All these tracts of land which lie outside of this donation as surveyed for Simmons were disposed of and patented to other parties prior to the issuance of the Simmons patent.

The honorable Secretary of the Interior, in his decision dated March 22, 1883, copy inclosed herein, in the case of Simmons *vs.* Eastham, holds that the issuance, delivery, and acceptance of said patent for the Simmons claim exhausted the jurisdiction of the Land Department over the matters involved.

In view of this condition of affairs I can see no objection to the proposed legislation when the corrections herein suggested are made.

Said bill No. 3382 is herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

W. M. STONE, *Acting Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Transcript of field notes of the survey of the Wheelock Simmons donation land claim——

Mr. VEST. It is not necessary to read the remainder of the report. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon one question. A former Secretary of the Interior speaks of an amendment to the bill. Is that amendment incorporated in the present bill?

Mr. DOLPH. I think so. I will compare the bill and report and answer in a moment. It is an old donation claim. The title has passed out of the Government for many years; but in granting the patent the line was run east instead of west. So they do not inclose any land unless they evidence their title; and they can not do it, the Land Office holds, without this legislation. The title has not been in the Government for many years.

Mr. VEST. I understand that it is an old donation claim. I have no doubt the general object of the bill is right, but I want to know whether the amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior is incorporated in the pending bill.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the bill be passed over informally and I will run over the report and see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over informally.

Mr. DOLPH subsequently said. I have examined the bill that was under consideration. I find that the amendments proposed by the Secretary of the Interior are in the bill. The bill is correct as it is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been informally laid aside, it is again before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Was the bill taken up in its order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was taken up in order and passed over informally a few minutes ago.

Mr. DOLPH. It has been read.

Mr. HARRIS. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the rules the Senate would proceed to the consideration of bills under Rule IX, but I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of to-day's session we shall proceed under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that during the remainder of to-day's session the Senate shall proceed under Rule VIII. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The pending bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

PUBLIC PARK RESERVATION IN OREGON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill on the Calendar will be proceeded with under Rule VIII.

The bill (S. 69) to grant to the State of Oregon townships 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 south, in ranges 5 and 6 east of Willamette meridian, in the State of Oregon, for a public park, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOLPH. All this land is embraced in the forest reservation now. A similar bill has several times passed Congress. It would not affect that question. It simply continues the reservation, but puts the burden on the State of protecting the park from being despoiled or trespassed upon. All the land has been withdrawn from settlement for several years.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The bill (S. 355) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation, in Montana, under the mining and homestead laws, for educational and other purposes, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. VEST. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 8, 1894.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

John M. B. Sill, of Michigan, to be minister resident and consul-general of the United States to Korea, vice Augustine Heard, resigned.

CHIEF JUSTICE SUPREME COURT OF UTAH.

Samuel A. Merritt, of Utah Territory, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, vice Charles S. Zane, whose term expired January 7, 1894.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA.

A. G. Curtin Bierer, of Oklahoma Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, as provided for by act approved December 21, 1893.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Albert A. Wilson, of the District of Columbia, to be marshal of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Daniel M. Ransdell, resigned.

Shaw F. Neely, of Kansas, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Kansas, vice Richard L. Walker, resigned.

J. V. Guillotte, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice John B. Donnally, whose term will expire January 20, 1894.

O. J. Carroll, of North Carolina, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of North Carolina, vice Joshua B. Hill, resigned.

Joseph E. Cronan, of North Dakota, to be marshal of the United States for the district of North Dakota, vice Albert F. Price, resigned.

J. Shelby Williams, of Texas, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Texas, vice J. J. Dickerson, resigned.

J. N. McKenzie, of Tennessee, to be marshal of the United States for the middle district of Tennessee, vice Carter B. Harrison, whose term will expire January 20, 1894.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Cato Sells, of Iowa, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Iowa, vice Maurice D. O'Connell, whose term will expire January 27, 1894.

William M. Smith, of Kentucky, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Kentucky, vice George W. Jolly, whose term will expire January 27, 1894.

Charles Allen Jones, of Nevada, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Nevada, vice John W. Whitcher, whose term will expire January 27, 1894.

John H. Senter, of Vermont, to be attorney of the United

States for the district of Vermont, vice Frank Plumley, resigned, to take effect January 10, 1894.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Waverly Stairley, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of California, to succeed H. W. Byington, resigned.

George W. Wilson, of Florida, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Florida, to succeed Dennis Eagan, resigned.

Mellville E. Carter, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of North Carolina, in place of Kope Elias, nominated to succeed William W. Rollins, resigned. The nomination of Mr. Elias is withdrawn.

Henry Blackman, of Oregon, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oregon, to succeed Milton Weidler, resigned.

Raymond E. Shearer, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of internal revenue for the ninth district of Pennsylvania, to succeed Sam M. Fridy, resigned.

Grant Herring, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of internal revenue for the twelfth district of Pennsylvania, to succeed Thomas F. Penman, removed.

Samuel A. Townes, of South Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of South Carolina, to succeed Eugene A. Webster, resigned.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

James R. Johnston, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, to succeed Walter Johnson, removed.

W. B. Humphrey, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Sioux City, in the State of Iowa, to succeed Jonas M. Cleland, resigned.

APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Alfred S. Kimball, of Maine, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine, to succeed Eben E. Rand, removed.

Simon C. Karrer, of Michigan, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan, to succeed Charles F. Kimball, removed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John B. Malony, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan, to succeed George H. Hopkins, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 19, 1894.

John T. Lesley, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Tampa, in the State of Florida, to succeed Edward R. Gunby, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Enoch A. Higbee, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Great Egg Harbor, in the State of New Jersey, to succeed John Price, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 14, 1894.

Benjamin M. Price, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Perth Amboy, in the State of New Jersey, to succeed William T. Hopper, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Frank N. Potter, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Cape Vincent, in the State of New York, to succeed G. Harrison Smith, removed.

Stephen H. Lane, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Pamlico, in the State of North Carolina, to succeed Robert Hancock, jr., resigned.

Wesley G. Andrews, of Virginia, to be collector of customs for the district of Petersburg, in the State of Virginia, to succeed T. Jefferson Jarratt, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

MEMBER MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. Charles J. Allen, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Missouri River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved July 5, 1884, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," vice Ernst, resigned.

MEMBER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. Amos Stickney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the commission provided for in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes, near its mouth, to its headwaters," vice Ernst, resigned.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Richard B. Hughes, of Rapid City, S. Dak., to be surveyor-general of South Dakota, vice Boetious H. Sullivan, to be removed.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Sylvester Hull, of Redding, Cal., to be register of the land office at Redding, Cal., vice Adolph Dobrowsky, to be removed.

James N. Fike, of Colby, Kans., to be register of the land office at Colby, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Kirwin with Oberlin land office and removal from Oberlin, vice Cyrus Anderson, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

John I. Lee, of Ashland, Kans., to be register of the land office at Dodge City, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Larned with Garden City land office and removal from Garden City, vice Daniel M. Frost, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Lafayette S. Barnes, of Redding, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Redding, Cal., vice John V. Scott, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

James F. Thompson, of Eureka, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Humboldt, Cal., vice Augustus J. Wiley, whose term of office will expire January 26, 1894.

Thomas J. McCue, of Norton, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Colby, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Kirwin with Oberlin land office and removal from Oberlin, vice James B. McGonigal, resigned.

George T. Crist, of Santa Fe, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Larned with Garden City land office and removal from Garden City, vice Jesse Taylor, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

Colin F. Macdonald, of St. Cloud, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at St. Cloud, Minn., vice William Westerman, term expired.

Marvin E. Mathews, of Marshall, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at Marshall, Minn., vice Everett P. Freeman, term expired.

Frank Harris, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be receiver of public moneys at Salt Lake City, Utah, vice Hoyt Sherman, jr., whose term of office will expire January 21, 1894.

PENSION AGENT.

Harrison H. Wheeler, of Ludington, Mich., to be pension agent at Detroit, Mich., vice Edward H. Harvey, to be removed.

INDIAN AGENT.

Joseph Clements, of Dakota City, Nebr., to be agent for the Indians of the Santee Agency in Nebraska, vice James E. Helms, to be removed.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

To be post chaplain.

The Rev. James Wilson Hillman, of New York, January 4, 1894, vice Tully, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery arm.

First Lieut. Henry J. Reilly, Fifth Artillery, to be captain, January 3, 1894, vice Fessenden, Fifth Artillery, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Oscar I. Straub, First Artillery, to be first lieutenant, January 3, 1894, vice Reilly, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Second Lieut. Lawrence H. Moses, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant in said corps, vice First Lieut. James A. Turner, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (junior grade) James H. Glennon, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. Charles A. Stone, retired.

Ensign Robert B. Dashiell, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. (junior grade) James H. Glennon, promoted.

Lieut. (junior grade) William R. Rush, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. S. L. Graham, retired [subject to the examinations required by law].

Ensign Edward E. Capehart, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. (junior grade) William R. Rush, promoted [subject to the examinations required by law].

POSTMASTERS.

Thomas R. Wilcockson, to be postmaster at Paragould, in the county of Greene and State of Arkansas, in the place of John S. Barker, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Jacob L. Argabrite, to be postmaster at Ventura, in the county of Ventura and State of California, in the place of Nathan H. Shaw, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John A. Monaghan, to be postmaster at Nokomis, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois, in the place of R. Gelly, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

John C. McGrath, to be postmaster at Jerseyville, in the county of Jersey and State of Illinois, in the place of A. H. Rue, resigned.

Samuel W. Chapman, to be postmaster at Elgin, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in the place of W. F. Hunter, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Jacob Marx, to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in the place of John H. Hodder, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

George E. Young, to be postmaster at Amboy, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois, in the place of J. E. Lewis, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Thomas K. Fleming, to be postmaster at Petersburg, in the county of Pike and State of Indiana, in the place of W. C. Adams, removed.

Emanuel B. Thumma, to be postmaster at Garrett, in the county of Dekalb and State of Indiana, in the place of Henry M. Bicknell, whose commission expires January 8, 1894.

Parley Sheldon, to be postmaster at Ames, in the county of Story and State of Iowa, in the place of J. E. Duncan, whose commission expires January 9, 1894.

Fred A. Lischer, to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Scott and State of Iowa, in the place of Henry Egbert, whose commission expires January 8, 1894.

William N. Hood, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Iowa, in the place of William Wilson, jr., whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

William S. McChesney, to be postmaster at Lexington, in the county of Fayette and State of Kentucky, in the place of James R. Howard, removed.

Alverdo M. Glover, to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Hamilton and State of Nebraska, in the place of John Tweedy, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Frank G. Tower, to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of T. E. Hayes, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Samuel S. Bowne, to be postmaster at Cooperstown, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in the place of F. L. Gilbert, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Nicholas Conzet, jr., to be postmaster at College Point, in the county of Queens and State of New York, in the place of H. Herbig, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

J. Horatio Earll, to be postmaster at Skaneateles, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York, in the place of Edson D. Gillett, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

David S. Haines, to be postmaster at Sandy Hill, in the county of Washington and State of New York, in the place of G. W. Clarke, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Josiah J. Hasbrouck, to be postmaster at New Paltz, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, in the place of Jesse Elting, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Leander B. Lent, to be postmaster at Brewster, in the county of Putnam and State of New York, in the place of E. W. Addis, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Daniel O'Leary, jr., to be postmaster at Glens Falls, in the county of Warren and State of New York, in the place of William W. Rockwell, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Stephen J. Lonergan, to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York, in the place of Lucian C. Smith, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Elijah W. Rawls, to be postmaster at Tarboro, in the county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina, in the place of Joseph J. Martin, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Frederick Gerth, to be postmaster at Millersville, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Carroll M. Lovell, to be postmaster at Dickson, in the county of Dickson and State of Tennessee, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Oliver P. Basford, to be postmaster at Flatonia, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas, in the place of Julius Laux, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John Topp, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin, in the place of John R. Decker, whose commission expires January 9, 1894.

Samuel M. Sinead, to be postmaster at Fond du Lac, in the county of Fond du Lac and State of Wisconsin, in the place of James T. Green, removed.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate January 8, 1894.

Frank W. Roberts, of Maine, whose nomination was delivered to the Senate December 5, 1893, to be consul of the United States at Barcelona, Spain.

John H. Stauffer, whose nomination was sent to the Senate on the 4th of January, 1894, to be postmaster at Millersville, county of Lancaster, in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 3, 1894.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Terence Martin, of Fargo, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Fargo, N. Dak.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John D. Stocker, of Georgia, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Atlanta, in the State of Georgia.

POSTMASTERS.

Edmund B. McClanahan, to be postmaster at Waukegan, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

F. Charles Donohue, to be postmaster at Freeport, in the county of Stephenson and State of Illinois.

John D. Waterman, to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Winnebago and State of Illinois.

Lewis McCoy, to be postmaster at Golconda, in the county of Pope and State of Illinois.

Charles N. Smith, to be postmaster at Belvidere, in the county of Boone and State of Illinois.

John W. F. King, to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida.

E. H. Taylor, to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Haywood and State of Tennessee.

Frank G. Wood, to be postmaster at Gerard, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois.

William H. O'Connell, to be postmaster at Audubon, in the county of Audubon and State of Iowa.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1894.

CONSULTING ENGINEER.

Frank H. Dabney, of Louisiana, to be consulting engineer of the United States on the International Boundary Commission provided for in the convention with Mexico, of March 1, 1889.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Waverly Stairley, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 8, 1894.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read, corrected, and approved.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I call up the report from the Committee on Rules, the pending question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call up the privileged question that I have raised.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] calls up the pending resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call up the question of privilege that I have raised, and that I claim to be pending.

The SPEAKER (continuing). The gentleman from Mississippi calls up the report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the question of privilege——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has called up a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I make the point of order, if the Speaker pleases, that the action of the Speaker in giving precedence, or attempting to give precedence, to a report of the Committee on Rules at this time over a question involving the highest privileges of the House, is "in violation of the honor, dignity, and privileges of the House," under the rulings of this House as shown by the Journal of the Forty-ninth Congress, first session. I demand that the question shall be submitted to the House for its determination, as otherwise the privileges of the House might be absolutely abrogated in every contingency that could possibly arise.

In the Forty-ninth Congress, first session, page 2548 of the Journal, this rule was laid down by Speaker Carlisle, in accordance with the uniform practice of the House:

Whenever a point of order is made that any matter or proceeding is in violation of the honor, dignity, or privileges of the House, it is not a question for the Chair but for the House itself to determine.

Under this ruling, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that

it is absolutely incumbent on the Speaker of the House to submit to the House, itself to decide, the question whether the privileges of the House, in determining the integrity of its own rights, proceedings, and functions, which are alleged to have been invaded, overthrown, or usurped by the Executive, presents a question of higher privilege than a mere rule as to the number of hours the House shall devote to the discussion or consideration of any bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question of which the House itself must take cognizance, for there is not a court in the United States sitting on any case that is not, under the rulings and precedents of the common law, required to take cognizance of notorious facts and matters of public information. Certainly nothing is more notorious than the facts proclaimed in every portion of the public press that the acts and circumstances which form the basis of this question of privilege that I have brought before the House, and the House's action on which I think to be absolutely essential to the maintenance of the dignity, the rights, and the capacity to act of a coördinate branch of the Government have become flagrant by reason of what has transpired abroad, to which I need not refer in detail.

Every member of this House knows that the situation which I have deprecated, and to which this resolution refers, has culminated already in accordance with the prediction that I made when I introduced the resolution.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives can not afford, for any mere temporary political exigency—it can not afford, under any passion or prejudice, to ignore a fundamental question which goes to the right of existence of this House itself, which I claim has been invaded and usurped. I make the point of order, under the rules of the House, that the question should be submitted to this House. I make the point of order that these proceedings, the Speaker's refusing to entertain a question of the highest privilege and insisting upon the consideration of a rule involving only an order of legislative procedure, thus barring out every other question, would bar out a President's message, would exclude an impeachment of the President, would refuse consideration of the fact even that a President might have sent a message to this House declaring that he had usurped imperial power and assumed to dissolve the Congress. According to the rulings of the Speaker, the House stands here manacled and unable to assert its own dignity or to protect its own rights. I insist that the point of order shall be submitted to the House for its own decision.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, if the House will indulge him for a moment, will make a statement. The Constitution provides that each House shall establish rules for its own government. This House, in the execution of that power, has established rules. Among the rules so established is one prescribing the rights of the members as to questions of personal privilege, and the rights of members in the aggregate as to questions respecting the honor and dignity of the House. The House has also provided, in the same rules, the manner and method by which the rules may be changed or altered; and in order that force and effect may be given to any intention and purpose of the House to alter its own rules, provision has been made that when a report is brought in for their alteration no motion shall be in order except the motion to adjourn, or, using the language of the rule—

No other dilatory motion.

There is now pending before the House an order to change the rules of the House. If the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] could invoke an existing rule to prevent the action of the House upon a proposed change of the rules, then you would be in that condition where you would have tied yourselves hand and foot, and could not change the rules that were once established. Suppose this report from the Committee on Rules was simply to repeal the very rule which the gentleman from Maine now invokes. Suppose it was a resolution to change the rules as to questions of privilege. Could it be contended for a moment that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] could defeat the wish of the House to change that rule by a resort to that rule itself; that he could say, "You shall not consider a proposition to change that rule, because I propose to ask you to act under that rule, although you now desire to change it?"

The proposition reported from the Committee on Rules is one which, if adopted, defines exactly what the House shall do from day to day until and including the 25th day of the month. And whilst it is true that there is a rule providing for matters of privilege, it is also true that this House has reserved the right to change that rule, to suspend or abrogate that rule; and the rule that is now before the House for its consideration has for its object the suspension of the operation of the very rule invoked by the gentleman, as well as any other rules which are in conflict with the express terms of the order itself. Therefore it is a question that is really for the House. If the House deems that its honor and dignity have been assailed by any action, either of the Speaker or any department of the Government, then if the House desires to proceed at once to consider that question the House can vote down this rule and proceed to consider it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Oh, no——

The SPEAKER. But the House has never delegated to one gentleman the exclusive right to take care of its honor and its dignity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Ah! but, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. That is a matter to be determined by a majority of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is exactly what I am demanding. [Cries of "Regular order!" on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. If a majority of the House desire to proceed with the question called up by the gentleman from Maine, if the House shall vote down the pending proposition from the Committee on Rules, then the gentleman from Maine will be recognized to call up his question of privilege, and if the question of consideration is not raised against it—or, if raised against it, is not sustained—then the House would proceed to consider that proposition. So that there is no such thing as any individual binding the House. If the House declines now to proceed as indicated by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], it is because the majority of the House do not wish so to proceed at this time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That has not been determined.

The SPEAKER. That question can be decided by the vote upon the report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. If the Speaker please, I call his attention to the fact—— [Cries of "Regular order!"] This is the "regular order." I call the Chair's attention to the fact that I am not arrogating to myself any special power. Speaker Carlisle, in the ruling to which I refer, held:

Whenever a point of order is made that any matter or proceeding is in violation of the honor, dignity, or privileges of the House, it is not a question for the Chair, but for the House itself to determine.

I make the point of order that it is a question which, *whenever* raised—and I am raising the question of order as to the ruling of the Chair—must be determined by the House. I make the point of order that the Speaker in his ruling, substituting his own interpretation as to his duties under the rules at this juncture, in place of the will of the House, is violating the privilege of this House to determine the question of order for itself. On that question Speaker Carlisle's ruling is perfectly clear—that "it is not a question for the Chair, but for the House itself to determine."

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is merely the organ of the House. The rules of the House direct the Speaker, when a report is pending from the Committee on Rules, that he shall entertain no motion except one motion to adjourn, nor shall he entertain any other dilatory motion; and the Chair holds that in the discharge of his duty as the executive officer of the House he must execute this rule. The House has made the rules. The present occupant of the Chair knows of no rule of action prescribed for him except such as is prescribed by the majority, embodied in the code of rules which they adopt.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Permit me to call the Chair's attention to this fact, which is very important here, that this can not be held in any sense to be a "dilatory motion." This resolution of mine was pending before the report of the Committee on Rules was brought in, and was recognized by the Speaker as a question of the highest privilege. I am simply asserting and urging the privilege which that resolution had acquired before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has on two previous days determined the question, and the question now is——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let us have it understood——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to make the motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want to know the meaning of the ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to make the motion at this time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the Chair has recognized me, and has made a ruling; and I appeal from that ruling of the Chair, and say if the rules and the privileges of this House collectively are less important than the question of a rule of procedure——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain an appeal on a question of recognition.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the Chair's refusal to entertain an appeal. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon ordering the previous question——

Mr. REED. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED. Does the Chair rule out the appeal of the gentleman from Maine, my colleague, on the ground that it is a dilatory motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair had stated to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] that under the rules the Chair was not permitted to recognize the gentleman to make the motion.

Mr. REED. But the Chair had recognized him——

The SPEAKER. The Chair had heard the gentleman.

Mr. REED. And had ruled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair ruled practically on the same question two days ago, on Friday and Saturday, and to-day had heard the gentleman, supposing that he might have some authority to offer.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I raised the point of order——

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated that he could not recognize the gentleman to make a motion, because the rules expressly say that he shall not recognize any motion except a motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED. The Chair has stated to the House that it would be in the power of the House to control this matter by direct action; namely, by opposing the adoption of the rule now presented. Would it be in order to raise the question of consideration against this in order test this very question? That the House should have control of its own proceedings would seem to be beyond dispute; but it can not have control of its own proceedings under the rules, as gentlemen upon the Democratic side are called upon to vote against a rule which otherwise they might desire.

They might be willing to vote against consideration upon the ground that as soon as they had disposed of this Hawaiian matter, either by laying it on the table or refusing to consider it, they could then proceed upon this proposed rule. But if they defeat the rule they deprive themselves of that right; and I take this occasion to suggest to the Chair that perhaps there ought to be a revision of the former ruling of the Chair, that the House could not raise the question of consideration against a report of the Committee on Rules. This is one of the bad consequences to which that ruling has led. That ruling, I think, was made under a mistaken idea that there was some analogy between the present situation and a motion for the suspension of the rules.

Of course, if the Chair believed that my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] was presenting this matter for purposes of delay, or anything of that sort, then, under the general parliamentary law of every civilized body, the Chair would have the right to rule it out, subject to future corrective action by the House if there were any abuse; but surely we ought not to be put in a position where the House may not take up a question relating to its own dignity by disposing temporarily of a proposition to change the rules without being obliged to dispose of it permanently. Allow me in this connection, in order to show the importance of this situation, and of the course of action that ought to be taken in regard to it, to suggest to the Chair a possibility. Suppose it were within the knowledge of any member of the House at this moment that somebody, some band of undisciplined or of disciplined people, were marching upon this House, and the House might desire to call for proper aid in order to preserve its existence. Suppose a member should rise in his place and say that he desired to present that as a question of the highest privilege, and to ask for action on the part of the House in order to preserve its own existence. Nobody would for an instant dispute the superior right of that question over the present proposition which the Speaker is about to lay before the House. The Chair will please observe that this point does not depend upon the importance of the question presented. I put an extreme case, because it is only by putting an extreme case that we can see the full extent of the ruling. The principle is precisely the same whenever any question of privilege is presented to the House, and the House alone can determine whether the question is of sufficient importance to justify the interruption of its present business.

Now let me say that a question of privilege is not dependent upon a rule of this House. Without any rule it is inherent in the nature of a legislative body that it must have the right to interrupt temporary business for the purpose of preserving its own existence; and what is necessary in order to preserve its own existence can only be determined by the House itself. I think that possibly the Speaker may have been led into error in regard to this—if he is in error. I mean to speak with perfect respect upon this subject, because I understand somewhat of the difficulties of ruling upon questions which spring up suddenly, and even of ruling upon questions as to which one has plenty of time for deliberation. But the question, I say, must be determined by the House, either primarily by the Speaker, with an appeal from his decision, or by submission to the House itself.

Now, this being the case, ought there not to be a series of rulings which will allow the House to remain in that position? It is perfectly true that the House has a right to change its rules, not merely under the Constitution, for in my judgment the Constitution is only declaratory of an inherent power which exists in every parliamentary body. It undoubtedly has the right to change its rules, and if this were a direct proposition to change this rule alone in order to get rid of this question as the House might desire, why then the intimation of the Speaker would seem to be entirely correct.

But here is a general proposition, and I do not believe that by any rulings which have been heretofore made this order, either in its inception or in its execution, could be saved from interruption when any matter of privilege concerning the House itself was up. In other words, I mean to assert that if this rule were actually adopted it would not abrogate the other rule to which my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] has appealed. If, in the midst of the discussion which is to take place under this rule, and which is limited and prescribed by the rule, any member should rise in his place and present a question of privilege relating to the existence of the House—which of course would be a question of privilege of the highest kind—my judgment is that the Chair would be obliged to rule that that question of privilege had precedence and to call upon the House to dispose of it.

Of course the thing which the Chair really has in mind, perhaps, although he may not be conscious of it, because this is a question of feeling—the feeling may be that this is for purposes of delay. Upon that question I have nothing to say except that the Chair has a perfect right, subject to the animadversion of the House afterward in proper form—the Chair has a perfect right, on his responsibility as Speaker of the House, to rule that motion out. But I interpose here—my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] knows that I have had nothing to do whatever with the proceedings with regard to this matter heretofore——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I cheerfully relieve my colleague from all responsibility for my action in this matter.

Mr. REED. I have had nothing to do with it; but I do desire that this matter shall be put upon a basis where the rule would be such that we can transact business in orderly fashion, and it seems to me that if the Chair would give consideration to the whole condition of affairs he would either change the intimation which has already been made or else permit the question of consideration to be raised.

I am quite well aware that the Chair has been justified by the action of the House. I am quite well aware that the action of the House sustaining an appeal from the decision of the Chair is conclusive evidence, in a way, of what parliamentary law is for the time being. That I fully admit. But at the same time we all know that a Speaker is sustained ordinarily by his side of the House, and it is advantageous for the dignity and honor of the House that that should be so. Yet there have been instances where Speakers, upon examining the matter, have seen fit to submit the whole situation to the House.

I have discharged my duty in presenting this matter as it seems to my mind.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to say——

The SPEAKER. One moment.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to emphasize, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment, please. On the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] as to the propriety of recognizing the right to raise the question of consideration on a report from the Committee on Rules, the Chair will say, it has always been held in this body that the question of consideration could not be raised against what is known and defined as the order of business. For instance, a gentleman makes a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain bill. The question of consideration can not be raised against that. The question of consideration is determined on that motion by voting it up or voting it down. Now, the Chair, in making the ruling in respect to a report from the Committee on Rules, regarded it as in the nature of a motion relating to the order of business, and therefore held that the question of consideration could not be raised, because the House could determine that order of business by voting the proposed rule up or voting it down, and the effect would be the same as though the question of consideration were recognized. The Chair so held in the last Congress and again in this; and the decision was sustained by the House.

Of course the Chair is aware, painfully aware, of the fact suggested by the gentleman from Maine, that very often the occupant of the chair is forced to make decisions without such investigation as he would like to give, and doubtless is often in error. But in regard to the present decision the Chair does not see that any harm can come from it, because it is within the power of the House at any time to dispose of the question presented. Take the present case. Suppose there were a great emergency, as suggested by the gentleman from Maine; it would be in the power of the House to dispose of the report from the Committee on Rules in forty minutes—to get it out of the way; a majority could get it out of the way in forty minutes. There are thirty

minutes allowed for debate; and then in ten minutes more the majority of the House could get the question out of the way. So that there could be no hardship as the effect of this ruling.

Of course, if there were no quorum present, or if members present failed to vote, so that no quorum appeared, there might be some embarrassment; but if a majority of the House should desire to dispose of the pending matter, so as to reach another matter, some great privileged question, it could do so. This is not like a lingering matter; it could be disposed of certainly in an hour, so as to reach any business that the House might desire to reach.

The Chair has thus, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine, given expression to the views that governed him in originally holding that the question of consideration could not be raised against a report of the Committee on Rules. The question is now upon the demand for the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Has the Speaker ruled upon the question of precedence now presented. If the Chair has——

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman to make the motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair stated a moment ago that this presented a question of order—he recognized it as a question of "the order of business." I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that a question of privilege takes precedence of every question of the order of business, according to the specific language of the rule and precedent I have quoted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has endeavored to express his views in regard to the question presented by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does the Chair decline to entertain an appeal?

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman again.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair declines to entertain an appeal?

The SPEAKER. No appeal can be entertained upon a question of recognition.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I simply protest against this proceeding as a usurpation on the part of the Speaker, only equaled by the usurpation on the part of the Executive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will take his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I shall do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will resume his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I shall do so under duress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will do so at once. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request the gentleman to resume his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It will not be necessary. I understand what force and duress are——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will take his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). And that they do not foreclose any constitutional right.

Mr. BOUTELLE resumed his seat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the demand of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] for the previous question.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BURROWS. Simply to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURROWS. There has been some delay in the adoption of this proposed rule presented by the Committee on Rules——

Mr. CATCHINGS. Let us have order, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible to hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has endeavored to preserve order upon the floor, and will request gentlemen to resume their seats and cease conversation.

Mr. BURROWS. I was saying that there has been some delay in the adoption of the report from the Committee on Rules, and I query whether the language of the rule itself ought not to be changed. It provides now as it stands that "next Monday," in the language of the rule, the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session commencing at that time to be for general debate only. If that is the intention of the rule it will be well to have it understood now. That is, however, its language, and of course the rule does not become operative until it is adopted by the House, although introduced several days ago. To pass the rule in its present form would require that on next Monday, a week from to-day, there shall be an evening session, commencing at 8 o'clock, for general debate.

The SPEAKER. To what part of the rule does the gentleman from Michigan refer?

Mr. BURROWS. To the last clause of the rule.

The SPEAKER. That refers to the general debate only.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes. If it is the intention to have the debate begin next Monday it ought to be understood now.

The SPEAKER. It provides for this week also. It may be necessary, however, to bring in another rule to correct that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is impossible to hear the ruling of the Chair in the confusion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan rose to ask whether, as the order was not adopted when presented—and we all, of course, understand the reason why the difficulty arises—the construction would be that the general debate at the evening session should begin on next Monday.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understood the Chair to make some ruling as to the question of debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggested that this refers to night sessions only, not to the day sessions. The Chair stated that it was the intention of the order that beginning with to-night evening sessions should be held for debate only; and if there was any doubt about it the rule could be made to conform to that intention.

The gentleman from Mississippi demands the previous question on the adoption of the resolution from the Committee on Rules, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BURROWS. Before that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask if the previous question be voted down whether it would be in order to amend the resolution by extending the time for debate a day or two?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That would not be necessary. The rule itself provides that we may bring in another rule to extend the time if necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 0, not voting 161; as follows:

YEAS—190.

Abbott,	Covert,	Ikirt,	Pendleton, Tex.
Alderson,	Cox,	Johnson, Ohio	Pendleton, W. Va.
Alexander,	Crain,	Jones,	Pigott,
Allen,	Crawford,	Kilgore,	Price,
Arnold,	Culberson,	Kribbs,	Reilly,
Bailey,	Cummings,	Kyle,	Richards, Ohio
Baldwin,	Davey,	Lane,	Richardson, Mich.
Bankhead,	De Armond,	Lapham,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bartlett,	De Forest,	Latimer,	Ritchie,
Barwig,	Denson,	Layton,	Robbins,
Bell, Tex.	Dinsmore,	Lester,	Robertson, La.
Beltzhoover,	Dockery,	Lisle,	Russell, Ga.
Berry,	Donovan,	Livingston,	Ryan,
Black, Ga.	Dunn,	Lockwood,	Sayers,
Black, Ill.	Dunphy,	Lynch,	Schermerhorn,
Blanchard,	Durborow,	Maddox,	Shell,
Bland,	Edmunds,	Magner,	Snodgrass,
Boatner,	Ellis, Ky.	Maguire,	Somers,
Bower, N. C.	English,	Mallory,	Springer,
Branch,	Enloe,	Marshall,	Stallings,
Brawley,	Epes,	Martin, Ind.	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Erdman,	McAleer,	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Everett,	McCreary, Ky.	Strait,
Bretz,	Fielder,	McCulloch,	Swanson,
Brookshire,	Fithian,	McDannold,	Talbert, S. C.
Brown,	Forman,	McDearmon,	Talbott, Md.
Bryan,	Fyan,	McEttrick,	Tarsney,
Bynum,	Geary,	McGann,	Tate,
Cabaniss,	Geissenhainer,	McKaig,	Taylor, Ind.
Caminetti,	Goldzier,	McLaurin,	Terry,
Cannon, Cal.	Goodnight,	McMillin,	Tracey,
Capehart,	Grady,	McNagny,	Tucker,
Caruth,	Gresham,	McRae,	Turner,
Catchings,	Griffin,	Meredith,	Turpin,
Causey,	Hall, Minn.	Money,	Tyler,
Clancy,	Hall, Mo.	Montgomery,	Warner,
Clark, Mo.	Hammond,	Morgan,	Washington,
Clarke, Ala.	Hare,	Moses,	Weadock,
Cobb, Mo.	Harter,	Mutchler,	Wells,
Cockran,	Hayes,	Neill,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cockrell,	Heard,	Oates,	Whiting,
Coffeen,	Henderson, N. C.	O'Neil,	Williams, Ill.
Compton,	Hendrix,	Outhwaite,	Williams, Miss.
Conn,	Holman,	Page,	Wilson, W. Va.
Coombs,	Hooker, Miss.	Paschal,	Wise,
Cooper, Fla.	Houk, Ohio	Patterson,	Woodard.
Cooper, Ind.	Hunter,	Paynter,	
Cornish.	Hutcheson,	Pearson,	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—161.

Adams, Ky.	Bowers, Cal.	Cooper, Tex.	Gear,
Adams, Pa.	Brattan,	Cooper, Wis.	Gillet, N. Y.
Aitken,	Brickner,	Cousins,	Gillett, Mass.
Aldrich,	Broderick,	Curtis, Kans.	Gorman,
Apsley,	Brosius,	Curtis, N. Y.	Graham,
Avery,	Bundy,	Dalzell,	Grosvenor,
Babcock,	Bunn,	Daniels,	Grout,
Baker, Kans.	Burnes,	Davis,	Hager,
Baker, N. H.	Burrows,	Dingley,	Hainer,
Barnes,	Cadmus,	Dolliver,	Haines,
Bartholdt,	Caldwell,	Doolittle,	Harmer,
Belden,	Campbell,	Draper,	Harris,
Bell, Colo.	Cannon, Ill.	Ellis, Oregon	Hartman,
Bingham,	Chickering,	Fletcher,	Hatch,
Blair,	Childs,	Funk,	Haugen,
Boen,	Cobb, Ala.	Funston,	Heiner,
Boutelle,	Cogswell,	Gardner,	Henderson, Ill.

Henderson, Iowa	Loudenslager,	Powers,	Strong,
Hepburn,	Lucas,	Randall,	Sweet,
Hermann,	Mahon,	Ray,	Tawney,
Hicks,	Marsh,	Rayner,	Taylor, Tenn.
Hilborn,	Marvin, N. Y.	Reed,	Thomas.
Hines,	McCall,	Reyburn,	Updegraff,
Hitt,	McCleary, Minn.	Robinson, Pa.	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Hooker, N. Y.	McDowell,	Rusk,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Hopkins, Ill.	McKeighan,	Russell, Conn.	Wadsworth,
Hopkins, Pa.	Meiklejohn,	Scranton,	Walker,
Houk, Tenn.	Mercer,	Settle,	Wanger,
Hudson,	Meyer,	Shaw,	Waugh,
Hulick,	Milliken,	Sherman,	Wever,
Hull,	Moon,	Sibley,	Wheeler, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.	Morse,	Sickles,	White,
Johnson, N. Dak.	Murray,	Simpson,	Wilson, Ohio
Joy,	Newlands,	Sipe,	Wilson, Wash.
Kem,	Northway,	Smith,	Wolverton,
Kiefer,	Payne,	Sperry,	Woomer,
Lacey,	Pence,	Stephenson,	Wright, Mass.
Lawson,	Perkins,	Stockdale,	Wright, Pa.
Lefever,	Phillips,	Stone, C. W.	
Linton,	Pickler,	Stone, W. A.	
Loud,	Post,	Storer,	

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HATCH with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. CAMPBELL with Mr. BELDEN.

For this day:

Mr. BARNES with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. BUNN with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. LACEY.

Mr. WOLVERTON with Mr. HEPBURN.

Mr. SICKLES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. COOPER of Texas with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BRATTAN with Mr. RAY.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. POST.

Mr. RAYNER with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask leave of absence for my colleague Gen. BINGHAM. I called to see him yesterday and found him sick in bed.

There being no objection, Mr. BINGHAM was excused.

During the roll call the following proceedings took place:

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, before the roll call proceeds further I ask the Clerk to read clause 7 of Rule XIV.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the rule at the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

7. While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no member shall walk out of or across the Hall, nor, when a member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no member shall wear his hat, or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope that rule will be enforced thoroughly in all of its particulars as well as in one.

The roll call was then resumed and concluded as above.

Mr. REED. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to a fact just stated to me, that is, that there are a considerable number of members under arrest. Would they have a right to vote?

The SPEAKER. That is a question the gentleman from Maine may recollect which came up in the last Congress, and it was then held that they might vote on any question except on their own cases; the idea being that there was no power on the part of the House to deprive a member of his right to vote.

Mr. REED. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided—or, has given utterance to a dictum I should say to be more accurate—that the House might imprison a member. If the House may imprison a member, of course it may deprive him of his vote. I can hardly conceive of a member being allowed to vote while he was actually under arrest and in contempt of the House.

I should have called the attention of the Chair to it had it been called to my attention earlier; but I did it as soon as I was informed. I think it is a matter of very great importance for the House to know precisely what the situation is.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, no member has been brought before the bar of the House for contempt.

Mr. REED. No members have been brought before the bar of the House, but the Sergeant-at-Arms can not neglect his duty——

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no evidence of the fact before the House.

Mr. REED. I am informed that the Sergeant-at-Arms has arrested some thirty members. If he has done so, and is neglecting his duty to report the matter to the House, then we ought to know that.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Whether any report has been made to the Chair of the arrest of any members?

The SPEAKER. No report has been made.

Mr. MCMILLIN. That is all upon which the House will act, of course.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that, as a matter of fact, the Sergeant-at-Arms said to him just before the House met that he was preparing his report, but that it would take him some little time to get it in order.

Mr. REED. I understand he has some thirty members of the House under arrest.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Sergeant-at-Arms so informed me.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] is not the person to whom the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms is to be made.

The SPEAKER. The ruling has been made heretofore that—

When a motion has been made to discharge from custody several members at the same time, the members thus in custody are not entitled to vote on the question; but when several members are present in custody under the same order, and a motion is made to discharge one, it is competent for the other members in custody to vote on the question.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is not a question of custody at all.

The SPEAKER. That simply shows that although a gentleman is in custody, yet he has the right to vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have no official knowledge of anybody being in custody.

Mr. SPRINGER. Regular order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand a quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. There is a quorum present.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am paired with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELDEN]. I ask leave to withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CAMPBELL] asks to withdraw his vote, stating that he is paired with his colleague [Mr. BELDEN].

Mr. REED. My object in intervening in this matter is simply that we shall arrive at a proper conclusion. I ask that the Chair cause to be read the authority which I send to the Clerk's desk. I have not had an opportunity to look at it, have not read it myself, but I am told that it bears on the subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Congressional Globe, July 13, 1848, page 938.]

Mr. BOTTS moved the previous question—in order, he remarked, that they might get to the public business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia being one of the gentlemen in custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Chair can not recognize him. [Great laughter.]

Mr. LINCOLN, remarking that he believed he was still a member, moved the previous question.

The Speaker announced the question upon dispensing with further proceedings in the case and remitting the fines imposed yesterday.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. VENABLE inquired of the Chair whether the gentlemen in custody were entitled to vote upon this question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that they are not entitled to vote.

Mr. Pettit rose and addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman from Indiana. [General laughter.]

Mr. HOUSTON of Alabama. I was here, sir. [A laugh.] I desire to know, if this motion should prevail, whether the amount of fees is to be paid to the Sergeant-of-Arms? [Cries of "Yes!" "Yes!"] And if the fines of gentlemen are remitted then are the fees to be paid out of the Treasury?

The Speaker replied in the affirmative.

Mr. REED. There is a distinct declaration on the part of the Speaker at that time.

The SPEAKER. The motion was to excuse the members in the aggregate.

Mr. REED. I think the Chair will see that the motion which was pending was simply to dispense with further proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The effect of which would be to discharge the members in custody.

Mr. REED. The effect might be that; but the ruling was that they could not vote.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That was upon the theory that they were interested in the vote.

Mr. REED. I do not think that is it. It seems to me that a member of the House cannot vote when he is in custody. The House may dispose of the question and put him out of custody. I want to suggest to the Speaker that perhaps the principle may be this: The House has ordered the arrest of members; how can it proceed to business until it disposes of that question? Otherwise we should have the very singular spectacle of men under arrest and in charge of the House voting, although not free members.

The SPEAKER. Of course the reply to that would be that we have no official information that any gentleman who is under arrest has voted.

Mr. REED. It does not matter whether the Chair has official information or not, when a member states that such is the fact,

on his information, and the Speaker confirms it by stating that the Sergeant-at-Arms so informs him.

I think the fact is beyond dispute; I think we ought not to hasten about this until we understand exactly what the rights and proprieties of the case are. It certainly would be a singular spectacle if men were to vote and the House were to proceed to business with members under arrest and their cases not disposed of.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I should think that the proper course would be now to proceed with the members, dispose of their cases, and then have them vote or not vote as the punishment of the House might indicate. That might be done without abrogating anything that has taken place.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see how it would be in the power of the House, even if it were disposed to do it, to prevent a member voting unless it expelled him. You might put him in jail, and of course if you take his body away he can not vote; but if he were in the House under any circumstances I do not see how it is in the power of the House to prevent his voting.

Mr. REED. Who was the Speaker at that Congress, may I ask?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine and find out.

Mr. REED. That decision was certainly made; but I recognize the fact that it must have been made in the call of the House, when considerable confusion reigned

Mr. BOUTELLE. This simply emphasizes the necessity of first determining what are the privileges of the House of Representatives, and whether we have a free and unshackled and unarrested House of Representatives to act upon a question.

Mr. BOATNER. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not hear the gentleman until the announcement is made. These statements have been made during a roll call. On this question the yeas are 189; the noes are none [applause on the Democratic side]: the ayes have it, and the previous question is ordered. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered, and move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi to control the fifteen minutes in favor of the proposition and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] the fifteen minutes in opposition.

Mr. REED. I desire to present this point again—that there are now members of the House under arrest, that they are necessarily, as it stands now, in contempt of the House, and I think that that matter ought to be settled. I do not ask that the matter be determined now, but I simply want to present it, so that when the question comes up for a vote the Chair may be able to find authorities and dispose of the question one way or the other. I do not care which way it is disposed of.

Mr. CATCHINGS. In what form do you call it up?

Mr. REED. I simply call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the same question will arise when we come to a vote on the main question. That is all. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maine if he desires to submit any remarks upon this question?

Mr. REED. I purpose to do so.

Mr. CATCHINGS. As some days have elapsed since this order was presented to the House, it may be well, perhaps, to restate distinctly just what the terms and conditions of the order are.

The purpose of this order is to so amend the rules of this House that up to and including a final vote on the passage of the bill only such business as is specifically named in this order shall be transacted. That business is as follows: It is allowable under the order to receive conference reports and reports from the Committee on Rules. It is allowable under the order to dispose of business on the Speaker's table. It is allowable for the Speaker to call committees for reports. When business of that character, if there shall be any such, has been disposed of, then, by the terms of this order, the House must proceed to the consideration of the bill. As the order is written what is known as "general debate" will expire with the adjournment of the House on Wednesday, the 10th of this month.

Beginning on Thursday morning, after such business as I have mentioned has been disposed of, the House is to enter upon the consideration of the bill under what is commonly known as the "five-minute rule," and its consideration under that rule is to proceed until the 25th, when it is hoped and expected that a final vote will be had. The rule also contemplated that, beginning with this night, there should be night sessions, the House being required to take a recess from the usual hour of adjournment until 8 o'clock for the purpose of having night sessions, such sessions to be devoted entirely to general debate. It was expected, of course, that this rule would be adopted on the day of its presentation.

So far as these night sessions are concerned, the rule reads that "beginning with Monday next," which is this Monday, "at the hour of 5:30 o'clock on each day the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to general debate on said bill only." As the order now stands, adopted literally, Monday of next week would be "next Monday;" but it is the purpose of the Committee on Rules to supplement this with another report, so that if the House chooses to do so it can begin with this general debate at evening sessions to-night. That is a trouble which springs from the fact I have stated, that the order was not adopted when it was expected it would be.

I wish to state, as a matter of general information, that when the McKinley bill was under discussion four days were allowed for general debate. This order had contemplated setting apart five days for general debate. On the McKinley bill eight days were given for discussion under the five-minute rule. One Sunday having intervened, the effect was that on the 14th day from the beginning of the consideration of that bill the final vote was had. Under the terms of this rule seventeen days are allowed for the discussion and consideration of the bill, including general debate and debate under the five-minute rule. The Committee on Rules, or the majority of the committee, had no desire to curtail debate upon this bill; but it was of the opinion that the condition of the business of the country was such that speedy action was more desired than discussion. We believed that we could not act too promptly in disposing finally of this measure.

Every man must appreciate that, so long as there is uncertainty as to what the action of the House upon this measure is to be, so long will there be an unnecessary amount of suspense and uncertainty in the conduct of the great business enterprises of this country. I have myself received communications from several managers of business industries, including some who are utterly opposed to this bill, stating that it is very much to be desired that whatever action is to be taken shall be taken speedily, and the Committee on Rules believed, Mr. Speaker, that in providing for a short and limited debate they were fairly representing the views of gentlemen upon this side of the Chamber.

This is the first time for many years that the Democratic party has had the opportunity of putting in the shape of legislation its views on the question of tariff taxation. We believe that the Wilson bill may be taken fairly as a great stride in the direction of the inauguration of the Democratic theory of taxation. Of course it is not understood that it is claimed, even by those who framed the bill, that it is perfect in all respects, for no human work can be perfect; but it is at all events a long step taken toward the establishment as a part of our system of the Democratic theory of levying tariff taxes for revenue only.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will subserve best the interests of this country by adopting this order and by speedily acting and voting upon the Wilson bill. There will undoubtedly be an opportunity given for votes upon important amendments that gentlemen may desire to offer, because there can be no wish on the part of anybody to force through a bill which is not acceptable at least to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, or a majority of them.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary or proper for me to add anything to what I have already said. I will state that it is my intention to yield now to my friend from Maine [Mr. REED], that he may occupy the fifteen minutes placed by the Speaker under his control, and after that I will yield such time as may remain of my fifteen minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman takes his seat I wish to make one inquiry. He has stated that a rule would be introduced later amendatory of this with reference to the evening sessions; is there any intention to introduce an amendment so as to give more than the three parts of days that remain for general debate?

Mr. CATCHINGS. That is a matter that we will take into consideration. My friend from Maine must remember that if two of the days which were intended to be devoted to general debate have been lost it has not been the fault of the overwhelming majority of members on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, entirely their fault.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Overwhelming majority!

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes, sir; I mean exactly what I say.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, it didn't "overwhelm" until a few minutes ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. CATCHINGS. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has been overwhelmed so many times during the past week that I should think he could afford to be quiet upon an occasion like this. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic

side.] I hope that my friend from Maine [Mr. REED] will now occupy his fifteen minutes.

Mr. REED. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition presented to the House is entirely unjustifiable. A bill has been brought in here which has so many different aspects that it needs more discussion than any bill that was ever submitted to the House. The House is not under the necessity, in any way, of crowding this measure. The majority of the party in control of this House is very large, and whatever it chooses to do it can do not only at the particular moment, but at any time when it sees fit. With a margin of 40 or 50 above a quorum and a majority over all of 80, there is not the slightest occasion for anything but perfectly liberal and open treatment of the other side. Nor has there been, prior to this, any system of hostility inaugurated. The only ground upon which it is even attempted to justify this course would seem to be the action which was taken upon the act of 1890. That action was then taken because the majority was not large, and also because a system of opposition from day to day had taken place to such an extent as rendered it essential that the majority should use its utmost power.

That bill, however, had been presented to the country for an entire month in completed condition; and the country had an opportunity to examine it. It had been prepared openly, not secretly. Everybody had had a hearing; everybody of either party had had an opportunity to present his views without stint and without limit. Moreover, the bill was not the establishment of any new principle, nor did it claim to establish any new principle. It was simply a revision of existing laws under the same principles which had governed those laws. Hence there was no such necessity for thorough discussion as there is at present.

You will notice that I do not bring up against this proposed rule the fact that the party which now presents it made the air vocal at that time with their declarations against any such rule. That I do not think is an argument; or if it is one, it is an argument which could so often have been repeated in this Congress and in the last that it loses its force on account of repetition. The spectacle of seeing the Democratic party repeat the actions which they condemned in the Congress when they were in a minority has been so common as not even to excite comment; and I suppose there is hardly a Democrat in this House who recalled, when the Speaker was presenting the right of the House to change its rules this very morning, that that battle was fought against the written protest of every Democrat in the House except Samuel S. Cox, who had too much sense to put himself on record in that way. [Laughter.]

The agument against the method of proceeding which is presented here is very simple and very concise. It does not allow sufficient time for the general discussion; it does not permit a thorough examination of the bill. The gentleman from Mississippi, with that keenness of insight which distinguishes him, attempted to break the force of this suggestion by saying that it was necessary that haste should be taken with the bill. Undoubtedly it is the duty of Congress in most thorough fashion to go over the bill and go over it as rapidly as possible. But haste in this House is not haste with regard to the bill. So far as we leave it wrong, so far as we leave it undiscussed, it will have to be discussed in the other legislative body; and the Constitution of the United States does not contemplate that the main discussion of a revenue bill shall take place in the Senate of the United States.

We are the representatives of the people, their direct representatives; and in our hands is placed the initiative with regard to all bills raising revenue. Upon us rests the first duty to consider carefully this measure; upon us rests the necessity of framing a bill which shall be satisfactory to the people before it is sent up to be ratified by the ambassadors of the sovereign States. [Laughter.] Yet that duty under the Constitution is the duty we propose to neglect; that is the duty which we propose to turn over to somebody else; and we are to do this because the gentleman from Mississippi has received some letters urging haste in the disposal of this matter. Right it is that there should be haste, but not haste in the tribunal which represents the people.

Further than that, to show the tendency of Democratic concentration and control, it is provided—the gentleman from Mississippi will correct me if I am wrong—it is provided in the pending order that this bill shall not be considered under the five-minute rule—shall not be considered under the rule which enables members to offer amendments to each section. On the contrary (am I right?), the bill is to be read as a whole and is then to be open to amendment in all its parts.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I was going to suggest that.

Mr. REED. It is to be read as a whole and then to be open for amendment in all its parts.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly. That was the provision of the order in reference to the McKinley bill.

Mr. REED. Precisely; but you are no more in favor of that now than you ever were; are you?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I am no more in favor of the McKinley bill than I ever was.

Mr. REED. Of course not. Why, sir, I can remember when Mr. Blount, then "paramount" among the Democracy of the House, as he has since been "paramount" in foreign parts [laughter], rifted the atmosphere with his representative cries upon that subject. But that is not argument. That is a very pleasant reproach; but it is no argument. I purpose to address myself to the merits of the matter and to show why this is an unsuitable method of proceeding upon such a bill as this. This, being a bill that is new in every detail, is precisely the bill for which the rules of the House, without change ever since it began to do business, requires consideration by paragraphs. Now, why has this been so? Why was a member allowed to offer amendments to each paragraph? Simply because the Committee of the Whole was the most democratic part of the democratic assembly. Each member was to have his right, and nobody could abridge it; and under our rules nobody can abridge it. The member's right to debate may be taken away from him, but his right to offer an amendment to each paragraph as it comes up is a right of which he can not be deprived and never has been.

Mr. CATCHINGS. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. REED. Surely.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Did every man who had an amendment which he desired to have voted on have an opportunity to offer it and have it voted on when the McKinley bill was under consideration?

Mr. REED. He did not; and the lesson to be drawn from that example is precisely what I am presenting to the House to-day.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question: whether about two hundred proposed amendments did not remain unacted on when we voted finally on the McKinley bill?

Mr. REED. Precisely. I am glad to have the gentleman afford that information; for it enables us to see what we are coming to. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for showing how such a proceeding works in practice.

Mr. CATCHINGS. You are now criticising the proceeding?

Mr. REED. I am now criticising a procedure by which you are trying to imitate what when the McKinley bill was up you condemned. I had hoped to hear you get up and apologize for what you have been doing, or at least that you would, as you have been doing in this Congress and the last, apologize silently.

Mr. CATCHINGS. We have not apologized at all.

Mr. REED. No; I know you have not got up and said so; but then imitation, my friend, is the sincerest form of flattery. [Laughter.]

Mr. CATCHINGS. I would like to ask my friend another question.

Mr. REED. Let me resume my argument, as I have but five minutes. But I yield to my friend from Mississippi, of course.

Mr. CATCHINGS. By no means; I will not take the gentleman's time.

Mr. REED. The point I make is that now you have the whole bill in front of you. What are you to expect? Have you any right, as a member of this House, to offer an amendment to that bill? Not at all. You are, each and every one of you, going to be dependent for recognition on whomsoever the Speaker shall put into the chair to preside in committee.

There is not a single one going to get an opportunity to offer an amendment except by the consent of the gentleman who is to preside over the Committee of the Whole. You are putting yourselves in his power absolutely, entirely, completely; and, yet methinks, this is the body, this is the set of men who are earnest and anxious for "debate," for "opportunities for discussion;" who were against having people "crowded out," as they were in the bad old times. [Laughter.] And here you are. Now, do you want to do it?

I do not appeal to you to stand by any former position which you took. That is optional with you. If you are satisfied from your own reasoning that you were then wrong it is a handsome thing not only for you to imitate us, but to say so openly, as the gentleman from Mississippi has declined to do.

But are you satisfied you were wrong? Are you satisfied that this is the right method for disposing of your power? For let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, you are the depositories of power. The right you have to act as members of this House arises from the Constitution of the United States, and the duties which are entailed upon you come from the same source. Among those duties is the duty of preparing such a revenue bill as will be satisfactory to the people whom you represent.

Unless you do that you do not perform your duty; and the Constitution has so strenuously imposed that duty upon you alone that, until you act, the Senate of the United States can not so

much as stir a finger. If this House intends to be jealous of its honor and of its prerogatives it will take such care, not as anybody else took, but as commends itself to the wisdom and the judgment and the sense of the members, who are responsible for their actions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine has two minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I hope the gentleman from Maine will occupy the remainder of his time so that I may close the debate. I prefer that.

Mr. REED. I think I will retain my two minutes. If necessary to say anything I will close the discussion.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I prefer that the gentleman should exhaust his time now. I have a right to close.

Mr. REED. Well, I do not suppose the gentleman has actually the right, for I may retain my two minutes and use it or not, as I see proper.

But I will take the two minutes to add simply this: That I trust if this thing is adopted the right of recognition may sacredly depend upon the judgment of the Chair, and may not be the subject of—ah—anything else. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Maine, who has just spoken, that whatever was done in the Fifty-first Congress in the consideration and passage of the McKinley bill is not necessarily persuasive, and does not necessarily excuse similar action by this House in the consideration of the bill now to be brought before us. It is our duty to have the bill brought before the House in such way that it shall have sufficient consideration under the rule for general debate, and that it shall have sufficient consideration under the rule for five-minutes debate, and that the members of the House who desire to do so shall have ample opportunity to present their amendments and have those amendments acted upon in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule proposed does not take away or abridge any of these necessary and proper rights. No men can be more interested in having this bill properly considered by the House, both under the general and the five-minutes debate, or in having the members of this body granted full opportunity to have their amendments offered and acted upon by the committee than those who have been charged with the duty of the preparation of the bill.

It did seem to us, after consultation with a very large number of our fellow-members, that the rule as originally presented by the Committee on Rules secured all of those rights. It proposed to give five days for general debate; it proposed to give twelve days for debate on the items of the bill; it proposed to begin the present week with night sessions for general debate, so that there could be no part of the bill and no item in it that might not have sufficient and instructive discussion in this House and before the country.

If two days of that time have been lost, the responsibility for that loss does not rest with those who were seeking to bring this bill before the House. But, sir, I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, that we shall throw even upon those who are responsible for it the loss of this time. I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, that there shall be any abridgment of the time to be given to general debate because of this loss, and I shall ask the House, before it takes the final vote upon this rule, to adopt, by unanimous consent, the amendments which I shall propose, first, that all of the present week, six days instead of five, as proposed in the original rule, shall be given to general debate; that beginning with to-night there may be, and if the members desire it there shall be, regular night sessions for general debate; that after the lapse of the present week, beginning with Monday morning of next week, debate shall begin upon the bill under the five-minute rule, and that the bill shall be put forward two weeks from that time, the 29th instead of the 25th, as proposed in the rule. [Applause.] And I shall also ask that the proposition of the rule allowing the privilege to print shall be incorporated also; provided, however, that the privilege shall end with the termination of the debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for an agreement to these amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that the order be modified so that the whole of this week may be given to general debate; that there be night sessions, beginning with to-night, and that the two weeks following shall be given to debate under the five-minute rule, with evening sessions for general debate, and that the vote be taken on Monday, the 29th, instead of Thursday, the 25th. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to any enlargement of debate, but I do not want, by my consent, to be supposed to admit that that leaves the thing in the proper shape, because we do not assent to it with any such proposition. We simply find ourselves in a minority at last.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. We do not ask the gentleman's assent to the rule, but that gentlemen assent to these proposed amendments to the rule.

Mr. REED. Whatever rule you gentlemen make up, you make up on your own responsibility. I am going to ask the House to recommit with instructions, if we are to be allowed that opportunity.

The SPEAKER. Before that, then, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Is there objection to the further request suggested by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], that this leave to print be construed to extend only up to and including the day of the passage of the bill, if it is passed; that it shall not extend indefinitely, but that gentlemen desiring to avail themselves of the leave to print must do so before or by the time the bill passes the House, should it pass?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that might be extended to one month after the passage of the bill. [Cries of "Oh, no!"] It will necessitate a great deal of labor on the part of members to prepare remarks for printing, when they will naturally desire to devote their time to attendance upon the debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. REED. Before that consent is given I want to suggest to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]—does the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] purpose to occupy an hour after the previous question is ordered, to close the debate on the bill?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That will depend entirely upon developments during the debate. I reserve the right to do that.

Mr. REED. I desire, if that is the case, that we may be allowed an hour and a half prior to that.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I understand that there is always an arrangement of that kind, by which the minority and the majority can close the debate.

Mr. REED. If that is the understanding, it is satisfactory.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I would not make any understanding——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that it might be agreed that on the 29th, before the vote is taken, each side shall have one hour for debate in the House. That would cover it.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I shall not object to that.

Mr. REED. That covers the right of the gentleman to close.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, then, that will be the understanding, that there shall be one hour of debate on each side in the House on Monday, the 29th, before the vote is taken. The Chair understands the modification of the order to have been agreed to. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] desires to make a motion, as the Chair understands.

Mr. SPRINGER. The agreement just made does not include my proposition with reference to extending the leave to print.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that leave to print be extended thirty days after the passage of the bill. [Cries of "No!"]

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say ten days. Members will not know the shape the bill is in on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his proposition so as to make it ten days.

Mr. CALDWELL and others. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine desires to submit a motion.

Mr. REED. I desire to submit a motion at the proper time to recommit this order.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear what is proceeding.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. BOATNER. I rose to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOATNER. A number of gentlemen desire to know whether this bill is to be considered in Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule, read by sections, in order that amendments may be offered when the section is considered?

The SPEAKER. Under the order, on the first day of its consideration under the five-minute rule, the bill is to be read through, and then for two weeks amendments are in order to any paragraph of the bill.

Mr. BOATNER. There is nothing in the rule that will guarantee a vote on any amendment offered to any paragraph in the bill.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing to prevent the committee from coming to a vote whenever it desires to do so.

Mr. REED. We saw that when the act of 1890 was reported

to the House there were two hundred amendments, upon none of which could a vote be taken.

Mr. OATES. I desire further information. I desire to know if the bill will be read by sections in the usual way, and amendments offered and disposed of and the sections not recurred to, or will it be in order to offer amendments to any part of the bill?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order to offer amendments to any part of the bill.

A MEMBER. At any time?

The SPEAKER. At any time when a gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BURROWS. That was not my understanding of the matter. Do I understand that the bill is not going to be taken up by paragraphs and considered open to amendments, but that the whole bill is to be read and then anyone can offer any amendments to any portion of it and consume the whole time on that?

The SPEAKER. There is nothing in the order that provides for consuming the whole time on any amendment. The order provides that when general debate has expired, which, under the order as it has been amended will be on next Monday, on that day the bill shall be read through entirely.

Mr. BURROWS. Before any amendments are offered.

The SPEAKER. Before any amendments are offered; and then that any amendment is in order to any part of the bill, and not to the paragraphs as read in the usual order.

Mr. BURROWS. Then we could take up any part of the bill, such as the administration features of the bill, and spend all the time on it.

The SPEAKER. Any part.

Mr. BURROWS. Any amendment offered will be debated for five minutes for or against; and then, no matter what it may be, for instance, it may be the administrative portion of the bill, which comes last, and any amendment can be offered; at the very first opportunity a gentleman may rise and such time as the House finds necessary or the committee finds necessary to consume in it can be occupied, and then another section of the administration bill can be taken up, and so on, according to recognition of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. That is right.

Mr. REED. It is to correct that that I desire to offer this proposition.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKLER. Suppose that twenty amendments accumulate on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. They can not. Under the rules of the House but four amendments can be pending at one time. An amendment, an amendment to that amendment, an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. PICKLER. And by this means the whole two weeks can be occupied.

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the committee does not vote them out of the way; but the committee can vote them out of the way, and, under the rule, ought to vote them out of the way. When five minutes' debate has been had for and against them it is the rule of the House that they shall be voted upon. The practice has extended it furthur, but the rule does not authorize it.

Mr. REED. These amendments can be offered in detail, and when one lot is disposed of another series can be offered.

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I want to make another suggestion. Would not the Committee on Rules have the right of way at all times, under the practice of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the practice of the House is to consider first the amendments offered to the bill by the committee reporting the bill.

Mr. REED. That is the practice of the House, as they did in the case of the act of 1890.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. They asked the consent of the committee, and that consent was granted.

Mr. REED. They would have control by general law.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; the Committee of the Whole would have control. Gentlemen are arguing the question as if the Committee of the Whole can not be trusted to take care of itself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine has a motion.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. There is so much confusion that we can not hear what is going on.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. [After a pause.] Does the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] desire to submit a motion?

Mr. REED. The proposition which I desire to submit, Mr. Speaker, if this is the proper time, is to recommit with instructions to report an order for consideration which will give more time for general debate or more time for debate, because I do not care to make general debate the principal question; I only think that there ought to be some time for debate. I will therefore move that the order be recommitted with instructions to report an order for consideration which will give more days for debate and reserve the right to amend each paragraph as it is reached in reading.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up his motion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it in order to move to recommit a proposition to amend the rules? Under the rule the Chair is to entertain but one dilatory motion, the motion to adjourn, and it seems to me that the proposition of the gentleman from Maine is not in order. The pending proposition is in the nature of a motion to suspend the rules; it is a suspension of certain rules and the adoption of another rule in their place, and I hold that a motion to recommit with instructions is not allowable upon a proposition of this kind. I do not remember any case where a motion to amend the rules, or to suspend the rules—and this, I repeat, is in the nature of a motion to suspend the rules—has been held to be subject to a motion to recommit with instructions. A bill is subject to that motion on its final passage, but not a proposition like this.

Mr. REED. It is subject to every motion. It is a proceeding of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is subject to all the motions that are allowed under the rules, but under the rule the Chair is to entertain but one motion—a motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. But the Chair has already entertained a motion for the previous question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course. That is in order.

Mr. REED. Of course.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course. That is a motion to cut off debate.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from Illinois will see at once that saying "Of course" does not answer the point. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, the motion for the previous question is a motion that is allowed for the purpose of cutting off debate. There would be no end of debate unless the previous question could be ordered. But, upon a proposition to suspend the rules or to change the rules, as in this case, which is the same thing as suspending the rules, only one motion can be entertained, which is a motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. The gentleman will see that that can not possibly be so——

The SPEAKER (interposing). The Chair would not hold this motion to be dilatory. The rule provides that but one motion to adjourn shall be entertained, and no other dilatory motion, but the Chair would not hold this to be a dilatory motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair entertained two motions to adjourn yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED moves to recommit with intructions to report an order of consideration, which will give more days for debate, and reserve the right to amend each paragraph as it is reached in reading.

The question being taken on the motion to recommit, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 174.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 6, nays 184, not voting 161; as follows:

YEAS—6.

Blair,	Daniels,	Newlands,	Wanger.
Bundy,	Hopkins, Pa.		

NAYS—184.

Abbott,	Bynum,	Cummings,	Gresham,
Alderson,	Cabaniss,	De Armond,	Griffin,
Alexander,	Caminetti,	De Forest,	Hall, Minn.
Allen,	Cannon, Cal.	Denson,	Hall, Mo.
Arnold,	Capehart,	Dinsmore,	Hammond,
Bailey,	Caruth,	Dockery,	Hare,
Baldwin,	Catchings,	Donovan,	Harter,
Bankhead,	Clancy,	Dunn,	Hayes,
Bartlett,	Clark, Mo.	Dunphy,	Heard,
Barwig,	Clarke, Ala.	Durborow,	Henderson, N. C.
Bell, Tex.	Cobb, Mo.	Edmunds,	Hendrix,
Berry,	Cockran,	Ellis, Ky.	Holman,
Black, Ga.	Cockrell,	English,	Hooker, Miss.
Black, Ill.	Coffeen,	Enloe,	Houk, Ohio
Blanchard	Compton,	Epes,	Hudson,
Bland,	Conn,	Erdman,	Hunter,
Boatner,	Coombs,	Everett,	Hutcheson,
Branch,	Cooper, Fla.	Fithian,	Ikirt,
Brawley,	Cooper, Ind.	Forman,	Johnson, Ohio
Breckinridge, Ark.	Cornish,	Fyan,	Jones,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Covert,	Geissenhainer,	Kilgore,
Bretz,	Cox,	Goldzier,	Kribbs,
Brookshire,	Crain,	Goodnight,	Kyle,
Brown,	Crawford,	Gorman,	Lane,
Bryan,	Culberson,	Grady,	Lapham,

Latimer,	McMillin,	Reilly,	Talbert, S. C.
Layton,	McNagny,	Richards, Ohio	Talbott, Md.
Lester,	McRae,	Richardson, Mich.	Tarsney,
Lisle,	Meredith,	Richardson, Tenn.	Tate,
Livingston,	Money,	Ritchie,	Taylor, Ind.
Lockwood,	Montgomery,	Robbins,	Terry,
Lynch,	Morgan,	Robertson, La.	Tracey,
Maddox,	Moses,	Rusk,	Tucker,
Maguire,	Mutchler,	Russell, Ga.	Turner,
Mallory,	Neill,	Ryan,	Turpin,
Marshall,	Oates,	Sayers,	Tyler,
Martin, Ind.	O'Neil,	Schermerhorn,	Warner,
McAleer,	Outhwaite,	Shell,	Washington,
McCreary, Ky.	Paschal,	Snodgrass,	Weadock,
McCulloch,	Patterson,	Somers,	Wells,
McDannold,	Paynter,	Springer,	Wheeler, Ala.
McDearmon,	Pearson,	Stallings,	Whiting,
McEttrick,	Pendleton, Tex.	Stevens,	Williams, Ill.
McGann,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Stone, Ky.	Williams, Miss.
McKaig,	Pigott,	Strait,	Wilson, W. Va.
McLaurin,	Price,	Swanson,	Wise.

NOT VOTING—161.

Adams, Ky.	Davey,	Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Pa.
Adams, Pa.	Davis,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Russell, Conn.
Aitken,	Dingley,	Joy,	Scranton,
Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Kem,	Settle,
Apsley,	Doolittle,	Kiefer,	Shaw,
Avery,	Draper,	Lacey,	Sherman,
Babcock,	Ellis, Oregon	Lawson,	Sibley,
Baker, Kans.	Fielder,	Lefever,	Sickles,
Baker, N. H.	Fletcher,	Linton,	Simpson.
Barnes,	Funk,	Loud,	Sipe,
Bartholdt,	Funston,	Loudenslager,	Smith,
Belden.	Gardner,	Lucas,	Sperry,
Bell, Colo.	Gear,	Magner,	Stephenson,
Beltzhoover,	Geary,	Mahon,	Stockdale,
Bingham,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marsh,	Stone, C. W.
Boen,	Gillett, Mass.	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Graham,	McCall,	Storer,
Bower, N. C.	Grosvenor,	McCleary, Minn.	Strong,
Bowers, Cal.	Grout,	McDowell,	Sweet,
Brattan,	Hager,	McKeighan,	Tawney,
Brickner,	Hainer,	Meiklejohn,	Taylor, Tenn.
Broderick,	Haines,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Brosius,	Harmer,	Meyer,	Updegraff,
Bunn,	Harris,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Burnes,	Hartman,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Burrows,	Hatch,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Cadmus,	Haugen,	Murray,	Walker,
Caldwell,	Heiner,	Northway,	Waugh,
Campbell,	Henderson, Ill.	Page,	Wever,
Cannon, Ill.	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Causey,	Hepburn,	Pence,	White,
Chickering,	Hermann,	Perkins,	Wilson, Ohio
Childs,	Hicks,	Phillips,	Wilson, Wash.
Cobb, Ala.	Hilborn,	Pickler,	Wolverton,
Cogswell.	Hines,	Post,	Woodard,
Cooper, Tex.	Hitt,	Powers,	Woomer,
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker, N. Y.	Randall,	Wright, Mass.
Cousins,	Hopkins, Ill.	Ray,	Wright, Pa.
Curtis, Kans.	Houk, Tenn.	Rayner,	
Curtis, N. Y.	Hulick,	Reed,	
Dalzell,	Hull,	Reyburn,	

So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules.

The question having been put,

The SPEAKER. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. REED. I call for a division.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 126, noes 55.

Mr. REED. I call for tellers.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 1, not voting 166; as follows:

YEAS—184.

Abbott,	Causey,	Epes,	Lane,
Alderson,	Clancy,	Erdman,	Lapham,
Alexander,	Clark, Mo.	Everett,	Latimer,
Allen,	Clarke, Ala.	Fithian,	Layton,
Arnold,	Cobb, Mo.	Forman,	Lester,
Bailey,	Cockran,	Fyan,	Lisle,
Baldwin,	Cockrell,	Geissenhainer,	Livingston,
Bankhead,	Coffeen,	Goldzier,	Lockwood,
Bartlett,	Compton,	Goodnight,	Lynch,
Barwig,	Conn,	Gorman,	Maddox,
Bell, Tex.	Coombs,	Grady,	Magner,
Berry,	Cooper, Fla.	Gresham,	Maguire,
Black, Ga.	Cooper, Ind.	Griffin,	Mallory,
Black, Ill.	Cornish,	Hall, Minn.	Marshall,
Blanchard,	Covert,	Hall, Mo.	Martin, Ind.
Bland,	Cox,	Hammond,	McAleer,
Boatner,	Crain,	Hare,	McCreary, Ky.
Branch,	Crawford,	Harter,	McCulloch,
Brawley,	Culberson,	Hayes,	McDannold,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Cummings,	Heard,	McDearmon,
Breckinridge, Ky.	De Armond,	Henderson, N. C.	McEttrick,
Bretz,	De Forest,	Hendrix,	McGann,
Brookshire,	Denson,	Holman,	McKaig,
Brown,	Dinsmore,	Hooker, Miss.	McLaurin,
Bryan,	Dockery,	Houk, Ohio	McMillin,
Bynum,	Donovan,	Hunter,	McNagny,
Cabaniss,	Dunphy,	Hutcheson,	McRae,
Caminetti,	Durborow,	Ikirt,	Meredith,
Cannon, Cal.	Edmunds,	Johnson, Ohio	Money,
Capehart,	Ellis, Ky.	Jones,	Montgomery,
Caruth,	English,	Kribbs,	Morgan,
Catchings,	Enloe,	Kyle,	Moses,
Neill,	Richards, Ohio	Springer,	Turner,
Oates,	Richardson, Mich.	Stallings,	Turpin,
O'Neil,	Richardson, Tenn.	Stevens,	Tyler,
Outhwaite,	Ritchie,	Stone, Ky.	Warner,
Page,	Robbins,	Strait,	Washington,
Paschal,	Robertson, La.	Swanson,	Weadock,
Patterson,	Rusk,	Talbott, Md.	Wells,
Paynter,	Russell, Ga.	Tarsney,	Wheeler, Ala.
Pearson,	Ryan,	Tate,	Whiting,
Pendleton, Tex.	Sayers,	Taylor, Ind.	Williams, Ill.
Pendleton, W. Va.	Schermerhorn,	Terry,	Williams, Miss.
Pigott,	Shell,	Tracey,	Wilson, W. Va.
Price,	Snodgrass,	Tucker,	Wise.
Reilly,	Somers,		Woodard.

NAYS—1.

Kilgore.

NOT VOTING—166.

Adams, Ky,	Daniels,	Hudson,	Reed,
Adams, Pa.	Davey,	Hulick,	Reyburn,
Aitken,	Davis,	Hull,	Robinson, Pa.
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Johnson, Ind.	Russell, Conn.
Apsley,	Dolliver,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scranton,
Avery,	Doolittle,	Joy,	Settle,
Babcock,	Draper,	Kem,	Shaw,
Baker, Kans.	Dunn.	Kiefer,	Sherman,
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Oregon	Lacey,	Sibley,
Barnes,	Fielder,	Lawson,	Sickles,
Bartholdt,	Fletcher,	Lefever,	Simpson,
Belden,	Funk,	Linton,	Sipe,
Bell, Colo.	Funston,	Loud,	Smith,
Beltzhoover,	Gardner,	Loudenslager,	Sperry,
Bingham,	Gear,	Lucas,	Stephenson,
Blair,	Geary,	Mahon,	Stockdale,
Boen,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marsh,	Stone, C. W.
Boutelle,	Gillett, Mass.	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, W. A.
Bower, N. C.	Graham,	McCall,	Storer,
Bowers, Cal.	Grosvenor,	McCleary, Minn.	Strong,
Brattan,	Grout,	McDowell,	Sweet,
Brickner,	Hager,	McKeighan,	Tawney,
Broderick,	Hainer,	Meiklejohn,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brosius,	Haines,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Bundy,	Harmer,	Meyer,	Updegraff,
Bunn,	Harris,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Burnes,	Hartman,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Burrows,	Hatch,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Cadmus,	Haugen,	Murray,	Walker,
Caldwell,	Heiner,	Mutchler,	Wanger,
Campbell,	Henderson, Ill.	Newlands,	Waugh,
Cannon, Ill.	Henderson, Iowa	Northway,	Wever,
Chickering,	Hepburn,	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Childs,	Hermann,	Pence,	White,
Cobb, Ala.	Hicks,	Perkins,	Wilson, Ohio
Cogswell,	Hilborn,	Phillips,	Wilson, Wash.
Cooper, Tex.	Hines,	Pickler,	Wolverton,
Cooper, Wis.	Hitt,	Post,	Woomer,
Cousins,	Hooker, N. Y.	Powers,	Wright, Mass.
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Ill.	Randall,	Wright, Pa.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Ray,	
Dalzell,	Houk, Tenn.	Rayner,	

So the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. CATCHINGS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WYLIE BAILEY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case Wylie Bailey against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DENNIS M'INTYRE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting the papers in the claim of Dennis McIntyre, postmaster at Mackinac Island, Mich., for losses sustained by burglary; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL CODAY, SR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Samuel Coday, sr., against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE ARMY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to promote the administration of justice in the Army, submitted by the Acting Judge-Advocate-General of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYÉS OF WAR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of the names of the clerks and other employés of the War Department and its offices from December, 1892, to November 30, 1893, and showing the time each was actually employed and the sums paid to each; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN T. HEARD.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and accompanying papers, relative to the claim of JOHN T. HEARD for services rendered to Western Cherokee Indians in their claim against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LAWS AND JOURNALS OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies of the laws and journals of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico; which was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will direct, if there be no objection, that the books accompanying this paper be filed in the library of the Hall of the House.

There was no objection.

R. S. PERKINS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of R. S. Perkins *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

FORD THEATER BUILDING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting sundry resolutions on the condition of the Ford Theater building, and calling attention to the necessity of providing quarters for the Record and Pension Division of the War Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY BRIDGE COMPANIES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following concurrent resolution of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That line 22, on page 2, of the bill (H. R. 3289), entitled "An act to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey," as enrolled by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, consisting of the following words, namely, "*and, provided further*, That nothing in this act," which words were included in said bill by error in the conference report, be, and the same are hereby, stricken from said bill, and said bill is directed to be enrolled without said line and words.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this a correction simply in accordance with the agreement of the conference committee?

The SPEAKER. It seems that some surplus language found its way into the bill. The Clerk will report the words proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That nothing in this act.

The SPEAKER. These words seem to have been erroneously inserted.

Mr. DINGLEY. On the part of the enrolling clerks?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The resolution shows that it was by an error in the conference committee.

Without objection, the resolution will be concurred in.

There was no objection.

DISQUALIFICATION OF REGISTERS AND RECEIVERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification.

The SPEAKER. This bill is reported from the Senate with an amendment.

Mr. McRAE. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 2796) entitled "An act relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualifications" do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That no register or receiver shall receive evidence in, hear or determine any cause pending in any district land office in which cause he is interested directly or indirectly, or has been of counsel, or where he is related to any of the parties in interest by consanguinity or affinity within the fourth degree, computing by the rules adopted by the common law.

"SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of every register or receiver so disqualified to report the fact of his disqualification to the Commissioner of the General Land Office as soon as he shall ascertain it and before the hearing of such cause, who thereupon, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall designate some other register, receiver, or special agent of the Land Department to act in the place of the disqualified officer, and the same authority is conferred on the officer so designated which such register or receiver would otherwise have possessed as to any such cause."

Mr. McRAE. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I notice that this is an entirely new bill. Will the gentleman please explain the changes made in the House bill?

Mr. McRAE. While it would appear to be an entirely new bill, in fact it is not.

The only difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment is this: That in section 1 of the House bill it was provided that parties in interest might waive this disqualification. That is not allowed by the Senate amendment. The second section of the bill as it passed the House provided for the pay of the actual expense of the officer designed to act. The Senate have reported these changes in the shape of one amendment, I suppose for convenience; but this is the only difference between the two Houses on this question.

The question being taken on concurring in the Senate amendment, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. McRAE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

UMATILLA IRRIGATION COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 738) extending the time allowed the Umatilla Irrigation Company for the construction of its ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon.

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the Speaker's table for the present, as a similar bill is about to be reported from the House committee.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

JOHN W. LEWIS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 71) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

DAVID B. GOTTWALS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, as this bill is simply to cure a defect in the title of property here, I will ask unanimous consent that it be now put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all real estate lying in the District of Columbia, heretofore purchased by and conveyed to David B. Gottwals, of said District, prior to the passage of this act, be relieved and exempted from all forfeitures heretofore incurred by the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," approved March 3, 1887.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. LEWIS.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago a bill for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon, was reported and no response made. I ask that it be permitted to lie upon the Speaker's table pending a report from the Committee on Claims on a similar bill.

The SPEAKER. It was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HERMANN. I ask that it be allowed to lie upon the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 71) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [M. HERMANN] asks that this bill may lie upon the Speaker's table temporarily, stating that a similar bill is before the Committee on Claims. Without objection the bill will temporarily lie upon the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRICKNER, for ten days, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. HATCH, indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

To Mr. HARRIS, for two weeks, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. PENCE, indefinitely, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. GRAHAM, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. WOLVERTON, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CORNISH, until Wednesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. GARDNER, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. CADMUS, for one day, on account of important business.

To Mr. COBB of Alabama, for five days, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. MEREDITH, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Martha F. Dickinson, there being no adverse report thereon.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

The SPEAKER. A reprint is asked of the bill (H. R. 4568) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of fraud in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof. It is stated that the print of this bill has been exhausted. Without objection a reprint will be ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MARSHALL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878.

COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports; when bills of the following titles were severally reported, read a first and second time, referred to the Calendars named below, and, with the accompanying documents, ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZANCES, ETC.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4954) relative to recognizances, stipulations, bonds, and undertakings, and to allow certain corporations to be accepted as surety thereon—to the House Calendar.

CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: The views of the minority of the Judiciary Committee to accompany the report of the committee on the bill (H. R. 4568) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of fraud in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof—ordered to be printed.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

Mr. CARUTH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported back favorably, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend section 5 of the act approved June 18, 1878, entitled "An act to organize the Life-Saving Service;" which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SWAMP-LAND GRANTS.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 118) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported the bill H. R. 5065 as a substitute for the bill H. R. 3610, to ratify the reservation of certain lands made for the benefit of Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 3610) was ordered to lie on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FINAL PROOF AND PAYMENT UNDER THE PUBLIC LAND LAWS.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 3458) extending the time for final proof and payment on lands claimed under the public land laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees for reports. In accordance with the rule just adopted, the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4864.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 4864) raising revenue. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman from West Virginia desires more than an hour, I hope the committee will grant him the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia be allowed to proceed without limit. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. WILSON of West Virginia addressed the Committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from West Virginia is very much fatigued by the exertion that is necessary in making so long an address, if he will yield I will move that the committee rise, which will give him an opportunity to speak under less adverse circumstances.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) reducing taxation and to raise revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms is ready to make a report on the writ given him, the Chair understands.

The Sergeant-at-Arms [Mr. Snow] appeared at the bar of the House.

Mr. SNOW (the Sergeant-at-Arms). Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the writ of the House, directed to me, I have to submit a written report, which I hand to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms in execution of the writ of the House.

The report was read, as follows:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1894.

SIR: I, H. W. Snow, Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives of the United States, have executed the within writ by service on the following members, and by acceptance of service as per telegrams herewith, to wit:

Hon. J. B. Brown, Hon. J. A. Geissenhainer, Hon. J. Lefever, Hon. J. F. Magner, Hon. C. S. Randall, Hon. D. E. Sickles (sickness, asks to be excused), Hon. L. E. Barnes, Hon. B. H. Bunn (sickness, asks to be excused), Hon. L. W. Turpin, Hon. F. A. Woodard, Hon. J. J. Gardner, Hon. D. B. Heiner, Hon. F. G. Newlands, Hon. E. M. Woomer, Hon. R. A. Childs, Hon. G. W. Fithian, Hon. J. L. McLaurin, Hon. W. J. Talbert, Hon. J. S. Sherman, Hon. G. B. Fielder, Hon. C. A. Cadmus, Hon. J. Cornish, Hon. T. J. Strait, Hon. W. J. White, Hon. D. N. Lockwood, Hon. J. A. Pickler, Hon. R. C. Davey, Hon. Silas Adams, Hon. C. J. Boatner.

The following members have not been personally served, but I return herewith the list with the information that I have from each:

Hon. S. B. Cooper, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. A. A. Taylor, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. P. S. Post, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. W. W. Grout, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. J. A. Scranton, sick, and asks to be excused; Hon. J. J. Belden, on the way to Washington; Hon. J. E. Cobb, on the way to Washington; Hon. George W. Ray, on the way to Washington; Hon. J. A. Tawney, on the way to Washington; Hon. Adolph Meyer, on the way to Washington.

The following members have not been found:

Hon. H. H. Bingham, Hon. T. R. Stockdale, Hon. H. C. Loudenslager, Hon. J. M. Wever.

All of which I return with the writ, as I am directed.

H. W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER *of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] this morning stated that he was present on Saturday on the roll call, and the correction was made in the Journal; therefore the gentleman's name will be stricken from the writ, without objection. It ought not to have been placed there.

The Chair desires to state as to one or two of these gentlemen, that perhaps the Chair has been at fault. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CORNISH] on Friday evening requested that the Chair present an application for a leave of absence for him until Monday. It escaped the memory of the Chair entirely. It was not the fault of the gentleman from New Jersey, but the fault of the Chair. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GEISSENHAINER] telegraphed for a leave to attend the funeral of a friend, and that was not presented to the House through the fault of the Chair. It was an oversight.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], who is not now in the House, being too unwell to remain, requested the Chair to state that he was absent by leave of the House, and as soon as he heard of the revocation of the leaves by the House, last Thursday or Friday, whenever it was, he started back. He

has gone out of the House now because he was too unwell to remain.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I make the point of order that under the rule he would be excusable; he would have the right to come in.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Now, I insist that, inasmuch as he is under the writ, does not that require some action on the part of the House?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I was about to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] was here, and requested that the Chair make the statement that he was too unwell to remain.

Mr. CATCHINGS. The object of the resolution having been accomplished, if it is not objectionable I will move that all gentlemen named by the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms be discharged from custody and excused.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection that order can be made. Without objection that order will be made. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to state that I have seen it in several newspapers that I was one of the delinquents. I was absent with the leave of the House in the first place, and I was absent at home, detained by sickness in my family. As soon as I could leave the sick bed in my family I came to Washington.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Journal discloses the fact that the gentleman had leave of absence on account of sickness in his family. In first making out the list of absentees that excuse was not discovered, but before the writ was issued it was discovered and the gentleman's name was not included.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Before that is entertained I desire to withdraw the motion to adjourn, as I understand there are several gentlemen who desire to speak to-night under the order made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee withdraws the motion to adjourn.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as I see that my name has been published in several papers among the names of members absent without leave, I desire to state that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 21, page 453, there appears an announcement that I was excused indefinitely on account of sickness. Being excused, I left Washington before the House took the holiday recess and went home. I returned as soon as my condition would permit, and when I received the notification of the Sergeant-at-Arms I was already on my way back to this city. I want to state further, that during the extra session I came here on the 7th day of August and did not miss a single roll call or a single vote during the whole of that session.

After the adjournment I went home and returned on the first day of the regular session, and did not miss a single vote or a single roll call until the day before the House took a recess for the holidays, when, as I have already stated, having obtained indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness, I went home and returned as soon as I was able. Let me add that I have never absented myself or refused to vote for the purpose of breaking a quorum, that I am here to do all I can to help the Democratic party to redeem the pledges they have made to the people, and that I object to being published as an absentee when in fact I was absent by leave of the House on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina that while his statement as to his leave of absence is correct, yet on last Thursday all leaves of absence were revoked by the House.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I telegraphed to my colleague [Mr. LATIMER] to have my leave of absence extended, and he put a written request to that effect upon the desk, but for some reason it was not presented.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments:

Mr. HOUK of Ohio as a member of the Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. JONES of Virginia as a member of the Committee on Elections.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The order adopted to-day provides that at half past 5 o'clock the House shall take a recess until 8 p. m., the evening session to be devoted to debate only upon the pending bill; and also that during the operation of the order the House shall meet daily at 11 a. m. The Chair understands that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has not concluded his remarks, and calls the attention of members to the fact that the House will meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock, when the gentleman from West Virginia will continue his speech.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from West Virginia, then, will not proceed this evening?

The SPEAKER. Not this evening. The Chair is informed by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that arrangements have been made for certain other gentlemen to speak at the evening session.

Mr. BURROWS. The evening session is for debate only?

The SPEAKER. For debate only upon the pending bill; and if there be no objection, instead of waiting until half past 5, the Chair will now declare the House in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

There was no objection, and the House accordingly (at 5 o'clock) took a recess until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The House reassembled at 8 p. m., the Speaker in the chair.

THE TARIFF.

The SPEAKER. The House is in session for debate only on the bill the title of which will be read.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, more than a year ago the Democratic party in its national platform, at Chicago, made the following declaration, which I select as my text on the present occasion. It reads as follows:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered. We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation. We indorse the effort made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party.

Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been ten reductions of the wages of laboring men to one increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since the tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade, as positive evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley act. We call attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus the homes of the farmers of the country have become burdened with real-estate mortgage debt of over $2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness. That in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real-estate mortgage debt averaging $165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

In one of the most memorable campaigns ever conducted in this country, after a full and exhaustive discussion last fall a year ago, the foregoing sentiment and declaration of principles were indorsed by 5,554,267 votes of American freemen, and the present Administration went into power pledged to this doctrine. This Congress is now assembled for the purpose of crystallizing this idea into law and to change a system that has for nearly thirty years robbed the masses of the American people for the benefit of the classes. The language used in the platform is plain and unambiguous, and the people understood the effect of their action. The five million and a half of voters who cast their ballots for the Democratic party solemnly placed themselves on record in favor of the abandonment of this false doctrine of protection.

And now, Mr. Chairman, it seems almost useless to consume the time of the House in going over the ground again. But the report of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill under consideration is filed, as it were, in the nature of a motion for a new trial, and with the usual audacity of error insists that the American people were mistaken in their action on the great question and that the proposition be resubmitted to them for their further consideration. The momentous issue may safely be intrusted in their hands. We read in Holy Writ that "The dog turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire," but it can not be presumed that a people who have just beheld the "promised land" and the dawn of industrial liberty will again return to Egyptian bondage, "to make bricks even without straw" for the millionaires of this country. Republican protection is the great fraud of this or any other age and the most pronounced misnomer of all languages.

It is a living falsehood now known and read by all intelligent laborers in this country from center to circumference. Triumphant wrong has never yet challenged the attention of mankind without awakening a spirit that ultimately proved unconquerable. Republican protection, which makes wrong a virtue and proclaims iniquity as its highest and noblest aspiration, has deliberately led to its own destruction. The object and purpose of all protective tariffs is the taxation of one man for the benefit of another. Every intelligent voter now knows that this is robbery, and why not call it robbery as is done in the platform? This robbery is defended by its friends by the impudent statement that it is beneficial to all, in this: that it raises the wages of labor; that it preserves the home market to the farmers; that it rests only on the foreigner; that it makes things cheap, and by the worse than infamous blasphemy, that but for this protective system we would have no prosperity or happiness in this country. Every voter knows that this is false, and at the election in 1892 more than 5,000,000 of votes were so recorded with the names and residence of the electors. This falsehood must be battered down and its shameful injustice made known to the world.

Under the tariff of 1883 the average rate was 47 per cent on all imported goods, but in 1890, a year of profound peace, and no increased demand for a national increase of revenue, by the McKinley bill the average duty was raised to 62 per cent, and on some articles being entirely prohibitory. The total value of imports into this country for the year 1892 was $827,402,462. Of this amount $396,402,804 was dutiable, and the balance, $457,999,658, was on the free list. The amount of customs duty collected for the year 1892 was $177,452,964.15, and from internal revenue the amount collected was $153,971,072.52. The amount of exports from this country in 1893 was $1,015,732,011, of which nearly 80 per cent was farm products. The amount of duty collected in 1893 was $203,355,016.73, and for internal revenue $161,027,623.93. Of this vast sum of $203,355,016.73, the farmers and laborers paid the greater part as the necessaries of life, and the articles used by the poor are to-day taxed nearly double as much as luxuries and articles used by the rich.

The McKinley bill was passed as claimed by its authors to protect the American people from the importation of the cheap pauper manufactured goods of foreign nations. For this ostensible purpose, therefore, the American people were compelled to pay the import duty which I have mentioned of $203,355,016.73. This vast sum was paid by the American people. It may at first have been paid by the importers, but it was finally paid by the consumers, and in the final adjustment of accounts it was paid by the farmers and laborers of this country, for in the end labor pays all taxes. Nearly all this vast sum was a protective tax, and the tax on articles consumed by the poor was nearly double the tax on articles used by the rich. In framing the McKinley bill the duty was laid on such articles as could be or were manufactured in this country, and such as could not were placed on the free list, and in the case of sugar a bounty was given to the producers of domestic sugar. So I am warranted in the statement that this gigantic sum of $203,355,016.73 was levied for the purpose of protection—the revenue being simply an incident.

The purpose and effect of all protective tariffs is to raise the price of goods imported so that they can not be sold in competition with domestic manufactured articles. A tariff is laid for revenue or protection, or it may be for both. A revenue tariff would be a just tariff if luxuries were taxed higher than the necessaries of life for the reason that the money would go into the public Treasury to pay the expenses of the Government, and it is supported by constitutional authority. A tariff for protection is laid upon the people for the benefit of a few and is without constitutional authority and therefore void, as there is no law to support it; hence it is robbery plain and simple. A protective tax is unjust because it is paid by the people, not for a public purpose, not to support the Government or to pay its debts, but to enrich the manufacturers.

This was the crime that brought about the Reign of Terror in France, more than a hundred years ago, when French manufacturers and aristocracy scoffed at all warnings and drank, laughed, danced, and collected their robber tariff from the people until public indignation gathered like a volcano, and, finally bursting forth, setting the guillotine at work upon the necks of the nobility. It was this nefarious protective policy that caused the prayer of millions in England to ascend to Heaven in vain for so many years for daily bread, and relief only came when the torch of the mob lit up the lurid sky and the cry of the multitude shook the very foundation of the House of Parliament itself, and it was then, and not till then, that Sir Robert Peel determined to give England the cheap loaf, which act was the crowning glory of his whole public career. As a matter of course, it is claimed by the tariff robbers that they share their plunder with the farmers and laborers of this country, but that falsehood has been exploded a thousand times, and still the assertion is renewed.

The same claim was made in England and France when successful tariff robbery was carried on for generations, but the people finally unmasked the villainy and caused the oppressors to apologize for their oppressions.

This protective tariff is the same everywhere the world over. There is but one fact about protection, and that fact is immutable and certain, and it is that this form of protection is robbery, injustice, and oppression.

The root of the protective abomination is the taxation of the one man for the benefit of another, and always the taxation of the poor for the benefit of the rich. Taxation reaches down to the base of society, and in the end labor pays all. The protective tariff stands as the most abhorrent work of class legislation, and sooner or later the just sense of all nations must revolt against it.

The robber tariff lives on lies and fattens on falsehood. It justifies plunder and stigmatizes the people who dare to enter a protest against it as free traders and enemies of free government. On its lying tongue words are made to change their meaning, and it has made right a wrong and has branded truth as a falsehood. Under its false assumption of protection it has driven hundreds to starvation and thousands of honest laboring men to the poorhouse. Its teachings, that a people can become rich by taxing themselves, are dishonest and pernicious. It is a justification to every thief, robber, burglar, bandit, and freebooter in the country. If the tariff law justifies the rich in robbing the farmer, why not also justify the poor in robbing the rich.

What a dreadful example this iniquitous protective system sets our young and rising generation. It teaches that it is better to be dishonest so you are rich than to be honest and poor. It sets aside the teachings of the fathers of the Republic, that exact justice was always the best hope of mankind. It sets aside the principle that labor alone produces wealth, and teaches men to come to Congress, as they have done, to secure the passage of a law by which they secure a license to rob their neighbors.

The McKinley bill was so framed. The ready-made clothing business asked for a tax, and they got what they asked, from 100 to 300 per cent. The iron industry asked for a tax, and it was given, from 50 to 75 per cent; and so with the other industries of the country. They made their own demand on Congress and it was granted by McKinley and his cohorts. This is proven by the report of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and a comparison of the McKinley bill. This was all explained in the debate on the McKinley bill by gentlemen who were then of the minority of the Committee of Ways and Means, and I see it referred to now in the report of the majority on the bill under discussion. It was a deliberate plan to allow the manufacturers to rob the people.

When Cæsar led his victorious army across the Rubicon and finally destroyed the liberties of his country, in order to secure the present and future support of his leading generals he divided a part of the plunder of war among them. And so the Republican party, in order to secure the support of millionaire manufacturers of this country in each returning election and to obtain the money to corrupt the voters of the country gave them permission to write the McKinley bill that authorized them to rob the farmers and laborers of this country in a single year of more than a billion of dollars—more than was ever divided among any gang of thieves or robbers since the dawn of creation. There may be some legal differences between Cæsarism and McKinleyism, but morally there is none at all. A tariff for protection has always been a robber system. It derives its name from the pirate Tarifa and a town and castle called after him located at the Strait of Gibraltar, where the Moorish pirates for a number of years in the eight centuries of the Mohammedan sway in Spain exacted tribute from every vessel entering or leaving the Mediterranean.

A certain part of the value of every cargo was taken by the robbers (history does not inform us, however, whether the robbery was ad valorem or specific), but the crime was tamely submitted to by the nations of Europe rather than be at the trouble and expense of hanging the tariff robbers. History, however, informs us that the owners of the cargoes of the ships so robbed by tariff thieves lost nothing by the robbery, for they simply added the value of the stolen goods to the value of the remainder, and the consumer in purchasing the remaining goods paid the value of the articles stolen as well as those he received. It was then, as it is to-day, the consumer paid the tariff as well as the price of the goods.

It may not be just to hold the word tariff responsible for its antecedents, and after all there may be nothing in a name. "That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet," but in this case the name has adhered to the thing with great

pertinacity if there is no kinship between them. Whatever else may be said of the tariff it is true to its history in one sense at least, that it always takes, but never gives; it always levies, but never contributes. It had its origin in crime, and it is a crime to-day. Any and every private interest in a public tax is a crime against liberty and against organized society. All of the collateral tariff infamies hang upon this one offense. Put an end to this feature of it and all danger will fade away, and it will then deprive no honest man unlawfully of anything that belongs to him.

The whole protection system is but a monstrous bribe. It is a bribe paid to Massachusetts and Pennsylvania for their support of the Republican party, the money to pay the bribe being stolen from the people of the West and South. The money is used to buy corporations, individuals, and the entire votes of a State. The system begins with bribery and is sustained by it, and its most notable triumphs are won by the use of money wrung from honest labor. In the language of the Chicago platform, "the McKinley bill is the culminating atrocity of class legislation and should be repealed."

A protective tariff as manifested in McKinleyism is the direst curse that ever damned the American people. It violates international law, human and divine, by prohibiting trade among the families of men, thus denying the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It has driven industry to want, beggary, and starvation; it has forced virtue dressed in rags to insanity; it has driven mothers with their infants at their breasts from the cottage hearth starving into the winter's blast and denied to the husband and father work necessary to support his family; it has made thousands of millionaires and millions of tramps—both a curse to society; it has filled prisons with criminals and the churches with hypocrites; it has driven millions of honest laborers to the soup houses to be fed in the name of charity with the products of their own labor, out of which they were robbed; it makes merchandise of men, slaves of women, beggars of children, and outcasts of all, and then retains power by bribery and fraud. It is the author of all the sweating systems in the world, where women and children sweat blood to be coined into money to satisfy the greed of Mammon, and it forges the promise of God into a lie, and we do see the seed of the righteous "begging bread," the divine promise to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Chairman, this is the indictment which was presented against the Republican party by the grand jury of the country and upon which it has been tried and convicted.

The first point made is that there is

NO CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO IMPOSE A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

This proposition is asserted in our platform. The Constitution reads as follows:

SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

In the interpretation of this clause of the Constitution the emphases are to be placed on the words "to pay the debts," and in this way to provide for the common defense and general welfare. If the section should receive any other interpretation than this it would not be a government of limited powers, but Congress would have unlimited power to levy a tax for anything that Congress might consider for the general welfare; which is not true.

The power of taxation is the greatest power exercised by any government; for the power to tax is the power to destroy. Every government must have the power of taxation, for without that power it can not exist. But in all free governments there must be a limit on the taxing power. If not it would simply be a monarchy. A tariff is a tax and therefore comes within the meaning of the Constitution mentioned. What, then, are taxes? Taxes are defined to be "the enforced proportional contribution from persons and property levied by the State by virtue of its sovereignty for support of government and for all public needs." A tax can only be levied for public purposes. A protective tariff being for the benefit of a certain industry which is private, is not within the meaning of the law and is therefore null and void. This being mainly a legal question, I wish to call the attention of the House to the law on this point as announced by the writers on elementary law as well as the adjudication of the courts of last resort in this country, State and national. Burroughs on Taxation, on page 6, states the law to be "that taxes can only be imposed for a public purpose; they can not be imposed for a private purpose."

Cooley on Taxation, page 55, states the law to be as follows:

It is the first requisite of lawful taxation that the purpose for which it is laid shall be a public purpose.

The same author, on page 126 of his book, says:

However important it may be to the community that industrial citizens should prosper in their industrial enterprises, it is not the business of government to aid them with its means. Enlightened states, while giving all necessary protection to their citizens, will leave everyone to depend for his success and prosperity in business on his own exertions, in the belief that by doing so his own industry will be more certainly enlisted, and his prosperity and happiness more probably secured.

It may therefore be safely asserted that taxation for the purpose of raising money from the public to be given or even loaned to private parties in order that they may use it in their individual business enterprises, is not recognized as an employment of the power for a public use. In contemplation of law it would be taking the common property of the whole community and handing it over to private parties for their private gain and consequently unlawful. Any incidental benefits to the public that might flow from it would not support it as legitimate taxation.

Hilliard on Taxation, page 12, affirms the law to be as follows:

Taxation is allowable only for public purposes.

The text-books all read one way, and I will now call your attention to the adjudication of the courts.

I find in a note to volume 16, American States Reports, a very valuable compilation of the authorities on this point, which has greatly aided me and from which I have selected most of the following cases, and I will now read them to the House. In 58 California Reports, 639, the court says:

To promote a public purpose by a tax levy upon the property in the State is within the power of the Legislature; but the Legislature has no power to impose taxes for the benefit of individuals connected with a private enterprise, even though the private enterprise might benefit the local public in a remote or collateral way.

In 27 Iowa Reports, 46, the supreme court of that State say:

Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes or to accomplish some governmental end. A tax for a private purpose is a solecism in language.

In 9 Kansas Reports, 689, it is said:

Taxation to aid ordinary manufactures or the establishment of enterprise, is a thing until recently quite unheard of, and the power must be denied to exist unless all limits to the appropriation of private property and to the power to tax be disregarded.

The supreme court of Iowa has held that no authority or even dictum can be found which asserts that there can be any legitimate taxation, where the money to be raised does not go into the public treasury, and that the uniform weight of public authority is that taxes are to be imposed for the use of the people and not for the benefit of individuals.

In 20 Michigan Reports, 474, the supreme court of that State say in regard to taxation:

It must be imposed for a public, not for a mere private purpose. Taxation is a mode of raising revenue for public purposes only, and when it is prostituted to objects in no way connected with public interest or welfare it ceases to be taxation and becomes public plunder.

The supreme court of Maine has held:

No public exigency can require private spoliation for the private benefit of favored individuals.

It is held in 60 Maine Reports, 124, that the Legislature of the State has no power to pass a law to authorize a town to raise money either by taxation or issuing its bonds and loan the same to private parties to enable them to erect mills and manufactories in such town, thereby to increase its wealth and business as well as the accommodation of its inhabitants. Such an object is entirely a private one and in no sense entitled to be called a public use of such a character as to justify the imposition of taxes upon the inhabitants and property of a town by a vote of the majority of such town.

The court say in the closing part of the opinion in this case:

To take directly or indirectly the property of individuals to loan to others for the purpose of private gain and speculation against the consent of those whose money is thus loaned would be to withdraw it from the protection of the constitution and submit it to the will of an irresponsible majority. It would be the robbery and spoliation of those whose estate is thus confiscated. No surer or more effectual method could be devised to deter from accumulation, to diminish capital, to render property insecure, and thus to paralyze industry.

The Legislature of Massachusetts passed a statute to authorize the city of Boston to issue bonds to the amount of $20,000,000 to be loaned to the owners of land upon which buildings were destroyed by fire. Commissioners were appointed to manage the loan and took a first mortgage upon the land at less than three-fourths its value to secure the payment of the money with interest.

The supreme judicial court of that State in 111 Massachusetts, 454, unanimously held that the statute was null and void and perpetually enjoined all proceeding to collect taxes to pay such bonds.

A similar statute was passed by the Legislature of West Virginia authorizing the city of Wheeling to issue bonds and loan the money for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of manufacturing interests, and to take bonds and mortgages upon property to secure its payment, and still the Supreme Court of the United States, in 106 United States Reports, held that such a statute was utterly void. The Supreme Court say in that case:

Taxation to pay the bonds in question is not taxation for a public object. It is taxation which taxes the private property of one person for the private use of another.

In 20 Michigan, 452, the supreme court of that State say:

It is not in the power of the State, in my opinion, under the name of a bounty or under any other cover or subterfuge, to furnish the capital to set private parties up in any kind of business or to subsidize their business after they entered upon it. A bounty law of which this is the real nature is void, whatever may be the pretense on which it may be enacted.

In 21 Pennsylvania State Reports, 168, the supreme court of that State say:

Taxation is a mode of raising revenue for public purposes; when it is prostituted to objects in no way connected with the public it ceases to be taxation and becomes plunder.

In 24 Wisconsin Reports, 356, the supreme court of that State say in regard to taxation:

It is conceded by all that a tax must be for a public and not for a private purpose. If, therefore the Legislature attempts to take money from the people by legal compulsion for merely private purposes, that is not a tax according to the essential meaning of the word, and, therefore, such a law is not, strictly speaking, unconstitutional as being prohibited by any positive provision of the Constitution, but is void for the reason that it is beyond the scope of legislation.

The Legislature of the State of Kansas passed a law in 1872 authorizing the city of Topeka, in order to develop and improve said city, to appropriate from its general funds, or by the issuance of bonds of said city to such an amount as the city council might determine. The city issued bonds to a certain corporation to the amount of $100,000 to enable the corporation to establish a manufactory of iron bridges in that city. In 20 Wallace, 664, the Supreme Court of the United States say of this case in refusing to allow said bonds to be paid by taxation from the property of the people of that city:

Of all powers conferred on the Government that of taxation is most liable to abuse. This power can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there are no implied limitations of the use for which the power may be exercised. To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation; it is a decree under legislative forms. Nor is it taxation. Beyond a cavil there can be no lawful taxation which is not laid for public purposes.

Mr. Chairman, many more decisions to the same effect could be cited, but I deem it unnecessary. In my examination of this question in the law library I found that the supreme court of nearly every State in this Union has passed on this question, and the consensus of judicial opinion is to the effect that there is no power under the Constitution, State or national, that authorizes a tax to be levied to build up private industries. I wish to call the attention of the House to another fact in connection with these decisions—that is, that a great many of these decisions were written by Republican judges who vote the Republican ticket and advocate a protective tariff on the stump. And yet when the question comes before them as to whether the State or nation can constitutionally levy a protective tariff or tax, under their oath of office and confronted with the crime of perjury they hold that it can not be done. Gentlemen, if an examination of the authorities I have cited does not convince you that a protective tariff is unconstitutional, then you are to be likened to the five brothers mentioned in the Scriptures, of whom Abraham said, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

There can be no legal doubt that under our Constitution a tax can not be levied on the people solely for the purpose of protection, and it should ever remain so. That power was not granted by the Constitution by the American people when the Government was formed nor has it been granted since. Such a law can be legally passed in England or Germany where they have no written constitution, but not in this country where our form of Government is one of limited powers. But for the sake of the argument grant the power to pass such a law; still it would be iniquitous and unjust, for it would be the right to tax one man for the benefit of another. If all the people are benefited alike then there is no benefit to any one.

If the sugar-raiser of Louisiana, Vermont, and Kansas should have a bounty from the public Treasury for the amount of sugar produced by them, then by parity of reason the corn-grower of Illinois, Iowa, and Indiana should have a bounty on corn. If the ocean carrying trade should be subsidized, then railroads and other inland modes of transportation should be subsidized. Why should one man in one trade be protected by a tariff tax for his encouragement and not another man in another occupation? Why should one man be compelled to pay a bounty to his neighbors when his neighbors pay no bounty to him? And if neighbors pay equal bounty to each other, where is the benefit?

It is therefore perfectly obvious that a tax to be protective must be unjust, for it must take from one class and give to another without receiving anything in return; that is what protection means and that is why it is called robbery. No man's rights can be based on another man's injury. If you take money from one man by law without his consent and give it to another you are certainly doing the first one an injury. Law can not make wrong right nor black white; you may pass a statute to that effect, but the ethical principle implanted in every honest human breast would revolt against it.

Protection contravenes the adage of the fathers of the Republic—that of "equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none." It promises large rewards to labor but it never fulfills the contract; it teaches that our farmers are the proper objects to be plundered if it can be done under the forms and sanction of law. It makes its levy upon the innocent and the unsuspecting without their knowledge and then divides it among the cunning and the unscrupulous. Every great fortune it creates results from the legal oppression of the poor. Protection draws its riches from the moans of the widow, the tears of the orphan, and the sweating-room of oppression. It is a financial monstrosity.

We build railroads, construct ships, open harbors, span rivers, tunnel mountains, appropriate millions for the improvement of harbors, construct ocean steamers, all for the benefit of free commerce in order to secure our part of the trade of the world, and then McKinleyism builds a Chinese wall around the country 62 feet high, and declares it would be a benefit to the American people if the Atlantic Ocean were "a sea of fire," forgetting that commerce is the golden girdle that binds the world together, and that we are not only citizens of the Republic, but of the world as well, and that even the love of country should not be greater than the love of mankind, and that all politics that war against the law of God are hurtful to the race. Restriction belongs to the past and is contrary to the spirit of freedom.

Freedom is our greatest glory. Our soil is free, our thought is free, our ballot is free, our speech is free, our press is free, our laboring men should be free; and I sincerely hope that when the measure under consideration is enacted into law it will secure larger liberty to the toiling millions of the world. That is what the election in 1892 meant, the liberty of trade, industrial and personal liberty. It was the mightiest revolution ever enacted in this country, and a solemn protest against the robbery of taxation. The whole system stood on two colossal falsehoods, the one that it would secure "better wages" to labor, and the other that it would secure the "home market" to the American farmer. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to examine these two propositions.

THE LABORING MAN AND THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The Democratic platform that I have read to the House declares "that since the McKinley bill became a law there has been ten reductions in the wages of labor to where there has been one increase." I maintain the truth of this proposition, and I am prepared to prove and maintain that a protective tariff never raised the wages of labor in this or any other country in the world. It was not intended by its authors that it should have that effect, and in the very nature of things it could not accomplish that end. The manufacturers of this country received the benefit of the protective tariff. I will grant that it enabled them to pay better wages to their laborers if they saw proper, but the question is, Did they do so? I insist they did not. The Carnegies, Rockwells, Scotts, and other tariff barons are able to pay their laborers $20 per day and still have sufficient left to support themselves and their families in luxury and idleness if they should live to the age of Methuselah. Protected manufacturers never showed any disposition to share their "bonus" with their workmen except upon compulsion.

But what did these protected millionaire capitalists pay their laborers? Simply the ordinary market wages. I am willing to admit that wages are higher in America than they are in Europe, but this is not due to the protective tariff. Wages were higher in this country than in Europe before McKinleyism was in swaddling clothes. The high wages in this country, if they may be called such, are due to other causes than a restrictive tariff. The labor unions and Knights of Labor have done more to secure reasonable wages for laboring men than all the tariff laws passed by the Republican party. There are, also, many other reasons why wages should be higher in this country than across the waters in foreign lands. England has a population of 400 to the square mile, and the average wages paid were 97 cents per day.

New England has a population of 210 to the square mile, and the average wages paid here were 1.02 per day, 5 cents more than in England. The State of Ohio has a population of 80 to the square mile and their wages average about $1.80. But while the wages are nominally 5 cents per day higher in Massachusetts than they are in England, yet this is more apparent than real when you take into account the purchasing power of money in that State and England.

I insist that a protective tariff always reduces the wages of labor, because it increases the price of consumption. When a protective tax is placed on anything coming into this country

from abroad, the price of that article to the consumer is increased to the amount of such tax.

If a man's clothing costs him more because of a restrictive tariff, then his wages will not purchase as much clothing. If the tariff were on labor, then the wages of labor would raise in accordance with the same rule that applies to goods; but the tariff is not on the labor (that is on the free list) but on the products of labor, which is entirely a different thing. If, however, the protective tariff should raise the price of wages at all, then it could only apply to those engaged in the protected industries, which only amount to less than 9 per cent of our laboring population. I wish to mention another fact that conclusively proves that a protective tariff does not increase the wages of the laborer, and that is that laborers in unprotective industries are as well paid off, if not better, than those in the protective industries. If a protective tariff raises the price of wages, then the wages in Germany and France should be higher than in free-trade England, which is not the fact.

There is a greater difference in wages of labor in the different States of the Union than there is between this country and Europe. Colorado pays wages three times as high as North Carolina, Dakota twice as high as Alabama, California nearly twice as high as Massachusetts, and Illinois higher than Virginia. At least this was the condition of things before the recent labor troubles in the West.

But when me make a final analysis of wages we find that it is not the dollars received, but the food and clothing that the money will buy. Profit is not the money handled, but the sum saved at the end of each year. But to prove conclusively, and beyond cavil, that the laboring man does not get the benefit of the protective tariff I will state the fact that the average labor cost of production in America in all the protected industries is but 18 per cent, or placed by the highest statistician at 21 per cent, and the average duty by the McKinley bill is over 50 per cent.

Now, who gets the tariff? The manufacturers, of course. If the laborers got it why should there now be 3,000,000 laborers out of employment willing to labor but no work to do? and in a country where there is more than sufficient for all, they are compelled to beg from place to place for their daily bread.

For the last twenty years the American people have been outrageously taxed "for the benefit of the laboring man." Why, then, manufacturers in robes and laborers in rags, millionaires and paupers? The poor are the laborers for whom these tariff laws were passed, for whose benefit the people have been taxed over a billion of dollars annually, yet organized cunning despoiled labor of it all.

When the McKinley bill was under consideration in this House Carnegie & Co. secured an increase of protection for their business (of course for the benefit of the laboring man, as is usual in such cases), but after the McKinley tariff went into effect Carnegie & Co. reduced the wages of their laborers; and in order to make the reduction more effectual they called in the Pinkerton thugs and knaves to shoot down the honest labor off of which they had grown rich. And finally the Republican recipe for all labor troubles, the militia, was called in, and organized labor at Homestead was again forced under the galling yoke of slavery. Then a committee of this House was sent to Homestead to investigate the question of wages by that highly protected institution which every man, woman, and child in the United States was taxed to support. And when the committee asked for information as to the manner in which these taxes were used the committee was informed that it was a private affair.

Not only did Carnegie & Co. reduce the price of wages in their factories, but since the passage of the McKinley tariff the wages of labor were reduced in several thousand other protected industries. My colleague and seat mate from New York [Mr. WARNER] in the last Congress furnished a list of the reduction of wages in the protected industries, which covers several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no doubt about the fact that the Chicago platform is correct in its statement that "since the passage of the McKinley bill there have been ten reductions in the wages of labor to where there has been one increase." The following statement, which I take from the Philadelphia Press of December 26, the very citadel of protection, as uttered by the General Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, reads that—

Everywhere is starvation and death, while corporate greed and avaricious money lords apply the arrogant lash with relentless fury, and Congress, like a wooden god, looks down in silent contempt on the miseries of the most patriotic and industrious people the world ever knew. With these conditions confronting the people everywhere, if we can not permeate society with a healty public opinion on the subject of labor and force the adoption of our principles we deserve defeat. In the city of Philadelphia laboring men have been voting the Republican ticket solidly for the past twenty years. "They have sown the wind and they reap the whirlwind."

THE FARMER AND THE HOME MARKET.

The Republican national committee of 1892 issued a pamphlet to be used in the campaign, and on the first page of the book it is promised of the McKinley bill "To scatter plenty over a smiling land;" and further on the statement is made that "It will secure work for thousands of idle men and women. It will materially reduce the farmer's expenses and greatly increase his profits, but it will not raise the price to the American consumer of one single article that can be termed a necessary expense." The McKinley bill is in force to-day and is scattering plenty over a smiling land. I wonder how the farmers of the country enjoy that plenty this year. What a roaring farce, this promise of the Republican party! If any class deserves well of this country it is the farming class.

The supreme rule of the Democratic party with reference to taxation is that the taxation from the citizen must be limited to the needs of the Government economically administered, and that any taxation beyond this, from whatever pretext of public policy, is an infringement upon Democratic freedom. In America the great burden of taxation falls upon the farmer. He belongs to a class which is first in number and economic importance to the country. It may be true that the question of numbers may not be of any particular consequence in considering the question of equal justice, for he would be entitled to equal political right if there were but one-half the number. It need not rest exclusively on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number, but upon the theory that every man is entitled to equal and exact justice.

With the farmer there is no combination or monopoly; he is confronted with the necessity of selling to the world on a purely competitive basis. The farmers' burdens from year to year are gradually growing heavier. The trite saying was, "Young man go West and grow up with the country." But the plan now is to organize corporations in the East for the special purpose of placing mortgages all over the West upon farms at nearly double the rate of interest prevailing in the East, and in this way the profits of farming are largely abstracted by the corporations and their ally, the protective tariff. The farm mortgages of the country amount now to nearly $4,000,000,000, and, of course, no sane person ever expects that this vast sum will ever be paid. It can not be paid; there is not money enough in the country to pay this stupendous debt. The cunning money sharks of the country have seen to it that there shall not be sufficient money in the country to transact its business, for they have contracted the currency nearly 50 per cent for that very purpose. The prisoner is in jail and they have destroyed the prison keys. What will the end be?

The Democratic platform explains the situation—that is, "that the protective system fosters no industry so fully as it does that of the sheriff." These mortgages will be foreclosed and the present occupants of the land will be turned out, as has been done already in thousands of cases in Kansas and other Western States, and these lands will be owned by the corporations which have eaten up the borrower by their modern cannibalism usury.

What next? Why, the axiomatic truth that "who owns the soil owns the labor on the soil" will have full operation. This is only another statement of the Divine truth that "the borrower is the servant of the lender."

The necessity that makes one man toil for the benefit of another man makes the first man the slave of the second whether his skin is black or white. This whole nefarious scheme is the work of plutocracy, aided by its natural guardian, the Republican party, and the special subject of attack is the farmer. He is made their dupe and victim. I had the honor during the last Presidential campaign to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], who is still serving in the other end of the Capitol, make a speech in my own town to the farmers. In his remarks he ridiculed the statement that Democrats make; that is, "that the consumers pay the tariff." He illustrated his position by the statement that under the McKinley bill the tariff duty on calico was 6 cents, and the price here was but 5 cents. He wanted the farmers to tell him who paid that duty, and the horny handed sons of toil laughed themselves almost silly at the profound wisdom of their Senator.

The Senator did not tell them, nor did they see proper to ask him, what would be the effect if there were no duty on calico. Clearly, if there were no duty at all on calico the domestic manufacturer would be compelled to sell for 4 cents, and if this is true then calico is protected 25 per cent. He used the same statement about a certain class of nails upon which the duty under the McKinley bill is more than the market price here. In each case he forgot, I suppose, to state what the effect would be if there were no duty on calico and nails. But he did not forget to tell them how the farmers were protected by the McKinley bill by a tariff on wheat of 20 cents, and then we had three cheers for the McKinley bill.

I saw some of the same farmers this summer selling their wheat for 40 cents per bushel, and I reminded them of the Senator's statement, and that I thought that if they would make out their bill

and send it to him for the 20 cents protection, the Senator would likely get it for them or give them a new chestnut.

Every intelligent person knew at the time that the pretended protection of the farmers by the McKinley bill on wheat was a fraud and a humbug. It could not be done in that way. Its real purpose was to still further deceive the farmers of the country into supporting the Republican party.

But, thank God, the scales have fallen from the eyes of the farmers and laborers, and they will not be deceived longer.

The requiem of the protective tariff system was sung in this country in 1892, and I know that it is dead, but I wish to punish the robber after death by giving it a few more kicks and cuffs. The Illinois farmer pays 50 per cent more for his manufactured goods than he would were there no tariff; therefore the Illinois farmer to the extent of that per cent is impoverished. Massachusetts sells her manufactured goods 50 per cent higher than she could sell them were there no tariff; therefore Massachusetts is enriched this per cent by reason of such protection. This being so, does not the Illinois farmer pay the tax of Massachusetts, and in addition thereto give her a bonus for the privilege? Labor creates all capital, and surely the laborer should at least have a just and full share of that which he creates.

If labor were allowed equal privilege with capital, then there would be no conflict between them. But when the Government steps in and by the exercise of power enters into partnership with capital and takes from labor the fruits of its production and gives it to capital, then labor becomes the slave of the master it has created, and in this way every farmer in the land is made the slave of capital.

Wealth has accumulated in this country in the last twenty years at a rate never before known, but it has been at a fearful cost to the farmer. The accumulation has not been of a uniform rate: hundreds have grown rich while millions have grown poor, all through the intervention of the Government that should protect all alike.

In order to show how unfairly the protective tariff treats the farmer, I will use some figures which I submitted to the House when the McKinley bill was under consideration, but they will bear repeating.

These figures are taken from the census of 1880 and they show the increase of wealth of the farmer under the Walker tariff, and the decrease under the protective tariff:

	Farm values.
1850	$3,271,575,422
1860	6,545,045,007
1870	9,262,803,861
1880	10,197,096,776
Increase	
1850 to 1860	$3,273,469,575 or 100 per cent.
1860 to 1870	2,717,758,854 or 41 per cent.
1870 to 1880	934,292,915 or 9 per cent.

It will be seen that there was an increase of 100 per cent from 1850 to 1860, and but 9 per cent from 1870 to 1880, when we had a high tariff.

Now I will take from the census of 1880 (Compendium, page 926) the following figures, which show the advantage manufacturers have over farmers:

Farms, 1880.	
Amount invested	$12,104,080,000
Value of products	22,790,272,000
Persons employed	7,670,400
Product per hand	$288
Manufacturers, 1880.	
Amount invested	$2,790,270,000
Total product	5,369,579,000
Cost of material	3,369,825,000
Value of product less material	$1,972,756,000
Persons employed	2,732,000
Product per hand	$721

What a splendid margin in favor of the manufacturers. Now, another lesson. How have farms increased as compared with other values? In 1860 the farmers owned nearly one-half the wealth of the nation, as appears from the census:

Farm values, 1860	$7,988,443,000
Other values	8,179,123,000
Farm values, 1880	12,140,081,000
Other values	31,537,902,000
Increase of farm values	4,123,688,000
Increase of other values	23,358,797,000
Increase of farm values in twenty years of protection	51 per cent.
Increase in other values for the same time	280 per cent.

Oh, for a name to call this infernal thing; robbery is too mild. I would call it Devil or Hell if I were not afraid it might offend his Satanic majesty.

As to the fallacy of the home market, I take some figures from the Statistician of 1893 as to our wheat product:

	Bushels.
Total wheat crop, 1891	611,780,000
Consumption for food	302,000,000
Seed	54,508,000
Surplus	255,172,000

Now, in order to consume the surplus so that the farmer would have a home market, it would require us to import into this country more than 50,000,000 persons to devour this wheat at 5 bushels per capita, or more immigrants than ever came to this country. What a blessing this would be for our laboring men. But this is not all; our surplus wheat is less than one-third the surplus of our farms that we ship and sell in foreign markets annually. So, therefore, in order to find a home market for all our farm surplus, we would be compelled to import three times 50,000,000 immigrants to consume it all.

What a ridiculous farce this would be. And yet Senator Cullom and men of his cloth talk to the farmers about their home market, and they swallow it as a Utopian dream and vote for a protective tariff, which will in the end, as certain as day follows night, result in driving the farmer from his homestead and his children to the poorhouse. The abandoned farms of New England tell more eloquently than words that the farmers have not shared in the increased profit from protection, neither has that home market of which they have heard so much materialized.

To sum the matter up, the census of 1880 shows that the manufacturers made on their business a net profit of 36½ per cent per annum, and on investigations of the census of 1890 it is found that the McKinley bill adds about 7½ per cent, making it now 44½ per cent, while the farms have not made over 2 per cent. This is the effect of protection, and if this is justice I have no conception of the meaning of that word. Mr. Chairman, I speak for the farmer, and I represent on this floor an agricultural district the equal of any in this Union of States, and a constituency as patriotic and generous-hearted as the world ever saw, and in their names and by their authority I solemnly protest against this iniquitous system that has clothed the toiler in rags and the rascal in robes, that applauds cunning and sneers at integrity, that has driven the American flag from the seas and given our carrying trade to England. It has filled the cottage of the laborer with sorrow and sent his children supperless to bed: it threatens the safety of our free institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the man who does not comprehend the iniquity and injustice of the protective system is a fool; the man who does and fails to denounce it is a coward; the man who comprehends it and favors it for party or personal ends is a knave, and the man who understands its workings and has the courage to denounce it is worthy of being called an American freeman.

Gentlemen, do not deceive yourselves; the battle for tariff reform is on and "he who halts is a coward, and he who doubts is damned."

Every consideration of justice, safety, and patriotism demands prompt and decisive action in the passage of the bill under consideration. It will reduce the average rate of duty 18.40 per cent, and the taxes, as estimated, nearly $75,000,000, and leave that sum in the pockets of the people; and more than $300,000,000 will be saved to the farmers and laborers in the reduction of the prices of things they must necessarily purchase and consume.

When this bill becomes a law it may reduce the income of Carnegie so that he will not be able to build another wing to his castle in the mountains of Scotland this year, and he may have to reduce the number of horses that he drives to his tallyho, but it will bring comfort to thousands of American homes, the citadel of American liberty. It will bring a glow of health to the cheek of the farmer's wife and bread to the children of labor.

The true grandeur and safety of this nation consist not in its great cities, gorgeous capitols, great corporations where opulent princes trade in money coined from the sweat of labor; but in strong, noble, honest men, pure, free, and happy women, sweet healthy children—in a word, in the well ordered homes of our laboring peasantry.

Mr. Chairman, in these homes the indomitable and unconquerable spirit of freedom had its birth, which gave life to the American nation, and when the nation was in danger from these homes came its defenders. The farmers are the founders of civilization and the protectors of liberty, and yet for the last quarter of a century in this country our farmers have been manacled and chained in worse than Egyptian bondage. But thanks to their own good sense and intelligence, they have finally succeeded in unbarring their prison door, and on the passage of this bill they will be restored to their original industrial freedom, to which they are entitled by nature and nature's God. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I think the most absurd statement that I have ever heard made on this floor since I have been a member of this House was one made a few minutes ago by the honorable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE] who has just taken his seat. If I understood him correctly he said that when a man went to a store and bought a dollar's worth of goods fifty cents of that dollar was taxes. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that that is the most absurd statement I have ever heard made upon this floor since I have been a member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively this afternoon to the

speech of the learned gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], and heard him ring the changes for an hour on the charge that the tariff was a tax.

And I heard him charge that the poor man of this country was, in consequence, paying an awful, fearful, oppressive tax upon his clothing, and the distinguished gentleman exhibited on this floor samples of European woolen used by the middle classes of men and women in the United States.

He told of the terrible per cent the American people had to pay to get these goods with which to clothe themselves and their children, and he almost put the Democratic side of the House in tears over the wrongs of the poor working people who, I think he said, had to work one day in three to pay their taxes in the form of duty.

I believe it was Nasby who in describing the funeral of a dear friend which he attended, and with whom he had enjoyed drinking whisky and cocktails on numerous occasions, said that he was unable to weep at his friend's funeral because when he thought of these occasions all the juices of his body went to his mouth and he could not weep. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

So I was unable to weep at the argument of the gentleman from West Virginia, because I know and everybody knows and he ought to know that the middle classes in this country do not buy the woolens or the clothing they wear in England, nor pay the awful duty he spoke of for the very good reason that they clothe themselves in better goods of American manufacture, and I affirm that the clothing worn by the great mass of the people in this country is manufactured in America, and that clothing in the United States is sold cheaper than in any other country on the face of the earth, and our countrymen are indifferent to the duty on European fabrics except as they protect American manufacturers and give employment to American labor. [Applause.]

The argument of the gentleman from West Virginia that the tariff is a tax has been so often exploded and refuted on this floor and elsewhere that it seems a waste of words to repeat the arguments.

Has the gentleman from West Virginia forgotten the delegation of merchants who appeared before his committee from Bermuda, and denounced the McKinley act and asked for its repeal, because they said they had to pay the duty in order to sell their goods in the American market? Two familiar illustrations of the fallacy of the tariff-tax argument suffice. I think that the duty on a barrel of salt is about $2. Hundreds of thousands of barrels are sold by the salt manufacturers of this country at 50 cents a barrel and the barrel thrown in.

Will not the gentleman from West Virginia tell me where the tax comes in? [Applause.]

The watch business affords another illustration of the effect of the duty to cheapen articles to the American consumer. The effect of placing a duty on watches, which were formerly bought principally in Europe, was to start twenty watch factories in this country, and to-day, owing to American skill, invention, and genius, the best watch made on the face of the earth is an American watch, and can be bought for one-half what it could when the duty was imposed.

THE EFFECTS OF FREE WOOL

The gentleman from West Virginia was quite correct in saying that sheep-raising for wool—and he might have added for any other purpose—had largely disappeared east of the Mississippi; and that disappearance has moved with gigantic strides since it was known that this Congress would insert a free-wool provision in this bill. The truth is that the farmers of this country, without a protective duty, can not compete at the price of labor in this country with the foreign producers of this article.

The truth is that the farmers are all killing their sheep and going out of the business, which explains the present unheard of low price of mutton, and I am told that not in seventy years has wool been so low in this country as now, and that Canadian manufacturers of woolens are paying duty and importing wool from the United States into Canada.

I think the learned professor from West Virginia has something yet to learn in regard to the woolen business and the cloth and clothing trade and the cost of the cloth and clothing largely and principally worn by the people of this country, and learned and scholarly as he is, he is not the only college professor who has something to learn. I think it was Senator Hoar who said that President Elliot could not pass examination as a freshman in the matter of the construction, cost, and tariff on parts of a wagon with which he illustrated a tariff speech. And I think it was Senator Hawley of Connecticut who said "the learned president of Harvard was ignorant of anything that was out doors."

The gentleman from West Virginia denounced the duty on coal and iron as an unjust subsidy to the bloated bondholders and the railroads of the country. And he would take this business away from the American railroads and American coastwise vessels.

Has the gentleman seen a map of the railroads of the United States that have gone into insolvency since this bill or its contents have been known.

I do not charge that threatened free coal is entirely responsible for this unprecedented failure of railroads, but it is undoubtedly due to the business prostration incident to Democratic success, and the threatened revolution in the economic and financial policy under which the country has enjoyed a wonderful prosperity for thirty years. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent upon this floor two hundred thousand people, largely engaged in the manufacturing business, and I think that I can truthfully say that for many years prior to one year ago last November, when it was known that Grover Cleveland was elected and the Democratic party was in control of all the Departments of the Government—I say prior to that time, and under the Republican policy of protection inaugurated by the Morrill tariff bill in 1860, my constituents in the old Second and new Twelfth (substantially the same) were as happy, contented, and prosperous as any people in any State or country on the face of the earth.

The manufacturing cities and villages were filled with happy and contented workingmen, many of them owning their own homes. Many of the towns and cities were adding waterworks, electric light plants were being married together by a network of electric railroads, the benefit of which the rich and the poor, the high and the low, all shared alike.

Educational institutions were thriving and prosperous. I think every town and city in the district has a public library, and many of them were erecting library buildings and establishing reading rooms for the benefit of all classes.

Institutions of religion were well supported; the spire of the house of God pointed toward Heaven in every village and hamlet in my district.

The farmers in the agricultural sections of my district found a ready and quick sale for their product in the manufacturing towns and cities. And under the wise and far-reaching statesmanship of the McKinley tariff bill the farmer, the manufacturer, the workingmen and employés, indeed all classes of citizens, and every occupation and business were enjoying a wonderful development and prosperity.

And I presume in this regard the history of the district I represent was the history of Massachusetts and other great Commonwealths of the Union.

At the election in November, 1892, the people for the first time in thirty years turned over the control of the House, Senate, and all the Departments of the Government to the Democratic party, elected upon the principles of the Chicago platform, which declared that all protection to American industries was unconstitutional, and which declared in favor of a tariff for revenue only, and which declared in favor of the repeal of the "10 per cent tax" and in favor of the revival of the old State bank.

The effect of this political revolution began to be immediately felt. The country was on the high tide of prosperity, and the result was not seriously felt at first; but in the face of the Democratic platform, manufacturers began to reduce their output; merchants began to buy sparingly, anticipating the lower prices promised by the Democratic speakers and papers, which resulted in the employment of less help and the discharge of many employés; one business reacted upon another, the consuming power of our people was gradually but surely reduced, and has been growing from bad to worse until the present time, until the conditions of 1857, when we were under a tariff for revenue the last time, are being repeated. In 1857, in the face of an abundant harvest, one inhabitant in thirteen and one-half in New York State was a pauper, and soup houses were opened in every ward in New York City to feed the starving poor.

So now in the face of the Wilson tariff bill, which threatens destruction to many of our great manufacturing interests, in the face of the abundant harvest of last year, relief committees are being organized in all the great centers of the country to feed the worthy and deserving poor.

And distress and gaunt hunger and want stares many an honest workingman and his family in the face. Instead of prosperity we have adversity, instead of happy and contented workingmen we have idle factories, or running on reduced time at reduced wages.

Instead of confidence we have distrust, and in consequence of the change in the economic and financial policy of the country from the Republican to the Democratic party it is believed that every species of property in this country has shrunk from 25 to 40 per cent, describing a grand total of $15,000,000,000, and the end is not yet.

The Democratic speakers and newspapers attempted to charge this terrible changed condition, which condition nobody could deny, to the Sherman act, and to the purchase of silver under that act.

After an agony of three months, the Democratic Senate repealed the purchasing clause of that act. The Democratic speakers and papers predicted that business would immediately brighten, and that prosperity would again return to our distressed country. And if their premises, as to the cause, were correct, that Republican silver legislation was the cause of the distress, their prophecy would prove to be true. Neither was true.

The purchasing clause of the Sherman act should have been repealed, as it was, but it was preposterous, false, and absurd to charge the present situation to that act. The Government could sink $3,000,000 a month in the ocean without producing any such result. The threatened revision of the tariff on free-trade lines, and as contemplated by the Wilson bill, now before us, was the immediate, direct, and almost the only cause of the appalling misfortune which has overtaken the country.

The Democrats are wont to describe their party and policy as the party of Jefferson, Jackson, and the Constitution. They must mean Jefferson Davis, Stonewall Jackson, and the Confederate constitution. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson were protectionists. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Wilson bill is drawn on the line of the Confederate constitution, which stood for absolute, unrestricted free trade, and the Southern and Confederate end is at present the dominant and controlling end of the Democratic party of the country, and they demand the privilege of exchanging their cotton, lumber, tobacco, rice, hemp, raised with cheap negro labor, for European goods also manufactured with cheap, poorly paid labor; and that is the policy that dominates and controls the country now. That is the policy which dictates our economic policy to the great manufacturing and empire States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts [applause], and also dictates that the agricultural products of Canada and the lumber of that vast region shall have the duty so reduced as to come in competition with the products of the great States of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.

The following quotation from the platform of Andrew Jackson shows conclusively that the present Democratic party is not the party of Jackson:

PLATFORM OF ANDREW JACKSON 1832.

Resolved, That an adequate protection of industry is indispensable to the prosperity of the country, and that an abandonment of the policy at this period would be attended with consequences serious to the best interests of this nation.

PLATFORM OF BENJAMIN HARRISON, 1892.

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which can not be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

PLATFORM OF GROVER CLEVELAND, 1892.

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud upon the labor of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of a few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only.

The Democrats of 1832 and the Republicans of 1892 seem to agree.

Since the development of the Democratic policy an election was held last November, and the country condemned the Democracy in thunder tones that drowned the roar of Niagara in the States where elections were held—in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Iowa. The Democratic party was buried out of sight, and the people of those great States commanded the Democratic party to halt; and surely, in the face of this verdict, there should be no economic legislation until the country can be heard from again in the Congressional elections of next fall. If the Wilson bill should be deferred until such election it could never pass this body.

The people have already pronounced against it; patriotism and honesty demand that its consideration shall be deferred until the voice of the people can again be heard.

And this is not all; incompetency marks the Democratic administration in every department, if not something worse. Witness our humiliation in the eyes of the civilized world over the foreign policy of President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham in the affairs of the Sandwich Islands—in painful contrast to the diplomacy and wise statesmanship of Benjamin Harrison and James G. Blaine.

Incompetency marks the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury; he undoubtedly precipitated the panic and augmented the distress of the country, and brought back our securities from abroad by an authorized interview last summer, in which he said it might be necessary to pay the Government's obligations in silver, and by his more recent utterances in favor of destroying the collateral behind the Treasury notes, issued for silver bullion, by threats to coin the seigniorage.

Now, while towns and cities are attempting to devise ways and means and to give public work to the unemployed, what a grand chance there is for the Government to do something in the same line by pushing public buildings and public works, already authorized by Congress, which would give work to thousands of the unemployed.

Instead of that wise policy on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, so far as I can learn, public buildings and public works are at a dead stand. Let me give an illustration or two: The Fifty-first Congress voted to erect a public post-office building at an expense of $75,000 at the city of Taunton, in my district, upon the condition that the city would donate the site; the grand old patriotic city of Taunton responded promptly and donated a beautiful park in the center of the city to the Government of the United States, and got the act legalized by the Legislature of Massachusetts; this lot when donated would have sold for $50,000 under the hammer; the title and all the preliminaries, survey, etc., were fully complete when the present Administration came into power nearly a year ago. In vain I have repeatedly urged upon the Secretary of the Treasury and upon the Supervising Architect the patriotic conduct of the city in donating the site, the unemployed workmen in the city, to whom the work would be a godsend, the fact that by the generous conduct of the city the Government would obtain a property worth $125,000 for $75,000. All my pleadings go for nothing. The grass in this beautiful park, now owned by the Government, was knee deep last summer, disfiguring the city, and not a blow was struck on this building, voted by Congress three years ago, and for which the money has been set aside.

Once more. The Government voted to build a post-office building in the city of Washington at the same time. There are thousands of unemployed mechanics in this city to whom this work would be a godsend, and would relieve the charitable people of Washington of a burden that they can ill afford to bear. A million dollars or more is to be expended for this building and practically nothing is being done upon it; a half dozen iron pillars have been stood up to show that the Secretary of the Treasury has not forgotten it, and on yesterday I saw two or three lonesome workmen pounding a bolt in one of these iron beams. These are but illustrations of the Government work which is so much needed all over the country.

A want of patriotism marks the conduct of the Secretary of the Interior, and these Halls have recently echoed with denunciations of that officer of the Government, and his unpatriotic and unjust conduct of the Pension Bureau, and, thank God, this denunciation was not confined to Republicans. There were found Democrats on this floor brave enough and manly enough to join with the Republicans, like the gentleman from Indiana Mr. MARTIN, and that scarred, maimed, and war-worn veteran of the Union Army, Gen. SICKLES, of New York. [Applause.]

Well may the country cry out, "How long: oh! how long?"

Now, I come to some specific items in the Wilson tariff bill now before us. This bill is certainly neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. It certainly is not drawn on the line of the Chicago platform.

While it ruthlessly slaughters many of the great industries of the country, and will either close these establishments or reduce the workmen to European level, it seems in other spots to be drawn on protection lines, especially when the interest to be protected is a Democratic one. On page 32 I find a high specific duty on the products of Florida, oranges and lemons, while apples raised in the Northern States are on the free list.

On page 30 I find a high specific duty on rice, a product of South Carolina and Louisiana and other Southern States.

Then it has its likes and dislikes in the Northern States, and there seems to be a method in this madness: To illustrate other features of the bill:

Gen. Alger, of Michigan, is perhaps the most extensive dealer in lumber in the United States; he is also a large contributor to the Republican campaign fund; his business is ruthlessly slaughtered by so low a duty or no duty as to bring him in direct competition with Canadian lumber just across the line.

On the other hand, the most extensive chocolate manufacturer in this country lives in Massachusetts. He is a very nice gentleman. He is a personal friend of mine. He makes the best chocolate, bromo, cocoa, and cocoa butter in the world. I use it in my family in preference to any foreign product. By his enterprise and skill, and thanks to the Republican policy of protection, he has built up an enormous business in these products. And I am told that his output reaches the enormous figure of 30 tons per day when the country is in its normal condition, and gives employment to many American workmen. He is a gener-

ous employer of labor, and an open-handed, generous, public-spirited citizen.

But I am sorry to have to say that this gentleman has gone astray upon the tariff, at least for other products than his own. He is a tariff reformer, and presides at their meetings; yes, more than that, he is a free trader and a stanch Democrat, and more than that he is the largest contributor in Massachusetts to the Democratic campaign fund; with that generosity which characterizes him in other directions he contributes thousands to the State and national Democratic campaign.

Now turn to page 34 of this bill, and there you read the strange device, "Chocolate, 2 cents per pound duty;" "Cocoa, 2 cents per pound duty;" "Cocoa butter, 3½ cents per pound duty."

The majority of the committee in their report argue at length in favor of ad valorum and not specific duty; but there is no ad valorem foolishness about the duty on chocolate and cocoa, but here is a specific duty of 2 cents per pound. Now I suggest to the committee that they offer an amendment here and make it 4 cents per pound, and thus enable my friend to double his subscription to the Democratic campaign fund, for they will need it at the next election. [Applause.]

Surely here is a sight for gods and men. In a bill drawn on free-trade lines these two illustrations which I have given are but illustrations of other simlar inconsistencies and acts of favoritism: a lumber-dealer, a large Republican contributor, marked for slaughter; a chocolate manufacturer, a large Democratic contributor, has every principle of the bill slaughtered and has his business protected by a high specific duty.

There is a large factory in my district at old Plymouth, Mass., that manufactures binding-twine; the treasurer, Mr. Holmes, is a red-hot Republican; binding-twine is put on the free list. They make binding-twine in Hongkong, China; they have the most improved American machinery; they pay the workmen 15 cents per day. There are 12,000 men employed in the cordage industry in New England; it is needless to describe the effect of this bill upon these manufacturers and workmen.

There are extensive granite quarries in Eastern Massachusetts, particularly in Quincy, which was formerly in my district. Turn to page 15, you will find the duty has been reduced to one-half on finished granite; this would enable the manufacturer at Quincy or Randolph to send granite blocks as ballast to Europe and have them returned finished for buildings, capitals, and monuments, and make a large saving at the present price of wages, with the duty in this bill. One of two things must happen if this bill passes, every granite quarry in this country must reduce wages or close.

These are but illustrations of the slaughter of other industries in my district by the proposed Wilson tariff bill.

Now, how is it proposed to make good the large loss in revenue which this bill contemplates? Why, by an income tax, which is a tax upon thrift and prosperity, and however fine it may be in theory, it is well described by the gentleman from New York, Mr. COCKRAN, when he says it should be styled a "bill to fine honest men and pay a premium on perjury."

Under the McKinley tariff bill the foreigners who sent goods to this country paid the tax, as was testified to by the merchants of Bermuda who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under this bill it is proposed to abandon that policy of having the foreigners who import goods into our country support the Government and pay the taxes. I say it is proposed to substitute for this policy a revival of the odious war tax to be paid by our own people, one of the most obnoxious and offensive of which is the income tax, which is paid by truthful, honest men, and entirely escaped by those that are dishonest. Of all the odious, unjust systems of taxation that were ever devised the income tax is the most odious and most offensive and most unjust. [Applause.]

On my return to Washington after the holiday recess, I sat in a seat with the agent of a great manufacturing corporation that employs thousands of workmen in the city of Fall River. He said to me, "If the Wilson bill becomes a law, our concern will have no alternative except to close our factory or reduce the wages of our employés 40 per cent, approximating the European level."

The talk about the benefit to manufacturers resulting from free raw material, free coal, free iron ore, and free wool called for by this bill will deceive no intelligent person.

The benefit to the manufacturers of my section resulting from the removal of 75 cents per ton on bituminous coal will in no way compensate for the reduced duty on the finished product of these establishments.

When you take into the account that a ton of iron when manufactured into tacks, rivets, printing presses, stoves, etc., is worth from $150 to $500 per ton, a duty of 75 cents per ton on coal and a small duty upon iron ore is not an important factor of the cost, and, I repeat, is unimportant as compared with the protection of these finished products from the competition of European manufacturers and poorly paid workmen.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take a statesman to see that if we reduce the duty on American agricultural or mechanical products so that we are to buy any considerable quantity of our goods in a foreign market, we can not at the same time manufacture these goods in our own country and give employment to American capital and American labor.

This bill strikes a blow at the great tack industry of my district and of Massachusetts by an ad valorem duty upon tacks that is too low for protection, and which will expose American manufacturers to injustice of undervaluation by foreign importers.

This bill provides for the importation of coal free of duty into the United States, and thus strikes a blow at American shipping and coastwise industry, which is now principally maintained by the coal interest.

And I have placed in my hand a memorial and resolutions passed against this bill by the Vessel Owners and Captains' National Association.

There is little doubt in my mind but that this bill, substantially as reported by the committee, will pass this Democratic House and Senate and be signed by Grover Cleveland and become a law, but I believe it is the duty of every Republican member of Congress to resist its passage by every means in his power.

There may be a slight improvement in business when the worst is known, when the uncertainty is removed and the policy of the Government is determined, until another Presidential election can be had; but there can be no permanent prosperity of the country while the present Democratic nightmare of free trade sits upon the vitals of the nation.

The Wilson law, at the longest, will be short lived; the baby's epitaph will fit this bill: "If I was so soon done for, what was I begun for?"

The country will have had an object lesson in Democratic control that will last the country another thirty years, and the friends of protection, the friends of the American agriculturist, the friends of the American manufacturer and American workman will surely elect the next national House of Representatives and the next President, and restore the country to the safe and Republican economic and financial policy under which we enjoyed for thirty years a marvelous growth and prosperity, unprecedented in the history of States and nations.

The following letter is a specimen of hundreds and untold thousands of letters that are being poured in upon members of Congress:

HAVERHILL, MASS., *January 6, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: Please do all you can to defeat the amendment or passage of the Wilson bill. It seems specially designed to annihilate values on all kinds of property, to destroy American industries, and to make American conditions for wage-earners impossible. The threat of its passage is shutting up our mills and workshops, shortening our hours of labor, cutting down our wages, and curtailing the farmers' market.

Respectfully,

GEORGE W. RUSSELL.

Would refer you to Gen. COGSWELL.

The following is a specimen of resolutions of boards of trade and commercial organizations all over the country being poured in upon members of Congress denouncing and protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill, and undoubtedly speaks the sentiment of these great organizations representing the business and commerce of the country:

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE, DREXEL BUILDING,
Philadelphia, January 5, 1894.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

At a quarterly meeting of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, held December 18, 1893, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the threatened radical modification by Congress of the existing tariff has caused and is causing widespread alarm and dismay among the industrial masses of the country, and general anxiety and distrust by the admission of wool, coal, iron ore, and other so-called raw materials to the free list, and by the sweeping reduction in rates of duty, and by the large substitution of ad valorem for specific duties; and

"Whereas the projected tariff bill now being prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, known as the Wilson bill, so far as the provisions of this bill have been given to the public, is intensifying alarm not only by its provisions, but by the uncertainty of the period when this bill, if enacted, shall take effect, is adding thousands to the already great army of the unemployed, creating deprivation and distress, which can not be easily relieved in the present depressed business condition of the country; and

"Whereas under the tariff system of the United States, which has existed since 1860, the unexampled prosperity of the nation can not be denied, and the threatened overthrow of such prosperity must not only be deplored, but condemned as rash and unjust; and

"Whereas the majority of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by continued and numerous amendments in the formation of the bill now about to be presented to Congress, show it is unsatisfactory even to its authors; and

"Whereas the apprehended passage of this unsatisfactory bill is throwing many thousands of the people out of employment, and compelling those

still employed to suffer great reduction in the wage received for their labor: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Philadelphia Board of Trade is unalterably opposed to the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Philadelphia Board of Trade the intended radical modification of the existing tariff is injudicious and unwise and must be condemned as tending to the destruction of industrial employment of vast bodies of the people, and so causing needless distress and hardship.

Resolved, That the executive officers of this board are requested to send the foregoing preamble and resolutions to Congress, and to urge our Senators and Representatives to oppose the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill as a measure destructive to the welfare of this nation.

[True copy.]

FREDERICK FRALEY,
President Philadelphia Board of Trade

Attest:
W. R. TUCKER.

Harmony, consistency, or unity is not expected in the Democratic party. The student of political history has only to turn back to the Congressional debates at the time the Republicans found it necessary to impose an income tax as a war measure to get money to carry on the war and save us a nation among the nations of the earth.

He will find that the Democratic party in Congress at that time denounced the income tax as inquisitorial, unconstitutional, and an outrage upon the private right of citizens.

It was then necessary as a war measure. There can be no justification of it in a time of profound peace. While one wing of the Democratic party is demanding this tax there is another wing that still adhere to their former position in regard to it.

The following quotations from leading papers of New York are fair illustrations, and undoubtedly voice the sentiment of the people in all the great centers of business and trade:

A HIGH-HANDED OUTRAGE.

[New York Herald.]

The majority of the Ways and Means Committee has committed the reckless blunder of deciding in favor of a sweeping general income tax.

Against such a monarchical, inquisitorial imposition American manhood would rebel and condemn to ignominy the political party responsible for it.

There is no earthly excuse for the tax, since it is as unnecessary for needed revenue as it is obnoxious. To inflict it upon the people without necessity or excuse would be nothing short of a high-handed outrage.

A FATAL MISTAKE.

[New York Times.]

After protesting for twenty years against the continued imposition of war taxes in time of peace, the Democratic party can not reimpose the most odious of the war taxes and escape general condemnation. To make a personal income tax a feature of the Wilson tariff bill is to commit one of those fatal mistakes of policy that drive a party from power or destroy it, just as some great indiscretion destroys a private reputation, or a wrong step brings down a financial house.

To begin with, the income tax was decided upon in the Ways and Means Committee against the judgment and votes of those members of the majority who represent the principles of the Democratic party that are vital, sound, and continuing; while the proposition obtained its support from those members who, while no doubt perfectly sincere, are all of them in greater or less degree, and some of them altogether, imbued with those errors of economic and financial doctrine that have robbed the Democratic party of the confidence and support of thousands of men who, on other grounds, would gladly act with it.

INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS ADVERSE TO THIS METHOD OF RAISING REVENUE.

Thomas G. Shearman: The last years of the American income tax were a carnival of fraud, perjury, and blackmail.

Marshall Field: Such a tax is an iniquity itself, and has no place on the statute books of such a country as this.

Edward Atkinson: The adoption of an income tax will necessarily destroy that party responsible for it, no matter what its merits in other respects may be.

John Claflin: An income tax in time of peace is a perfect outrage. I have talked with many of the big wholesalers in the dry goods district, and neither there nor elsewhere have I found a single man in favor of it.

David A. Wells: It seems hardly open to dispute that a general income tax, with such inquisitorial features as are essential to make it effective as a revenue measure, can not be successfully administered under a free and popular form of government.

William E. Gladstone: I believe it does more than any other tax to demoralize and corrupt the people. So long as you consent, without special purpose, to levy the income tax as a part of the ordinary and permanent revenue of the country, so long it will be vain to talk of economy and effective reduction of expenditure.

A PREMIUM ON PERJURY.

[New York Press.]

An income tax is class legislation of the worst sort. It assails the fundamental doctrines of Americanism. It puts a premium on perjury. It necessitates the employment of a vast army of spies and informers, commissioned to pry into every man's business and intrude in matters with which the Government has no right, under ordinary conditions, to interfere.

ITS POLITICAL EFFECT.

[Brooklyn Eagle.]

If the Democratic party tries to pass, or by a majority of its Representatives and Senators at Washington favors, an income tax bill, it will probably lose control of the next Congress and will certainly deserve to do so.

AD VALOREM VS. SPECIFIC DUTIES.

An examination of the tariff bill now before the House shows that three hundred and fifty-four items of this bill are put under ad valorem duties. The claim made by the majority of the committee that it is impossible to make equitable specific duties, is not borne out by the facts or experience, either in this country or in other countries.

As has been so forcibly pointed out by others, the injustice to our merchants and manufacturers from ad valorem duties grows out of the fact that they open the door for fraud in undervaluation, and are thus another link in the free-trade evils to which this bill proposes to commit the country.

The following table confirms my statement above:

TARIFFS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The following shows the number of articles on which duties are imposed by ten foreign countries:

England imposes duties on 38 articles.
France imposes duties on 619 articles.
Austria imposes duties on 397 articles.
Russia imposes duties on 440 articles.
Sweden imposes duties on more than 300 articles.
Denmark imposes duties on 63 articles.
All the above duties are specific.
Germany's tariff makes 434 articles dutiable, and imposes specific duties on all but two.
Italy's tariff covers 837 articles, and on all but one the duties are specific.
Norway collects customs on more than 500 articles, and the duties are specific, except in six instances.
Spain with 369 articles on its tariff imposes an ad valorem duty on but one.
The above shows that out of more than 3,937 duties only 10 are on an ad valorem basis.

Thus it will be seen that this bill proposes to do indirectly, through the medium of undervaluation, what a majority of the committee have not the courage to do openly.

This bill by its extensive changes from specific duty—that is, by a duty by the piece, by the dozen, by the pound, by the cubic foot—to ad valorem duty, that is a percentage of the value fixed upon the goods by the exporter or importer, admitting of fraud in undervaluation. While it appears to afford protection and has the appearance of continuing something like the duty of the McKinley bill, as a matter of fact it throws down protection and exposes our manufacturers to cruel and unjust foreign competition.

Such a thing as consistency in the Democratic party is not looked for or expected. For thirty years they have repeatedly occupied the camp of the Republican party of previous Administrations.

The following quotation from Secretary Manning's report of 1886 shows the attitude of the Democratic party at that time as hostile to ad valorem duties:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestably, they are even notoriously, inherent in that system.

And again, in 1888, Secretary Fairchild urged and demanded that when changes were made in duties they should be in the direction of substituting specific for ad valorem duties. This is what Secretary Fairchild said in 1888:

The high ad valorem tariff of the last quarter of a century has been the fruitful cause of devices to gain improper advantage at the custom-house. It is, therefore, desirable that in revising and reducing rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem, so far as the nature of the merchandise will admit.

That this bill is drawn in the interest of foreign and English manufacturers you have only to examine the files of English papers to discover. The Manchester (England) Courier says that the Wilson bill is "much more thorough than the most sanguine people on this side ventured to anticipate." It certainly is a good bill for people on that side.

I will insert in my remarks as germane to this discussion a letter from the author of the McKinley bill, giving his reason for protective policy and the protective bill which it is now proposed to repeal:

WHY M'KINLEY IS A PROTECTIONIST—COMPARISON WITH A REVENUE TARIFF.

I am a protectionist because I believe the protective system is best adapted to our conditions and citizenship. It does everything which a revenue tariff can do and vastly more. It supplies needed revenue—a revenue tariff can do no more. It accomplishes this end with equal if not greater certainty than a revenue tariff, and while doing this it widely discriminates in favor of American interests and is ever mindful of the welfare of the American people. It protects our own products against those of the alien and the stranger, while the domestic consumer is secured reasonable prices through domestic competition. It diversifies the employments and multiplies the opportunities of our people, secures an unrivaled home market for agriculture and unrivaled wages for labor. It encourages skill and genius to their highest activity and under its operation we have reached the foremost rank in invention and mechanism and the widest individual and national prosperity. It favors the United States and is the true friend of every American girl and boy struggling upward. It builds up; it never pulls down.

W. MCKINLEY, JR.

To sum up, the purpose of the pending bill is to relieve foreigners from paying the duties upon goods which they import into this country in competition with American goods, and to impose new and odious taxes upon our own people to make up the deficiency. And pray what benefit will free wool, free coal, and free iron ore be to the section of country which I represent, if the same legislation which gives it destroys the home market and deprives our manufacturers of an opportunity to dispose of their finished products?

The following anteconvention utterances of distinguished Democrats in 1892, in the light of the events of the past year, sound like the voice of prophecy, and I commend these prophecies, which are now history, to the thoughtful and serious consideration of Congress and the country:

I have frequent misgivings as to the wisdom of again putting me in nomination.—*Grover Cleveland.*

Grover Cleveland is the only man that could have led us to disaster.—*Senator Blackburn.*

Nominate Mr. Cleveland, and we march—through a slaughter house into an open grave.—*Henry Watterson.*

Mr. Cleveland by his message, for which I honor him, has challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination.—*Senator Vest.*

Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt about the above utterances of distinguished Democrats being history that doubt will be entirely removed to the country and the world at the next Congressional and national election. [Laughter and applause.]

And I bid my distressed countrymen who are now suffering from Democratic rule, incompetency, and inefficiency to be of good courage. The country has learned a lesson that will not be forgotten by the living generation.

Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.

The country will surely again return to the economic and financial policy of the Republican party, and the greatest Republic of all history, the Republic upon whose dominions the sun never sets, because evening twilight in Alaska gilds the rock-bound coast of Maine with the rays of the morning sun. I say this greatest Republic of all history, when the present Democratic nightmare shall have passed away, will again under Republican rule enter upon a history of glory, prosperity, and development unequaled in our past glorious history. [Applause].

And I conclude these remarks with the prayer of Daniel Webster at the laying of the corner stone of this extension to the Capitol, July 4, 1851, as follows:

And all here assembled, whether belonging to public or private life, with hearts devoutly thankful to Almighty God for the preservation of the liberty and happiness of the country, unite in sincere and fervent prayers that this deposit and the walls and arches, the domes and towers, the columns and entablatures now to be erected over it may endure forever. God save the United States of America.

[Loud applause onthe Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BELL of Texas said: Mr. Chairman, the effect of tariff charges, or import duties, has probably been the theme of more thorough, exhaustive, and able discussions than any economic question which has engaged the attention of students, scholars, or statesmen, and it is impossible that anything could be added to the strength of the arguments with which the advocates of the conflicting theories on that subject have supported their respective positions; but the greatly improved methods of collecting statistics and the valuable experience of various countries under the different systems in recent years has rendered it possible to demonstrate the correctness of opinions which could formerly be upheld only by the force of reasoning.

In the remarks which I am about to sumbit I will not stray from the beaten paths, but I hope to be able to elucidate the subject under consideration by referring to and commenting upon certain facts and figures which were not available in previous discussions.

When individuals organized themselves into societies they conferred upon their government the right to take such portion of their property as might be necessary to enable it to execute the purposes for which it was formed. This is the power of taxation. It is an attribute of sovereignty, and one which is essential to the very existence of governments. The method of exercising this power by the imposition of imposts upon imports is called a tariff. There is no doubt of the authority of our Government to resort to this means of raising the revenue with which to meet its legitimate expenses, and it is generally conceded that no method has yet been devised by which the burdens of taxation can in this country be more equitably distributed than by a tariff when properly adjusted.

The question therefore naturally arises, in what way and for what purpose should the duties upon the importation of commodities be levied?

There are two kinds of tariff: one for revenue, and the other for protection. A tariff for revenue is one where the tolls are sufficiently low to permit the sale of imported goods without a loss. A tariff for protection is one where the tolls are so high as to prevent, under ordinary circumstances, the sale of imported goods without a loss.

If an article on which imposts are levied is imported, the duty collected passes into the national Treasury, and the consumer contributes to that amount to the support of the Government. This is a tax.

If an article on which an impost charge is levied is not imported, no revenue is derived from it; and the increased price which the consumer has to pay for it, in consequence of his not being allowed to buy in a cheaper market on account of the duty, is not a tax, but is a donation under the forms of law of the property of the purchaser of the article to its original owner. This is so abhorrent to our ideas of justice, and is so foreign to our conceptions of the proper functions of legislation, that, stripped of all collateral considerations, no one could be found to defend it; but, say its advocates, "the good results which follow and flow from a protective tariff more than compensate for its inherent injustice and admitted evils," and they cite the enormous accumulation of wealth in this country in support of their position. If the wonderful development of our resources in the last thirty years is attributable to the operation of the protective system which has prevailed during that time, it affords a strong argument in its favor; but if it can be shown that we have grown great in spite of that system, and that in consequence of it some sections and classes had prospered at the expense of other sections and classes, then no excuse can be found for its continuance.

Let us, then, see what has been the effect of our tariff laws. While legislation can not create property, it can transfer its ownership. I will illustrate this by taking, as an example, a pair of shoes which if purchased in England would cost, landed at New York, $1. The duty on them would be 25 cents. The purchaser of the shoes would have to give $1.25 for them. If he should buy the imported shoes, the Government has taken 25 cents of his money for its own purposes. If he should buy a similar pair of domestic make at, say, $1.20, the laws have taken 20 cents of his earnings and given it to another. It is entirely immaterial, so far as this branch of my argument is concerned, whether the additional 20 cents which the purchaser has been compelled to pay in consequence of the tariff charges inures to the ultimate benefit of the manufacturer or his employés.

The point I make is that the ownership of the 20 cents has by legislation been changed from the purchaser of the shoes to the manufacturer. I have not been able to learn the value of the boots and shoes which are consumed by the 65,000,000 people in the United States; but, as shown by the census of 1880, their value for that year was $193,477,412, and at the present time it certainly could not be less than $300,000,000 per annum. Of course, the cost of these articles is not enhanced by the tariff quite to the extent of the impost charges on them, for if so they would be imported; but the Statistical Abstract shows that the value of the boots and shoes imported for 1891 was $74,567.38; for 1892, $90,578.89, and for 1893, $95,662.42.

The duty on boots and shoes, as I have stated, is 25 per cent ad valorem, and the manufacturers tell us that they can not afford to make them if the tariff is reduced. This indicates that the cost of these articles is increased nearly to the amount of the duty by it. But, to be perfectly conservative, let us assume that we only have to pay 5 per cent more on the first cost of our boots and shoes than we would if it were not for the tariff. The people of this country, then, pay $15,000,000 per annum bounty on their boots and shoes, and the Government receives from the tariff which renders this necessary less than $25,000 in taxes.

It would not be practicable in the limited time which I am allowed to consume under the rules to investigate many of the items which are subjected to tariff charges; but at the risk of being tedious, I wish to consider its effect on a few more articles, and in doing so I will select those which are in the most common use. The duty on nails, spikes, and tacks ranges from 1½ to 4 cents per pound, being equivalent to an ad valorem charge of from 30 to 107 per cent, and the value of them imported during 1890 was $2,728.15; for 1891, $3,046.34; for 1892, $3,552.94. I am informed by the officers of the Census Bureau that the value of the nails manufactured by the establishments engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel during the census year was $12,333,603, but that as many establishments make nails that do not manufacture iron and steel, the actual output of nails in this country will largely exceed that amount.

It may be, then, safely assumed that the value of the nails, spikes, and tacks annually consumed in this country amounts to $30,000,000. The average import charges on these items is 48 per cent; but if the manufacturers realized only 10 per cent more for them than they would if it were not for the duty, they received $3,000,000 bounty on the nails, spikes, and tacks used by the people of the United States for the year 1892, while the Government obtained in taxes from the tariff on these articles $1,316.

On common screws the duty ranged from 5 to 14 cents per pound, or from 46 to 110 per cent ad valorem, and yet, during the year 1892 there was absolutely none imported. I have been unable to obtain any estimate of the value of the screws manufactured in this country, but for the year 1880 it was $2,184,894. If there has been no increase in the output of this industry, and if the cost of the screws was increased only 10 per cent by the tariff charges on them, the manufacturers collected a bounty of $218,489 from our people on this item, while the Government did

not receive a cent of revenue from the tariff charges which rendered this possible.

Of course the articles which I have been discussing present extreme cases or there would be very little income obtained from the tariff, while as a matter of fact most of our revenue is derived from that source. But it is a notable fact that on almost all the articles which the necessities of the people compel them to have, the tariff charges are at present so high as to be prohibitory, but to make the injustice of the laws complete, on those articles which people buy only because they feel able to do so they are sufficiently low (as they should be on everything) to render it profitable to import them, and hence the purchasers are not deprived of the benefit of competition between home and foreign producers.

For instance, during the year 1892, the customs collected on wool hats amounted to $9,864.83; on silks, to $16,965,637.03; on blankets, to $4,872.48; on wines, to $5,058,661.71. In other words, the tariff on most of the necessaries of life is prohibitory, while on the luxuries it is on a revenue basis.

By the census it was ascertained that the value of the manufactured goods of domestic make subject to duty consumed by the people of the United States was annually in 1870, in round numbers, $3,000,000,000; in 1880, $6,000,000,000, while it is supposed that for 1890 the amount will exceed $8,000,000,000. If the average annual consumption of the protected articles for the past twenty years has been $6,000,000,000, the total for that period would be $120,000,000,000. The average of the imposts levied has during all that time exceeded 40 per cent ad valorem, but if the first cost of the goods was enhanced by them only 10 per cent, the bounty which one class of our citizens—the manufacturers—have been able to collect under the forms of law in the last twenty years, amounts to $12,000,000,000, and yet during the same time the Government collected from the tariff which enabled them to do so only $3,746,173,761.09, and nearly all of this from such luxuries as silks, wines, tobacco, diamonds, etc.

It will be observed that I have not been discussing the question as to the additional amount the consumer has been compelled to pay for the protected domestic products in consequence of the tariff charges, for that will be much more than the bounty which goes to the manufacturers. Every one who handles anything until it reaches the person who buys it for actual use will expect to make a profit on his entire investment which, in the case of a protected article, will include what might properly be called its legitimate cost and also the bounty paid on it. If, therefore, the wholesale merchant has to give $110 for goods which he could get for $100 but for the tariff, he will charge a profit on the $100 and also on the $10, and the retail merchant will charge a profit on the entire amount which he has paid the wholesale merchant, which will include the bounty and the profit on the bounty.

I am not sufficiently familiar with, and have not been able to learn enough about the per cent which the merchants add to the cost of the goods which they sell to enable me to form any satisfactory estimate of the profit on the bounty on the $120,000,000,000 worth of goods of domestic make consumed by our people in the last two decades, but it must be enormous.

If all of our citizens were engaged in avocations which enabled them to receive equal advantages from the imposts levied neither injury nor benefit would result from them; but a large majority of the inhabitants of this country can not, in the very nature of things, be profited by a tariff, because there is a surplus of what they produce, which must be exported. While the population, as shown by the census of 1890, has been made known, the number following the different pursuits has not yet been ascertained; but it may be safely assumed that the proportion of those engaged in the various callings is about the same as in 1880.

At that time, of the 17,392,099 of our people who were engaged in all kinds of business, 2,623,089 were employed in such manufacturing industries as it was claimed were benefited by a high tariff. Of the others 7,670,493 were employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal service, 1,800,258 in trade and transportation, and the butchers, carpenters, blacksmiths, tailors, masons, bakers, and persons in similar avocations numbered 1,214,023. To put it in another form: one-seventh of the laboring population of this country is engaged in industries which are supposed to be benefited by a protective tariff, while six-sevenths are employed in those which can not receive any advantage from tariff charges.

I will illustrate this by taking the case of a farmer, though the same thing is applicable to the lawyer, the doctor, the blacksmith, the carpenter, the railroad employé, and most others. It is a familiar maxim of political economy that the surplus of a commodity regulates its price. There is a duty of 20 cents a bushel on wheat. If last year we had not produced as much wheat as our necessities required, the growers could, and would, have held their crops until the price advanced to a point nearly equal to the value of the foreign article plus the transportation charges and impost duties. The tariff on wheat would then have benefited the wheat-raiser; but, as a matter of fact, we produced over 150,000,000 bushels more wheat than we could consume.

The owners of it were compelled to find a market for this surplus in some other country or allow it to go to ruin on their hands. When they sent it abroad they had to sell it in competition with the products of the foreign growers of similar produce. If the price obtained for the wheat sent abroad had been such as to realize to the shipper $1 per bushel, after deducting the charges on it, competition amongst the home buyers would have fixed the value of that which was consumed here as well as that which was to be exported at $1 per bushel, but when the consumers of wheat in foreign countries could obtain the supplies they needed from other sources at such prices that after deducting the charges only 60 cents per bushel could be realized for our wheat sent abroad, the price of that consumed in this country, as well as that exported, was correspondingly reduced.

This shows clearly that a tariff on an article can not enhance its price as long as there is more of it in the country levying the tariff than is needed there: and this is the case with nearly everything the farmers produce, such as cheese, butter, beef, bacon, lard, corn and other breadstuffs, cotton, etc. The farmer, then, must have the price of his products fixed in the foreign market, where he must come in competition with those who have been permitted to buy in a cheap or unprotected market. That is, the farmers in this country have been compelled, by the tariff, to pay, say, 10 per cent more than their competitors for all the articles covered by it which they and their families use.

I presume it will be admitted that the farmers work harder, live more economically, and utilize the services of their families to a greater extent than do any other class, and they might, therefore, reasonably expect that, at least, an equal proportion of the accumulating capital of the country would fall to their share; but as there has been for a number of years a protective tariff on nearly everything which they buy, if the theories I have been advancing are correct, this has not been the case.

The only benefits which it is claimed that the farmers derive from protection is that it is supposed to provide a market for such things as will not bear long shipments, like milk, vegetables, fruits, etc., and that it saves them freights on their other products. As most of the manufacturing establishments are located in New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, the farmers of that section would, if this is correct, receive the greatest benefit from our tariff system. The statistics collected under the census of 1890 have not yet been compiled, but I have been able to procure returns as to most of the States, and they disclose some startling results. While the assessed valuation of the property in the ten States which I have just named increased from 1880, when it was $9,094,289,423 to $12,403,167,633 in 1890, making an actual increase of $3,308,878,210, the value of the farm lands, including the fences and buildings on them, in the same States, decreased from $3,930,930,755 in 1880 to $3,585,938,744 in 1890, showing a net loss of $344,992,011.

The value of farms, like all other property, is regulated by their productive capacity. If a farm could be made to yield a revenue of 10 per cent per annum on the amount invested in it, after deducting all expenses, it would be worth just twice as much as if it could only be made to realize a net profit of 5 per cent. So, when we find that the value of the farms in the States spoken of have decreased as they have, we must look to the profits derived from them to account for the loss in their value.

In 1880 the value of the productions on the farms in the ten States that I have named was $597,557,645, while in 1890 their value had decreased to $551,541,564, making a net decrease of $46,016,081. And yet, during this time the value of the implements and machinery used on these farms had increased from $137,604,606 in 1880 to $146,343,598 in 1890, making a net increase of $8,738,992, and the value of the live stock on them from $389,848,579 in 1880 to $430,084,194 in 1890, making a net increase of $40,135,615. It will be seen, then, that while the owners of the farms in the section of the country upon the growth of which I have been commenting have had $48,000,000 more invested in machinery and live stock with which to make a profit on their holdings in 1890 than they had in 1880, still they actually realized $46,000,000 less on them than they did in 1880. There must be some reason for this deplorable state of affairs. It can not be possible that such an avocation as that of farming could grow less profitable each year without some cause.

It may be said that there was no possibility of an advance in farm values in these States because the farm lands were thoroughly developed in 1880. This would prove a reasonable explanation of the fact that there has been no great increase in the value of the farms, but it can not account for an actual decrease in their value. It must be observed, too, that I am not arguing here

simply that the farmers are not receiving a just proportion of the increasing capital of the section of the country in which they are located, but I am showing that they have actually been suffering a loss. What explanation can be offered for this? When one class is less prosperous than another there must be some discrimination against it; and when we find that the farmers in the most favored region of the Union are not only not receiving any of the augmenting wealth of the country, but have been failing to keep what they had previously accumulated, we know that they must be laboring under some unnatural disadvantage.

What is this disadvantage? It can not be that the farmers, of whom I have been speaking, have been suffering from an insufficient volume of circulating medium with which to transact their business, because everyone knows that there is and has been an absolute plethora of money in the States where they live, and, besides, if that was the trouble, it would have affected all of those in the same section who are engaged in other productive callings; but some of them have been wonderfully prosperous. It can not be that the pension laws, the operation of which bear so heavily upon some other sections of our country, have caused the misfortunes of those of whom I speak, for they are to a greater extent than any other class the beneficiaries of those laws. It can not be that they are less industrious than their neighbors, or that they are more extravagant in their habits or mode of living, for it will not be questioned but that the farmers are the most industrious and economical of our citizens.

The only discrimination against the farmer is that he is compelled under the tariff laws to buy in a protected or high market, while, from the nature of his calling, he is compelled to sell in an unprotected or cheap market. When, therefore, we reason from cause to effect, we necessarily conclude that those of the inhabitants of our country who are the recipients of governmental favors are prospering at the expense of those who are not, and the correctness of this conclusion is substantiated not only by a comparison of the accumulations of those engaged in the different callings during the same periods, but of those in the same callings at times when such discriminations did and did not exist. From 1850 to 1860 the tariff was nearer on a strictly revenue basis than at any time in our history, and during that decade the value of the farms in the ten States already named increased from $1,813,767,398 to $2,800,081,466, a net increase of $986,314,068, while all of the property in those States increased in value from $3,635,715,971 to $6,785,505,845. This shows that under that system each class received something like a just proportion of the aggregate earnings of the entire population.

But, convincing as are the figures I have just cited as to the injurious effects of our legislation upon a large class of our citizens, they are not more so than are the same character of statistics when extended to the entire country. According to the estimate of the Superintendent of the Census the wealth of the United States increased from 1880 to 1890, $20,000,000,000, while the value of the farms increased $3,080,000,000. During the same decade the value of the farm products increased $246,000,000, while the value of the farming implements and the live stock used on the farms increased $1,577,000,000. When it is remembered that those engaged in agriculture constitute about one-half of our population, it will be seen that there is for some reason a very uneven distribution of the accumulations of the wealth-producing forces of the nation. This was not the case formerly. Between 1850 and 1860 our country was not afflicted with a protective tariff, and the value of the property in the United States increased from $7,135,780,228 to $16,159,616,068, while the value of the farms increased from $3,271,575,426 to $6,645,045,007.

These well authenticated and undisputed statistics prove beyond controversy that under a low or revenue tariff those to whose energy and enterprise we are indebted for our marvelous growth, received the just reward of their toil and frugality, while under a high or protective tariff the fruits of their industry and economy are transferred to others.

But the protective system has not been more unjust or more discriminating in its operation upon individuals and classes than upon sections. From 1880 to 1890 the assessed valuation of property in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, the principal manufacturing States of the Union, increased exclusive of farming properties $1,529,442,166, while the assessed valuations in the agricultural states of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas increased, including farm values, city property, railroads, and everything else, only $1,428,969,834 during the same time, and yet the population in the sixteen States named increased 3,729,709, as against 1,430,981 in the two States.

When it is remembered that the inhabitants of these different sections are of similar intelligence, industry, and habits, it must be conceded that there has been some unnatural cause for the fearful disparity in their relative prosperity as shown by these figures. What can be this unnatural cause? I can imagine none except that those living in one section have been receiving the benefits of protection, while those living in the other have been suffering from its unjust and injurious operations.

I wish next to consider the effect of a protective tariff upon manufacturing enterprises, and in this connection I remind you that the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of America are preëminently a manufacturing people. From the first settlement of the country, equally with the sister arts of agriculture and commerce, our manufactures, without any adventitious aids, advanced with the increase of population. As early as 1708 complaint was made to the British Parliament by the English manufacturers that three-fourths of the linens and woolens used in the province of New York were made there, and similar complaints were subsequently preferred against the other colonies. It was the efforts of the mother country to suppress their growing manufactories more than anything else which caused our ancestors to withdraw their allegiance from her.

For the decade beginning 1850, during which a strictly revenue tariff prevailed, the value of the products of our manufactories increased from $553,000,000 to $1,009,000,000, or at the rate of 90 per cent, while our population increased only 35 per cent. So it appears that the development of our manufactories has been continuous regardless of tariff legislation. And why should not this be the case? Our mechanics are confessedly the most intelligent in the world. They use labor-saving machinery to a greater extent than do the mechanics of any other country. And, after all, the marvelous inventions of recent years have reduced the issue of competition to the question of who can utilize to the greatest advantage the most labor-saving machinery.

A very small proportion of the inhabitants of the earth are capable of using to any great extent the complicated machinery which is being made to do the work formerly done by human hands. It is for this reason that the artisans of the United Kingdom are able to supply with manufactured products the markets of nations which have far greater natural advantages.

I do not question but that protection enables manufacturers to obtain better prices for their products, if they do not produce more than enough to supply the home market, but I do deny that it promotes their permanent prosperity.

As I have already shown, if there is less of a commodity, on which there is a tariff, produced in a country than is consumed, the owners of it can realize for it the cost of similar products in other countries plus the transportation charges and nearly the amount of the duty. If, however, the supply should exceed the demand, competition amongst the owners of the commodity would cause the price to decline until they could only obtain the cost of their possessions and a reasonable compensation for the use of their capital invested and for their personal services. It is, therefore, to the interest of the manufacturers of any article which is subject to a duty to keep down such competition at home as would prevent them from realizing the full benefit of the tariff rather than to extend their business to the utmost limit and secure foreign markets for the surplus products of their industry.

Hence it is that the manufacturers in so many lines have limited the output of their plants by the formation of trusts or the organization of combines. The effect of this on their employés I will discuss later on, but its injurious effect upon manufactories will be perceived at once. Instead of causing our manufacturers to strike out in manful strife and defiantly demand a share of the markets of the world it has caused them to content themselves with a monopoly of the markets of one country.

But we are told that our manufacturers can not compete with the English, and that if the tariff is materially lowered, they will be ruined. Let us see if their fears are well founded. The reason assigned by our manufacturers for their inability to compete with foreigners is because they pay higher wages to their employés. It is undoubtedly a fact that laborers of all kinds receive better compensation in this country than elsewhere, if we estimate it in money, by the week; but if we estimate their compensation by the results accomplished, then such is not the case. This is because of the greater intelligence and efficiency of our laborers, the more extensive use of machinery in this country, and the longer time which our mechanics work in a week. I will try to make this plain by illustrating with the boot and shoe industry, though what I say of it will apply equally well to others.

I find in Harper's Magazine a very well written article, in which an intelligent writer makes a careful estimate of the comparative labor cost in this country and in England of certain articles. The results of his investigations show as follows:

American ladies' shoes, wholesaling at $1.50 per pair, cost for labor of making, 25 cents; English-made ladies' shoes, wholesaling at $1.50 per pair, cost for labor of making, 34 cents; American-made men's shoes, wholesaling at

$2.60 per pair, cost for labor of making, 33 cents; English-made men's shoes, wholesaling at $2.60 per pair, cost for labor of making, 50 cents.

This corresponds with all the estimates I have seen on the subject. It shows that the American manufacturer actually obtains his labor for less than his competitor, and that in that respect he is prepared to successfully compete in the open markets with his rival. For the year 1892 we exported to the United Kingdom upper leather of the value of $3,379,659 and sole leather of the value of $4,314,121, while for the same period we imported from that country upper leather of the value of $9,927 and sole leather of the value of $20,783. This proves that leather is more costly in Great Britain than in the United States, for if it was not it would not be shipped from this country to that.

As leather is the only material used in making boots and shoes the cost of which is worth considering, it follows that the American manufacturer of those articles obtains his materials at least as cheaply as do those engaged in the same industry in England, and yet the value of the boots and shoes exported from the United States for the year 1892 was only $914,974, and the total value of all manufactures of leather $1,566,418, while there was exported from the United Kingdom for the year 1891 to Brazil alone manufactures of leather of the value of $1,299,961.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to remark to the gentleman that there is a reason why American manufacturers sell goods abroad cheaper than they do in this country, a reason which operates for the benefit of American workingmen, by allowing the manufacturers to work off their surplus products, and thus to give additional employment to their operatives, often upon newer styles of goods.

Mr. BELL of Texas. The gentleman misunderstood me. I was stating as a matter of fact that they do not send their goods abroad.

Mr. MORSE. Then I did misunderstand the gentleman.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I state that as a matter of fact the value of manufactures of leather sent abroad by the manufacturers of this country is only about a million and a half a year, while England sends to Brazil alone a million and a quarter of such manufactures.

Mr. MORSE. Well, Mr. Chairman, the argument is frequently made on the other side against protection that American manufacturers sell goods cheaper abroad than they do at home, and I wanted to explain that.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I do not care to yield for that purpose just now, because my time is so limited. I see that the gentleman has fallen into an error as to my line of argument.

When we consider that our manufacturers of leather have an advantage of others in the cost of material and in the relative labor cost, in what way can we account for their surrender of the valuable markets for their products except on the theory that they are limiting the output of articles in that line so as to prevent an oversupply in the home market? In other words, it appears that they prefer making fewer articles at a larger profit to making more at a less profit, even if the aggregate gain should be greater.

What is true with reference to the one industry of which I have been speaking is also true of most others. Formerly, when a very large part of the work was done by hand, the labor cost of the finished product represented a much larger proportion of the cost of the article than at present. The various items which go to make up the cost of the finished manufactured product is discussed very fully in the Report of Statistics of Labor for Massachusetts for the year 1890.

This is a very valuable work, and I expect to quote from it frequently. So far as I can discover it deals fairly and candidly with the subjects of which it treats. It certainly can not be suspected of any prejudice against protection, for the arguments in it are all in favor of a protective tariff, though, as I say, I think the facts and figures given are correctly stated. According to this report the labor cost of all the articles manufactured in Massachusetts at the time it was published was 24.87 per cent of the value of the finished product.

The cost of material in some industries is enhanced by the tariff while in others it is not, but the disastrous effects of protection, so far as our foreign commerce is concerned, extends to nearly every manufactured product. For instance, take the item of cotton goods. As we are the greatest cotton-exporting country our manufacturers can obtain their raw materials cheaper than can others. If there is any enterprise in which they ought to outstrip all competitors it is in this, and when they were not hampered by restrictive laws, and when their enterprize was not stunted by the unnatural advantages conferred upon them, they were rapidly doing so.

As I have frequently stated, between 1850 and 1860 we had a low or revenue tariff, but between 1880 and 1890 we had a high or protective tariff. The value of the manufactures of cotton exported from the United States increased from $4,734,424 in 1850 to $10,934,796 in 1860, while it decreased from $10,467,651 in 1880 to $9,999,277 in 1890. Hence, it is clear that under a low tariff we were rapidly becoming the great cotton manufacturing nation, but under a high tariff we have been losing the prestige we had gained. Why is this? Were the circumstances surrounding the industries materially different during the two periods? At each time we had an advantage in the cost of raw materials equal to the expense of shipping it across the ocean.

In the latter decade we had been paying higher wages than did our competitors, but so we did in the former. Our monetary standard was in each instance the same. So far as the volume of money can contribute to the prosperity of a people the advantage was all in favor of the later period, for the greatest circulation at any time from 1850 to 1860 was $12.85 per capita, while from 1880 to 1890 the lowest was $19.41. We did not suffer during either of the decades compared from any general plague or pestilence and we were at peace with the world.

The friends of the protective system attribute much of the growth of our manufactures between 1850 and 1860 to the fact that the European nations were engaged in the Crimean war during a part of that time. The Crimean war lasted from March, 1854, to April, 1856, while the growth of our manufactures and the expansion of our foreign commerce preserved about the same proportion each year for the entire decade, except that in 1858 they declined in consequence of the monetary disturbance of 1857. But it might be supposed that the other nations were manufacturing their cotton goods, and that that was the reason of the falling off in our exports in that line. In order to show that this is not the case, and also to show the extent of the markets we have surrendered, I will give the figures on the importations of a few countries.

The value of the manufactures of cotton imported for the year 1891 was, into Mexico from the United States, $602,382; from the United Kingdom, $2,772,506. Into Brazil from the United States, $803,700; from the United Kingdom, $12,499,274. Into the Argentines from the United States, $779,246; from the United Kingdom, $8,216,730. And the proportion is about the same when applied to the other importing nations. In what way can we account for the abandonment of these markets by our manufacturers except upon the theory that they find the monopoly of the home market so satisfactory that they supinely content themselves with it.

What is true of the two industries which I have used as illustrations is true of most others; but I think a comparison of the growth of those I have mentioned under the different systems of tariff charges will suffice to refute the claim that our manufactories have been in any way benefited by protection.

But there is one other industry to which I desire to call special attention. There had been a tariff of 20 per cent on quinine prior to July, 1879, when it was placed on the free list. I have been unable to obtain any information of the amount of quinine manufactured in the United States at any time, because, in taking the census, it is not separated from certain other medicines, but it is manufactured from cincona and other barks, none of which are found in this country, and since an accurate account is kept of all importations, and since the barks to which I have referred are not used for any other purpose except to convert into quinine, we can calculate with reasonable certainty as to the amount of quinine manufactured at different periods. There was imported of the barks which I will designate under the general head of cincona, in 1876, 5,280,150 pounds; in 1877, 1,760,445 pounds; in 1878, 4,826,290 pounds; in 1879, 6,387,378 pounds.

This will afford some idea of the extent of the industry we are considering at the time of the repeal of the law imposing a tariff on its products. While the bill to repeal the duty was pending the usual cry of the beneficiaries of governmental favor was raised, and a doleful picture of the ruin which was about to be inflicted upon them was drawn; but, nevertheless, we find that about the same output of quinine from the American factories has continued. The cinchona imported for 1880 was 6,013,877 pounds; for 1881, 4,219,403; for 1882, 5,010,547, and while for some years the amount imported has been less, and for others more, the average has been greater since the tariff on quinine was repealed than before, which shows that the manufacturers of quinine in this country have been, and are, able to compete with foreign manufacturers. And they have been doing so in spite of the most unjust discriminations, for on the alcohol used by them in the process of manufacturing they have had to pay an internal-revenue tax equivalent to $1.70 per gallon, while their European competitors obtained their solvents free of any similar charge.

It is a familiar claim of the protectionists that the prices of protected products are lower than they were formerly because of protection. They argue that because steel rails were selling at $120 per ton when the law was passed which imposed a very heavy duty on rails, and are now selling at $29 per ton, the reduction was caused by the stimulation in the production of the

rails occasioned by the duty on them. If this theory be correct how are we to account for the decrease in the price of quinine? As I am informed by the Statistician of the Treasury Department, that in 1877, quinine commanded $4.50 an ounce; in 1878, $3.60; in 1880, $2.50; while in 1890 it could be obtained for 44 cents an ounce. As a matter of fact the decline in the price of quinine was occasioned by the improved methods of making it and by the great decline in the cost of cincona, and was not affected by the tariff. The same thing is true as to steel rails and other protected products.

But whatever may have been the cause of it, it is an undoubted fact that the ability of the American people to produce has outgrown their capacity to consume. We must, therefore, either find foreign markets for our manufactured goods, as we have for our agricultural products, or we must be content to not only not extend our manufactures, but to abandon some of those we now have. The suggestion that we ought to continue any policy which would retard our industrial development ought to be received with no favor by a people whose energy, ingenuity, and enterprise in peace has only been equaled by their valor and patriotism in war.

It was to have been expected that the efforts to reduce the tariff to a revenue basis would meet with opposition from those who have been accustomed to look to the Government instead of to rely upon themselves to promote their prosperity. And here history but repeats itself. The reforms in her tariff which enabled the United Kingdom to become the unquestioned commercial nation of the world were effected after the most stubborn contest, and yet no party which would suggest a return to the old system could now obtain a following in that country. When the low tariff of 1846 was proposed, the same cries which now fill the land were heard on every hand. It was said that the passage of that law meant the destruction of our manufactures, the debasement of our labor, and the general ruin of our country. Every representative of the four principal manufacturing States of New England voted against it. After the beneficial effects of the change had been demonstrated when in 1857 a proposition was made to reduce the duties still further, practically all the representatives of those States favored it. Mr. Blaine, in his history, says:

> This act (the tariff act of 1857) was well received by the people, and, indeed, was concurred in by a considerable portion of the Republican party.

May we not reasonably hope that when the beneficent results which will flow from the adoption of the policy of the party now in power manifest themselves we will have the earnest coöperation of the bitterest opponents of the measure under discussion in making the further reduction in our tariff rates which will surely follow?

I do not contend that protection inures to the advantage of those engaged in all kinds of protected industries, for the experience of the past clearly demonstrates that it does not. This is particularly the case with the wool-grower, as will be shown by comparing the prices obtained for their clip in this country at different times and the amount realized here and in England for the same grades of wool at the same time.

This subject was thoroughly investigated by the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fifty-second Congress, and the result was embodied in a very interesting report. There had never been a high tariff on wool in this country prior to 1867, when the duty was fixed at from 10 to 12 cents per pound and at 10 to 11 per cent ad valorem, and while the rates have been slightly changed at different times since, they have always been very great; yet, as is shown in the report to which I refer, the average price realized for fine washed clothing wool for the ten years ending with 1860 was 50.8 cents per pound, and for coarse washed clothing wool was 38.2 cents per pound, while for the ten years ending with 1890 the average price realized for fine washed clothing wool was 34.1 and for coarse washed clothing wool 24.4 cents per pound.

Perhaps no better illustration could be given of the impracticability of forcing people into any calling by law than that which sheep husbandry affords. In 1868, when the high tariff on wool went into effect, there were in the United States east of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers 37,864,600 sheep, and this number has decreased year by year until in 1891 there were in these States only 18,476,400. It will be observed that the time selected for making this comparison could not be more favorable for the sheep business, because the States referred to included those which had suffered most from the ravages of war, and in 1868 they had not had time to recuperate and regain their normal supply of sheep, and they accordingly show an increase, which, however, is more than offset by enormous decrease in the other States.

The showing in some of the States and Territories where they could obtain the free use of Government land is much better. For instance, in Montana the number of sheep increased from 2,000 in 1870 to 2,000,000 in 1891, and in Utah the increase for that time was about the same. The total number of sheep in the United States in 1868 was in round numbers 39,000,000, and in 1891 41,000,000. In other words, while the population of this country has about doubled in the last twenty-four years, the number of sheep has increased only 4,000,000.

The theory on which protectionists formerly justified their doctrine was that they were in favor of fostering infant industries until they could meet foreign competition. The wool-growers have had the benefit of the highest protection for twenty-four years, and yet the price of their product has been growing lower and the number of their sheep, except in a few favored localities, has been growing less all the time. When we had no or a low tariff on wool the increase in the number of sheep kept pace with the increase of population. Since we have had protection the number of sheep, in proportion to our population and the price realized for wool, have both decreased. Why is this? Like every result there is a cause for it, which we can find if we will investigate carefully.

The report of the committee to which I have referred shows the relative price in this country and in England of washed wool of the grades grown in the United States from 1867 to 1891. The average for the whole time was in England, where there has been no duty on it, 41.08 cents per pound; in America, where there has been a high duty all that time, it was 41.48 cents per pound; but most of the time the price in Philadelphia and Boston was less than in London. At first sight this would seem somewhat singular, but the reason for it is susceptible of a satisfactory explanation. We only grow one grade of wool in the United States, and in order to render that suitable for manufacturing into most kinds of woolen goods it is necessary to mix it with certain coarser grades of wool, which must be imported. The duty on this is so great that the American manufacturer of woolen goods is absolutely barred out of foreign markets.

There is, therefore, no demand here for more wool than enough to make the product sufficient for our local wants, and since the supply of the kinds of wool grown in this country exceeds the demand for it it follows that its price is fixed by the amount which could be realized for it in a foreign country. That is, the seller would not take less for it than he could obtain for it by shipping it abroad, and the purchaser not being compelled to have it will not give more. Of course the same law of supply and demand which regulates the price of everything else affects the price of wool, and hence we find that sometimes when the supply is limited and the demand great the wool-grower realizes an enhanced price for his product in consequence of protection.

For instance, during the years 1871 and 1872, owing to the temporarily increased demand occasioned by the tariff of 1867, the average price of American wool in Boston was 10 cents per pound greater than was the price of the same grade of wool in London; while if we except these two years the average price for the remaining twenty-two years between 1867 and 1891 has been greater in London than in Boston. If the wool-growers could organize a trust and limit the quantity of wool produced, or withhold it until the manufacturers were compelled to buy, they could realize for it the price of the foreign article, plus the transportation charges and nearly the amount of the duty on similar wool; but, as it is impossible for them to do so, whenever they grow more wool of any kind than is needed in this country, the competition between the sellers of it reduces the price. This seems to be a sufficient explanation of the well-established fact that wool commanded a better price in this country under a low than under a high tariff, and that its average price has been about the same in Boston where we have had a high tariff, as in London where they have had none.

But, it may be asked, why has not the consumption of wool increased in proportion to the growth of our population? The answer to this is very clear. In consequence of the high price of woolens in comparison with other things the poorer class of our people have been using other kinds of goods and our manufacturers have been using substitutes for wool. As an evidence of this, look at the development of the shoddy industry, a business which would perhaps never have had an existence, and which certainly could never have attained its present proportions but for the exorbitant price which our manufacturers have obtained on their woolen goods. The value of the manufactures of shoddy in the United States increased to $9,208,011 in 1890, from $1,767,592 in 1870. There was grown in the United States for 1890 only 92,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, and there was used during the same year in the manufacture of woolen goods in this country 61,626,261 pounds of shoddy. When it is considered that shoddy is only one of the substitutes for wool which is used in the manufacture of woolens the decreased demand for wool will be readily understood.

But there is another reason—and, in my judgment, a convincing one—why protection can not permanently benefit the wool-grower. Woolen goods are so indispensable not only to the

comfort, but to the health of those living in the latitude covered by the United States, that there never can be a permanent policy adopted which does not procure for our people the best goods for the least money. If, therefore, the tariff on wool enhanced its price there would be a continual agitation at each election for the repeal of the duty on it which would keep the industry in such a state of uncertainty that no wool-grower could make a reasonably accurate calculation on his income a year in advance.

This applies to all kinds of protected avocations, but to none with so much force as to wool-growing; because, owing to the absolute necessity for the use of woolens, the effort to have them cheapened will be so great, and because from the nature of their business the wool-growers can least of all guard against an oversupply of their products. If the manufacturers of woolens find that there is about to be a surplus of their outputs they can and do close down their mills until the stock on hand is reduced to such proportions as they desire, and the only loss they sustain in the meantime is the interest on their investment. On the other hand, the expense of the wool-growers is the same, regardless of the price they obtain for their wool; and if they realize that they are causing an overproduction of their product there is no way in which they can check it except by exterminating their flocks. If they attempt to do that there is an oversupply of mutton, and they can not sell their sheep. For these reasons I think it plain that protection has not and will not benefit the wool-grower.

The next point to which I wish to invite attention is as to the effect tariff charges have on the wages of those engaged in industries which are supposed to receive the benefit of protection. Of course the more the manufacturers realize for their products, the more they could afford to pay their employés; but manufacturers are like other people, and get whatever they have to buy as cheaply as they can and sell whatever they have to sell for as much as possible. It is conceded that wages are higher in the United States than anywhere else, and the protectionists claim that it is so because of protection. A complete answer to this is found in the fact that wages were much higher here than in foreign countries before our protective system was adopted, and are much higher in England, where they have free trade, than in Germany or France, where they have protection; but the truth is that wages are regulated by the supply of and demand for the service of the laborers.

If there were not enough mechanics in this country to do the necessary work in any particular trade, those who were here could command almost any price for their services until their high wages would cause their numbers to be increased by immigration or by others taking up their calling; but if a part of the mechanics could do the work in their line, the competition would cut down the price until the wages would become so low that a portion of them would have to seek other fields of employment. In this way the equilibrium between the demand for and supply of laborers is regulated. When it is considered that over one-half of the manual laborers in this country are engaged in agricultural pursuits, it will be perceived that anything which reduces the returns for agricultural services and diverts m ny from that calling must necessarily produce competition which will cause a reduction in the wages of those engaged in all the other avocations.

If, therefore, the farmers of this country were relieved of all unnecessary burdens, and allowed to buy their supplies where they could be had the cheapest, the increased profit of agriculture would enable laborers in all other callings to command better wages, and would result in loss to none except to those manufacturers who in consequence of protection have curtailed competition in the output of their products by the formation of trusts.

This proposition is too clear to admit of dispute or doubt, but I am prepared to support it, as I have all others that I have made, by an appeal to authenticated facts of history. I will present figures showing a comparison of the increase of wages during times when we had, and when we did not have, a high tariff, and also the increase in wages at the same time in countries where different tariff systems prevailed.

The report of the statistics of labor for Massachusetts for 1885 contains a comparison of the wages received in the United States at different periods in the various callings and brings the comparison up to 1883. As I have frequently stated, from 1850 to 1860 we had a low or revenue tariff, while from 1860 to 1883 we had a high or protective tariff. No periods could be selected which would have been more favorable for a comparison than those named, for the war between the States had not become a disturbing factor in 1860 and had ceased to be such in 1883. The increase of wages in most avocations was greater in the ten years when we had a low than in the twenty-three years when we had a high tariff.

I will give a few examples:

	1850.	1860.	1883.
Carpenters received for a day's work	$1.37	$2.03	$2.41
Glass-makers received for a day's work	2.44	2.96	2.01
Machinists received for a day's work	1.62	2.15	2.25
Painters received for a day's work	1.47	1.85	1.97
Shipbuilders received for a day's work	1.35	3.65	3.25
Tanners received for a day's work	1.13	1.67	1.86

These will suffice to show that the increase of wages has neither been dependent upon nor advanced by our protective system.

The report from which I have obtained these statistics shows that the wages of workmen in only three industries in the United States had declined in 1860 as compared with 1850, while the wages of workmen in 118 industries had declined in 1883 as compared with 1860. But it might be suggested that for some reason there was an abnormal increase in wages during the decade ending in 1860.

As a matter of fact, wages have shown an upward tendency from the earliest recorded time. The progress has been broken at intervals by calamities which have checked the onward current, but as soon as the financial embarrassments which seem to visit all countries with periodical regularity have ceased to exercise a depressing influence, the upward flow has continued. This will be made to appear very clearly by comparing the increase of wages in any one calling for a long period. I will take the wages of a blacksmith as an illustration. A blacksmith received for a day's work in 1820, 84 cents; in 1830, $1.12; in 1840, $1.40; in 1850, $1.47; in 1860, $1.69; in 1883, $1.92.

The experience of our country alone is sufficient to establish the correctness of the statement that wages have advanced, not in consequence of, but in spite of legislation; but this position can be fortified by comparing the increase of wages in other countries where they have had a different tariff system. The advance in wages in Great Britain, which had been continuous while they adhered to the protective system, was not only not checked but was accelerated when they embraced the more liberal doctrines of free trade.

In order to form a comparison of the growth of wages here and in Great Britain, the compilers of the excellent report to which I have referred investigated the wages paid in a given number of industries in the two countries from 1872 to 1883, and the result ascertained was that in 46.21 per cent of the industries investigated in Massachusetts there had been an increase of wages, while in 53.79 per cent there had been a decrease. In Great Britain in 44.42 per cent there had been an advance, and in 55.58 per cent there had been a decrease, but the average of all the wages in the callings investigated for the time mentioned showed an advance of 9.74 per cent in Great Britain, while in Massachusetts it showed a loss of 5.41 per cent.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Yes, sir; if it is not too long.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman's statement be true, how does he account for the petitions from all the workingmen of this country pouring in against this change in the tariff?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I do not concede that to be the fact at all. I understand that some of the working people of this country, so far as they can be threatened and coerced and bulldozed into it by the manufacturers, have sent in some such petitions. [Applause on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must remind visitors in the galleries that they are not at liberty to applaud. They are here by the courtesy of the House and must observe order.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to remark to the gentleman from Texas that I represented numerous petitions from workingmen who were not bulldozed.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Oh, I do not doubt that there may be individual instances of that kind.

Mr. MORSE. Petitions from half a million workingmen.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Well, there may be half a million even who have sent in such petitions; but, while that may be true, I dare say, it is also a fact that there are hundreds and thousands and millions of the working people of this country who have expressed themselves at the ballot box and elsewhere in favor of the reversal of the system under which we have come so near to ruin. The people of the country have expressed themselves in that way by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MORSE. Last fall? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BELL of Texas. Yes, last fall and the fall before, and time and time again in the past, as they probably will do very frequently hereafter, whenever an election is held presenting the issue on which the members of this House were elected. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, when it is remembered that in Great Britain they had no new land to be opened up and no new channels of employment into which their surplus labor could be diverted, as we have had, it will be perceived that a stronger showing than this could not be made against the restrictive system which we have so long maintained, as is now claimed in the interest of labor.

As I have stated, weekly wages have always been much higher in America than in England, but there are a number of differences in the economic conditions prevailing in the countries which render a comparison on this line very unsatisfactory. The American mechanic works 12 per cent longer on an average in a week than does his English rival, while he has much less steady employment. These two items alone are sufficient to prevent us from being able to determine absolutely the relative earnings of those engaged in the same lines of industry here and there, as expressed in money, but after all, it is not the rate of money wages which concerns the workmen so much, as what might be termed real wages, or the amount of subsistence obtainable for a given amount of labor.

If tariff charges do not enhance the price of products, they certainly do not benefit the manufacturer, and do not enable him to pay his employés better wages. If they do enhance the price of the finished products, the laborer has to pay more for the proportion of them which he consumes than does his competitor, and hence it is very doubtful if our mechanics do really receive better wages than do foreigners of equal skill engaged in the same callings. A strong evidence that they do not is found in the fact that very few mechanics immigrate to the United States. As our laws are much more liberal than those of other countries, especially in the educational advantages afforded the poor, if we were paying much better wages in mechanical pursuits than could be obtained elsewhere, we would receive a large immigration of skilled workmen; but nearly all of our immigrants are either farmers or laborers who engage in other avocations in which they can realize no benefit from protection.

Another consideration of the greatest importance to all persons, and particularly to those who must depend upon their wages to maintain themselves, is the steadiness of their employment. If a mechanic obtains a very high price for his work, but is idle most of the time, he will soon consume all he has earned while he was engaged. Manifestly the more extended the market the less likely it is to become oversupplied. There might be, and doubtless has many times been, more of a certain article produced than the whole world could consume; and in such case there is absolutely no remedy except to curtail production until the stock in existence is used up. In the mean time, those engaged in producing that commodity would have to remain idle or resort to some other employment. I have already shown how an oversupply of anything will prevent the owner of it from obtaining the benefit of the tariff on similar articles.

In order that they may realize the highest possible price for their products the manufacturers must keep the supply so limited that competition among themselves will not reduce it. When our manufactories were in their infancy and could not make as many goods as we needed, there was no occasion for our manufacturers to guard against an oversupply. Now, however, since they are able to turn out more than our people can use, whenever the quantity of their commodities is too large, instead of sending them to foreign markets, they close up their factories and throw out of work their employés. This same thing might happen if our markets were more extended, but it would be less likely to when we have access to the markets of the world for our manufactured products than when we are restricted to one market.

I think that I have shown very clearly that our protective system has not resulted, and can not result, in any advantage to the employés engaged in those industries which are supposed to be benefited by it. But if such was the case, and if every cent of the enhanced cost of the products of our factories caused by protection was paid directly to the laborers who made them, I would not abate one particle in my opposition to the system. If I should my memory would revert to the honest, patient, and laborious cotton-growers, working in an almost tropical sun, and requiring the assistance of all the members of their families, in order that they might overcome in the free markets of the world the competition of the poorest paid labor known to man. It seems as if the American mechanic would spurn the insinuation that he is unable to successfully contend with foreign competitors when his countrymen in other callings have under the most adverse circumstances, and in spite of the most oppressive governmental burdens, demonstrated their ability to defy all opposition. Let me show how this has been done.

Twenty-eight years ago the inhabitants of the cotton-growing section of the United States had just passed through the most disastrous experience with which any people have been afflicted in modern times. Their stock had been stolen or confiscated; their buildings burned; their fences destroyed; their farms turned into waste places. They had no supplies for the coming year and no credit with which to obtain them. Thousands and tens of thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, of the flower of the land had perished on the battlefield or wasted away in Federal prisons. Those who by education, intelligence, and experience were alone prepared to direct public affairs were disfranchised, and the most superstitious, ignorant, and easily imposed upon of people were invested with the ballot.

By a series of legislative enactments, the most cruel which have ever disgraced the annals of civilization, the management of their local concerns were turned over for years to unscrupulous adventurers, whose interest in those they governed was limited by the amount they could steal from them and from whose peculations more injury resulted than from the four years of relentless war. Thus handicapped the Southern people entered the race for supremacy in the production of cotton, and for the year 1868 grew 2,652,000 bales, while India, Egypt, and all other countries furnished 2,564,000 bales. It will be seen that we then supplied about one-half of the raw cotton for the world. Three years later the proportion had been slightly changed, for in 1871 the United States furnished 3,241,000 as against 3,036,000 supplied by all other countries. But the real struggle had hardly begun. Like the athletes of old, the Southern people girded up their loins for a renewed contest, and relying on their individual manhood, and looking to the Government for nothing, distanced all comers.

In 1881 they produced 6,073,000 bales of cotton, while all the other countries produced 2,500,000 bales, and still maintaining their lead in 1891 they furnished 10,800,000 out of a total supply of 14,190,000 bales. And yet we are told that the American laborer can not compete with foreigners. Pray, who are the American laborers if the cotton-growers are not? They have competed with foreigners and have taken from them their markets, and while they were doing so have been subject to the most grievous burdens. They have had to pay a bonus on the implements with which they cultivate their crops; on the machinery with which they rendered their cotton available, and on the very bagging and ties with which they prepared it for shipment. They have had to pay a bounty on everything worn or used by them or their families; on all materials used in building their houses, their barns, and their fences; and yet the value of the exports of the raw cotton produced by them from 1866 to 1893 was $5,925,932,320.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if those workingmen of whom he is speaking now have been sending up petitions against a change in the tariff?

Mr. BELL of Texas. They! No, sir; they are only sending such petitions as they have always sent, just asking us to give them a fair show and no favor. That is all in God's world they have ever asked or ever will ask. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I would like to ask the gentleman what rate of wages those men get who are employed in producing the cotton that competes with the cheap labor of India. And does the gentleman desire to reduce the intelligent white labor of this country to the same conditions that exist in India?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I will answer that. It is the intelligent white laborer that is now competing successfully in the markets of the world in the production of cotton.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. What rate of wages is paid to the labor which produces in the gentleman's State the cotton that comes into competition with the India cotton?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course, the wages paid there are just whatever——

Mr. DOOLITTLE. What rate of wages is paid per day or per month?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course, the men working on those farms get whatever——

Mr. DOOLITTLE. How much do they get per day or per month?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course, I am not prepared to answer such a question. I do not know precisely what they get. But I do know as a matter of fact that they have to pay 25 per cent tax on the shoes which they buy, a tax which goes not to the support of the Government, but to the manufacturer.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman be kind enough to answer my question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I am not able to do so in exact terms.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Does not the gentleman know it to be true that this labor in his State to which he has referred is not paid per month or per day the wages that is paid for the same kind of labor performed in the North and West by white men?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I suppose the wages are substantially the same, or the laborers in other sections would come to our country.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The same rate of wages?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Substantially. Of course, I do not suppose that farm laborers are paid so much anywhere in this country as skilled labor receives; but I suppose that farm labor throughout the country is paid about the same that is paid in the State of Texas.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Is it not true that such labor in your State is not paid more than $10 or $12 a month?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I think that is about correct.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I have heard it so stated here frequently by Representatives from your State.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. May I put an inquiry to the gentleman?

Mr. BELL of Texas. You may if you will be quick, for my time is very limited.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. Are the laboring men you speak of represented on the floor of this House?

Mr. BELL of Texas. They are. I presume the gentleman imagines that the laboring men who make cotton in Texas are colored people. If that is his supposition it is simply an illustration of the want of information which gentlemen on the other side have in regard to our affairs in the South. Let me say here that the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor has probably fewer colored voters in it than the district represented by any gentleman on the other side of the House. There is one county in my district which cast last year 3,500 votes, and which has not a single colored man in it. I do not mean to say merely that a colored vote was not cast, but that there is no colored man in the county; and that county shipped last year 25,000 bales of cotton. In the county in which I have lived for the last eighteen years there was only one colored man residing at the last election. I do not mean only one colored man voting, but only one living there. The ignorance of some gentlemen on the other side in regard to the condition of things in the South is a constant source of surprise to us.

Mr. Chairman, almost as good a showing as that which I have made for the cotton-grower can be made for the wheat-raiser of the Northwest, while the products of those engaged in these pursuits have never been enhanced one particle by protection.

But we are asked, Do not the farmers get what they have to buy cheaper than they formerly did? Our reply is, certainly they do: and if it is right that other people should receive all the benefits arising from the cheapening of products occasioned by the inventions of labor-saving machinery they have no right to complain; but the competitors of our farmers not only get their supplies for less than they formerly did, but as applied to those things which are subject to a protective tariff for less than our farmers can now obtain them, and certainly we ought not to longer continue a system which places at a disadvantage and renders harder the lot of those upon whom we all are ultimately dependent. As the price of the farmer's products is fixed in foreign markets we can not by legislation enhance it, but we can assist him to overcome competition there, by lessening the expense of production, and the only way we can do that is by reducing the cost of his supplies; but of this I desire to say more later on.

The doctrine of protection proceeds on the erroneous theory that every time people trade one party to the contract loses, when in fact the more they trade the richer they get if each receives from the other something he needs which it would have taken him longer to produce than it did to produce the article he parted with for it. When people are not hampered by restrictive legislation, and are permitted to trade where they can buy the cheapest, experience soon demonstrates where the various necessaries or luxuries of life can be produced with the least expenditure of labor, and they adapt themselves to the conditions prescribed by the laws of nature. Those I represent could, by some hot-house process, raise all the coffee they use, but since they can for less than one-tenth the cost raise other things which they can exchange for the coffee they consume, it would be foolish for them to do so.

It would be more absurd in detail, but not a particle different in principle, for our Government to attempt to coerce her citizens into growing their coffee than to try to force them to engage in any of the other unprofitable businesses. An industry which requires the assistance of protection is an unprofitable one, and if we take out of profitable employment a part of our citizens and put them at unprofitable work, those who remain in the profitable employment must support them. Hence it is that our agriculturists, being engaged in a business which is profitable, as theirs is, not on account of the large returns they receive, but on account of the economies they practice, are compelled not only to maintain their own business, but to contribute enough from their savings to render profitable the calling of others. Such an unjust and unnatural condition as this could not be productive of prosperity, and, unless my reasoning is very much at fault, it will be found that the growth of our country since we have had the protective system will not compare favorably with its development before we adopted it.

No periods could be found which would be more favorable for a fair comparison of the effects of the different tariff systems than the decades ending in 1860 and 1890. The low tariff of 1846 had time to be put into full operation at the beginning of the former and the high tariff had been in operation for years at the beginning of the latter. The economical conditions otherwise than as to the customs laws were very similar, as has been previously stated. I have already shown how under a low tariff our agriculture flourished, our manufactures prospered, our commerce extended, our wages advanced, and how the wealth of the country was somewhat evenly divided amongst those who created it. I have also shown how under a high tariff our agriculture faded, our manufactures languished, our commerce dwindled, our wages decreased, and how the wealth of the country became concentrated in the hands of the few.

I desire now to make a few final comparisons, but, before doing so, there is one other matter which ought to receive some consideration. As I have already stated, the wealth of the country increased during the decade ending in 1890 to the enormous amount of $20,000,000,000, and this fact is by some regarded as an evidence of the beneficial effects of protection, and we are asked why there was such an increase if the operation of a prohibitory tariff is as injurious as we contend that it is. Our reply is, that our resources are so bountiful and the energies of our people are so great that we have been prospering in spite of the difficulties under which we have labored. Our condition has been aptly likened to that of a spendthrift who has inherited a magnificent estate which yields an income larger than he can squander, and which continues to accumulate in spite of his extravagance. However, it is not the actual, but the relative increase which affords the proper basis of comparison to enable us to determine whether we have been augmenting our wealth more rapidly under the one system than the other.

Between 1850 and 1860 the aggregate wealth of the United States increased 126 per cent, while the population increased 35.58 per cent. Between 1880 and 1890, it increased 46 per cent, while the population increased 24.86 per cent. The value of the exports from the United States between 1850 and 1860, increased 130 per cent; between 1880 and 1890, 2½ per cent. This last statement seems almost incredible, and would, at least, raise a question as to whether there was not some unusual reason for so slight a gain in such an important item as that of our exports to foreign countries.

I, therefore, will extend the comparison. Between 1879 and 1889 the value of our exports increased 2.4 per cent, while between 1881 and 1891 it actually decreased 4.7 per cent. The value of the imports into this country increased from 1850 to 1860, 104 per cent; from 1880 to 1890, 18 per cent. In 1860 of the total imports into and the exports from the United States, 66.5 per cent was transported in our own vessels, while in 1880 only 17.4 per cent was, and in 1890 it decreased to 12.9 per cent, and in 1892 to 12.3 per cent, thus affording us abundant grounds for fearing that if our laws are not modified the American merchant marine, once the pride of every patriotic heart, will soon entirely disappear from the high seas.

But convincing as are these comparisons of the injurious results of the efforts of man to defy the laws of nature, they are not more so than was the condition in which our country was after a fair trial of the different tariff systems for a sufficient time to afford an opportunity for each to thoroughly demonstrate its effects. After fourteen years' experience under a strictly revenue tariff our people were fully and profitably employed, and the public countenance exhibited tranquillity, contentment, and happiness. It was this period which Gen. Garfield, in one of those speeches delivered in this House which so much added to his fame, described in this language:

> The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity.

Senator MORRILL one of the ablest advocates of protection, in a speech delivered in 1867, describing the condition of our country in 1860, said:

> And that was a year of as large production and as much general prosperity as any perhaps in our history.

What a contrast does this picture present to the enforced idleness, misery, and suffering which we now see on every hand. But some say that the stagnation prevailing in all kinds of business in our country is caused by the apprehended change in our tariff schedules, and much complaint is heard of those who are attempting to lessen the burdens under which we have been laboring so long.

If it be true that our disturbances are occasioned or aggravated by threatened legislation, it would be as unreasonable to blame those who are trying to make needed changes in our customs laws as it would be to blame the surgeon who applies the probe, and to allow the assailant who inflicted the wound to go without censure.

But are our troubles due to the causes assigned by those who are trying to defeat the reforms for which the American people have so overwhelmingly pronounced? From their statements one would imagine that until within the last ten months we had been in the enjoyment of unbounded prosperity, when, as a matter of fact, our ills are merely the culmination of troubles begun long before there was any reasonable prospect of early tariff reform, and when, in truth, the possibility of that reform was hastened, if not occasioned, by the prevalence of the hardest times and most universal suffering which had been experienced for years.

The McKinley tariff bill, under which the already exorbitant customs tolls were greatly increased, became a law in 1890, and it so stimulated the home industries that their output greatly exceeded the capacity of our people to consume them. The inevitable result was that the factories closed down, strikes ensued, riots followed, and the party to whose legislation this deplorable state of affairs was properly attributed met with the most overwhelming rebuke which had been administered to any political organization within the memory of man. These occurrences are of such recent date that it is, perhaps, useless to substantiate the statement which I have just made; but I will submit some evidence to establish its correctness. The extracts which I will read are taken from reliable journals.

January 14, 1892:

The mills of the Oxford Nail and Iron Company, of Oxford, N. J., have been shut down for over two months. It is a mystery how the people live. In many houses there has not been a coal fire for weeks. If something is not done soon families are likely to starve to death.

February 14, 1892:

Owing to continued depression in the iron trade the Chesapeake Nail Works, and the puddling department of the Central Iron Works shut down to-night, throwing between 200 and 300 men out of employment.

March 17, 1893:

Twelve iron furnaces at Birmingham, Ala., reduced wages 10 per cent on Tuesday, because of the low price of iron. The men accepted the inevitable.

The Trade Review says:

The one thing in order is curtailment. There are signs, too, that the work has begun. Five Valley furnaces will quit within a week we are assured. That all that has been said within these past three months of the desperately unwholesome condition of the market was founded on fact appears on the one hand by the wholesale discharge of employés and the shutting down of puddling mills, and on the other hand by the bad failure of a prominent Valley iron firm, which there can be but little doubt will be followed by the blowing out of more than one stack.

April 13, 1893:

The Quaker Oatmeal Mills of Ravenna, Ohio, employing 150 men, have shut down indefinitely. This is part of the plan of the American Cereal Company, "The oat-meal trust," to limit production and force prices up, in order that some returns can be earned on its capital.

May 12, 1892:

The Iron Age reported that the manufacturers of the Mahoning and Shenango Valleys have agreed upon a scale of wages which they will present to the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers in June, and that "it is understood that a thorough rearrangement of prices has been made and that quite a material reduction in the price of puddling has been demanded."

June 5, 1892:

At a mass meeting of the Cloth Hat and Cap Makers' Union in New York on to-day over 700 men, representing 26 out of the 30 shops in the city, discussed the grievance of wage reduction. It was said that during the last year several reductions in their wages at different times had made a total reduction of 70 per cent, and that during the best four months of the year the best men have been unable to earn more than $6 a week. They will make an effort to get wages back above starvation point. Pitiable as is the lot of these men it is no worse than that of hat-makers elsewhere in this country since the McKinley bill came their way. A few years ago the hat factories of Bloomfield, Watsessung, and East Orange, N. J., were prosperous and gave steady employment to hundreds of hands. The almost prohibitive duty on hatters' raw materials has caused the business to dwindle until now no mill in Bloomfield is running on full time and many of the employés have sought work in other business.

Similar evidence of the evil effects of the increased duties imposed by the act of 1890 could be added indefinitely, but these will suffice to show the falsity of the claim that our business paralysis has come upon us since there has been a prospect of a speedy tariff reform, and much less has it been caused by it.

What, then, has been the cause of the depression which has become so severe, so universal, and so long-continued? The explanation is to me perfectly clear. Everybody in this country is dependent, directly or indirectly, upon the agriculturists. If, therefore, the farmers are prosperous others will be. If they are not, none can be.

I have already shown how, under the operation of the high tariff, a portion of the earnings of the farmers, which ought to have remained their property, has been for years diverted from them and donated to others. As prior to the adoption of the protective system the property of the country was somewhat evenly divided, the farmers had about their just proportion of it. But gradually, though surely, their possessions were drawn from them; since after paying protection prices for what they had to buy while realizing only free-trade prices for what they had to sell, they could not, even with the strictest economy, earn enough to supply themselves and their families with the comforts and conveniences which modern civilization demands, their original capital became impaired. To make good their losses they were compelled to borrow. The Census Department has compiled the figures showing the amount of the mortgage debt on real estate, outside of the cities and towns, in all the States and Territories, except Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington, and the result is startling.

In 1891 it was $537,236,947, an increase since 1880 of 57.58 per cent. In some of the agricultural States the per cent of increase largely exceeded the average. In Alabama it was 270 per cent; in Georgia, 218 per cent; in Florida, 533 per cent; in Tennessee, 197 per cent; in Mississippi, 143 per cent; in Arkansas, 150 per cent; in Missouri, 106 per cent; in Nebraska, 234 per cent. It is claimed that the money borrowed has been devoted to the improvement of the farms, and that is doubtless so to a considerable extent in the new States, though it can not be the case with those east of the Mississippi River.

But there is a limit to all things. The money-lenders realized that they had advanced all they could with safety on the farmers' property, and this source of obtaining ready money was cut off. Our farmers, therefore, being unable to buy the merchants' goods the merchants had no occasion to purchase from the manufacturers, and our manufacturers being restricted to the home markets were compelled to close their establishments and deprive of work thousands of their employés. This, happening as it did at a time when values had been unduly inflated by wild speculations conducted to a great extent on borrowed capital, caused the collapse which has resulted in so much suffering, misery, and loss.

It remains now to discuss the means by which we can check the adverse tide, which seems to be about to engulf our country in wreck and ruin.

The remedy proposed by the advocates of protection, represented on this floor by the Republicans, is to allow the existing tariff laws to remain unaltered. Unless everything that I have said is utterly fallacious, this suggestion should not be dignified with controversy. It is as if the physician whose patient had impaired his health and undermined his constitution by the continued use of alcohol should prescribe more excessive libations of the same fluid as an antidote for that which had caused his troubles.

The remedy proposed by the advocates of inflation, represented on this floor by the Populists, is to, in some manner, make money more plentiful. Though the methods by which they have heretofore proposed to do this do not commend themselves to my judgment and will encounter my earnest opposition, still with the results they will seek to accomplish, if they should ever make an effort to expand our circulating medium, I will be in full sympathy, and I am not only willing but anxious to vote for any measure looking to an increase in the volume of our currency to the very uttermost limit to which that can be done without impairing its absolute and immediate convertibility into the coin of the country.

But while I believe that it would be to our interest to have the very largest possible circulation, provided it is safe and sound, still I do not agree with those who contend that an insufficient quantity of money contributed to any material extent to our present troubles. It must not be forgotten that we have had a much larger circulation, aggregate and per capita, each year for the past ten years, while the vast body of our people have been growing poorer and poorer, than we had at any time when they were growing richer and richer. Nor should it be forgotten that our circulation has been increasing every year during the past fifteen years, and that as our circulation grew larger the times grew harder. In 1878 the money in the United States in circulation, that is, outside of the Treasury, was $15.32 per capita. In 1890, when the acute stage of present troubles struck us, it had grown to $22.82, in 1891 to $23.41, in 1892 to $24.44, and in 1893 to $25.57.

Just at this time, when there is almost a complete stagnation in all kinds of business enterprises, the banks all over the land have the largest balances of cash on hand which has ever been known. Money can be had in the financial centers at as low a rate of interest as any reasonable man could desire. Business has not been paralyzed because money can not be had at reasonable rates of interest, but money can not be loaned at reasonable rates of interest because business has been paralyzed. The cure for this state of affairs must be found not so much in increasing

our circulating medium as in adopting some policy which will permit a more extensive and just circulation of the medium we already have.

Another thing which must not be overlooked is that the price of our agricultural products, as I have shown, is fixed in foreign markets. How, then, could the fact that we have a larger volume of money affect the price of our cotton, our wheat, or our corn when we can not increase the volume of the money of the country where their prices are fixed.

But, after all, if we had a per capita circulation of $50, the causes which have drained practically all of the capital of the country into one section of it and concentrated it in the hands of a comparatively few people would affect the increased circulation in the same way.

The remedy proposed by the advocates of tariff reform, represented on this floor by the Democrats, is to abandon the system under the operation of which we have been brought to the verge of ruin and to return to the one under which all will be "free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement," and which "will not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," and to restore the prosperity of all by permitting the prosperity of those upon whom all are dependent.

A bill by which we seek to accomplish this result has been framed by the committee having the matter in charge, and is now the subject of consideration. It is one which, with the exception of a single item, meets with my unqualified approval. I can not agree that because the policy of paying a bounty to one class of our citizens (the sugar-growers) was inaugurated by another party, we should undo that wrong gradually. I am in favor of an immediate repeal of the law which provides that a part of the taxes which have been collected from all our people should be donated to a few of them. Otherwise I regard the measure under discussion as one which, in view of the depleted condition of our Treasury, is as nearly up to the ideal tariff reform bill as could be reasonably hoped for.

If the changes proposed should be accomplished the present duties on imported goods, which are equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 49.58 per cent, will be reduced to 30.66 per cent. If this reduction applied in equal proportions to all imports it would neither satisfy the just demands of our people nor be consistent with our platform declaration, that "the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only."

But, as I have shown, the tariff on many articles is already on a revenue basis, and accordingly we find that, as to those things, there has been but little and in some cases no reduction, while as to a few there has been an increase. For instance, the revenue derived from the duty on champagnes and wines imported in 1892 amounted to $5,058,661.71, and it is not proposed to change the rates on these articles. The revenue paid on imported silks for 1892 was $16,965,637.03, and it is only proposed to reduce the tariff charges on silks from 53.56 per cent to 45.13 per cent. On the imports of tobacco the revenues collected was $10,265,067.98, and it is only proposed to reduce the duty from 117.82 per cent to 91.58 per cent. The duty on diamonds and pearls, which has heretofore been 10 per cent, it is proposed to increase to 15 per cent.

In contrast to these, I will state the present and proposed rates on a few of the articles on which the duty is now prohibitory. On wool hats the present duty ranges from 86 to 106 per cent; the proposed duty from 25 to 35 per cent. On flannels the present duty from 84 to 103 per cent; the proposed duty from 25 to 40 per cent. On blankets, present duty from 80 to 103 per cent; proposed duty from 25 to 35 per cent. On shawls, present duty from 88 to 150 per cent; proposed duty 40 per cent.

The average duty on metals and the manufactures thereof, under the present law, is 58.91 per cent, under the proposed law it would be 35.50 per cent. In this, as in other lines, the reductions which it is proposed to make do not apply to everything in equal proportions, but is greatest on such articles as we are compelled to use. It is not proposed to make any change in the duty of 35 per cent now imposed on swords, sword blades, and side arms; while cotton ties, now subject to a duty of from 40.03 to 50.23 per cent, are to be placed on the free list.

No change is recommended in the duty of 25 per cent now imposed on watches; but on screws it is proposed to reduce the present rate, which runs from 46 to 110 per cent, to 30 per cent. The duty on dice, chessmen, and billiard balls is to remain 50 per cent, as at present. Salt, now subject to a duty of from 35.14 to 82.33 per cent, is to be put on the free list. The duty on firecrackers, gunpowder, and percussion caps, which now ranges from 25.81 per cent to 147.32 per cent, is to remain as at present; coal, now subject to a duty ranging from 22.72 to 28.68 per cent, is to be admitted free. No reduction is proposed in the present tariff charges of 20 per cent on furs; lumber, now subject to a duty ranging from 8.33 per cent to 21.40 per cent, is to be placed on the free list. The tariff of 25 per cent on the manufactures of amber, asbestus, coral, and jet is to remain as at present; but iron, which is now subject to a tariff ranging from 15 to 42.70 per cent, is to be admitted free.

So, it will be seen that while the reductions of the duties on necessaries is very considerable, the average is not very great, because the reductions on luxuries is so small.

What changes will place the tariff on a revenue basis as to an article on which the duty has heretofore been prohibitory can only be determined by experiment. If, after the lapse of sufficient time to test the matter, it is ascertained that on some things the rate is still prohibitory, further reductions can be and doubtless will be made.

Representing, as I do, a constituency which is as essentially agricultural perhaps as any represented on this floor, I can not forbear to express my gratification at the consideration the committee which framed the bill under discussion has accorded to that most important of all industries.

Each change recommended by the committee will, if adopted, lessen the disadvantages under which our farmers have labored, and will enable them to retain a larger portion of the wealth they create. While they will still be compelled to have the price of their products fixed on a free-trade basis, they will be able to obtain much of what they buy at free-trade prices.

This is particularly the case with the cotton-planter. If the recommendations of the committee are adopted, he can obtain, without having their cost enhanced by a tariff on them; the lumber with which he builds his houses, his barns, and his fences; the oil with which he lights and the fuels with which he heats his dwelling; the salt with which he seasons his food and preserves his meats, the medicines with which he heals his sick, the implements with which he cultivates his crop, the machinery with which he renders his cotton available for market, the ties with which he prepares it for shipment, and when exported the bagging with which he protects it. He can obtain the benefit of the lower prices which will result from the competition between the home and foreign producers of the hardware he uses; of the clothes, the hats, and the shoes he wears, and of everything else he consumes.

It is not strange that one who has been the recipient, as I have, of continued favors from a constituency whose chief industry is the production of cotton, should hail with delight the prospects of the adoption of a policy which will lessen the burdens and render more prosperous the condition of those who have contributed so much to the prosperity of, but who have received such little consideration from their Government as have the cotton-growers.

For this policy the American freemen have declared in no uncertain tones. But the battle is not yet won. Self-confident from continued triumphs and the possession of unlimited capital, tenacious of old theories and honestly fearing the result of any change, the beneficiaries of protection will contest every inch, and, like the old guard, will to a man die in the last ditch.

With unfaltering faith the Democracy of the nation, never elated in victory, never daunted in defeat, marches to the performance of her mission, and will renew charge after charge until she solves the people's problems and rights the people's wrongs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman, in some remarks made in the Fifty-second Congress when a bill similar to this was pending, which was intended to give some manufacturers a bonus at the expense of the wool-grower, I said:

> I have sometimes thought that if the people of these United States would highly resolve to hang by the neck until he was dead the first citizen, and every other citizen or alien, whether in Congress or out of Congress, who proposed, within the next twenty years, any change whatever in the tariff laws of the United States, it would conduce more to the permanent prosperity of the country than any resolution ever made and enforced by the American people. [Laughter.]
>
> What this country wants, and must have, for its permanent prosperity, is certainty and stability of its laws; not continual change and uncertainty.

I said then "I sometimes thought so;" I say now I think so all the time; for the very threat of such change, coupled with the power the Democratic party now has to put the threat into execution, has produced widespread disaster throughout the land.

We were told three or four months ago that the so-called Sherman law caused all the trouble and distress that then covered the land, and the President called the Congress together to remove that cause by repealing that law. It was done. The law was repealed, but it is now seen that it had no more power to allay the public distress than would the casting of a pebble to still the mighty waves of the Atlantic. It is now patent to everyone what a wicked fraud this hue and cry set on the Sherman law was. What a clumsy and futile attempt to divert attention from the real cause of the distress that then hovered over all our country and rests on it to-day, which was the attack of the Democratic President and his managers upon the business

interests and welfare of the American people for the benefit of all Europe.

It is unfortunate for all the people that the exigencies of the Democratic party seem to require it always to attack the business interests of the country, and every industry in it, except those clustered around Wall street, and of the foreigners doing business within its shadows; but it is a party that is only democratic in name. It is in fact the close ally and servant of aristocracy; witness its attempt to overthrow a republic and set up a monarchy; the attorney for foreign money-lenders and domestic stock gamblers and corporations.

This bill is nothing more and nothing less than the ordinary tariff tinkers' bill, which has made its appearance often in Congress for years past; but owing to the fact that a Republican Senate or a Republican President has heretofore stood between the people and the threatened harm, no injury had been done.

The pending proposition is entitled "A bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes." But this title does not express the true purpose of the bill. To do that it must be amended so as to read, "A bill for the relief of the Democratic party, at the expense of the producers and laboring people of the United States, and to reduce the revenue."

The authors of the bill confess that it will reduce the revenue $70,000,000, and there is no doubt that it will accomplish its purposes most effectively, and also in a different direction from that intended. It will relieve that party from all responsibility for legislation for twenty years, beginning March 4, 1895, and will soon after relieve it of the cares of government in every department.

It is true that a majority of the people of the United States voted for the policy set out in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago by voting for the candidates standing upon it. There was no uncertainty about the tariff plank in that platform. It was plain and concise, admitting of but one meaning. Of course it may be charged that not being double-faced it could not be a genuine Democratic plank. However that may be, they put it in their platform and every Democratic candidate stood upon it. The people of this country can not claim to have been deceived by the tariff plank.

The Democratic party claimed that the policy of "protection was a fraud," a "robbery," and, besides that, was unconstitutional. It said to all the raisin-growers of the twelve counties of the Seventh California district—for in every county of that district the production of raisins is a leading industry—"The tariff that gives you a protection of 2½ cents per pound on raisins, that compels the raisin-growers of Spain to pay 2½ cents per pound toll, to come into your markets and compete with you, is a fraud and a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few, and besides is unconstitutional. We will reform that tariff, take that protection you now enjoy away."

They said to nearly all the producers in the country—not to all, for they had some pets—the same to nearly all operatives in the factories throughout the land—not to all of them—that "the protection given you by the tariff to the articles you are manufacturing, thereby enabling you to receive greater wages than you otherwise would, is a fraud, a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few, and is unconstitutional."

Mr. Chairman, theories are beautiful things sometimes; facts are very obstinate things. I have a few facts to present. Here are some raisins for which the other day I paid here in Washington at retail 15 cents a pound; here are some purchased at another store, for which I paid 25 cents a pound; here are some for which I paid at another store 30 cents a pound. All these raisins are from Fresno County, Cal., in my district. All of them are of the same grade. These raisins, the retail price of which was at different stores 15 cents, 25 cents, and 30 cents, are, as I have said, of the same grade, a grade of which Fresno County alone has sent out this year over 2,000 car loads. For those raisins the producers receive from 3½ cents to 4 cents a pound, free on board the cars.

Now, I want to ask any really smart gentleman (I do not want anybody else to attempt to reply) whether he supposes that if this tariff bill, taking 1 cent off the duty on raisins should go into effect, the man on F street here who charges me 40 cents a pound for imported raisins will the next day after the bill is passed cut the price down to 39 cents; or that the man from whom I bought this other specimen of imported raisins for 35 cents a pound of the same brand (his store being on the avenue and not quite as stylish as the one on F street, where I bought those for 40 cents), will put the price down to 34 cents a pound. You all know better than to suppose such a thing. You know how stupid and ridiculous it is to make an argument that this reduction of the duty on raisins will in any case inure to the extent of 1 penny to the benefit of any consumer in the United States. Every man of common sense knows that such will not be the effect. [Applause.] You simply lose that much money from your Treasury.

Then you propose in this bill to reduce the duty on oranges. The duty now on oranges is 10 cents per cubic foot, which you propose to reduce to 8 cents. Now with first-class large oranges there will be about forty in a cubic foot—from forty to fifty. The reduction of duty proposed in this bill on a dozen oranges, sold at retail in the city of Washington to-day at 75 cents a dozen, would be about one-half of a cent. Do you suppose that if you reduce the tariff in this way the man who is now charging 75 cents a dozen for those oranges will, after you have adopted this Democratic tariff, reduce the price to 74½ cents? You know he will not. That is your argument. You know as well as I do that it does not affect the customer at all, and all your bill is to benefit the importer, the handler, the dealer, and nowhere in this bill is the interest and welfare of the consumer benefited.

Your Democratic argument—one of your strongest arguments—has circled around the dinner pail of the workingman. I bought one to-day and weighed it. It weighed 4 ounces, and cost 10 cents. You propose to reduce the tariff about 1 cent a pound on tin. That would reduce the price of the workingman's pail in accordance with your idea, if it be a correct one, exactly one-fourth of a cent. Allowing the workingman four pails a year, you would take off the burden of taxation each year to the amount of a whole red cent from that workingman. [Laughter and applause.]

But while making this tremendous saving in the way of taxation laid upon him, you have taken $150 from him of his wages for that year; and then you can boast that you have reduced the price of his dinner pail a quarter of a cent!

Mr. MORSE. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. BOWERS of California. Oh, yes.

Mr. MORSE. I want to suggest to my friend that I fear the workingman is more concerned now about something to put into the pail than what he has to pay for it.

Mr. BOWERS of California. That is the lamentable fact. I have here a letter from an old friend in Wisconsin, one of the proprietors of a large manufactory. It is as follows:

FORT ATKINSON, WIS., *December 22, 1892.*

DEAR SIR: What I want is a copy of the Wilson tariff bill, if you can send it to me, and I would also like the minority report. I am taking quite an interest in this tariff matter because it affects us somewhat. While the tariff on tin is to be reduced, it seems as though it would be to our advantage; but dealers in Chicago tell us that tin would be no cheaper under the new tariff law, as manufacturers in England have told them this summer that if it was reduced they should advance the price on tin, and I believe that the dealers and brokers in tin in Chicago firmly believe this to be so.

I am in hopes that our tin industry has got such a start that it will be able to hold its own, even now, but of this I am a little doubtful. Had it continued two years longer we should have been able to obtain all the tin wanted in America, made by American manufacturers.

Yours respectfully,

D. W. CURTIS.

Hon. W. W. BOWERS,
193 Fourth street, SE., Washington, D. C.

The gentleman from Texas who preceded me told us about the resources of the cotton States, and how cotton-growers went to work like men without any aid or any tariff for protection and raised so much cotton. But he did not tell why the rice-growers in the Carolinas did not wade into their work like men without asking a cent and a half a pound protection? Why do you give it to them? Did they ask for it, or is it a fact that you have some friends, some pets, in the rice business, who own some rice plantations? [Laughter.]

The people of six of the nine counties then comprising the Seventh California district accepted the Democratic platform and went Democratic by a good majority, and when the returns came in showing that the Democratic platform had won, they celebrated the victory in grand style, got up big processions, held large ratification meetings, shouted themselves hoarse, and fell on each others' necks in an ecstacy of joy. As it was in California, so everywhere, the victory of reform was celebrated, and if any man was happier than a Democrat in those days, it was the festive Mugwump, who was once a Republican, but failing to get a nomination for some office, let the canker of disappointed ambition prey upon him until the very blood in his veins ran sour, and he became a natural-born Mugwump; and by the way, specimens of this kind of homo were greatly prized and admired by our Democratic friends; they laid the best offices they had at their feet and Democrats became their servants.

I am speaking of the conditions that existed one year ago. There have been some changes since then, some very great changes, even among Democrats, although I may say, parenthetically, that the condition I have described of Democratic admiration for, and subserviency to, Mugwumps seems to remain the same in the higher circles of Democracy, as shown by recent events.

But now in California those people who were so enthusiastic for reform are again holding meetings, not to ratify reform over again. Oh, no; very serious business meetings have taken the place of political meetings. These people are not quite as delirious as they were. The low diet prescribed for them by the

Democratic reform doctors has cooled their fevered blood. Somehow the great reform victory has not panned out the blessings it promised in the blossom; they find its fruit—like the apples of Sodom, fair to the eye—turn to ashes in their mouths, and even the pretty little roosters they carried on their hats so proudly have turned into poor little scrawny black crows.

Hardly had the echoes of the anvils which were fired at the cross-roads ratification, or of the cannon fired in the towns in celebration of the great reform victory died away before the people began to realize that a change was taking place. They felt a chill in the air. For more than twenty years they had basked in the sunshine of American prosperity, and during all these years the ring of the hammer on the anvil, the whir of the mill-wheel, the sounding blows from the forges, the throbbing of all the mighty machinery everywhere, all blending together in the grand anthem of industry, had rung in their ears, and they had kept time with its step and melody, and every breeze carried the swelling notes of the chorus of the worker's song.

But now fainter and fainter came the melody; farther and farther away it seemed; note after note dropped out of the song, and in their stead there came the discordant cry of dismay, the wail of distress, the sounds of the mourning for murdered opportunities and industries. They saw the fires die in the furnaces, the wheels of the mill fall asleep, the miner's pick growing rusty, and the sounds from the forge had died away. They saw the black clouds of Democracy drifting across the sky, and prosperity fly away. They saw that Democracy and prosperity could not dwell together; that they were opposites, incompatible, unassimilable, and must forever remain strangers to each other.

Forced to see and feel all this, these people now say to you, "We have deceived ourselves; we have been punished enough for our folly; give us back the prosperity and the peace and the comfort we enjoyed under protection, for one day of the glorious sun of Republican prosperity is worth a thousand years of such as this one given us by the Democracy. Take away your tariff reform, take it back to the devil who invented it and who owns it; we want no more of it." So say the farmers, so say the producers, so say all the workers in the field and shop who have made this country what it is.

Who asks for the passage of this bill? Is it the farmer? No. The miner? No. The wool-grower? No. The manufacturer? No. The workman in the factories? No. Any American industry? No. All of these protest against it; from every section of the country, from Maine to Texas, from Florida to Washington, the protests come thick and fast.

Mr. PICKLER. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BELL] says that they are "coerced."

Mr. BOWERS of California. Coerced! Well there will be some other gentlemen coerced about the next time the people get a chance to talk to them at the polls. [Laughter and applause.]

This bill comes in here followed by the imprecations of the American people, and in his secret heart many a member who will be forced to vote for it curses the fate that compels him, and will hereafter. Pushed in here by Democratic politicians at the demand of importers and foreigners, denounced by every industry in the United States, who is left asking for it? England, France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and Canada; all these are asking for it. It is in fact "all Europe against America," and in this contest we see the Democratic President and his managers espousing the interests of Europe as against their own people. Who else demands this legislation? The newspapers owned by foreign importers. Who else? The bond dealers. Who else? The capitalists. Who else? The corporations. Who else? The man who would rather give employment to an English or a French manufactory than to an American industry; to a vineyardist in France or Spain than to one in the United States. Who else? The man who would rather see thousands and tens of thousands of American citizens walking the streets asking for work and bread, as they do to-day under this Democratic Administration, than employed in the mills and mines and on the farms as they were under the American policy of the Republican party. Who else? No one. Have I overdrawn the picture in this statement?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think you have.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I will cite the best Democratic authority, and call the President of the United States as a witness, that I have not. Will you accept his evidence?

Mr. SIMPSON. I do not know that I will.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Here is what he says to you. Here is the extraordinary confession he makes in his message to this Congress:

> In my great desire for the success of this measure I can not resist the suggestion that its success can only be attained by means of unselfish counsel on the part of the friends of tariff reform, and as a result of their willingness to subordinate personal desires and ambition to the general good. The local interests affected by the proposed tariff are so numerous and so varied that if all insisted upon them, legislation embodying the reform must inevitably fail.—*Cleveland's Message.*

Can there be a better reason given than the one he has here given you for the defeat of this bill? He tells this Congress plainly that if it consults the interests of the people of the United States, then this tariff cake becomes dough on both sides. This reform must fail if the local interests of the people are consulted. Well, a reform that is antagonistic and harmful to the local interests of our people ought to fail, and will fail sooner or later. All interests are local; what is termed the general interest is but the sum of the local interests, and there is not a local interest but this bill touches. Not a change it proposes to make from existing law that will not be detrimental to the true interests of our people and advantageous to the interests of the people of Europe, and there is hardly a township in the United States, inhabited by a white person, that this malign bill does not threaten with harm.

The motto of the Republican party always has been, and is now, "American opportunities and American markets belong to American citizens who have made them."

The motto of the Democratic party to-day is: "American opportunities and American markets belong to the world. No discrimination in favor of American citizens as against foreigners."

I read from the Pall Mall Gazette, one of the leading journals of England:

> LONDON, *November 9, 1892.*
>
> The Pall Mall Gazette this afternoon says that "both the merchants and the unemployed workingmen of England have reason to rejoice at the Democratic victory, as with the possibility of the reopening of the American market to the goods of Birmingham, Bradford, and Manchester, capitalists will get a chance to procure some return on their money invested, and the workingmen will have an opportunity to get a decent price for their labor without the necessity of striking."

And every English journal said substantially the same. England is unanimous for the passage of this bill; so is France, and Germany, and Spain, and Italy, and Canada. It has no opposition anywhere in the world except from the great mass of the people of the United States.

One more citation from an English newspaper, the Warehouseman and Draper. It says:

> Speaking at Sheffield at the banquet in honor of the anniversary of American independence, Mr. Folsom, the United States consul in that town, who is now on the point of retiring, expressed the satisfaction that he felt in the belief that "before another twelve months have rolled by Sheffield will not be subjected to the onerous and oppressive duties of the United States which have so restricted her trade."

For years the Democratic politicians have rung the changes on Republican extravagance and corruption. They have sought to impress upon the people the idea that they were being robbed by the protective tariff; that our workmen were being oppressed and the country going to the dogs, and a lot more of such rubbish. It is true that comparisons are odious, but as the Democratic politicians invite them they should have them. Let us contrast the condition of this country as it was under Republican rule, as it is under Democratic rule. I will hold up the picture of the Republican rule as painted by some first-class Democratic artists. We will not go back far, only to last year.

On the 17th of July, 1892, the New York Herald (Democratic) remarked:

> The business of the country is in a provokingly healthy condition. * * * New industrial enterprises for manufacturing iron, cotton, and woolen fabrics are going into operation in various sections. * * * In the face of such a condition of things the calamity howler must remain silent.

On July 15, 1892, the Boston Herald, a pronounced advocate of Cleveland and free trade, asked:

> Where is the idle woolen mill to-day? There is none. * * * Not only are the great majority of the woolen mills employed, but many * * * are contemplating enlargements and improvements, or such enlargements and improvements are already begun. What does all this mean? It means simply the greatest consumption of wool the country has known for many years.

On the 10th of September, 1892, the Dry Goods Economist, also tarred with the free-trade brush, was constrained to remark that—

> Dress goods manufacturers ought to be happy this season because they are busy delivering the goods already ordered and booking orders for more. * * * They can confidently look forward to a continuous run of business for the next six months.

R. G. Dun & Co.'s Report, a colorless trade paper, in July, 1892, said:

> A fiscal year never matched in the history of the country in volume of industrial productions, in magnitude of domestic exchanges, or in foreign trade has just closed.

That eminent free-trader Edward Atkinson, whose knowledge of economics compares with that of Mr. Cleveland as an encyclopedia compares with a primer, says, speaking of the country under Republican rule:

> There has never been a period in the history of this or any other country when the general rate of wages was as high as it is now, or the price of goods

relatively to the wages as low as they are to-day, nor a period when the workman, in the strict sense of the word, has so fully secured to his own use and enjoyment such a steadily and progressively increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product.

The honorable member from New York, Mr. COCKRAN, taking as his authority the Aldrich report, which, he said, emanated from a Democratic Bureau of Statistics, and the accuracy of whose figures had never been disputed, showed that "never before in the history of human civilization have wages been so high, measured by gold." And that "by the figures of this Aldrich commit ee we find that labor enjoys to-day the largest proportion of that which it produces that it has ever enjoyed in the history of the world." As the Aldrich report was made March 3, 1893, one day before the Democratic party came into power, and most of its figures only include the year 1891, this is valuable testimony to the prosperity of the country under Republican rule.

This is the picture painted by Democrats and free traders of the prosperous condition of this country up to the time it was ascertained that the Democrats had come into power in all the Departments of the Federal Government. Never before did this nation or any other that ever existed on earth make such progress and enjoy such a degree of prosperity as the United States during the twenty-five years of Republican rule preceding the 5th day of November, 1892. Never before anywhere, in any land, did the common people receive so large a recompense for their labor or enjoy to so great an extent the luxuries as well as the comforts of life, as did all the people of the United States during that period.

Shall I draw the picture of the condition of the country under Democratic rule as it is to-day? I hardly deem it necessary. It is too familiar to all of us. You see it everywhere; every morning it stares at you from your newspaper, the pictures of closed mills, of dead industries, of enforced idleness and destitution in places where heretofore work and wages, comfort and contentment, held the reins and kept even pace with the passing days. Never before in the history of the nation did such widespread, and universal commercial and financial disaster come upon it as came with the accession of the Democratic party to power. It would seem that disaster and Democracy were twins, bound by a common tie which, if severed, leads to the death of both.

This bill is a fraud; a proposition to rob the many for the benefit of the few. It is so characterized by the assembled wisdom of the Democratic party the last time it pulled itself together at Chicago. I will read from the gospel according to Democracy, its last testament, chapter 3:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud and a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few; * * * the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only.

And yet in the face of this declaration the chiefs of that party bring in here this unconstitutional bill, without a doubt the worst specimen of a protective tariff bill ever introduced in Congress, containing the most outrageous discrimination against the many for the benefit of the few, against the farmer and the producer and in favor of the toll-taker. Do the farmers and the producers of this country constitute the few and the manufacturers the many? [Applause.]

This extraordinary specimen of a protective tariff bill says to all the wool-growers of this country, "The Republican policy which protects your product by a tariff of from 25 to 40 per cent is a fraud and a robbery of the many (big mill-owners) for the benefit of the few (sheep-herders). It shall cease. You must take your places by the side of and on a level with the bushmen of Australia and New Zealand, and compete with them if you will persist in such low-down business as wool-growing." At the same time it pats lovingly on the back the big mill-owner who manufactures that wool, and says to him, "You are my hearty; your product shall have 40 per cent protection; you shall not be forced to compete with the cheap goods of Europe. Those foreign manufacturers shall pay you half their goods are worth before they shall come into the American market and compete with you. We will take care of you; but we've no use for that sheep-herder, doncher know."

What a beautiful sample of Democratic revenue reform this thing is. Was there ever a more shameless discrimination attempted?

I read a few days ago in a newspaper a large number of New Year's sentiments, contributed, the paper said, by many of the greatest men in the world; among them I read the following sentiment:

Powerful as our Government is, it never had or can have authority to tax one man to make another's vocation pay.

This sentiment was signed by one of the distinguished members of this House from Tennessee. I have read many times that the tariff was a tax, and this our Democratic friends to the last man stoutly maintain. They denounce the McKinley tariff law, charging that it does exactly the thing that the honorable gentleman from Tennessee declared this Government had no authority to do; and yet, wherein does this bill, which I presume the honorable gentleman will support and vote for, differ from the McKinley act? In two respects only; both are essentially and entirely protective tariff bills, different first in this: The McKinley act was intended to raise an adequate revenue for the support of the Government by increasing the tax on foreign goods, in the form of a tariff, and thus decreasing the tax upon our own people and our own products.

This bill proposes the exact reverse—to reduce the revenue by reducing the tax on foreign goods and thus creating a necessity for increasing the tax on our own people and our own products. Second. The McKinley act sought as far as possible to do equal justice; to give all an equal share of protection. It gave the wool-grower the same protection it did the wool-handler, the manufacturer. This bill makes the most abominable and shameless discrimination as to the persons, industries, and localities it seeks to protect, and every line in this bill fixing a tariff rate is drawn for the protection of some article, some industry, some class, and not "for revenue only."

Upon what theory of a tariff for revenue only can paragraph 193, page 29, be defended, which fixes the duty on barley 20 per cent ad valorem and barley malt 30 per cent ad valorem? Upon none. It was to protect the maltster, and to give him 33⅓ per cent more protection than was given the barley-grower, and the change was made from 25 per cent, as it was in the original draft of the bill, to 30 per cent, upon the representation to the committee that the maltster needed that amount of duty for the protection of his industry.

Upon what theory of a tariff for revenue only is the duty upon rice made specific—1¼ cents per pound—while other grains have ad valorem duties upon them. Why ad valorem duties on barley and specific duties on rice? Upon what theory of a tariff for revenue only can the sliding scale of bounties to be paid the sugar producer be defended? None. It is protection. Nothing else; and if there is anything in our system of taxation that taxes one man to make another's vocation pay it is this sugar schedule. It is an impossibility for a tariff for revenue only to have a sliding scale of ad valorem duties, or both ad valorem and specific duties, or a free list; because any and every variation in a rate of duty or exemption from duty is for protection; must be. Neither the Democratic party nor any other party ever introduced a general tariff bill for revenue only, which, of course, must tax all imports alike. No party dare to do so stupid a thing. All these bills are for protection and revenue the same as this one, only this is the most unjust, illogical proposition of the kind ever made.

See paragraphs 101 and 102, page 15, marble, rough in block or squared, 40 cents per cubic foot; but sawed, dressed, or otherwise manufactured, 75 cents per cubic foot.

In tariff for revenue only, why should there be different ad valorem rates of duty on marble?

The Oakland Times, one of the leading Democratic papers of California, said editorially a few days ago:

This Congress was elected to reform the tariff. The complexion of the Senate was changed to facilitate the work. Benjamin Harrison was displaced from the Presidency to make room for Grover Cleveland in order that tariff duties could be reduced to a revenue basis.

"A tariff for revenue" in contradistinction to a tariff for protection was the issue of the last Presidential election. It was debated on the stump in every State and discussed in every newspaper and periodical in the land. Party platforms clearly defined the issue, and parties accepted the gauge of battle on the lines thus laid down. The issue was not dodged, nor was it, as in many cases, so connected and cumbered with other issues that it did not stand alone and sharply defined.

The Times states the exact facts as to this issue. The Democratic party was pledged to "a tariff for revenue only" and against protection. The Republican party was squarely pledged to protection.

In view of all these indisputable facts, the following letter, written by the honorable chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and whose name is given to this bill, becomes very interesting reading:

INTERESTS OF MANUFACTURERS—CHAIRMAN WILSON POINTS OUT THAT HE HAS A TENDER CONSIDERATION FOR THEM.

BOSTON, *January 2.*

The American Wool and Cotton Reporter will to-morrow publish the following letter from Chairman WILSON, of the Ways and Means Committee:

"In your issue of December 28 I find in a letter from Mr. James McLaughlin, jr., Glenside Woolen Mills, the following statement:

"'The writer has just returned from Washington, after having a conference with Mr. WILSON and the Hon. DAVID B. HILL, and both of these men expressed themselves as having no interest in the mill-owners, but if it can be shown that it will affect the voters' interest they are ready to consider a change in the tariff bill,' etc.

"Permit me to state that so far as I am referred to this statement is absolutely incorrect. I never expressed any such statement and never entertained any such idea. I do not recall any conversation with the writer, but that may be due to my inability to remember all with whom I have recently

talked. I do believe, and have said to gentlemen thus interviewing me, that the interests of 70,000,000 men, women, and children, who consume woolen goods, should have paramount consideration; but the fact that I have reported a bill carrying 40 per cent protection to mill-owners—$4 on $10 worth of goods—shows a very tender consideration for the interests of the mill-owners, especially in view of the fact that in 1866 the joint report of the wool manufacturers and wool-growers only asked that 'all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted shall be subjected to a duty which shall be equal to 25 per cent net.' This is only one of numberless misrepresentations I have undertaken to correct.

"WM. L. WILSON."

Now, if there is any one man more competent to speak of this bill, what it means to do, what it is, it must be the gentleman whose name it bears, and is in large part the architect and superintendent of it, and he here unequivocally declares that the bill he has reported "carries 40 per cent protection to mill-owners, $4 on $10 worth of goods." So I have the testimony of the chairman of the committee that I have characterized this bill aright; it is for protection, and is in no respect consonant with the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago, and no Democrat who is honestly in favor of that platform and its tariff plank can consistently vote for it, and no Democrat can redeem his pledge to support "a tariff for revenue only" by voting for this bill. On the contrary, he squarely violates that pledge.

Having shown that this bill is for protection, the only argument germane to it is, Is it a better protective-tariff bill than the McKinley act? Are the benefits of protection more evenly distributed, and the burdens, if any, more equitably laid? To all these questions the American people answer emphatically, no. From beginning to end this bill singles out certain industries and products to which it accords protection, and from others equally entitled it refuses protection. Protection is refused to the miner who digs out the iron ore and the coal to melt it, but is given to the man who burns the coal and lets liquid iron run into the open troughs of sand. You say that coal and ore are raw material. But they are the finished product of the miner, and the rough, shapeless pig of iron when it goes into the rolling-mill or foundry is as absolutely and entirely raw material as is the coal placed under it to melt it, or as is the farmer's wool when it enters the woolen factory.

The honorable chairman of the committee labored hard and long to-day in his speech to show that wool should be put on the free list. I present for his consideration the following telegram, to show what the wool-growers and manufacturers of California think about it—practical men engaged in the business about which they telegraph me—and I place their declarations beside those of the politicians and theorists who bring in such bills as this:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *January 3, 1894.*

Hon. W. W. BOWERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

At a meeting of the wool-growers, dealers, and manufacturers held this day, it was resolved that we, the wool-growers, dealers, and manufacturers of California, irrespective of party, do hereby protest in the most emphatic terms against changes in the tariff affecting wool and woolens as proposed by the Wilson bill. We assert that to remove the duty from wool and woolens will prostrate, if not wholly destroy, an industry which gives direct employment to 30,000 of our citizens. We call upon you as a representative of California interests to work and vote against these propositions.

I. R. HALL,
B. P. FLINT,
THOMAS DENIGAN,
C. S. MOSES,
JAMES P. HULME,
JOHN E. SHOOBERT,
Committee.
JACOB ROSENBERG, *President.*
FRED S. MOODY, *Secretary.*

And in this connection I present this letter from the honorable Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., December 22, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of December 18, covering report on silk culture in Southern California from Mrs. Carrie Williams, and to thank you for transmitting the report to this office.

The entomologist to whom the report has been submitted states that he has long been aware of the perfect adaptability of the climate of California to the culture of the domestic silk-worm, but that the difficulty in the matter of silk culture in this country is the absolute lack of a profitable market for the cocoons. Raw silk is imported from abroad at such low rates as to practically preclude competition on the part of American sericulturists.

Respectfully, yours,

EDWIN WILLITS, *Acting Secretary.*

Hon. W. W. BOWERS, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

As a companion piece to the letter of the honorable Assistant Secretary I present herewith extracts from the letter referred to by him, which was dated at San Diego, Cal., December 29, 1893:

W. W. BOWERS,
House of Representatives, United States:

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 22d instant came to me to-day. I thank you sincerely for the same.

Yes; "the last paragraph" gives the whole silk business away. On page 16 of that "report of silk culture in New South Wales" which I lent you last summer, C. V. Riley, M. A., PH. D., entomologist of the American Government, is quoted as saying "The greater value of labor here as compared with labor in older silk-growing countries has been in the past a most serious obstacle in the United States, but conditions exist to-day that render this obstacle by no means insuperable."

Then he contrasts the conditions and requirements here and in the older silk-growing countries, showing that 20 or 30 cents a day there is as much toward a living as three or four times that amount here. He also shows that there are hundreds of thousands of women and girls all over our country who might produce silk without depriving the laboring classes of their employment, and yet tend to enrich both themselves and their country. Perhaps Mr. Willits was not aware of his superiors' sentiments now before the world on this subject.

You know, Mr. BOWERS, and so do I, that the industry may be made continuous for nine months of the year. This is the strong point in our favor, and it has never been even hinted at before. It is a demonstrated fact now. I have the evidence here. There could not be a greater farce perpetrated on any people than to import silk as raw silk when it is reeled silk. This is the pivot of silk on the tariff. The silk importers call it raw silk as a blind, while they know, and I know, and all who have investigated the subject know, that it is reeled. Every thread of silk is twisted on the reels before it is imported, and yet they call it raw silk. What! Is raw cotton cotton yarn, or is it not raw just as it comes from the pod, not twisted or operated on by machinery?

With due respect, yours,

MRS. CARRIE WILLIAMS.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may have been the sentiments of the American people one year and a half ago on tariff reform, the evidence presented us on all sides is overwhelming that to-day the great majority of the people of this nation are in favor of adequate and equitable protection for all American industries; protection not only against the competition of the products of the cheap labor of foreign countries, but protection against the importation of the cheap laborers themselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RYAN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. KILGORE (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1894, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 5061) to repeal section 4716, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 5062) to grant the Gainesville, McAlister and St. Louis Railway Company the right to build two branch lines and to grant the right of way therefor through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WAUGH: A bill (H. R. 5063) prohibiting the dropping, suspending, or reducing of pensions, and the restoration of pensions already dropped, suspended, or reduced in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5064) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COFFEEN: A bill (H. R. 5066) to encourage and establish better facilities for travel to and from, into and through, the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 5067) authorizing the Secretary of War to deed Ford's Theater building and grounds to the Grand Army of the Republic and the Local Legion of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'NEIL: A bill (H. R. 5068) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow money in anticipation of the revenues, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to examine and report upon the cost of deepening the harbors of Superior and Duluth and their entries to a uniform depth of 20 feet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A concurrent resolution to print 8,000 copies of the report of the Bureau of Ethnology—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R 5069) making appropriation for construction, repairs, etc., of public works for Charlevoix

Harbor, Charlevoix, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamship Tallapoosa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of Oldham County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5072) for the benefit of John W. Kirby, late sheriff of Gallatin County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5073) to correct the military record of John Bach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) to correct the military record of Andrew Duda—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) to correct the date of muster of Company F, Pacific Battalion Missouri Home Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) to correct military record of Charles Burswitz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 5077) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aranans Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of George P. Rowell & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDMUNDS: A bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of J. Henry Rives—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 5080) granting a pension to Garrett L. Joice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) granting a pension to Mary C. Taylor, widow of William N. Gilbert, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of E. Douglass, late Indian agent at White Earth Indian Agency—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) granting a pension to Anson Northrup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: A bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to Luther L. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 5085) to relieve Francis Remenlein from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to James G. Laughlin, Alexander M. Laughlin, Williamson Durley, and Charles Leeper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 5087) granting a pension to Margaret Brennan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5088) for the relief of Andrew Defiel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company, of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) for the relief of Thomas Buckingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of Mrs. Clara E. Bryant, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of Amas Woodruff, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Norton, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5094) granting an increase of pension to James H. Bolton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of Henry B. Kretzler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 5096) for the relief of George W. Wood—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5097) to increase the pension of Mary Stahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5098) for the relief of Charles N. Warner, late first lieutenant of the Fourth Artillery of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. APSLEY: Petition of 125 employés of Abbott & Co., of Graniteville, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AVERY: Protest of C. O. Frye, I. E. Stilwell, Clay Gregory, and 200 others, against the lead-ore clause of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. O. Frye, E. D. Porter, and O. H. Bicker, against the lead-ore clause of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lead miners all over the country, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Cole and Nellie Cole, of St. Louis, Mich., asking for uniform rate of 35 cents per pound on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pacific Pine Lumber Company, California, against repeal of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John O'Neil, Robert O'Neil, and David H. Fisherman, of Grand Traverse, Mich., asking that linen netting twine be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): Petition of M. S. Sickles and 34 others, for the reduction of duty on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN: Petition of workingmen and citizens of Ely, Minn., requesting that the present tariff on iron ore be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of workingmen and citizens of Virginia, Minn., requesting the reduction of present tariff on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of a citizens' meeting at Duluth, Minn., requesting their Representatives in Congress to work for and vote for the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of glass-bottle workers of South St. Louis, against the reduction of the duty on manufactures of glass bottles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Lithograph Artists and Engineers' Protective Association, against certain schedules of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ironworkers of South St. Louis, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of miners of Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, against the lead schedule of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRICKNER: Petition of A. Boetteher, manufacturer of cigars at Cedarsburg, Wis., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Theil, of St. Michaels, Wis., manufacturer of cigars, praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. A. Williams and others, of North Prairie, Wis., protesting against any change in the duty on barley and barley malt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petitions of Maj. Collins and 140 others, of Brazil, Ind., and of Andrew Yount and 170 others, of Yountsville, Ind., protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNDY: Memorial of Eagle Lodge No. 15, Ohio Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Ironton, Ohio, opposing the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition R. B. Miller and 123 other citizens of Ironton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFEEN: Petition of 23 citizens of Casper, Wyo., and vicinity, against the repeal of the McKinley tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 29 citizens of Rock Springs, Wyo.; of 18 citizens of Douglas, Wyo., and vicinity; of sundry citizens of Rawlins Springs and vicinity, and of 18 citizens of Douglas, Wyo., and vicinity, protesting against the repeal of the McKinley tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of the Board of Trade of Salem, Mass., in favor of a permanent appropriation for Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Salem, Mass., for improvement of Salem harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COVERT: Petition of Alois Hubal and other citizens

of Suffolk County, N. Y., relative to duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petitions of citizens of Humboldt, Kans., also of the manufacturers of cigars of Fort Scott, Kans., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Osawatomie, Kans., for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Workmen in the phosphorus works of Rancocas, N. J., requesting that no change be made in the existing duty on phosphorus—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars of New Brunswick, N. J., in relation to the duty on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of Loyal T. Ives, of New Brunswick, N. J., against changing the duty on knitting-machine needles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of the Rariton Woolen Mills, Rariton, N. J., against the passage of Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial, preamble, and resolutions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of J. W. Harrison and 59 others, of Wilkesville, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of persons, firms, and corporations engaged in lead mining in Missouri, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Kansas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Colorado, California, and Montana, protesting against certain provisions of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of the Lithographers' International P. and I. Association of the United States and Canada, urging a specific duty on lithographic goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Commercial Knitting Company, of Troy, N. Y., against the reduction of duty on knit goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of employés of Cunningham & Patten, manufacturers, of Germantown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, preamble and resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution of the State Legislature committee of the Travelers' Protective Association of Wisconsin, in favor of the passage of House bill 3291, providing for the issuance of a joint interchangeable 5,000-mile railroad ticket with special privileges as to free baggage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Petition of I. E. Bigsby and 82 other citizens of Blackhawk County, Iowa, praying for the defeat of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Geo. F. Gawinand and 3 others, of Waterloo, Iowa, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wm. W. Davis and 44 other ex-Union soldiers, of Buchanan County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of a just and equitable service pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition from I. G. Eberhart, esq., La Porte City, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Messrs. Morrill & Co., of Waterloo, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition from Smith, Lichty & Hellman Company, of Waterloo, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Upper Iowa National Conference of the M. E. Church, praying for the repeal of the Geary law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, paper from Wesley E. Dobson, esq., of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging the establishment of a technical department at the National College of the Deaf at Kendall Green—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, papers from Leonard Hutchinson, esq., of Waverly, Iowa, urging the establishment of a technical department at the National College for the Deaf at Kendall Green—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Board of Trade opposing the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of C. O. Frye and 257 others, miners of lead and ores in Missouri and Kansas, for specific duty of three-quarters of a cent per pound on lead ore, and protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial and resolution of the lithographers of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, praying a specific duty on lithographic goods instead of the existing or proposed ad valorem duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 212 citizens and companies interested in lead and ore mining for duty of three-quarters of a cent a pound on lead ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Remonstrance against the removal of the Southern Ute Indians to San Juan County, Utah—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 252 miners of lead ore in southwest Missouri and southeast Kansas, protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania: Thirteen petitions of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., containing 428 names, against any reduction of the tariff on leaf tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 31 citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Joplin, Mo., against the reduction of the duty on lead ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 51 citizens of Murray, Pa., against any change in the present tariff rates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the representatives of 175 men of Clinton County, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Pennsylvania, against any reduction of the duty on gold, silver, aluminum, or any metal leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of C. W. Green & Co. and 8 others, asking that all suspended pensions be restored, and that hereafter no pension be suspended until after proof of fraud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wm. H. H. Brown and 40 others, asking the enactment of an equitable pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IKIRT (by request): Petition of 24 citizens of Middle Branch, Ohio, of 57 citizens of Hanover, Ohio, and of 24 citizens of Plain Township, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of citizens of Sheridan County, Nebr., praying that no change be made in the present tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Burnham, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of Frank Teller and others of Philadelphia, for a uniform rate of 35 cents per pound on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars of Philadelphia, for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. A. Wass, of G. Flaudenmerer and others, of Louis Michaelsen, of Frederick Heil and others, and of Trauntve ler and others, for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employés of the Germantown Spinning Company, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of Economy Mills of Sevill, Schofield & Co., Manayunk, Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lithograph artists and others, asking for an increase of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of the Boston Society of Natural History, for the removal of all duties on scientific and philosophical apparatus whose use is in instruction or research—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Two petitions for a reduction on letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition that Ford's Theater be not used for Government purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Affidavits and account of Edward S. Davis against the United States for property taken during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Boston Typographical Union, No. 13, praying for the Government ownership and control of all telegraph systems in the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Protest from employers of labor, work-

ingmen, and others of Redington, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of Lewis T. Bowers, of Chardon, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William H. Crock and others, of Cayahoga Falls, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William T. Grandel and others, of Ravenna, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. W. Davis and others, of Trumbull County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry B. Shields and others, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas Kelley and others, of East Precinct Township, Norton County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIGOTT (by request): Memorial and bill of Sarah Winthrop Smith, of Seymour, Conn., for the extension of the right of suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), remonstrance of John L. Gray and others, of the Waterville Cutlery Company, against the reduction of duty on cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of M. Whiteley & Co., of Philadelphia, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of the overseers and operatives of the Westport Manufacturing Company and cotton manufacturers of Westport, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RITCHIE: Petition of Roth & Friedman, of Toledo, and employers, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Phœnixville, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Phœnixville, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and citizens of Phœnixville, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest of 29 employés of the Greenmanville Company's woolen mill at Mystic, Conn., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of a representative convention of 8,000 farmers of Hartford County, Conn., against the tobacco reduction of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Kirtland Bros. and others, of Utica, N. Y., favoring a uniform rate of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Memorial of the board of supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., irrespective of politics, protesting against the reduction in any manner of the duty on iron ore, and affirming that such action would strike a death blow to the business interests of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials from the workmen, employers of labor, and others, citizens of Iron River, Mich., and from the employers of labor, workmen, and other citizens of Palmer, Mich., without regard to politics, protesting against placing iron ore on the free list, and affirming that such action would result in great distress and suffering in Northern Michigan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS: Petition of 105 employés of the woolen establishment of Philips & Kunhardt, of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of August Fels, agent, and 258 other employés of the Merrimack Woolen Mills of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of Cigarmakers' Union, No. 114, of Jacksonville, Ill., against any increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of G. W. Van Slyke & Horton and 110 of their employés at Albany, N. Y., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents a pound on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition for the relief of Mary Stahl, wife of Josiah F. Stahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WAUGH: Protest of James A. Bieber and 279 laborers and mechanics of Frankfort, Clinton County, Ind., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of 120 workingmen against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 182 lithograph artists, engravers, printers, transferrers, and others, asking an increase of duty on Schedule C, plates, and Schedule M, paper books—to the Committtee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 86 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 229 employés of Landesman, Hirschheimer & Co., manufacturers of cloaks, of Cleveland, Ohio, asking that the duty on cloaks remain as it is in the McKinley bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of merchants, jobbers, and dealers, protesting against the 10 cents a pack tax to be placed on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 124 employés of Adams Jewett Company, Cleveland, Ohio, asking that a duty be placed on burlap bags, both new and second-hand—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Petitions of W. F. Dibble and others, tobacco-growers, of Albany Township, Bradford County, Pa., and of George W. Wilson and others, of Canton, Bradford County, Pa., against reduction of duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 9, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the resolution of the Senate to correct an error in the report of the committee on conference on the bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices and making provision in case of such disqualification.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of J. Berre King and George R. King, of New York City, manufacturers of calcined plaster, praying for the retention of the present duty upon calcined and land plaster; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorial of Foss & Co., of Boston, Mass., and 797 other dealers of the New England States in woolen rags, remonstrating against woolen rags being placed on the free list, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of A. S. Potter and 61 others, overseers and operatives of the Adamsdale Yarn Mill, of Adamsdale, Mass., and of Chasrles W. Wolff and 119 others, overseers and operatives of the C. A. Edgarton Manufacturing Company, of Shirley, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Millard F. Johnson, of Middleboro, Mass., praying that all tariff legislation be deferred until the Fifty-fourth Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John Curran and other citizens of Lynn, Mass., praying that the so-called Wilson tariff bill

be abandoned; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John C. Tobin and 850 other employés of the Roxbury (Mass.) Carpet Company, praying that a specific duty be placed on tapestry carpets; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of John C. Tobin, chairman, and others, employés in carpet manufactories and other industries of Roxbury, Mass., in mass meeting assembled, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Jacob Quirbach and 19 other cigar manufacturers of Massachusetts, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Boston Newspaper Mailers' Union, No. 1, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Millard F. Johnson, of Middleboro, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the conversion of grains and vegetables of all sorts into any form of alcoholic liquors for the space of three years; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Society of Natural History of Boston, Mass., praying for the removal of all duty on scientific and philosophical apparatus used in instruction or research; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE. I present a petition of the Central Labor Union of Lowell, Mass., praying for an investigation by Congress of alleged violations of the eight-hour law. The petition sets forth the eight-hour law as passed by the last Congress in reference to work performed on any Government building. It states certain violations of the law, and asks that they be investigated by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask my colleague if he has any information of any workmen in Massachusetts who are overworked? I have not myself been able to find one.

Mr. LODGE. I have not, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of 78 ex-Union soldiers and citizens of Iowa, praying for the enactment of a just and equitable service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PEFFER. I present the petition of C. O. Frye and a large number of other citizens of Kansas and Missouri, praying for fair treatment in the proposed tariff legislation. They protest against that provision in the proposed tariff bill which prescribes 15 per cent ad valorem on lead ores and admits duty free all ores in which the value in silver is greater than that of lead, and ask that a specific duty be placed upon lead in all ores and drosses. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER presented the petition of A. C. Husey and other cigar manufacturers of Wichita, Kans., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHOUP presented the petition of Hon. John F. Hansen and 32 other citizens and wool-growers of Cassia County, Idaho, irrespective of party, and the petition of R. F. Whitney and 97 other citizens and wool-growers of Elmore County, Idaho, praying that no change be made in the present tariff affecting the wool and woolen schedule now in force; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VOORHEES presented the petition of C. C. Bicket and other citizens of Louisville, Ky., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented petitions of Solomon Meyer and 3 other cigar manufacturers of Goshen; of M. Hegarty and 3 other cigar manufacturers of Terre Haute; of James M. Stewart and 5 other cigar manufacturers of Frankfort; of F. W. Hathaway and 7 other cigar manufacturers of Brookville; of William A. Steffen and other citizens of Indiana; of W. F. Kessler and other cigar manufacturers of Auburn; of J. H. Springer and 10 other cigar manufacturers of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COKE presented the petition of Dr. G. B. Foscen and other physicians of Texas, praying for the establishment of a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented a petition signed by 15 members of the bar of Crockett, Houston County, Tex., praying that Houston County be placed in the new judicial district proposed to be created by Congress, to be called the judicial district of South Texas; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented memorials of Liken & Bach, of Sebewaing, and of A. J. Bailey & Son, of Leslie, in the State of Michigan, and of the A. J. P. Dewey Stave Company of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the placing of hoops and staves on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of Edward C. Anthony and 348 other citizens of Negaunee; of Frank Warnberg and 320 other citizens of Republic; of William J. Thomas and 180 other citizens of Negaunee, and of W. H. Johnson and 515 other citizens of Ishpeming, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the removal of the present duty on iron ore; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

POSTMASTERS' ACCOUNTS.

Mr. HUNTON. I am instructed by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department. I am also requested by the committee to ask for the immediate consideration of the bill, as the Post-Office Department seems to be desirous of its immediate passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Virginia asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill just reported be considered at this time. Is there objection?

Mr. HOAR. My attention was called away for a moment. I should like to have the title of the bill read.

The bill was read by title.

Mr. HUNTON. I beg leave to state in explanation of the bill that the subject was referred to the joint commission of the two Houses to investigate and determine what new methods of business are desirable in the Departments of the Government, and they reported it favorably after examining a good many experts in the Post-Office Department. The only object of the bill is to add to section 407——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Virginia that the question is not debatable. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not had time to examine the bill. I have intended to ask for information from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury in regard to it. I do not know anything about the change of accounts that is proposed. It may involve a very grave and a very difficult matter, and it may be all right. I should like to have a little time to examine the bill.

Mr. HUNTON. I will state the only change made by the bill. Instead of sending the receipts for money deposited to the Postmaster-General or one of his assistants whose duty it is to send them down to the Auditor, the object of the proposed amendment of the law is to send them direct to the Auditor, and the Auditor will pass upon them and send them up to the Treasury.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Sixth Auditor of the Treasury Department is the accounting officer of the Post-Office Department, and he is also an important officer of the Treasury Department. He performs a double function. Heretofore it has been necessary under the existing law to have these accounts pass through the Postmaster-General and also the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury Department. In that way, no doubt, some double work is involved, but it seems to be absolutely necessary according to the organization of the Treasury Department. Unless this matter has been understood carefully by the heads of the two Departments who have charge of the subject the change ought not to be made. It is a very delicate question.

Mr. HUNTON. As I understand the report made by the joint commission it has consulted with both Departments. The object of the amendment of the law is to save time and money in the examination of these deposits.

Mr. CULLOM. This is a bill reported from what is known as the Joint Commission to inquire into the status of the laws organizing the Executive Departments, or the members of the commission on the part of the Senate, and it was under consideration some days ago. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who has been very sadly called from the Senate, has a special interest in the bill, and if there is to be any contention over it I ask that it be laid aside until he returns.

Mr. VEST. What is the bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CULLOM. If the Chair will allow me, I will state to the Senator from Missouri that it is a bill reported in the first instance by his colleague from the Joint Commission. It was subsequently referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and it now comes back to the Senate. If there is to be any controversy over the question of its passage, I hope no action will be taken until the Senator from Missouri returns.

Mr. VEST. I join in that request. My colleague will be here on Thursday.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the Senator from Illinois to object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I do.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill goes to the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1396) to authorize a compromise and settlement with the State of Arkansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1397) for the relief of the heirs of William Wakefield, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1398) to secure the rights of pensioners, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 49) for the relief of James P. Veach; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. QUAY. I submit an amendment which I intend to propose to the joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes. I desire, in submitting it, to call the attention of the Senators from Texas, who appear to be in charge of the joint resolution, to the proposed amendment. I move that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1209) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FORCE IN SUPERVISING ARCHITECT'S OFFICE.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire whether there is need of additional service in the Bureau of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury with respect to the matter of the erection of Government buildings, and report by bill or otherwise.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas asks for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection?

Mr. VEST. Let it lie over.

Mr. DOLPH. I do not rise to object, but I wish to say——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Being objected to, the resolution goes over.

Mr. DOLPH. I wish permission to say a word. Already the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has the subject before it upon a bill introduced by myself to repeal the limitation of the amount that may be expended for plans. I hope the committee will give attention soon to the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution being objected to, goes over.

GEORGE P. FURBER.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That there be allowed and paid George P. Furber, lately clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the sum of $1,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate, for his services and expenses in preparing the new edition of the Senate Election Cases, and the volume concerning the privileges of the Senate.

INCREASE OF GOLD COIN.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate from what source or sources the gold coin in this country outside of the Treasury of the United States was increased to the amount of $86,869,482 during the fiscal year 1893, as expressed in his recent report for that year, and if derived from different sources, give the sources respectively from which derived and the amount thereof.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. At the request of the mover, the resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to the officers and employés of the Senate who were borne on the rolls of the Senate April 15, 1893, at the close of the special session of the Senate, and who were not borne on said rolls November 3, 1893, at the close of the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, a sum equal to one month's pay, at the compensation paid them according to law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GORMAN. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] has been compelled to leave the city on account of severe indisposition, and I ask for him a leave of absence for two weeks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without objection, the leave of absence is granted.

REIMPORTATION OF CATTLE AND HORSES FROM MEXICO.

Mr. COKE. I report from the Committee on Finance, at the request of the Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. HARRIS], the joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes, with an amendment striking out the preamble and changing the title to correspond. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. VOORHEES. Has the mistake which occurred in the preamble been cured?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The present occupant of the chair would state to the Senator from Indiana that the amendment striking out the preamble and amending the title to make it conform to the body of the resolution is recommended by the committee.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is right.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would state to the Senator from Texas that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] within the last few moments sent to the Secretary's desk an amendment which he proposes to offer to the pending joint resolution. The Chair does not see the Senator from Pennsylvania in his seat.

Mr. COKE. At the proper time I shall offer the amendment if the Senator from Pennsylvania is not here.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas a drought has existed in Southwest and Northwest Texas for a period of several years so severe as to practically destroy the grass upon the ranges therein, and causing so great a scarcity of grass and water that the stock in said vast region of Texas are and have been for months suffering and dying in large numbers; and

Whereas both sufficient water and grass exist on the south side of the Rio Grande in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas said Republic has expressed a willingness to enter into reciprocal relations with this Government with a view to relieving the stock interests of Texas for a fixed period of time by permitting the importation of stock into Mexico for grazing purposes only; therefore, in view of the premises, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered to permit the owners of cattle and horses in Texas who shall hereafter transport their cattle and horses into the Republic of Mexico to reimport or retransport the same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed for the protection of the revenue of the Government of the United States; and he is also authorized to make such rules and regulations with the Government of Mexico as will protect the revenue of the Government of the United States should a similar privilege for a similar period of time be asked by said Republic of Mexico for any of its citizens under like conditions as exist in the section of Texas before mentioned: Therefore,

Resolved, etc., That any owner or owners of cattle or horses in the United States be, and they are hereby, authorized to remove their herds across the Rio Grande into Mexico, for the purpose of grazing, and reintroduce them into the United States without charge for import duties, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

SEC. 2. That the same privilege above given to citizens of the United States is hereby granted to citizens of Mexico who may desire to introduce their cattle and horses into the United States for like purpose.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall expire within twelve months from the date of its passage.

Mr. HARRIS (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The joint resolution must be first considered and passed, and then I propose to move to strike out the preamble and to amend the title. There is also an amendment which the Senator from Pennsylvania desires to submit.

Mr. QUAY. I am informed by the Senator in charge of the joint resolution, who is especially interested in it, that the probable effect of my amendment will be to imperil the final passage of

the joint resolution upon its return to the House of Representatives, and therefore I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I will state to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the committee direct me to move to strike out the preamble and to amend the title. The joint resolution, therefore, will have to go back to the House of Representatives. If the Senator desires to offer his amendment, the reason he assigns for not doing so is not quite sufficient, as the joint resolution will have to be returned to the other House.

Mr. QUAY. My understanding is that the joint resolution would probably fail in the other House if the special amendment which I intended to offer should be adopted, which is to extend the resolution so as to apply to the Territory of Arizona as well as to the State of Texas. Therefore, I have said to the Senator from Texas that I should not press the amendment, and I shall not.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER). The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance to strike out the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HARRIS, the title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT OF DIPLOMATIC AGENTS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CHANDLER on the 8th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and report to the Senate their opinion as to the cases in which the President may constitutionally send to foreign countries agents, representatives, or commissioners, without the advice and consent of the Senate, and whether or not there was constitutional authority for the appointment in March last, without the advice and consent of the Senate, of Hon. James H. Blount as commissioner to the Hawaiian Islands with the powers conferred upon him by his letter of appointment and such other instructions as were given to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this resolution. There is going forward before the Committee on Foreign Relations an exhaustive inquiry into the condition of the Hawaiian Islands, our relations thereto, and the conduct of our recent minister to those islands, from which committee there will doubtless be a report in due time.

The object I have in asking the Committee on the Judiciary to make the proposed inquiry into the right of the President, without the advice or consent of the Senate, to send Mr. Blount upon his mission of March last, is because I desire to keep, if possible, the question of the constitutional right of appointment of officers of this character separate from a consideration of the merits of the Hawaiian controversy.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Judiciary Committee may as well inquire whether or not Mr. Blount's mission was one which the President could commit to him under the Constitution, and further tell the Senate and the country their opinion as to the cases in which agents or representatives of the President, or commissioners from the President, may be sent abroad without the advice and consent of the Senate.

It was, I repeat, in order to keep this legal and constitutional question separate from the merits of the main controversy that I introduced the resolution, and I hope there will be no objection to its passage.

Mr. VEST. Do I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to ask for the adoption of the resolution?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That was the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. VEST. I think it will be evident from the reading of the resolution already adopted by the Senate, which has committed this entire investigation to the Committee on Foreign Relations, that the action now asked for by the Senator from New Hampshire is entirely unnecessary. I ask that the Secretary read the resolution under which the Committee on Foreign Relations is now proceeding. They are examining witnesses from hour to hour upon the very question which is involved in this resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations shall inquire and report whether any, and, if so, what irregularities have occurred in the diplomatic or other intercourse between the United States and Hawaii in relation to the recent political revolution in Hawaii, and to this end said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I repeat, it must be evident from the reading of this resolution that for us to adopt the resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is simply to reiterate or rather to reënact what has already been done by the Senate.

I am authorized, although not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to state that the very question submitted in the pending resolution is now being investigated by the Committee on Foreign Relations. By the terms of the resolution already enacted and under which the Committee on Foreign Relations is now proceeding, that committee is instructed to inquire as to any irregularities in the diplomatic intercourse between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands, and if Mr. Blount or anybody else has been appointed irregularly and without the power to make the appointment; that is the very essence of the inquiry which is now going on.

Unless some Senator desires to speak further on the resolution, I move to lay it on the table, and I call for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri, that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN. I hope the Senator will withdraw that motion for a moment.

Mr. VEST. With the greatest pleasure.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. SHERMAN. Ordinarily I should vote for a resolution of this kind, as a matter of course; but under the circumstances, as the Committee on Foreign Relations are now examining into this same matter, I do not feel that I can conscientiously vote to interfere with the examination being made by the Committee on Foreign Relations or disturb or interrupt them. I think, therefore, that to make another inquiry by another committee would be discourteous to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The chairman of that committee is not present, and I think the Senator from New Hampshire had better allow the resolution to lie over.

Mr. CHANDLER. In view of the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, I withdraw the resolution. I had hoped that the Senate would consent to its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the resolution will be withdrawn. The Chair hears none.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I gave notice the other day that to-day I should call up the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes. I desire, if there is no Senator prepared to speak upon the bill at the present moment, that it shall be called up at 2 o'clock and made the unfinished business at that hour. I give notice that at 2 o'clock I shall call up the bill; and then, if there is no Senator prepared to speak, we can proceed to consider it or take such other action with regard to it as the Senate may desire.

I only rose for the purpose of saying that, instead of calling the bill up now as I had intended, I shall call it up at 2 o'clock in order that it may be the unfinished business.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, in view of the notice he has given, I will state that I do not believe there will be any objection to the taking up of the bill in order that it may become the unfinished business at the time the Senator indicates, but I ask the indulgence of the Senate with reference to the minority report. I have it in proof form upon my desk, but I have been unable to get certain statistics which I desired to incorporate in it, and therefore shall not be able to present it and have it printed so as to be on the desks of Senators before Monday next. I therefore inquire of the Senator whether, when the bill is taken up at 2 o'clock, if there is no Senator prepared to speak on either side, there will be any objection to the bill going over until Monday next?

I will add further, if the Senator will allow me, that there is no Senator on this side of the Chamber prepared to speak on the subject at this time. Senators undoubtedly will be ready to speak next week. It is for the purpose of reaching an amicable understanding about the debate that I make this suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. GRAY. I should much prefer, so far as I am concerned, to accede to the request of my friend from New Hampshire or any reasonable request of gentlemen on the other side, in regard to the consideration of the bill; but I think, after the time that has elapsed and the notice that has been given, I shall have to call it up and ask the Senate to consider it. If there is anyone prepared to speak, of course that will be the time when he may be heard, but I have no intention of pressing unduly the consideration of the bill, nor do I feel, from what I hear from those who are interested in this matter, that I ought to consent to a post-

ponement of the whole matter until Monday. It may be, if there is no one prepared to go on with the debate at 2 o'clock, that some one may be prepared to speak to-morrow or some subsequent day of the present week. But I do not think the Senator from New Hampshire will have reason to complain of any want of indulgence or want of courtesy on this side in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I have no such anticipation. I should like to ask the Senator whether when the bill is taken up we may expect from him or some other member of the majority of the committee a statement of the reasons why the election laws ought to be repealed, other than those which are contained in the majority report?

Mr. GRAY. I can not say, unless there is some one here whom I do not now know of who may be ready to speak on the bill.

FORT MAGINNIS MILITARY RESERVATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar of General Orders under Rule VIII is in order and will be proceeded with.

The bill (S. 335) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation in Montana, under the mining and homestead laws for educational and other purposes, was announced as first in order on the Calendar; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the lands embraced within the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation in Montana to be regularly surveyed by an extension of the public survey over the unsurveyed portions thereof.

SEC. 2. That there be, and there is hereby, granted to the State of Montana the use of one section (in square form) of said reservation, to be selected so as to embrace all buildings or improvements constructed upon said reservation for the use of said post, together with the water right belonging to and used by the same, to be used by said State for educational purposes, and to revert to the United States whenever such use shall cease.

SEC. 3. That the remainder of said reservation, after the approval of the survey thereof by the Secretary of the Interior, shall become a part of the public domain and subject to exploration, location, entry, and settlement under the mining, homestead, and other land laws of the United States, and not otherwise: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall limit the operations of any grant of land heretofore made to the State of Montana for educational or other purposes.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHAUNCEY M. LOCKWOOD.

The bill (S. 109) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood to commence their suit in the Court of Claims for extra mail service on route No. 16637, extending from Salt Lake City, Utah, to The Dalles, Oregon. It provides that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate the same upon the basis of justice and equity, and to render a final judgment therein for the value of such extra mail service performed as aforesaid; and from any judgment that may be rendered in the cause either party thereto may appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; and the bar of the statute of limitations shall not avail in such cases.

Mr. VEST. I ask for the reading of the report.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will allow me to make a single suggestion before the report is read.

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he reported the bill?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I did.

Mr. HOAR. Then I desire to make the suggestion to him. I understand Congress has a perfect right to impose upon the Court of Claims the duty and confer upon it the power, of course, of deciding claims in which the United States is a party according to justice and equity as distinct from a legal obligation. That unquestionably is within the power of Congress. But when it comes to an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, I do not understand that there is any legislative power to authorize that court to decide causes except upon the question of legal obligation, of course including the word "equity" in the sense in which it is used in jurisprudence; but I do not understand that to be what the pending bill says.

For instance, suppose there was a case where an official of the United States had given some assurance to a party so that his claim was not brought within the period fixed by the statute of limitations, anybody would clearly understand that a private person under such circumstances would not insist upon the bar, and it would be a very unjust thing for the United States to do so. We might say to the Court of Claims or to the Secretary of the Treasury, or any other creature of legislation, "Look into that case, and you are authorized to deal with the matter according to your sense of what is equitable and fair and just between the parties." But we can not give an appeal on that question to the Supreme Court of the United States. They are a constitutional court with constitutional powers. They have more than once indicated that they can not be required to perform any but their constitutional functions. So it seems to me if this bill is to pass, the provision for an appeal ought to be stricken out, so far as it includes anything but a legal obligation.

The same proposition was made by the late President Harrison, when he was a Senator, in regard to the French spoliation claims, in which he undertook to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; and the Senate were satisfied, and I believe that very eminent lawyer himself was satisfied, on discussion, that we could not give an appeal to the Supreme Court under such circumstances.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I think there is a great deal of force in what the Senator from Massachusetts says in relation to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. So far as I am personally concerned, I should be very glad to strike out the provision that gives an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is conceded that the Court of Claims has jurisdiction to pass on a case referred to it by an act of Congress upon the basis of justice and equity. It seems to me we can safely trust that court with this case. If the Senator desires to amend the bill in that respect, I certainly have no objection.

I will say a word or two to the Senator from Missouri, who has called for the reading of the report, and then if he desires to have the report read, it can be read. This is the tenth report that has been made on this claim, the report being every time favorable. There has never been a dissenting report. It has come from the Committee on Post-offices and Post-Roads under three several organizations of that committee. A similar bill has passed the Senate heretofore three separate times, after discussion at one time, and on the other occasions without discussion, I may say.

I will state the bill in brief. Mr. Chauncey M. Lockwood was the contractor under proposals issued by the Post-Office Department in 1868 to carry the mails from Salt Lake to The Dalles, Oregon. At the time he put in his bid there was a law upon the statute book providing in effect that all mail matter going west, except letter mail, should go by the Isthmus of Panama. After he had put in his bid and the contract had been awarded to him, Congress repealed the act, the effect of which was to throw over this route all mail matter which had previously gone by the Isthmus, and it presented a case of very great hardship.

The testimony in the case (numerous affidavits of postmasters along the route, other mail contractors, and persons having knowledge of the subject) is to the effect that the amount of mail was thereby very largely increased, necessitating a very large increase of means of transportation. As I said, the committees heretofore upon a thorough examination of the case have never had any hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the legal representatives of this man ought to be permitted to go to the Court of Claims for an adjudication to determine whether anything ought to be paid, and if so what amount.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The five minutes of the Senator from Oregon have expired.

Mr. VEST. I should like to have the report read, especially as to the limitation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the report.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, September 6, 1893, and read as follows:

The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 109) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood, having had the same under consideration, beg to submit the following report:

A similar bill has been under consideration in the committee at three previous sessions, at each of which it was reported favorably, and has passed the Senate on three several occasions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The statement which has just been read by the Secretary would seem to contradict my statement made a moment ago. The Secretary is reading from an old report which was adopted by the present committee.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the report and was interrupted by

Mr. ALLISON. I object to the further consideration of the bill. We can not deal with it under the five-minutes rule.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill, being objected to, goes over. Does the Senator from Iowa desire to place the bill under Rule IX, or leave it on the Calendar without prejudice?

Mr. ALLISON. I object to its consideration now. I do not especially desire that it shall go under Rule IX.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will remain on the Calendar under Rule VIII, going over under objection.

Mr. VEST. Speaking for myself, as I asked that the report should be read, I have no objection to the bill if the Senator from Oregon will agree to strike out all after the word "equity," in line 9. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts as to the

appellate jurisdiction which it is attempted to confer by the bill. There is another clause in the bill to which I specifically and strenuously object, and that is——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa withdraw his objection?

Mr. ALLISON. Not at present. When the Senators have the bill in hand, so that we may understand precisely what they propose to do with it, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask that the bill may retain its place on the Calendar, under Rule VIII.

Mr. VEST. It goes over, then, under objection?

Mr. DOLPH. Let it go over informally, that we may see whether the Senators can not agree about it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill, being objected to, goes over without prejudice, holding its place on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

L. A. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 110) for the relief of L. A. Davis was announced as next in order, and was read.

Mr. VEST. I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The same principle is involved in this bill, and I ask that it may go over with the other one.

Mr. VEST. Yes, let it go with the one just passed over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill goes over without prejudice under Rule VIII.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL QUESTIONS.

The next business on the Calendar was a concurrent resolution providing for a joint committee of the two Houses to consider questions of finance, etc.

Mr. VEST. Let that go over. It can not be considered under the five minutes rule.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The concurrent resolution goes over under Rule IX.

SAMUEL COLLINS.

The bill (S. 411) for the relief of Samuel Collins, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Samuel Collins, of Water Valley, Miss., $230.11.

Mr. VEST. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, submitted by Mr. PASCO, September 7, 1893, as follows:

This case was before the Senate in the Fifty-second Congress. The amount then claimed was $500. The committee, after carefully considering the facts made a favorable report, but reduced the amount to $230, and amended the bill accordingly. In this form it passed the Senate and went to the House of Representatives, where no final action was taken. The present bill is identical with the amended bill which then received the favorable consideration and action of the Senate, and the committee having again considered the case, adopt so much of the former report as sets forth the facts, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The part of the former report thus adopted is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 531, Fifty-second Congress, first session.]

"The purpose of the present bill is to pay to Samuel Collins, of Water Valley, Miss., certain bounty money due him for enlisting in Company I, Fifth United States Colored Heavy Artillery, during the late war. His claim for $300 was allowed March 17, 1870, per settlement No. 556104, authorized by joint resolution of Congress of January 13, 1864. The certificate for this sum was made payable to the Commissioner of the Freedman's Bureau in accordance with law, and the money was paid to the chief disbursing officer of the Bureau April 1, 1870, and passed into the hands of C. L. C. Cass, the local agent at Jackson, Miss., on December 3, 1871.

"This agent claimed that he paid the money to the soldier and exhibited a receipt purporting to be signed by Collins and witnessed by two witnesses. The claimant, however, insisted that he had not received the money, and urged his demand against the Government for payment. The agent, Cass, then stated that the money in this case and another had been paid to the wrong persons, but failed or refused to make good his mistake or negligence.

"Thereupon suits were instituted in the name of the United States by the United States district attorney in the district court of the southern district of Mississippi against the agent, Cass, for the recovery of the amounts improperly paid to the wrong parties, or wrongfully withheld by him while acting as agent of the Freedman's Bureau and disbursing officer of the Government.

"The two suits were consolidated, and Mr. Cass in his defense set up a counterclaim against the United States, which on the trial was disallowed, and a judgment was rendered in favor of the United States for the aggregate amounts due to the two soldiers, with interest and costs. An appeal was taken to the circuit court and the judgment of the district court was sustained.

"An execution was issued upon the judgment and the net sum collected upon it was $77.39, and as to the residue of the amount it was returned *nulla bona*. Of this amount $69.89 was paid to the claimant, Collins, and he has received only that sum upon his bounty claim of $300, the Department ruling, according to law, that no further action could be taken with reference to the payment of the balance without the action of the Congress.

"The record of the Cass suit is before the committee, and a letter from the judge who presided at the trial, who gives a brief history of the case; also a letter from the Second Auditor of the Treasury. Upon these the foregoing statements are based, and the judge's letter is herewith submitted as a part of this report.

"It is very clear that the unpaid part of Collin's bounty is still due to him by the United States. The default was on the part of one of its officers to whom the money was intrusted and it never reached him. The United States has a judgment against the officer for the money which he received and failed to pay, and the prosecution of the suit in its name, by its own officer, is a full recognition of the fact that it was the money of the Government that was withheld and that no payment had ever been made that would discharge its liability.

"The $300 is still due the claimant, less the $69.89 that he received after the partial recovery upon the execution. This leaves a balance of $230.11. "

* * * * * * *

JACKSON, MISS., *May 17, 1886.*

GENTLEMEN: I learn that there is a bill referred to you providing for an appropriation of some three or four hundred dollars to Samuel Collins, a colored man of Water Valley, in this State, for that amount due him as a soldier in the late war, as bounty money.

The sum of $300 was duly allowed said Collins, and an order drawn in his favor upon one L. C. Cass, then receiver of public money in this city. Cass refused to pay the money to Collins, claiming that he had paid it to some one else. The United States district attorney brought suit against Cass upon this claim, in the name of the United States, for the use of Collins; also, in the name of the United States for the use of another of the same character. These suits were consolidated. Cass defended on the ground that the United States owed him as salary an amount more than the claim. The case was submitted to the court as of a jury.

This was in the district court. A judgment was given in this court for the claims, interest, and costs, from which Cass appealed to the circuit court, by which the judgment of the district court was affirmed and an execution was issued; returned *nulla bona*.

Collins has never received this money, and should have it.

The written opinion delivered in the district court at the time sets out the facts, and which I herewith inclose. I further state that Collins is a good, industrious, honest, colored man, who has been for many years in the employment of the Illinois Central Railroad Company, and much respected by those who know him and for whom he labors.

If Cass is living, and the money can be made upon the judgment against him, the Government can be reimbursed, but Collins ought not to be dependent upon that recovery, but should have his money; he should not be defeated by the embezzlement and fraud of a dishonest agent.

R. A. HILL,
United States Judge.

THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PASCO. The letter from Judge Hill sets forth the principal facts in the case. I will state in addition that this matter has received the careful consideration of the Committee on Claims. It was unanimously passed through the committee during the last Congress and again during the present Congress. A similar bill passed the Senate during the last Congress, but it was not considered in the other House. The claim is eminently just. Collins is entitled to his bounty. It was paid to the wrong person without any fault on his part, and the Government has taken a judgment against the person who illegally and unlawfully received it. I think there is no doubt but that the bill should pass.

Mr. VEST. I wish to call the attention of my friend from Florida to one principle which is adopted in this proposed legislation, and it is a very dangerous one; it has always met with opposition in both Houses of Congress. I refer to the principle or practice that the Government is to be responsible for the defalcation or the criminal act of one of its agents. The principle has never been recognized by Congress, and if recognized it would take immense amounts of money out of the Treasury.

Mr. PASCO. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that the money was turned over to the agent of the Government for the purpose of being paid to Collins, and he never paid it to him.

Mr. VEST. He embezzled it?

Mr. PASCO. Yes; and the money never went lawfully from the possession of the Government. The man never received his money; it was stayed in the hands of the Government by the unlawful act of the Government's own agent, and certainly Collins ought not to be responsible under such circumstances.

Mr. VEST. Of course, it is a very hard case upon this colored man. I do not deny that. We have had a great many cases of hardship before us; but the bill establishes a precedent which I do not like and which I have always resisted. I will not object to the bill. It involves a small amount; and the Senate can pass it if it chooses.

Mr. DOLPH. It seems to me that the Senator from Missouri is not quite correct in his statement that this is a case where the Government is not responsible for the default of its agent. The money was the money of the Government, and of course when it was embezzled by the Government's own agent—a receiver of public moneys—it was the loss of the Government. It was never the money of the claimant, and never was paid to the claimant by the Government. Therefore the claimant ought not to be saddled with the loss, and the Government ought not to refuse to pay him because its agent squandered the money without paying the claimant.

Mr. PASCO. I will call attention to the fact that it was the Government who intrusted the agent and not the individual. The following paragraph from page 2 of the report accompanying the bill will, perhaps, make it a little clearer:

It is very clear that the unpaid part of Collins's bounty is still due to him by the United States. The default was on the part of one of its officers to whom the money was intrusted, and it never reached him. The United States has a judgment against the officer for the money which he received and failed to pay, and the prosecution of the suit in its name, by its own

officer, is a full recognition of the fact that it was the money of the Government that was withheld and that no payment had ever been made that would discharge its liability.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that an action was brought in the Federal courts for the recovery of this money, and that a judgment was rendered against the agent, and the execution which was issued was returned *nulla bona*. Was that judgment entered in the name of the United States?

Mr. PASCO. Yes, in the name of the United States. It was treated at the time as a dishonest act against the United States. The United States prosecuted its remedy through the courts and obtained a judgment, and has the judgment now standing for the amount, but it has never been collected on account of the return of *nulla bona*.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OWNERS OF THE SHILLINGER PATENTS.

The bill (S. 724) for the relief of the owners of the Shillinger patents was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VEST. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report, submitted by Mr. PLATT September 8, 1893, and was interrupted by

Mr. VEST. I object to the further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri objects to the further consideration of the bill. As the present occupant of the chair reported the bill, he trusts that it may go over without prejudice.

Mr. VEST. There is no objection to that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over without prejudice.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. GORMAN. I withdraw the motion, of course.

Mr. HARRIS. I merely desire to suggest to the Senator from Maryland that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] desires at 2 o'clock to make a certain bill the unfinished business; and I was also inquired of before I left the chair about how long the Senate would be in session to-day. I suppose there will be messages from the President within the next half hour.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that that can be done just as well to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not hear the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Delaware can on to-morrow make the same suggestion at 2 o'clock that he might make to-day.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course he can.

Mr. GORMAN. We can resume legislative business about 2 o'clock, if necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, in resuming the legislative session after 2 o'clock, I ask of the Chair what is the order of business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The order of business is the Calendar of General Orders under Rule IX.

Mr. GRAY. I move, then, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2331, known as the elections bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals and for other purposes.

The bill was read.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to inform the Senator from Delaware that the minority report is substantially ready to be submitted and printed so that it may be seen by Senators who are desirous of seeing it before Monday next.

When the Senator gave notice this morning of his intention to move to take up the bill after the morning hour, I stated that I thought, while there were Senators on this side of the Chamber who desired to debate the bill, none of them would probably be ready to speak during this week. Therefore I suggest to the Senator, inasmuch as there are several speeches to be made this week, that the bill be allowed to go over until Monday next, retaining its position as the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether he can give any prognosis of the course of debate upon the other side of the Chamber, as to the time it will take, the number of speeches that will probably be made, or as to when, so far as he knows, it will be likely that a vote may be reached upon the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have frequently heard that inquiry made in the Senate Chamber, but hardly at this stage of the consideration of an important bill. I have stated frankly the whole situation to the Senator.

Mr. GRAY. I have no wish at all to press the consideration of the bill to the inconvenience of those who really wish to debate it; and as there has already been notice given of speeches to-morrow and next day on the Hawaiian matter, I am willing to accede, so far as I am concerned, to the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, but I should like to have an understanding that the bill shall be taken up at the expiration of the morning hour on Monday next at 2 o'clock.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the proposition I intended to make to the Senator, that the bill shall be considered the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New Hampshire ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that that agreement be made?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware make such request?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

Mr. GORMAN. Is it the understanding of the Senator in charge of the bill that on Monday next at 2 o'clock it shall be proceeded with, and then be pressed to the exclusion of other matters? I make the inquiry for the reason that we all know other important public matters will be pressing in a very short time, and as the Senate has already been delayed one week and now almost another, I ask whether it be the understanding or intention that the bill shall be proceeded with?

Mr. GRAY. That is my own understanding; and I would say now that I shall feel called upon on Monday, when the bill is taken up as the unfinished business, and thereafter, to press for its consideration until a conclusion is arrived at in regard to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the bill is up for consideration to-day; at 2 o'clock on Monday next it will be up for consideration and will be the unfinished business. Does the Senator mean that he shall press for its consideration in any extraordinary method or in any extraordinary haste?

Mr. GRAY. No.

Mr. CHANDLER. Or only in the ordinary method in which the unfinished business is always considered in this body?

Mr. GRAY. I suppose in the ordinary method in which unfinished business is kept before the Senate, if there is any desire to do so by those having it in charge, until some action is taken upon it. That would be my idea as to what is to be done, and I now give notice that I shall do it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator whether any extraordinary method of proceeding with the bill with reference to the debate thereon is proposed by him?

Mr. GRAY. The very object, so far as I am concerned, in acceding to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire to this second postponement of the consideration of the bill, would be that there could be no possible objection to going on in the regular order with this bill as the unfinished business. I do not suppose that any of the traditional customs of the Senate—I do not say "courtesy," as that seems to be a tabooed word—will be violated by those who are interested in bringing the pending bill to a conclusion.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not suppose so from anything which the Senator from Delaware said. It was only the inquiry of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] which led me to infer that he desired to give notice that the ordinary method of debate on important measures would not be adopted.

Mr. GRAY. The consideration of this matter is an important one. I think it will awaken the attention of the Senate and I have no doubt of the country, or that portion of it who are interested in what goes on here, and that there will be sufficient interest taken in it on both sides to keep the debate alive until we arrive at the natural end of such things—that is, a vote.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe that myself, and therefore I hope that on Monday next the Senator from Delaware will give us some reasons additional to those contained in the majority report why this bill should pass.

Mr. GRAY. I think those of us who are interested in the

passage of this bill are quite justified in asking that the Senate shall, in its ordinary way, continue the consideration of the bill reasonably and continuously until the end is reached.

Mr. CHANDLER. To that course I do not propose to make any objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Delaware asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that the further consideration of the pending bill be postponed until Monday next, the bill holding its place as the unfinished business in the Senate, and that at 2 o'clock on that day the bill be proceeded with. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware, when the minority report comes in, which will be, I understand, within a day or two at any rate, that the majority report and the views of the minority be printed together for the convenience of the Senate.

Mr. GRAY. Of course, it is understood that the majority report—and the Senator has been a member of the committee longer than I have been—is a favorable report of the bill with a reference to the House report.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have the two reports together if there is no objection. The majority of the committee has, as I understand, adopted the House report, and it will be more convenient, instead of having separate documents, to have the two together. Therefore I ask an order of the Senate, if there be no objection, that when the minority report comes in the two reports may be printed together for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection that order will be made. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 10, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1894.

ASSAYER.

Guy Bryan, of Missouri, to be assayer in charge at the United States assay office at St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Charles Speck, of Missouri, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri.

Webster Withers, of Missouri, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri.

POSTMASTER.

James Kleckner, to be postmaster at Mifflinburg, in the county of Union and State of Pennsylvania.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1894.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Albert A. Wilson, of the District of Columbia, to be marshal of the United States for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John H. Senter, of Vermont, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Vermont.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Samuel A. Townes, of South Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 9, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McKEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday, on account of sickness. Had I been present I would have voted, as I have heretofore voted, for the consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules.

EXPENSES OF COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Railroads, recommending an increase in the estimate for traveling expenses for his office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General, recommending that the appropriation for the compensation of assistants to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia be increased; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a copy of the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of William Chasteen and Margaret Garrison against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUNN, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. PAGE, for three days, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. MONEY, for two weeks, on account of important business.

ROADS AND STREETS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to report a bill (H. R. 5102) making appropriations to provide for the construction of county roads and suburban streets in the District of Columbia, and to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COMPTON], from the Committee on Appropriations, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which he now reports from that committee.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, that bill has never been reported by any committee.

The SPEAKER. It is reported by the Committee on Appropriations this morning.

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] objects. The bill will be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PRESENTATION OF A PETITION.

Mr. APSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition signed by Samuel Irving and 4,038 other workingmen of Fitchburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill. It is a nonpartisan petition and it is signed by both Democrats and Republicans in about equal numbers. It is the voice of more than four thousand heretofore prosperous workingmen of one place speaking out against the passage of this deceiving bill, which is satisfactory to no one, not even the committee that presents it. I would like to have the preamble and resolutions printed in the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent therefor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the preamble and resolutions may be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. SNODGRASS. I object.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is wholly unusual to print these things in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

CALL OF COMMITTEES FOR REPORTS.

The committees were then called for reports, but no reports of a public character were presented.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 69) to grant to the State of Oregon townships 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 south, in ranges 5 and 6 east of the Willamette meridian, in the State of Oregon, for a public park;

A bill (S. 79) to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife;

A bill (S. 418) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the

United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852; and

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of William Hendershott, of Butteville, Oregon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey;

A bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878; and

A bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification.

THE TARIFF.

The SPEAKER. Under the order made yesterday, the House will now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The order adopted yesterday is as follows:

Resolved, That after the passage of this resolution the House shall meet each legislative day at 11 o'clock a. m. That beginning to-day without intervening motion, except conference reports and reports from the Committee on Rules, the Journal shall be read, business under clause 1 of Rule XXIV shall be disposed of, the Speaker shall call the committees for reports, and then the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) "to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes."

That general debate on said bill shall be limited to the hour of adjournment on Saturday, the 13th of January; that on Monday, the 15th January present, said bill shall be read through, and shall from day to day be open to amendment in any part thereof.

That on Monday, the 29th day of January, at the hour of 12 o'clock m., said bill, with all amendments recommended by or that may be pending in the Committee of the Whole, shall be reported to the House; that two hours' debate be then allowed, and then the previous question shall be considered ordered upon pending amendments and the bill to its passage; that without other motion the vote shall then be taken on pending amendments, on the engrossment and third reading, on a motion to recommit with or without instructions should such motion be made, on the final passage of the bill, and on a motion to reconsider and lay on the table.

That beginning to-day, at the hour of 5:30 o'clock each day the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to general debate on said bill only. General leave to print remarks on said bill is hereby granted.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

[Mr. WILSON of West Virginia addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. In brief, answering the remarks made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] in response to a question submitted to him during his speech by myself, and for which answer he subsequently apologized, I desire to say that I charged his remarks to his associations with slavery before the war and to some of his present associations on that side of the House, and consequently accept his apology.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I hope the gentleman will not make me think that my apology was due rather to myself than to him.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, the measure now under consideration has for its avowed object a radical modification of the tariff act of 1890. It involves not only a change of rates, but a complete reversal of an economic policy. The law of 1890 was enacted not only with a view of securing revenue for the support of the Government, but for the further purpose of giving encouragement to the creation of new enterprises and protection to American industries and American workmen against unequal and injurious foreign competition.

In its practical workings it accomplished both these results.

ACT 1890 AND REVENUE.

That act went into effect October 6, 1890, and as a measure for revenue it met, so long as its operation was undisturbed, the needed requirements of the Government. This appears by the following financial statement from the Treasury Department of "Receipts and expenditures" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and subsequent years.

Receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal years 1891 to 1893 inclusive.

Year.	Total revenue.	Total expenditures, including premium.	Excess of revenue over expenditures.
1891	$392 612, 447. 31	$365, 773, 905. 35	$26, 838, 541. 96
1892	354, 937, 784. 24	345, 023, 330. 58	9, 914, 453. 66
1893	385, 818, 028. 78	383, 477, 954. 49	2, 340, 074. 29

From this it will be observed that during each of these years the revenues derived under the act of 1890 were somewhat in excess of governmental needs.

Since the 1st of July, 1893, however, there has been a marked decline in the public revenues until they have actually fallen below the requirements for the public service. During the first six months of the present fiscal year, viz, from July 1, 1893, to January 1, 1894, the total receipts amounted to only $151,715,444, as against $194,251,640 for the corresponding period of 1892, showing a falling off in the revenues to the amount of $42,535,595. The same ratio of loss continued throughout the current fiscal year would result in an alarming deficiency.

I venture to suggest, however, in this connection, that this decline in the public revenues during the present fiscal year is not attributable to any defect in the law of 1890, but rather to the general derangement and prostration of business throughout the country. The ascendency of a political party pledged to the destruction of our protective policy has not only crippled and suspended the operation of our domestic manufacturers, but the importer of foreign fabrics naturally curtails his importations in the hope of securing their admission into our markets upon more favorable conditions.

I confidently assert that if the election of 1892 had resulted in the retention of the Republican party in power, accompanied as it would have been with the assurance of the continuance of the American policy of protection, the effect upon the public revenues as well as the general prosperity of the country would have been entirely reversed. [Applause on the Republican side.] In support of this opinion I beg leave to refer to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of December 5, 1892, wherein he estimates the revenues of the Government under the act of 1890, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, as follows:

From customs	$210, 000, 000. 00
From internal revenue	175, 000, 000. 00
From miscellaneous sources	20, 000, 000. 00
From postal service	85, 125, 365. 38
Total estimated revenue	490, 121, 365. 38
The Secretary also estimated the total expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, exclusive of the sinking fund at	457, 261, 335. 33
Leaving an estimated surplus of	32, 860, 030. 05

This estimate was made, however, upon the supposition that the act of 1890 was to remain undisturbed. In connection with these estimates the Secretary took the precaution to say in his report:

The estimated receipts are based upon conditions prevailing prior to the late election. Public opinion having directed a change of policy, particularly in the tariff laws, the altered conditions resulting therefrom render it impossible at the present time to estimate the annual income with any marked degree of accuracy, and it is impossible to predict the effect that such proposed radical changes would have upon the future revenues of the Government.

Under all of the circumstances it would be inappropriate in me to undertake to make an estimate other than as already stated, but it is not out of place to remark that the business community having a full knowledge of proposed tariff reductions, the inevitable result will be a falling off in importations and a corresponding decrease in the revenues. The extent of this decrease no one will be able to measure until business shall again adjust itself to new conditions.

A careful review of all the facts fully justifies the opinion that the large increase of receipts ascribed to the marvelous prosperity of the country under the present revenue system would, if continued, enable the Department during the coming fiscal year to meet all obligations without the slightest impairment of its cash, and thereafter continue to show a material improvement in its condition.

President Harrison in his last annual message joined in this apprehension when he said:

It is possible also that this uncertainty may result in decreased revenues from custom duties, for our merchants will make cautious orders for foreign goods in view of the prospect of tariff reductions and the uncertainty as to when they will take effect.

I think, therefore, it may be confidently asserted that if the act of 1890 could have been undisturbed in its operation by public assurance of its continued enforcement instead of public apprehension of its early repeal, it would have yielded sufficient revenue to have met the ordinary expenses of the Government and thus accomplish one of the chief purposes for which it was enacted. If, however, it had failed to yield the full measure of

such requirement the deficiency could have easily been supplied without disturbing the business interests of the country by a general revision of the tariff.

ACT OF 1890 AND PROTECTION.

As a measure of protection to American industries and American labor, the act of 1890 in its results more than justified the prediction of its friends. That it would stimulate the development of new enterprises and promote the growth of established industries was confidently asserted, but that its beneficent effect would be so quickly manifest and so marvelous exceeded the highest hopes of the most sanguine. It induced capital to embark in untried ventures, enlarged the field of labor's profitable employment, augmented our domestic and foreign trade, and quickened with a new life the manifold industries of all our people.

President Harrison only affirmed the truth of history when in his last annual message to Congress he said:

So high a degree of prosperity and so general a diffusion of the comforts of life were never before enjoyed by our people.

This exultant declaration made but a little over one year ago, incredible as it seems in the midst of present appalling conditions, was nevertheless grounded on indisputable facts.

The American Economist, a journal of the highest character, in its issue of October 22, 1892, published the result of a partial census of the industrial growth of the country under the act of 1890, which disclosed that from the time that act went into effect, October 6, 1890, 345 new industries had been established in the United States and 108 existing plants extended and improved, demanding an increased outlay of $40,499,050 in capital and the employment of 75,000 additional laborers. In the textile industries alone, during the first six months of 1892, 135 new factories were built, comprising

40 cotton mills (21 of which were located in the Southern States),
48 knitting mills,
26 woolen mills,
15 silk mills,
4 plush mills, and
2 linen mills.

In September, 1882, there were 15,200,000 working spindles, an increase of 660,000 over 1891; while during the year 1891, American mills consumed 2,396,000 bales of cotton in the manufacture of domestic fabrics; it required 2,584,000 bales in 1892, showing an increased consumption of 188,000 bales in a single year.

The report of the commissioner of labor for the State of New York discloses the astounding fact that in 67 different industries in that State the value of the increased output in 1891 over 1890 was $31,315,130.68, involving an increased bestowment of wages of $6,377,925.09.

By the labor report for the State of Massachusetts it appears that 3,745 industries in that State paid to labor in 1891 $129,416,248, against $126,030,303 in 1890, an enlarged expenditure of $3,335,945 in wages alone, with an increase of 7,346 employés and an augmented investment of capital to the amount of $9,932,490.

But, marvelous as was this development, yet nowhere in the field of our industrial achievements was the triumph of our protective system more completely vindicated than in the creation of the American tin-plate industry. It is as astounding as it is gratifying. The report of Mr. Ayer, the special agent of the Treasury Department, shows that this industry has been substantially created in this country as one of the results of the act of 1890. On the 1st day of July, 1891, there was practically no manufacture of tin plate in the United States.

	Pounds.
From July 1, 1891, to September 30, 1891, 5 manufactories produced	826, 922
From October 1, 1891, to December 31, 1891, 11 factories produced	1, 409, 821
From January 1, 1892, to March 31, 1892, 20 factories produced	3, 209, 225
From April 1, 1892, to June 30, 1892, 26 factories produced	8, 200, 751
Making a total production during the first year under the operation of this law of	13, 646, 719
From July 1, 1892, to September 30, 1892, 32 factories produced	10, 952, 725
From October 1, 1892, to December 31, 1892, 32 factories produced	19, 756, 491
From January 1, 1893, to March 31, 1893, 33 factories produced	29, 566, 399
From April 1, 1893, to June 30, 1893, 35 factories produced	39, 543, 587
Making a total production for the second fiscal year of	99, 819, 202

To this should be added the amount of American sheet iron and steel made into articles and wares, tin and terne plated, during the same period, which amounted for the year ending June 30, 1892, to 5,620,867 pounds, and for the year ending June 30, 1893, to 8,802,621 pounds, making an aggregate manufacture of tin and terne plates in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, of 19,267,586 pounds and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, of 108,621,883 pounds, or a total in two years of 127,889,469 pounds.

In view of this marvelous development, Mr. Ayer was justified in saying in his report of October 24, 1892:

It would seem entirely within the range of possibilities that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, which will be the third year that the law will have been enforced, the United States will produce an amount of tin and terne plate equal to its own consumption, and nearly all of which will be made from American black plates.

Yet in the report of the committee this great and growing industry is characterized as a "bogus enterprise."

What is true in the tin-plate industry is equally exemplified in other interests.

But it is not necessary to multiply instances. I might consume the hour in summoning an array of unimpeachable witnesses to the potent influence of the act of 1890 in establishing and maintaining increased industrial development and promoting the enlarged employment of labor with the resultant prosperity and happiness to all our people. In no single particular did the act of 1890 fail to secure the beneficent results its authors designed, and every prophecy of ill in which its enemies indulged utterly failed of fulfillment.

You said it would develop no new industries—it created them by the hundreds. You said it would bring no resultant benefits to our workmen—it secured for them enlarged employment and increased wages. You said it would enhance the cost of the protected article—it cheapened it to the consumer. You said, it would diminish our foreign trade—it augmented it in 1892 to $1,857,680,610, an increase over the previous year of $128,283,604. You said it would shut out our products from foreign markets—our export trade increased $145,797,388, swelling its volume to $1,030,278,148, the largest ever known in the history of the country and exceeding the value of our imports by $202,875,686. You said it would paralyze our domestic trade—it was never more vigorous than in the years immediately following its enactment. And so every prophecy of ill found swift and complete refutation in increased industrial activity on every hand and enhanced individual and national prosperity. [Applause.]

PRESENT DEPRESSION NOT CAUSED BY ACT OF 1890.

We are therefore justified in asserting that the act of 1890, could its permanency have been assured, would have accomplished the double purpose for which it was enacted—revenue and protection.

It may be answered, however, that the tariff act of 1890 has been in continuous operation since its enactment and is still in force, and yet under it revenues have declined and industries decayed. Conceding this to be true, we deny that the existing deplorable condition of the country is attributable in any degree whatever to the law itself.

The McKinley tariff never closed a mill in the United States [applause], shut up a mine, stopped a wheel [applause], blew out a furnace fire, or drove a single workman into the streets. [Applause.] This general paralysis of business throughout the country comes solely from the ascendency of a political party pledged to the repeal of the act of 1890, and the substitution therefor of a tariff divested of all protective features. With such a party in full control of the Government is it any wonder that domestic manufacturers suspend operations until advised of the conditions under which they must market their output?

Business prudence dictated the suspension of the manufacture of domestic fabrics with high-priced labor until the conditions should be determined upon which the foreign competing products should be permitted to enter our markets. Importers naturally limited their orders to the strict necessities of trade in anticipation of more favorable conditions. And so manufacturer and importer alike prudently suspended business until the Democratic party should fix the terms upon which they would be permitted to resume. When the judge pronounces the sentence of death on the convicted felon there is no change in the law, but the victim is apt to lose interest in human affairs. [Laughter.] On an ocean voyage the chart and compass may remain undisturbed, but with a madman at the wheel and a lunatic on the bridge [laughter] the interest of the passengers will be chiefly centered in the supply of life-preservers. [Laughter.]

This industrial depression came, therefore, not as the result of existing tariff rates, but from an apprehension (it seems now to have been well founded) that these rates were to be so modified as to overthrow and destroy our protective policy, exposing our domestic manufacturers to a ruinous foreign competition and in-

augurate in this country an era of free trade with all its attendant evils.

How easily you might demonstrate the beneficial effects of restored confidence. You have but to abandon the policy upon which you have entered, recommit this bill, and permit existing tariff regulations to remain undisturbed, and all our industries will quickly revive. [Applause on the Republican side.] But such an exhibition of wisdom and patriotism is not to be expected of a party pledged to "tariff reform," and American workmen must tramp and starve, great industrial plants must go into disuse and decay, while the Democratic party is attempting to secure revenue from imported goods without conferring protection upon American capital and American labor. [Renewed applause.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, 1892.

And this brings me to the consideration of the general character and purposes of this bill. The Democratic party, in its national platform of 1892, declared, "We denounce Republican protection as a fraud. * * * We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue only."

No political party in the United States in its public declaration of principles was ever before bold enough to assail a protective tariff as unconstitutional, and no parallel to this extreme declaration can be found in the whole history of our country outside of the South Carolina ordinance of nullification. And in this connection it is curious to note the close harmony between the two declarations.

SOUTH CAROLINA ORDINANCE OF NULLIFICATION.

Whereas the Congress of the United States by various acts purporting to be acts laying duties and imposts on foreign imports, but in reality intended for the protection of domestic manufacturers—hath extended its just powers under the Constitution: We, therefore, the people of the State of South Carolina, in convention assembled, do declare and ordain and it is hereby declared and ordained, that the several acts and parts of acts of the Congress of the United States purporting to be laws for the imposing of duties and imposts on the importation of foreign commodities—are unauthorized by the Constitution of the United States and violate the true meaning and intent thereof, and are null, void, and no law.

It will be seen, therefore, that the ground on which the Democratic nullifiers stood in 1832, and from which they were driven by the stern patriotism of Gen. Jackson, is at last reoccupied in 1892, sixty years later, in force, by the whole Democratic party. And it is not difficult now to understand the alacrity with which the Northern Democracy obeys the command to take position in support of the unconstitutionality of a protective tariff and the confidence with which it seems to be inspired, reënforced as it is by the Southern wing of the Democratic party (now unhappily dominating the Republic) which evinced its deep-seated hostility to the principle of protection by ingrafting in its Confederate constitution the following expressed inhibition:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, and excises for revenue only, necessary to pay debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes or importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Democratic party in 1892, with its two wings reunited, the South in the lead, moving under the Confederate banner of free trade to the complete overthrow of our protective system.

THE ISSUE BETWEEN PARTIES.

Before proceeding further in this debate it is well to note the exact point in controversy between the two contending political forces. It may be safely asserted that both parties believe in raising some portion of the needed revenues for the support of the Government by imposing duties on foreign products coming into our markets, and the only points at issue are:

First. The class of articles upon which these duties shall be levied; and

Second. The rate of duty they shall bear.

On the one hand, the Democratic party insists that revenue is the only lawful purpose for which any duty can be imposed and that such exactions therefore must be for revenue only, regardless of the conditions or necessities of American industries or American labor; and to that end they would admit free of duty, indiscriminately, all products which they are pleased to denominate "raw material," and impose a rate of duty on manufactured articles sufficiently low to insure their importation into our market, and thereby secure the only purpose of a Democratic tariff, namely, "revenue."

On the one hand, the Republican party believes in a tariff which, while yielding revenue for the support of the Government, shall at the same time be so adjusted as to promote the establishment and maintenance of domestic industries and the protection of American workmen; and to that end would admit free of duty all articles raw or manufactured (except luxuries) coming from any place on the face of the globe, the like of which are not or can not be advantageously produced in this country, and impose duties only on the things we do or can produce and make that rate high enough to measure the difference between the cost of the foreign and domestic product, and by that means stimulate the development of all our resources and insure the employment of all our people.

Circumscribed within these narrow limits lies the whole field of the controversy, and on this ground the contending political forces confront each other in open and determined hostility. The Republican party stands, I believe, securely intrenched behind the bulwark of the American policy of protection and will resist to the last the combined forces of free trade from whatever quarter they may come, confident of ultimate and triumphant support by the enlightened judgment of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

In making this assault upon our protective system the Democratic party seeks to justify its course upon the theory expressed in its Chicago platform and reiterated in the report of the majority, "That the Federal Government has no constitutional power to collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only;" and that as the existing tariff is confessedly constructed for the purpose of securing both revenue and protection, it becomes necessary to readjust the schedules of duties to a revenue basis, and so avoid not only the fact but the suspicion of intended protection to any domestic industry, and thus conform to the Democratic construction of the National Constitution. It is for such purposes, I suppose, and such only, that this revision is undertaken.

There can scarcely be a necessity at this late day to enter into a defense of the constitutionality of a protective tariff. When it is remembered the Federal Constitution was adopted to remedy the defects of the government of the confederation, among which none was more glaring than the want of power in the central government to prescribe and enforce a uniform system of customs duties, it is inconceivable that the framers of that instrument would neglect the correction of the very evils which its adoption was intended to remove.

Seven years of trial of the confederation demonstrated the necessity of a national government invested with power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," and "to provide for the common defense and general welfare," the want of which under the confederation exposed the States to domestic jealousy and discord and the machinations of foreign powers. The Congress being powerless under the confederation to enact tariff laws without the consent of all the States, and that consent being withheld, each State undertook the regulation of its own trade with foreign nations and with the other States upon such terms as seemed most advantageous to itself.

This policy resulted in a multiplicity of custom laws as numerous as the States. One State would impose certain duties on foreign goods, while an adjacent State would for the purpose of securing trade admit the same class of goods into its ports free of duty, and so the selfish policy of each exposed all to the cupidity of foreign powers. Domestic industries, brought into existence and maintained through the exigency of war, were swept down in peace by a flood of imported goods, and manufacturer and laborer alike involved in a common ruin. It was to remedy this condition that "the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations" and "to provide for the common defense and general welfare" was conferred by the Federal Constitution upon the National Government.

Mr. Webster, in 1833, well said:

The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution.

Again in 1844, he said:

In Colonial times and during the time of the convention, the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union; regard to be had, in laying this duty, to the protection of American labor and industry.

I defy the man in any degree conversant with the history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, to say that protection of American labor and industry was not a leading, I might almost say the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted.

Fisher Ames, a member of the first Congress under the Constitution, in debate on the first tariff bill, said:

I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than by any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare.

But of more value than the individual opinion of men, however eminent, is the contemporaneous interpretation of the Constitution as expressed in the earliest legislation under it. The first act of any moment in the First Congress, suggested by Ham-

ilton, presented by Madison, and approved by Washington, related to the tariff, and its purpose was declared in the preamble as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debt of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on imported goods, etc.: therefore be it enacted.

That act received the official approval of Washington July 4, 1789, and was everywhere hailed as a second declaration of independence. If it had been in violation of the Constitution none would have been more apt to discover it than Washington himself, who, as president of the convention which framed it, must have been fully possessed of the scope and spirit of that instrument. In addition to this the early Presidents took frequent occasion to refer approvingly to the course of national legislation looking to the protection of domestic manufactures.

President Washington, in his last annual message to Congress, said:

Congress has repeatedly and not without success directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.

President Adams spoke of—

The wisdom and efficiency of the measures which have been adopted by Congress for the protection of commerce.

Thomas Jefferson spoke of the duty of Congress:

To protect the manufacturers adapted to our circumstances.

In one of his messages to Congress, when the question of disposing of the surplus revenues was arresting public attention, and the suggestion was made to dispense with some part of the customs duties, he took occasion to say:

Shall we suppress the imposts and give that advantage to foreign over our domestic manufacturers?

Again he said:

The general inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependency upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in caves or dens. I am proud to say that I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comforts. The prohibiting duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made within ourselves, without regard to difference of price, secures us against a relapse into foreign dependency.

In 1809 Mr. Jefferson wrote to Mr. Humphrey as follows:

My own idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw materials.

In 1817 he was elected a member of the "Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufactures," and in his letter of acceptance said:

The history of the last twenty years has been a significant lesson for us all to depend for necessities on ourselves alone, and I hope twenty years more will place the American hemisphere under a system of its own, essentially peaceable and industrious and not needing to extract its comforts out of the eternal fires raging in the Old World.

President Madison, justly recognized as the "Father of the Constitution," in a special message to Congress in 1809, said:

It will be worthy of the just and provident care of Congress to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens.

And again in 1815:

But there is no such subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress than consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and obtained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant attention of Congress.

James Monroe, in his inaugural address, among other things, said:

Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing, as we do, all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend in the degree we have done on supplies from other countries. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for raw materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets.

President Monroe, in his seventh annual message to Congress, said:

Having formerly communicated my views to Congress respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures, and the principle on which it should be founded, I have only to add that those views remain unchanged. I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture, or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country.

President John Quincy Adams, in a message to Congress in 1828, speaking of our agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests, said:

All these interests are alike under the protecting power of legislative authority.

But it is needless to continue these citations. Enough appears to establish beyond controversy that the want of power under the Confederation to impose duties on imports with a view not only of raising revenue but of insuring the development and protection of domestic manufactures, was one of the most potent reasons urged in favor of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and that these powers were embraced in that instrument and promptly invoked by the National Government without hesitancy or question.

Great signification is justly attached to the construction of the Constitution, by those who were first called upon to administer it, in view of the fact that Washington, the president of the convention which framed it, became the first executive officer to enforce it, and of the thirty-eight men who considered, framed, and signed that instrument fifteen were chosen members of the first Congress organized under it, among whom were Roger Sherman, Robert Morris, and James Madison, while Fisher Ames, Rufus King, Richard Henry Lee, and James Monroe, men scarcely less noted for their patriotism and sound judgment, participated in the work of giving force and effect to the Federal Constitution.

In the light of these facts you will have some difficulty, I apprehend, in convincing the American people that a tariff adjusted in the interest of domestic industries is in violation of the Constitution. Intelligent people will not be apt to discard the patriotic opinions of Washington, Madison, Jefferson, and their contemporaries and accept the partisan interpretation of modern Democracy.

Having said this much in answer to the assumption that a protective tariff is unconstitutional, let us pass to a consideration of the substance of this measure.

TARIFF REFORM.

And here we have at last translated into apt phrase the hitherto mysterious doctrine of "tariff reform."

You have now conjured with these words for the last time. Having ceased to be mysterious they will lose their magic power to deceive and mislead the people. "Tariff reform" is finally interpreted to mean "free raw material" and reduction of duties on competing foreign products entering our markets below the protective point, regardless of the consequences to American industries or American labor. This is "tariff reform."

Before proceeding to a specific explanation, I desire to say that this measure as a whole stands without a parallel in the history of proposed tariff legislation in this country. It was framed with the evident intention of carrying out that portion of the Democratic platform and policy which declared for a "tariff for revenue only," and is the boldest step yet taken by any party in the United States in the direction of free trade—a step which, if it shall find popular following in this country, will certainly lead to individual disaster and national bankruptcy.

But daring as is the advance made, it seems from the report of the committee that while adhering to the doctrine of the unconstitutionality of the protective tariff, the majority have been restrained in their headlong course toward free trade by the "existence of great industries" which impede their progress and which they hesitate to utterly destroy; and then in apologetic tone assure their followers and the country that "the bill is not offered as a complete response to the mandate of the American people" and does not "profess to be purged from all protection."

Are we then to understand that further "response" from the Democratic party may be expected, in which the tariff is to be wholly "purged from all protection" and the destruction of American industries and the pauperization of American workmen fully consummated? Is this the prospect you hold out to a people already driven by your threatened policy to the very verge of despair and desperation? If such be your purpose, the only escape then lies in the hope that long before you are able to complete your desolating work an indignant people will drive you forever from power. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And in this connection I desire to say that, whatever may have been the purpose of the majority in framing this bill, that in so far as it conforms to the Democratic platform of 1892 it will, if enacted into law, prove disastrous to the interests involved, and in so far as it fails to redeem the party pledges it is either a confession of error or an exhibition of cowardice. [Applause.] If in error you ought to be patriotic enough to promptly avow it, abandon the policy upon which you have entered, and permit the country to resume its industrial prosperity. If, on the other hand, you still adhere to the principles of the Chicago platform and have failed to embody them in this measure, you have openly betrayed the confidence of the people who intrusted you with power.

LOSS OF REVENUE.

But upon examination of this bill, in connection with the estimated revenues it will secure, the startling fact is disclosed that

as a revenue measure it is confessedly inadequate, it being conceded that upon the basis of last year's importations it will occasion a serious loss of revenue estimated anywhere from sixty to seventy-five millions of dollars annually, to be supplied either by an enormous increase of importations to the detriment or destruction of domestic industries or by resorting to a system of internal taxation as pernicious as it is offensive. The final determination of the majority touching the extent of internal taxation to be imposed, has not yet been disclosed by the Executive.

And in this connection the query is naturally suggested whether this sudden conversion of the Democratic party to a system of direct internal taxation is not attributable in a large degree, if not chiefly, to the fact that it is, if not the most direct, at least the most effective method of insuring the ultimate destruction of our protective system. For it is apparent, the more revenue secured from internal sources the less to be derived from duties on imports, and the less imposed and collected on foreign goods the more nearly we approach absolute free trade.

THE FREE LIST.

The first proposition arresting attention in this bill is the proposed transfer of one hundred and thirty-one articles from the dutiable to the free list. Of these, twenty-nine are taken from the chemical schedule, three from the schedule of earths and earthenware, fourteen metals and manufactures of metals, nineteen articles of wood, two from the schedule of spirits, six from flax, hemp, and jute, and their manufactures; twenty-seven agricultural products, twenty items of wool from the unwashed clip to the scoured fleece and finished noil, and eleven articles from the schedule of sundries, together with coffee, skins, and hides released from the possibility of customs exactions by the total repeal of the reciprocity provision of the act of 1890.

It will not escape notice in this connection that upon examination of the list of articles thus transferred from the dutiable to the free list the interests of the farmer seem to have been selected for special assault and destruction, as nearly one-half of the items embraced in this proposed transfer are the fruits of domestic husbandry. Even the duty of 20 per cent ad volorem accorded the American farmer on his wheat, corn, rye, oats, buckwheat, and their manufactures is to be removed, and all these products admitted free of duty from any country extending like privileges to us. The way is thus open to the Canadian farmer to invade our markets at will.

But let us look for a moment at the scope of this proposition as a whole. Of the class of articles thus proposed to be transferred to the free list, there were imported into the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, $50,933,409 worth, upon which there was collected under existing law the sum of $13,789,022 of public revenue. The immediate effect of this proposition, therefore, if adopted, will be to open our markets to the free importation of nearly $51,000,000 of foreign products, accompanied with the voluntary surrender of nearly $14,000,000 of annual revenue.

It is a free donation to foreigners, at a time, too, when the Treasury of the United States is in pressing need of increased resources. There is not in it even a suggestion of reciprocity by which some concessions might be secured for our surplus products in the markets of the nations thus favored with free entrance into our own. It is a bald free-trade gift—the price paid for a Democratic theory.

Such a proposition would at any time arrest public attention, but to be made in the presence of a depleted Treasury, and with its Secretary asking to be clothed with power to issue bonds on which he may borrow money to meet the current expenses of the Government, is a proposition so startling as to challenge the credulity of mankind. [Prolonged applause on Republican side.] There is only one explanation possible, and that is found in the exclamation of an English statesman, "It is free trade gone mad." The present free list ought to be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the most advanced free trader. The act of 1890 enlarged it to the very limit of safety to American industries and American labor.

The value of our free imports increased from $266,103,048 in 1890 to $444,172,064 in 1893, while our dutiable imports fell off from $507,571,764 in 1890 to $400,282,519 in 1893. And yet it is proposed to increase our free imports to more than $490,000,000, while reducing the dutiable to $354,000,000.

But, serious in its results as this proposition would seem to be, yet its far-reaching consequences can only appear when we consider the class of products to be accorded free entrance into our markets. If the articles proposed to be transferred to the free list were exclusively of foreign production and therefore not to come in competition with American industries and American labor, no advocate of the American system would make complaint, however extended the catalogue, for it would be in harmony with the theory of protection.

But the one hundred and thirty-one articles proposed to be transferred to the free list are not exclusively of foreign origin. They are of domestic production, built up and sustained by the investment of American capital and the employment of American labor. They are the products of our factories, our mines, our forests, our mills, our flocks and our fields, which you propose thus to expose to the merciless and unrestrained assault of our foreign rivals. And to what end? That the manufacturers, forsooth, may have the advantage of "free raw material."

Heretofore if there was any one class of our people the Democratic party inveighed against more than another it was the manufacturer, but he has now, it seems, become the object of your deepest solicitude, while the humble laborer for whom you have professed so much anxiety in the past is abandoned to an unequal battle with his foreign antagonists. The hardy miner, the intelligent flock master and farmer, and all the producers of what you are pleased to call "raw materials," are to be forced to contend unaided with the cheapest labor on the globe that the manufacturer may enjoy the boon of "free raw material."

Why should not the producers of raw material be accorded the same consideration as the manufacturer of that material into his finished product? Why should the miner in his perilous vocation be utterly abandoned, while the workers in the raw material which he produces are given some measure of consideration? Why should the farmer, having invested his all in fields and flocks, be forced into an unequal competition with Australia and South America, while the manufacturer of woolen fabrics secures some measure of protection? And in this connection it is but just to say that the woolen manufacturers as a body demand no such unjustifiable discrimination.

But I notice every "tariff reformer" urges free raw material as an indispensible adjunct to the consummation of his theory. "There is method in his madness." No one understands better than he that free raw material will be swiftly followed by free manufactured goods. It will be protection for all or protection for none. [Applause.] When you force the producers of raw material into unrestrained competition with the world the manufacturers of this raw material into the finished fabric will speedily share the same fate.

How long do you suppose the wool-growers of this country will submit to be taxed, as you are pleased to call it, on their woolen goods, after you have forced their wool onto the free list to the destruction of their flocks and their fortunes? Human nature is very much the same everywhere and the spirit of retaliation will find swift and terrible expression. When you have completed this proposed transfer it is the beginning of the end of the protective system in the United States; and I apprehend it is the knowledge of this fact which inspires the free trader of to-day with unflagging zeal in the advocacy of free raw material.

Yet I confess that in the light of this measure it is somewhat difficult to understand the Democratic idea of raw material.

For example, you put one class of clays on the free list, while another, adapted to the use of the same industry, is made dutiable. One would suppose that clay was about as "raw" a material as could be imagined. Yet, while putting the clays of New Jersey on the free list, you impose a duty of $2 a ton on the clays of Florida, Georgia, and other Southern States. One would surmise what was raw material in New Jersey would be "raw material" in Florida. But it seems not. One would suppose that hoop iron would be the same, regardless of the uses to which it is applied. Not so. On the farmer's bucket it is taxed, around the planter's cotton it is free. Washed wool and washed clay ought to hold the same place in Democratic philosophy. Yet the wool of the Northern farmer is "raw material," while the washed clay in the hands of the Southern producer is a highly finished product. It is useless, however, to attempt to extract from this bill the Democratic conception of raw material. The truth is, there is no such thing as raw material, except in nature's storehouse.

The iron in the mountain, the coal in its native bed, the trees in the forest, the stone in the quarry—these are raw material in their natural condition, and untouched by the hand of labor would remain raw material forever and continue absolutely valueless. But when labor touches them and transforms them to the uses of mankind that moment they cease to be raw material and become the finished product of invested capital and expended labor. You may continue to delude yourself with the theory that these things are raw material, but you will not deceive the intelligent labor of this country, through whose mighty energies they are produced.

But let us go a step farther and consider the effect upon the industries involved before this proposed free list shall be enacted into law. The only reason assigned by the advocates of this measure in support of free raw material is that it will give cheaper raw material and so bring a resultant benefit to the consumers of the finished product into which such material enters. The whole argument proceeds and is grounded upon that

theory. The contention is that the manufacturer can secure his raw material, if free, cheaper elsewhere than in the United States.

If it will not give him cheaper raw material, either by purchasing abroad or forcing our domestic producers down to the level of the world's market, then this step is without rhyme or reason and the whole bill formed upon this assumption must be recast. That the manufacturer will secure his raw material, when free, in the cheapest market goes without saying, and it becomes important to inquire, therefore, what effect free trade in raw material will have on domestic producers of the competing product.

WOOL AND IRON ORE.

Among the articles proposed to be transferred to the free list are wool and iron ore. When this shall have been consummated the manufacturer of woolen goods will surely secure his raw material in the cheapest market. He will draw his supply of wool from Australia, South America, Turkey, and South Africa, where lands are practically free and climatic conditions conduce to the cheapest production. The manufacturer of pig iron will turn to Spain, Cuba, England, and the world s sources of cheapest supply for his iron ore. This will inevitably result in one of two things—the destruction of our flocks and the closing of our mines or the lowering of our conditions to the level of our foreign competitors.

"To this complexion we must come at last."

In the case of the American wool-grower it is not within his power to reach the conditions, if such a step was desirable, which would enable him to successfully compete with the foreign producer. High-priced lands, a rigorous climate, American wages and the cost of transportation, offer an irresistible barrier to the successful prosecution of this industry in the United States under free trade.

How can our flock masters contend with Australia in an open market where 600,000,000 pounds of wool are produced annually from flocks grazing on lands which are rented for a penny an acre a year? Or with the 460,000,000 pounds of annual production in South America, where lands are free and labor commands only 8 cents a day? Or with Russia's 350,000,000 pounds produced with 15 cents daily labor? Or with South Africa, Turkey, and Asia, where 10 cents a day is the highest recompense awarded in this industry?

Under free trade these countries could put their wool down in our markets at a price less than the cost of production here, and the consequence would be the complete destruction of this great and growing industry in the United States. This would be attended with the sacrifice of 47,000,000 sheep, in which 2,000,000 farmers have invested $100,000,000 in capital, and the abandonment of extensive ranches with all their valuable improvements. It is idle to contend that with free wool this industry could survive.

Our farmers are too intelligent to be deceived, and they are already selling their flocks or driving them to the slaughter pen in the hope of saving something from the general wreck which is sure to follow. I regret that time and space forbid the presentation of protests in my hands, from thirty-four States and Territories, against the consummation of this atrocious outrage. Yet this would probably fall now upon deaf ears, but the time is not far distant when they will be heard. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] in his speech of yesterday, in advocacy of free wool, summoned to his support the statement of a Representative from the State of Texas, to the effect that the industry of wool-growing can be carried on as cheaply in that State as anywhere on the globe; and that free wool would not therefore be injurious to the flock masters of that State. Against this assertion I interpose a remonstrance fifty feet long from the citizens of Texas bearing eleven hundred signatures, in condemnation of the policy of free wool. Let this be your answer [unrolling the remonstrance]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Turn to the iron industry; with free trade in iron ore how can the American miner in Michigan and elsewhere in the United States successfully contend with the miners of England, Spain, Cuba, and the ore-producing countries of the old world? The average wages in the Lake Superior mining district for drillers or miners is $2.25 to $2.75 per day while the same class of laborers in England receive $1.21 and in Spain only from 60 to 72 cents per day. With us, common laborers receive from $1.60 to $2 a day, in England from 72 to 84 cents, and in Spain 36 to 60 cents a day. Even the boys in the Lake Superior mines receive from $1 to $1.25 per day, while boys and women in England secure from 24 to 60 cents, and in Spain 24 to 36 cents a day. It is in evidence before the Ways and Means Committee that the wages of miners on Lake Superior are more than 3½ times those of Bilbao, and more than double those in the Cleveland (English) district. With these conditions staring us in the face there is no escape from the conclusion that with free iron ore we must either close our mines or reduce the cost of production to the lowest level of the world's supply.

But to cheapen production involves a reduction of wages to the level of Spanish and Cuban labor—a proposition repugnant to every instinct of American manhood and to be resisted, I trust, to the last, by the laboring people of this country through every legitimate instrumentality at their command. Already the suggestion of free trade in iron ore has closed our mines, forced the miners out of employment, and driven a people who were never before dependent upon public charity to beggary and want. The good people of my State, in every town and hamlet, are already contributing to their necessities.

I hold in my hand a memorial from the citizens of the city of Bessemer, in the State of Michigan, addressed to the President of the United States, setting forth the conditions of the miners in the upper peninsula, from which I desire to make some extracts.

Hon. Grover Cleveland, President of the United States:

The citizens of the city of Bessemer, in the county of Gogebic and State of Michigan, regardless of party or political affiliations, in meeting assembled, view with alarm the reported action of the Ways and Means Committee of Congress in recommending that iron ore be placed upon the free list, and respectfully submit for your consideration:

That during the year 1892 the number of men directly employed in the mines of this county, in the mining of iron ore, was not less than 6,000, whose average wage-earning power were from $350,000 to $400,000 monthly.

In addition there was expended by the mines monthly for mining-timber, wood, lagging, and mining supplies $150,000 to $200,000, which indirectly gave employment to over one thousand additional workmen, and that the prosperity of this county and its people is dependent almost wholly upon the prosperity of the iron industries.

Owing to doubts, fears, and uncertainty as to the policy of the General Government relative to the protection of American industries and American labor, and especially as to the reported intention to change existing tariff schedules and class iron ore as raw material and place it upon the free list, every mine in this county has been closed down to await the settlement of tariff legislation, and that thousands of laborers have been thrown out of employment and are unable to obtain work at any price, and that much want and suffering exists in this community in consequence.

The only labor now employed in this county is that engaged in manning the pumps and keeping the mines free from water, and that the whole number thus employed will not exceed 400 men all told, whose average monthly earnings will not exceed $12,000 to $15,000.

Thousands of men in this county, able and willing to work, are unable to secure employment, are in actual want, and hundreds of honest and deserving families are in consequence obliged to ask public aid and subsist on public charity.

The expenditures for poor purposes in the county of Gogebic during the year 1892 did not exceed $10,000, and that the expenditures of eight months in the present year have already exceeded $25,000, and that owing to the approach of winter, and the destitution and want existing in this section, the expenditures for poor purposes must be greatly increased.

Owing to the calls made upon it the funds of this county, available for poor purposes, have been exhausted, and all funds available for other purposes have been applied to relieve want and suffering among our people, and that the county treasury is now empty and there will be no funds therein available for any purpose before March 1, 1894.

To relieve the pressing necessities of the poor, orders are being issued by the commissioners, but that owing to there being no available funds to take up such orders, the same are becoming valueless, and that unless the mines resume work at an early date great suffering and distress will result.

Investigation shows that there are in this city alone one hundred families, about five hundred persons, mostly women and children, dependent upon public charity and in pressing need of immediate assistance in the shape of food and clothing to relieve their wants, and that the condition of affairs in other sections of the county is comparatively no better than the condition of affairs in this city.

The classing of iron ore as raw material and placing it upon the list of articles to be admitted free of duty will be destructive to the mining industries of this section and the prosperity of our people, and we respectfully, but none the less earnestly, protest against such contemplated action by the Administration and the present Congress, and urge not only that the present duty be retained, but increased as well, believing that such action would bring to the depressed industries of our section a return of its past prosperity.

We respectfully submit that iron ore in its natural state, and in place in the earth before human labor has been expended upon it, is raw material, and its value is determined by the royalty demanded upon it by the owners of the soil, which on this range averages 35 cents per ton. The cost of a ton of iron ore delivered to the furnaces at Lake Erie points is $3.96.

To which must be added the cost of superintendence and interest on the capital invested. And we protest against iron ore being classed as raw material when more than ten-elevenths of its value at the furnace, where it is consumed, consists of the labor and cost of its production and transportation.

The iron ore from our mines loaded for transportation to the furnace is the finished product of our people. The finished product of our mines is the raw material of the producers of pig iron, and what is the finished product of one industry is ever the raw material of the next in the ascending scale of manufactures.

We submit that every article into which human labor has entered and has increased or multiplied its value, in order to render it available for the use of man, has ceased to be raw material, and we demand, as a matter of simple justice, that the product of American labor, whether in the forest or on the farm, in the factory, or in the deepness and darkness of the mine, shall be protected, to the end that the American markets be reserved for American labor and be freed from competition for bare existence with the cheaper and degrading conditions surrounding the labor of other lands.

We therefore sincerely but earnestly protest against iron ore being classed as raw material and placed among the list of articles admitted free of duty, and we ask, in the name of common humanity, in the name of our desolated homes and suffering poor, that this nation be not committed to a policy that must prove destructive alike to its industries and the prosperity of its people.

It is a condition not a theory that confronts us, and confronted by this condition, we respectfully ask that should you as Chief Executive feel

bound to recommend in your annual message the adoption of the tariff policy outlined by the Ways and Means Committee, that you submit this our respectful but earnest protest against the adoption of such a policy to the Congress of the United States.

Such is the condition of labor in a single city in my State. I submit also the following protest from the board of supervisors of the county of Gogebic in confirmation of the foregoing memorial:

To the Congress of the United States:

The board of supervisors of Gogebic County, State of Michigan, in regular meeting assembled, at the court-house of said county, this 13th day of December, 1893, respectfully but most earnestly remonstrate against the reported intention of the House Committee on Ways and Means to class iron ore as a raw material and as such put it on the free list.

Iron ore is the only product our people have to dispose of; its production employs our labor, supports our population, and maintains our homes. In fact, without it this county and the entire Gogebic range become waste and depopulated and its people must seek employment elsewhere.

Our people have invested their all, the accumulations of years of prosperity, in the Gogebic iron range and its industries, and we submit that it is neither fair nor just to ruin a whole community in order that the consistency of a theory may be demonstrated.

So long as other products are protected, we ask the same treatment for ours, and we ask it as a matter of right.

The condition of affairs in this county to-day is indeed appalling, and must appeal to every human heart at all sensitive to the promptings of justice.

Six months ago there were employed in the mines of this county 5,000 men; to-day there is less than 500.

The average wage then paid was $1.85 per day; to-day the few employed are working for $1 and less, and thousands of men able and willing to work are unable to obtain employment even at the wages named.

Our county treasury is empty, and poor orders to the amount of some $15,000 outstanding and more accumulating every month. Taxes will not be paid, as our people have not the funds to pay with, and there are now not less than 5,000 persons in the county receiving public aid and dependent for support on outside public charity, and the governor of this State has already in behalf of our people by proclamation called upon the charitable people of Michigan for assistance.

The enforcement of your committee's proposed policy means simply the depopulation of this county, and the practical confiscation, by destruction, of all that our people have accumulated by economy and prudence during more prosperous times.

We appeal to you, therefore, in the name of our constituents and in the name of our equal rights as American citizens, to stay this ill-advised undertaking and let iron ore remain as it now stands—one of the products of American enterprise and labor—and as such entitled to equal treatment with every other American interest and industry.

EFFECT ON OTHER INTERESTS.

If the mere approach of free trade produces such appalling results, who can depict the awful consequences when it shall take full possession of this industry. But this is not all. Dependent upon the successful operation of our mines there are other interests of vast concern which under free trade will surely be jeopardized and destroyed. In the Lake Superior district alone $71,325,122 have been invested in mines; $10,885,665 in docks built and used exclusively for shipping ore; $32,014,594 have been expended in the construction of railways leading from these mines to the docks; $29,933,107 have gone into transportation facilities on the Great Lakes: $12,392,880 into docks and equipments for receiving and distributing this ore on the ports of Lake Erie, and $26,343,617 invested in railways for conveying this ore from these ports to inland mills and furnaces, making a grand total of $182,894,985 of invested capital, all of which is to be imperiled or destroyed. The mines will become valueless, the railways abandoned, docks become useless, and our splendid lake transports will rot at decaying wharves.

EXTENT OF INTERESTS AFFECTED BY FREE LIST.

Thus far I have confined my remarks to the probable effect upon only two of the industries, the products of which you propose to transfer to the free list. Were it possible to consider in detail the entire catalogue of one hundred and thirty-one articles with a view of ascertaining the extent of the interests involved and the probable effect of free trade on our domestic industries and labor, I am sure even the authors of this measure would hesitate to consummate their desolating work.

I beg leave to append to my remarks a statement from official sources of the capital invested, material used, labor employed, wages paid, and annual output, so far as attainable in the industries you have determined to transfer from the dutiable to the free list.

An examination of this table will disclose the magnitude of the interests you propose to jeopardize. We of the minority intend to resist to the last this wanton destruction of American interests. We believe in the development of all our industrial resources to the fullest possible extent and to that end would extend the same measure of protection to the producers of raw material as to the workers in the more advanced product.

We would not only be independent of foreigners for our manufactured goods, but for the raw material out of which they are fabricated. [Applause on the Republican side.] I can conceive of no policy more detrimental to American manufacturers and American labor than the abandonment of the production so far as possible of our own raw material. Such a policy would not only drive labor from the largest field of its employment, but it would dry up one of the most bountiful sources of national wealth and reduce our manufacturing industries to complete dependence on foreign nations for the supply of their raw material.

Such a result would be disastrous even to the interests it is proposed to promote, for when we have slaughtered our flocks, closed our mines, and wholly abandoned the production of our own raw material, the foreigner would take advantage of our helpless condition and impose upon us whatever burden his cupidity might suggest. We, therefore, would protect all interests, whether of the mine or the furnace, the field or the factory, to the end that all our people may receive profitable employment and the nation attain its highest possible development. [Applause.]

THE SOUTH.

And in this connection I can not refrain from expressing my amazement that you people of the South are so blind to your own interests as to cringe beneath the party lash and give this measure your support. A bountiful Providence has placed within your reach an inexhaustible supply of raw material which needs only to be utilized to give you an industrial impetus and development which would be the marvel of the age. Your mountains are bursting with iron and coal, your forests unexplored invite to new fields of unmeasured wealth, and how long will you be content to stumble over these natural gifts that you may do homage to a theory which, if it ever had any place in human affairs, belongs to other conditions and to another generation.

Let me implore you to turn your backs on the dead past and face the future. Place yourselves abreast with the spirit of the age by laying hold of the mighty possibilities within your grasp, and so aid in securing the highest prosperity of your people and the industrial advancement of our common country. [Applause.]

But not content with giving the freedom of our markets to the individual importer, you further provide that "All articles imported by the United States shall come in free of duty." In the act of 1890 this provision was eliminated from the law for the reason it was found to be a fruitful source of fraud on the revenues.

It was under such a provision as this that a single party was able to underbid and drive all others from the field of domestic competition and secure Government contracts for furnishing plate glass for public buildings and succeeded in defrauding the Government out of more than a million dollars of revenue. Under this provision the United States can purchase abroad and bring in free of duty clothing and equipments for its Army and Navy, all supplies for its hospital and Indian service, and everything which it may require in the vast range of its necessities. And so the American manufacturer is practically excluded from competing for any contract for supplies to be furnished his own Government.

By these means you propose to enlist the Government itself among the forces hostile to the development and maintenance of domestic manufactures. The Government is to be permitted to use the people's money to cripple and destroy the industries of its own citizens. It is no answer to say that for the Government to pay duties on its own imports is simply taking money out of the Treasury with one hand and returning it with the other, and therefore a mere matter of bookkeeping.

While this is true when the Government purchases abroad, yet it can avoid that idle ceremony by simply buying at home, and thereby sustain and promote its own industrial growth. No government ought to exact of the citizen what it is not willing to accept for itself. But this provision will undoubtedly be retained, because it is in harmony with the policy of free trade. It is only another weapon in the hands of an unfriendly Administration with which to cripple and destroy domestic industries.

But passing from the consideration of the free list to the dutiable schedules, we find here the same spirit of hostility manifested in every provision. There is not a schedule in which there are not some industries which will be imperiled by the passage of its bill—many will be utterly destroyed. On the other hand if there is any provision in this bill which will stimulate a single domestic industry or give increased employment to labor it has not been pointed out. The measure as a whole looks only to lessened industries and lower wages.

It ought to be entitled "A bill to lessen the revenue, destroy American industries, and pauperize American labor." The majority seem to have been actuated only by the desire to lower duties all along the line, regardless of the consequences to American industries or American labor. And in this connection it is noticeable that not a line in it is responsive to the public hearings had before the Committee on Ways and Means. You were admonished that our chemical industry "is one to be encouraged"—you have seriously depressed it.

You were advised by the workers in pottery that with lower duties they could not compete with the cheaper labor of Germany

and England, and they implored you "for the sake of the hundreds of idle potters who are now walking the streets, for the sake of our wives and children, we implore you not to reduce the tariff"—you wholly disregarded their appeal. The workers in glass urged "a tariff sufficient to cover the difference in cost of labor and material between the United States and those competing foreign countries whose labor and material cost less"—you have denied their request.

The workers in metals from the crudest form to the most highly finished product besought you with united voice to continue protection and so aid them in securing good wages and maintaining the American standard of labor—you turned a deaf ear to their entreaties. The woolen and cotton manufacturers pointed out the disastrous consequences of the step you have taken in this bill—you declined to heed their admonitions.

The agriculturists asked to be protected in their flocks and the products of their farms. You slaughtered their interests without mercy. I repeat, therefore, the hearings might as well never have taken place so far as any seeming effect was produced on the majority of the committee. What secret advices you may have had in framing this bill will probably never be disclosed, but that they were from sources unfriendly to American interests can not, in the light of this measure, be seriously questioned or denied.

EFFECT OF LOWERING DUTIES.

As to the general effect on our industries should this measure be enacted into law there is no room for doubt. That it will stimulate importations to the detriment of American industries and American labor will not be controverted. Even existing rates, in many instances, have not been sufficient to restrain injurious foreign competition.

In spite of our efforts to foster and protect our pottery industries, importations have steadily increased from $4,954,813 in 1884 to $9,529,431 in 1893. If under the present rate of duty there was imported into this country in 1893 $9,529,431 worth of foreign pottery, what will be the volume of importations when your reduce duties from 55 and 60 per cent to 35 and 45 per cent, coupled with the exclusion from duties of the outside coverings? It is stated that 7,500 crates of English crockery are now awaiting the passage of this bill to be shipped into our market.

If $9,000,000 worth of pocket cutlery was imported into the United States last year under an ad valorem duty ranging from 63 to 95 per cent, who can calculate the value of importations under the proposed rate of 45 per cent? If $17,470,178 of chemical products were imported into this country in 1892, under a duty of 32 per cent, what will be the value of the importations under a duty of 25 per cent? If crockery, glassware, and articles in Schedule B came into this country to the amount of $22,329,305 in 1892, under a 50 per cent duty, what will be the importations under a duty of 33 per cent?

If the importations of metals in 1892 aggregated $38,288,459 worth under a 53 per cent, what will be the importations under a duty of 32 per cent? If $30,514,607 worth of agricultural products found a market in this country in 1892 under 32 per cent duty, what will be the volume of importations under a duty of 22 per cent? If in 1892 there came into this country of cotton manufactures $17,052,525 worth under a 55 per cent duty, what will be the importations under a 38 per cent duty? If $38,061,565 worth of flax, hemp, jute, and the articles enumerated in Schedule J came into this market in 1892 under a 44 per cent duty, what will be the importations under a 32 per cent duty? If $35,792,973 worth of wool and woolen manufactures came in 1892 under an average duty of 95 per cent, what will be the importations under a duty of 39 per cent?

It is beyond question that under such a radical reduction of rates importation will be enormously increased to the serious detriment of domestic industries and domestic labor.

There will be, too, no compensatory advantage to the Government, for it is susceptible of demonstration that in many instances the revenue derived under this bill, if the entire demand for the home consumption was supplied from abroad, would be less than under existing law.

I shall not pause to call attention to the many incongruities in this bill. The committee may be able to explain why pig iron is taxed, and cotton ties are free. Why the Northern farmer, with harvest labor at $2 a day, is allowed 20 per cent on his wheat, and the rice producer of the South, with 75 cents day labor, secures 71 per cent.

Why tallow, wool-grease, and degras are made free as tanners' materials, while the sumac of Virginia and North Carolina, used for the same purpose, is protected. Why the farmers' potatoes secure only 10 per cent consideration, while peanuts of Virginia grow in security behind a Chinese wall of 35 per cent. Why in many instances the duty on the finished article is less, or no more than on the articles entering into its manufacture. But I can not pursue this inquiry. There is one criticism I would not venture to make, but as it comes from one of your own party organs, the Troy Daily Times, I venture to ask the Clerk to read the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

[Troy Daily Times, December 16, 1893.]

There are many evidences that the subcommittee which brought forth the Wilson bill are tyros in tariff tinkering. Section 273 of the measure as first published reads as follows: "Collars and cuffs and shirts and all articles of wearing apparel of every description not specially provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of linen, and linen hydraulic hose, 35 per cent ad valorem." The committee must have imagined that hydraulic hose related to some form of stockings designed to prevent wet feet. The attention of the tariff smashers is respectfully called to the fact that hydraulic hose is only another name for a certain kind of fire hose, not that of a variety of stockings.

[Troy Daily Times, December 18, 1893.]

The framers of the Wilson bill having classified hydraulic hose, which is used exclusively for extinguishing fires, among articles of wearing apparel, no doubt will remodel that extraordinary measure so as to include hydraulic rams and spinning-mules in the live-stock schedule.

[Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. BURROWS. I have only to say that the bill as a whole is as unscientific as it is un-American.

But the most startling feature connected with and running through the entire dutiable schedules is the general substitution of ad valorem for specific rates. Under existing law, duties are imposed wherever possible by the yard, pound, or quantity and not according to value. The object of this was to avoid undervaluations and insure an honest collection of the revenues. It was to protect not only the revenues of the Government but our domestic manufactures as well. In the committee s bill this policy is abandoned, and five hundred specific rates have been changed to ad valorem. If anything was needed in addition to lowered duties to complete the destruction of our protective system, it is supplied by the substitution of ad valorem for specific rates. Under such a policy, coupled with the reductions proposed, revenue and domestic industries will alike diminish, and the latter in many instances disappear.

The reason assigned for this step by the learned chairman of the committee in his advance pronunciamento announcing the completion of the committee's labors, is that specific duties "frequently conceal a rate of taxation too enormous to be submitted to if expressed in ad valorem terms," and then cites as an example "the duty of 8 cents on 100 pounds of salt, which amounts to 80 per cent on 'a common necessity of life.'" The consumer of salt does not realize the heavy tribute he is forced to pay of one-twelfth of a cent a pound on this "common necessity of life" and only appreciates the enormity of the outrage when advised it is over 80 per cent ad valorem. [Laughter.] Can it be possible that for the purpose of continuing this deception the committee retain a specific duty of 1¼ cents per pound on rice that the consumer of this "common necessity of life" may remain ignorant of the fact that he is bearing a burden of 71 per cent? But it is urged as a further objection to specific rates, that they operate unequally on the consumers of cheaper goods. But it must be remembered that on all the cheaper class of fabrics it is a matter of comparative indifference whether the rate is specific or ad valorem, as domestic competition has reduced the price of such articles in many cases to the consumer even below the duty itself.

Furthermore, specific duties serve to keep out of our markets cheap adulterated fabrics which are practically worthless to the purchaser, and insure a better grade of goods for the poor and rich alike. It is a matter of surprise that the chairman should have the courage to further state that "specific duties lead to greater frauds in administration, for counting and weighing at the custom-houses are done by the cheapest and most easily corrupted labor."

I may be permitted to say, in this connection, it will be a revelation to the laboring people of the country that in the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means they are as a class more easily corrupted than their more fortunate brethren. But when the chairman states that "specific duties lead to greater frauds in administration," he flies in the face of a current of authority which he can not successfully resist. The method of levying duties has been the subject of thorough and repeated investigation, and it is not too much to say that ad valorem duties are condemned by the almost unanimous verdict of those whose opinions are entitled to respectful consideration. I invoke the judgment of every Secretary of the Treasury investigating the subject, from Hamilton to Manning, in refutation of the position assumed by the majority.

In 1795 Secretary Hamilton reports to the House of Representatives that by existing laws about one-third of the duties was derived from articles rated ad valorem, and adds:

In other nations, experience has led to contract more and more the number of articles rated ad valorem, and, of course, to extend the number of those rated specifically; that is, according to weight, measure, or other rules of quantity. The reason of this is obvious: it is to guard against evasions, which infallibly happens in a greater or less degree when duties are high. It is needless to repeat that this will contribute as much to the interest of the fair trader as to that of the revenue.

Secretary Gallatin, reporting to the Senate in 1801, said:

In order to guard as far as possible against the value of goods being underrated in the invoices, it would be eligible to lay specific duties on all such articles now paying duties ad valorem as may be susceptible of that alteration.

Secretary Dallas, reporting to the House of Representatives in 1816, says:

Articles imported to a great amount should rather be charged with specific duties upon their weight and measure, in order to guard against evasions and frauds, than with ad valorem duties on their value.

Secretary Crawford, in 1817, said:

It is certainly prudent to diminish as far as practicable the list of articles paying ad valorem duties.

Secretary Meredith, in his report of December 3, 1849, says:

I propose a return to the system of specific duties on articles on which they can be conveniently laid. The effects of the present ad valorem system are twofold, viz, on the revenue and on our own productions. Experience has, I think, demonstrated that, looking exclusively to the revenue, a specific duty is more easily assessed, more favorable to commerce, more equal, and less exposed to frauds than any other system. This system obviates the difficulties and controversies which attend an appraisement of the foreign market value of each invoice, and it imposes an equal duty on equal quantities of the same commodity. Under the ad valorem system goods of the same kind and quality, and between which there can not be a difference in value in the same market at any given time, nevertheless may often pay different amounts of duty. Thus the hazards of trade are unnecessarily increased.

As the standard of value at every port must at last depend upon the average of the invoices that are passed there, every successful attempt at undervaluation renders more easy all that follow it. The consequences are, not only that the revenue suffers, that a certain sum is in effect annually given by the public among dishonest importers as a premium for their dishonesty, but that fair American importers may be gradually driven out of the business and their places supplied by unknown and uncrupulous foreign adventurers.

It will be remembered that this report of Secretary Meredith was made after the tariff of 1846 had been in operation three years—a tariff which eliminated all specific duties and embraced only ad valorems. And yet the committee has the hardihood to assert in its report—

Under the tariff from 1846 to 1861 this system was again tried and proved to be as successful in administration as it was just in principle.

The effect of ad valorem duties was made the subject of special inquiry by Secretary Meredith by calling upon custom officers throughout the United States to report the practical operation of ad valorem duties as provided for under the act of 1846. The report of the Secretary was based on the replies received from these official sources and they were practically unanimous in condemnation of the ad valorem system, both in its "administration" and in "principle."

The collector at New Orleans said, among other things:

There is no doubt that if the subject were referred to practical business men, to our merchants, and to those whose duties it is to administrate the law, the officers of the customs, it would be decided with singular unanimity that the ad valorem system is defective and that it works injuriously to public as well as to private interests.

The theory may be perfect, but its successful operation is impractical in consequence of universal and permanent objection—the fallibility of human judgment and the corruption of the human heart. The present system yielding protection when it is not wanted, and denying protection when it is most needed, is of all systems the most tantalizing, deceptive, and ruinous.

The customs official at the port of New York said:

The effect of abolishing specific duties has been to inundate our markets with merchandise of very inferior quality in addition to the incentive of low valuations. The effect produced upon the business of American merchants by the universal system of ad valorem duties has been a very largely increased ratio of importations by foreigners over Americans owing to the increased facilities for undervaluations of ad valorem duties and the low estimate of the solemnity of the custom-house oaths entertained among merchants in many foreign countries.

Not only officials, but leading business men everywhere throughout the country condemn the system of ad valorems with practical unanimity.

The following is taken from a statement of a business man in Boston:

In regard to the effect upon the business of American merchants engaged in the importations of foreign goods, the effect is to destroy the American importer and to turn the whole business of importing into the hands of foreigners. The experience of the past three years has shown that the business of importing has increased in the hands of foreigners immensely, and in the hands of American merchants has diminished very greatly, so that the whole business of the country under the present ad valorem system will soon fall into the hands of the fraudulent foreigners, and the American merchant will be thrown out of his honest and legitimate calling. The present tariff discriminates in favor of the foreigner, and again the American has been where there is no fraud.

These and many other citations might be made from the reports of officials and business men showing the universal condemnation of the ad valorem system. It is a notorious fact that under that system, embodied in the tariff of 1846, every American importer of wines in the city of New Orleans except two, in three years were completely driven out of business by foreigners. And it was officially declared that three-fourths of the business of importing in the city of New York under the tariff of 1846 and by the system of ad valorem rates had been turned over to foreigners. How the committee, in the face of this recorded evidence against the ad valorem system after three years of trial, could have the effrontery to declare that its operation had been "successful in administration as it was just in principle" is past human comprehension.

Secretary Bristow, in his annual report for 1876, said:

Another remedy, and the most effective which could be adopted for correcting the evils of the appraisement system, is the substitution, so far as practicable, of specific for ad valorem duties. The entire process of ascertaining duties would be more simple, certain, and safe. Opportunities for collusive undervaluation would be greatly lessened, and if errors were committed they could not, as to specific rates and amounts, be accounted for except upon the supposition of culpable negligence or actual fraud; whereas, in respect to ad valorem duties, an error of judgment may readily be assigned as a sufficient explanation.

Secretary Sherman, in his report to Congress for 1878, made the following suggestions:

As a rule, specific duties are to be preferred to either ad valorem or compound rates, and in any future revision of the tariff it is hoped that Congress will give preference to this system of imposing duties as far as practicable.

During the Administration of President Arthur steps were taken to ascertain through our consuls abroad and by means of special agents of the Treasury the extent of the frauds practiced on our revenues, and Secretary Folger in submitting his report of March 28, 1884, with accompanying documents, said:

These papers seem to furnish conclusive evidence of general and extensive undervaluation of imported merchandise subject to ad valorem duties. Besides the serious loss to the revenue consequent upon undervaluation as indicated in these reports, the practice has a demoralizing influence upon our trade with other countries. The lack of safe grounds against it offers a premium to dishonesty and makes it impossible for an honorable manufacturer or dealer in Europe to compete with his less conscientious rival for the American trade, and the honest American is precluded from importing lines of goods thus undervalued.

I can not refrain in this connection from making some quotations from these reports which form the basis of the Secretary's suggestions.

George C. Tichenor, one of the most accomplished and trustworthy special agents ever connected with the Treasury Department, said:

An English gentleman connected with one of the largest silk houses in the United Kingdom informed me that one of the most extensive and reputable manufacturers of silks in the Zurich district informed him that he consigned all his products for the American market to a commission house at New York, and that his consular invoices were uniformly undervalued, generally at 20 per cent. He justified his actions as follows: First. That the United States tariff was iniquitous and contrary to public policy and international comity. Second. He could not ship to the United States if he declared his goods at their true value. Third. It had become an established custom both at Zurich and Lyons. Fourth. He had to calculate upon some bad debts and losses in the United States.

I myself conversed with manufacturers who in effect admitted that the practice of undervaluing had become almost universal, and they expressed themselves as being extremely desirous that it should be broken up, since the competition in the practice was year by year becoming sharper, until it had become a race amongst them, in which the New York commission agents were the greatest winners. The undervaluation of silks at Zurich is not alone in invoicing the goods at prices below their true market value, but it is quite a common practice to make deductions also from such prices in the form of "allowances" for pretended defects or imperfections in the goods, under such designations as "imperfect," "defective," "light," "spotted," "soft," "streaked," "uneven," "wrinkled," "bad," "dirty," etc.

These reports abundantly show that the ingenuity and depravity alike of the Old World and our own have been ceaselessly employed in devising means and perfecting plans for defrauding our revenues and evading our customs laws. There is scarcely any kind or description of merchandise, subject to ad valorem duty, imported into this country from beyond the seas but has been or is being undervalued more or less.

I merely state a fact known to most merchants and tourists who have visited continental Europe of late years that the practice of undervaluing has become so common and universal there that even the shopkeepers and small tradespeople voluntarily tender American buyers, of small or large articles, invoices specially made for "the customs." Numerous instances of the kind came directly under my observation, and I was told that in most cases the purchasers accepted such invoices most cheerfully, and at times requested them.

There are in this country, largely at New York, an army of commission agents, who, in order to secure business, advise and urge foreign manufacturers to undervalue their consignments to them, as they make advances generally on such basis. In a large number of cases the goods are "declared for duty" at and below the bare cost of manufacture, and the commission agent, who can make such returns of sales as pleases him is enabled through dishonesty to profit both from the consignor and the revenues.

While the old ad valorem system appears most equitable and just, all experience has shown that under it the dishonest importers prosper, while the honest ones and the revenues suffer, and it has proved to be most expensive to the Government and people and vexatious and demoralizing to customs officers and employés.

I do not hesitate to say that I am entirely convinced that the only safe and sure remedy for undervaluation, in all its forms, is specific duties, and I believe that after careful consideration and preparation on the part of those charged with the revision of our tariff the same will be found applicable to most articles of import. Speaking of the French tariff, he says:

It is known that this system was substituted for the ad valorem system as a protective measure, and it is a significant fact that, pending the late protracted negotiations between the English and French Governments concerning an international commercial treaty, the French manufacturers, particularly those in the district of Roubaix, made public remonstrance against any concession in the direction of ad valorem duties, or departure from the specific system, as to textile fabrics or tissues, urging as a reason that English goods would come in undervalued as much, they said, as 30 per cent. I apprehend they reasoned from experience and practice.

Mr. Mason, our consul at Basle, under date of February 5, 1884, said:

The undervaluations and other irregularities by which the United States revenues have been, particularly since 1874, systematically defrauded, and

the protective intention of the tariff laws to a greater or less degree neutralized, may be traced to various causes, among which are:

1. Excess of production in Europe and the consequent eagerness of manufacturers to pour into the American market everything that they find superfluous here. In the ribbon manufacture, for example, factories are often run at their full capacity during the dull season of the year, and the superfluous product thus produced is consigned to the United States at the bare cost of production or less, where, if it is admitted at the declared prices, it undersells and destroys the market for all similar goods imported by actual purchasers at real market values.

According to European theories America is the great national producer of food and raw materials and the great consumer of manufactured products. That the people of the United States should produce and export a large surplus of breadstuffs, cotton, meat, and petroleum is well enough (except as regards pork), but that they should insist upon manufacturing silks, watches, and other products of skilled labor at home and even hope to export their surplus of such manufactures, is regarded as an audacious violation of the natural laws of production and consumption. The United States duty laws become, therefore, to many European eyes, a false and unjustifiable barrier to international commerce, to evade which involves no violation of conscience or moral reproach.

There are exporters in Europe who would scorn a dishonest act toward an individual, who would redeem their unwritten promise with their last franc, but who sign their names to undervalued invoices for America without a twinge of conscience or regret unless the false declaration is subsequently detected and punished.

Mr. Mason then makes a series of suggestions to remedy these frauds upon our revenue, and the first suggestion is as follows:

The substitution, wherever possible, of specific for ad valorem duties.

Mr. Shaw, our consul at Manchester, in his report of February, 1884, said:

The chief difficulty which consular officers on one side of the line and appraising officers on the other have to contend with in arriving at the dutiable value is found in that large class of merchandise upon which ad valorem duties are levied.

As a rule, specific duties on all articles are easily and fairly collected. There is generally little chance of evading payment in these cases.

The great trouble—the ever-pressing struggle—arises over the long and varied list of articles upon which ad valorem duties are imposed. These cause consular and appraising officers and the Treasury authorities endless anxiety. The perplexities surrounding and incident to the fair collection of this class of duties are vast; and those who know about the constant and ingenious shifts resorted to by importers to evade payment of just dues on the one hand, and how extremely difficult it is to detect such devices and undervaluations on the other, are surprised that our duties are as well collected as they are at present.

But even the opinions of Secretary Manning seem to have been wholly overlooked or disregarded, who while Secretary of the Treasury addressed a series of twenty-four inquires to the customs officers of the United States, at all of the important ports of entry, among which was the following,

Would a change from ad valorem to specific rates be a benefit to the revenue and help to diminish a tendency to bribery, providing the existing quantity of duty is to be levied in the future, and could specific rates be applied to all textile fabrics?

The answer to these interrogatories are embraced in a volume of nearly a thousand pages, and are substantially unanimous in opposition to ad valorem and in favor of specific duties. I can not refrain from a single quotation from one of these replies from James D. Power, a special agent of the Treasury:

Ad valorem rates of duty afford temptations and opportunities for fraud which can not be guarded against, even by the most rigid rules and vigilant watchfulness. The assessment of values under this system is based upon expert knowledge of values, the most uncertain and arbitrary method that could be devised. Under the ad valorem system fraud has prospered and demoralized the importing trade, which has passed from the hands of American citizens into the control of men who have taken advantage of our high imprt duties to enrich themselves at the expense of the revenue and the ruined trade of the American wholesale firms.

Fraud of this nature is difficult to detect and more difficult still to establish. In the absence of documentary proof it resolves itself into a mere difference of opinion between experts; and the owner of the suspected goods can at all times procure experts who will maintain the correctness of his invoice prices, or he may select an easier and more convincing and efficacious line of defense by procuring affidavits from his buyer or partner abroad to the effect that the invoice cost was the actual price paid for the goods.

While fraud may be perpetrated under the system of specific rates by return of false weights and measures and by false classification, the officer lending himself to such fraud exposes himself to risks, sure in the end to lead to discovery, discharge from the service, and the prosecution under the law, because false weights and measures and false classifications can not, as in the case of undervaluation, be sheltered by the specious claim of mistaken judgment.

Secretary Manning, in making his report of December 7, 1885, based on these responses, said:

It is desirable that in revising and reducing rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem so far as the nature of the merchandise will admit. Theoretically considered, ad valorem are preferable to specific duties; but in practice, under such rates as we have had and must continue to have for years to come, the former are the too easy source of deception and inequality at the custom-house. Congress has it in its power to change from time to time, as may be advisable, specific rates so as to meet any permanent changes in values.

Secretary Manning summed up the whole matter as follows:

One hears it often said that if our ad valorem rates did not exceed 25 per cent or 30 per cent, undervaluations and temptations to undervaluations would disappear; but the records of the Department for 1817, 1840, and 1857 do not uphold that conclusion. Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestibly, they are even notoriously inherent in that system.

In view of this overwhelming testimony it is purile to contend in favor of the superiority of ad valorem over specific rates. Against the opinions of the more theorists of to-day, I interpose the substantial judgment of practical business men, experienced officials, and the practice of the most enlightened nations on the globe. In all continental nations excepting the Netherlands ad valorem tariffs have been substantially discarded. France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Sweden and Norway, Russia, Switzerland, Belgium, Portugal, and Spain, as the result of long experience with both systems, have settled down to the collection of their custom revenues almost wholly on a specific basis. It is more than folly, therefore, to attempt to foist upon this country a system condemned by a century of our own history and the experience of the leading European nations.

It is not surprising, however, that the party of free trade in the United States should make this method of levying duties the leading feature of its policy. It is a fit accompaniment to this bill. It removes the last safeguard to American industries and strikes down the last hope for our protective system. If there was nothing else in this measure deserving public condemnation, this alone ought to be sufficient to insure its overwhelming defeat.

But the members of the majority seek to secure public approval for the destruction of specific duties by pluming themselves with a show of lessened ad valorems, hoping thereby to divert public attention and secure popular applause.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] in commenting upon high ad valorems under existing law made an exhibit of two pieces of cloth, suited, as he declared, to the uses of our laboring people, upon which there was a duty of from 200 to 300 per cent. Through the courtesy of the gentleman I have those identical samples before me. Here they are. A laboring man would be ashamed to wear either. What are they? One is a plush with cotton back and warp, and a filling of mohair waste, while the other has the additional adornment of cows' hair. There is not an ounce of wool in either. We placed a high duty on this stuff for the very purpose of keeping it out of our market, and saving our laboring people from being imposed upon with these cheap fabrics. [Applause.] Having driven our workmen out of employment by your free-trade policy, you now offer them the consolation of lower ad valorems on clothing of cotton and cows' hair.

When commenting on high ad valorem on crockery, the gentleman omitted to state that a toilet set of twelve pieces, which in 1878 cost $13.25, can be had now for $4; that a tea set of fifty-six pieces, decorated, which cost in 1878 $11.75, costs now but $3, and that a decorated dinner set of one hundred and twenty-five pieces, which cost in 1878 $46.70, can now be secured, after fifteen years of high advalorems on crockery, for $13.

Let me say to the gentleman that the masses of the people, however, at this time are not specially enthusiastic over the prospects of lower ad valorems. Our workmen are not searching for low ad valorems, but for employment. Shivering by desolate hearths over the expiring embers of the last handful of coal, they are not solicitous about ad valorems, but fuel.

Starving families clutching for the last morsel of food, can not be lulled into forgetfulness of present misery by the announcement of lower ad valorems on the necessities of life. Tramping the streets, out of employment, receiving alms, lower ad valorems will not heal the wounded pride of the brave men who never before were dependent on public charity. The laboring people of this country ask not lower ad valorems, but work. They prefer high ad valorems, constant employment, and abundant wages, to low ad valorems, idleness, and want. [Applause.]

But why press this issue of free trade? It has been repeatedly tried in this country, and has always been with the same disastrous consequences. It was tested most fully under the old confederation, and the flood of foreign importations not only swept away our manufactures, but the very foundations of that government. It was resorted to again in 1816 and with the same disastrous consequences; again in 1832, and the recollection of the panic and desolation of 1837 is still within the memory of living men. We again entered on this destructive policy in 1846 and 1857, and it culminated in individual and national bankruptcy. Yet the committee extol the tariff of 1846 and 1857 and make the astounding declaration that "During a period of fifteen years of low tariff, from 1846 to 1861, there was a healthy and harmonious growth of agriculture and all the other great industries of the country." An army of living witnesses could be called to refute this assertion. The history of that period will not sustain that declaration. Under the operation of these tariffs, industries declined, public revenues fell off, labor was forced out of employment, and general disaster and ruin was visited upon our people. A single quotation from the New York Tribune of January 15, 1855, will serve to show the deplorable condition of the single city of New York.

Go and see thousands, men and women, boys and girls, old and young, black and white, of all nations, crowding and jostling each other, almost

fighting for a first chance, acting more like hungry wolves than human beings, in a land of plenty, waiting until the food is ready for distribution. Such a scene may be seen every day between 11 and 2 o'clock around the corner of Orange and Chatham streets, where charity gives a dinner to the poor, and soup and bread to others to carry to their miserable families. The cry of hard times reaches us from every part of the country. The making of roads is stopped, factories are closed, and houses and ships are no longer being built.

Factory hands, road-makers, carpenters, bricklayers, and laborers are idle, and paralysis is rapidly embracing every pursuit in the country. The cause of all this stoppage of circulation is to be found in the steady outflow of gold to pay foreign laborers for the cloth, the shoes, the iron, and other things that could be produced by American labor, but which can not be so produced under our present revenue system.

It is an uncontrovertible fact that during a period of thirteen years, from 1848 to 1860, covering almost the entire era under the tariffs of 1846 and 1857, that the balance of trade against this country aggregated more than four hundred and twenty millions, and that exports of gold for the same period exceeded our imports by more than four hundred and thirty millions. And that while in 1850 our imported merchandise amounted to only one hundred and sixty-four millions, yet in 1857 it reached the enormous sum of three hundred and thirty-three millions. And though our imports increased, our public revenues declined. Our warehouses were full of goods which importers declined to take from bond either because they were unable to pay the duties or there was no demand for their consumption.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Howell Cobb, in his annual reports for 1857, 1858, and 1859, while extolling the system of free trade, of which he was a most pronounced advocate, nevertheless was asking to be clothed with power to borrow money to meet the expenses of the Government in a time of peace. And it is a notorious fact that not only was the Treasury depleted, but the public credit became so seriously impaired that the obligations of this Government was negotiated at a discount of 12 per cent. Millard Fillmore, in his third annual message to Congress, December 6, 1852, depicted the condition of the country under this low ad valorem system in no uncertain terms.

Without repeating the arguments contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is, the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it is coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing establishments are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost, thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer to that extent is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus produce. In the third place, the destruction of our manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our market, and he consequently raises the price of the article sent here for sale, as is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England.

I submit, therefore, that the committee is not justified in its assertion that the tariffs of 1846 and 1857 brought a "healthy growth to all the industries of our country." It was precisely the reverse, and these warnings of history ought to be sufficient to deter you from the repetition of the folly.

On the contrary, the eras of protection in this country have always been periods of marked prosperity, and we never recovered from the disastrous consequences of the experiment of free trade at any time until protection was restored. The history of our country in 1824 and 1828, 1842 and 1862 fully sustains this assertion. The last thirty years of continuous protection stands out as the golden era of our national existence.

Take down the census report for 1860 and 1890 and mark the gigantic strides by which we have reached our industrial supremacy. In that period of thirty years, despite the ravages of war, our population rose from 31,443,321 to 62,622,250; our acreage, from 407,212,538 to 815,000,000; improved lands, from 162,110,000 to 400,000,000; engaged in agriculture, from 4,335,758 to 9,600,000; value of lands, fences, and buildings, from $6,645,045,007 to $13,110,031,384; improvements and machinery, from $246,118,141 to $550,000,000; live stock on farms, from $1,039,329,915 to $2,418,766,028; cereals, from 1,239,039,947 bushels to 3,209,742,000 bushels.

Capital invested in manfactures, from $1,009,855,715 to $4,600,000,000; value of production, $1,885,861,676 to $8,700,000,000; wages paid in manufactures, $378,878,916 to $2,000,000,000; accumulations in savings banks, from $149,277,554, or $4.75 per capita, to $1,524,844,500, or $24.35 per capita; railways, 28,920 miles to 163,597 miles; assets of these roads from $1,867,248,720 to $10,278,835,746; street railways from 403 miles to 5,783 miles; investment in roads and equipments, from $14,862,840 to $389,359,289; assessed valuation of real and personal property, from $12,084,560,005 to $24,651,585,465, while the real value of the nation's wealth rose rom $16,129,616,063 to $63,648,000,000.

Yet in the face of this magnificent triumph it is now proposed to call a halt in the industrial march and turn the column backward over the deserted and disastrous pathway leading to free trade. The command has already been given, and consternation has taken possession of all our people. The record of this single year's disasters stands without a parallel in the history of our country. Fifteen thousand five hundred and sixty business failures, seventy-three railways, aggregating 31,878 miles, and representing untold millions of property, gone into the hands of receivers and to bankruptcy. Our mines and factories are closed, smokeless chimneys stand like monuments above the graves of dead industries, while an army of the unemployed are tramping the streets begging for bread.

Bradstreet, in a recent publication after a careful enumeration of the unemployed throughout the country, states that there are "in New England 65,200 unemployed and 154,000 dependent; New York and New Jersey, 223,250 unemployed and 563,750 dependent; Pennsylvania, 151,500 unemployed and 449,200 dependent; Central Western States, 227,340 unemployed and 443,310 dependent; Northwestern States, 64,900 unemployed and 175,800 dependent; Pacific coast, 25,800 unemployed and 4,700 dependent; Southern States, 43,065 unemployed and 122,650 dependent; making a frightful aggregate of 801,885 people unemployed and 1,956,710 dependent."

Yet the half has not been told. The record of this year's industrial and individual suffering resulting from this proposed legislation will never be made up. It exceeds the possibilities of human calculation.

I implore you to abandon this suicidal policy. Have you not pursued it far enough to become convinced of its disastrous consequences? It is no longer an experiment—it has become a public crime. You have it within your power to instantly relieve this appalling situation. You have only to substitute for the pending measure a joint resolution declaratory of your purpose to maintain existing law in full force and effect during the continuance of this Administration, and business activity would instantly take the place of business depression. It would arrest the slaughter of our flocks, open our mines, relight the fires of our furnaces, unchain the wheels of our industries, start every spindle and loom; while whistles and factory bells would call the tramping starving millions back from enforced idleness to profitable employment and the American Republic would leap with a bound to its accustomed place in the van of industrial nations. [Prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to remind our visiting friends in the galleries that such demonstrations are not allowable under the rules, and a repetition of them will warrant the Chair in having the galleries cleared. [Renewed applause.] The Sergeant-at-Arms will be directed to remove visitors from the galleries unless they cease their demonstrations.

A MEMBER. They vote, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

The following are the statistics referred to by Mr. BURROWS:

APPENDIX.

STATISTICS RELATING TO ITEMS IN SCHEDULES A, B, G, AND N.

[Eleventh Census of the United States—Statistics of manufactures.]

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY.

The following statement includes the manufacture of paints, varnish, fertilizers, chemicals, dyestuffs, and extracts, celluloid, high explosives, gunpowder, bone, ivory, and lamp black, oils, resinous and essential:

Number of establishments	1,626
Capital	$168,462,044
Total number of employés	43,701
Total wages	$25,321,077
Officers and clerks	5,953
Officers' and clerks' wages	$7,464,260
All other employés	37,748
All other employés' wages	$17,856,817
Cost of materials used	$106,521,980
Total value of products	$177,811,823

Statement relating to particular products included in the preceding table.

Sulphuric Acid.

Sulphuric acid 50° Beaume	pounds..	1,009,863,407
Sulphuric acid 50° Beaume	value..	$1,836,572
Sulphuric acid 60° Beaume	pounds..	20,379,908
Sulphuric acid 60° Beaume	value..	$122,940
Sulphuric acid 65° Beaume	pounds..	254,533,657
Sulphuric acid 66° Beaume	value..	$3,249,602
Sulphuric acid	total pounds..	1,284,776,947
Sulphuric acid	total value..	$5,193,978

Of the above 50° acid, 581,536,200 pounds were consumed by those manufacturing it in the manufacture of fertilizers, and the value for this amount is not shown.

Paints and colors.

Barytes	pounds..	43,143,000
Barytes	value..	$377,939
Iron oxide and other earth colors (a)	pounds..	139,372,483
Iron oxide and other earth colors (a)	value..	$1,068,800

(a) Includes ocher and ocherous earth dry, sienna and sienna earth dry, umber and umber earth dry.

[Eleventh Census of the United States—Statistics of manufactures.]

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR THE PETROLEUM REFINING INDUSTRY.

Number of establishments		94
Capital		$77,416,206
Total number of employés		12,471
Total wages		$6,999,673
Officers and clerks	number..	1,068
Officers and clerks	wages..	$1,117,011

All other employés	number	11,403
All other employés	wages	$5,872,467
Total cost of materials used		$67,918,723
Crude oil used	gallons	1,292,460,402
Crude oil used	cost	$45,006,988
Total value of all products		$85,001,196
Burning oils:		
Barrels		16,967,397
Value		$47,642,537
Residuum:		
Barrels		1,194,907
Value		$1,225,490
Paraffin oil:		
Barrels		684,849
Value		$3,022,048
Reduced oil:		
Barrels		856,730
Value		$2,333,623
Neutral filtered oils:		
Barrels		112,724
Value		$435,351
Filtered cylinder oils:		
Barrels		278,573
Value		$1,526,096
Ointments and grease:		
Barrels		43,098
Value		$789,089
Gasoline—		
Barrels		101,064
Value		$394,676
Naphtha—		
Barrels		3,189,398
Value		$6,720,712
Paraffine wax—		
Barrels		241,951
Value		$2,904,902
Coke—		
Bushels		494,221
Value		$56,997
Naphtha black—		
Barrels		437
Value		$946
All other products		$17,732,431

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR THE SALT INDUSTRY.

Number of establishments		194
Capital		$12,408,216
Total number of employés		4,090
Total wages		$1,026,003
Officers and clerks, number	174	
Officers and clerks, wages	$166,085	
All other employés, number	3,916	
All other employés, wages	$1,459,318	
Cost of materials used		$1,725,161
Number of bushels of salt manufactured		48,488,714
Value of salt manufactured		$5,123,493

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR THE COKE INDUSTRY, SCHEDULE N, EXCLUSIVE OF GAS COKE.

Number of establishments		218
Capital		$17,462,729
Total number of employés		9,159
Total wages		$4,186,264
Officers and clerks, number	161	
Officers and clerk, wages	$113,632	
All other employés, number	8,998	
All other employés, wages	$4,072,632	
Quantity of coal used, tons		15,795,087
Total cost of materials used		$11,509,737
Quantity of coke manufactured, tons		10,008,169
Total value of product		$16,498,345

STATISTICS RELATING TO THE MINERAL INDUSTRIES, SCHEDULE C, AND COAL.

[Eleventh Census of the United States.]

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR MINERAL INDUSTRIES.

Iron ore.

Number of mines producing	592
Capital	$109,766,199
Number of employés	38,227
Wages	$14,409,151
Other expenditures	$10,372,507
Number of tons mined (long tons)	14,518,041
Value of ore mined	$33,351,978

Copper ore.

Capital	$62,623,228
Number of employés at mines	8,791
Wages	$6,216,921
Other expenses	$5,845,259
Total copper product from all sources (pounds)	226,055,962

Production in principal producing States.

States and Territories.	Ore produced.	Mineral.	Black copper.	Matte.	Fine copper contents.
	Short tons.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Michigan	2,433,733	117,804,926			87,455,675
Montana	698,837		10,176,744	147,800,590	97,868,064
Arizona	155,586		29,532,493	4,126,000	31,332,685
New Mexico	34,586		4,000	7,620,800	3,883,014
Total	3,322,742	117,804,926	39,713,237	159,547,390	220,569,438

Bituminous coal.

Number of mines, regular, 2,218; local 9,920	12,138
Capital	$160,722,319
Number of employés	175,242
Wages	$89,765,711
Other expenditures	$15,558,492
Number of tons mined	95,629,026
Value of coal	$94,346,809

Average price per ton, $0.99.

Antimony.

Wages	$12,218
Other expenditures	$11,004
Number of tons of ore	265
Number of tons star regulus produced, 115; value	$28,000

[Eleventh Census of the United States.]

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR MINERAL INDUSTRIES.

Mica.

Capital		$691,550
Number of employés		185
Wages		$42,174
Other expenditures		$16,161
Cut mica produced	pounds	49,500
Cut mica produced	value	$50,000
Scrap mica produced	tons	196
Scrap mica produced	value	$2,450
Total value		$52,450

Nickel.

Capital	$270,000
Number of employés	187
Wages	$93,800
Other expenditures	$32,387
Number of tons in matte	1,151
Value	$40,000

(The above ore contains a small proportion of oxide of cobalt).

Sulphur.

Capital	$320,750
Number of employés	12
Wages	$3,410
Supplies	$1,700
Amount of ore produced, 1,150 tons; refined sulphur, 450 tons—value	$7,850

Crude barytes—Schedule A.

Capital	$351,150
Number of tons mined	21,400
Value of barytes mined	$100,313

Ocher—Schedule A.

Capital	$386,453
Number of employés	196
Wages	$59,695
Supplies and expenses	$26,552
Number of tons mined	15,153
Value of ocher mined	$177,472

[Eleventh Census of the United States.]

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR MINERAL INDUSTRIES.

Metallic paints.

Capital	$462,164
Number of employés	199
Wages	$75,360
Supplies and other expenses	$88,427
Number of tons mined	21,026
Value of metallic paints mined	$286,294

Chromic iron ore.

Number of mines (all in California)	6
Capital invested	$8,000
Number of employés	30
Wages	$6,000
Other expenditures	$4,000
Number of tons mined	2,000
Value at San Francisco, Cal	$30,000

Quicksilver.

Productive establishments	11
Capital (a)	$1,221,114
Number of employés	937
Wages	$626,289
Other expenditures	266,112
Number of flasks produced (b)	26,464
Value of product	$1,199,500

(a) Does not include $112,000 capital invested in six idle establishments.
(b) Does not include 20 flasks made in Oregon, the value being less than $1,000.

[Eleventh census of the United States. Statistics of the Mineral Industries.]

Sandstone (including freestone).

Number of quarries	803
Total capital invested	$17,776,467
Number of employés	16,925
Total wages	$6,257,580
All other expenses	1,872,715
Number of cubic feet of sandstone	71,571,054
Value, total both sand and freestone	$10,816,057

Granite.

Number of quarries	874
Total capital invested	$10,115,449
Number of employés	22,313
Total wages	29,629,485
All other expenses	$1,883,536
Number of cubic feet of granite	62,287,156
Value	$14,464,095

Limestone.

Number of quarries		1,954
Total capital invested		$27,022,325
Number of employés		30,644
Total wages		$10,121,985
All other expenses		$4,970,729
Total value of products		$19,095,179
Stone for building purposes	cubic feet	92,289,896
Stone for building purposes	value	$5,405,671
Stone for street work	cubic feet	46,491,022
Stone for street work	value	$2,383,456
Stone for bridge, dam, and railroad work	cubic feet	26,679,012
Stone for bridge, dam, and railroad work	value	$1,289,622
Stone for miscellaneous purposes	cubic feet	549,875
Stone for miscellaneous purposes	value	$46,079
All other products	value	$9,970,351

Bluestone.

Number of quarries (systematically operated)		217
Total capital invested		$635,757
Number of employés		1,790
Wages		$527,636
All other expenses		$80,948
Number of cubic feet of bluestone		5,126,340
Value		$1,689,600

Slate.

Number of quarries		212
Total capital invested		$10,569,503
Number of employés		6,170
Wages		$2,218,982
All other expenses		$543,140
Number of squares of roofing slate		835,625
Value of roofing slate	$2,797,904	
Value of slate for other purposes	$684,609	
Total value of slate		$3,482,513

RECAPITULATION.

Stone.

(Including sandstone, granite, limestone, bluestone, and slate.)

Number of quarries	4,000
Total capital invested	$75,119,591
Number of employés	77,845
Wages	$28,746,666
All other expenses	$9,351,068
Number of cubic feet of stone *	304,904,955
Total value of stone	$49,547,450

*Not including slate.

[Eleventh Census of the United States—Statistics of agriculture.]

Statement of the production of certain farm products.

	Quantity.	Value.
Broom corn, tons	20,000	Not reported.
Peas, bushels	6,215,349	Do
Wool, pounds	191,278,084	Do
Hempseed, bushels	10,250,410	Do
Hemp, tons	11,511	$1,102,602
Flax product	Not reported.	$10,436,228
Flax fiber, pounds	241,389	Not reported.

[Eleventh Census of the United States—Statistics of manufactures.]

STATEMENT GIVING TOTALS FOR WOOL MANUFACTURE, INCLUDING WOOLEN, WORSTED, CARPET, FELT, WOOL HAT, HOSIERY, AND KNITTING MILLS.

Number of establishments	2,489
Capital invested	$296,494,481
Number of officers, firm members, and clerks	5,273
Wages paid officers, firm members, and clerks	$5,742,848
All other employés	213,859
Wages paid all other employés	$70,917,894
Cost of materials used	$203,095,572
Value of products	$337,768,524

Quantity and value of some of the different materials used.

Scoured wool (domestic and foreign) pounds	214,945,513
Camel's hair and noils:	
Pounds	7,684,804
Cost	$1,250,307
Mohair and noils:	
Pounds	2,136,244
Cost	$848,533
All other animal hair:	
Pounds	16,865,764
Cost	$1,153,997
Waste and wool noils:	
Pounds	23,370,056
Cost	$5,417,429
Woolen yarn:	
Pounds	31,385,664
Cost	$11,285,379
Worsted yarn:	
Pounds	26,813,717
Cost	$23,345,646
Mohair yarn:	
Pounds	738,777
Cost	$534,169

Quantity and value of some of the different products.

Woolen yarn, all wool:	
Pounds	35,415,360
Value	$10,742,982
Woolen yarn, union or merino:	
Pounds	6,799,813
Value	$2,330,088
Worsted yarn:	
Pounds	23,376,182
Value	$22,411,363
Woolen card rolls:	
Pounds	1,435,215
Value	$704,581
Worsted slubbing and tops:	
Pounds	391,501
Value	$103,516
Worsted noils:	
Pounds	4,466,621
Value	$1,462,050

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire at this time to place in the RECORD some information which may be desired by the members, and which was obtained from the Department of State. On the 20th of May last I addressed some questions to the Department of State, and they were submitted to consuls in foreign countries. The information obtained in regard to the operation of the income tax in England, Prussia, Italy, Austria, and several of the German provinces I have felt it my duty to put in the RECORD, in order that those who are studying the question and preparing themselves on either side of it may have the advantage of the information collected by the Government. This information will appear in the RECORD to-morrow morning, except where it is contained in reports printed in foreign languages, and these reports will be left with the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee, where they can be consulted by members.

Questions submitted May 20, 1893, to Hon. Alvey A. Adee, Second Assistant Secretary of State, and by him submitted to the United States consuls in foreign countries where an income tax is collected.

First. How long has the income tax been collected?

Second. What rate is levied and what exemptions are allowed?

Third. Is the tax graded, and what is the total annual income from the tax?

Fourth. What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax; has the rate been increased or have the exemptions been changed? And what is meant by "income"?

Fifth. Is the tax assessed by an officer, or does the citizen make return under oath?

Sixth. What punishment is provided for a failure to make proper return of income?

Seventh. Does the tax grow in popularity, or is it becoming more distasteful; and if there is complaint, is it from those who pay or from those who escape the tax?

Eighth. Is the tax collected through local authorities or by a representative of the general government?

Ninth. Give any other facts in connection with the tax or its methods of assessment and collection which will enable one to judge of its wisdom and its advantages and disadvantages.

ENGLAND.

The questions put by Mr. W. Q. Gresham in his letter to Mr. Henry White, of the United States embassy, have been answered categorically.

In dealing with the questions raised the board's twenty-eighth report (1885) has been adopted as a basis and it has been brought up to date—so far as figures are available.

That report incorporates more or less all the previous reports of the board of inland revenue since 1857, and may be considered a fair résumé of what has taken place since the income tax was first imposed.

The following publications are herewith forwarded, viz:

1. Twenty-eighth Report of the Board of Inland Revenue, 1885.
2. Pamphlet entitled "Some opinions on certain recently revived propositions suggested with a view to a more equal incidence of the income tax," by F. L. Robinson, esq., C. B., deputy chairman to the board.

This pamphlet contains references to all the important discussions in connection with the proposed "differential" and "graduated" systems, and will prove very valuable in connection with questions 7 and 9.

3. A collection of acts relating to the income tax.
4. Some of the forms used in the administration of the tax.

QUESTION 1.

First. How long has the income tax been collected?

A short historical statement is annexed, showing when the income tax was first imposed.

The act which first created a tax with reference to income was the 38 George III, cap. 16, in 1798.

The tax was continued until 1816, when it ceased.

It was subsequently reimposed in 1842, since which year it has continued in force.

The statement referred to has been taken from the twenty-eighth report of the Board of Inland Revenue, made in 1885, a copy of which report is herewith forwarded for the information of the United States Government.

INCOME TAX—SHORT HISTORICAL STATEMENT.

The origin of the tax dates from 1798.

In that year an act was introduced at the instance of Mr. Pitt, entitled "An act for granting to His Majesty an aid and contribution for the prosecution of the war." This act did not, in fact, impose a duty upon property, but imposed additional duties of assessed taxes, regulated by the amount of income which the person charged with assessed taxes possessed, provided such person possessed an income of £60 a year or upward. The produce of the tax for the first year under that system was £1,855,996.

In the year 1799, by the act of the 39 Geo. III, c. 13, the duties granted by the above-mentioned act of 1798 were repealed, and in lieu thereof a duty was imposed upon incomes at the rate of 10 per cent. By this act all persons were required to make returns of the whole of their income from whatso-

ever source the same was derived, exemption being granted to those whose incomes were under £60 a year, and reduced rates charged on incomes between that amount and £200 a year. The produce of the tax in the first year after this alteration was £6,046,024, or about a quarter of a million for every penny of the tax.

In 1803 the present system of charging incomes upon all property and profit at their first source was introduced, and the return of the whole income, previously required, was abandoned. By this act (43 Geo. III, c. 122) the various descriptions of income chargeable with duty were, for the first time, distributed under the several schedules A, B, C, D, and E, as at present. A poundage rate, varying from 3*d.* to 11*d.* in the pound, was imposed upon all incomes between £60 and £150 a year, and 5 per cent upon all incomes amounting to or exceeding the latter sum. The profits of farmers were assumed for the purposes of the act to be three-fourths of the annual value of the lands and tenements they occupied if the land were in England, and one-half in Scotland, instead of requiring from that class a return of their actual profits, as in the case of trades and professions generally. Exemption was confined to incomes of less than £60 a year, from whatever source arising. The principle of taxing income at its source is thus explained in some observations on the tax, published at the time under the authority of Government. "As the former duty was imposed on a general account of income from all sources, the present duty is imposed on each source, by itself, in the hands of the first possessor, at the same time permitting its diffusion through every natural channel in its course to the hands of the ultimate proprietor.

"Instead of the landlord and the various claimants upon him in succession, it looks to the occupier only. Instead of the creditor, it looks to the fund from which the debt is answered. In the place of a complicated account, collected from the various sources from which the income of an individual is derived, it applies to the source itself to answer for its increase. By these means its object is attained with more facility and certainty, and with less intricacy and disclosure, diminishing the occasions of evasion by the means of exaction; thus the charge is gradually diffused from the first possessor to the ultimate proprietor, the private transactions of life are protected from the public eye, and the revenue is more effectually guarded."

The produce of the tax under this system at the reduced rate of 5 per cent was almost equal to that of 1799, when the rate was 10 per cent.

Between the years 1803 and 1806, several acts were passed relating to the income tax, which made no alteration in the principle, but in the latter year by 46 Geo. III, cap. 65, the rate of duty was again increased to 10 per cent. The exemption on incomes from realized property under £60 a year (which before existed) was, with a few exceptions, repealed, entire exemption was limited to incomes under £50 a year in the whole, and a graduated scale imposed upon incomes between £50 and £150 a year, but limited to profits of trades, professions, and offices.

The following extract from the guide book, published by the tax office at that period, will explain the grounds for the alteration. It states "that the regulation in the former act by which exemption was granted on the whole of every person's income under £60 a year, which was intended to have a strict and limited operation, has been introductive of the greatest frauds upon the public. It is notorious that persons living in easy circumstances, nay, even in apparent affluence, have returned their income under £60, although their annual expenditure has been treble that sum, and to whom there was no ground for imputing extravagance. The income of whole parishes has been swept away by this fraud, such persons generally bringing their income below £60. Hence it is that the legislature found the necessity of confining the exemptions to £50, that their former returns may be made use of."

By this act of 1806 the dividends in the public funds, which had hitherto been returned by the recipients as a part of their income, were for the first time brought within the principle which charged income at its first source, provision being made that the bank should make the assessment and deduct the tax from the dividends, instead of a return for assessment being required from the proprietors of the stock. An exemption was, however, granted for that portion of the funds which was the bona fide property of foreigners resident abroad.

An allowance for the repairs of buildings, which before existed, was taken away by this act, and abatements, previously allowed to persons with a certain number of children, were likewise discontinued. The allowance for life assurance was confined to persons whose incomes were less than £150 a year.

In the year 1816 the income tax ceased. It was not revived until the year 1842, when it was reimposed by Sir Robert Peel's government, not as a war tax but for the purpose of repairing the deficiency which then occurred in the revenue to meet the expenditure of the country, and to enable the Government to make some reforms, with the view of benefiting the commerce and manufactures of the kingdom.

Sir Robert Peel's act followed the general principles laid down in that of 1806; the duty was imposed at the rate of 7*d.* in the pound, being £2 18*s.* 4*d.* per cent, and total exemption was granted to persons whose whole income was under £150 a year.

By the act of 1842 the duty on farmers was imposed on half the annual value of the lands and tenements occupied in England instead of three-fourths, and on about one-third in Scotland instead of one-half, as under the former act of 1806.

From that time till 1853 but little alteration was made in the law.

In 1853 Mr. Gladstone introduced an act by which the tax was reimposed for a period of seven years, with various alterations and modifications. By this act the original rate of duty of 7*d.* in the pound was continued for two years, 6*d.* in the pound was imposed for the next two years, and 5*d.* for the remaining period of three years, ending 5th April, 1860, when it was intended to cease altogether, and the duties under Schedule B were proportioned accordingly. The total exemption accorded to incomes under £150 was repealed and limited to incomes under £100. Incomes amounting to £100 and not amounting to £150 were not subjected to the full amount of tax payable on property and profits generally. The rate of duty on such incomes was fixed at 5*d.* in the pound annually for the whole period of seven years.

The additional amount thus brought into charge on incomes from £100 to £150 was in Great Britain £14,467,300, which at 5*d.* in the pound produced a revenue of £301,320.

Under this act the income tax was for the first time extended to Ireland. The profits of farmers in Ireland were estimated at the same rate as those in Scotland; that is to say, at about one-third of the annual value.

On the declaration of war with Russia, it was found necessary to double the income tax from the 5th April, 1854; and a further increase was afterwards imposed by the act 18 Vict., c. 20, from the 5th April, 1855, of 2*d.* in the pound on incomes of £150 a year or upwards; and of 1½*d.* in the pound on incomes amounting to £100 and not to £150 a year, making 1*s.* 4*d.* in the former case and 11½*d.* in the latter.

This is the highest point to which the tax has ever been raised since its reimposition in 1842.

The act which granted the duty of 1*s.* 4*d.* in the pound declared that it should continue in force until the 6th April after the expiration of one year from the ratification of the treaty of peace. As this did not take place until the financial year 1856, the act did not expire until the 5th April, 1858. In 1857, however, the tax was reduced to 7*d.* in the pound.

The Russian war upset the calculations that had been made in 1853 as to the cessation of the income tax in 1860. Instead of being abolished in that year it was charged at the rate of 10*d.*

In February, 1861, a select committee was appointed by the House of Commons, on the motion of Mr. Hubbard, "to inquire into the present mode of assessing and collecting the income and property tax, and whether any mode of levying the same so as to render the tax more equitable can be adopted."

The committee reported as follows:

"The attention of your committee on the present occasion has been mainly directed to a scheme proposed by their chairman, and explained by him both in written memoranda and in oral evidence, the principal features of which appear to be as follows:

"First. A proposal to make net instead of gross income the basis of assessment to the tax; not ascertaining the net income by an account of actual outgoings, but assuming it by a deduction, founded on an average from certain classes of gross income.

"Second. A proposal to divide all incomes into two classes, of which the one should comprise incomes called spontaneous, and the other incomes called industrial; and to tax the former upon the full amount of the net income, and the latter upon two-thirds of that amount.

"Third. A proposal to distinguish in certain cases between the interest of invested capital and the repayment by installments of the invested capital itself, and to levy the tax upon the interest only, and not upon the repaid portions of capital.

"These three proposals are addressed to three complaints which are popularly made against the income tax in its present form, viz, that it taxes the owners of property in respect of income which they do not get; that it presses too hardly upon skill and industry as compared with property; and that it deals with capital, in certain cases, as if it were income, and taxes it accordingly.

"The proposals which your committee have had under consideration are framed upon the assumption that the complaints to which your committee have adverted are well founded, and they are contrived with much ingenuity with a view to meeting them.

"Your committee, however, after full consideration, have arrived at the conclusion that the plan proposed by their chairman does not afford a basis for a practicable and equitable readjustment of the income tax, and they feel so strongly the dangers and ill consequences, to be apprehended from an attempt to unsettle the present basis of the tax, without a clear perception of the mode in which it is to be reconstructed, that they are not prepared to offer to your honorable House any suggestions for its amendment.

"This tax having now been made the subject of investigation before two committees (a reference to a committee which had considered the question about ten years previously), and no proposal for its amendment having been found satisfactory, your committee are brought to the conclusion that the objections which are urged against it are objections to its nature and essence rather than to the particular shape which has been given to it.

"Your committee also feel that it would be unjust to make any alteration in the present incidence of the income tax without, at the same time, taking into consideration the pressure of other taxation upon the various interests of the country, some of it imposed by recent legislation, and in one case especially, that of the succession duty, to some extent by way of compensation.

To those who are desirous of pursuing the subject, we suggest a reference to Mr. Gladstone's financial statement of 1853.

In 1863, an important alteration was made in favor of the class of incomes termed by Mr. Gladstone "minor incomes," which were previously exempted when under £100 a year, and were taxed at less than the full rate when between £100 and £150.

The total exemption of incomes under £100 a year was continued, but in place of the lower rate on incomes between £100 and £150 an abatement of £60 was allowed in assessing all incomes of £100 and under £200 a year.

In laying his proposal before the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone stated that in his opinion "the sore place, above and beyond all others in the working of the income tax, is at the point where incomes range from £100 to £200 per annum," and he expressed his conviction that the effect of his plan, if adopted, would be "to mitigate in a remarkable degree the difficulties which are now felt in the application of the tax to the lower incomes, especially at the two critical points of £100 and £150 a year."

The allowance relieved from tax in the year 1863–'64 income amounted to about £10,000,000, and in the following year to upwards of £12,000,000, and it is believed that the produce of the tax was thus reduced by about £75,000 per penny.

In 1872, Mr. Lowe increased the abatement granted to the smaller incomes, and allowed £80 to be deducted from all incomes between £100 and £300. By so doing he afforded relief in the course of the two years following to nearly 130,000 persons, while the amount of income on which abatements could be granted was increased in the same time from about £18,000,000 to £34,000,000, and it is estimated that the produce of the tax was reduced by about £50,000 per penny.

The year 1874 is memorable in the history of the income tax, both on account of Mr. Gladstone's offer to repeal it altogether, and also from the fact that after the change of government which took place in that year the rate of the tax was reduced by Sir Stafford Northcote to 2*d.*, the lowest point which it has ever reached.

In 1876 Sir Stafford Northcote again extended the system of exemptions and abatements. The limit of total exemption was raised from £100 to £150, while an abatement of £120 was allowed on all incomes between £150 and £400 per annum, instead of the existing allowance of £80 on incomes under £300. Inasmuch as we have no means of ascertaining the numbers of persons who are totally exempt from income tax it is impossible to state the effect of these measures separately.

Sir Stafford Northcote estimated the combined loss at £130,000 per penny, but it is now believed that the loss, by raising the limit of total exemption from £100 to £150, did not much exceed £80,000 per penny.

Upon this assumption the total effect of the two reductions must have been much less than estimated, inasmuch as the claims for abatement on incomes under £400 in 1876–'77 was only £156,000 per penny, against £163,000 per penny claimed on incomes under £300 in 1875–'76; the reason being, of course, that the exemption of incomes under £150 reduced the claims for abatement on incomes under £400. Altogether we are inclined to put the net loss at from £50,000 to £60,000 per penny.

The net produce for each penny of the tax in 1892–'93 was £2,215,000 (about).

QUESTION 2.

Second. What rate is levied and what exemptions are allowed?

1. A list of the rates of income tax since 1842 is herewith annexed, together with the amount of duty charged and realized in each year since the reimposition of the tax, viz, 1842.

A statement is also furnished showing the net produce for each penny of tax.

INCOME TAX.

Amount of duty charged and realized in each year from the 5th day of April, 1842, the rate in the pound at which such tax was levied in each year, the name of the chancellor of the exchequer imposing or continuing such tax.

Year ended 5th April—	United Kingdom. Total income tax charged.	Net produce after allowing for sums discharged or returned in default and for repayments of duty. Total.	For each penny of tax.	Receipt in addition for unassessed duty and for recoveries from default schedules.	Rate of duty on incomes of— £100 and under £150 a year.	£150 a year and upward.	Name of chancellor of the exchequer imposing or continuing income tax.	Incomes wholly exempted.	Annual income in respect of which an abatement was allowed.	Amount of abatement.
1843	a£5,607,798	£5,405,161	£772,166			7*d.* in the £	Right Hon. Henry Goulburn *b*.	Under £150 per annum.		
1844	a5,504,083	5,260,136	751,455	£5		do	do	do		
1845	a5,473,691	5,245,493	749,356	80		do	do	do		
1846	a5,710,178	5,496,091	785,156	1		do	do *c*	do		
1847	a5,790,617	5,589,606	798,515	169		do	Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood, Bart.	do		
1848	a5,634,670	5,567,799	795,399	67		do	do	do		
1849	a5,792,060	5,583,296	790,469	1,952		do	do *d*	do		
1850	a5,739,274	5,474,416	782,059	510		do	do *d*	do		
1851	a5,754,160	5,508,205	786,886	1,705		do	do *d*	do		
1852	a5,845,297	5,568,390	709,055	1,913		do	do	do		
1853	a5,931,982	5,667,421	809,631	2,609		do	Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli	do		
1854	7,215,137	6,898,567	1,004,468	10,111	5*d.* in the £	do	Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone	Under £100 per annum.		
1855	14,358,091	13,633,646	998,428	13,467	10*d.* in the £	1*s.* 2*d.* in the £	do	do		
1856	16,545,508	15,715,684	1,001,403	10,928	11¼*d.* in the £	1*s.* 4*d.* in the £	Right Hon. Sir George C. Lewis, Bart.	do		
1857	16,915,232	16,037,461	1,023,005	10,186	11¼*d.* in the £	do	do	do		
1858	7,905,595	7,466,296	1,088,923	13,168	5*d.* in the £	7*d.* in the £	do	do		
1859	5,758,905	5,461,564	1,092,310	14,541	do	5*d.* in the £	Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli	do		
1860	10,434,697	9,910,054	1,116,794	24,083	6¼*d.* in the £	9*d.* in the £	Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone	do		
1861	11,627,231	11,057,437	1,122,258	11,949	7*d.* in the £	10*d.* in the £	do	do		
1862	10,990,103	10,451,198	1,161,255	6,955	6*d.* in the £	9*d.* in the £	do	do		
1863	11,248,641	10,723,390	1,192,863	8,283	do	do	do	do		
					All incomes of £100 a year and upwards.					
1864	9,001,483	8,332,047	1,218,964	(*e*)	7*d.* in the £		Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone	do	£100 and less than £200.	[illegible]
1865	8,256,518	7,676,356	1,312,726		6*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1866	5,768,254	5,321,450	1,280,362		4*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1867	5,028,495	5,663,238	1,415,809		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1868	7,641,368	7,141,075	1,428,215		do 1*d.* in the £ (Abyssinian war).		Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli do	do do	do do	[illegible]
1869	9,244,778	8,615,325	1,435,887		6*d.* in the £		Right Hon. G. Ward Hunt	do	do	[illegible]
1870	7,884,772	7,381,498	1,476,298		5*d.* in the £		Right Hon. Robert Lowe *f*	do	do	[illegible]
1871	6,668,587	6,208,125	1,592,031		4*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1872	10,363,246	9,925,654	1,654,277		6*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1873	7,282,260	6,964,388	1,741,088		4*d.* in the £		do	do	£100 and less than £300.	[illegible]
1874	5,768,696	5,563,934	1,854,644		3*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1875	3,998,370	3,890,520	1,945,260		2*d.* in the £		Right Hon. Sir Stafford H. Northcote, Bart.	do	do	[illegible]
1876	4,032,492	3,956,169	1,978,084		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
					Incomes of £150 a year and upwards.					
1877	5,891,899	5,714,899	1,904,779		3*d.* in the £		do	Under £150 per annum.	£150 and less than £400.	[illegible]
1878	5,940,739	5,727,017	1,909,005		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1879	9,224,945	9,395,365	1,879,073		5*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1880	9,746,927	9,233,322	1,846,664		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1881	11,827,724	11,199,816	1,866,636		do 1*d.* in the £, owing to repeal of malt duty.		Right Hon. Sir S. H. Northcote, Bart. (original budget). Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone	do do	do do	[illegible]
1882	10,147,407	9,578,414	1,915,683		5*d.* in the £					
1883	13,545,282	12,758,661	1,962,871		6¼*d.* in the £					
1884	10,670,636	10,083,927	2,016,785		5*d.* in the £		Right Hon. H. C. Childers	do	do	[illegible]
1885	12,771,798	12,013,332	2,002,222		do 1*d.* in the £		do do	do do	do do	[illegible]
1886	17,037,899	15,843,065	1,980,395		8*d.* in the £		Right Hon. Sir W. V. Harcourt	do	do	[illegible]
1887	16,933,836	15,723,555	1,965,440		do		Right Hon. G. J Goschen	do	do	[illegible]
1888	14,981,160	13,948,844	1,992,690		7*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1889	13,128,973	12,272,521	2,045,587		6*d.* in the £		do	do	do	[illegible]
1890	13,059,404	12,849,349	2,141,558		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1891	14,324,681	*g*13,288,000	2,214,000		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1892	14,595,430	*g*12,290,000	*g*2,215,000		do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1893	*g*14,530,000				do		do	do	do	[illegible]
1894					7*d.* in the £		Right Hon. Sir W. V. Harcourt	do	do	[illegible]

a Great Britain only.

b The income tax for the years 1842 to 1844 was imposed on financial statement made by Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., first lord of the treasury—in 1842.

c The income tax for the years 1845 to 1847 was imposed on financial statement made by Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., first lord of the treasury—in 1845.

d The income tax for the years 1848 to 1859 was imposed on financial statement made by Right Hon. Lord John Russell, first lord of the treasury—in 1848.

e Included in third column from 1853–'64.

f The income tax for the year 1871, so far as relates to the addition of 2*d.* in the £, was imposed on financial statement made by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, first lord of the treasury.

g Provisional figures; actual amounts not having been yet completely ascertained.

2. EXEMPTIONS

Incomes under £150 are exempt.

Incomes under £400 are subject to an abatement of £120.

Premiums for life insurance are exempt. The amount must not exceed one-sixth of the total income.

There are other exemptions extending to charities, universities, friendly, industrial, and provident societies, hospitals, etc., details of which will be found in the collection of acts relating to the income tax forwarded herewith.

QUESTION 3.

Third. Is the tax graded, and what is the total annual income from the tax?

1. The tax is not graded except in so far as the exemption of income under

£150 is concerned, and further in the case of the abatement of £120, which is allowed as regards incomes sub £400. See answer to Question 2 (2).

2. The total annual income from the tax will be found in the statement furnished in answer to Question 2 (1).

QUESTION 4.

Fourth. What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax; has the rate been increased or have the exemptions been changed? And what is meant by "income"?

1. See answer to Question 1.

2. See answer to Question 2 (1).

3. "Income" for the purposes of the income tax is defined as follows (16 and 17 Vict., c. 34):

II. For the purpose of classifying and distinguishing the several properties, profits, and gains for and in respect of which the said duties are by this act granted, and for the purposes of the provisions for assessing, raising, levying, and collecting such duties respectively, the said duties shall be deemed to be granted and made payable yearly for and in respect of the several properties, profits, and gain respectively described or comprised in the several schedules contained in this act, and marked respectively A, B, C, D, and E, and to be charged under such respective schedules; that is to say—

SCHEDULE A.

For and in respect of the property in all lands, tenements, hereditaments, and heritages in the United Kingdom, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual value thereof.

SCHEDULE B.

For and in respect of the occupation of all such lands, tenements, hereditaments, and heritages as aforesaid, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual value thereof.

SCHEDULE C.

For and in respect of all profits arising from interest, annuities, dividends, and shares of annuities payable to any person, body politic or corporate, company or society, whether corporate or not corporate, out of any public revenue, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual amount thereof.

SCHEDULE D.

For and in respect of the annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person residing in the United Kingdom from any kind of property whatever, whether situate in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and for and in respect of the annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person residing in the United Kingdom from any profession, trade, employment, or vocation, whether the same shall be respectively carried on in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual amount of such profits and gains.

And for and in respect of the annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person whatever, whether a subject of Her Majesty or not, although not resident within the United Kingdom, from any property whatever in the United Kingdom, or any profession, trade, employment, or vocation exercised within the United Kingdom, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual amounts of profits and gains.

And for and in respect of all interest of money, annuities, and other annual profits and gains not charged by virtue of any of the other schedules contained in this act, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual amount thereof.

SCHEDULE E.

For and in respect of every public office or employment of profit, and upon every annuity, pension, or stipend payable by Her Majesty or out of the public revenue of the United Kingdom, except annuities charged to the duties under the said Schedule C, and to be charged for every 20s. of the annual amount thereof.

QUESTION 5.

Fifth. Is the tax assessed by an officer, or does the citizen make return under oath?

It is the duty of all persons, from whom returns are required, to furnish such returns to the local assessor, who is an officer of the district commissioners of taxes; but in the event of taxpayers electing to be assessed by the special commissioners, who are a separate body appointed by the Crown, then the returns are rendered to the surveyor of taxes, who is also an officer appointed by the Crown.

These returns are not under oath. If the commissioners consider the returns satisfactory then assessments are made in accordance therewith; if unsatisfactory, then assessments are made in such amounts as they may consider sufficient to cover liability.

In cases where returns are not furnished estimated assessments are made, but the persons neglecting to make such returns render themselves liable to penalties.

For a fuller account of the assessment and collection of the income tax see pages 76 to 79 of the Twenty-eighth Report on Inland Revenue sent herewith.

QUESTION 6.

Sixth. What punishment is provided for a failure to make proper return of income?

The penalties on persons neglecting or refusing to make returns are £20 and treble duty when imposed by the income-tax authorities; £50 when proceedings are taken in the high court of justice.

QUESTION 7.

Seventh. Does the tax grow in popularity, or is it becoming more distasteful; and if there is complaint, is it from those who pay or from those who escape the tax?

See answer to question 9.

QUESTION 8.

Eighth. Is the tax collected through local authorities or by a representative of the general government?

The mode of assessment and collection of the income tax is described in the Twenty-eighth Report on Inland Revenue. (See pages 76 to 79.)

QUESTION 9.

Ninth. Give any other facts in connection with the tax or its methods of assessment and collection which will enable one to judge of its wisdom and its advantages or disadvantages?

[Extract from the Twenty-eighth Report on Inland Revenue, pages 84 and 85.]

It may appear remarkable that in spite of all its drawbacks, and the constant attacks to which it has been subjected, the income tax should have remained in force for more than fifty years without undergoing any serious alterations. The fact of its having done so, furnishes a strong reason for assuming that its present form is as good as or better than any other that could be devised, and this assumption appears to us to be strengthened by the following considerations:

The two main objections that have been raised against the income tax are its inquisitorial character, and the inequitable nature of its incidence.

As regards the second of these objections we have nothing substantial to add to the report of the committee of 1861, who declared their opinion "that it would be unjust to make any alteration in the present incidence of the income tax without at the same time taking into consideration the pressure of other taxation upon the various interests of the country, some of it imposed by recent legislation, and in one case especially, that of the succession duty, to some extent by way of compensation."

The most common complaint against the incidence of the income tax is that it falls as heavily on persons who earn their incomes by skill and labor as on those who derive their incomes from property. In order to weigh the gravity of this objection it is necessary to consider what other taxes are paid by the owners of property from which persons whose incomes are acquired by their own skill and labor are free.

Let us take the simple case of a person just appointed to an office with a salary of £600 per annum, and compare it with the case of a person just succeeding to £20,000 in consols, on which the annual interest is also £600.

In the course of thirty years, supposing no change to take place in their circumstances, what amounts will each pay to the State? The one will pay income tax only, and if we take the average rate of the tax at 6d. he will pay £15 a year, making in all £450. But the other will, at the very least, pay, on succeeding to his consols, probate duty at 3 per cent, that is £600, as well as income tax. The property owner, therefore, will contribute to the exchequer more than double the amount contributed by the officeholder. A comparison can not be made so simply when real instead of personal property is concerned, as the special taxes to which it is subject, namely, the house duty, land tax, and succession duty can not be calculated as accurately as the probate duty.

But this example is sufficient for our purpose, and makes it quite clear that in considering the burdens imposed by the income tax on incomes derived from realized and unrealized property, respectively, it must always be remembered that realized property is charged with other financial burdens than the income tax itself.

With regard to the inquisitorial character of the income tax, we may observe that under the present system the evil is reduced to a minimum. It is quite conceivable that in no case is the full amount of any person's income known, either by any local authorities or by our own officers, excepting the incomes of those who claim exemption or abatement, and who have to furnish particulars of their incomes from all sources in order to establish their claims. It is quite certain that in multitudes of cases the full amount of the incomes can not be known to any authority. A person who is assessed under Schedule D in respect of some business he carries on in London may have additional income derived from land elsewhere and taxed under Schedule A as well as investments in consols, which are charged under Schedule C. In each instance the tax is certain to be paid, but there are no means of, or object in ascertaining that it is in each instance paid by the same individual. Neither can the incomes of persons be discovered who have money invested in the shares of railway and other companies, which pay the income tax on their profits directly to the revenue, and then deduct it from the dividends they pay to their shareholders. No authority can tell the amount of any particular shareholder's holding, or in how many companies he may have money invested.

It will have been noticed in our opening remarks upon the income tax that, in the first place, the tax was regulated by the amount of the income of the taxpayer; but that, although it was imposed under these conditions by Mr. Pitt in 1798, it was entirely reconstituted in 1799, and again in 1803. In 1799 the tax was equalized on all incomes, with certain exemptions and abatements such as now exist, and a return of their total income was required from every person. In 1803 this return was abolished, and the present system of taxing incomes at their source was adopted.

A graduated income tax has, therefore, once been tried, and given up after the experience of one year only; while an income tax dependent on returns of their total incomes from whatever source derived, made by taxpayers, has also been tried, and, after an existence of four years, abandoned. That this should have been the case is not surprising if the enormous temptations to fraud, which a tax so levied must present, are considered, as well as the stringent and irritating measures of supervision by which alone fraud could be prevented, even supposing that any measures would suffice for its prevention.

The supervision employed between 1799 and 1803 certainly did not achieve its object, for the produce of the tax under the system established in 1799, when the charge was at the rate of 10 per cent, scarcely exceeded the produce of the tax under the system established in 1803, though the rate was reduced to 5 per cent.

At the present time it is not too much to say that under Schedules A, B, and E fraudulent evasion is very difficult; and that under Schedules C and D, in a large number of instances, no temptation to fraud exists, inasmuch as the tax is paid for the taxpayer instead of by himself; and that, in fact, successful frauds can scarcely now be perpetrated excepting when the assessments must depend either entirely or in part on the returns furnished by the persons concerned.

It is probably owing to these considerations that proposals which have been made from time to time for a graduated income tax have never been received with favor by anyone who has had practical experience of the working of the income tax acts. A graduated income tax could only be made dependent on personal returns of income and the doors would thus be widely reopened to fraud.

In conclusion we may point out that the income tax in its first shape lasted only one year and in its second shape for only four years, while in its third and present shape it lasted for thirteen years before its abolition in 1816, and has remained so now for more than fifty years since its reimposition in 1842. The contrast is striking, and the advantages of the present system could scarcely be more conclusively proved. If, however, additional proof were needed it might be found in the fact that the present system has met with the approval of every eminent statesman who, since the days of Mr. Pitt, has had to control the finances of the country.

[Extract from Bradstreets, May 13, 1893.]

One of the most interesting features of the recent budget speech of the British chancellor of the exchequer was the showing there made as to the growth of the income tax during recent years. In introducing the subject he said that the maintenance of the strength of this tax and the continual growth of its yield were simply marvelous, and that nobody who had studied the question could understand how, in all the vicissitudes of trade and apparent oscillation of property, the income tax was a source of constantly increased and increasing revenue. It had been shown, the chancellor said, by his predecessor, Mr. Goschen, that the yield of the income tax did not mainly depend on the principle of conspicuous trade or decline with its depression. In estimating the yield of the income tax for the fiscal year just ended Mr. Goschen calculated a fall of only £400,000 on a total of £13,800,000 in the preceding year, which was the highest point at which the yield of the income tax had ever stood. As a matter of fact the income tax yielded a total of £13,470,000, or £70,000 more than the estimate of Mr. Goschen, and £220,000 more than for the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. Goschen's estimate, his successor recalls, was received with scepti-

cism by many people, who thought it impossible to believe that the yield of the tax would not fall off to a greater degree. In noticing the existence of this state of feeling at the time Mr. Goschen said: "If I am to judge simply by the statistical returns, by the gossip of the city, by complaints in Lancashire, or by the position in Yorkshire, and if I am to listen to the committee, or to be influenced by the general feeling, I might come to the conclusion that there would be a very large gap in the income-tax returns for the year." He then proceeded to show that while public attention was fixed on the great staple industries of the country—cotton, gold, iron—"there is a mighty trade going on, there is a wealth being rolled up—wealth of which no published statistics exist, but which is nevertheless accumulating and adding to the capital of the country." He pointed out that the profits of the cotton trade were less than the aggregate profits of the medical profession, and that the profits of the coal mines were still less than those of the lawyers. As has been shown, events bore out the substantial correctness of his estimate.

Sir William Harcourt, in discussing the question further, said:

"The growth of the income tax is one of the most remarkable features of our finance. In 1889, when it was reduced to 6*d.*, its yield was £12,700,000; in 1892, only three years later, it was £13,810,000, or an increase of £1,100,000; and even with the decline last year it is still £700,000 more than it was in 1889. I have had some remarkable figures on this subject taken out which give the yield for the penny for the last eight years on each of the several schedules separately, a far better test than taking it upon the whole. They are new figures, and they are very deserving of the attention of the House. They give accurately the real yield of the tax, and are not merely the exchequer receipts for the year, which vary very much. Now, sir, in the year 1886, that is the commencement of the last Parliament, the income tax yielded £1,900,000 for the penny, and in 1893, which is just concluded, it yielded £2,291,000 for the penny.

"It will surprise many people to learn that the produce of Schedule A, lands and houses, has actually risen from £670,000 for the penny in 1886 to £676,000 in 1893. As everybody will anticipate, it has fallen heavily upon agricultural land—it has fallen from £217,000 for the penny to £191,000; but it has risen upon houses from £452,000 to £484,000, so that taking the two together there is an actual rise upon Schedule A. Schedule B, the occupiers of land schedule, has, as might be expected, heavily fallen. It has fallen from £48,000 for the penny to £36,000. As to Schedule D, the profits of the trade companies, etc., the yield in 1886 was £968,000 for the penny, and in 1893, in spite of the ruin which is said to attend all trade and to have destroyed all profits, it is £1,208,000—the highest that it has ever been. Schedule E, which represents the growth of salaries, the salaries of public employés and the employés of companies, has a remarkable figure, too. In 1882, ten years ago, the yield of that schedule was £118,000 for the penny, and in 1893 it is £152,000. When Sir Robert Peel imposed the income tax in 1842 the yield was £770,000 for the penny; it is now three times as much, and it would have required in his time an income tax of 1*s.* 6*d.* in the £1 to raise a similar amount. I have laid these figures before the House because I think that even in times of depression, and apparently of what are called bad times, it is well that the House and the country should know what is the actual condition of things."

In reviewing these figures the chancellor of the exchequer said that the steady and vast growth in the produce of the income tax and of the probate duties constituted the most irrefragable evidence of the solid advance in wealth, both in the annual income and the accumulated capital of the nation, and formed a conclusive answer to those pessimists who assured the country that it was being ruined by a vicious commercial system. "It is true," he added, "that this trade or that trade, this industry or that industry may have its ups and downs, its adversity and prosperity, but there is a perpetual compensation in all directions; the small rivulets of increasing income from every source, and the accumulated savings of the country supply the deficiencies of the larger stream, and year after year more capital is invested, and therefore there is a larger income earned."

The chancellor of the exchequer, it may be remarked, shows his confidence in the staying qualities of the income tax by adopting for the current fiscal year the estimate made by Mr. Goschen last year, namely £13,400,000. Furthermore, in order to meet the deficit shown by the balance sheet for the current fiscal year, he proposes an increase of a penny in the pound in the income tax, viz, from 6*d.* to 7*d.* in the pound. It is estimated that a penny in the pound will yield £1,750,000 the first year, which will just cover the deficit, estimated at £1,574,000, and leave a slight margin for contingencies.

PRUSSIA.

As the Kingdom of Prussia so largely preponderates over its fellow members in the German Union in wealth, population, and other resources, Prussian legislation on income taxation would seem to merit paramount consideration, and in the subjoined report, embodied in the answers given to the series of questions submitted to this legation, attention has for this reason been given exclusively to the provisions of that legislation.

The first Prussian income tax law, sufficiently general and uniform in its application to deserve that name, was enacted May 1, 1851. Further legislation on this subject ensued in 1873, 1875, 1877, and 1883. Those laws, however, are no longer in force, a law adopted some two years since having replaced them. The purpose of this report being a practical one, it will suffice to state that the tendency of the legislation on this subject has been to simplify progressively this species of taxation, and make its operation more general and uniform; to increase the amount of income which is exempted as being necessary to the support of its owner; to tax small incomes less, great ones more; and to abolish in its application distinctions based on the source of the income, or on residence, trade, or profession. This tendency has resulted in the present income tax law, enacted June 24, 1891.

Legislation on this subject, in great part of very recent date, and enacted since and largely modelled upon the present Prussian law, exists in nearly all of the twenty-four states, which, together with Prussia, constitute the German Empire.

The Imperial Government imposes no income tax. The existing laws on this subject are the laws of the individual German states, and the revenues accruing from them belong to the individual states, the means needed to defray the expenses of the Imperial Government being derived mainly from customs, and, in case of need, contributions, called matricular contributions, from the individual states.

In Prussia the income tax law of June 24, 1891, together with the regulation respecting its execution of August 5, 1891, which will be found in inclosures 1*a* to 1*c*, constitute the law on this subject now in force.

The historical development of the income tax existing in Prussia will appear from a consideration of the following laws relating to the subject: the law of May 30, 1820 (Law Collection, page 140), respecting the introduction of a class and classified income tax; the law of May 25, 1873 (Law Collection, page 213), respecting the amendment of the law last above mentioned, and the income tax law of June 24, 1891.

In reply to the particular questions submitted the following answers are given:

I. ANSWER TO QUESTION 1.

"How long has the income tax been collected?"

It appears to have been collected in Prussia for about twenty years past.

II. ANSWER TO QUESTION 2.

"What rate is levied and what exemptions are allowed?"

The rate levied by the present income tax will appear in the provisions of section 17 of the law of June 24, 1891 (see following answer). The exemptions from the tax are stated in sections 3, 5, and 6 of that law, and are as follows:

EXEMPTIONS.

The following persons are exempt from income taxation:

a. 1. The members of the royal house and of the princely house of Hohenzollern.

2. The members of the former royal house of Hanover, and of the former princely houses of the Electorate of Hesse and the Duchy of Nassau.

3. The representatives of foreign powers accredited to the Emperor and King, and the plenipotentiaries to the Bundesrath of other states of the German Union, the officers assigned to them, as well as the persons, in so far as they are foreigners, who are in their service or in that of their officers.

4. Other persons who, in accordance with the principles of international law, or pursuant to particular agreements concluded with other states, are entitled to claim exemption from the income tax. The exemptions granted under Nos. 2 and 3 do not extend to certain income declared taxable by section 2 of this law; that is to say, to income consisting of salaries, pensions, etc., paid by the Prussian state treasury, etc. Nor do these exemptions extend to those cases in which the foreign states concerned do not accord reciprocity.

b. All incomes under 900 marks are exempt.

c. Incomes derived as follows are exempt:

1. Incomes from realty situated in other states of the German Union or in a German protectorate, or from industries conducted therein, as well as from salaries, pensions, and "waiting money" (money paid by the state to a person to whom a place is promised, until a vacancy occurs), accruing to German military persons and civil officials or to relatives entitled in case of death from the treasury of another state of the German Union.

2. Income accruing to foreigners liable to taxation pursuant to section 1, No. 3 of the law, from foreign realty or industrial pursuits, when such persons neither reside in Prussia nor sojourn there for business purposes.

3. The military income of noncommissioned officers and privates, as well as the military income of all persons in the standing army or navy, while they belong to a part of the army or navy which has been placed on a war footing.

4. That part of the military service income, exceeding the amount of salary which entitles to pension, of such state and imperial officials and officers as have their service domicile abroad. In so far as such persons may be required to pay corresponding direct taxes abroad, such excess also remains exempt.

5. Income consisting of increases of pensions and of additions on account of mutilations sustained which have been accorded to war invalids, pursuant to legal provisions, as well as salaries *honoris causa* connected with war decorations.

Reductions in rates are granted as follows;

For each member of a family who is under 14 years of age and is not liable to be independently assessed pursuant to section 11 (*i. e.*, children who have income wholly independent of the parent and not subject to his control) a reduction is allowed of 50 marks in the taxable income, not exceeding 3,000 marks, of the head of the house; with a further provision that if there be three or more such members of a family, the reduction shall in any case amount to that represented by an entire rate-group (section 17).

In making an assessment it is permissible (section 19), in view of particular economic conditions affecting essentially the ability to pay of the person to be taxed, to make such allowance in his behalf, that in the case of a taxable income of not more than 9,500 marks, a maximum reduction to the extent of three of the rate-groups prescribed in section 17 may be granted. The circumstances to be considered in this connection are exceptional burdens arising from the support and education of children, the obligation to support helpless relatives, permanent sickness, indebtedness, and particular misfortunes.

III. ANSWER TO QUESTION 3.

"Is the tax graded, and what is the total annual income from the tax?"

GRADE OF TAX.

There are grades with a progressive percentage according to the height of the income on which tax is to be paid: less than 1 per cent is charged on incomes up to 1,200 marks; on incomes of 1,200 marks, 1; of 3,000 marks, 2; of 10,000 marks, 3; and of 100,000 marks, 4 per cent of the income.

RATE OF TAX.

The following schedule will show the gradually increasing rates levied, beginning with incomes of more than 900 marks, and ending with incomes of 100,000 marks, which latter pay the maximum rate of 4 per cent.

These are the tax-groups herein referred to:

Income of more than—	And up to (inclusive)—	Rate.	Income of more than—	And up to (inclusive)—	Rate.
Marks.	*Marks.*	*Marks.*	*Marks.*	*Marks.*	*Marks.*
900	1,050	6	3,900	4,200	92
1,050	1,200	9	4,200	4,500	101
1,200	1,350	12	4,500	5,000	118
1,350	1,500	16	5,000	5,500	132
1,500	1,650	21	5,500	6,000	146
1,650	1,800	26	6,000	6,500	160
1,800	2,100	31	6,500	7,000	173
2,100	2,400	36	7,000	7,500	192
2,400	2,700	44	7,500	8,000	212
2,700	3,000	52	8,000	8,500	232
3,000	3,300	60	8,500	9,000	252
3,300	3,600	70	9,000	9,500	276
3,600	3,900	80	9,500	10,500	300

The rate is increased as follows for the following incomes:

Incomes of more than—	Up to (inclusive)—	For each—	By—
Marks.	*Marks.*	*Marks.*	*Marks.*
10,500	30,500	1,000	30
30,500	52,000	1,500	60
52,000	78,000	2,000	80
78,000	100,000	2,000	100

For incomes of more than 100,000 marks up to (inclusive) 105,000 marks the tax is 4,000 marks, and increases for larger incomes by 200 marks for each additional 5,000 marks of income.

The annual revenue from the tax:

For the year 1892–'93, 124,842,848 marks, about $30,210,712; for the year 1893–'94, 123,172,858 marks, about $30,7.3,214.

These are, however, not the final amounts, but only those assessed in the first instance by the appropriate authorities, and reached, therefore, without consideration of increases or diminutions occurring in consequence of decisions on appeal or otherwise.

IV. ANSWER TO QUESTION 4.

"What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax? Has the rate increased, or have the exemptions been changed, and what is meant by 'income'?"

The tax rates prevailing under the law of June 24, 1891, are for smaller incomes lower and for larger incomes higher than those that prevailed previously. For instance, according to the law of 1873, incomes of 3,000 marks (about $750) or less were uniformly taxed with 3 per cent. Now the tax on them is 2 per cent. More and more from time to time have the smaller incomes been relieved from taxation. The law of 1851 taxed all incomes. The law of 1873 exempted all incomes up to 420 marks (about $105); the law of May 26, 1883 (Law collection, page 37), all up to 900 marks (about $225); and thus it stands under the law of June 24, 1891.

AS TO WHAT IS MEANT BY INCOME.

What is meant by taxable income is determined by section 7 of the law of June 24, 1891, which declares that all annual income accruing in money or money's worth from the following shall be regarded as taxable, viz:

1. Capital.
2. Real estate, leases, and rents, including the rent value of the house, or the part of the same, belonging to and occupied by the taxpayer himself.
3. Trade and commerce, including mining.
4. Occupations from which pecuniary profit may be derived, all rights (all "gettings" is the very comprehensive word used in the law) to receive periodical payments or profits from sources not mentioned above (*i. e.*, premiums, royalties, annuities, or payments in the nature thereof), and all advantages of any kind from which profit is derivable, however they have come to or been acquired by the holder of the rights.

V. ANSWER TO QUESTION 5.

"Is the tax assessed by an officer or does the citizen make return under oath?"

With respect to the assessment of taxpayers, a distinction must be made between those having an income up to 3,000 marks (about $750), and those with an income exceeding that sum.

The latter are required to make each year a written declaration of the amount of their income, which declaration is to be verified by an assertion (not an oath) at the end of it that the statements are made according to the best of the declarant's knowledge and upon his conscience "nach bestem wissen und gewissen" (section 24 of the law). The tax is fixed on the basis of the statements contained in the declaration if considered satisfactory by the income-tax assessment commissions, of which one is constituted pursuant to the provisions of section 34 of the law, for each of the circuits of the Kingdom of Prussia. The assessment of taxpayers with incomes up to 3,000 marks (about $750) is made by primary assessment commissions, who act for one or more communities or landed estate districts (section 31). The estimates of these latter commissions are subject to the confirmation of the chairman of the income-tax assessment commission, who, if he proposes a change in the rate fixed, must submit the matter to the decision of the commission (section 36 of the law).

VI. ANSWER TO QUESTION 6.

"What punishment is provided for a failure to make proper return of income?"

The provisions respecting punishment for failure to make proper returns of income are contained in sections 66 and following of the law.

SEC. 66. Whoever, in the tax declaration, or when answering the questions put to him by the appropriate authority, or in order to secure relief under the law, knowingly makes false or insufficient statements regarding his taxable income, or regarding the income of those whom he represents which are calculated to secure a reduction of the tax, or withholds information regarding his taxable income, which, according to the regulations of this law, he is bound to make known, will be punished with from four to ten times the amount of the loss—in case a loss has been suffered by the state—otherwise with from four to ten times the amount of the annual tax of which it was intended to defraud the state, but [in this latter case] at least with a fine of 100 marks.

Instead of this punishment a penalty of from 20 to 100 marks shall be paid, if the circumstances indicate that the incorrect or incomplete statements, or the withholding of information regarding taxable income, were, though made or done wilfully, not made for the purpose of evading the payment of tax.

A person who has made an incorrect statement before the appropriate authority may escape punishment by disclosing the error and paying (within the time limited by law) the tax; providing such disclosure and payment be made before a charge has been made or an investigation begun on the subject.

SEC. 67. The collection of tax fraudulently withheld takes place in addition to and independently of that of the penalty.

The liability to pay tax fraudulently withheld is barred by limitation in ten years and passes to the heirs but not beyond the amount of their inheritance, and when it devolves on them it is barred by limitation in five years. The period of limitation in the case of the taxpayer begins with the end of the tax-year in which the fraud takes place.

The fixing of the amount of the tax to be paid in case of fraud rests with the government [the chief local administrative authority] from whose decision appeal lies only to the minister of finance.

SEC. 68. Whoever refuses to give the information demanded of him, pursuant to section 22, or upon insufficient grounds of excuse does not within the period limited furnish the same at all, or furnishing the same furnishes it incompletely or incorrectly, is punishable with a fine of 300 marks.

Whoever does not, in accordance with the duty prescribed by section 61, in due season give notice of his arrival and departure [in matter of residence] is to pay a penalty of 20 marks.

SEC. 69. The officials who participate in the assessment of tax, and the members of the commissions, are liable to a penal fine up to 1,500 marks (about $375), or to imprisonment for three months, if they, without authorization, make known the circumstances as to the earnings, property, or income of the taxpayer, and especially the contents of a tax declaration, or of the proceedings which have taken place in relation to the same.

Prosecution in such case takes place, however, only at the instance of the government [the chief local administrative authority] or the taxpayer.

SEC. 70. The pecuniary penalties, to be determined according to sections 66, 68, and 69, are, if they can not be collected, to be changed into imprisonment according to the existing regulations of the penal code of the German Empire. (Sections 28 and 29.)

The investigation and decision respecting the punishable acts designated in sections 66 and 68 rest with the court, unless the accused, within a specified period of which he is to have notice, voluntarily pays the fine in the amount primarily fixed by the Government together with the costs that have arisen in consequence of the procedure taken against him.

The chief governmental administrative officers are empowered to impose a milder punishment than is prescribed in section 66.

If the accused has no residence in Prussia, judicial proceedings take place, without the provisional determination of the punishment by the Government. This is also the case where the Government for other reasons declares that it will for the present desist from fixing the punishment, or where the accused waives such previous provisional determination.

The decision regarding tax fraudulently withheld rests in all cases with the administrative authorities, but proceedings for violation of the provisions respecting the duty of secrecy (section 69) are to be in the courts.

VII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 7.

"Does the tax grow in popularity or is it becoming more distasteful; and if there is complaint is it from those who pay or those who escape the tax?"

It will have been seen that taxation of incomes has existed in Prussia for more than forty years. It is one of various taxes, and the result of my observation on the subject is that the fact that it is a tax upon incomes does not of itself constitute in the popular mind an objection to it. In other words, it does not appear that objection is made that in order to raise the money which is obtained by that tax, other things should be taxed instead of incomes, and that incomes should not be taxed.

As will have been seen, the burdens of income taxation in Prussia fal most heavily on those who are best able to bear them. The law exempts all incomes under 900 marks (about $225), and the taxation is graded. While an income of 1,200 marks (about $300) is taxed at the rate of 1 per cent, one of 3,000 marks (about $750) is taxed at 2, one of 10,000 (about $2,500) at 3, and one of 100,000 marks (about $25,000) at 4 per cent. Favor is shown in the law to those who have to bear exceptional burdens arising from support and education of children, the obligation to support helpless relations, permanent illness, indebtedness, and particular misfortunes. It may be remarked that the taxpayer is not required to make oath to the statement which he must make for taxation of his income, but it is to be made under his solemn declarations or asseveration on "knowledge and conscience."

VIII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 8.

"Is the tax collected through local authorities or by a representative of of the general government?"

The collection of the income tax is, as regards incomes up to 3,000 marks, in several provinces confided to the communities, who receive for this service 2 per cent of the income actually collected (section 73, subdivision 3 of the law). Otherwise this duty devolves upon the royal treasury officers, of which one exists in each circuit of Prussia. These officers are so organized that there is but one state officer in each, the rent-master, who, upon his own responsibility, may employ private assistants.

BAVARIA.

I. ANSWER TO QUESTION 1.

"How long has the income tax been collected?"

An income tax has existed in Bavaria since October 1, 1848.

According to the laws of June 4, 1848 (Bavarian Law-sheet, page 154), and of July 11, 1850 (Bavarian Law-sheet, page 205), income tax was to be paid on all net incomes, whether reached by some of the other species of taxation or not, and whether consisting of money, or money's worth, or of "selbstbenutzung" [the value of the use or occupation of a thing, or property by the owner of it himself], whether permanent or temporary, and whether dependent on legal obligation or the free will of other persons. This income tax remained in force until 1856.

From the 1st of October, 1856, in pursuance of the law relating to income tax of May 31 of that year—the general income tax previously existing was replaced by a particular income tax, intended to reach income not reached by any direct tax; that is to say, income derived from the following sources: from earnings acquired in liberal occupations (not carried on in a regular business like way), from scientific and artistic occupations; from salaries and service emoluments; retired pay and contributions to support; from jointures, stipends granted to prebendaries; receipts arising from peasant-holdings consisting of cottages without land, annuities and the like. This particular income tax has in respect to its underlying principles been retained in the income-tax law now in force, of May 19, 1881 (Law-sheet No. 31, page 441), which, together with the regulation concerning its execution of July 29, 1881 (Law-sheet No. 46), is herewith transmitted—inclosures 2a and 2b. Details respecting the subject of this income tax will be found in articles 1 and 2 of this law.

II AND III. ANSWER TO QUESTIONS 2 AND 3.

(2) "What rate is levied and what exemptions are allowed?" and

(3) "Is the tax graded, and what is the total annual income from the tax?"

The rates levied are treated of in three groups, and within these groups are graded in the manner stated in article 5 of the law. The rate is in the first group one-third of 1 per cent, in the second it increases from about four-tenths of 1 per cent to a little more than 1 per cent, while in the third the rate up to an income of 1,020 marks, amounts to one-third of 1 per cent, and even in the highest grades remains something less than 1 per cent. According to a provision of a law relating to finance, an additional tax of 6 pfennig on the mark in the case of Groups I and II, and of 11 pfennigs on the mark in that of Group III is levied. The annual yield of the income tax for the year 1892 was 2,110,038 marks. The exemptions from the income tax are enumerated in articles 12, 13, and 14 of the law of May 19, 1881.

IV. ANSWER TO QUESTION 4.

"What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax? Has the rate increased or have the exemptions been changed, and what is meant by income?"

The important change which has taken place in the taxation system of Bavaria since an income tax has existed there has been discussed already in the answer to question 1. This also answers the question "What is meant by income?" in the sense of the Bavarian income-tax law now in force. The changes in the tax rates since the law of May 31, 1856, consist solely in the conversion of their expression in florins into the present money of the Empire. The addition imposed by a finance law (hereinbefore referred to) was, however, increased from the year 1882 by 1 per cent.

As regards the exemptions enumerated in the income-tax law of May 19, 1881, the same were contained in the law of 1856 in article 12, number 1 and numbers 3 to 8, but were expressed in a somewhat different form. In this connection it should be added that the amounts stated in number 6 at 500 marks were, in the law of 1856, put at 200 florins each, and in the before-mentioned law of February 25, 1880, at 350 marks each. The exemption under number 2 of article 12 was newly introduced in the text of the law of 1881.

A similar exemption had, however, been in fact conceded as early as 1856. Finally, the exemptions under articles 13 and 14 of the law of 1881 are also new.

V. ANSWER TO QUESTION 5.

"Is the tax assessed by an officer or does the citizen make return under oath?"

Pursuant to the income-tax law of May 19, 1881, all persons from whom income tax is due are required to make a declaration respecting their taxable income. The declaration is not under oath. After the receipt of the declaration the amount of taxable income is fixed by a tax committee, in which the local revenue officer is entitled to take part in discussion, but not to vote.

VI. ANSWER TO QUESTION 6.

"What punishment is provided for a failure to make proper return of income?"

A failure to make the required declaration is punishable by a fine up to 50 marks (article 66, number 3, of the law). Incorrect statements, knowingly made, which are calculated to lead to a loss of tax to the Government are, by articles 65 and 66 of the law, made punishable with a fine of from five to ten times the amount of the annual tax of which it was intended to defraud the Government.

VII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 7.

"Does the tax grow in popularity, or is it becoming more distasteful, and if there is complaint is it from those who pay or those who escape the tax?"

This question has already been answered in the first reply to the instructions to which this is a further response.

VIII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 8.

"Is the tax collected through local authorities or by a representative of the general government?"

The collection of the income tax takes place in the seven governmental districts of the Kingdom situated on the right side of the Rhine by Government officials (rent officers). In the palatinate the collection is by the local communal authorities.

WURTEMBERG.

In the Kingdom of Wurtemberg there is no general income-tax law embracing incomes. The Wurtemberg income tax reaches income only from appanages, capital sums, and securities on the one hand and from salaries and professional practice on the other. In addition there are particular direct taxes on realty, buildings, and industries.

An official publication of the law of September 19, 1852, relating to the taxation of income from capital sums, securities, and professional practice, edited with application to the most recent conditions, accompanies this report as inclosure 4.

In replying to the questions propounded, the law itself is referred to where particular items are best answered in that way.

I. ANSWER TO QUESTION 1.

"How long has the income tax been collected?"

Direct taxation of income from capital sums and securities, salaries, and pensions was introduced in the year 1820 as an auxiliary to the ordinary direct taxation of realty, buildings, and industries. Something (but it was but little) had been done before in the way of this kind of taxation. The law of September 19, 1852, already referred to, is in force to-day.

II. ANSWER TO QUESTION 2.

"What rate is levied, and what exemptions are allowed?"

At present the tax rate is 4.4 per cent of the taxable annual amount (see answer to question 3); from the 1st of April, 1894, it will be 4.8 per cent. The exemptions allowed are enumerated in article 3 of the law.

III. ANSWER TO QUESTION 3.

"Is the tax graded, and what is the total annual income from the tax?"

The tax on income from capital sums and securities is not graded; the entire annual income is regarded as the taxable annual amount. On the other hand, the tax on income from salaries and professional practice is graded, as appears in article 5 of the law.

The yield of the tax on income from capital sums and securities for the year 1891-'92, in round numbers, was 4,000,000 marks, and on income from salaries and professional practice 1,400,000 marks.

The yield is gradually increasing.

IV. ANSWER TO QUESTION 4.

"What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax; has the rate increased or have the exemptions been changed, and what is meant by income?"

The law of 1852 has not been changed in important respects. The various changes affecting minor points are stated in the inclosed "Manual Edition."

The tax rate was originally for income from salaries and professional practice, 6 per cent; for income from capital sums and securities, 5 per cent.

From the 1st of July, 1858, it was uniformly 4 per cent; from the 1st of July, 1868, 4.4 per cent; from the 1st of July, 1871, 4.8 per cent; from the 1st of April, 1880, 4.4 per cent of the taxable annual amount, and from the 1st of April, 1894, it will be 4.8 per cent again.

As regards changes in the exemptions, Article 3 of the law, as published in the accompanying Manual Edition, is again referred to.

V. ANSWER TO QUESTION 5.

"Is the tax assessed by an officer, or does the citizen make return under oath?"

The tax is based on declarations by those from whom tax is due, which are not under oath.

VI. ANSWER TO QUESTION 6.

"What punishment is provided for a failure to make proper return of income?"

Improper returns of income are punishable with ten times the amount of the sum withheld. Article 11 and following of the law.

VII. Question 7, as to the popularity of the tax, has been answered in the reply to the instructions to which this is a further reply.

VIII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 8.

"Is the tax collected through local authorities or by a representative of the general government?"

The tax is collected by persons in the service of the state—the so-called local tax officials appointed for each community.

BADEN.

I. ANSWER TO QUESTION 1.

"How long has the income tax been collected?"

In the Grand Duchy of Baden an income tax has been levied since the 1st of January, 1886. The tax is based on the law of June 24, 1884 (inclosure 5a).

II. ANSWER TO QUESTION 2.

"What rate is levied, and what exemptions are allowed?"

Since the 1st of January, 1892, the tax rate levied is 2 per cent.

The exemptions are stated in article 6 of the law. The most important one is that which frees from the tax all incomes under 500 marks.

III. ANSWER TO QUESTION 3.

"Is the tax graded, and what is the total income from the tax?"

The manner in which the tax is graded is shown in article 13 of the law.

The entire net yield of the income tax for the year 1891 was 5,723,754 marks. For the year 1892-'93 (for which year the tax rate has been reduced from 2½ to 2 per cent) the net yield is estimated at 4,580,123 marks.

IV. ANSWER TO QUESTION 4.

"What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax; has the rate increased or have the exemptions been changed? And what is meant by income?"

Since the introduction of the income tax, but one change has taken place, viz, that effected by the law of the 6th of May, 1892 (inclosure 5b), and the "regulation" issued to carry it out (inclosure 5c). By this amendment cooperative societies doing an open business, registered associations which conduct a business resembling that of banking, and insurance companies based on mutuality and employing agents, are to be exempt from income tax after the 1st of January, 1894.

The tax rate was from the 1st of January, 1886, until the 31st of December, 1891, 2½ per cent. From the 1st of January, 1892, it has been reduced to 2 per cent.

No changes have taken place in the exemptions stated in article 6 of the law.

What is meant by income is defined in articles 2 to 4 of the law and in sections 1 to 11 of the auxiliary regulation of the ministry of finance of the 17th of February, 1885 (inclosure 5).

V. ANSWER TO QUESTION 5.

"Is the tax assessed by an officer or does the citizen make return under oath?"

The person owing tax is required to make a declaration (not under oath). See Articles 12 and 14 to 19 of the law. On the basis of and after examination of such declaration it devolves upon the board of estimate to fix the amount of the taxable income.

In each community the board of estimate consists of the burgomaster and, according to the size of the community, of from three to twelve other members, who are appointed by the district councillor, a local administrative officer, from the number of persons in the place who are assessed for income or other direct taxation. The taxpayer has the right to appeal from the decision of the board of estimate to the superior tax authorities, and, as against the decision of the latter, to the court of administration.

VI. ANSWER TO QUESTION 6.

"What punishment is provided for a failure to make a proper return of income?"

Whoever fails to make a declaration of the tax he owes or makes an incorrect one is punishable by a fine of eight times the amount of the loss the Government would have sustained. (See articles 26 and 27 of the law.)

VII. Question 7, as to the popularity of the tax, is answered in the first reply of these interrogatories.

VIII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 8.

"Is the tax collected through local authorities or by a representative of the general government?"

The tax is collected by state officers.

BREMEN.

I. ANSWER TO QUESTION 1.

"How long has the income tax been collected?"

An income tax has been levied since the year 1818.

II. ANSWER TO QUESTION 2.

"What rate is levied and what exemptions are allowed?"

The rate levied has been for incomes taxed at a specific rate of percentage as follows for the following periods:

From 1848 to 1871, 1 per cent; for 1872, 1½ per cent; for 1873 and 1874, 2 per cent; for 1875, 2 per cent; for 1876, 3 per cent; for 1877, 4½ per cent; for 1878, 3 per cent; from 1879 to 1892, 4 per cent.

For the year 1893 the rate is 4 per cent with an addition for incomes of over 6,000 marks—as shown by the accompanying law of the 14th of March, 1893 (inclosure 11a). See also answer to question 3.

The exemptions allowed are stated in section 3 of the law of the 17th of December, 1874 (inclosure 11b).

III. ANSWER TO QUESTION 3.

"Is the tax graded, and what is the total annual income from the tax?"

Compare section 4 of the law of the 17th of December, 1874, and the scale in inclosure A, accompanying the same, which scale has been changed by the law of the 16th of November, 1880. The scale of the last mentioned law is still in force.

The yield of the tax varies considerably. It was as follows for the last ten years:

	Marks.		Marks.
For 1883	2,618,540	For 1888-'89	2,427,663
For 1884	2,501,474	For 1889-'90	2,844,315
For 1885-'86	2,237,977	For 1890-'91	3,291,396
For 1886-'87	2,164,623	For 1891-'92	3,633,794
For 1887-'88	2,186,490	For 1892-'93	3,225,093

IV. ANSWER TO QUESTION 4.

"What important changes have been made during the existence of the tax; has the rate increased or have the exemptions been changed, and what is meant by 'income'?"

A material change in the manner of levying the tax was introduced by the law of the 25th of October, 1874 (inclosure 11d). See answer to question 3. As regards changes in tax rates, see answer to question 2. Up to the year 1874 the rate was from incomes of from 250 up to 400 reichsthale s. gold, 1 reichsthaler (1 reichsthaler = 3 marks 3½ pfennigs); for incomes of from 400 to 500 reichsthalers, gold, 2½ reichsthalers, and for incomes of 500 reichsthalers or more, 1 per cent. In 1872, and again in 1873, the rate was changed somewhat, especially the amounts to which a specific rate of percentage applied. In 1874 the scale appended to the law of the 17th of December, 1874, and in 1881, that now in force pursuant to the law of the 16th of November, 1880 (inclosure 11c), were introduced. The following exemptions existed: Until 1872, incomes under 250 reichsthalers, gold (about 830 marks); in 1873 and 1874 incomes under 750 marks, and since 1875 (law of 1874), incomes under 600 marks; otherwise exemptions have not been materially changed.

What is meant by taxable income, is told in section 5 of the law and its inclosure B; see also amendments thereto of 1880 and 1885 (inclosure 11c, page 119; inclosure 11e, and inclosure 11f).

V. ANSWER TO QUESTION 5.

"Is the tax assessed by an officer, or does the citizen make return under oath?"

Until 1874 the tax was paid for incomes not taxed at a specific rate of percentage, but at a fixed sum, publicly, as was also the tax for incomes taxable at a specific rate of percentage. Whatever sum in excess was due the taxpayer was required, not on oath, but upon the faith of his oath as a citizen (Bürgereid) to cast (no control whatever in regard to the amount cast in being exercised) into a chest, the so-called castle-chest (schloss-kiste). Whoever, for instance, had an income of 100,000 reichsthalers, gold, was required (until 1871) to pay 5 reichsthalers publicly, and to throw (covered up enveloped) into the box 995 reichsthalers; *i. e.*, as to the amount so thrown into the chest, it was put in secretly; and, indeed, there was no guaranty that the true or any amount was put in. This system was replaced in the year 1875 by that introduced by the law of the 17th of December, 1874 (inclosure 11*b*), which is based on the declaration (subject to official examination and determination) of the taxpayer. It may be incidentally remarked in this place that a comparison of the yield of the tax under the present system with the yield under the former system, without such examination and determination, shows that the returns made under the former system were essentially correct.

Details respecting the new system will be found in sections 8 to 10 of the law of the 17th of December, 1874 (see also amendment of the 5th of January (inclosure 11*g*) as also the law of the 25th of October, 1874 (inclosure 11*d*) declaring what authorities shall be competent to collect the income tax (see also amendments of the 24th of January, 1886, and of the 26th of March, 1892, (inclosures 11*h* and 11*i*). From the above-mentioned laws it will be perceived it may be added, that the "assessment board" consists of 4 members of the Bremen senate and of 12 members of the popular representative body of that city.

VI. ANSWER TO QUESTION 6.

"What punishment is provided for a failure to make proper return of income?"

See sections 11 and 12 of the law.

VIII. ANSWER TO QUESTION 8.

"Is the tax collected through local authorities, or by representatives of the general government?"

The tax is collected by state authorities, viz, by the general tax office in Bremen, and subordinate tax offices.

AUSTRIA.

In 1892 the Austrian Government collected about $10,000,000 from an income tax.

In volume 28 of Consular Reports (1883) the consul-general at Vienna makes the following report in regard to the income tax (his report was submitted to this Government April 30, 1887):

"An income tax has existed in Austria since the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was repealed in 1829 and reënacted in 1849.

"This tax is divided into three classes:

"First class. Under the first class the following income is taxed: (*a*) the income derived from all those trades and occupations which are subject to a license tax; (*b*) the income of mining and smelting establishments; (*c*) the profits made by the tenants of agricultural lands and of tenants of tolls and consumption tax districts.

"Second class. (*a*) Income from services rendered or labor performed in occupations not subject to a license tax; (*b*) annual income or dividends paid by life insurance or other companies or societies.

"Under this class are included the salaries of public and private officers and servants; pensions, donations, and other pecuniary assistance received by public functionaries, servants, and officers retired from active service; pensions of the widows and children of civil and military officers; also the pecuniary donations made out of the public funds, either national or local, to cloisters or theological orders; also the incomes of authors, artists, physicians, and veterinary surgeons, midwives, and private teachers (the latter only in towns of less than 4,000 souls); the income of university professors from lecture and examination fees. Servants are only taxed under this class if their total income exceeds 600 florins ($236.16) per annum.

"Third class. Under this class are embraced: Interest from loans and other outstanding demands and claims; interest from invested capital; income from savings banks and life-insurance companies. Benevolent and mutual assistance corporations and stipends are also included in this class.

"*Exemptions from income tax.*—The pay of officers and soldiers in active service, also that of reserve officers; the income of cloisters devoted to the care of the sick, of schools and benevolent institutions; the pensions of the members of the Maria Theresa Order (declaration); the donations connected with the medal for bravery; day laborers; the interest on deposits in savings and post savings banks, all incomes not exceeding 315 florins ($113.08) per annum; the income of mutual laborers' insurance companies; the income from the following public bonds: (*a*) The 5 per cent Austrian stock or bonds; (*b*) the Austrian gold bonds; (*c*) bonds of the city of Vienna of 1867; (*d*) bonds of the Danube regulating commission of 1878; (*e*) certain bonds of Tyrol; (*f*) state railroad bonds; (*g*) bonds of all railroads subject to tax; (*h*) bonds of the Austro-Hungarian Bank; (*i*) bonds of the Mortgage Bank of Bohemia; (*j*) bonds of the national debt and of the lottery loans of 1854 and 1860; a number of other corporation bonds.

"*Fines and penalties.*—In case the party subject to the income tax makes either a false return or intentionally neglects to make any return, thrice the amount of the tax is imposed, payment of which, however, includes the tax itself, so that the fine proper is double the amount of the tax.

"*The percentage paid as income tax.*—Additional percentages have been imposed from time to time, and numerous amendments of the original law have been enacted, and a careful perusal of this mass of legislation furnishes as final result the following:

"Under the first class above mentioned the income tax collected under the laws now in force is progressive and amounts to from 8½ per cent to 10 per cent of the net income. Under the second class from 17 per cent to 20 per cent, and under the third class to 10 per cent."

ITALY.

In 1892 the Italian Government raised about $45,000,000 from an income tax.

In volume 28 of Consular Reports (1883), the consul-general reports from Italy the following (date of report September 23, 1887):

"The tax on incomes is 12 per cent, and an additional sum amounting to one-tenth of this amount as a contribution to the war fund, making a total of 13.20 per cent on the income. (To certain communes there is a restitution of one-tenth of the amount collected for an income tax within their limits.)

"This tax is levied on all incomes derived from any source whatsoever, except from lands and buildings, the manner of assessing differing, however, according to the sources of incomes.

"(*a*) Permanent incomes, those derived from interests on loans, are taxed at their full amount.

"(*b*) Temporary incomes accruing from the use of capital and the results of labor and industry are taxed six-eighths of their gross amounts.

"(*c*) Temporary incomes in which capital and labor are not employed, such as professional incomes, stipends, pensions, etc., are taxed at five-eighths of their gross amounts.

"(*d*) Incomes derived from stipends, pensions, etc., paid by the State, are taxed at four-eighths of their gross amounts.

"In the above classification, incomes included under the head of *b*, *c*, and *d*, are exempted from taxes whenever the amount of the income does not exceed $77.20, and they are reduced according to a graduated scale $48.26, $38.60, $28.96, and $19.30 if not exceeding $154.40."

SWITZERLAND.

[Extracts from an article entitled "Income and property taxes in Switzerland," by Gustav Cohn, in volume 4, Political Science Quarterly, 1889.]

ZURICH.

Two different tendencies, accordingly are leading to the same result, viz, to the introduction of heavy direct taxation: first, the change of opinion concerning the equities; and secondly, the great increased demand which is itself the product of advanced views regarding the duties of state and community. Both tendencies form part of the general democratic drift of the age. First, the effort is to remove the burdens from the shoulders of the majority of the people and to put them on the shoulders of the wealthy; secondly, an attempt is made to render the public organs of state and community servicable to the interests of the majority in a greater degree than formerly through improved institutions of learning, means of communication, etc. This democratic movement has gone furthest in the canton of Zurich, whose constitution of April 18, 1869, promulgates the following characteristic principles:

"ART. 28. The people exercise the legislative power in conjunction with the cantonal council.

"ART. 30. The popular vote on the legislative acts of the cantonal council (referendum) takes place twice a year, in spring and autumn."

Among the economic principles (article 19) are to be noticed:

"All persons liable to taxation must contribute to the burdens of state and community in proportion to the means at their disposal.

"The property and income tax is to be arranged according to classes on the principle of moderate and just progression.

"Property of small value belonging to persons unable to work, as well as that part of all incomes which is absolutely necessary to life, is exempt.

"The progression shall not exceed five times the simple rate in the case of income nor double the simple rate in case of property.

"Property can be assessed only proportionally for local burdens. The state levies the tax on inheritances progressively according to the remoteness of relationship and the size of the inheritance. No new taxes on the consumption of necessities can be introduced. The salt tax is to be reduced forthwith."

* * * * * * *

In the tax law of Zurich the scale of progression is fixed according to this method, with one scale for property and a second scale, connected with the first, for personal income. The rate for the property tax is so fixed that of the first 20,000 francs of each individual mass of property only five-tenths is put in the tax lists, of the succeding 30,000 francs only six-tenths, of the next 50,000 francs only seven-tenths, of the next 100,000 francs only eight-tenths, of the next succeeding 200,000 francs only nine-tenths, and only the surplus over and above the sum last mentioned is entered at the full amount. We have here a relief in favor of the smaller property, which in the case of the smallest property amounts to one-half of the total sum, a relief which did not exist in the older tax laws of Zurich (1832 and 1861). The amount of the tax to be levied is fixed annually by the cantonal council on motion of the government. The second scale, for personal income, is connected with the first scale in such wise that, according to the provision of the law, 2 francs are paid as taxes on each 100 of the income rate wherever 1 franc is paid on a thousand of the property rate, which means that the average income from property is assumed to be 5 per cent.

The scale of the rate for personal income is then developed in much more rapid progression. In the first place, the minimum of existence declared exempt by the constitution of 1869 is interpreted to include, for every income, the first 500 francs. On the succeeding 1,500 francs only two-tenths is to be put into the tax list, of the next 1,500 francs only four-tenths, of the next 3,000 francs only six-tenths, of the next 4,000 francs only eight-tenths; the full rate beginning with amounts above 10,500 francs. In the income tax, as in the property tax, the relief accrues to every individual income, no matter how large. With the rate as it stands since 1877 (four per mill) an income of 50,000—100,000 francs pays almost 3 per cent, but an income of 2,000 francs only 1½ per cent.

* * * * * * * *

Reckoning together all communal and cantonal taxes paid by an inhabitant of Zurich, the average sum per capita is 32 francs in direct taxes and but 2 francs in indirect taxes. Adding to these the indirect taxes levied for the confederation (principally import duties), we obtain an additional sum of 7½ francs per capita. Altogether, therefore, fully three-fourths is raised in the form which corresponds to the demands of modern radicalism—by income and property taxes.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, stories of suffering always appeal strongly to the humane heart. One of the consummate arts of the orator, of which I submit we have this day had a shining and lustrous example, is to so intertwine righteous sentiments with errors of conclusion and statement as to confuse the judgment of men upon really existing facts.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has depicted suffering in its extreme form. Whether it is as widespread, as deep and universal as he has declared, is a question susceptible, possibly, of proof. What we do know is, that every instance of suffering is caught up and repeated here until it would appear as if, throughout the entire American Union, misery, famine, and starvation were stalking hand in hand. If it be admitted that a tithe of the terrors depicted by the gentleman exists, the picture would still be a very sorrowful one. But organized charity has gone forth, and from the stored-up wealth of the American people has so far relieved the suffering in every city

and hamlet of the American Union that not a single instance comes to us of that extreme destitution, penury, and death which mark the end.

NOT DUE TO DEMOCRATIC LAWS.

I am not disposed, however, to undervalue or to underestimate the extent of the suffering actually prevailing. Beginning with the grewsome picture quoted by the gentleman as drawn by Mr. Greeley as long ago as 1855, down to this time, under all circumstances and under all administrations some suffering has prevailed in our land and in every other. There is no community in the world, there never was; there is no system of industry in the world, there never was, in which and under which, at some time or other, human misery has not waited upon human improvidences and human mistakes.

But it is worth noting that the strength of the assault upon the measure before this House is made before that measure has taken effect, months, probably, before one line of it can be operative in any part of the Republic. The suffering that is depicted, supposing it to exist, comes after a period of thirty years of laws written, every one of them, by the Republican party, and not one of them formed by the Democratic party.

The Democratic party during that time has compelled relief and action in regard to certain measures; but the whole responsibility of Government has not been upon us until with the coming in of this Congress on the 4th of March, 1893. And at that time it is a matter of fact susceptible of demonstration, and clear to every gentleman on the floor of this House, that the widespread misery dwelt upon had already descended. Until this hour not a single provision of the protective system which culminated in the McKinley law had been qualified in any degree, either in recital or in operation.

On the contrary, the Democratic Administration which succeeded that of Mr. Harrison enforced that law and is enforcing it to-day as honestly as though it had been written in the statute book by its own Congress.

So, that if the existing condition of affairs may be said to be due to the operation of law, you can not say we did it. So far as the law has produced the ruin that the gentleman depicts, in that far the law has been a law of high protection, rising higher and higher, and finally culminating in the prohibitive tariff of 1890.

THE FARMING INTERESTS ARE ADVANCED BY LABOR AND NOT BY PROTECTION.

I represent in part on this floor the State of Illinois, which, along with her great commercial development, her municipal growth, and her manufacturing progress, is still the formest agricultural State in the Union; her population fairly represents that of the entire United States. About one-half of our people are upon the farms, and the others are in all the varied industries of the time. Such is the general proportion of the entire population of the United States.

Now, during the last thirty years that population has worked, has progressed, and has produced an extraordinary amount of wealth; not because the products of their farms were protected, because we all know that while certain clauses of pretended protection for farmers have been written into law, as a matter of fact they have neither required nor received any genuine protection. It is talking idly to say that because a statute of the United States gives nominal protection to grain, that that has conferred either a market or protection upon the farmers of the country.

It has not done so, but after thirty years of sham protection, here or abroad, all the products of the farm are selling for a less figure than they ever sold before since records were kept of American industries; while "protection" has increased, products have steadily diminished in price until 45 or 50 cents is the best price for wheat, and a like low rate for corn and oats, in spite of the boasted home market reserved by the policy of protection.

But I am not making a speech for the farmer. He spoke for himself in November, 1892, from every hillside and from every prairie in the land. [Applause.] I am seeking to show by statistics that the American farmer has produced a vast amount of wealth, set forth better in two statements which I here insert; one made by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1889, and one compiled by the Statistician of the Agricultural Department from the census of 1890:

As far back as 1880 the value of the farms of the United States exceeded $10,000,000,000. To the unremitting industry of their owners these farms yielded an aggregate annual value of nearly $4,000,000,000, in the production of which a vast population of nearly 8,000,000 toilers utilized nearly half a billion worth of farm implements. The value of live-stock on farms, estimated in the last census to be worth over $1,500,000,000 is shown by the reliable statistics collected by this Department, to be worth to-day $2,507,000,000. A low estimate of the number of farmers and farm laborers employed on our 5,000,000 farms places it at nearly 10,000,000 persons, representing 30,000,000 people, or nearly one-half of our present population.

STATISTICS OF AGRICULTURE.

TABLE I.—*Summary for the Eleventh Census, 1890.*

Divisions, etc.	Number of farms.	Acres in farms.			Valuation.		
		Total.	Improved.	Unimproved.	Land, fences, and buildings.	Implements and machinery.	Live stock on hand June 1, 1890.
North Atlantic Division	658,569	62,743,523	42,338,025	20,405,501	$2,589,200,537	$116,868,252	$313,902,504
Maine	62,013	6,179,925	3,044,666	3,135,259	98,567,730	5,499,413	18,280,140
New Hampshire	29,151	3,459,018	1,727,387	1,731,631	66,162,600	3,594,850	10,450,125
Vermont	32,572	4,395,646	2,656,943	1,739,703	80,427,490	4,733,560	16,644,320
Massachusetts	34,374	2,998,282	1,657,024	1,341,258	127,538,284	5,938,940	14,200,178
Rhode Island	5,500	469,281	274,491	194,790	21,873,479	941,030	2,364,970
Connecticut	26,350	2,253,432	1,379,419	874,013	95,000,595	3,075,495	9,974,618
New York	226,223	21,961,562	16,389,380	5,572,182	908,127,286	46,659,465	124,523,96
New Jersey	30,828	2,662,009	1,999,117	662,892	159,262,840	7,378,644	15,811,430
Pennsylvania	211,557	18,364,370	13,210,597	5,153,773	922,240,233	39,046,855	101,652,758
South Atlantic Division	749,600	100,157,573	41,677,371	58,480,202	1,135,319,670	36,444,018	161,631,801
Delaware	9,381	1,035,602	762,655	293,037	39,586,080	1,835,570	4,198,810
Maryland	40,796	4,952,390	3,412,908	1,539,482	175,058,550	6,540,090	19,194,330
District of Columbia	382	11,745	9,898	1,847	6,471,120	79,760	129,150
Virginini	127,600	19,104,951	9,125,545	9,979,406	254,490,600	6,593,688	33,404,281
West Virginia	72,773	10,321,326	4,554,000	5,767,326	151,880,300	3,116,420	23,964,610
North Carolina	178,359	22,651,896	7,828,569	14,823,327	183,977,010	7,183,210	25,547,290
South Carolina	115,008	13,184,652	5,255,237	7,929,415	99,104,000	4,172,262	16,572,410
Georgia	171,071	25,200,435	9,582,866	15,617,569	152,006,230	5,764,978	31,477,990
Florida	34,228	3,674,486	1,145,693	2,528,793	72,745,180	1,188,040	7,142,980
North Central Division							
Ohio	251,430	23,352,408	18,338,824	5,013,584	1,046,738,247	29,475,346	116,181,690
Indiana	198,167	20,362,516	15,107,482	5,255,034	754,789,110	21,172,255	93,361,422
Illinois	240,681	30,498,277	25,609,060	4,889,217	1,262,870,587	34,456,938	180,431,662
Michigan	172,344	14,785,636	9,865,350	4,920,286	556,190,070	22,182,600	69,564,985
Wisconsin	146,409	16,787,988	9,793,931	6,994,057	477,524,507	19,167,010	63,784,377
Minnesota	116,851	18,663,645	11,127,953	7,535,692	340,059,470	16,916,473	57,725,683
Iowa	201,903	30,491,541	25,428,899	5,062,642	857,581,022	36,665,315	206,436,242
Missouri	238,043	30,780,240	19,792,313	10,987,977	625,856,361	21,830,719	138,701,173
North Dakota[a]							
South Dakota[a]							
Nebraska	113,608	21,503,444	15,247,705	6,345,739	402,358,913	16,468,977	92,971,920
Kansas	166,617	30,214,456	22,303,301	7,911,155	559,726,046	18,869,790	128,068,305
South Central Division	1,086,772	156,448,294	66,288,824	90,159,470	1,440,022,598	58,343,772	351,028,828
Kentucky	179,264	21,412,229	11,818,882	9,593,347	346,339,360	10,906,506	70,924,400
Tennessee	174,412	20,161,583	9,362,555	10,799,028	242,700,540	9,936,880	60,254,530
Alabama	157,772	19,853,000	7,696,343	12,154,657	111,051,390	4,511,645	30,776,720
Mississippi	144,318	17,572,547	6,849,390	10,723,157	127,423,157	5,968,865	33,695,435

[a] State not completed as to farms, acreage, valuations, and cost of fertilizers.

STATISTICS OF AGRICULTURE—continued.

Divisions, etc.	Number of farms.	Acres in farms.			Valuation.		
		Total.	Improved.	Unimproved.	Land, fences, and buildings.	Implements and machinery.	Live stock on hand June 1, 1890.
North Atlantic Division—Continued.							
Louisiana	69,294	9,544,219	3,774,668	5,769,551	85,381,270	7,167,355	17,898,380
Texas	228,126	51,406,937	20,746,215	30,660,722	399,971,289	13,746,541	103,259,503
Oklahoma	8,826	1,606,423	563,728	1,042,695	8,581,170	133,580	3,206,270
Arkansas	124,760	14,891,356	5,475,043	9,416,313	118,574,422	5,672,430	30,772,880
Western Division	145,878	47,282,233	23,020,410	24,261,823	1,094,942,620	30,366,110	186,958,178
Montana	5,603	1,964,197	915,517	1,048,680	25,512,340	1,356,010	21,620,687
Wyoming	3,125	1,830,432	476,831	1,353,601	14,460,880	522,250	15,348,331
Colorado	16,389	4,598,941	1,823,520	2,775,421	85,035,180	2,728,850	22,594,010
New Mexico	4,458	787,882	283,106	524,776	8,140,800	291,140	7,247,130
Arizona	1,426	1,297,033	104,128	1,192,905	7,222,230	196,580	3,257,600
Utah	10,517	1,323,705	546,223	775,482	28,402,780	1,164,660	6,813,830
Nevada	1,277	1,661,416	723,052	938,364	12,339,410	537,480	5,801,820
Idaho	6,603	1,302,256	606,362	695,894	17,431,580	1,172,460	7,253,490
Washington	18,056	4,179,190	1,820,832	2,358,358	83,461,660	3,150,200	14,113,110
Oregon	25,530	6,909,888	3,516,000	3,393,888	115,819,200	4,556,770	22,648,830
California	52,894	21,427,293	12,222,839	9,204,454	697,116,630	14,689,710	60,259,220

Divisions, etc.	Live stock on hand June 1, 1890, and life-stock products on farms in 1889.													
	Horses.	Mules and asses.	Working oxen.	Milch cows.	Other cattle.	Swine.	Sheep, not including spring lambs.	Number of fleeces shorn spring of 1890 and fall of 1889.	Pounds of wool.	Gallons of milk.	Pounds of butter.	Pounds of cheese.	Pounds of honey.	Pounds of wax.
United States	14,969,467	2,295,532	1,117,494	16,511,950	33,734,128	57,409,583	35,935,364	32,126,868	165,449,239	5,209,125,507	1,024,223,468	18,726,818	63,897,327	1,164,588
North Atlantic Division	1,738,861	43,683	167,943	3,351,061	1,942,720	2,753,349	4,133,027	3,335,733	18,446,578	1,435,739,255	246,788,544	6,693,671	7,882,690	127,229
Maine	109,156	278	33,105	157,278	108,727	91,297	370,484	352,806	1,864,009	57,969,791	15,593,315	696,052	260,481	4,119
New Hampshire	52,458	123	23,648	109,423	89,817	58,585	131,611	123,158	717,149	42,633,268	7,942,840	341,235	112,114	1,674
Vermont	89,960	330	21,249	231,419	142,620	92,083	333,947	315,332	2,118,883	90,712,230	23,314,063	609,586	379,096	5,793
Massachusetts	63,638	196	9,831	172,046	74,251	91,483	51,438	47,862	241,314	82,571,924	8,358,703	122,900	90,929	1,690
Rhode Island	9,864	51	2,609	23,943	5,225	12,055	11,400	9,950	41,021	10,610,547	965,456	24,631	13,740	358
Connecticut	43,764	279	21,019	127,892	54,750	62,087	37,652	30,919	126,508	54,413,822	7,196,095	112,566	130,632	3,683
New York	664,430	4,630	37,293	1,440,230	653,809	843,342	1,528,979	1,187,120	6,715,696	663,917,240	98,241,813	4,324,028	4,281,964	66,054
New Jersey	86,925	8,227	1,825	161,576	48,661	224,388	55,409	41,927	180,844	64,003,953	8,367,218	23,613	160,310	3,381
Pennsylvania	618,660	29,563	17,364	927,254	761,800	1,278,029	1,612,107	1,226,669	6,441,164	368,906,480	76,809,041	439,060	2,453,424	32,877
South Atlantic Division	880,758	417,393	262,982	1,369,466	2,257,659	5,082,321	2,445,386	1,844,260	6,555,151	331,728,677	78,270,911	271,291	8,668,791	305,005
Delaware	25,656	4,819	3,846	32,574	15,424	44,981	12,265	10,731	47,281	10,699,362	2,026,498	359	66,468	1,612
Maryland	130,395	14,161	17,066	142,198	107,925	312,020	132,329	101,535	543,225	46,601,218	9,999,602	9,573	301,157	5,946
District of Columbia	826	41	.....	863	125	1,306	14	.....	.....	459,978	13,760	.....	341	20
Virginia	242,512	37,533	61,571	273,634	412,129	796,691	495,313	355,741	1,449,219	78,143,459	17,949,966	109,187	1,531,147	44,114
West Virginia	154,722	7,390	29,366	188,492	348,208	411,018	785,053	568,014	2,560,859	59,449,066	14,063,627	74,372	1,218,686	22,109
North Carolina	131,451	100,011	58,192	223,416	349,295	1,251,006	402,247	322,573	733,765	55,250,665	13,129,374	60,760	2,373,560	120,447
South Carolina	59,888	86,306	26,150	107,184	134,959	494,696	79,421	61,064	157,707	23,833,631	5,737,557	2,476	856,688	27,739
Georgia	103,501	157,377	49,108	287,717	537,101	1,396,362	440,459	349,768	841,141	52,234,508	14,483,323	12,833	1,757,758	49,935
Florida	31,807	9,755	17,683	113,388	352,493	374,241	98,278	74,834	221,954	5,056,790	867,195	1,731	562,986	27,083
North Central Division	8,571,177	657,653	181,329	8,240,999	16,150,072	37,624,632	12,332,084	9,854,644	60,965,237	2,719,414,765	520,625,636	6,669,421	29,766,640	353,398
Ohio	880,067	18,058	14,035	794,833	953,619	3,275,922	4,060,729	3,683,823	20,987,574	326,925,396	74,990,307	1,068,083	2,894,059	33,520
Indiana	720,035	59,644	6,563	579,287	926,058	3,320,817	1,081,133	779,755	4,863,404	200,510,797	48,477,766	360,948	2,106,817	24,564
Illinois	1,335,289	107,875	6,579	1,067,886	1,908,654	5,924,818	922,631	649,394	4,490,773	307,269,464	57,121,486	343,456	4,602,941	50,420
Michigan	516,117	3,822	29,795	497,611	519,365	1,126,141	2,400,318	1,971,315	12,378,318	224,537,488	50,197,481	328,682	2,487,134	26,750
Wisconsin	460,740	5,752	20,481	792,620	834,846	1,347,750	984,972	761,776	4,981,083	303,701,134	46,295,623	906,296	3,515,761	46,058
Minnesota	461,509	9,511	32,505	593,908	747,164	853,715	399,049	312,861	1,945,249	182,968,973	34,766,409	670,642	1,160,390	12,050
Iowa	1,312,079	41,648	2,367	1,498,418	3,394,765	8,266,779	547,394	361,642	2,649,652	486,961,411	72,893,079	1,038,358	6,813,412	67,339
Missouri	946,401	251,714	14,006	851,076	2,104,634	4,987,432	950,562	672,935	4,040,064	193,931,103	43,108,521	288,620	5,492,178	75,670
North Dakota	130,931	8,709	21,339	88,289	172,246	92,213	136,413	76,412	510,417	26,566,112	5,712,566	131,374	990	8
South Dakota	250,305	7,671	22,495	210,240	455,183	590,465	238,448	157,371	1,073,909	59,666,525	13,127,244	303,951	55,833	1,566
Nebraska	626,789	46,512	5,768	505,045	1,631,784	3,815,647	209,243	118,364	791,534	144,768,263	27,818,078	463,831	746,212	6,262
Kansas	930,305	95,937	4,495	741,786	2,441,752	4,022,933	401,192	308,997	2,253,240	201,608,099	46,117,076	759,210	890,913	8,880
South Central Division	2,354,662	1,093,722	488,764	2,829,657	8,406,062	10,894,270	6,217,868	6,038,810	21,911,238	509,693,663	135,192,272	318,367	11,914,123	237,290
Kentucky	401,356	151,649	58,926	364,516	642,649	2,036,746	937,124	663,367	2,777,533	118,497,289	29,038,406	64,822	2,310,615	37,225
Tennessee	311,842	203,639	40,630	345,311	579,398	1,922,912	540,996	455,653	1,397,666	107,657,116	28,314,387	69,919	2,284,155	63,290
Alabama	121,207	134,800	97,300	292,088	486,588	1,421,884	386,380	351,716	768,589	55,508,687	14,548,435	6,131	1,824,286	68,984
Mississippi	155,050	156,755	95,577	310,159	509,042	1,163,141	451,779	374,936	1,038,186	50,803,371	12,988,537	4,898	822,673	21,926
Louisiana	126,797	88,028	41,975	167,223	371,905	509,935	186,167	143,173	440,686	12,881,927	2,089,774	3,939	271,962	8,584
Texas	1,026,002	227,432	98,284	1,003,439	5,090,829	2,252,476	3,454,858	3,826,721	14,917,068	118,475,330	32,100,560	145,730	3,286,386	62,509
Oklahoma	25,554	4,923	1,627	16,756	108,572	21,962	16,565	12,201	59,114	1,544,280	387,929	1,600	2,800	25
Arkansas	186,874	126,496	54,445	330,165	608,079	1,505,214	243,999	211,043	512,396	54,325,673	15,724,144	21,328	1,111,246	24,811
Western Division	1,424,006	83,081	16,476	720,767	4,977,615	1,055,011	10,806,999	11,053,421	57,571,035	202,549,207	43,346,105	4,774,068	5,665,083	93,666
Montana	142,959	959	546	24,143	667,209	17,132	1,859,016	1,426,093	9,335,551	6,038,096	1,062,185	11,512	20	.....
Wyoming	87,403	1,242	630	11,684	673,655	6,794	712,520	545,892	4,146,773	3,064,588	428,269	15,196	350	.....
Colorado	155,170	7,130	1,282	76,948	630,631	64,356	717,990	561,951	3,234,234	19,680,791	3,282,080	87,183	390,906	7,901
New Mexico	38,130	8,367	4,990	18,507	554,014	10,471	1,248,970	1,088,250	4,074,503	717,155	86,042	18,931	21,470	98
Arizona	15,780	946	150	4,874	263,098	6,217	102,427	91,171	551,365	709,225	115,203	10,855	126,124	668
Utah	65,057	1,554	427	45,982	153,857	27,046	1,014,176	928,943	4,660,250	8,614,694	1,759,354	163,539	479,158	11,708
Nevada	56,788	1,723	52	9,273	201,575	7,373	273,469	247,246	1,450,868	2,532,052	489,057	51,207	88,557	2,825
Idaho	84,135	1,012	346	27,278	191,807	32,188	357,712	326,168	2,119,242	5,085,863	1,078,103	207,213	37,146	.....
Washington	153,770	1,345	3,787	70,721	180,626	90,274	265,267	246,415	1,556,792	19,873,281	3,482,225	71,281	156,435	2,957
Oregon	224,962	4,946	3,144	114,156	403,348	208,259	1,780,312	1,575,043	9,982,910	25,042,276	4,786,277	265,576	435,028	7,272
California	390,852	53,848	1,122	317,201	1,048,795	584,899	2,475,140	3,416,246	16,358,547	111,191,186	26,776,704	3,971,575	3,929,889	60,237

STATISTICS OF AGRICULTURE—continued.

Divisions, etc.	Cereal production in 1889.											
	Barley.		Buckwheat.		Indian corn.		Oats.		Rye.		Wheat.	
	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.
The United States	3,220,834	78,332,976	837,164	12,110,349	72,087,752	2,122,327,547	28,310,677	809,250,066	2,171,604	28,421,398	33,579,514	468,373,908
North Atlantic Division	406,032	9,587,050	542,498	8,750,506	2,172,038	72,191,305	3,141,114	86,891,504	682,930	8,085,361	1,917,709	32,012,544
Maine	11,072	286,282	22,395	466,411	10,891	380,662	121,612	3,668,909	791	6,664	4,116	79,826
New Hampshire	4,934	112,378	3,117	75,048	23,746	968,806	26,618	892,243	1,056	11,962	2,027	36,192
Vermont	16,427	420,761	13,429	271,216	41,790	1,709,686	101,582	3,316,141	3,379	43,256	8,397	164,720
Massachusetts	1,785	38,715	2,473	31,300	34,010	1,330,101	14,331	388,819	10,665	117,091	112	1,813
Rhode Island	369	8,009	41	349	7,819	253,810	3,648	100,520	779	9,617	11	91
Connecticut	273	5,747	4,006	46,104	40,445	1,471,979	24,428	593,691	15,100	214,935	443	7,482
New York	349,311	8,220,242	280,029	4,675,735	493,320	15,109,969	1,417,371	38,896,479	236,874	3,065,623	462,561	8,304,529
New Jersey	47	1,043	13,520	114,626	267,648	8,637,011	121,327	2,837,293	77,245	874,049	121,579	1,823,382
Pennsylvania	20,950	493,893	210,488	3,069,717	1,252,369	42,318,279	1,310,197	36,197,409	336,041	3,742,164	1,318,472	21,565,499
South Atlantic division	4,755	84,482	28,978	277,807	9,623,254	131,455,786	2,203,751	23,736,705	124,640	1,268,879	2,670,335	27,435,104
Delaware	12	205	325	3,081	174,796	3,097,164	19,374	382,900	775	6,625	94,368	1,501,060
Maryland	818	18,778	7,569	96,747	586,617	14,928,143	99,195	2,019,658	34,302	352,596	510,727	8,348,177
District of Columbia			2	20	349	10,755	63	1,371	111	1,099	30	609
Virginia	2,051	40,982	5,170	41,199	1,600,690	27,172,493	495,508	5,695,100	52,063	397,394	737,510	7,904,092
West Virginia	326	5,387	13,696	120,469	592,763	13,730,506	180,815	2,946,652	14,962	117,113	349,016	3,634,197
North Carolina	302	3,521	1,800	12,621	2,360,627	25,783,623	541,851	4,512,762	56,496	276,339	666,509	4,292,035
South Carolina	688	9,428	65	472	1,345,990	13,770,417	308,056	3,019,119	4,129	17,303	115,510	658,351
Georgia	549	6,053	332	3,162	2,582,316	29,261,422	516,886	4,767,821	20,949	87,021	196,633	1,096,312
Florida	9	128	19	126	378,906	3,701,264	42,003	391,321	853	13,389	32	220
North Central Division	1,838,286	47,257,785	254,975	3,042,395	44,873,346	1,598,870,008	19,859,736	645,127,344	1,176,117	17,951,629	22,581,556	321,316,830
Ohio	37,092	1,059,915	14,052	162,833	3,189,553	113,802,318	1,215,355	40,136,732	59,643	1,007,156	2,269,585	35,559,208
Indiana	10,280	250,200	9,548	99,959	3,586,190	108,843,004	1,102,479	31,491,661	62,890	877,532	2,570,017	37,318,798
Illinois	41,390	1,197,206	9,763	107,080	7,863,025	289,697,256	3,870,702	137,624,828	165,598	2,628,046	2,240,932	27,389,444
Michigan	99,305	2,522,376	70,046	811,977	994,597	28,785,579	1,085,759	36,961,193	140,754	2,101,713	1,501,235	24,771,171
Wisconsin	474,914	15,225,872	77,456	1,064,178	1,120,341	34,024,216	1,627,151	60,739,052	275,058	4,250,582	744,080	11,698,922
Minnesota	868,510	9,100,683	22,090	281,705	901,690	24,696,446	1,579,258	49,958,791	62,869	1,252,663	3,372,627	52,300,247
Iowa	518,729	13,406,122	25,243	286,746	7,585,522	313,130,782	3,752,141	146,679,289	96,707	1,445,283	595,548	8,249,786
Missouri	1,504	34,863	2,802	28,440	6,072,121	196,999,016	1,676,706	39,820,149	24,283	308,807	1,946,785	30,113,821
North Dakota	109,400	1,570,717	147	999	11,954	178,729	402,855	5,773,129	1,568	12,195	2,709,421	26,403,365
South Dakota	97,370	902,005	1,561	11,423	753,209	13,152,008	580,289	7,469,846	9,229	65,183	2,259,816	16,541,138
Nebraska	82,890	1,822,111	15,356	120,000	5,480,279	215,895,996	1,503,515	43,843,640	81,372	1,085,083	798,855	10,571,059
Kansas	7,201	165,715	6,907	67,115	7,314,765	259,574,508	1,463,526	44,629,034	199,146	2,917,386	1,582,635	30,399,871
South Central Division	12,587	382,552	2,510	22,251	15,164,583	314,101,239	2,560,328	37,859,361	82,493	686,607	2,313,200	24,502,856
Kentucky	5,776	165,959	384	3,804	2,960,382	78,434,847	645,316	8,775,814	45,546	423,847	898,694	10,707,462
Tennessee	3,585	63,866	1,231	7,143	2,791,324	63,635,350	588,138	7,355,160	26,443	165,621	877,361	8,300,789
Alabama	200	1,996	352	4,622	2,127,302	30,072,161	344,782	3,230,455	2,190	14,616	39,641	208,591
Mississippi	80	875	56	345	1,706,352	26,148,144	133,361	1,362,290	406	3,544	2,519	16,570
Louisiana	41	598			837,516	13,081,954	27,023	297,271	73	374	41	257
Texas	2,782	48,152	99	1,263	3,079,907	69,112,150	528,924	12,581,360	5,255	62,370	352,477	4,283,344
Oklahoma	17	112			13,307	234,315	4,446	76,194	110	1,052	2,003	30,175
Arkansas	106	904	388	5,074	1,648,443	33,982,318	288,332	4,180,877	2,470	15,181	140,464	955,668
Western Division	959,145	21,121,107	1,203	17,300	254,581	5,109,209	555,748	15,635,752	45,424	428,922	4,096,714	63,106,631
Montana	4,052	160,902	13	199	1,019	14,225	52,768	1,535,615	14	198	18,696	457,607
Wyoming	486	11,763	20	140	1,977	25,172	14,607	388,505	141	2,055	4,584	74,450
Colorado	12,086	331,556	117	2,091	119,310	1,511,907	67,959	2,514,480	4,615	54,158	126,999	2,845,439
New Mexico	1,484	35,034	61	744	22,539	583,489	9,314	193,632	69	610	21,853	343,484
Arizona	10,644	252,992			4,331	62,535	1,472	33,996	29	207	6,225	100,328
Utah	6,440	163,328	15	316	5,782	84,760	22,747	597,947	3,289	33,928	84,505	1,515,465
Nevada	8,081	237,192			274	6,540	3,400	99,126	54	502	3,631	81,486
Idaho	10,004	236,471	16	305	1,307	24,695	21,997	587,407	1,092	10,809	63,704	1,176,878
Washington	51,351	1,209,140	27	430	9,883	156,413	65,080	2,273,182	1,763	19,188	372,658	6,345,426
Oregon	37,722	874,353	250	2,678	12,101	238,203	218,736	5,948,594	6,845	65,206	553,052	9,296,734
California	815,905	17,848,386	664	10,398	70,903	2,281,270	57,569	1,463,068	27,413	243,871	2,840,807	40,869,337

Divisions, etc.	Fiber, 1889.							Sugar and molasses, 1889.				
	Cotton.		Flax.			Hemp.		Cane.			Maple.	
	Acres.	Bales.	Acres.	Seed, bushels.	Fiber, pounds.	Acres.	Tons.	Acres.	Pounds of sugar.	Gallons of molasses.	Pounds of sugar.	Gallons of molasses.
The United States	20,172,890	7,471,116	1,318,608	10,250,410	241,382	25,054	11,511	270,600	302,731,895	25,398,954	32,952,927	2,226,376
North Atlantic Division			3,467	25,568	17,610	47	25				29,037,260	1,019,578
Maine			24	46	1,611						84,537	71,818
New Hampshire											2,124,515	81,997
Vermont			1	20							14,123,921	218,252
Massachusetts			1	4							558,674	33,632
Rhode Island												
Connecticut											8,617	1,437
New York			2,922	21,307	15,625	47	25				10,485,023	437,658
New Jersey			2	8							210	134
Pennsylvania			517	4,183	173						1,651,163	154,650
South Atlantic Division	6,746,292	2,338,609	311	1,052	34,778			35,408	4,667,120	5,078,062	368,712	24,663
Delaware												
Maryland			1	2							156,284	1,021
District of Columbia												
Virginia	39,213	5,375	131	538	27,133						26,991	3,468
West Virginia			36	115	4,008						177,724	19,032
North Carolina	1,147,136	225,261	143	397	3,637						7,713	1,142
South Carolina	1,987,469	747,190						3,218	200,400	382,830		
Georgia	3,345,104	1,191,846						21,696	1,310,630	3,217,629		
Florida	227,370	57,928						10,194	3,156,090	1,477,613		
North Central Division	55,617	14,673	1,301,137	10,085,923	174,016	1,517	681				3,526,194	1,202,481
Ohio			20,553	145,537	18,377	66	20				1,575,562	727,142
Indiana			2,737	17,506	4,350						67,329	189,627

STATISTICS OF AGRICULTURE—continued.

Divisions, etc.	Fiber, 1880.							Sugar and molasses, 1880.				
	Cotton.		Flax.			Hemp.		Cane.			Maple.	
	Acres.	Bales.	Acres.	Seed, bushels.	Fiber, pounds.	Acres.	Tons.	Acres.	Pounds of sugar.	Gallons of molasses.	Pounds of sugar.	Gallons of molasses.
North central Division—Continued.												
Illinois			4,672	35,013	57,776	1,178	556				13,260	13,978
Michigan			417	3,719	31,610						1,641,402	197,775
Wisconsin			5,973	68,227	4,591						128,410	48,006
Minnesota			303,635	2,721,987	8,609						34,917	12,091
Iowa			280,085	2,282,359	6,281						45,120	14,413
Missouri	54,880	14,461	56,421	450,831	1,458	79	31				20,182	8,333
North Dakota			43,724	164,319	568							
South Dakota			354,951	1,801,114	3,278							2
Nebraska			163,900	1,401,104	1,025	134	54				12	30
Kansas	731	212	114,069	994,127	36,003	60	20					
South Central Division	13,300,909	5,083,728	277	2,178	14,985	23,468	10,794	241,698	298,064,775	20,320,892	20,761	11,654
Kentucky	2,629	873	186	1,321	12,295	23,468	10,794				11,259	10,468
Tennessee	747,471	190,579	17	51	2,664						9,167	1,186
Alabama	2,761,165	915,210						18,981	390,835	2,301,538		
Mississippi	2,883,278	1,154,725						12,627	67,869	1,516,981		
Louisiana	1,270,154	659,180						193,704	292,124,050	14,241,081		
Texas	3,934,525	1,471,242	72	794				16,386	5,482,030	2,161,342		
Oklahoma	1,109	425										
Arkansas	1,700,578	691,494	2	12	26						335	
Western Division			13,506	135,689		22	11					
Montana												
Wyoming												
Colorado			422	1,994								
New Mexico												
Arizona												
Utah												
Nevada												
Idaho			8,002	83,409								
Washington			4,270	42,285								
Oregon			563	3,871								
California			249	4,130		22	11					
Indian Territory	70,076	34,115										

Divisions, etc.	Rice.		Tobacco.		Hops.		Broom corn.		Pulse.		
	Acres.	Pounds.	Acres.	Pounds.	Acres.	Pounds.	Acres.	Pounds.	Dry Canada peas, bushels.	Cow peas, bushels.	Beans (dry), bushels.
The United States	161,312	128,590,934	695,301	488,256,645	50,212	39,171,270	93,425	38,557,429	2,812,437	3,402,912	3,163,554
North Atlantic Division			44,080	50,133,320	36,809	20,150,940	1,058	491,052	218,456	63,069	1,365,880
Maine			1	200	37	24,873			18,780	4,366	149,710
New Hampshire			57	86,593	15	9,033			2,749	776	44,589
Vermont			50	70,518	81	51,705			9,240	1,141	31,820
Massachusetts			2,012	2,794,848	2	800	1	800	2,310	618	11,300
Rhode Island									300	138	1,637
Connecticut			6,331	8,874,924			1	543	961	963	1,734
New York			8,629	9,316,135	36,670	20,063,029	993	450,380	177,835	50,891	1,111,510
New Jersey			45	33,855			6	3,010	2,423	2,028	2,164
Pennsylvania			26,955	28,956,247	4	1,500	57	36,319	3,858	2,148	11,356
South Atlantic Division	74,395	51,753,952	234,981	100,843,545			466	288,077	56,977	2,149,786	128,636
Delaware			20	29,680			14	2,430	167	81	517
Maryland			20,274	12,356,838			8	3,368	3,812	860	1,495
District of Columbia									203	10	148
Virginia	3	360	110,579	48,522,655			140	43,159	7,547	12,317	24,048
West Virginia			4,647	2,602,021			31	13,743	435	464	31,260
North Carolina	12,241	5,846,404	97,077	36,375,258			15	6,155	9,967	427,317	36,909
South Carolina	42,239	30,338,951	394	222,898			54	14,463	7,803	690,478	8,018
Georgia	18,126	14,556,432	800	268,752			33	7,939	19,371	955,299	19,619
Florida	1,787	1,011,805	1,190	470,443			171	196,820	7,672	62,960	6,613
North Central Division			86,789	77,604,367	1,164	526,936	88,047	36,090,935	2,411,679	37,472	812,645
Ohio			44,303	37,953,563			1,574	801,957	17,225	3,293	30,213
Indiana			9,373	7,710,297	29	10,464	413	157,231	10,513	2,231	34,988
Illinois			4,155	3,042,936	44	22,300	34,340	15,932,502	2,746	6,264	21,308
Michigan			22	11,984	121	64,815	11	5,079	1,427,988	487	434,014
Wisconsin			17,241	19,380,166	967	428,547	157	92,468	918,517	541	117,144
Minnesota			49	23,285	2	500	80	42,090	8,965	1,288	61,009
Iowa			124	74,396			1,108	507,072	18,880	8,360	33,769
Missouri			11,350	9,424,823	1	310	2,618	1,051,139	1,973	12,513	29,632
North Dakota			2	590					703	152	584
South Dakota			1	195			237	117,200	887	132	3,723
Nebraska			46	11,049			16,792	6,514,763	1,318	491	28,225
Kansas			123	62,083			30,717	10,809,434	1,964	1,720	18,036
South Central Division	86,917	76,836,982	329,379	259,650,580			2,550	949,385	39,750	1,103,543	113,087
Kentucky			274,587	221,880,303			195	93,063	2,775	5,670	56,046
Tennessee			51,471	36,368,395			1,439	409,436	6,442	90,530	29,780
Alabama	810	399,270	679	162,430			61	25,698	5,409	321,004	4,841
Mississippi	1,543	676,746	234	62,111			41	24,776	4,205	250,321	2,890
Louisiana	84,377	75,645,433	109	46,845			24	11,420	3,058	78,642	542
Texas	178	108,423	423	175,706			596	315,741	9,850	195,842	10,273
Oklahoma							59	16,550	6	369	145
Arkansas	9	7,110	1,876	954,790			135	52,701	8,005	161,165	8,570
Western Division			72	24,834	12,239	18,493,394	1,304	737,980	85,575	49,042	743,306
Montana			(a)	25					4,464	5,148	692
Wyoming					2	750			181	1	232

STATISTICS OF AGRICULTURE—continued.

Divisions, etc.	Rice.		Tobacco.		Hops.		Broom corn.		Pulse.		
	Acres.	Pounds.	Acres.	Pounds.	Acres.	Pounds.	Acres.	Pounds.	Dry Canada peas, bushels.	Cow peas, bushels.	Beans (dry), bushels.
Western Division—Continued.											
Colorado			2	120	20	18,300	301	60,165	20,572	24,698	7,303
New Mexico			6	1,415			102	24,500	2,046	5,384	7,843
Arizona			(a)	2					30		6,946
Utah							16	14,000	1,483	385	482
Nevada									15	2	226
Idaho							13	4,240	881	226	1,060
Washington			25	7,040	5,113	8,313,280	55	22,000	20,068	4,855	1,358
Oregon			12	3,325	3,130	3,613,727	2	1,100	4,607	6,517	3,712
California			27	12,907	3,974	6,547,338	815	611,975	30,538	1,826	713,480

a Less than 1 acre.

To-day there are 6,000,000 farms in America; there are 9,000,000 farming people, owners and laborers; there are 35,000,000 people upon these farms depending immediately upon that industry; the value of the farms is $13,000,000,000; the annual product of the farms is $4,500,000,000; and, more than that, the farmers of the United States, by their "raw material," pay three-fourths of all of the foreign exchanges of the country.

Unburdened by the protection system they would be a prosperous, mighty people; what their condition is will appear later. They are as good, as clean, as honest as their forbear. They have been as frugal in most cases as those who have gone before them; and we all recognize that as a matter of fact, what they produce is the measure of values of all that is produced by any people, unless you shall add the little of the raw products of the mines and fisheries, because all men come to his mill; because all that all men do in the way of labor and accumulation they do that they may enjoy the fruits of the earth; the best measure of a people's prosperity is the condition of the farming classes. The manufacturer exchanges for the product of their labor. The work of the mechanic, of the lawyer, of the merchant, of the doctor are all exchanged with them, and they can get no more than the farmers raise.

DEBT ACCUMULATIONS OF A PROTECTION PERIOD.

Yet, despite the productiveness of our soil and the vast wealth yielded to agricultural toil, there exists in degree the condition of misery described by the gentleman from Michigan, and in addition a vast indebtedness that balances to a large extent the presumed prosperity described as existing prior to 1893. I have a statement from the Treasury dated January 4, 1894, which I here offer.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1894.

MY DEAR SIR: Inclosed is the statement in regard to the public and private indebtedness of the United States, which was promised you to-day.

In the item of real-estate mortgages the estimate covers less than $200,000,000 for four States, the remainder of the $6,000,000,000 being actual figures, as shown by census tables.

Very truly, yours,

J. H. WARDLE, *Chief Clerk.*

Hon. JOHN C. BLACK, *Washington, D. C.*

MINIMUM DEBT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Private debt.

Quasi-public corporations:		
Steam railways (funded)	$4,631,473,184	
Street railways (funded)	151,872,289	
Telephone companies (funded)	4,992,565	
Telegraph, public water, gas, electric lighting, and power companies (estimated)	200,000,000	
Other quasi-public corporations (to make round total)	11,661,962	
Total		$5,000,000,000
Private corporations and individuals:		
Real-estate mortgages (estimated)	6,000,000,000	
Crop liens in the South (estimated)	350,000,000	
Chattel mortgages (estimated)	350,000,000	
National banks (loans and overdrafts)	1,986,058,320	
Other banks (loans and overdrafts, not including real-estate mortgages)	1,172,918,415	
Other private debts (to make round total)	1,191,023,265	
Total		11,000,000,000
Total private debt		16,000,000,000

Public debt.

United States	$891,960,104	
States	228,997,389	
Counties	145,048,045	
Municipalities	724,463,060	
School districts	36,701,948	
Total		2,027,170,546
Grand total		18,027,170,546

I will only dwell upon two of the totals. They show that the public debts of the United States to-day are $2,000,000,000, and that the private debts of the people of the United States are $16,000,000,000. At the beginning of the period of high protection there was scarcely any public indebtedness and very little private indebtedness in this country. This is the accumulation of burdens which has been made by some process during thirty years of protection. Now, gentlemen, we can afford to deal with utter fairness with each other. I do not claim that the protective tariff is responsible for all of this indebtedness. I know that it represents something of progress, but you and I know that it also represents a vast amount of poverty, that it is all debt; and to-day upon this debt accumulated during the period of boundless protection the American people are paying yearly at the rate of $900,000,000 of interest.

Now, it seems to be very clear that where there has been a process of law according to a given system, acting without interruption and universally for a long period, the result is fairly chargeable to the system itself. What we know is that in some way or other, in spite of the vast products which I have described, and instead of the vast wealth which the American people believed they were accumulating, it is found at the end of this period that a great mass of the people are miserably poor, and that our communities and individuals are indebted in immense sums, while, on the other hand, enormous accumulations of property are found in the hands of private parties.

I make no raid upon private wealth. I pass by all attack upon it. I point to the fact that everywhere throughout favored sections of the country, those favored by the tariff laws, enormous fortunes have been accumulated by individuals, and it is out of the surplus of those fortunes that the deeds of charity are being done which are to-day found necessary in this land. If the wealth produced had remained distributed in anything like a reasonable degree of proportion; if it had not, by some secret process, been drawn off into these special side-pockets it would be found reasonably distributed among the people of the country, and the sight of poor men begging for bread, while a very few of our people enjoy all the proceeds of thirty years of labor and prosperity, would not be possible. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is any other thing that will account for this disproportionate distribution of wealth I should like to know where it has appeared and what record there is of it.

EXTENT OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXATION.

We know that year after year the Government of the United States has taken from the consumers of this country from two to three hundred million dollars of revenue, and we know that at the same time under the operation of the same laws sums equivalent to four or five times that amount (according to the different calculations of economists) have also been taken from those consumers and given to the protected industries of the land. This has been done upon two pretexts. One has been that a home market was to be created by this system and preserved for the benefit of the farmers and mechanics, the laboring men, and all American citizens.

Is that true? If it is true, where is that market to-day? It is dissipated, gone; and to-day the poorest home market in the world is that which is contained within the tariff protection of the McKinley act.

Another thing that is claimed for the policy of protection is that it increases wages of the workingmen employed under this home-market arrangement. I doubt if it can possibly be established as a fact that it has had that effect. The subject has been gone into very extensively by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], and I am inclined to accept the conclusions that he has reached. I doubt if it can be shown that, running through the whole period of time covered by the protective system, the average wages of the average American laborer have been greater than the wages of such workers in other lands that are equally or anything like equally favored of nature.

But, averaging the times of depression, of poverty, and of idleness with the flush times, is it true that the general average of wages has been increased? I doubt it very much.

The skill of the statistician would have to be called in to establish the fact. But what we do know is that upon several occasions the wages have absolutely ceased in the American home market, and that this is one of those occasions. Protection has not kept the wage market up at this hour, nor for a twelvemonth past. And the same thing has occurred three times during the ascendency of the protective system. Gentlemen, if protection is the beneficent power that you believe it to be, why is it that in 1873 a ruin more widespread than that which now prevails in the land shook the financial structure of America?

There was no thought then that the Democratic party was about to come into power. It had scarcely votes enough left in the electoral college the year before to make a record: Republicanism was in the affluence of the successful administration of its own system. Yet, in 1873, such a paralysis as we are now suffering under passed over American industries; then, as now, railroads were put into the hands of receivers, trades were checked in their establishment, properties were mortgaged, and the most active industry in the land was the industry of the sheriff.

Why was it that long before the narrow contest of 1884 was decided by less than 1,300 votes in the city of New York—why was it that while every energy of a clean and kindly Administration was put forward to enforce the laws of the country in regard to the collection of its revenue—why was it that 1884 was a year of commercial disaster and ruin, widespread indeed, although not as widespread as this, if protection has the power claimed for it? You knew that the Senate would be held, that no law overthrowing that system could be passed without the consent of the Republican Senate, and that you were secure in the administration of the protective laws of the Government for two years at least, as you really were until 1892.

Yet with this system in full force there was in 1884 another earthquake period, another period of disaster to business, another period of poor wages. And so it is that three times within thirty years, saying nothing of the failures of intervening years, which ran up to one hundred and fifty, one hundred and sixty, one hundred and ninety million dollars a year, the fact is that three times in thirty years under a completed system of protection the business industries of this country have been shaken and overwhelmed. To show the extent of these misfortunes I insert from the United States Statistical Abstract a table of failures:

Number and per cent of commercial failures and the liabilities involved in failures in the United States for each calendar year from 1879 to 1892, inclusive.

[From the annual circular of R. G. Dun & Co., New York.]

Calendar years.	Number of failures.	Number of business concerns.	Per cent of failures.	Liabilities.
1879	6,658	702,157	.95	$98,149,053
1880	4,735	746,823	.63	65,752,000
1881	5,582	781,689	.71	81,155,932
1882	6,738	822,256	.82	101,547,566
1883	9,184	863,593	1.06	172,874,192
1884	10,968	904,759	1.21	226,343,427
1885	10,637	919,990	1.16	124,220,321
1886	9,834	969,841	1.01	114,644,119
1887	9,634	994,281	.90	167,560,944
1888	10,679	1,046,662	1.02	123,829,973
1889	10,882	1,051,140	1.04	148,784,337
1890	10,907	1,110,500	.98	189,856,964
1891	12,273	1,142,951	1.07	189,868,638
1892	10,344	1,172,705	.88	114,044,167

THE PANIC YEAR, 1893—LARGEST NUMBER OF BUSINESS FAILURES EVER RECORDED IN THE UNITED STATES.

NEW YORK, *December 29.*

Bradstreet's will to-morrow publish a review of the business troubles during the year. It says it will doubtless be known as the "panic year, 1893," and has brought with it the largest number of business failures ever recorded in the United States, the total amounting to 15,560.

Continuing, Bradstreet's says:

The increase in the number of mercantile failures in 1893, as compared with the year before, is more than 51 per cent, which, it is unnecessary to explain, is the heaviest annual increase on record. The proportion of individuals, firms, and corporations having a recognized place in business communities throughout the United States which failed during the past year has been 1.51 or 1½ in every 100, as compared with 1 in 100 or 1 per cent in 1892, and as compared with 1.32 per cent, or nearly 1½ in every 1,000 in the last preceding important panic year, 1884.

The grand total of estimated liabilities of individuals, firms, and corporations in business, including banks which reported liabilities in excess of their actual assets, amounts to $403,000,000 in round numbers, or nearly four times the corresponding total of 1892, when the total number of failures was two-thirds as large as this year. The next largest aggregate of liabilities was in the panic year, 1884—$248,700,000, and after that in 1891—$193,100,000, and next in order in 1883—$175,900,000, and fifth in rank in 1890—$175,000,000.

Protection does not protect the financial interests of the country. It creates at times a feverish interest. It gives a false impetus. It may advance a particular industry at the expense of others, but in weighing upon the whole body of the people it is inevitable that it should produce the two results of heavy taxation and discrimination in the benefits of government. And it always has done so.

HARD TIMES NOT DUE TO DEMOCRATIC SUCCESS.

But, say gentlemen, the existing condition may be attributed to the installment in power of the Democratic party. In all the rounds of fact we ask for one that proves this. What section of altered law, what minute of changed fiscal administration, what single alteration in the forces heretofore prevailing has occurred since the 4th of March last? It is well enough in the poetic and sp endid style of my esteemed friend to dwell upon the cause that he has assigned, but when you ask for the fact upon which it is built, that fact is lacking.

BALANCE OF TRADE AGAINST US.

I offer what I regard as reasonable additional explanations of the existing condition of affairs. In 1890 and 1891 we raised the greatest crops that ever were raised in this country. Our excess of corn was 500,000,000 bushels in a year. Our excess of wheat and other products was proportionally great. About that time, too, the agitation began for bringing the World s Fair to these shores, and agents were sent to Europe in every direction, who stimulated intercourse; and the result was that we shipped abroad the largest exports we had ever made up to that time, of grain, which had to be had by Europe, met there by a corresponding deficit in the natural output. Europe needed our produce and took it in an extraordinary extent; and she sent back to us vast quantities of our obligations. But still the balance against her in the transaction arising out of the year 1891 amounted to nearly $200,000,000.

But in the next year our people discounted the crop that they thought was to come. They traded with Europe more extensively, or as extensively as they had done on the crop of the year 1891. And when the crop of the last year, 1892, was summed up, it was found to be greatly short of reasonable expectations. By that process the trade balance against us, as is shown by the figures from the Treasury Department, published in its tables, shifted in a single year nearly $300,000,000. And we had to pay the balance as Europe had to pay the preceding balance in our favor.

That payment has been made during 1893, and it accounts, in my judgment, to a large extent, for the prevailing hard times which set in about the time that American gold was being shipped to Europe. And when you reflect that the active currency of the country is probably less than $1,500,000,000, and that in a single year the trade balances against us were shifted $300,000,000, you can well understand that at the close of this year there would be a tightening in every part of our business.

EXTRAVAGANT PUBLIC EXPENDITURES SPENDING THE SURPLUS.

Nor was that all. During the year 1891 and a part of the year 1892 this Government was engaged in expending the surplus which had been accumulated through years of frugality. The legislation entered into by the preceding Congresses and maturing during this year, maturing in the shape of appropriations, maturing in the shape of largesses, stripped the Treasury bare, and have rendered it necessary for it to hold on with the grip of financial despair to every dollar that it can hold. So that before the middle of the year the surplus in the Treasury was already exhausted, not by changing revenues, not by reducing the income, but by extraordinary expenditures, by having to pay the balances of trade against us and by enormous private payments of our people going abroad. The consequence is that to-day, when we come to settle up, we are "short;" and the cash we should have in the hands of our manufacturers and operators and laborers is in the coffers of Europe.

Now, it seems to me that all of these forces actually existing, naturally working, have produced the condition of affairs now existing. It is unnecessary to call upon fancy and say that it was the incoming of the Democratic party and its installment in power that has produced this result. That is an old wife's fable, unsusceptible of proof, resting simply in common rumor.

NOT DUE TO PERIODICITY.

It has been sought to explain this condition of affairs by the very ingenious hypothesis of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], that it was inevitable in human affairs that periods of inflation and depression would occur. I do not believe it. I believe that every time a financial crisis occurs it is directly traceable to and caused by disregard of some wise and just law of business. It is because some honest method has been forgotten, or some mistake made in fiscal legislation. And so in the depressions which have come, followed by alternations, it has not been owing to any fatalism or any chance that recurs as regularly as a baleful comet, but has been due to a disregard of the laws of taxation, equality, and economy. [Applause on the Dem-

ocratic side.] It is because the insidious hand, the inevitable hand of tariff-protection law has been reaching out and gathering in taxes from every quarter of the land.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has said very earnestly that the industries of this country were waiting to know upon what terms the Democratic party proposed to allow them to continue in business. Upon terms of absolute and honest equality! [Applause on the Democratic side.] Upon terms that will tax them, not for the benefit of their neighbor, but for the revenues of the Government.

The gentleman seems to have been greatly disturbed by the fact that the pending bill puts 131 articles more on the free list. He seems to forget that these articles, if they are sought for in America, will be sought for by the consumers of these 131 articles and that they will come with less of expense to the consumer than they would otherwise have done but for the intervention of the Wilson bill. And pursuing the same line, the gentleman spoke with upraised hand of the terrible consequences that were to happen to this country from opening the doors between Canada and the United States.

Canadian products are selling no cheaper to-day than American products. Canadian labor crosses the line freely, and but within a few days a remonstrance was forwarded here by some association of workingmen up near the northern line, complaining because Canadian workmen cross the boundary in the morning, do a day's work in the United States, and return to their homes at night. The spirit of protection is abroad in that association, and they were seeking to "protect" the American laborer against his brother who happened to be born across the line.

PROHIBITIVE PROTECTION AND IMMIGRATION AS AFFECTING LABOR.

This, Mr. Chairman, is an instance of the false position into which the public mind has been forced by long worshiping at the altars of protection. It seems to me that the gravest charge that can be brought against the protective system, as it has been developed under our laws, is that it not only is excessive in its taxation, but it tends to disorganize society and to perpetuate the artificial divisions between peoples who otherwise would slowly but certainly come together. It seems to me that possibly the worst effect produced by the system of protection, independent of the ruin that has fallen on the laborers of the country, who have the world's markets withdrawn from them, is the fact that it produces unnatural immigration of great bodies of men from one country to another.

Mr. REED. What may unnatural immigration mean?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. My colleague, if he will permit me an interruption, instances the case of a Canadian laboring man coming over into our country, working a day and returning, not bearing the burdens of citizenship, but returning again to his own home, as being complained of by the American laborer. Does my colleague mean to say that we should pursue a policy of permitting the coming of foreign citizens here in competition with our own people, and who do not bear the burdens of citizenship?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I will answer the gentleman's question. There is to-day setting in, and there has been for ten years last past, from Europe, especially from Poland and Hungary, from Italy, and from other countries largely dominated by what are known as the Latin races, a vast immigration of people averaging about half a million each year for the last ten years. Now, if they came here naturally——

Mr. REED. How would that be?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I will answer the gentleman. I say if they came here naturally without artificial attraction, if they were a part of the great migratory masses that at one time or another have left their domiciles and sought new lands, "unawed by influences and unbought by gain," I should be willing to welcome the arrival of every one amongst them. But in so far as the protective system of laws has been responsible for their departure from their homes and their lodgment amongst us, I look upon their coming with doubt.

The pretense has been published abroad, it has been translated into all the languages of the world wherever newspapers are circulated, that under the protective system higher wages were being paid to the American than to any other workingman in the world. Now, I am aware that this is not the sole cause of this extraordinary migration. I know that the steamship and railroad companies have sent their agents abroad to harry the mountains and the valleys for the purpose of bringing men here who in the first place would pay their fares, so as to enable these companies to run their lines with profit, and in the second place, to ship them on to our great unsubdued regions, in order that railroad lands might be taken up and occupied by them, to such an extent that to-day, in the settlements of the far Northwest, there are regions where not a word of English, or any other language cognate to it, is spoken by the inhabitants in their daily intercourse.

But the strongest reason that has induced this unprecedented immigration, that which has been the mainspring to all this, is the false and alluring cry, dinned in the ear of the laborer, formerly contented in Europe and elsewhere, that here he could have higher wages; and the consequence of these causes combined, and especially of the last, has been that, until the opening of last year, when the cholera scare came upon us and for a time a rigid quarantine checked the movement, there was a movement of foreign populations into this country as great almost as the movement of the Moors out of Spain or of the Israelites out of Egypt. I denominate an immigration so obtained as artificial.

And what was the consequence? When, in addition to the expenditure of the surplus, paying it out upon every hand till there was a bankrupt Treasury at the national capital, in addition to a vast balance of trade against us which had to be paid, we found 500,000 men and women and children coming into our midst each year to be taken care of; we did not find them seeking these homes in the far West in full extent, but, as the flies are drawn to the honey, they went to the places where they were told these wages were to be had. They went to the great cities of Boston and Chicago and New York and Philadelphia. They have jammed in there and the result has been that the American workingmen have suffered.

I do not mean the American by birth, but I mean the man who has been fitted here for workmanship; who has been coming here in natural and ordinary fashion for many years, attracted by our institutions and the love of liberty; who has been trained in our life and our industries. He has been crowded away, and his place has been taken by this vast incoming mass, or else his wages have been cut down and he has been compelled to take half a loaf where formerly a whole loaf was granted him.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will my friend allow me——

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. One moment. Now, I will proceed to answer your question, which was whether I thought that the Canadian, who did not bear the burdens of this Government, ought to be allowed to cross the line and to share, with the American, the labor to be had on this side the line?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Where he returns to his own country?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Where he returns to his own home at night. The distinction there is not a distinction of race. It is not a distinction of blood. Brothers are found on both sides of that line. Sons upon each side have the same father. I would not interdict the coming of that man. I would let him come until it was demonstrated that the folly which sought to deepen the lines of political division between two kindred nations was unworthy of being longer continued in American legislation.

Mr. REED. That is, until the wages are equal.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will my colleague allow me another question?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. My colleague refers to a half million of immigrants coming to this country each year, the most of whom are attracted by the larger wages here. Do I understand my friend, that the remedy which he would propose to prevent that immigration would be by decreasing the wages of the American workingman by bringing him into competition, not with the half million who come to our borders annually from abroad, but with the labor of the two hundred millions on the other side, who would send their products here free, in competiton with our labor?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Well, the question is ponderous, but fair, and I will try to reply to it. If I was being chased by bees, I would throw the honey down. If I was being set upon by wolves, I would get the fresh meat out of their sight.

Mr. REED. Even if the children also did not get it?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. If I was certain that the American workingman of to-day was being overwhelmed by a vast mass of men seeking these shores because they believed that wages were higher—a belief which is false in the long run—and if I believed that that delusion depended upon a system of misleading laws, I should seek to repeal those laws, to let wages have their natural place all around the world, and let people move all around the world in their own way. I would not toll them over here by a system of laws, the effect of which is to drive American workingmen from their places, and to delude into starvation those who are thus attracted here.

Mr. REED. Then the gentleman favors an equality of wages between this country and others from which we have immigration?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. That is not a fair way to put the question.

Mr. REED. You can make it fair in answering.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I make answer by the removal of the artificial means by which we create a fictitious value of the article of wages, and let wages have its natural level, as it does elsewhere.

Mr. REED. If we have, then, a higher level, if we keep a portion of the honey, and still keep a portion of the meat, they will be after it. Now, when you take away the honey and the meat and hide it, do you take it away from the children?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I have not been talking about children, I had been talking about men.

Mr. REED. Say men, then, if that pleases you better.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. In answer I would restore a natural condition of affairs by taking down the protective system, which pretends to give higher wages here than otherwise would be given.

Mr. REED. You say, pretend to give higher wages! Do these people go back disappointed?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Yes, sir; they are going back in large numbers now——

Mr. REED. Now! That is true. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. And protective laws are still in force.

Mr. REED. Why, you talk about the law being still in vogue. You might as well talk about having a policeman protect a community when you put him in jail. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Well, I do not think so.

Mr. REED. I know you do not.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. There has been no law repealed.

Mr. REED. But do you not know that the act of 1890 is practically suspended in its operation; and that you have had, as it were, a pistol at its head?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. It was not before the election.

Mr. REED. Before the election! Which election?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. The election of 1892.

Mr. REED. The election of 1892, before we entered this disastrous period.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I know that it has not been, and that this year the revenues collected under it are greater than they were last year.

Mr. REED. This year?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. The Treasury accounts tell a different story. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Our sources of information seem to be different. I want no mistaken impression left on the mind of the gentleman from Maine——

Mr. REED. You have not left it.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois (continuing). Or any other person here as to the exact meaning that should be attached to what I have said in regard to this question of foreign immigration. I believe it is wrong to the American workman and to the American people to put up a system of taxation which produces a false system of wages, and which, when it is reached by the workers for it, instantly disappears. I am not opposed in any way to a free and untrammeled movement of the races of man about this earth. I believe that to be one of the high purposes of the Democratic party. I think that in its mission of peace and fraternity, of fair taxation, and the removal of unnatural barriers, the Democratic party has yet to pave the way for a universal kindly fraternity of all men where doctrines of equality and brotherhood will prevail; where the narrow opinions of locality will disappear, and where a man's boast will be that he is a citizen, not of some pent-up Utica, but a citizen of the world.

DEMOCRACY MUST ADVANCE IN ITS WORK.

The Democratic party must stand ready to advance upon the line of fair and honest taxation, no matter what conclusions its enemies may draw, or what gloomy prognostics they may indulge in with regard to the future. I do not believe that the unshackled energies of the American people will work out such doleful results as we have had depicted. I can not think that mills will close all over the Union; that there will be a complete cessation of business, and that starvation's hordes will increase. With the passing of winter will come the renewal of life, and when the Democratic party has established, as it will establish, the right doctrine of commercial intercourse, the results of its wisdom and justice will begin to be felt and prosperity will return.

SEEK TRUTH REGARDLESS OF ITS SURROUNDINGS.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] chose to indulge in a stricture which I thought had become worn and obsolete. In criticising the platform of the Democratic party, as adopted at Chicago, he told us that he had found a marvelous resemblance between its enunciation of the doctrine of commercial freedom, and the nullification ordinance of South Carolina and certain recitals in the Confederate constitution. I have examined the constitution of the State of Michigan somewhat, and I find that it contains many declarations word for word the same as those that were found in the Confederate constitution. The Confederate constitution guaranteed the advantages of the writ of habeas corpus: it guaranteed freedom from unusual search and seizure; it guaranteed equality before the law, and it recognized the existence of Almighty God. So does the constitution of the State of Michigan; so does the constitution of the State of Illinois.

But, Mr. Chairman, does it make any difference in the value of a truth where it has been recited or where it is found? Because a constitution, in the overthrow of which I had some small and humble part, because that constitution contained truths that are the heritage of our race, truths that have been written in every charter of freedom from Magna Charta down to the present day, because the doctrines of personal liberty and of commercial liberty and of equality before the law and the acknowledgement of a Divine Ruler of the world were contained in the Confederate constitution, shall we therefore blot them out of our own constitutions?

If it was a truth, as announced in the Confederate constitution, that the tariff should be for revenue only, are we to reject that truth to-day upon a cry which is addressed, not to reason, but to prejudice? We are to search for the truth wherever it can be found, and this House knows that every truth the people prize, every truth that free men of all races prize, has been first of all wrested by rebels from the control of tyrants. That was true of the Declaration of Independence, it was true of the Federal Constitution, it was true of the Bill of Rights granted by English kings, it is true of every enunciation by which human liberty has been established and human liberty secured; and it is idle at this time in the century to attempt to belittle an issue by referring to the fact that South Carolina may have asserted a proposition or the Confederate constitution declared it. We welcome truth wherever we find it, and place it in its proper relation.

DUTY OF THE DEMOCRATS OF THE HOUSE.

The Democratic party has pledged itself to carry out the policy embodied in this bill, some of whose provisions I think will bear amendment, for, as the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means well said, it is not a perfect instrument. Very few perfect instruments fall from human hands. It has been brought into this House that we may work upon it; it has been brought into this House that we may consider it; it has been brought into this House that we may mold and improve and pass upon it. It is not the completed work either of the party or of the Congress. I say that the duty of the Democratic party with regard to it is to advance along the line of this bill, which points to free raw materials, to reduced taxation, to enlarged commerce, and to a broader and kinder intercourse with our fellow-men.

The gentleman from Michigan grew eloquent upon the question of free raw wool, and thought it was very dreadful that $14,000,000 of taxation should be remitted to the American people and that $51,000,000 of free goods should be added to those already coming in over the border. I wonder whether it occurred to the gentleman that if the poor who are now in the land had had their share of that free trade earlier they would not now be suffering as they are. But it happens that I have a single illustration which will close what I have to say upon this subject. Here in the midst of winter we are assured that thousands and hundreds of thousands of laborers, their wives and children are receiving charity, and free raw materials, worked up by American genius and American machinery, certainly would not have tended to bring about that condition of affairs.

But to my illustration. A gentleman departing from these shores a few weeks ago wrote me, after he had passed through London and had gone to the Mediterranean, that while in London he had bought a suit of wool clothing in the open market for which he had paid thirteen dollars and some cents. That suit was not shoddy; it was the same sort of goods as the writer wore at home, and for which he would have been obliged to pay at least $35.

Mr. Chairman, if upon each of the backs that are now suffering the pangs of cold such a suit could have been put in time by the policy we advocate, commercial freedom, or free trade, if you please, would not have been without its compensations. And if free trade or fair commercial freedom will tend to furnish more cheaply to the toilers of America the essential supplies of life, I am in favor of that commercial freedom even if branded with the name "free trade." [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not see why we should shrink back from the name of free traders. [Applause.] It seems to me that everything that the human race has won that is worth having has borne upon its banners and set in plumes that decked its highest frontlet the word "free." Free speech, free press, free

thought, everything you have that is worth having has "free" woven into it; and in the end we will add commerce that is free from unjust exactions to the mighty list. [Applause.]

The American people voted that we should do this thing. The American people voted that we should strike off every unjust, discriminating, and unnecessary burden of taxation. And I am in favor, gentlemen, of executing their will, even though from the ambush of protection on every side arrows of hate and misrepresentation continue to be hurtled. We did not expect when we entered on this crusade that the monopolists of the land would be with us. We do not expect it now. We are not seeking their cooperation. We, the American people, and the party of the American people, are great enough and strong enough to succeed in this reform of the tariff, and in the enactment substantially of this Wilson bill without the aid of any monopolist in America. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois obtained the floor.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is how half past 4 o'clock. My colleague [Mr. HOPKINS], who has just been recognized, can not complete his speech this afternoon. I suggest, therefore, that he yield for a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If that is the pleasure of the committee, it will be satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEIL in the chair). The Chair did not hear the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I remarked that it is now half past 4 o'clock, and that my colleague, who has just been recognized, can not complete his speech this evening. I believe the House meets at 11 o'clock in the morning, does it not?

Several MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Therefore, as my colleague can not complete his remarks this evening, I suggest that he yield now for a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. REED. Perhaps some other gentleman would like to go on.

Mr. DALZELL. There is an hour left yet.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. This will not interfere, as I understand, with the night session.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I am content to go on——

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand my colleague [Mr. HOPKINS] to say that he is ready to proceed now.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If it is the wish of the committee, I will do so.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, this motion is a good way to test the sense of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman press his motion?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will make that motion; it can do no harm to take the sense of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order adopted by the House, as the Chair understands, the Committee of the Whole must sit each day until half past 5 o'clock. Therefore it would require unanimous consent for the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Do I understand that the Committee of the Whole must remain in session until half past 5?

The CHAIRMAN. It must, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CULBERSON. If the gentleman from Illinois does not wish to proceed now, there is a member over here who will be glad to speak.

Mr. SPRINGER. My colleague has said that he is ready to proceed.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman from Illinois gives way now, that would not deprive this side of the House of the hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that it would.

Mr. HOPKINS. If I should yield now I would be recognized for the first hour in the morning?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not for the present occupant of the chair to say. According to the impression of the Chair, the side of the House represented by the gentleman from Illinois would not lose this hour, if some gentleman on the other side should go on at the present time. The Chair has no doubt that in the morning the occupant of the chair would recognize the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Very well.

Mr. SICKLES. We are to take the regular recess to-day?

The CHAIRMAN. The order fixes a recess for half past 5 o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not want to interrupt the regular course of business, but I observe that an effort is being made now to induce a gentleman on this side to speak who is entitled to the floor at the evening session to-night. If he speaks now the present arrangement will be broken up; and it occurs to me that we had better adhere to the plan originally contemplated.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I am perfectly willing to proceed now as I had intended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the resolution in the platform that was adopted by the Democratic party at its last national convention, asserting as a fundamental principle of that party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue alone, brought that question prominently before the American people in the great Presidential campaign of 1892. It is not surprising that many misguided Democrats interpreted the overwhelming defeat of the Republican party in that memorable campaign as an indorsement by the American people of their denunciation of protection and all tariff legislation.

The exultant spirit with which the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House commenced their labor in the preparation of the bill which was intended to carry out the pledges of their party contained in their national platform has been very materially cooled by the recent elections in all of the Northern States. Their interpretation of the political victory of 1892 has not been accepted by the industrial North, and if we can judge from protests which have been heard from Birmingham, Ala., West Virginia, Louisiana, and other sections in the South where the spirit of industry has found lodgment, it has not been accepted by the people of the South either.

The bill which has been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means is certainly an anomaly in Congressional legislation. It neither comes up to the standard of the bold and defiant declarations of their party platform, nor meets the approval or expectations of the more conservative element of their party. As a revenue measure it is a confessed failure. With the Treasury almost depleted and the Government marching on the high road to bankruptcy, this bill still further reduces the revenues of the Government and cuts off its power to meet its obligations to the enormous amount of $70,000,000 annually.

It ignores the fundamental principle of the Democratic party, that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only, by putting and keeping upon the free list all the staple and leading articles of import where the duty would be a duty for revenue only, such as a duty upon tea, coffee, sugar, and many other articles which, under Republican legislation, have been placed upon the free list, Republicans contending that these are the necessaries of life and should be brought in free of duty. This in itself is a cowardly surrender of the boasted principles which the Democrats claim are so dear to their hearts.

While they have been loud and long in their denunciations of Republicans and of the Republican method of tariff legislation, they have not, in this bill, had the courage of their convictions to reverse the legislation of the Republican party in this respect, and put a revenue duty upon any of these articles. They have compromised with their consciences, however, by making a deadly assault in the bill upon every industry throughout the New England, Northern, and Western States. No industry that was giving employment to labor at remunerative wages and was developing a market for the products of American farmers has escaped.

I shall later on in my remarks pay more particular attention to the schedules in this most remarkable bill, and shall endeavor to show that those schedules have been prepared with no friendly interest in American manufactures, with no love or care for American wage-earners, and in a spirit which has called forth the most profound acknowledgments from foreign importers and foreign manufacturers. It will not escape the attention of the people throughout the North generally, that the controlling minds in the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means who have formulated and presented to the country this strange bill come from a section of the country that has in times past been pronounced in the advocacy of free trade, and has shown a keener appreciation for the friendship of free-trade England than any disposition to cultivate fraternal relations with that section of our Union which lies north of that imaginary division known as Mason and Dixon's line.

The subject of tariff legislation has become, and is now, one of absorbing interest to all classes and conditions of people in the United States. There is no subject which will so readily challenge the respectful attention of an audience as this much-talked-of tariff question. People have come to appreciate the fact that the adoption or rejection of the policy of protection as advocated and maintained by the Republican party, for now more than a generation, is one which affects the interest of every citizen, I care not what his calling may be or in what portion of this grand Union his home may be found. In view of this, it seems to me that it is not inappropriate to briefly review the legislation of this country from its earliest days upon this subject and to point out some of the leading historical facts con-

nected with this class of legislation, and from these draw such conclusions as in my judgment this legislation and these facts warrant.

It is important, too, that the people of this country should not forget that one of the great, if not the great cause for the rejection of the Articles of Confederation and the adoption of the Constitution of the United States was to enable our forefathers by proper tariff legislation to protect the interests of the recently emancipated colonists from the grasping avarice of English manufacturers and English importers, and to build up in the American Republic vast and varied industries in numbers and character which would be sufficient not only to meet the wants of the American people, but to make our country one of the important factors in the commerce of the world.

It is important, too, that the American farmers and the laboring people of the country should understand and remember that the doctrine of free trade as advocated by the Democratic party first found its birth and its subsequent support among the great leaders at the South, whose hearts never beat in sympathy with the cause of the laboring men, and who believed in establishing a social aristocracy in this country under which the men who obtained their livelihood by manual labor would forever "be hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the favored class, who arrogated to themselves all the rights and advantages that accrue to American citizenship, and looked upon their less fortunate brothers as but little better than the slaves who tilled the soil of their vast plantations.

The second bill that passed the first Congress that ever assembled under the Constitution, and that was signed by George Washington, was a tariff bill intended to be protective in its character. It was hailed by the farmers as well as the artisans of those days as a declaration of industrial emancipation from English power scarcely second to that great declaration of political independence which resulted in the establishment of the American Republic. This first tariff bill was fathered by a Virginian in the person of James Madison, one of the illustrious Presidents of the United States. Any person who will take the time to read the proceedings of Congress during the session which gave birth to this now famous piece of legislation, will affirm what I now assert, that the object and the purpose of legislation of that character was to build up in the different sections of the American Republic industries which would furnish all classes and kinds of products necessary to meet the wants of the American citizen.

There was no division of political parties on this question at that time. The feeling of patriotism was too active and too great to permit partisanship to sway the votes or control the voice of any of the people's representatives in preparing and in enacting into law legislation which would enable the Government to raise a revenue by levying and collecting import duties and at the same time would serve as a stimulus to induce capital to invest in manufacturing industries on this side of the Atlantic.

I have neither the time nor the inclination to follow in detail the various pieces of legislation that was from time to time enacted to enlarge and strengthen this first tariff bill. At this period in the history of our country the principles of protection, as now advocated by the Republican party, found its stanchest defenders in the Southern States. Whoever will take the pains to examine the debates of Congress when the tariff law of 1816 was being considered, will find that John C. Calhoun of South Carolina was the man who was most prominent in the advocacy of that measure and of protective legislation generally; and in a great speech in support of the bill when it was pending in this House advanced arguments in favor of protection which he himself at no subsequent date was ever able to overthrow, and which to-day stand unanswered by any of the advocates of free trade.

Up to this time in the history of our country the slave-owners of the South had not perceived that legislation which developed industries that required a high grade of mechanical skill and intelligence, to be successfully carried on, was destructive of the very principle of slave labor, and that in the race of prosperity and the accumulation of wealth they were being distanced by their sister States in the North.

John C. Calhoun, the protectionist of 1816, was one of the first great Southern leaders to discover this fact. He was seconded and supported by Senator Hayne, of his own State, and by McDuffie, one of the ablest, most eloquent, and fearless advocates of free trade who have ever discussed that doctrine on the floor of this House. No argument in favor of free trade and in support of the Democratic position on this question has been advanced during the present generation that was not touched upon, enriched, and embellished by the genius of McDuffie.

Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee who framed the bill now under consideration, and who have presented to the country their report upon that bill, have gathered their inspiration and their arguments from the rich field that was furnished them in reports and speeches made by this celebrated advocate of free trade during the time that he was chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House. He lived in a different generation and under different conditions than the free traders of to-day and was a more fearless and frank advocate than his followers in this generation. The Republican party has ever contended that protection builds up the social as well as the material condition of the laboring men of America and that free trade has the directly opposite tendency. That the one system is to ennoble and the other to degrade the wage-earners of this country. The free-trade advocates of to-day attempt to avoid this logical conclusion by contending that American laborers can accomplish more in the same space of time, and that a reduction of import duty will not necessitate a corresponding reduction in the wages of the laborer.

I shall before I finish show the utter fallacy of this position. My purpose here and now, however, is to show that the men who formerly advocated free trade, and who are regarded as the fathers of the Democratic thought upon this subject, were too honest and too fearless in the advocacy of their opinions to resort to any such subterfuge. They planted their faith upon the peculiar institutions that existed in the South; they proposed an alliance with free-trade England because they believed that by such an alliance only could slavery be maintained. They saw at the North that the men who worked in the furnaces and wrought at the forges were men who had a controlling voice in the local, Congressional, and State, as well as national elections. They viewed with apprehension the onward march of this class of American citizens in the highways of intelligence and social advancement. They believed that the spirit of liberty could be best carried forward by the maintenance of an aristocracy such as at that time was held in the South, and that the laboring man should not participate in the rights that are accorded under the Constitution to an American citizen, and in support of this assertion I crave the indulgence of the House while I quote a few selections from a speech of Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, delivered in this House on the 11th day of May, 1830. In speaking upon this labor question and the influence that protection has in benefiting the wage-earners, he said:

> Yielding to the influence of a mawkish and mistaken humanity, our own statesmen have generally conceded that slavery is a political evil as it regards the white population. Now, sir, I firmly believe that there never has existed a form of slavery so favorable to the happiness of the servants, and at the same time so conducive to political freedom, as that which we are considering.
>
> Where those who perform the menial and degrading offices of society constitute a part of a political body and participate in the government of the country, through the elective franchise, this high privilege is degraded, and the spirit of liberty as well as its security diminished. It is not in the natur of things that a mere dependent who brushes your coat and cleans your boots can be regarded by you with a feeling of equality which is due to a freeman, nor is it expected that he should have the profound feelings that belong to a freeman.
>
> A state of servile dependence is utterly incompatible with political freedom; and by conferring the right of suffrage upon persons in that condition, whatever may be their color, you do not elevate them to the character of freemen, but degrade liberty to their level. What, sir, would you expect from an election where hostlers and grooms, and postillions and footmen, should come to the polls and control the result? Where all the offices of dependent servitude are performed by a separate caste, distinguished by color, and wholly excluded from all participation in the Government, it is not to be doubted that the spirit of freedom is rendered much more proud and lofty by the very contrast.

Mr. McDuffie asserts in this speech what was believed and practiced by all the leading free traders at the South. In his elaborate and able argument he undertook to demonstrate how much better it would be for the South to sell their raw products, which consisted at that time principally of cotton, to the English manufacturers free of duty, and to permit the English manufacturers to import the manufactured products, not only of cotton, but of all other industries, into this country free of duty in exchange therefor. The tillers of the soil, such as our farmers at the North, and the men who labor in our mines, our foundries, and our factories, found no lot or place in his scheme of government. They belonged to a class who, in the opinion of this great free trader, ought to be thankful that they were permitted even to live in the same country with such choice spirits as himself and his free-trade associates.

The cardinal principle announced in the constitution of the so-called Confederate States was an absolute prohibition of any imposition of import duties. Free trade was there recognized as clearly and as fully as it has ever been asserted in any civilized government. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and other leading members of the Democratic portion of the committee who are principally responsible for this bill with all its free-trade qualities and tendencies, not only rallied to the support of the constitution containing such declarations as these, but imperiled their lives upon more than one occasion in its defense, in the hope that it might become an established fact. While disappointed in their efforts to destroy

the Union and establish their ideal free-trade government, they have ever been constant to this doctrine.

It is therefore not surprising that a bill is here presented that is not only a menace to the industries that have developed and enriched the New England, Middle, and Western States, and would have made the Southern States blossom like a rose had the people in this favored section taken advantage of the legislation and developed the resources of their States, but is also antagonistic to the rights and dearest interests of the wage-workers in this country. Disguise it as they may in any form of rhetoric, the stern fact appears that in the whole history of our country, whenever the principles of free trade have temporarily obtained the ascendency, we have had times of industrial depression and capital has remained uninvested. The furnace fires have gone out, the busy hum of the spindle and the loom has been hushed, and the laborer has walked the streets unemployed, while hunger and want have been the companions of his wife and children.

The import duties imposed under the law of 1816 were not high enough to protect American industries against the vast amount of imported goods that were shipped to this country by English manufacturers, and the universal judgment of history is that the people of this country for the years following that and preceding the legislation of 1824 and 1828 suffered financial and commercial distress to a degree that drove them well nigh into general bankruptcy. There was an almost universal demand for legislation that would guarantee a sufficient protection to American manufacturers against the onslaught that was being made upon them by foreign manufacturers. Mr. Bolles, in his Financial History of the United States, in speaking of this period, says:

During the four years between 1817 and 1821, the holders of property in the United States were supposed to have suffered a depreciation of nearly $300,000,000. General bankruptcy spread its darkness over the land; many of the wealthiest families were reduced to poverty; laborers suffered for want of bread; improvements of all sorts were abandoned, and a scene of the most intense national distress ensued.

The same historian goes on to describe the condition of iron manufacturers at this period, and among other things says:

Every man who made it his principal business, who sold his iron and purchased his provision and stock, was ruined. His forges, his lands, his goods and chattels were all struck off under the sheriff's hammer at public auction; he himself was driven to jail; his workmen were unemployed; some of them followed their employer to prison; others emigrated to new countries; their families were reduced to abject want and were compelled to ask relief from the town or resort to beggary.

It was this condition of the American people, so graphically and truly described by this eminent writer, that led to the tariff legislation of 1824, and to the still stronger protective measure known as the tariff law of 1828. Those who are familiar with the history of our country immediately following this legislation will bear me out in the statement that I make, that every industry seemed inspired with new life; old mills were started up, and new ones were built; furnace fires were again lighted; and instead of feeding the laboring class, unemployed and walking the streets in idleness, they were given employment at good wages, and as if by magic a depressed and poverty-stricken country was changed into a happy, contented, and industrious people.

This condition of affairs continued until the agitation and aggression of the free traders of the South forced the country into the compromise measure of 1832, a measure which in many respects resembles the bill now under consideration. The avowed object of many of the supporters of that great measure was to reach absolute free trade by a system of deductions from import duties yearly until a period should be reached when a custom-house would be a thing of the past. I shall not take the time to go into an elaborate discussion of the history of that great measure and the results under it. It is enough for my purpose to show to this House what the facts of history demonstrate; that the scenes and incidents that followed the extraordinary importation of goods into this country from 1817 to 1821 were again experienced, and that the thriving mills and factories throughout the North were seized with an industrial paralysis, progressive in its nature, which threatened the ultimate extinction of the life of all such industries in our Republic.

The condition of the farmer was but little better than that of the laboring man. The richness of the earth yielded abundant crops to the cultivation of man, but there was no money in the country; there was no market for the surplus farm products; there was an abundance of foreign goods in the American markets, but no money or means possessed by the farmer with which to purchase them. It is stated by competent authority that so baleful was the influence of the compromise measure here referred to, on the industries of the country prior to the act of 1842, that more than 200,000 persons, chiefly factory hands, were out of employment in the section of the country east of the Hudson River. You must remember, gentlemen, that that was at a period when our country's population was scarcely over one-third of what it is now.

This vast army of unemployed factory hands was the sacrifice made to appease the wrath of the free-trade advocates of America. Their cry for work or for bread for their families touched the hearts of the American people, and a demand was made upon Congress to reenact such legislation as would restore these men to their wanted callings. It was in response to such appeals that the tariff act of 1842 was enacted into law, and upon its passage every establishment was at once set in motion and every unemployed factory hand was given employment. I can not refrain in this connection from quoting from an article written by Freeman Hunt, a Democrat and the editor of the Merchants' Magazine, a periodical of wide circulation in those days, and one which voiced the sentiments of the manufacturing and commercial classes of the country. In speaking upon this subject he said:

The condition of the country at the date of the passage of the act of 1842 was humiliating in the extreme. The Treasury, unable to obtain at home the means required for administering the Government, even on the most economical scale, had failed in all its efforts to negotiate a loan at 6 per cent, even in the same foreign markets in which it had but recently paid at par a debt bearing an interest of only 3 per cent. Many of the States, and some of the oldest of them, had been forced to suspend the payment of the interest of their debts. The banks to a great extent were in a state of suspension. Of the merchants, a large portion had become bankrupt; factories and furnaces being closed hundreds of thousands of persons were totally unemployed; commerce had scarcely an existence, those who could not sell their own labor being unable to purchase of others. Nevertheless, deep as was the abyss into which the nation had been plunged, so magical was the effect of the adoption of the system that had turned the balance of trade in its favor that scarcely had the act of August, 1842, become a law, when the Government found that it could have all its wants supplied at home. Mills, factories, and furnaces long closed were again opened; labor came into demand, and before the close of its third year prosperity almost universally reigned.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that the experiences of the people of this country which have here been mentioned, would have been sufficient to have created an almost united sentiment in favor of ample and complete protection to all American industries, and I think, sir, had it not been for the influence that was exerted by the slave-owners of the South in favor of free trade, that the legislation of this country upon this subject would have, from 1842 to the present time, been uniform and continuous. But the great leaders who recklessly plunged this country into civil war had come to believe that the preservation of slavery depended upon the establishment of free trade in America, and they were sufficiently strong to enact a legislation that was intended to gradually reach this object of their ambition.

It was in pursuance of this, that the great measure known as the Walker law became a part of the legislation of our country in 1846; and it was the same influence, exerted, in my judgment, against the best interests of America, that enabled the same class of legislators to procure the still further free-trade legislation of 1857. The condition of our country under these laws is too well known to the American people to require a restatement at my hands here. It was a repetition of the same old story, a story of a depleted Treasury, of the balance of trade against our country; of idle mills and dead furnaces; general stagnation in business; all of the attendant hardships that follow the cultivation of agricultural products without adequate markets: factory hands without employment; homes without the comforts and necessaries of life; and little children asking their mothers for bread where none was to be given. Mr. Greeley, in a few sentences, has given a picture of the condition of the people of New York during this free-trade period, which I commend to the consideration of my free-trade friends before they vote upon this pending bill. On January 15, 1855, there appeared in the New York Tribune the following article:

Who is hungry? Go and see. You that are full-fed and know not what it is to be hungry—perhaps never saw a hungry man—go and see. Go and see thousands, men and women, boys and girls, old and young, black and white, of all nations, crowding and jostling each other, almost fighting for the first chance, acting more like hungry wolves than human beings, in a land of plenty. It is only by the continuous efforts of two policemen that the crowd can be kept in order, or made to wait until the food is ready for distribution. Such a scene may be seen between 11 and 2 o'clock around the corner of Orange and Chatham streets, where charity gives a dinner to the poor, and soup and bread to others to carry to their miserable families. On Saturday we spent an hour there at the hour of high tide. We have never see anything like it before. Upward of a thousand people were fed with a plate of soup, a piece of bread, and a piece of meat on the premises, and in all more than 1,600. On the same day 1,130 portions of soup were dealt out at Stewart's "soup kitchen," in the rear of the great store, corner of Reede street and Broadway.

At the rooms on Duane street, for the relief of the poor, on the same day, they gave food to 2,256. In the Sixth ward alone over 6,000 persons were fed by charity on Saturday, January 13. And this is only one day in one ward. Meanwhile scenes of a like nature are being enacted all over the city. A procession of several thousand persons kept marching about the streets yesterday, with flags and banners which bore such inscriptions as "Hunger is a sharp thorn;" "We want work." Such are the scenes that are being enacted daily before our eyes, while the cry of hard times reaches us from every part of the country. The making of roads is stopped, factories are closed, and houses and ships are no longer being built. Factory hands, road-makers, carpenters, bricklayers, and laborers are idle, paralysis is rapidly embracing every pursuit in the country. The cause of all this stoppage of circulation is to be found in the steady outflow of gold to pay foreign laborers for the cloth, the shoes, the iron, and the other things that could be produced by American labor, but which can not be so produced under our present revenue system.

The Republican party has been denounced by the Democratic party for its steady adherence to the principles of protection, and for its courageous support of legislation that has created and developed these vast and varied industries throughout the length and breadth of our land. Our principles have been denounced as a fraud and a robbery of the great majority for the benefit of the few, but I thank God that no such scenes as these, which have been so faithfully portrayed by Horace Greeley, have ever been repeated or witnessed during the entire period that the Republican party was in control of the destinies of this great Republic. No large classes of men have ever been compelled under Republican administration to appeal to charity for the support of themselves and those of their families who are dearer to them than their own lives. None of the great cities that have grown up under the beneficent legislation that has been given to the country by the Republican party have ever had within their borders to establish soup-houses to protect the poor of their numbers.

It is the boast of the Republican party and the glory of its administration that it has given to this country such laws and such legislation as have diversified labor and induced capital to invest in new industries and furnish employment at good wages to all who had a desire to earn a livelihood by honest industry.

For two hundred years England has been mistress of the seas. Her commerce has been carried on under English flags to every civilized port in the world. She has been selfish and aggressive in the extreme. The moneyed and manufacturing interests of England have directed her commercial and legislative policy. Like Alexander the Great, her ambition has been to commercially dominate and control all the great manufacturing interests in every part of the known world. Her colonial policy with America was to prevent the establishment of any new industries on the American continent, and to destroy those which had found a foothold.

The industry and the energy of this country under her colonial system were made to feed and increase her home manufactures. That illiberal and hostile policy which the mother country displayed to the colonies in our early history has been steadfastly pursued by her from that day to this. Whatever advancement has been made by American manufacturers has been over the protest and in spite of the piratical rivalry of that great manufacturing country. The sentiment on this question that has always prevailed in England was voiced by Lord Brougham in 1816, in a remarkable speech relating to the financial and industrial condition of England, in which he recommended to British manufacturers to export and sell their products in this country at a loss, holding that it was well worth while to incur a loss upon first exportations, in order by the glut to stifle those rising manufactories in the United States; stating that after this was done the British manufacturers could put their prices back where they could make a profit that would not only recompense them for the sacrifices made in destroying American manufactories, but would yield them a handsome profit besides.

This advice of this great statesman has been adopted by English manufacturers again and again during the last seventy years. There is scarcely a successful industry which is now amply and fully protected under existing law that has not felt the crushing effect of that policy under previous inadequate import duties; but in every instance where Congress has given the American producers a duty which would be sufficient to protect and encourage the industry, it has not only been successfully carried on, but has furnished the article to the American consumer at a less price than was exacted by the foreign competitor when he controlled the market.

For more than two generations English manufacturers and English importers have taken almost as lively an interest in our Presidential campaigns as the citizens themselves; and ever since the organization of the Republican party the English Government, regardless of political divisions at home, have been united in their opposition to the policy of the Republican party and to its political success. The reason is plain. The Republican party has advocated what Henry Clay so eloquently styled the American policy, while during this period the Democratic party has advocated a policy of free trade that found its ablest advocates and most fertile disseminators of that particular faith among English capitalists and English statesmen. The so-called Walker tariff of 1846 was framed on lines and political ideas congenial to the English mind; and it is said that the report of Secretary Walker, which treats upon this subject, received the unprecedented recognition of a republication in England by authority of the British Parliament.

During the campaign which resulted in the election of Mr. Polk as President over the protectionist, Henry Clay, the London Times said:

A subscription was recently opened to raise funds to circulate free trade tracts in foreign countries; about £440,000 were subscribed. Some of these tracts are to be printed in New York for circulation in the United States.

At this time it was published in Niles that at Manchester £100,000 was raised for the same purpose; and the same publication charges:

It has never been denied that most of the money thus raised was used to elect Polk, with the expectation or understanding that the tariff of 1842 would be radically modified in the direction of free trade.

Whether there was an understanding or not, it is a little remarkable that, immediately after the election of Polk as President, the Walker law of 1846 was formulated and passed by Congress, and was received with every mark of approval in England. English newspapers and English manufacturers have denounced every protective tariff measure that has been fathered and passed by the Republican party from the Morrill bill to the McKinley law. The Cobden Club, a famous free-trade organization, has increased its membership by establishing headquarters in New York, and many of the leading statesmen in the Democratic party to-day are members of this free-trade organization. The present Secretary of the Treasury is one of its shining lights. Its avowed object and purpose is to commit this Government to the doctrines of free trade.

When the McKinley bill was presented to the House of Representatives and was under discussion, the most virulent and scandalous criticisms and opposition were found in the English press and in utterances of English statesmen. No Democratic member in this House, in the discussion of that great measure, ever indulged in harsher language in the denunciation of it than can be found in the great English journals of that day. The election of President Cleveland and the restoration of the Democratic party to power, with full control of both Houses of Congress, after more than a generation, has been accepted by the people of Great Britain as a triumph of the free-trade doctrine, and ever since the preparation of this bill was commenced by the Committee on Ways and Means, foreign importers and foreign manufacturers have been maturing their plans to again take possession of the American markets.

The publication of the President's message in London before it was given out to the American people is in harmony with the present order of things and of the position of this great Democratic party. The Republican party is an American party. It believes in advancing the interests of the American citizen over that of the foreigner; it believes in protecting the wages of the American laborer over that of his foreign competitor; it believes that the American manufacturer has some claims upon the American Government that are not possessed by those in any foreign country, and it believes that the interests of all classes and shades of people in this country will be best subserved by holding the American market for the benefit of American laborers, American farmers, and American manufacturers. Holding these views, as we do, it is not strange that the principles of our party are not popular in Great Britain. It is not remarkable in view of all this that the Democratic party finds as strong support in England as they do in America; and defeat for them is felt as keenly abroad as it is by their own leaders here.

The recent election in the States of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Iowa indicate that the people of this country are beginning to realize that their interests are jeopardized by the success of the Democratic party in 1892. This generation has grown up under Republican administration and protective laws. They know nothing by experience of free trade or Democratic ascendency. It is true that history teaches that the best interests of this country are protected and subserved by maintaining adequate tariff laws; but so persistent have been the advocates of free trade, and so emphatic have been the denunciations by the Democrats of the Republican party and Republican measures, that many honest and true citizens believed that a change in the Administration would be followed by additional prosperity to the people and better times in all classes and grades of business.

Republicans in the campaign of 1892 pointed out again and again the evil results that would inevitably follow an overwhelming Democratic victory; but it seems that an object lesson was necessary to demonstrate fully and completely the inability of the Democratic party to govern and control a country composed of 67,000,000 people, and to prove that their industrial and economical policy was one which inured to the benefit of our great commercial rival, England, and to the detriment of our own people.

The fallacy that a properly graduated tariff law increases the price of the products manufactured in this country to the consumer, has been so often exposed that it seems almost useless to discuss it here, and I would not were it not for the fact that, both in the report of the committee and in the discussion that has been so far had upon this great measure, the contention is made that the import duty is added to the foreign price when the consumer purchases the imported article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that he have permission to continue his remarks without limit in the morning

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I now ask that the committee rise, as it is near the time fixed by the special order for taking a recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee must rise now, and go into the House.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4864, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I desire to state, Mr. Speaker, in justice to myself, that on yesterday the Chair stated, in connection with the action of the House towards certain members who had been temporarily absent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CORNISH] had requested the Chair to present an application for a leave of absence until Monday, which had escaped the memory of the Chair, and that it was not the fault of the gentleman from New Jersey but the fault of the Chair. On that statement the gentleman from New Jersey was not published as a delinquent. Also in regard to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN]. He said:

I simply wish to state that I have seen it in several newspapers that I was one of the delinquents. I was absent with the leave of the House in the first place, and I was at home, detained by sickness in my family.

The Chair stated in response to this that it appeared from the Journal the gentleman from Mississippi had leave of absence on account of sickness in his family, but in making up the list of absentees that fact was overlooked. The Speaker further stated that that being the fact, the gentleman's name would not be included in the list of delinquents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in justice to myself, let me state that I had the advantage of both of these instances, and yet my name was published as a delinquent. I wish to call the attention of the House to this injustice that seems to have been done to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina had leave of absence, as he has stated: but all leaves of absence were revoked by order of the House. The gentleman from South Carolina had pending on the desk another application for leave of absence, which escaped the attention of the Chair.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. That is the fact, Mr. Speaker, that I desired to have stated.

The SPEAKER. That is correct; it escaped the attention of the Chair.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. And that oversight caused me to be published as a delinquent.

The SPEAKER. The facts of the case are that the gentleman was not here, but some request was placed upon the desk, and it would have been submitted to the House, but by some oversight it was not submitted.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. That was what I desired to call the attention of the House to, Mr. Speaker, simply that this justice might be done to me.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will preside at the evening session.

The hour of 5 o'clock and 30 minutes having now arrived, the Chair declares the House in recess until 8 o'clock p. m., the evening session to be devoted exclusively to debate on the pending bill.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by Mr. BROOKSHIRE as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is now in session for the purpose of debate only on the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole under the special order for the purpose of considering this bill.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, in a message which the President sent to Congress in December, 1885, he said that "The zealous watchfulness of our constituents, great and small, supplements their suffrages, and before the tribunals they establish every public servant should be judged."

With a unanimity not often to be found among the constituents of a Representative, the people of the Nineteenth Congressional district of New York, which I have the honor to represent here, have taken a stand in regard to the bill now before the House, which will constitute the principle of the tribunal by which I, who am their public servant, shall be judged.

It is for me a source of infinite regret that, at a time when the interests of so great a constituency are in such jeopardy as they are placed in by the provisions of this bill, when the populations of the many surrounding towns and villages and the large farming district which are dependent upon it for their prosperity are watching with so much anxiety the conduct of their Representative in Congress, they have not upon the floor of this House at this crisis an advocate of more ability and experience. Fortunately for me, they have marked out the course which I should pursue, and fortunately, too, the course which they have thus marked out for me is one which meets with my heartiest approval, and which it is my pleasure as well as my duty to follow.

I have before me a memorial to this illustrious body, signed by 69,819 persons, 50,465 of whom are inhabitants of the city of Troy and vicinity, and which I shall present to the House tomorrow. I ask the Clerk to read said memorial.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The people of Troy, without regard to party affiliations, in mass meeting assembled, do respectfully petition your honorable body and represent as follows: That this city and the surrounding country is the center of the great collar, cuff, and shirt making industries of the United States. The capital invested in Troy alone in these industries is $5,000,000; employment is here given to upwards of 15,000 persons, to whom more than $4,000,000 in wages is annually paid This money finds its way into all the channels of trade and its effect is beneficially felt by every interest in the community. Fully 90 per cent of the employés are women, and the work is done by them not only in the factories but at their homes, both in the city and the farming districts. The busy and prosperous communities which occupy this valley, the large number of individual property-owners and the thrifty and skilful body of artisans who have made their homes here, and who are sources of strength to the State in times of peace as well as war, are all powerful witnesses to the value and importance of these industries and are entitled to the favorable consideration of the National Legislature.

Indeed, the continued growth and prosperity of this city and the neighboring villages is absolutely dependent upon the success of these industries and the payment of fair wages to the employés. The recent census shows that the manufacture of shirts is carried on in 113 cities of the country, with a capital invested of more than $12,000,000 and an annual product of nearly $30,000,000. Labor is the chief item in these manufactures, being 60 per cent of the cost of production. Under the existing law the duties levied on foreign goods are 40 per cent ad valorem, and 30 cents per dozen on collars and cuffs made wholly or in part of linen, 35 per cent ad valorem and 15 cents per dozen on cotton collars and cuffs, 55 per cent ad valorem on shirts, and 35 per cent on shirting linens. By the Wilson bill it is proposed to entirely abolish the specific duties and to reduce the ad valorem rates to 35 per cent on collars, cuffs, and shirts, while nothing like a corresponding reduction is made in the duties on the raw materials of the manufactured product, linen being reduced from 35 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

As to collars and cuffs these rates are less than the ad valorem rates which existed prior to the passage of the tariff law of 1890. It will be impossible to meet foreign competition with these rates of duties. A vast disproportion exists in the wages paid to employés in these industries in this country and those paid abroad; the average weekly wages being $3 in Scotland, $2.70 in France, $2.70 in Londonderry, $2.40 in Berlin, and $1.50 in Saxony, while it is $8 in Troy. The reductions in the present rates will result in the taking of wages from the home-workers for the benefit of foreigners and will seriously cripple, if they do not destroy, a considerable portion of the domestic manufacture. They will inevitably tend to degrade our labor to the inferior conditions that prevail in other lands. They will bring distress to thousands of homes, and idleness and want to a great body of deserving citizens, who will find it impossible to obtain employment in any other occupations where the labor of women can be fairly remunerated.

Your honorable body is undoubtedly aware of the ease with which ad valorem duties can be evaded by undervaluation. The practice, which it is conceded prevails in this respect, together with the facts already pointed out, make the proposed rates of practically no benefit to our manufacturers or wage-earners.

The present tariff has not raised the prices of these articles to consumers, nor has it created any combinations or trusts which control the business, nor has it proven to be prohibitory of all foreign competition; but, on the contrary, the domestic competition is greater than ever it was before, while the prices to the consumers have been reduced. We raise our voices, then, on behalf of thousands of wage-earners whose comfortable living is threatened by the proposed reduction and of an important domestic manufacture in which our fellow-citizens have large sums of money invested, and we earnestly protest against the enactment of the Wilson bill in its present form, and respectfully ask your honorable body to modify it by continuing the rates of duties that now exist upon the importation of collars, cuffs, and shirts.

Mr. HAINES. This memorial was adopted on Tuesday evening, December 19, at a meeting held in the city of Troy to protest against the provisions of this bill. The meeting was presided over by the Democratic mayor of the city and addressed by several of the principal Democratic officers of the city of Troy and the county of Rensselaer, and it was approved by the press of the two counties which constitute the Nineteenth Congressional district, without regard to party affiliations.

The principle upon which my constituents contend against this bill has been stated for them and for me by a President whom we have twice assisted in placing at the head of the Executive Department of the Government.

Justice and fairness dictate—

Said he in one of his messages—

that in any modification of our present laws relating to revenue, the industries and interests which have been encouraged by such laws, and in which our citizens have large investments, should not be ruthlessly injured or destroyed. We should also deal with the subject in such a manner as to protect the interests of American labor, which is the capital of our workingmen.

Another principle by which we should be guided in the consideration of this question, and by which I shall be guided in the stand I take on this bill, has been stated by one of the most eminent and influential Democrats in the country:

That the tariff on manufactured articles should, as a general rule, be larger where similar articles are manufactured in this country than where they are not. That the tariff imposed upon all manufactured articles (other than those which, for good reasons, are placed on the free list) should equal the difference between the rate of wages paid in this and foreign countries, so far as labor enters into the cost of their production.

So far as concerns the interests which I have the honor to represent, these principles have been totally ignored by the framers of the bill before the House. The opposition of my constituents to the bill is not the opposition "that rallies behind the intolerance of monopoly or the power of concentrated wealth, or the inertia of fixed habits," or the alleged "honest errors of a generation of false teachers." We oppose the bill for the reason that, while its designers were "forced to consider," they did not consider in framing it, so far as my constituents are concerned, "that great interests do exist, whose existence and prosperity it is no part of our reform either to imperil or to curtail."

The framers of the bill themselves lay down a principle by which they claim to have been governed, and which, so far as the industries of my district are concerned, they altogether abandon, that "in adjusting duties upon what may be called the finished products we have tried to impose such rates as will not destroy or distress any of our own industries on the one hand, nor on the other secure to them absolute and oppressive monopoly of the whole market." If this rule had been strictly adhered to by the framers of this bill in considering the shirt, collar, and cuff industry the tariff now existing would not be disturbed; and that industry has not "an absolute and oppressive monopoly of the whole market;" while the change proposed by this bill in the existing tariff will not only distress but will go far to destroy the great industry upon which the prosperity of my district largely depends.

I will take the principle approved by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, attributed by them in their report to the late President Garfield, that—

Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy the monopoly of the trade, and regulate the prices as they please.

The population of the city of Troy is 70,000. From 15 per cent to 20 per cent of this population is directly interested in the collar and cuff industry. The city of Troy has $5,000,000 of capital invested in that enterprise. The annual sales of those products amount to nearly $10,000,000. The annual wages paid amount to $4,300,000. There are 15,749 persons employed, the wages paid to whom amount to 44½ per cent of the sales and 60 per cent of the cost.

In 113 cities of the United States the amount of capital invested in the shirt industry is $12,151,900, and the value of the product is nearly $30,000,000. There are 26,560 persons employed in the shirt industry alone; and of this number 8,713 are engaged in that business in the city of Troy.

Ninety per cent of the persons employed in these industries in Troy are women. No other industry in the State of New York gives employment to so large a proportion of women. This industry gives them employment not only in the factories, but in their homes. About one-half the work is done in the factories; the rest is done in homes throughout the city and in the farming districts for many miles around. These industries are the principal source of income for families representing 50,000 persons in and around the city of Troy. They are the only source of ready-money income of the wives and daughters of the farmers in a wide extent of territory around that city.

The tariff of 1883 gave no recognition to these industries and practically no protection. In 1886 the factories ceased producing for some time, owing to a strike, and the foreign manufacturers of collars, cuffs, and shirts, taking advantage of the condition of the market here due to the cessation of work in Troy, sent over a considerable quantity of their products, the importation of which from that time to this has steadily increased.

It is important to bear in mind in connection with these importations that the foreign manufacturers are represented in this country by agents and sell directly to the consumer.

The advent of these products of the foreign manufacturers threatened to cripple the collar and shirt industry of this country, and made a substantial measure of protection necessary to preserve it. This protection was afforded by the "customs laws of 1890." This protection did not exclude foreign goods, while it saved the principal industry of the city of Troy. The German goods especially were constantly growing in demand. For a few years after 1886 the shelves of the retail dealers were filled with them and, as I shall show later on, they would ultimately have driven the domestic article from the market if the tariff act of 1890 had not been passed. Troy had already suffered greatly from the closing and removal of various industries in which, for twenty years prior to 1890, a large part of its population had been engaged. Machine shops, iron and steel industries, woolen goods, door, sash, and blind factories, and upwards of thirty-seven concerns engaged in the manufacture of collars, bosoms, and shirts have gone out of business, and for the few years between 1886 and 1890 it looked as if the last important industry remaining to Troy was about to disappear.

The tariff on shirts provided for by the bill before the House is the same as it was before 1890, when this condition of things existed; and on collars, it proposes 5 per cent less than was levied prior to 1890.

The passage of the law of 1890, to which I have referred, did not increase the price of collars and shirts, and did not increase the profits of the manufacturers, as will appear later. Nor did the law of 1890 decrease importations, as the customs reports show that the importation of shirts increased 112 per cent in 1892 over 1891, and during the same period the importation of collars and cuffs increased 95 per cent.

I have said that the prices of these goods did not increase after the passage of the laws of 1890, known as the McKinley bill, and that that law was not prohibitive. Under the tariff laws of 1883 the duty on collars and cuffs was 40 per cent. Business increased under that tariff until the foreign competition to which I have referred and which commenced in 1886. The bill before the House reduces the tariff on linen collars 5 per cent; so that there is 5 per cent less protection to these industries than under the laws of 1883, although under the laws of 1883 the importations largely increased from 1886 to 1890, and, as I have stated, had not the tariff been materially increased in that year the domestic trade would have been ruined.

These questions as to whether the McKinley bill prohibited importation increased the price to consumers and the profits of the manufacturers were discussed before the Committee on Ways and Means, before which the foreign and the home manufacturers had a hearing; and it resulted from this hearing that the statements, the ideas, and the propositions of the foreign manufacturers were accepted to the letter by the majority of the committee, and the testimony of the home manufacturers and their claims have been totally ignored. The bill before the House embodies the ideas of the foreign manufacturers.

The position which the foreign manufacturers thought would be fair to them, and which they stated, the very duty which they proposed has been embodied in the bill; and it would appear that the representations of the home manufacturers were regarded as utterly without foundation, their position untenable, the great interests they represented and the vast amount and the character of the labor they employed entitled to no consideration whatever.

Permit me to say here that this is not a protest on my part in behalf of capitalists. My principal concern is for the labor engaged in these industries, which is the principal factor in shirt and collar making. This labor is nearly altogether performed by women, for whom the proposed change in the tariff laws means loss of work, reduction of wages, destitution, degradation.

At the hearing before the committee the foreign manufacturers were represented by an importer in the city of New York, a gentleman named Rosenfeld, who read a statement before the committee in which he stated that he believed "that justice to the consumer as well as to the manufacturer may be secured by the reduction of the rate of duty in the proposed new tariff bill on linen cloth of, say, from 35 to 25 per cent, and fixing the rate of duty on the finished articles at 35 per cent." These propositions were practically adopted by the committee. They make the duty upon linen cloth 30 per cent, and they fix the rate of duty on the finished article at the figure suggested by the foreign importer.

It is worth while considering, from some of the statements that this gentleman made in his testimony, what degree of credit he is entitled to, as at his suggestion the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States propose to cripple a great industry and impoverish 50,000 of my constituents. In his written statement he replies to the committee as follows:

I am not controlled by selfish interests wholly, because under the tariff act of 1890 my importations have not been diminished.

Why, therefore, not being controlled by selfish interests in the matter which he represented, he should have imposed upon the committee the grossest misrepresentations in regard to the

most material questions, is not comprehensible to the disingenuous mind. He stated that the home concerns combined to form trusts and keep up prices; that they made from 75 to 100 per cent in Troy, and that he thought a man in business ought to make no more than 35 per cent. He said the importer of the foreign articles makes 30 per cent, and he wants to make 37½ per cent.

It was shown by the affidavits of the leading manufacturers of Troy:

That the collar and cuff business is localized in the hands of about thirty manufacturing concerns, among whom there are no combinations or trusts, but, on the contrary, a sharp and spirited rivalry and competition exists, compelling the offering of the productions at the lowest prices at which they can be made.

So that Mr. Rosenfeld's representation to the committee in regard to this alleged trust did not have the slightest foundation in fact; and Mr. Rosenfeld, being engaged in the business, must necessarily have known it.

It was shown before the committee by the representatives of the home manufacturers that instead of 75 and 100 per cent profit, as stated by Mr. Rosenfeld, the manufacturers received no more than from 2 to 7½ per cent, except in some extreme styles, where the profits reach as high as 12½ per cent. In some instances, on collars, it was shown that the profit was only 2 per cent. It was shown that a certain popular German shirt, which now sells for $13.50 a dozen less 6 per cent, gives a profit to the German importer of 26 per cent on his selling price, or 35 per cent on his cost price, and that under the proposed bill before the House the importer could sell the same shirt for $10.80 a dozen and make the same profit. To produce this shirt at their factories would cost the Troy manufacturers $10.34; to manfacture the same shirt in Germany costs only $5.76. Under the McKinley bill, the duty on such a shirt, at 55 per cent, amounts to $3.17, and with 6 per cent freight, 34 cents, leaves the net cost delivered in New York, $9.27; and as the shirt sells at $13.50 less 6 per cent, making $12.69 net, it leaves the importer a profit of 26 per cent.

Permit me to call your attention once more to the fact that these shirts are sold directly to the consumer by the German manufacturer through his agent at the port of entry.

Under the bill before the House the same shirt that cost in Germany $5.76, 35 per cent duty; $1.91, 6 per cent; freight, 34 cents; total cost delivered at the port of entry, $8.01, being sold for $10.80, leaves a net profit of 26 per cent. After the payment of the duty and freight, aggregating 41 per cent of the cost in Germany, these shirts, in the store of the importer in the city of New York, represent a cost of $2.33 less per dozen than the same goods can be manufactured for by the manufacturers in the city of Troy.

It was shown before the committee that a collar manufactured in Germany, which can be sold in the city of New York at 77 cents a dozen, less 6 per cent, would cost to manufacture in the city of Troy 81 cents a dozen.

It was shown that a collar manufactured in Berlin, which, under the present tariff, after the payment of duty and freight, sells in the city of New York for $1.98 a dozen wholesale, sells at retail at 25 cents, or more than one-third of the cost in the hands of the importer in New York.

It was shown that collars manufactured in the city of Troy, which Mr. Rosenfeld represented as being sold for 75 per cent profit, were sold by the manufacturer at 5½ per cent profit, and that a German collar, which it costs to land in New York duty and freight paid, $1.69 a dozen net, costs $1.33 to manufacture in Troy in material and labor alone.

It was shown that the average profit of the home manufacturer is 6 per cent.

The home manufacturers showed that they were satisfied if they got 5 per cent profit on the greater part of the articles they manufactured. The foreign manufacturer under the present tariff gets 26 per cent, and in some instances 31 per cent profit, and he thinks he ought to get 37½ per cent. Mr. Rosenfeld, therefore, grossly misrepresented the facts to the committee in regard to the alleged trusts and combinations among the manufacturers in Troy, in regard to the cost of manufacturing their goods, and in regard to their profits.

But the most serious misrepresentation made by Mr. Rosenfeld was in regard to the wages of the German operatives engaged in the shirt, collar, and cuff industry. He stated that the wages of girls in that business in Berlin is $8 a week. During the sessions of the committee one of the Troy manufacturers telegraphed to Germany, asking how much an operative earned a week in a German shirt factory, and the answer, which came from Billefeld, Germany, was: "Here, from 6 to 15 marks per week; United States currency, $1.44 to $3.60 per week." And in reply to a similar question telegraphed to Glasgow, the answer was: "Average in Glasgow, 12 shillings and 6 pence per week for cutters and machinists," which would be $3 per week. It was shown by one of the representatives of the home manufacturers that in Germany a forewoman gets $3 a week, and here a forewoman gets $12 and $14 a week; and one firm was shown to pay more than that.

This bill proposes a reduction on linen used in the manufacture of shirts and collars at 5 per cent. The ratio of protection afforded to shirts and collars, by reason of this reduction, is thirty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent on shirts, and three-fourths of 1 per cent on collars and cuffs. The ratio of value of the linen in a shirt to the total cost of the shirt is 7 per cent; and the ratio of value of the linen in collars to the total cost is 15 per cent. So that the increased tariff on linen will but very slightly decrease the cost of production of these articles, and as the additional cost of production, apart from the cost of labor that enters into their manufacture, will remain the same, and as the profits of the manufacturers are now down to a minimum, whatever reductions there may be in the items of cost fall principally on labor; and hence it becomes important, in considering this question, to take into view the condition of the labor market in regard to these industries in the United States and in Europe.

The average wages of an operative in Berlin is $2.42 a week; in Saxony it is $1.50 a week, and in Japan $1 a week. The consular reports show that the wages of these operatives in recent years have not varied. It appears in No. 74 of Reports from the Consuls of the United States for February, 1887, at page 377, that the wages of a female operative in a factory in Germany averages $1.71 per week; the lowest is $1.61 per week, and the highest $1.87 per week; and that young girls get as low as $1.14 a week; that male adults average $3.50 a week.

The report of Consul Miller, in No. 88 of the Consular Reports for January, 1888, shows that a skillful seamstress can only earn about $3 a week; and that the greater part of the families engaged in the industries to which I have alluded can not earn sufficient wages to support themselves apart from their families. He says that among a large part of them potatoes form the principal food of the workers; that a large number eat no dinner; that in the summer they live during the week on bread and herrings or sausages, and "only eat a decent meal on Sundays." In Consular Reports No. 89 for February, 1888, page 206, it is shown that female workers in the Dresden district get from 2½ cents to 3½ cents an hour, or from $1.32 to $1.80 per week, if they work ten hours a day.

In Consular Reports, No. 117, the consul at Mannheim, in November, 1889, shows the manner in which these women live:

The lives of those toiling in these factories are like those of all other workers in German mills—whether they want little or not they get it. They prepare soft down and feathers for others, sleeping themselves on sea grass or common straw, when not on wood shavings. They live so poorly and closely huddled together that economists, urged, perhaps, by the investigation of philanthropists, are pushing upon the attention of the government the problem of building or having built better tenements for the working classes. Their food is uniformly simple, dry rye bread being its chief part. This they bring with them to the mill and eat during the "rests," the half-hour recesses at 8 to 8:30 and 4 to 4:30. The girls in the feather factories are far from healthy. I do not wonder. The dust and dirt are suffocating and disagreeable; still, all that mechanical skill and scientific research has been able to do has, perhaps, been done to ventilate such factories.

I say "perhaps," because I doubt whether the lives of those who toil in the dirt and dust of these mills are regarded as of sufficient importance to awaken enough interest to make a search half as thorough as a scientist would make to discover the causes of some physical disturbances around some million-mile-away planet. The heartless "Was wissen, was fühlen die Leute?" (What do the people know or feel?) on the part of the manufacturers more than justifies the governmental interference, which by all kinds of legislation paternally protective seeks to put about the persons of all parts and classes of the population safeguards against danger and securities and indemnities when injured.

The consul at Glasgow reported in February, 1890, in No. 115 of these Reports, that the highest wages paid to adult women is $3.71 a week, and the lowest $2.16. The consul-general at Berlin reported in February, 1890, that the average of the female operatives at present there get from $1.52 to $2.10 a week; and in other parts of Germany it is shown, by Consular Reports, No. 153, at page 173, that the wages of an adult female worker is from 72 cents to $3.60 a week.

The wages of a female operative in Troy would have to be reduced 60 per cent, if the bill before the House goes into effect, to enable the manufacturer in Troy to compete with the manufacturer in Berlin.

A week's wages in Berlin is $2.40 on the average, which, with 35 per cent duty added, 84 cents, makes $3.24. For the same labor a female operative in Troy earns from $7 to $8, which is the average wages paid there.

The dread of this tariff reduction has already within the past year caused a loss of $2,000,000 of wages to the workers employed in the shirt and collar industry of Troy. The wages have remained the same, but as Troy operatives are paid largely by the piece, reduction in the volume of the products of the factories have reduced the amount paid to the employés, so that the volume of wages paid the operatives now, compared with that of a year ago, shows a decrease of 50 per cent.

The bill before the House affords no protection to the workers, as these articles are protected only so far as the rate on the article exceeds the rate on the base of supply. When the rate under this bill on linen cloth is 30 per cent and on cotton cloth suitable for collars 40 per cent, an average of 35 per cent, and the rate on manufactured collars is 35 per cent, it follows that the bill affords no protection.

Hence, I think it has fairly been shown that so far as these industries are concerned the principle enunciated in the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, that "duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product," has been abandoned in the bill before the House. The duties under the tariff laws of 1890 have not been so high as to enable the manufacturers to drive out the foreign article, as I have shown that the importation of the foreign article has increased since 1890; and hence, the home manufacturers do not enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and do not regulate prices as they please.

If the foreign manufacturer would sell his goods at the same profit with which the home manufacturer is content the foreign product might be sold in this country, under existing laws, very much cheaper than it has been sold since 1890. Thus the "measure of protection," which, according to the committee, "should extend only so far as to create competition," is the measure of protection, in regard to these industries, which has existed since 1890, and the result of the bill before the House will be to deprive these industries of the measure of protection which has created competition and give a monopoly to the foreign manufacturer.

The American female operatives can not live upon the wages which the home manufacturers could afford to pay them, if this bill goes into effect. Their habits of life are fixed; they do not live in luxury, but they lead a comfortable existence; the wages that are paid to them enable them to live in decency and comfort, to dress respectably, to procure wholesome food, to live in comfortable dwellings and amid comfortable surroundings. To deprive them of the protection which the present tariff laws afford them will result in changing all of the present conditions under which they live, and will leave a great number of them without any occupation at all. Nor can it be said that they can find employment in other walks of life. They can not find employment in other manufacturing centers in the East.

The manufacturers of the East are not increasing. The utmost they can do is to maintain the business they have already established. The disruption of all kinds of domestic and business relations, by throwing out of employment such vast numbers of persons as will result from the passage of this bill, will cause a general unsettling of the condition of things in all walks of life in great manufacturing centers like the city of Troy, and the discontented elements of society will be increased by a large number of persons who have heretofore exercised the most healthful influence in favor of order and good government.

These employés are, or may be under existing laws, in good circumstances; they are fairly well educated; they are intelligent; they are contented, or have every reason to be contented, with their condition; they receive steady employment. If they are deprived of the protection which confers these benefits upon them, they will be reduced to the condition, and physically, mentally, and morally will soon descend to the level, of the unfortunate workers in Germany, whose unhappy condition is a never-failing source of comment on the part of the consuls in Europe.

Some philanthropists and politicians have claimed that the remedy for the effects of a low tariff would be found if the manufacturers would share with their employés more liberally the wealth which they are alleged to accumulate with the aid of labor. I think it was sufficiently shown before the Ways and Means Committee that the manufacturers of Troy have not accumulated and can not, from the small profits which they make on their products, accumulate any great amount of wealth.

While I do not undertake the defense of the manufacturers, I must say, from a personal inquiry into the matter, that very few of them within the last twenty-five years have been enabled to make more than a fair competence, as the result of more than a quarter of a century of hard work and great risk of capital, and that the severe competition to which they are subjected in these days even among the manufacturers of our own country, has resulted in the small profits to which I have alluded and in forcing a great many concerns to go out of business, whose places have not been filled up by new industries. The time when a manufacturer might commence upon a small capital and gradually increase his business in extent from profits has long since passed away, and only copartnerships or corporations with large capital can now expect to operate with any degree of success.

The opposition, therefore, to this measure does not come principally from the manufacturers, but from the workers. The workers will be the first to suffer; and it will be difficult if not impossible for them to obtain employment in other fields of industry. The greatest destitution, followed by the usual labor troubles which bring so much disgrace to our form of government, will inevitably result.

I do not think that politics ought to enter into the discussion of a question like this. For my part I am here to take the position which I occupy on this question without any regard to the political result to myself. At the same time I have no hesitation in saying that I believe if this bill is passed I shall be the last Democratic Representative who will appear in this House from the Nineteenth Congressional district of New York.

If this bill is passed there will be an influx of foreign-made collars and shirts at such prices as will entirely displace the American-made product, a condition of things which will inevitably continue until the home manufacturer shall be enabled to meet the competition by forcing their employés to descend to the condition of the workers of Europe and Japan. The foreign-made goods will come from Austria, from England, from France, from Saxony, and from Japan.

An immense influx of cheap goods will come from Saxony, where the labor engaged in this industry can be had for $1.70 a week. They will come from France, which to-day has the largest shirt factory in the world, employing 6,000 hands. They will come from Berlin and from Glasgow, where the most skillful workers in the world can be had for $2 and $3 a week. They will come from Japan, where collars of the most finished design and workmanship are made at an expense for labor of $1 a week. They will come from Austria, the collars and cuffs of which are already sold in and fill the markets of all the countries of America except the United States. That country had one of the most splendid exhibits at the World's Fair at Chicago, although they have never sought the trade of the United States; and a vast quantity of the goods of that country, made at a minimum cost of labor impossible of attainment here, will flood our markets if the bill before the House should be passed in its present form.

Nor is it Troy alone that will be affected by this result. The United States census reports show that shirts are manufactured in fifty-eight towns and cities in the United States, and that there are 776 firms engaged in the business, besides a vast number of small retail dealers, who will be proportionately affected. The census reports show that the shirt factories in the United States manufacture goods to the extent of more than $28,000,000 a year and give employment to nearly 27,000 persons.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will allow me an interruption.

Mr. HAINES. Certainly.

Mr. HARTMAN. There are some of us who are anxious for a little further information. We are anxious to know whether that document before you, which looks like a book, is an infernal machine, a Democratic bible, or simply a record of the sins and transgressions of the Democratic party. Will you kindly inform us? [Laughter.]

Mr. HAINES. If the gentleman will come close enough, he is at liberty, in a few moments, to open up the book and examine it, and he will find that in it are protests secured, irrespective of party, from my constituents to the number of between fifty and fifty-one thousand.

Mr. HARTMAN. And not secured under duress?

Mr. HAINES. Decidedly not. If any one can compel the mayor of the city of Troy, N. Y., the Democratic board of aldermen, and the Democratic board of supervisors of Rensselaer County, and every Democratic officeholder of Troy, a city of 70,000 population, and which in November last, in spite of the Republican cyclone, gave 6,000 Democratic majority—I say, if these people can be compelled, there might be some ground for such an allegation.

Mr. SIMPSON. For further information I should like to ask the gentleman if that petition is altogether from the people who make collars and shirts, or from the people who wear shirts and collars? [Laughter.]

Mr. HAINES. Both. The manufacturers, too, have offered a separate petition which will be properly placed before the committee.

Mr. HARTMAN. Does that include the people that wear socks also? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. HAINES. It includes 16,000 people employed in making the collars and cuffs, which gives them remunerative employment at better wages and better living than is received in the same business in any other part of the world. This is their protest against being reduced to the condition of foreign pauper labor.

Mr. SIMPSON. It strikes me that this petition comes from one district alone in the United States, and as there are three hundred and fifty or more other districts where it is presumed that people wear shirts and collars, and some of them socks

[laughter], that the interests of those that wear shirts and collars are greater in the aggregate than those who make them, and if those who wear the shirts and collars should send up a petition, why I apprehend this petition would not be in it a little bit. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAINES. I fully agree with you; but I ask you who wear our collars and cuffs—and we make 95 per cent of all that are made in the United States—if there is a disposition on your part to throw out sixteen thousand laborers in my district, 90 per cent of whom are women, simply to save 1 cent on a collar, and that not against local competition, but to favor the foreigner? [Applause.]

I am convinced that, if this question was thoroughly understood, there is not an honest, loyal Representative on this floor, whether Democrat or Republican who sits here, who would permit this bill to pass until we receive in protection the amount that measures the difference between the wages of foreign countries and those we pay in this country.

Mr. BRYAN. May I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. HAINES. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. I was not permitted to hear the first part of your remarks, because I did not know you were going to speak, or I would have been here.

Mr. HAINES. Thank you.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to ask you what is the difference in cost—what protection do you ask?

Mr. HAINES. We ask the protection afforded by the McKinley bill, which, in this instance, is absolutely necessary. [Applause on the Republican side.] As I have said previously, I am not here in the interest of the manufacturers of Troy, but over 50,000 people living in one county in my district have asked me to represent them here in the manner that I am attempting to do to-night. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I want to ask him if the protection asked for by the operatives and manufacturers of Troy is as large a per cent as the protection given by this bill to the rice-producers of the Carolinas?

Mr. HAINES. In answer to that I will say that I have not the slightest idea what protection is to be given to the rice-producers, and I have not the slightest conception as to what protection is necessary to the rice-producers; but I know the necessity of protection, and the necessity for all I ask, for the people of the Nineteenth district of New York.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me ask you, if we change the bill in the House here so as to give you the protection that you now have under the McKinley bill, would you be satisfied with the bill and help to pass it?

Mr. HAINES. Undoubtedly, if my district was taken care of.

Mr. HARTMAN. If protection to the collar and cuff industry is a desirable thing, do not you think you could shy your castor into the ring and help the boys who are trying to get protection on wool and lead a little bit also, for the purpose of preventing the throwing out of employment of thousands and tens of thousands of men engaged in those industries? If it is a good thing for you, is it not it a pretty good thing for us also?

Mr. HAINES. I believe that if you, representing that interest, can demonstrate to this Democratic House that there is need and necessity for such protection, this Democratic House will give it to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be allowed five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. The claim that this foreign competition will result in making these goods cheaper to the consumer can be shown by experience and the natural course of trade to be unfounded. The domestic competition, even under protection, has kept prices at the lowest possible point, and the evidence before the Ways and Means Committee showed that the foreign manufacturers maintained their high prices, notwithstanding the excessive profits they made upon their goods. The rivalry among the domestic manufacturers is so great that they sell these goods at prices as low as the prices for which the same goods are sold in Europe. They make smaller profits than the European manufacturers, but they pay higher wages. The foreigner will continue to sell at the same prices, and will make regular profits.

There has been no diminution of the profits of the importer since the passage of the tariff laws of 1890. He sells directly to the consumer, as I have already stated, and he can invoice his goods, under custom-house rules, at cost, plus 10 per cent, instead of at the selling price in the country from which he exports; and this rule he frequently evades by undervaluation.

The Mr. Rosenfeld who was the mouthpiece of the importers before the committee admitted that after the passage of the tariff bill of 1890 he only raised his price 5 cents per dozen, while the duty was increased 30 cents per dozen and 5 per cent; so that either he made an exorbitant profit on his goods before the tariff act of 1890 became a law, or he now undervalues his goods and thus evades payment of part of the present duty.

The only other person who will be benefited by this bill is the dealer. The bill provides for a reduction of 3 cents apiece on collars, and 15 cents each on shirts, which will be added to the profits of the dealers. As these articles are sold under regular brands and at standard and fixed prices, according to the value, ranging for instance, at 3 collars for 25 cents, or 10 cents each; or 2 collars for 25 cents, or 15 cents each; or 3 collars for 50 cents, or 20 cents each; or at popular prices of 10, 15, and 25 cents, respectively, the dealer will continue to sell at these customary prices and be the only person besides the foreign manufacturer who will benefit by the reduction.

The home trade and the workers will further suffer a loss, if this bill is passed, by the restriction of the business of the home manufacturers. The sale of these goods has a limit, and by restricting the market of the home manufacturer, which will result in effect from the influx of foreign goods, if this bill is passed, the quantity of labor employed will consequently be greatly reduced. If the market is divided with the foreign manufacturer the amount of labor now employed in the home product will necessarily be proportionately reduced. This will be unfair to home labor for this reason, if no other, that the market was created by home labor.

Detached collars and cuffs first came into vogue in the United States, and were introduced by the manufacturers of Troy. Collars and cuffs not attached to the shirt were unknown as an article of commerce in Europe until recent years. They were first manufactured for the trade in the city of Troy, and it is only in recent years that the European manufacturers entered into the business of making and exporting them.

It follows, therefore, that if the present bill is passed the American manufacturers engaged in the collar and shirt business will have to succumb to foreign competition. The bill before the House, as I have said again and again, affords no protection.

I do not deem it necessary to discuss the arguments which have been brought forward on both sides for and against the system of ad valorem duties. The most eminent Democrats as well as the most eminent Republicans during the past twenty years, and some of the most eminent statesmen of the country, have raised their voices against the system of ad valorem duties. The manufacturers of the country have no faith in it. Its principal advocates have always been found among the agents of the importers or among the importers themselves. It has been shown again and again, from every experience and from indisputable facts, that under that system the greatest frauds have at all times been perpetrated against the Government. The system is discredited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAINES. I trust that the House will indulge me for a moment longer so that I may be enabled to appeal to the House that this bill should not pass, or that it should be modified, at least, so far as concerns the industries for which I speak, so as to leave the tariff existing as framed under the laws of 1890. I make this appeal in the name and at the request of more than 70,000 of the inhabitants of my own Congressional district. I make it in the name of 50,000 persons in that district who will be immediately and disastrously affected by the bill. I make it in behalf of many thousands of families in and around the city of Troy. And in making it I am supported by the Democratic platforms of all the national conventions that have been held during the last twenty years. [Great applause in House and galleries.]

Mr. WOOMER. Mr. Chairman, if the question before us were not one of extraordinary importance I should cheerfully refrain from attempting to add anything to the full exposition it has received, and content myself with casting my vote in accordance with the demands of the country and my constituency. But the matter now under consideration is one of such vital interest to my native State, and to the district which elected me a member of this body, that I am unwilling to forego the right to add my protest to the many warnings that Congress has already received. The State of Pennsylvania has a right to require that her representatives in the National Legislature maintain that consistent and unfaltering attitude which has been hers from the very beginning of the protective controversy.

Much of the prosperity of that State is due to the wise and beneficent legislation of the past, much of it depends upon the continuance of that legislation in the future. It is little wonder, then, that now when her prosperity is attacked, when it is flung into her teeth that the tariff is to be reformed and that it will not be reformed in the interests of Pennsylvania, she could de-

clare, as she now does, that no such radical alteration as is proposed shall be made but in defiance of her solemn protest.

But, sir, I am not to be understood as representing the great manufacturing State of Pennsylvania as a suppliant begging for your charity to assist her to maintain a position that does not rightfully belong to her. The Representatives of the Keystone State do not come before you in any such pitiable condition; they base their right to advise and warn you upon their experience with the system you propose to destroy, and they have a right to be heard, because the history of their State records the advantages of that system and the dangers of its overthrow.

What protection has done for Pennsylvania it has also done for many other Commonwealths of this Union, and will do for such as have not already felt its strengthening aid, in the near future; and we ask you carefully to heed the lesson our experience teaches before you withdraw the protection of the Government from the great partially developed resources of the nation at the time that their need of it is most pressing. We freely admit that it is to the advantage of Pennsylvania to have the present degree of protection continued, but we deny that this makes out the charge of sectionalism that has been hurled at us, for we are convinced that the interests of our State and those of the nation are identical; that it is a patriotic thing to legislate for the national prosperity, and that no better rule exists for discovering what the national interest really is than by taking the sum total of the local interests of the many communities that together compose this country.

And if you, gentlemen, vote in sympathy with the true interests of the constituencies you represent, there is little danger that this question will be decided in the way the workingmen of America tremble to think it will be decided; for the wage-earners of the nation are following the progress of this bill with an anxiety that is pitiful in its intensity; they have never before seen such a tremendous blow threatened at their means of livelihood, and they are organizing as they never did before to impress upon you what this bill means to them. The representatives of the purely agricultural districts of the South, whose influence was all-powerful in framing this measure, do not know, they could hardly understand the distress that this wanton and untimely attack upon the industries of the country has produced; they can hardly conceive the sufferings which hundreds of thousands of men who earn their living in the workshop and the factory are now undergoing; they can not realize the poverty that has come into manufacturing centers with the closing of the mills and the banking of the furnaces.

It seems to me then that this issue can be decided without any reference to economic arguments. The first duty of Congress is to alleviate the almost universal distress which the fear of its probable course has caused by giving back to the workingmen the opportunity to work, to earn the wages that will give bread to them and their children. These are not the times to indulge in experiments with the system upon which our industries are founded. For more than thirty years the business interests of the country have adjusted themselves with reference to a definite, consistent policy on the part of the Government. Capital has been lavishly invested in these industries upon the assumption that the same policy was to continue; employers have regulated wages with regard to it, and by reason of its beneficial influence the American wage-earner has accustomed himself to a standard of comfortable living which none of us I think has any wish to lower.

These considerations should surely be sufficient very strongly to impress us with the danger of doing anything to disturb the basis upon which so much depends. The possibility of such a disturbance, with its far-reaching consequences, is something from which the wisest might shrink in the most prosperous times after having taken the greatest precautions; and heedlessly and deliberately to aggravate distress when the manufactures of the nation are reeling under the mere threat of the assault made upon them, when armies of unemployed men are looking wistfully toward Washington as their only hope, is worse than unstatesmanlike; it is wicked and criminal.

We are told, however, as an unanswerable reply to any criticism of this bill, that it is merely in obedience to the express command of the American people. Ever since the Presidential election in 1892 it has been dinned into our ears in the press and upon the floor of Congress that the Democratic party has been intrusted with a mission by the voters of this country to apply its peculiar ideas to the tariff question, and it has been calmly assumed that the election of the present Administration was an unqualified sanction of the radical declarations of the Chicago platform; a reference to this supposed popular indorsement has been thought sufficient to close all debate upon the question. I deny that any such mission was given by the people to the party in power, and insist that the popular verdict of 1892, whether taken by itself or in the light of subsequent events, can not be regarded as an expression of discontent with the tariff policy of the Republican party.

We all have heard the story of the Athenian citizen who voted to ostracise Aristides because he was tired of hearing him called "the just;" and it was much this same sort of feeling that led to the defeat of the Republican party in the last Presidential campaign. The people well knew that party had proved equal to every one of the great responsibilities imposed upon it; that for more than thirty years it had given to the country the greatest prosperity any nation had ever known; that it had solved problems more difficult than those any other party had ever been called upon to solve, and in the belief that their prosperity was so firmly established as to be impregnable against any assaults, they listened to the cheap promises of the Democratic party and yielded to its request for a trial. The unfortunate labor troubles of that year contributed to this result, but it was principally due to apathy and restlessness; the people voted for a change, hardly knowing why they did it.

The lack of any foundation to the notion that this Administration is authorized to convert its tariff theories into legislation is completely shown by the defeat of the party in control in last fall's election; when the voters of the United States realized that their vote had been misunderstood, their carelessness misinterpreted, they were prompt to set themselves right and declare as emphatically as they knew how what their real views on this question are. However the results of 1892 can be construed, the vote of last November can bear but one interpretation; the only national issue involved was the question of tariff reduction, and the people recorded their decision in unmistakable terms. In the deplorable condition of business to-day you have no right to go on with a measure that has been condemned in every State where an election means anything; you have no right to pass an act which the people have warned you they will never allow to become permanent.

It is not, after all, strange that a party which for a third of a century had been debarred from control of the Government should persuade itself that its return to power marked an epoch in history, and ascribe an undeserved importance to such an unexpected and unfortunate event. It is still less strange than this that the people have discovered as soon as they have that such a long freedom from responsibility has developed, as might have been foreseen, a very high degree of incompetency in the Democratic party to introduce measures of any lasting value. The pity is that the crude attempts of this inexperienced and untrained party are far from harmless, but that they fall with crushing force upon the industries which have been developed and can only be continued by adhering to the views of their opponents.

I am one of those who believe that the protective system should form a permanent part of our national policy; for while I admit that industries begun by its assistance should become independent after the period of their infancy is passed, yet in the varied industrial development of a country so rich in resources and an age so pregnant with mechanical inventions and improvements as our own, there must inevitably be at all times some new industries, or new forms of those already carried on, that stand for a time in need of protective aid, though in the future they may be successfully pursued without it. Were there nothing else in this question than this, the idea of a permanent protective duty in any single industry might be excluded, but another factor of the greatest importance enters into the question and causes us to arrive at an entirely different result.

Since the Morrill tariff marked the beginning of substantial protection there has been a steady rise in the wages paid to American labor. Wages have reached a point that permits those who receive them to enjoy a measure of comfort unknown to the workingmen of other nations; the American wage-earner is well able to provide himself with many articles that not long ago were considered luxuries in this country, and will for many years continue to rank as such in others; his children are spared from the obligation to labor at tender years, and are given an education that affords them an equal start in life with those of wealthier citizens; he enjoys shorter hours of work, and has better opportunities to improve his leisure and condition than his fellow-workman across the ocean. It is the most vital interest of the nation that this gratifying condition of things be continued, and it can be maintained in no other way than by keeping wages at their present figures.

But, with the invasion of foreign competition invited by this bill such a thing is impossible. Manufacturers will be compelled to reduce the wages of their employés to meet the cut-throat prices of foreign competitors. This bill gives to the manufacturer the alternative of dismantling his plant or of lowering the wages of his working people, and of the two evils it is hard to say which is the lesser to the workingman. That the wage-earner will be compensated for his diminished returns by

any corresponding increase in his necessary outlays is untrue. The fact that the very commodities which enter most largely into the cost of living are those to which the free-traders direct this country to devote all its powers indicates its falsity, and the statistics in the most careful examinations of the subject within my reach—the Senate report on retail prices and wages—is absolutely conclusive. It is at least beyond disproof that the higher wages are the greater is the margin for saving, and as this margin is not expended but invested, workingmen will require some proof that the interest on their savings will be increased by this bill in the proportion that their chances for accumulating them are diminished, before they are ready to accept it.

Another argument very frequently employed among the farming communities is that this increase in the rate of wages comes directly out of the pockets of the agricultural classes. The higher prices that persons employed in one protected industry may have to pay for the articles produced by those engaged in another industry also protected are made up, it is admitted even by the free trader, by the higher prices that they in turn receive from the rest of the public; but it is alleged that in the last resort what our friends choose to call "the tariff tax" falls upon the farmers. This conclusion will not, however, bear examination; the farmer receives his share of the benefits of protection equally with the other wealth producers of the land, and indeed the articles for which he pays a higher price because of a protected system are so few and the increase is so inconsiderable that the advantages are overwhelmingly on his side; he receives a direct and substantial benefit in the exclusion from the home markets of many articles of which wool, potatoes, eggs, live stock, and the like are instances, which, if imported free, would force him into an unprofitable competition.

What is of much greater service to him is the home market that the protective system gives him at his very door. The establishment of every manufacturing town, of every industrial plant, opens a market to the adjoining farmers where they can dispose of their products at good prices with little or no charge for transportation; it enables them to diversify the productions of their farm, and to place less reliance upon the great staple crops like wheat and cotton, in which they must compete in the world's exchanges with the poorly paid Egyptian fellah and the Indian ryot; they are able to go into the business of raising small fruits, truck, poultry, and many products for which a manufacturing community offers a remunerative market; and finally, they are guaranteed against overproductions and overcrowding of their business by the manifold opportunities that diversified industries create for labor. It is a matter worthy of the most serious consideration of the farmers of this country, to calculate what the effect of the return to the soil of the millions of persons now engaged in protected pursuits would mean to them, and this is the logical result of the adoption of a system that would narrow the present numerous fields of national industry.

The protective system is strongest when viewed as a whole. It provides for the most varied forms of industrial activity; it seeks to distribute the gifts of nature among the largest number of recipients, and to give to each a fair and equal chance with any other to enjoy his part of the national prosperity. It is perfectly possible to lay one's finger on this or that branch of the system, and by excluding everything not directly affecting that particular subject to arrive at an unfavorable result. This was the ingenious course of the Democratic party with what has been well called their popgun policy in the Fifty-second Congress; but it is manifestly unfair. The interdependence of manufactures and agriculture and trade and transportation must all be considered; and never before was this correlation of the different branches of industry so well illustrated as to-day, when the farmer must sacrifice his crops at ruinous prices, the storekeeper close his store for want of business, the railroad manager discharge his hands and reduce his service, and the banker contract his discounts and withdraw his aid because of the blight that the fear of tariff changes has brought upon the manufacturing industries of the nation.

The sympathy of all industries with one another, and the effect upon the whole of an injury to any part, is foreign to the ideas of the writers on political economy whose views we are bidden to accept as final upon this question; their writings reflect the conditions of industrial society as it existed in the past much more accurately than they do the conditions with which we have now to do, and these dogmas are very materially qualified when applied to modern business conditions; at best they are tendencies rather than laws, and recent industrial history has shown us that these tendencies are often checked and not infrequently completely arrested by the present industrial methods. We have to-day to do with the regulation of competition and production in the place of the unrestricted competition of the theorists; we know that manufacturers will and do sell their goods at unusually low prices to gain or keep control of markets against competitors; we know that the importer very often pays a part or the whole of a customs duty without making a proportionate increase in the price of his wares.

All these things are opposed to the teachings of the old political economists, and are but a few of the many instances that might be given. We have to-day, in a word, a highly complex business and industrial organization with which Mill and Adam Smith were not acquainted, an artificial organization as compared with the society upon which their arguments rest, and we must deal with them artificially. The "let alone" doctrine is unsuited to these times, and the advocates of it and not we are yet in darkness; we decline all their sympathy with our supposed economic ignorance in the full confidence that our would-be teachers will some day pay a little attention to the facts and appreciate the changes that have taken place. If for the present they will only refrain from invoking these antiquated documents as inspired and infallible authorities we shall be content.

I know of no better illustration of the mutual benefits that accrue to a whole community from a protective tariff than the experience of the section with which I am most familiar; it reflects very accurately the varied industrial life which that system has so successfully introduced upon a larger scale throughout the country. The proportion of persons engaged in agriculture to those employed in manufactures varies somewhat in the three counties which I represent, but the totals may roughly be taken as equal; of those not engaged in farming fully two-thirds are directly dependent upon some form or other of the iron industry; in my own county are situated the famous Cornwall mines, which have now been worked for more than one hundred and fifty years, and still form the richest and most accessible ore supply in the seaboard States; iron-ore mining was naturally the first industry of any consequence established, together with the closely related manufacture of pig iron from the ore so mined. From this small beginning there arose in time other manufactures, but these were insignificant until the iron industry first received its deserved protection in 1861; since that date almost every form of the manufactures of iron has been established in the close vicinity, until the Congressional district now contains not only the large number of blast furnaces and rolling mills which perhaps might be expected in a locality so favored by natural advantages, but establishments for the manufacture of steel rails, malleable iron, bolts and nuts, chains, nails, agricultural implements of no less importance.

We have several plants that are either the largest or among the largest of the kind in the United States, and which never would have been established had it not been for the protection that the Republican party afforded them. Now, the men who earn their wages in these mines and mills and manufactories, and the neighboring farmers who supply their tables are not willing to come down to the scale of wages which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] spoke of as prevailing in that State. If they were they might be willing to accept this bill.

It was said, I think, that ten or twelve dollars a month was considered a very fair average income in Texas, and that on little more than double that amount the gentleman's happy constituents reveled in luxury. The farmers and workers that I represent have fortunately thus far been spared from the effort to live upon such limited means, and I am very greatly mistaken if they have any wish to attempt the experiment. The workingmen of my district know that their wages steadily increased under Republican rule, that work was plentiful, and that under the latest developments of protection in the McKinley act markets had been opened up with the South American countries that promised them a new era of increased prosperity. The farmers know that under this same Republican rule, although the prices of some of the staple crops had either fallen or remained stationary, the value of the annual products of their farms steadily increased, because they were able to put more and more of their land into other crops to supply the men employed at the near-by mills and factories, and that the price of every article they used steadily declined, and they, too, are unprepared to live upon the Texas scale, from which they are exempt as long as the neighboring industries are prosperous; they, too, are very anxious that the duties protecting those industries should not be diminished; nor do they make an exception in the case of the duty on iron ore.

It is assumed by many gentlemen on this floor that the remark that ore is a raw material fully and finally answers any plea for the retention of the duty upon it, but so is everything raw material to a manufacturer who produces a more highly finished product than the last was, no matter how many processes it may have gone through, or how much labor may have been expended upon it before it reached his hands; something more than this is required before we can refuse the demand that the wages of

the workingman shall not be reduced by any act of ours. He is entitled to be protected, whether he labors in the ore mines or in the steel mill or in the woolen factory. The miner differs from more skilled mechanics in degree and not in kind, and is as well entitled as they to have the reward of his labor maintained.

If we once admit that it is desirable to keep wages at their present rate it is the rankest injustice and discrimination to except the laborers in the mines from the advantages of the tariff. It is a more serious objection that labor of this class is often performed by those foreigners who are least welcome in our country, and it is almost the only encouraging incident of the present depression that these gentry have been driven back to their native lands by lack of work and must cross the Atlantic before they can again secure employment here, and Congress will not do its duty if it does not take this favorable opportunity to prevent this undesirable foreign element from again coming into ruinous competition with American labor, by enacting more stringent immigration laws.

Thus far only the wisdom of the policy upon which this bill rests has been considered, but the methods by which the results sought are attempted to be obtained are no less open to criticism. If the Democratic theory that the American people authorized the present proposed measures by their vote in 1892 be correct, then the popular instructions are to be found in the platform of that party, and it has been given no discretionary power to alter the line of action there set forth. We learned from that very interesting document, the tariff plank in the Chicago platform, that duties are to be limited to the supply of the revenues required for the necessities of the Government economically administered; that is, the people have, according to the Democratic supposition, directed a reduction of tariff duties only when the revenues derived from them exceed such necessary expenses, but in place of any such surplus of revenue we are confronted with a deficit of seventy-five millions even with the present receipts from customs duties. Where, then, is the popular mandate that justifies a bill providing for a further reduction of fifty millions in these already shrunken receipts?

Our contention is that the proper course for Congress to pursue under these circumstances would be to refuse to make any change in the tariff laws now upon the statute book; with the revival of prosperity and public confidence that such action would insure, we could look forward to an increase in the revenues to their normal figure, and there would be no occasion to devise any untried methods for supplying a deficit, simply because such a deficit would not then exist. We may note again that the expenses of the Government in the Chicago platform are to be only those of a government ecomically administered. There has been no serious effort made to fulfill this pledge but in one branch of the national expenditure, and that the last that should have been touched.

The obligations of the Government to its pensioners are of too sacred a nature to be lightly and recklessly broken, and whatever the frauds that have been perpetrated in this respect may be, and the Administration has been very unsuccessful in finding many such, it is my deliberate conviction that the manner in which the economy in the Pension Bureau has been affected is one of the greatest national disgraces of our history; the methods employed were mean and unworthy of a great Government; suspensions and removals from the list were attended with the most scandalous injustice, and the results attained are trivial. I do not suppose that there is a member of this House representing a district north of Mason and Dixon's line who could not give numerous cases in which deserving veterans have had the pittance they received from the Government stopped or reduced upon the most frivolous pretexts, where the unjust conduct of the Government has deprived a worthy soldier of his sole means of support and reduced him to beggary.

I could certainly give many such instances that have come within my own limited experience, and this, I repeat, has been the only serious effort of the party in power to reduce the expenses of Government. Again, if we are to look to the Democratic platform of 1892 for the terms of the contract upon which that party was given control of the country, we find still greater difficulty in understanding how even the least incidental protection is permissible, much less the avowed protection that this bill gives to certain industries which have been fortunate enough to obtain the favor of its authors. Where do the gentlemen derive their right to recede a step from their instructions? If the tariff is unconstitutional and a robbery, by what right do they tamper with the evil? Their duty is plain, and upon their theory the responsibility is with the people; they have declared that protective duties should be immediately and entirely eradicated, and yet they have introduced a measure just consistent enough with their promises to produce the maximum amount of harm, and yet falling far short of what their platform announced their policy to be.

The attempt to balance the different constructions that the Democratic platform is capable of has resulted in a scheme that is consistent with neither of them. They have not dared to live up to one interpretation of it, and frankly say that with the present deficit in sight they are not bound to remove any of the present duties. Neither have they dared to carry their ideas to the other extreme, and give the country a tariff for revenue only. The gap that their equivocal policy creates between the receipts necessary to carry on the Government and those provided by this bill is to be filled by the iniquitous income tax. No one knows what this tax will produce, and no one seems to care; something was wanted to fill the void in the National Treasury that will be created by this measure, and this tax has been tossed in in want of something better to fill it. A new set of revenue officials and an annoying inquest annually into every man's private affairs is to be forced upon the country because the Democratic party has not the courage of its convictions.

Another great defect of this measure, in the substitution of ad valorem for specific duties, has been fully pointed out in this debate, and its many dangers shown. It is unnecessary to say anything further to show that this bill is, as might be expected from the work of a party whose business it has been to criticise and destroy what wiser men have created, a half-hearted, inconsistent, incomplete measure, a Janus-faced god looking toward free traders and protectionists, and not forgetting to squint incidentally at the Populists. We can briefly describe it when we say that it is characteristic of the dominant party, and that implies that it has reached the lowest depths of incompetency.

Gentlemen, many of you must already realize that your triumph will be but short-lived. You received your quit-notice from the country but a few months ago; you know well that the return to power of your opponents is imminent, and you are now on the point of enacting a law that is manifestly unfair to the most important industrial interests of the nation. You have taken good care to protect the Southern planter, but the Northern manufacturer and the Northern farmer have asked in vain for your consideration. It may be worth your while to reflect that when this question comes up again before a House whose disposition will be very different from this one, your statements and your votes may be taken as conclusive evidence against you and yours.

The Republican party will always be true to its record. It will treat this matter as it always has treated it, in a thoroughly broad, national way; but it may in the future have no other recourse than to accept what you, and your constituents through you, assert to be the principles that should govern the tariff policy of the nation, and the Republican party perhaps will not be willing to accept the exceptions to these principles that you are now making in favor of your particular local interests. It therefore will be well for you to assure yourselves of the interests of your constituents and to think very carefully before you misrepresent them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PENDLETON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is said that death and taxes are the only two absolutely certain things, but to these may be added another certainty, and that is that no bill which promises any substantial relief to the tax-burdened people will meet the approval of the tariff-protected industries. So that those who imagine it possible to frame a measure to satisfy both taxpayers and tax-eaters had as well dismiss the pleasing illusion. The tariff is a tax, and taxes must be paid if the Government is to be supported. If we were just now beginning our national existence, without the Constitution and without a fiscal system, and were trying to raise the necessary revenue in the way fairest to the people and most impartial in its treatment of all industries, many thinking and fair-minded men, after the experience of one hundred years, would hesitate before consenting to any tax on imports. Other things being equal, that country will make the most rapid growth where a free people are governed by just and equal laws; where production is not burdened by heavy taxes, nor distribution misdirected by discriminating legislation.

The dominant party has before it two imperative duties, first, to reduce the burden of taxation; next, to adjust that burden so that it will be equally borne by all, as nearly as is possible, under any system deriving its largest revenue from the tax on imports. From the foundation of the Government to the present, under all parties, the Government has derived its largest support from its customs duties. The reasons originally urged for these duties were the necessities of the Government and the duty to aid our struggling industries. Temporary protection was advocated by one party and acquiesced in by many of the leaders in the other, and surely if it was ever defensible it was at the beginning of our national existence, when we had not only inaugurated a separate Government, but had adopted a theory in gov-

ernment which was a threat to monarchical institutions and excited their profoundest apprehensions.

Our people then felt themselves compelled to subordinate theories to emergencies, and prepare for inevitable collisions with those European nations who had not yet been taught to respect our rights and fear our strength; but, Mr. Chairman, the Government was cheaply administered and our demands for revenue so much smaller then than now that from the beginning up to 1860 our entire expense did not during that time exceed $2 per capita per annum. The manufacturers thought a modest tax of 10 or 20 per cent per annum would be amply sufficient to cover the difference between European and American wages, and confidently looked forward to the period when even this small measure of protection could be dispensed with; but now, after one hundred years of national existence and thirty years of Republican rule, we find these puling infant industries, grown to lusty manhood, declaiming more loudly than ever the necessity for continued protection.

Protection and higher protection have gone hand in hand with extravagance and greater extravagance, and, Mr. Chairman, one of the worst features of the protection theory is, that while the masses favor cheap government, the entire body of manufacturing industries favors costly government, because that means high tariff, and high tariff means larger profits for the manufacturers. A recent instance is the conduct of the Republican party under Mr. Harrison. Mr. Cleveland left a surplus of one hundred millions. The Republicans had a golden opportunity to lighten the burdens of the people, but it answered their petitions by increasing their taxes, and got rid of their surplus by adding to their expenses. "We asked for bread and they gave us a stone."

The Republican theory assumes the right to direct the course of industry by taxing some for the benefit of others. It makes some less profitable in order to make others more profitable. This is a dangerous power in any government, but especially in a republican government where equality of rights should be as closely allied to equality of conditions as may be obtainable under just laws. We see before us the natural and inevitable consequence of such pernicious theories. Protected by the ocean from the aggressive designs of other powers, blessed with cheap and fertile lands, and enjoying a larger measure of freedom than any other people, our progress has been more rapid than any other in all history. The people have spread over and conquered a continent, and wealth has accumulated beyond the dreams of the miser; but, Mr. Chairman, when we inquire how this wealth has been distributed we find that thirty thousand people own one-half of it, and sixty-three millions of people own the other half.

While a few are reveling in law-made wealth, thousands, aye, millions, are suffering for the necessaries of life, and many throng the streets and beg for bread. I grant you, sir, that some men will not thrive under the best government, and that others will thrive under the worst governments; but all men are entitled to just government. Inequalities in condition are inseparable from human affairs; though deplorable, they are unavoidable, but surely legislation ought not to accelerate this tendency.

I leave to those who have better opportunities and more aptitude for statistics to show the exact comparative growth in wealth of the different sections in the last decade, but I state a proposition which I think will not be denied when I say that the manufacturing have vastly outstripped the agricultural regions in the race for profit, and when we have traced this increased wealth we will find that it has not lodged in the pocket of the laborer, but in the strong box of the manufacturer.

As the danger from foreign cannon no longer alarms us, we are now told by our Republican friends that the present danger is foreign cheap labor, and against this we must level our legislative artillery. We are told that a high tariff is necessary to enable the manufacturer to pay high wages and compete with the pauper labor of Europe.

High tariff means high prices to the consumer, and three-fourths of the workingmen engaged in unprotected industries are taxed and made less prosperous in order to pay higher wages to the other fourth; but, Mr. Chairman, after having a tax laid ostensibly in their interest they are denied the benefit of it, for the law kindly turns it over to the manufacturer, and he scours the market and stands upon the seashore beckoning to the landing immigrant to come and work in competition with his high-priced American brother.

If pauper labor is so despicable in Europe, why should it be so lovable when it lands in Castle Garden? If the Republican party is really so much in love with the American laborer, why does it not, after taxing all the people for his ostensible benefit, follow the tax into the factory and see that it is equitably distributed among its beneficiaries. True, it would savor of paternalism, but not more so than the entire protective theory. The Republicans claim that high tariff and high wages are inseparable, and that the one is indispensable to the other. The Democrats say that this contention is neither correct nor just. They say that high wages do not necessarily follow from high tariffs, and if they did it would not be right to lower the wages of three men to add to the wages of the fourth. To escape this proposition the Republicans say that high tariff means not higher but lower prices. If it means lower prices what becomes of the workingman for whom they profess so much solicitude? Is it possible that it brings both lower prices and higher wages? And if the manufacturer has to pay higher wages, and take less for his goods, where does his profit come in?

Mr. Chairman, the American people can no longer be deluded with such indefensible pretenses. The value of products has for many years suffered a gradual, sometimes a rapid decline, but this decline is world-wide, and is not confined to protective tariff countries. Goods are cheap here, but cheaper still beyond the tariff wall. If this were not true the manufacturers themselves would assist to level the wall so that their cheaper goods could go out and compete with the world.

Reciprocity has been for several years a favorite word in their mouths. Protection and reciprocity in their abstract meaning convey ideas that are very dear to the American heart, but as reciprocity is applied by the Republican party it means high-priced goods for the American consumer and cheaper goods for the foreign consumer. It means that the American manufacturer shall have the American market free from competition with the European market, but that he may take the same class of goods to South America and then sell them for less money in competition with the European market.

In fact, the modern article of reciprocity seems to have been invented solely for the benefit of the foreign consumer and the American manufacturer, and in the transaction the great mass of burden-bearing American taxpayers are forgotten. Another fear agonizing the Republican party is that if the tariff bars are let down a flood of cheap foreign goods will be let in, and the people will buy too many of them. It would naturally follow that they would buy more, because the same amount of money would purchase more; but, Mr. Chairman, is not the average American citizen capable of running his own business, and can he not wisely determine for himself how to spend his money after he has made it?

This is the Democratic theory, but the Republicans seem to think it a province of the Government to build up certain industries, to give certain classes higher wages, and finally to direct the purchases of the people and protect them from overconsumption. This is paternalism pure and simple, and it is not wonderful that a party which advocates such doctrines should be the author and advocate of every plan which has been proposed to enlarge the power of the General Government at the expense of the State and individual citizen.

The sole reliance for the continuance of our free institutions is the capacity of the individual for self-government. This power can only be preserved and increased by letting him absolutely alone, protecting him in all his rights, and taking from his toil as a tax only his fair pro rata of the necessary levy. It is not our province—

> To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land
> And read our history in a nation's eyes.

Plenty is created by industry, and its creator should be allowed to scatter or keep it just as he prefers. Under Republican rule wealth has rapidly increased, but production has been abnormally increased and made more profitable in some industries, and heavily burdened and made less profitable in other directions. The result has been to concentrate enormous wealth with certain individuals and classes, and to deprive larger classes of their share in the prosperity. Men have opened their eyes to these conditions. In the manufacturing States we find that the workingmen, for whom the Republicans profess so much solicitude, are compelled to combine in societies to secure their shares of the profits voted to them out of the pockets of the American people, but grudgingly given, and often refused by the manufacturer.

In the West and South, in the wheat and cotton regions, we find every year more hard work and less profit in productions. They are compelled to make their products for sale in a foreign market, in competition with the cheap labor of the world, but to return home and buy their goods in a protected market. They toil from year's end to year's end and their profits, if they make profits at all, are growing smaller and smaller. Such a condition must result in discontent. We want just and equal laws that will compel every man to bear his own burden, but protect him from bearing the burden of others. We want our intelligent American citizenship to rely on their cultivated minds and brawny arms and not on the Government at Wash-

ington for their prosperity. Agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, the great sources of our prosperity, will reach their best and most healthful development when neither fostered nor hindered by special legislation.

In 1860 at least three-fourths of our carrying trade was done in our own vessels; now after thirty years of protection our merchant marine is reduced to a beggarly 15 per cent. After a few more years of such protection the American flag will be driven from the ocean. The former incumbent of the Presidency, for whom the people, without regard to party, entertain a genuine respect, said in one of his many able speeches made in the campaign of 1888, that the Democrats were "students of maxims, not of markets." His meaning, of course, was that the Democrats were theoretical, not practical; and that the Republicans were the practical business men, the students, and makers or discoverers of markets.

As a fact Mr. Chairman, where are the markets they have opened to us? In the words of Mr. Blaine the McKinley bill has not found a sale for "a bushel of wheat or a pound of pork;" but, sir, perhaps they will claim that the purpose of the protective policy is to find a home market for our raw materials and food products, and a foreign market for our manufactures. Let us see what success they have made in this. We now consume about two million bales of cotton, and the annual product is more than eight million bales. If it has taken one hundred years to reach this point, at the same ratio it will take over three hundred years before the cotton can all be consumed at home.

The manufacturer enjoying a comfortable seat on the prostrate form of the cotton raiser can say: "Be patient, my friend; the good time will come in the sweet by and by, three hundred years hence: only work for us until then, and then having become rich at your expense we will allow you to make something for yourself." But Mr. Speaker, this is a very uncomfortable position for the under man to occupy, with nothing to feed on but promises that may not be redeemed until the judgment day. Now let us see about a foreign market for manufacturers. I have an official report from the Bureau of Statistics which shows that from 1847 to 1860, fourteen years, the percentage of exports of manufactures of cotton, iron and steel, leather and wool were 5.22 of the whole; from 1880 to 1893 the percentage of exports of these articles had risen to 5.61 per cent or a net proportionate increase of .39 per cent.

Now, if it takes us at the period of our greatest national activity thirty-three years to make an increase of .39 per cent, it is easy calculated how long it will be before we sweep proud Britania from the ocean, and again the under man in the intensity of his agony may gasp between breaths and say, "Oh, Lord, how long."

The pending bill, Mr. Chairman, bears hard on the section which I have the honor in part to represent, because it puts raw materials on the free list; and in my ignorance, perhaps, of the correct principles which underlie a revenue tariff, I have never been able to see any good reason why we should not collect some revenue from every article that passes through the custom-house; yet believing that the present measure is better for the whole people and more just than the law which it is designed to supplant I shall vote for it, reserving the right to support amendments intended to perfect the bill.

Loving my country without regard to class, section, or party, I rejoice in its prosperity, and while the wealth of the manufacturer is largely the result of favoring and discriminating legislation, yet they are our people, and their wealth is our wealth, and in changing from favoritism to justice the changes should be so gradual that they can adapt themselves to the change without serious injury or financial and commercial paralysis, and I believe that the moderate bill now under consideration will accomplish that purpose. The entire people are waiting upon our action, industry is inactive, commerce is waiting, enterprise is suspended, suspense is continued injury, certainty of any sort is beneficial.

We know our duty, and we know that duty and interest point in the same direction. Let us lighten the burden of agriculture, unfetter commerce, strike the shackles from all industry, impose the same burdens, and give the same privileges to all. Give them all an open field and a fair fight. Reduce expenses, reduce taxes, and inaugurate a just, honest, and economical Government, and when we return to our homes we will deserve and receive the plaudits of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. PENDLETON of Texas having expired, on motion of Mr. KILGORE, it was extended ten minutes.

[Mr. CURTIS of New York addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation and to provide revenue for the Government, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes) the House adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PASCHAL: A bill (H. R. 5099) for appropriation of $40,000 to repair, improve, or erect buildings at Government military post at Del Rio, Tex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5100) to appropriate Government land for a cemetery, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5101) to provide that neither of the United States district land offices at Hugo or Lat mar, in the State of Colorado, shall be abolished or consolidated, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BALDWIN: A bill (H. R. 5103) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CONN: A bill (H. R. 5104) for additional appropriations for a public building at South Bend, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RITCHIE: A bill (H. R. 5105) to purchase, inclose, and improve the sites, or portions thereof, of certain forts, battlefields, and graves of American soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Maumee Valley, and to erect thereon appropriate monuments and commemorative tablets—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOCKWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5106) to provide for the construction of a bridge or tunnel across Niagara River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) for the necessary and better protection of American labor and enforcement of the law of domicile, and the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 107) directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commissioner of engineers to examine and report upon the cost of deepening the harbors of Superior and Duluth and their extremes to a uniform depth of 20 feet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A concurrent resolution to print 8,000 copies of the report of the Fish Commissioner for the year 1893—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. McLAURIN: A resolution to place Granville Tennant on the roll of the Doorkeeper as a page—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 5108) empowering and directing the Secretary of War to furnish two pieces of condemned cannon to Lakeside Cemetery, Michigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5109) granting a pension to Margaret Meyer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 5110) for the relief of Jennie E. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CABANISS: A bill (H. R. 5111) for the relief of John I. Patman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONN: A bill (H. R. 5112) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 5113) for the relief of Enoch Voyles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5114) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5115) for the relief of James L. Ord, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKAIG (by request): A bill (H. R. 5116) for the relief of Reuben A. Hurley, of Montgomery County, Md., administrator *de bonis non* of A. F. Hurley, deceased, late of Lyon

County, Nev., for stores and supplies furnished by the decedent to the Utah volunteers in 1860, during the suppression of Indian hostilities, as found by the Court of Claims and the War Claims Committee of the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5117) to correct the military record of Frank G. Gardner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) increasing the pension of Lewis H. McCaskey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of John H. Fralick—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5120) for relief of the legal representatives of Carroll Winters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) for the relief of H. P. Bennett—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

By Mr. ALDRICH: Protest of Edward B. Bacon and 55 others, employés of Clement Balne & Co., wholesale clothiers of Chicago; of James F. Shields and 42 others, employés of Henry W. King & Co., wholesale clothiers of Chicago; and of J. L. Howe and 24 others, employés of E. Rothschilds & Bros., wholesale clothiers of Chicago, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. S. Roberts and 80 others, miners and workingmen of the Menominee iron district, Michigan, protesting against the placing of iron ore on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. APSLEY: Petition of Samuel Irving and 4,038 others, of Fitchburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 124 employés of Abbott & Co., of Forge Village, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN: Petition of workingmen and citizens of Ely, Minn., asking for a reduction of tariff on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARWIG: Petition of citizens of Jefferson, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Copeland & Ryder Shoe Factory, at Jefferson, Wis., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLANCHARD: Petitions of citizens of Louisiana and Texas, for improvement of Sabine River, in Louisiana and Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CONN: Protest of the South Bend Woolen Company and the A. C. Staley Manufacturing Company, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the business men of South Bend, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Petition of the Carpenters' District Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the Government ownership and control of telegraphs—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of William Charles Schuter and F. R. Rice, and other manufacturers and makers of cigars, of St. Louis, Mo., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Applebaum and others, makers of cigars, of St. Louis, Mo., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of 200 honorably discharged Union soldiers of John Kyle Post, Grand Army of the Republic, and others of Coggon, Iowa, for a just and equitable service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States and District of Columbia—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of miners of lead ores in Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, in favor of a specific duty on lead in all ores and drosses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Workingmen's Protective Tariff League of Philadelphia, of Philadelphia Board of Trade, and of the South Pittsburg (Pa.) Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employing printers of Pittsburg in favor of repeal of provision permitting the Postmaster-General to have return request printed on stamped envelopes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of lithographers of New York, Brooklyn, and New Jersey, in favor of an amendment to the Wilson bill relating to lithographic products, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of Pittsburg, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURBOROW: Petition of shoe manufacturers and jobbers of the city of Chicago, praying that sole leather be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of Cohn Bros. and Kohn, Schoenbrun & Co., both of Chicago, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial to Congress for a national alphabet—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of 47 employés of the Oregon City Manufacturing Company, of Oregon, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: Protest of 204 workmen, constituting the entire force employed in the glass-cutting establishment of T. G. Hawkes & Co., covering New York, against a reduction of the tariff on cut glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of 11 members of Onsted (Mich.) Grange, No. 279, Patrons of Husbandry, asking for the passage of Senate bill 1136, to provide for the Government ownership and control of the telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 35 soldiers of Ypsilanti, Mich., asking that all claims for pensions be made special and disposed of at once—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAGER: Petition of honorably discharged Union soldiers and sailors of Iowa, for the enactment of a law prohibiting the suspension of pensions pending investigation of alleged fraud; also praying that all pensions now suspended be restored until pending investigations are concluded—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Pottawatomie, Iowa, for a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Protest of lead-ore miners of Missouri and Kansas against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois (by request): Petition of Philip S. Wales, medical director of the United States Navy, praying for relief of charges standing against him as such officer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of O. Frenell, J. F. Cox, R. Knox, and 101 other citizens of Henry County, Ill., praying for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: Protest of laborers in Salem (Oregon) Woolen Mills, against change of duty on woolens—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Board of Trade of Salem, Oreg., denying and repudiating the statements made by the governor of Oregon, representing the State and people to be in a wretched condition—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of A. L. Ogg and 27 other citizens of Warren County, Iowa, asking that all suspended pensions be restored and no further suspension be allowed except on proof of fraud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of A. L. Ogg and 27 others of Warren County, Iowa, asking the enactment of an equitable service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Two petitions from officers of the United States Army and citizens of New Mexico, praying Congress to pass the act entitled "An act to amend the act of February 14, 1885"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: Petition of subassociation northwest No. 10, Lithographers' International Protective and Insurance Association, United States and Canada, asking that no reduction be made in tariff upon lithograph work—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of 55 citizens of Nebraska, who are members of Garrison No. 53, asking for the passage of an act to

amend the act of February 14, 1885, relative to the reënlistment of enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of S. T. Wire Dealers' Association, Viticultural Commission, 5,000 vineyardists, and over 20,000 others interested, against the clause relative to wire in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of coal-miners of Huntingdon County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, House bill No. 4864—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of George S. Campbell and others, of Philadelphia, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of St. Botolph Club, of Boston, Mass., for the placing of paintings and statuary on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Protest of F. W. Betz and other citizens of Fairmont, Minn., against proposed change in the McKinley act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Petition and papers to accompany House bill 4999—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIEKLEJOHN: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of miners of lead in Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, praying that a specific duty be placed upon lead in all ores and drosses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUTCHLER (by request): Protest of mine owners and laborers and others of South Easton, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of citizens of Ithaca, N. Y., as to duty on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., for a duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of fur-hat manufacturers of South Norwalk, Conn., for retention of present tariff duty on fur hats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of Messrs. Reiche's, Albany, N. Y., asking that a duty of 35 cents a pound be laid on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Vanpel and others, citizens of Albany, N. Y., for a uniform rate of 35 cents a pound on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. Q. Cunningham and T. E. Cunningham, of Albany, N. Y., that a uniform duty of 35 cents a pound be imposed on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Cohoes, Troy, and Lansingburg, N. Y., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 90 members of Garrison 34, Watervliet Arsenal, West Troy, N. Y., favoring amendments to act relative to retirement of enlisted men in the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 83 employés of Globe Knitting Mills, of Cohoes, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of M. Larson and 144 others, citizens of Stockholm, Pepin County, Wis., farmers and dealers in barley, against the reduction in duty on barley proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Two petitions of Martin Lutz and of John Weikert and others, of Utica, N. Y., asking for a uniform rate of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the employés of P. & F. Corbin Manufacturing Company against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, their employés, and others interested, of Canton, Hartford County; also, petition of the same from South Windsor, Hartford, and other places in Connecticut, protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of workingmen employed in the shops at East Berlin, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial from 569 miners and others directly engaged in the iron industry at Ishpeming, Mich., protesting against the proposed placing of iron ore on the free list, and representing that great suffering must ensue if such action is taken by Congress—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 728 miners, workingmen, and citizens of Negaunee, Mich., regardless of politics, protesting against the removal of the duty on iron ore, and announcing that such action by Congress must bring destitution to a large proportion of the people of that section, among whom there is already great suffering, owing to the uncertainty as to the action of Congress concerning iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 178 workmen, employers of labor, and and others, citizens of Bessemer, Mich., without regard to any political relation, expressing great anxiety concerning proposed legislation in reference to iron ore, protesting against the placing of this commodity on the free list, and affirming that such action would work great hardship to the people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 144 citizens and business men of Ishpeming, Mich., regardless of politics, protesting against the removal of the duty on iron ore, and affirming that such action would bring grave distress not only to those engaged in the iron industry in Northern Michigan, but to large numbers of other people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 37 workmen, employés and citizens of Marquette County, Mich., irrespective of politics, protesting against the removal of the duty on iron ore, and affirming that such action would result in great hardship to the people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 284 workingmen, employers of labor, and others, citizens of Republic, Mich., irrespective of party relations, remonstrating against the free admission of iron ore and declaring that such action would prove most disastrous to the iron industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of employés of the Duncan Salt Company against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 100 employés of Josiah Perry, Webster, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 195 employés of the Stoneville Worsted Company, Auburn, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 7 employés of Samuel A. Prescott, Wilkinsonville, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 258 employés of Forehand Ames Company, Worcester, Mass., protesting against the proposed change in the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of C. Huber, jr., manufacturer and employés, makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of Charles E. Alderman and 109 others, employés of the Surface Coating Paper Mills, of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Ino Lewis and 118 other citizens of Great Barrington, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of the manufacturers and makers of cigars for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 10, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The VICE-PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport the same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 439) for the relief of David R. Gottwals;

A bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878; and

A bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McMILLAN presented memorials of Gilbert Hodgkin and 128 other citizens of Ishpeming; of G. R. Persons and 36 other citizens of Marquette County; of G. R. Persons and 79 other citizens of Ishpeming, and of James Harvey and 62 workingmen, employers of labor and others, citizens of Negaunee, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the memorial of Hugh Mitchelson and 38 other cigar-manufacturers of East Granby, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present duty on leaf tobacco and cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Theodore Cameron and 2 other cigar-manufacturers of Westport, Conn., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of 70 operatives of the Dana Warp Mills, of Westbrook, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORMAN presented a memorial of sundry workingmen of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for the establishment of a road department similar to the Agricultural Department at Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented 13 petitions of Louis Hellwig and other cigar-manufacturers, citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented petitions of citizens of Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, Logansport, Crown Point, Connersville, Laporte, and Bloomington, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the imposition of a duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WASHBURN presented the memorial of O. G. Korb and other citizens of Ely, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, and especially against placing iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 269) for the relief of Jacob I. Cohen and J. Randolph Mordecai, administrators of M. C. Mordecai, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 8th instant, intended to be proposed to the naval appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 299) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dock at the Portsmouth navy-yard; reported it favorably as an amendment to the naval appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the House concurrent resolution relative to the appointment of a commission on the part of the House and the Senate to consider the personnel of the Navy, to report it with amendments. I ask that the concurrent resolution may go to the Calendar, stating that the Committee on Naval Affairs, instead of providing for a joint commission, as the other House have done, substituted for it a provision that subcommittees of the two committees may act together, so that the whole matter may be in the hands of the committees of the two Houses.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask my friend from Maine to give notice that he will ask for the early consideration of the concurrent resolution, as it is important that the joint committee should get to work?

Mr. HALE. Yes, I am obliged to the Senator from South Carolina. I give notice that I shall call up the concurrent resolution for passage at an early day. I presume there will be no objection to it.

Mr. FRYE (to Mr. HALE). Can you not have it passed now?

Mr. HALE. I do not know but that the Senate will agree to pass it now. I ask consent for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read at length.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HALE. If the Secretary will read the amendments I will explain in brief the effect of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Amendments proposed by the committee:

Strike out, after the word "concurring," page 1, line 12, the words "that a special joint committee, consisting of three members of the House and three members of the Senate, be appointed, respectively, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate," and insert, "that subcommittees of the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, to be selected by each of said committees, are hereby directed to act jointly."

After the word "convenient," in line 6, page 2, insert "to said committees."

Strike out all after the word "premises" in line 8, page 2.

Mr. HALE. The object of the concurrent resolution is to take into consideration the great and difficult questions that have arisen as to the personnel and the rank of the Navy. It is a matter that ought to be attended to. The House of Representatives have provided for a joint committee to consider the whole subject and report to Congress. Senators will remember that a few days ago, upon another report from a joint commission of this kind, the sense of the Senate was shown very clearly against such joint commissions. The Committee on Naval Affairs, in the amendments which I report, have stricken out the feature of a joint committee separate and apart from the two committees, and simply provide that subcommittees of the two committees may act jointly. That is desirable, because there is no necessity that the investigation should be made in two places. It can all be done at once.

That is the effect of the first amendment. Then by the second amendment it is provided that instead of reporting to Congress the subcommittees shall report to their respective committees, and they of course to their respective Houses. The whole matter is to go through the channels by which the two bodies act, and I think it is a wise thing in this case and generally, because the committees are constituted for the very purpose of attending to these duties. If the Secretary will now read the concurrent resolution as it will stand after the amendments are made every Senator will see what is provided by it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as suggested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That subcommittees of the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, to be selected by each of said committees, are hereby directed to act jointly, whose duty it shall be to fully investigate and consider the entire subject of the rank, pay, and all other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy; to have power to send for persons and papers, sit during the recess, if any, and during the sitting of both Houses, and to report at any time after it convenes as may be convenient to such committees what legislation, if any, is necessary in the premises.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine what significance he gives to the phrase "to act jointly."

Mr. HALE. That the two subcommittees, instead of each taking the same testimony separately, may act together. That in fact is the distinctive feature of the amendments.

Mr. HOAR. Would it not be more strictly in accordance with parliamentary phraseology to say, "to act in concurrence?" A joint committee, I understand, makes one committee, and that committee acts by its majority; it does not require a majority of each; that is, a majority of the House committee and a minority of the Senate committee might adopt a particular report. I do not suppose that is the intention; but I submit to the Senator from Maine whether the words "to act in concurrence" would not better express what he desires to get at.

Mr. HALE. I do not think there is much difference between the two, although I think the word "jointly," selected by the committee would more certainly tend to bring them together. At the same time I think no such question would arise as the Senator suggests.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to indulge in any personalities towards my friend from Maine, but if I were to do so I should say that I think there is no member of this body who is more remarkable for neatness and elegance in his style of expression. I know it must have been very hard for him indeed to have had to report the curious example of language which he has reported, and that he is not in the least responsible for it.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator refer to the amendments or to the House provision?

Mr. HOAR. I refer to so much of the original resolution as is proposed to be left by the committee.

Mr. HALE. The Senator's compliment to the clause inserted by the Senate committee does not apply to the House provision, I understand; I think, perhaps, the language is well enough as it is.

Mr. HOAR. I shall move to strike out the second part of the preamble when that is reached.

Mr. HALE. I do not object to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine for the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and it is before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Now the Senator from Massachusetts has an amendment to offer to which I do not object.

Mr. HOAR. If the Secretary will read the whole preamble again, I will move to strike out part of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The preamble will be again read.

The Secretary read the preamble, as follows:

Whereas there are constantly before Congress numerous bills dealing with the question of rank and pay in the Navy and other matters concerning the personnel of the same; and

Whereas the present laws relating to this subject are in many instances imperfect, inconsistent, unjust, and the result of piece-meal legislation: Therefore be it

Mr. HOAR. I move to strike out the second whereas.

Mr. HALE. I do not see much force in the preamble. I do not object to the entire preamble being stricken out. It is not needed.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; I make that motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the preamble will be stricken out. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution as amended.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

PRINTING OF FIRST COMPTROLLER'S REPORT.

Mr. GORMAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the report of the First Comptroller of the Treasury, forwarding books and stating accounts settled by his office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893, to report adversely upon the printing thereof; and I ask for the adoption of the report. This is in conformity with the usual custom.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be agreed to, in the absence of objection.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY REPORT.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the Report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892, 1,500 copies of Part I in quarto form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 900 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and 2,800 copies of Part II in octavo form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,200 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

LEGATION QUARTERS AT PEKING, CHINA.

Mr. MORGAN. By direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I present a communication from the Secretary of State, relating to an increase of appropriation for the payment for the lease of property at Peking, China, for the use of our legation there, and I move its reference to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1399) to promote the efficiency of the naval militia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1400) to commission passed assistant surgeons in the United States Navy and to provide for their examination preliminary to their promotion to the grade of surgeon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS. At the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia I introduce a bill, which, after a second reading, I ask may be referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1401) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act for the further protection of property from fire and safety of lives in the District of Columbia," was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1402) to create the office of foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1403) to authorize the reconstruction of a bridge across the Niobrara River near the village of Niobrara, Nebr., and making an appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1404) to open to settlement and provide for the disposal of the public lands of the "Old Sheridan reservation," in the State of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1405) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamer Despatch on Assateague Shoals, Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 1406) for the relief of Eliza H. Yerger and Mary Virginia Rawlins, both born Sizer, daughters and only heirs at law of Henry E. Sizer, deceased, late of Jackson, State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANDERSON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1407) for the relief of William H. Sloan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1408) to provide for the purchase of additional land in the square now occupied by the custom-house in the city of Baltimore, Md., and for the preparation of plans and specifications for a new custom-house building; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1409) for the relief of James A. Windsor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HUNTON introduced a bill (S. 1410) for the relief of John H. Redman, a citizen of King George County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1411) to increase the facilities of the Post-Office Department for obtaining the use of buildings for post-office purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 50) directing the Secretary of the Interior to permit certain persons to enter lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

INVESTIGATION OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay the necessary expenses of the investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, including mileage and lawful fees for attendance of witnesses, and the employment of a stenographer, in pursuance of Senate resolution of December 20, 1893, out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

STREET TRAVEL IN WASHINGTON.

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to have erected suitable and convenient sheds or covers at each and every transfer station of the street car and herdic lines of the District of Columbia for the protection of passengers.

PRINTING OF TARIFF STATISTICS.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,000 copies of Senate Report No. 2130, Fifty-first Congress, second session, "Rates of duty on imports into the United States from 1789 to 1890, inclusive, together with the statistics relating thereto;" of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

LANDS ON ANASTASIA ISLAND, FLORIDA.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, requested to suspend all further action in respect of admitting land claims under the laws of the United States on the island of Anastasia, Florida, during the present session of Congress, and until the expiration of the next session of Congress, unless Congressional action on the subject shall have been taken meantime.

On motion of Mr. HALE it was—

Ordered, That the papers relating to land claims on the island of Anastasia, Florida, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. HALE. On the same subject matter I present a petition of the heirs of Jesse Fish, jr., of the State of Florida, praying Congress to confirm the report of the commissioners appointed granting to them 10,000 acres of land on what is known as Anastasia Island, and directing the issuance of a patent to secure to them the undisturbed possession of their own. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

FORCE IN SUPERVISING ARCHITECT'S OFFICE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEFFER on the 9th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire whether there is need of additional service in the Bureau of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury with respect to the matter of the erection of Government buildings, and report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the reason for introducing the resolution. Some four or five or perhaps more years ago an appropriation was made by Congress for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at the city of Salina, in the State of Kansas. Nothing has been done about the matter by the Department, and my attention was called to it for the first time during the past session of the Senate, when the mayor of the city and one or two other citizens came to Washington for the purpose of looking after it and inquiring why nothing had been done. They went to the Treasury Department and had a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury and with the Supervising Architect, and learned from the latter named gentleman that the reason no action had been taken in the way of erecting the building at Salina was that there was not sufficient help in his office to keep up with the work that was given to him by Congress. With a view of ascertaining something further about it, and also urging action, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury making inquiry, and I will ask that the Secretary read the letter in response.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter will be read, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1894.

SIR: Referring to your letters of the 18th and 27th ultimo, relating to the construction of the new United States post-office building at Salina, Kans., I have to advise you that the Salina building is one of twenty-seven authorized by Congress for which this office has not been able hitherto to commence the working drawings. The delay in these cases is due to the inadequate technical force employed in the office, which is necessarily limited by the amount fixed by Congress annually for payment for such services. The pressure also on the office for drawings necessary to prevent the interruption of work on the buildings already commenced is such as to render it impossible for me to fix at this time a date when the drawings for the Salina building can be taken in hand. They, however, will be taken up at the earliest possible moment.

Respectfully yours,

J. O'ROURKE,
Supervising Architect.

Hon. W. A. PEFFER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PEFFER. It appears from this letter that not only has nothing been done in relation to the erection of the building, but that for want of help the Department is not able to give us any encouragement as to when the work can be done. At each session of Congress there are appropriations made for other buildings in other parts of the country. I introduced a bill upon the first day of this session, proposing to enlarge the building at Topeka, the capital of my State, and several other applications of a similar character are about to be made. This is true of all the States in the Union.

It seems to me that under those circumstances, Mr. President, it will be well for the committee to make inquiry, and if it be true—as there can be no doubt that it is true—that the Department needs more assistance in order to get up with this work, the committees should so advise the Senate, that we may act accordingly.

Public buildings would not be authorized, indeed they would not be asked for, if it were not to accommodate the people. I know in my own town it is necessary now to rent other rooms for the purpose of accommodating different divisions of the public service. The pension agency is one case where we are compelled to rent a room in another part of the city to accommodate the pension business.

I therefore submit, with great respect to the committee, that this is a matter with which they may very properly deal, and I hope they will do so promptly.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to be permitted to say one word in reënforcement of what has been so well said by the honorable Senator from Kansas.

I think every visitor to the exhibition at Chicago, even those who were familiar with the greatest works of the architectural genius of other countries and of past ages, experienced a feeling of pride at the wonderful achievement of the genius of the architects of the United States in the designing and construction of those buildings. Those exquisite forms of beauty and grace were in perishable material. When collected in one neighborhood their relations to each other constituted a result which I think nothing in human history has surpassed. Why should not that architectural genius be called into the service of the United States in the construction of our public buildings?

I desire to find no fault with and to make no imputation upon the ability of the gentlemen who have from time to time since I have been in the public service held the office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury; but our public buildings are the creation of a single mind, and so long as one and the same man remains in that office they have been and will be largely the creation of a tired and exhausted mind. No one man, however able he may be, can design, unless he keeps along in the same rut and on the same model and plan, this vast number of public buildings, and it seems to me that there ought to be a provision made—it would not and ought not largely to increase the expense—by which the best architectural genius in this country should be summoned into this service, either by having an association of architects employed to give out this work, or by giving amplest authority to the Supervising Architect himself to employ the eminent men of all parts of the country, not merely as assistants, but as original designers, either by competition or where an architect has won his spurs and his genius is well known, by confidence, and not a particular architect to be selected for the purpose.

I hope the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will address themselves to bringing about that much-needed reform, which will not only accomplish all that my honorable friend from Kansas desires of promptness in the accomplishment of the work so far as the Architect can bring that to pass, but will give to the people of the United States all over the country public buildings which will increase their sentiment of pride and reverence for the Republic itself. There is no reason why in Italy, France, England, and Germany, the traveler should see in every little village some structure of beauty and grace which he remembers always as one of the fairest visions of life, and we should be condemned to tameness and sameness and mediocrity in our public architecture.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts had given his usual attention to this subject he would have known that Congress has done all it could in the direction he has indicated in his remarks. We have a provision already in a general appropriation act that the architects of the United States shall be invited to submit plans for the construction of public buildings, and there is already authority in the Treasury Department to employ them.

This matter has been considered by the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House and the Senate, and legislation was formulated in a bill which was afterwards put into a general appropriation act. To the trouble in the whole matter I have called the attention of the Senate repeatedly since I have been connected with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We do not pay a sufficient salary to the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department. We expect to obtain first-class talent for a very low salary, and we have never been able to do it. That is the first defect.

In the second place the system under which public buildings have been constructed in the United States has been such as to preclude the possibility of obtaining first-class buildings. We have proceeded in this matter upon a sporadic principle, every Senator and Representative attempting to get the largest appropriation possible for his city or town, without regard to the recommendations made by the Supervising Architect as to the kind of building that should be constructed.

Now, as to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas, I have no particular objection to it, but I suggest to him that a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives is now engaged in examining the different branches of the public service and going through the bureaus of the different Departments in order to make a report as to their reorganization. It is an open secret that the Supervising Architect's Bureau needs reorganization.

Again, I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that his resolution should go to the standing committee of the Senate which is charged with an examination of the different branches of the civil service. That would be the appropriate reference, and as chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate I would prefer to have it referred to that committee. The committee of which I am chairman has done all it could in the direction indicated by the resolution, and if it is agreeable to him I should like that change to be made. I ask the Senator from Kansas to have his resolution referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

Mr. PEFFER. I have no objection. Let the resolution be so referred.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution be read again.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate perfectly the desire of the Senator from Kansas and other Senators with regard to the construction of public buildings, and I know how annoying is the delay where Congress has already directed the construction of such buildings. The underlying fact is that Congress has made provision for the construction of more buildings than it

was possible to have the plans prepared for by the Treasury Department with the present force, efficient as it may be, and as I have no doubt it is. But there is another consideration which Senators must not overlook. We have appropriated so much more money than there is revenue to meet the expenditures that it is not possible to force the construction, to employ additional architects for the plans, or to commence the erection of buildings unless additional provision shall be made by Congress to supply the Treasury with money. When the Senator from Kansas or any other Senator has in mind any provision of law or resolution of this body to expedite work upon public structures he must at the same time be prepared to vote for an additional loan to the Treasury or an increase of the revenues from taxation.

This condition applies not only to the present Administration, but to the one which has just gone out of power. There have been three hundred and odd million of dollars more appropriated in the last three years than the revenues of the Government have amounted to. While I have no objection to an inquiry as to the amount of money that ought to be expended in facilitating all matters in the Treasury Department in the preparation of plans, I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that we are met immediately afterward with the greater question, where is the money to come from?

I am myself very anxious to have all the public buildings that are necessary for Government purposes constructed at the earliest possible moment, but the condition in which the Treasury is found, and has been for a year past and will be for the next year, is the important question which is to come up for consideration in this body.

I trust, notwithstanding the objection of the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to have the resolution referred to his committee, that on examination he will waive the objection. He has had great familiarity with this work. The committee would examine it intelligently and come back again, I have no doubt, with proper recommendations, as they have done in the past. Then their recommendations would go to the Committee on Appropriations, as a matter of course, with the other question I have suggested, which is much more serious, and which will confront us.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, in connection with this subject I wish to put myself upon the record. The present condition of the United States, with the millions of unemployed and starving people who are to be found throughout the country, demands, in my judgment, the most liberal expenditure on the part of the Federal Government. The credit of this country is inexhaustible, and it is easy to provide a form in which it may be utilized to relieve the millions of people who are now out of employment. No more important question can address itself to the consideration of a statesman and of those who are charged with public duty than that of a public policy which will at least prevent widespread want and suffering for the want of employment because work can not be had.

My own judgment is that noninterest-paying Treasury notes ought to be issued to a great extent, and every important public work in the United States which is useful and necessary ought now to be encouraged and liberal expenditures made for its conduct. I should go further. I would even appropriate money for the construction under the immediate direction and supervision of the United States, of the great water way across the continent at Nicaragua, if it be ascertained to be practicable. It surprises me that more attention is not given to the condition in which our people are found everywhere throughout the country, without employment and dependent upon the unstable confidence to be inspired in business men for renewed enterprises which may give them employment.

I wish to put myself upon record as favoring liberal expenditures, and whatever financial policy may be necessary to utilize the public credit of the United States in the shape of Treasury notes which may pass current in order to relieve the distress prevailing throughout the country.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, very early in the special session of Congress I introduced a bill to repeal the limitation contained in the sundry civil appropriation act, I think, as to the amount of money that may be expended in any one year in the office of the Supervising Architect for the preparation of plans and for clerical services. The bill was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I was informed then by members of the Committee on Appropriations that the provision I complained of was one which was contained in previous appropriation acts, and that the amount which was permitted to be expended under the provision of the last sundry civil act for that purpose was as large or larger than had been expended in previous years. I was also told that if a larger appropriation were made additional office room for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury would have to be provided, and that was an objection to the expenditure of a larger sum in any one year.

Now, I have ascertained that in the opinion of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury if the amount were increased fifty or a hundred thousand dollars, which may be used for that purpose for the present fiscal year, no additional room would be required, but that with that increased appropriation and an increase in the clerical force the necessary plans for the public buildings which Congress has provided for could be prepared and the buildings could be commenced.

I hardly thought, as the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds desired my bill to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, that it would receive immediate consideration; but I desire to call the attention of the Senate again to the proposition that the only purpose of this provision in the sundry civil act, limiting the amount which may be expended in any one year by the Supervising Architect for the preparation of plans, of moneys already appropriated for public buildings, is to prevent the expenditure of money already appropriated and lessen the expenditures of the Government. The money is already appropriated. The cost of the preparation of the plans comes out of the appropriations made for the different public buildings, and the limitation in the sundry civil act is not a limitation of appropriation, but simply a limitation of the expenditure for the purposes stated in any one year out of moneys already appropriated for public buildings.

I do not agree with my friend from Florida that it is the duty of the General Government, or the State governments, or even of the numerous municipalities, to provide for the general destitution and want in the community, and to furnish idle laborers with employment of which they have been deprived by the fear of hostile legislation by Congress. If it is desirable that these men shall be employed, as I once before stated on this floor, let the Senate or the Congress pass a resolution assuring the country that there will be no hostile tariff legislation during the present Congress; give the country opportunity to reverse its verdict upon the question of protection and the chance to elect another House of Representatives, and it will not be ten days until every industry in the country will be in full blast and labor will be employed. If we are going to try to remedy the troubles let us adopt the true remedy.

Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Florida give me an opportunity I have been waiting for recently to notice certain transactions in my own State. Our worthy governor saw fit to address a letter to the President of the United States, I think on Christmas day, in which he took the President to task for his position on the financial question, for favoring a repeal of the Sherman law, and in which he asserted that two-thirds of the people of the State of Oregon were unemployed and in destitution and want on account of the repeal of the provision of the Sherman law authorizing the purchase of silver. The press in my State is very indignant at the State having been advertised in that manner by the governor, and the boards of trade of Salem and Portland have adopted resolutions denying the statements of the governor and asserting that he has misrepresented the condition of our people.

Mr. ALLEN. With the permission of the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. DOLPH. I should prefer not to be interrupted just now. I will yield directly.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. DOLPH. I do not wish to be interrupted until I complete my statement.

Mr. ALLEN. Has the Senator the letter of the governor containing the statement he has just attributed to him?

Mr. DOLPH. I have not, but I have the resolution. I do not care to reproduce the letter. I am not advertising Governor Pennoyer. I propose to correct his statement in regard to the condition of the people of my State.

Mr. ALLEN. I have the letter——

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator goes entirely beyond the governor's statement.

Mr. DOLPH. I think not. I do not know in what respect I have done so. I have stated only one fact, I think, concerning the governor's letter, and that is that he stated that two-thirds of the people of my State were unemployed. The truth is that Oregon is suffering, like every other State in the Union, from the present depression of business and the financial disturbance. There have been some failures of banks in Portland. There has been some suspension of industries, but probably Oregon is suffering as little as any other State in the Union. There are not a great many unemployed people. Of course it is difficult for people now to borrow money for speculative purposes. The money of some of the people has been tied up in suspended banks and there are some people unemployed, but the general condition of the peo-

ple of the State of Oregon is quite as prosperous as that of any other State in the Union.

I have had transmitted to me, with the request that I give it all possible publicity, a resolution of the Board of Trade of Salem, Oregon, which is as follows:

Whereas the Governor of the State of Oregon has abused the official position conferred upon him by the people by addressing the President of the United States a letter containing certain statements injurious to the Commonwealth and calculated to create an erroneous impression in the minds of those not acquainted with the facts, thereby deterring those who might contemplate engaging in productive industries here: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the board of trade and business men of Salem, most emphatically deny the assertions of the governor and brand his statements as false, and aver that, notwithstanding the pervading depression, there is no widespread destitution or actual want in Oregon, and that the governor in claiming that two-thirds of our people are without employment while one-third are without the means of subsistence was guilty of gross misrepresentation; and we request our representatives in Congress to present these resolutions to the President of the United States and to deny, in both Senate and House, the truth of the governor's statements. While admitting that Oregon is suffering from the prevailing hard times, we confidently claim that there is less poverty here in proportion to the population than in any other State in the Union, and the prospects for the future are excellent.

ALBERT I. WAGNER,
Secretary Salem Board of Trade.

Mr. President, I have discharged my duty in this regard.

Mr. VEST. I hardly anticipated, sir, that a little ordinary resolution in regard to the expenditure for public buildings would lead to a discussion of the Senatorial question in Oregon. I am also profoundly astonished that the Senator from Oregon should have now changed his opinion as to the causes of the depression of business throughout the country. Unless my memory has absolutely deserted me, I think I recollect some very eloquent speeches by the Senator from Oregon during the last silver discussion, in which he promised us that if there should be a repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act a millenium of prosperity would flood the country like the sunlight on a May day. He, with his friends, succeeded in securing the repeal of that clause, but yet the sunlight has not materialized, and the country is suffering to-day to a greater extent than almost ever before in its history.

After having failed to prophesy correctly in that regard, the Senator from Oregon has discovered another cause of calamity, and that is the tariff. But it is a singular contradiction of his statement that the depression extends throughout the whole world. Business in Europe is depressed as well as in the United States, and certainly our tariff has not affected business relations there. It is also a singular fact that whenever such statements as those alluded to by the Senator from Oregon as having been made by his governor are brought forward in either House of Congress they are denied most emphatically, as in this instance, by the Senators and Representatives from those States. While we are told that there is a general depression throughout the country, the Representatives and Senators are always ready to contradict the assertion that in their States an unusual degree of depression exists.

Coming back to the real matter before the Senate, I did not care in the few remarks I made in reply to the Senator from Kansas, or rather in discussing his resolution, to allude to the condition of the Treasury of the United States, as has been done by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. When the Senator from Oregon sent to the committee of which I am chairman his bill removing the limitation upon the amount to be expended in any one year in plans and specifications of public buildings, as a matter of course it involved to a large extent the condition of the Treasury of the country.

It was not my purpose, Mr. President, to avoid any legitimate duty when I suggested to the Senator from Oregon when he came to the reference of that bill that it should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The idea in my mind was that the Committee on Appropriations was the proper committee to look into legislation which increased the expenditures of the Government, and it was an open secret then, as it is now, that the condition of the Treasury of the United States was such that appropriations by us, unless we furnished additional means to the Treasury, constituted simply an empty farce. It is known, without any official inquiry, that more money must be furnished in some way to the Treasury. We can appropriate. What is it but a simple and empty appropriation unless money is furnished to the Treasury with which to pay these appropriations? Until that question could be in some sort of way met, and the amount in the Treasury properly ascertained, I was reluctant to report a bill which took off the limitation in the general appropriation bill and extended the expenditures of the Government without understanding exactly where we stood.

I am glad that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] has stated here so frankly the real condition. It is above all party. The representatives of the people must now meet the situation as it exists, and in some sort of way furnish the money in order to carry on the Government.

I do not care to indulge in any partisan discussion. It is not my purpose to go back and show the condition of the Treasury when it was passed over by our Republican friends to us. It is enough now for Senators to know that the Treasury is practically empty, and that we must furnish the money in order to meet such appropriations as Congress thinks proper to make. It is very easy to find out how money should be expended, but the question is where is the money to be obtained?

I shall not follow the Senator from Oregon in his attempt to make the tariff policy of the Democratic party responsible for existing conditions. Those conditions were upon us before the tariff agitation commenced. They came from other causes, and every intelligent man in the United States knows it.

It is no good now, however, to indulge in recrimination, but it is the highest duty of statesmanship, without regard to party, to meet the condition as it is and adopt some means by which to replenish the exchequer of the country in order that our appropriations may amount to something.

Mr. DOLPH. I regret exceedingly that so able and distinguished a Senator as the Senator from Missouri should have paid so little attention to my speech upon the silver question as to indulge in the idea he has stated, that I ever suggested that our business disturbances and financial troubles were the result of the operation of the Sherman law. On the contrary, on the very day that the President's message was received at the special session of Congress, I took occasion to dissent from the statement of the President that the then existing condition of the country had been brought about by the operation of the Sherman law, and asserted that, in my judgment, the then condition of the country was the result of threatened hostile tariff legislation, a cause which had always produced in this country similar conditions.

Again, on the 3d day of October, in another speech I made upon the bill for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, I took occasion to amplify that statement to some extent, and then stated what I have substantially repeated this morning in regard to the securing of prosperity to the country by assuring the country that there would be no hostile tariff legislation at the present session of Congress. I did assert on more than one occasion in discussing the silver bill that, in my judgment, its repeal would not greatly aid in restoring the prosperity of the country; and then, not being willing to occupy the time of the Senate and let the impression go to the Senate and the country that I was seeking to delay the final vote upon that measure, I promised that when an opportunity came when I could do so without interfering with the other business of the Senate, I would undertake to prove by reference to our history from the foundation of the Government to the present time that what had this recently happened in this country had always happened when the protective policy had been abandoned or its abandonment had been threatened.

On the 18th of last month I fulfilled my promise, and notwithstanding the Senator from Missouri asserts that every intelligent man knows that the present condition of the country is not the result of threatened tariff legislation, I desire to say that, in my judgment and in the judgment of a good many others, I then established the proposition beyond controversy by reference to our history, by reference to the messages of the Presidents of the United States, by reference to the speeches of Democrats and of Whigs in Congress, and by other historical references, that what has happened since the last Presidential election in this country has always happened whenever the protective system has been abandoned or its abandonment has been threatened.

I say, I regret that it is necessary to correct the honorable Senator from Missouri. I hoped that he had paid better attention to what I said upon the silver question than to make the assertion which he did.

Mr. PEFFER. I merely wish to add a few more words. I do not desire to be sidetracked, if I may use that Western phrase, by the threat of a deficit in the Treasury, for I think it is safe to say that if the present policy of the Government of the United States, without regard to party, is to be continued it will not be long until there will not be anything that they call a dollar in the Treasury or anywhere else in the country; for it seems, Mr. President, that it has been the policy of every Administration since the time of the great war to contract our money to the gold basis, and then to place the gold in the hands of a few speculators so that they shall have control not only of the money of the people but, through the money, of their business. If we are going to wait until there is money in the Treasury according to the present and past policies of the Administration we shall never have any money there and we shall never have any public buildings.

But it is a mistake to say—and the word "mistake" is hardly expressive of what I mean—that there is not money enough on hand to carry out every contract of the Government. I wish to

say to the Senator from Maryland, to the Senator from Missouri, and to other Senators who believe as they do, that there is an abundance of money in the Treasury at this hour to meet every appropriation which has been made by Congress. I do not mean to say that there is gold in the Treasury—I do not mean to say that at all—but I mean to say that, according to the platforms of those parties, the Democratic and the Republican, everything we are now using as money is money and that it is just as good as gold, that for all practical purposes national-bank notes are just as good as gold, for all practical purposes silver certificates are just as good as gold, Treasury notes just as good as gold, greenbacks just as good as gold, and silver dollars just as good as gold; and we have—I do not know how much, because I have not figured the amount exactly—an abundance of that kind of money which the people out where I live are very glad to take, and I have no doubt the people in the State that the Senator from Oregon represents so ably are quite anxious to get that money out, and so it is everywhere in the country. There is an abundance of that kind of money, I will say to Senators. So there can be no trouble on that score, and if we can prevail upon the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to take charge of this resolution and see that the Supervising Architect is properly supplied with help to catch up with his work—if that is a proper expression—there will be no trouble about the money by the poor fellows who do the work. It is just such money as the rest of us have.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment being withdrawn, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TARIFF POLICY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to give notice that on Monday next, the 15th instant, after the routine morning business, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate to submit some remarks on the resolution I offered the 20th day of December relating to the tariff.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. ALLEN. I call up the resolution I offered yesterday, which is now lying on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized by the Chair, under notice previously given.

Mr. ALLEN. My resolution comes over, as I suppose, as the unfinished business from yesterday, but under the circumstances the resolution may be passed over for the present.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask to have taken from the table the resolution introduced on the 3d instant by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] respecting the affairs of Hawaii.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 3d instant, as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, pending the investigation ordered by resolution of December 21, directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into our relations with Hawaii, there should be no interference on the part of this Government, by moral influence or physical force, for the restoration of Lilliuokalani or the maintenance of the Provisional Government in the Hawaiian Islands, and that our naval forces should be used in said islands only for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. As the Senator from Minnesota desires to make some observations on the resolution, I ask at this time unanimous consent that he may be permitted to conclude his remarks without interruption by the intervention of the hour of 2 o'clock, and that at the conclusion of his remarks the regular order may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAY. What is the regular order?

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose there is no regular order unless it be the Calendar. I ask that the Senator from Minnesota may be permitted to conclude his remarks without the customary interruption at the close of the morning hour.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on the 4th day of March, 1893, there was no question pending between this Government and the Government of Hawaii except the consideration of the treaty of annexation. All preceding questions, whatever they were, had been gathered up into the recognition of that Government, and had been settled in the most solemn form by the conclusion of a convention which had been submitted to the Senate. The Provisional Government of Hawaii had also been recognized by the nations of the civilized world, and from no quarter of the horizon was there any portent whatever of trouble to come.

Immediately upon the accession of the present Administration recommendations were made and action was taken which, in the course of their performance and in their consequences, have largely undone, and threaten entirely to undo, the composed condition of affairs which up to that time had existed. Our relations to those islands are now such as to excite the gravest apprehension, and seem to be fraught with consequences which, as they evolve from day to day, no foresight can adequately predict. The widest divergence of opinion exists, the matter is thrown into the sea of debate and public discussion, and it is my purpose, with powers which I regret are not adequate to so great an occasion, to discuss somewhat extensively the past and the present of those transactions.

Mr. President, the relations of Hawaii to the United States are and have been peculiar and exceptional. For more than fifty years, as a matter of announced national policy on the part of this Government, acquiesced in by Hawaii and by the nations of the civilized world, those islands have been entailed to the United States, and as to the United States have been in reversion when the time should come when the fleeting monarchy which has existed there should expire. There has not been a Secretary of State since 1840 who has not announced this determination and this policy. Mr. Webster, Mr. Legaré, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Seward, Mr. Blaine, and all who have held that office have spoken in the voice of their Government in this respect with no uncertain tone, and it has been acquiesced in by foreign nations.

So that it is neither extraordinary nor remarkable that at sometime under favorable circumstances and conditions that to which manifest destiny had dedicated those islands should be brought to pass. Indeed in 1854, Mr. Marcy, then being Secretary of State, a treaty of annexation was negotiated and only failed of confirmation because of its condition respecting pecuniary compensation to be made, and because of the fact that the treaty provided that the Islands of Hawaii should become a State in the Union.

Mr. President, the condition of that country, like all communities which have emerged or are emerging from barbarism into civilization, has always been peculiar and precarious. It has been subjected to foreign intervention over and over again, and those interventions were the occasions of many expressions of policy by the various Secretaries of State whom I have mentioned.

In 1836 the English negotiated relations with that island under the guns of a frigate. In 1839 the French did the same. In 1843 the English Government by force took possession of those islands and held them for months. The French did so substantially on another occasion, and when in 1851, under the guns of a French man-of-war, treaty obligations were demanded of the Kingdom of Hawaii, the then king executed a deed of cession and delivered it in escrow to the United States representative to be opened and considered as received upon the happening of certain events.

As I shall, in the course of the remarks which I propose to make, discuss at considerable length the events of January, 1893, in that island and the events subsequent to that time, it is, in my conception of the subject, necessary and proper, not for the purpose of vindicating particularly what has been done, but for showing the reasons and occasions of the action of the civilized people of those islands, to go somewhat into the history of the repeated occasions of oppression and abuse of power which finally brought those people to a conviction that they were under a condition of government which they could no longer endure and which authorized them to resort to the sacred right of revolution.

The reciprocity treaty with the Hawaiian Islands was concluded in 1876. Before that time and from the beginning of its history, or from the beginning of the time when civilization had come in contact with its history, those islands had been, so far as their civilized condition was concerned, the outgrowth of American influence, American settlement, and American civilization. It was a proud memorial of these. No other government exercising a protectorate or a sovereignty over the people of any other islands in the Pacific Ocean had brought about such results. The English found a republican form of government recently organized by the Maoris in New Zealand when they took possession in 1840, and where are the Maoris now? Swept away by the inexorable destructiveness of British administration.

But here in these islands, through American settlement, American influence, American wealth, and American Christianity, is presented the only instance in all that vast sea of a people forming themselves into a government under the guidance of civilization. So when the reciprocity treaty of 1876 became oper-

ative, there poured into those islands thus prepared an enormous accession of American enterprise, wealth, and people, and its influence upon the destinies of that island of all kinds was of the most beneficent character.

But the new influences had to contend with a condition of things destined to soon pass away. The experiment of monarchical rule, then being conducted there, was ephemeral in its very nature.

Mr. President, relations such as those between this Government and that implied a certain right of intervention and control and interference. Such intervention and control have been exercised over and over again. That which would not be necessary in any situation which may now be conceived of as to relations which we have with any other nation of the world has been necessary there.

In 1874, by the death of the King without issue, he naming no successor, the office became elective by the Legislature. Strife arose between the partisans of Queen Emma, who represented the British interests, and those of the late King Kalakaua, whose disposition toward the United States was supposed to be favorable. The Legislature of Hawaii convened. There was an election. It resulted in the choice of the late King. Immediately a riot sprang up, intended by its contrivers to grow to the proportions of a revolution. The rioters were natives. They broke into the legislative chamber where the ceremony of election was taking place, and assaulted and beat the legislators then in the performance of their duty. Whereupon, without invitation, upon the mere motion of the United States minister, the American marines were landed from the ship of war then in the harbor of Honolulu, and that election was thereupon conducted and concluded, and King Kalakaua was inaugurated under the direct supervision and guard of American military power.

In 1880 there was trouble in Hawaii because a foreign adventurer by the name of Moreno, who had become minister of foreign affairs or of finance, was playing havoc with the interests of the islands. The situation became so intolerable that all the foreign ministers raised their flags over their legations, and declined to hold any further intercourse with that Government until Moreno was displaced.

In time the Government became corrupt—corrupt beyond example, inefficient beyond precedent; it became the prey of every flagitious scheme which was not able to obtain a foothold in any other land. The opium bill of 1886, designed by its promoters to have its inevitable effect of producing a moral lethargy upon the people, was introduced, and a most singular system of bribery did its work.

A Chinese named Aki gave to the then King $71,000 as a consideration for a license to be thereafter issued to him. Another Chinese paid to the King $80,000 for the same thing, but took the precaution to get the license before he paid his money. The consequence of which was that Aki committed suicide and his estate went into administration. Because of the excesses, the profligacy, the riotous expenditure of the late King, his private debts had become about $250,000, and he was compelled to assign the crown lands to trustees as security for the payment. The administrator of Aki put in his claim. It was contended on the part of the Hawaiian Government, or by the trustees, that the contract was against good morals and public policy, and therefore was void; but by a strange yet I think logical application of the ancient maxim that the king can do no wrong, the supreme court of Hawaii held the contract valid and held the estate for the repayment of the sum.

The year 1887 was marked with great disturbances. Many events, which the limitations of the present occasion do not permit me to recount in detail, had brought this about. Many people from civilized lands had come in; great operations were going on, agricultural and otherwise; the existing constitution of 1874 was distasteful to them—unjust, for it contained instrumentalities of oppression. Accordingly, in that year a revolution was organized—revolutions are frequent in that island—and volunteer companies were equipped. Foreign residents addressed their ministers and stated that the situation as it had been was intolerable. Mass meetings were held, guarded by armed volunteer troops; business was suspended, and resolutions were passed declaring that the monarchy had ceased to exist through its incompetency and corruption.

A committee was sent to the King with this resolution. He called upon certain foreign ministers, those of the United States and Great Britain and Portugal, and offered to put his Kingdom into their hands if he could be extricated from what he considered the personal peril of his position. They declined this, and advised him to promulgate a new constitution at once, acceding to the demands of the revolutionists. He followed the advice. This was the constitution of 1887, which the ex-queen, by a revolutionary act, and in violation of the terms of every constitution which ever has subsisted in that island, undertook to abrogate by her own personal decree, and to restore that of 1874, which contained the unjust and oppressive provisions to which I have alluded.

After the adoption of the constitution of 1887 the next three years and a half of the history of that island were marked with sedition, conspiracy, and tumult. There was a revolution in July, 1889, and it resulted in insurrection, fighting in the streets, and much bloodshed.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. My impression is that the Senator is not strictly accurate when he says that Queen Liliuokalani proposed to restore the constitution of 1874. I think the evidence shows that she proposed a constitution of her own, which was infinitely worse than that of 1874.

Mr. DAVIS. I have compared the constitutions of 1887 and 1874 with what purports to be a copy of the constitution which she proposed to promulgate in January, 1893, and which until a very recent date has been visible to no man, and I am inclined to think that my general statement in that respect is correct.

Mr. FRYE. I simply desire to say further in relation to that, that there may be similar features in the constitution of 1874 to the one proposed by the Queen, but as published in the Blount report there are some parts of it left out of the constitution which the Queen proposes, notably the article which provided for disfranchising all the white inhabitants.

Mr. DAVIS. I shall come to that in the due course of my remarks. I propose to analyze those constitutions before I get through.

There was another conspiracy in 1888, the direct object of which was to depose the then King, and the ultimate object of which was to procure an abrogation of the constitution of 1887 and a return to the former bad condition of affairs.

Mr. President, I wish to impute in the discussion I am about to make upon this question of fact improper motives to no man. I have, however, become impressed with the conviction that upon the testimony which Mr. Blount took in the Hawaiian Islands, and upon that alone, his report can not be sustained.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator will pardon me one moment, I should like him to state right there if it is a fact that his argument is proceeding upon the evidence printed in the Blount report, and that he has not been present as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to hear the evidence which has been since taken?

Mr. DAVIS. That is true. In what I shall say, Mr. President, respecting the bearing of the testimony upon the Blount report, I shall confine myself exclusively to the testimony reported by that gentleman in connection with it. I will also state that, as a matter of fact, and designedly, I have not attended a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations now conducting its investigations. No syllable of the testimony taken there has been reported to me. I am unable to use it. I would not use it if I could, owing to the manifest impropriety of any such action. But I purpose to test the report so far as I can by the testimony which was taken by Mr. Blount and which it is asserted sustains it; and it does seem to me, weighing it with as much impartiality as one can who has convictions upon either side of the subject, that, instead of sustaining the conclusions to which the commissioner came, it sustains the action of Minister Stevens and sustains the action of the preceding Administration based thereon.

As I said, another conspiracy was inaugurated in 1888, all of these conspiracies having for their object the deprivation of the people there, who are of American and European birth, of the civil rights guaranteed to them by the constitution of 1887, having for their object a reversion to the old order of things whereby only native subjects were electors and eligible to office. The King having granted the constitution of 1887 under the conditions of force and duress which I have stated, many of his subjects were naturally dissatisfied, and accordingly the conspiracy of 1888 was entered into, in which the recent Queen, then Mrs. Dominis, was a prime mover, for the purpose of deposing her brother. Its object was to compel by force the King to abdicate.

The King got forty-eight hours to temporize, and the result was that some of the revolutionists were arrested, the conspiracy was frustrated, and the object of Mrs. Dominis, who afterwards became queen, was not attained. I cite this and other analogous facts to show the character and disposition of this woman, what she has done in the past, what her purposes have been, how she has violated pledges and oaths, and how much reliance can be placed upon any assurance of hers that her conduct in the future will ever be otherwise than it has been in the past.

Another revolution or conspiracy took shape and force on the 30th day of July, 1889, and Mrs. Dominis was back of that. It was known as the Wilcox insurrection. He arrayed a force of one hundred men, and he was a man perfectly competent to

carry out a design of that character. He is a somewhat remarkable personage, of Hawaiian birth, largely of Hawaiian blood. He was educated in his youth at the expense of the Government of the islands in the military schools of Italy, and served as a subaltern in the artillery service of that Kingdom until he was recalled by his own government. He entered into a conspiracy to dethrone the King, and Mrs. Dominis, the King's sister, was a confederate with him. With characteristic falsity she afterwards disavowed it, but no one can read the evidence in this report without being convinced that such was the fact, the scheme being throughout to procure a return to the old bad order of things.

Wilcox with his armed force moved out early in the morning and took possession of the government building. He received large accessions. The King fled from his palace and took refuge in a boathouse, under the guns of the United States man-of-war Adams. Some ten Hawaiians were killed in the fighting which ensued before the insurrection was put down.

On that occasion, in 1889, in the presence of a revolution organized and carried out to overthrow the King, the then minister of the United States did not hesitate. His conduct was never condemned. Mr. Merrill, who was then our minister, without any invitation from the Government, landed the American marines from the ship of war then in the harbor. He landed them because it was necessary to protect American life and property, no matter what the incidental results or the collateral consequences might be as to the stability of the Kingdom itself. His conduct was never blamed. Later in the afternoon, at the request of the Government, which he had not asked before, another detachment was landed and he reports:

The appearance of the marines on the streets and at the legation had a very favorable effect upon the populace.

Here was a conspiracy to overthrow the throne, necessarily implicating American interests in the result, whichever way the result might be, threatening violence; and yet before anything overt had happened, an article of property destroyed, or the life or safety of a single person actually threatened, the then minister landed the American troops, and no exception was ever taken to that act.

The time came for the King to die, and Mrs. Dominis was elected as his successor and took the title of Queen Liliuokalani.

Mr. MORGAN. Mrs. Dominis was not elected by the Legislature; she was appointed by Kalakaua.

Mr. DAVIS. I did not mean to say that. The constitution of that kingdom, issue failing, empowers the king the right to designate his successor, and that failing, the right of election vests in the Legislature. She was designated by her brother. When she was inducted into the sovereignty, under circumstances of great solemnity, she took an oath administered by the chief justice of the Kingdom to support the constitution of the year 1887; and yet her words had scarcely died away (certainly not from the recollection and hopes of those who heard them) before, in the early part of the year 1892, she began to conspire to do that which she afterwards attempted to do in January, 1893. She purposed and conspired to promulgate a constitution similar to that of January 14, 1893, and which when attempted resulted in her downfall. She requested Wilcox, the trained military man who conducted the preceding revolution, to assist her in the attempt and he refused. She caused warrants to be issued for 37 members of the Patriotic League. She laid plans to attack and shoot in the streets all who should resist her intended proceedings. Proclamations of martial law were drafted, to be made efficient by their issuance whenever it should be thought necessary.

Not meeting with sufficient encouragement, that attempt took no efficient shape; but the fact that it was made so recently after her coronation, so recently after she had sworn to support the constitution under which she had been inaugurated, with the other facts and circumstances to which I have called and to which I shall call attention, shows how little she is to be trusted and how justifiable her subjects were at the time of the revolution of January, 1893, in declaring that the time had passed when they could put any faith in her promises, and that any excuse or promise she might make was only significant of ulterior designs of the same character intended by her.

The year 1893 came in. The Legislature had been in session several months. The constitution of that kingdom provided, not that the cabinet should exist as long as the sovereign pleased, but that it should continue until voted out by a want of confidence of the Legislature. Up to January three cabinets had been voted out. It also provided that no royal act should be of validity unless countersigned by one member of the cabinet, who should thereby become responsible therefor.

During the session of this Legislature many causes conspired to produce the greatest discontent and alarm among the people of those islands. The opium-license bill came up again; but worse than that, the Louisiana lottery, driven from its own country, made its appearance through its agents in those islands and was seeking to spread over them the blight of another leprosy.

The result was that about the 11th of January, 1893, a bill was passed providing for granting opium licenses and another was passed granting a franchise to certain persons, but which, it was understood, was to go from them to the Louisiana lottery. The subsidy to be paid by the lottery company to the Hawaiian Government annually for the lottery franchise was $500,000, and the amount expected to be realized annually from the operations of the opium-license statute was $200,000, in all $700,000; one-third of the sum had hitherto been the highest revenues of the Kingdom. Of course, the feelings of the law-abiding people of the islands, of those who saw the correct way to civilization and who were leading in it, were outraged.

It was, however, a mere matter of domestic administration, and perhaps might have been suffered but for other proceedings. It being feared that no member of the then cabinet would countersign those bills, as required by the Hawaiian constitution, in order to make the Queen's approval valid, it was resolved by those who had secured the passage of those bills by bribery and corruption that they would obviate that difficulty by voting out the cabinet, whose action they feared, and by voting in one whom the Queen should nominate, upon whose favorable action they knew they could rely.

Accordingly, a vote of want of confidence was passed, and the ministry that was feared gave way to one from which much was to be expected with certainty. On the 14th day of January, 1893, if I am not mistaken in the date, the work all having been done to which I have alluded, the Queen prorogued the Legislature. The constitution of Hawaii contained a provision that any amendment of that instrument should be considered by two successive Legislatures, and be submitted to the people in the meantime. No proposition was heard in that Legislature for the amendment of the constitution; no knowledge or hint had been given to the public of the intention of the Queen; but immediately upon the prorogation, and upon the same day, word was given out to the native population to repair to the palace, and that the Queen was about to proclaim another constitution.

The announcement was heard with alarm, with indignation. The ultimate extent of her purposes could only be conjectured, but it was believed that they were radical and subversive in their character to rights existing and property invested in those islands by foreign-born residents, and yet who were citizens for all purposes of holding office and of voting. It is a most singular commentary upon this revolution and everything connected with it, and a most emphatic refutation of the pretexts of the defunct monarchy that it had the power at that time to crush the revolution, that from the time of the announcement of the Queen's intention to her ministers, of her wish and purpose to promulgate a new constitution, they were in continual conference with Thurston and the other revolutionists, receiving proposals from them.

On Saturday at 11 a. m., testifies Mr. Smith, Thurston and Colburn, the minister of the interior, had a conference at Hartwell's office, and here is what took place. W. O. Smith, at page 489, states in substance that about 11 o'clock Saturday morning he found Thurston, Hartwell, and Colburn, one of the cabinet, in Hartwell's office talking very earnestly. Colburn very much excited. Colburn said that the ministers had been informed that the Queen would promulgate a constitution immediately after the prorogation. Colburn was excited and very much alarmed. Colburn's manner was that of a scared man, very much frightened. Smith says that a number of native members knew that the new constitution was coming.

A meeting of some of the native members of the Legislature had been held on the preceding Friday night. It was reported that John Kaluna, a member, was very violent in his speech; and stated at that meeting that he could kill five or six men, and would be perfectly willing to be hung for it, or die if he only had the opportunity to kill five or six more in defense of the proposed constitution. On a subsequent occasion, on the same day, Colburn came to Smith's office wearing a blue sash, only worn on state occasions, and asked Smith to go with him to the attorney-general's office (Colburn was the minister of finance, and the attorney-general was Mr. Peterson) in the Government building. Smith went and found there Peterson, Colburn, and Cornwell (the minister of the interior), Thurston, Wundenburg, and McFarlane. Colburn stated what had taken place at the palace. The others advised the ministers not to resign. A messenger came from the Queen requesting the ministers to return to the palace. At the time the whole of the Queen's guard was drawn up in front of the palace.

Then, describing the various streets, Mr. Smith says that on the Waikikki side of the main entrance to the palace and on the

Ewa side of that entrance was a large crowd of natives—two or three hundred—and half as many more on the Makai side.

Mr. HOAR. What day was that?

Mr. DAVIS. This was Saturday. Smith says when the messenger came to summon them he told them not to return, explaining that three being absent it was a majority of the Government. Colburn expressed unwillingness to go, stating that he feared an excited mob and felt that their lives were in danger if they went back. It was decided to send for Parker to come over. He came, and the whole situation was discussed.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. Parker was the other member of the cabinet?

Mr. DAVIS. Parker was the minister of foreign affairs. There was a third conference between the revolutionists and the Queen's minister held at 3 o'clock in the afternoon of Saturday, concerning which Mr. Smith states in substance on page 489:

> After the attempt to promulgate the constitution, and at about half past 3, Colburn overtook Thurston and myself returning to my office and told us how the Queen in great anger had stated to the people that she had been unable to carry out her wishes and had been prevented.

Concerning this third interview Mr. Waterhouse states in substance on page 47:

Colburn stated that the Queen had gotten them into a room and requested them to sign the new constitution; they asked for a half hour to talk it over; in the meantime the natives were talking quite loud, and Colburn thought it about time for him to get out of it. So they went out the back way to the Government house. If they had gone out the front way the natives were all out there, and they were afraid. They wanted to know if the merchants would support them in their position. After discussing the matter a committee of safety was appointed.

I pause here, Mr. President, to call attention to the fact that this potent monarchy which it is now asserted was all through these proceedings, if it had been let alone by the United States, powerful enough to put down the insurrection, was, through three of its cabinet ministers, consulting with the revolutionists for what was deemed to be the public good. It was at the last consultation that the committee of public safety was appointed. The ministers had fled from the palace. The royal power was broken then and there.

Its executive arm was palsied. No element of force able to sustain it appears during the four days covered by these events except in the person of Mr. Wilson, concerning whom this testimony is full, and who was the only one of the Queen's adherents, I am bound to say, who throughout this entire business showed any courage or manhood, or was willing to employ the powers which it is said she possessed to put down the revolution, which they knew from its very inception was in progress, and which they assisted up to a certain point and knowingly helped to carry out.

There was still a fourth conference upon that Saturday, but it was probably not the fourth in order. This depends upon the statement made to Mr. Blount by Mr. Colburn, one of the ministers (page 30). January 14, Colburn and Peterson conferred with Thurston and others at Smith's office, and Thurston submitted to them a written plan of action in case the Queen persisted. This Colburn and Peterson took, and told Thurston they would await developments. The Queen was very determined at first. Mr. Colburn further states that Mr. Thurston came to him and insisted that he (Mr. Colburn) should oppose the Queen's intention, and that he would receive all the support wanted, even if necessary to depose her. This was at the Government building, whence the ministers returned to the palace.

The proposition which Colburn and Peterson took from Mr. Thurston on that Saturday was that the Queen under certain circumstances should be deposed, and that they should take part in the act of deposition. And these ministers, invested with such powers, powerful enough, as they afterward said in this testimony, to suppress the insurrection if they had been let alone, neither on that Saturday, nor on any day thereafter, took one step, so far as physical force is concerned, to attempt to do it, but put the proposition for the deposition of the Queen, in which they were to assist, into their own pockets and took it into further consideration. Some of these conferences to which I have alluded took place at the Government building and some of them were held at the office of Mr. R. O. Smith. Mr. Smith says, page 489:

> And we heard from various sources of the violent speeches of William White and others threatening bloodshed, and we returned and reported this to the meeting. My office was crowded with people. Colburn worked his way in, and Peterson appeared a little later and Colburn repeated his statement. This was after the constitution was attempted to be promulgated.

There is much more in this testimony to the same effect, but I have given in a condensed way the substance of some of its salient points.

This was a singular revolution, avowed, open, known to the Queen's ministers, they consulting and finally confederating with the revolutionists in a certain contingency, not one of them invoking any show whatever of physical force for its repression. The fact is that the monarchy was physically and morally gone on Saturday, two days, nearly three days, before a United States marine put his foot upon the island. They knew perfectly well—and the silence of the Queen all through these proceedings is significant, for nobody claims that she is not a bold and brave woman—that the days of the monarchy were over. The revolution was, like the great volcano on the neighboring island, giving signs of an activity which no human power could repress, but in the presence of which all human beings were hushed awaiting the unavoidable convulsion that was shortly to come to pass with irresistible power.

The proceedings at the palace when the Queen attempted to promulgate this constitution throw great light upon what she intended to do, whether she did in good faith then or thereafter defer her intention, how much reliance can be placed upon her promises now, and whether the apprehensions of the people on the island—the American people, the English people, the German people, the Norwegian people, the Portuguese people—were well founded, that there was no safety for them if the rotten dynasty should be suffered to continue. What took place at the palace does not seem to have impressed the mind of Commissioner Blount with any particular force, and yet it is concurred in by witnesses of the highest respectability. I shall take the liberty to read some condensations of their testimony. I will read first from the report of the committee on public safety, page 316. I read this for what it is worth, and ask no further credence for it than is derived from corroborative evidence to which in a few minutes I shall call the attention of the Senate.

These portions of the testimony which I shall state pertain to the proceedings that took place at the palace between 1 o'clock and 4 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, the 14th of January, 1893; and I may say that the entire events of the revolution are comprised within that Saturday, and the following Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday.

The Queen turned a deaf ear to the protests of the cabinet that the proposed action would cause the streets to run red with blood, and threatened that unless they complied with her demands she would state from the steps of the palace that the reason she did not give the people the new constitution was because the ministers would not let her. Three of the ministers feared mob violence and went to the Government house. They were summoned back, but refused to go. Later they returned to the palace, and for nearly three hours she again endeavored to force them to acquiesce. Upon their final refusal, in a public speech in the throne room, and again from the upper gallery of the palace, she announced that she desired to issue the new constitution, but was prevented by her ministers, and would do so in a few days. So the committee of public safety reported to the people.

I wish the Senate to be properly impressed with the situation as it was at the time. A constitution was to be promulgated without any previous public announcement of the fact. It had been kept a profound secret except as to very few people. It was to be promulgated by a revolutionary act to be committed by the Queen, in violation of the existing constitution which she had sworn to support. It does not appear in this testimony that anybody but Peterson, and perhaps some of the natives, knew of the existence of such an instrument before it was presented by the Queen at the palace about 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, and he had been carrying it around in his pocket for about eleven days. The entire royal forces of the island were drawn up in line and in arms before the palace, the force being limited to seventy-five by the law of the kingdom. Word had been sent out to the natives to appear, and hundreds of them surrounded the palace on all sides where the troops were not—an excited mob. Bearing in mind the previous attempts to forcibly abrogate the constitution of 1887, the conspiracies in which the Queen then in private life had figured and in which blood had been shed, this testimony and that which follows and corroborates it is very significant, not only as to the character of the woman, but as to the utter want of reliance which any circumspect person or administration can place in her assurance of her future good conduct.

Mr. Bishop, who was present on the same occasion, says in substance that the Queen drew up the household troops in front of the palace and determined to promulgate a new constitution; that she used violent language toward her ministers and they fled, and that she said she abandoned her intention for the present, but told her native subjects that she did so with regret, and would promulgate the constitution within a short time. And, as Mr. Bishop says, this wrecked her government.

Let me call attention to the testimony of Chief Justice Judd, who had been summoned from the seat of judgment where he was holding court to attend at the palace—he learning for the

first time when he was summoned what the object of the message was. Mr. Judd had sworn the Queen to the constitution of 1887. He is a man of great prominence in the island, and is of the very highest personal character. Let us consider his version of the events at the palace, of which he was a personal witness. He says, in substance, that the Queen invited him to attend at the promulgation of the new constitution.

Shortly before the invitation, the chief justice was told that an advocate of the lottery bill was going to the palace, with a large number following, and that the Queen was going to proclaim a new constitution. The chief justice proceeds to say that the Queen was in great agitation, and at the same time controlled herself. He gives her language as follows: "She had prepared a new constitution which she thought would meet the purposes required and meet the approval of the people, but" she said "with great sorrow, I am obliged to tell you that I can not do it now, but I ask you to go home and love me and I will continue to love you, and in a few days you will have your wishes gratified." Whereupon a member of the Legislature turned around and said: "What shall we do with these men who prevent the gratification of our wishes?"

He was seeking an object of vengeance, and asked what shall be done with the cabinet, who in obedience to their constitutional duty, and in fear for the personal consequences to themselves, had refused to countersign the proclamation of the Queen giving out the new constitution, abrogating a constitution which she had been solemnly sworn to support, and which contained provision for the only method by which it could be amended, namely, by a new organic instrument, or by amendments which were to be passed upon by the action of two successive Legislatures. And as against this any royal proclamation promulgating another constitution was revolutionary in its character, and by its very force and effect absolved every subject of the Queen from allegiance to her, just as surely as the arbitrary acts of the King of Great Britain absolved our forefathers from allegiance to him.

Mr. Boyd was also present and he says the Queen was a very angry woman when at 4 p. m. Saturday she returned to the throne room, where were assembled the Hui Kalaiaina with most of the native members of the Legislature, the cabinet, the governor of Oahu, the young princess, Chief Justice Judd, and Mr. Justice Bickerton, the staff, ladies of the court, kahili bearers and others. She ascended the dais and spoke substantially as follows: "Princes, nobles, and representatives: I have listened to the thousands of voices of my people that have come to me, and I am prepared to grant their request.

"The present constitution is full of defects, as the chief justice here will testify, as questions regarding it have so often come before him for settlement. It is so faulty that I think a new one should be granted. I have prepared one, in which the rights of all have been regarded—a constitution suited to the wishes of the people. I was ready and expected to proclaim the new constitution to day as a suitable occasion for it, and thus satisfy the wishes of my dear people. But, with deep regret, I say that I have met with obstacles that prevent it. Return to your homes peaceably and quietly, and continue to look toward me and I will look toward you. Keep me ever in your love. I am obliged to postpone the granting of the new constitution for a few days. I must confer with my cabinet, and when, after you return home, you may see it, receive it graciously. You have my love, and with sorrow I now dismiss you."

There is published, in the evidence which accompanies the report of Commissioner Blount, extracts from an article or a work called Two Weeks of Hawaiian History, which gives a somewhat circumstantial account of the proceedings at the palace.

Its substance is that Mr. White replied, thanking the Queen and assuring her of the love of the people and that they would wait patiently until their desires should be fulfilled; to which the Queen responded with thanks, and left the throne room.

This was after she had announced her failure.

Mr. Kaunamano then began, in a loud voice, an inflammatory harangue, which was suppressed. He demanded the lives of the members of the cabinet who had opposed the wishes of Her Majesty, and declared that he thirsted for bloodshed. A few moments later the Queen went out upon the upper balcony of the palace and addressed the crowd. She told them that on account of the perfidy of her ministers she was unable to give them the constitution which she had promised them, but that she would take the earliest opportunity of procuring it for them. The crowd then gave three cheers. Representative White then proceeded to the steps of the palace and began an address. He told the crowd that the cabinet had betrayed them, and that instead of going home peaceably they should go into the palace and kill and bury them. Attempts were made to stop him, which he resisted, saying that he would never close his mouth until the new constitution was granted. Finally he yielded to expostulations.

Mr. President, this discussion of the question of fact has perhaps been wearisome, but I am very anxious to lay before the Senate testimony which evidently made no impression whatever upon the mind of Commissioner Blount. It seems to me if he had had the least desire to sustain his own country in this matter, to sustain what had been done for our glory and credit, and not to discompose a condition of affairs which when he went there was settled, that some weight might have been given to this testimony. I am aware that there is scattered through this record testimony which can be strained and perverted according to the condition of mind in which you look at the transaction, to sustain to some degree the report of Commissioner Blount.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota, before he passes from the narrative he has just made, whether he has found anywhere, in the report of Mr. Blount, or the statement of the case on either side, in the evidence or elsewhere, in the discussion of the press or otherwise, any claim that the Queen had any constitutional power to proclaim a constitution? Has any human being claimed that, so far as the Senator knows?

Mr. DAVIS. No human being has ever made that claim. It has been conceded from all points and it must be conceded that it was a revolutionary act, in violation of the constitution which the Queen had sworn to support.

It is a proper time now, Mr. President, to state very briefly what these constitutions were; those which had been, were, and were proposed, and to which these events have relevance. There was the constitution of 1874, the constitution of 1887, which was that in force during the Queen's reign, and the proposed constitution. I said some time ago that the influx into the island of people of European and American birth after the convention of 1876, establishing reciprocity between that government and ours, had been so great, and the property thereby created so vast in value that it was felt, felt by them, felt by many of the enlightened natives, that their interests were not safe until there could be some radical change in the organic law whereby, by the right of voting and the right of holding office, they could in some degree protect the great interests which they had created. Out of this conviction sprang the constitution of 1887.

The constitution of 1874 gave the King the absolute right of veto. The constitution of 1887 provided, as ours does, that a vetoed bill could be passed over the disapproval of the executive by a two-thirds vote. It is certain that the Queen proposed in the constitution which in 1893 she intended and attempted to promulgate, to restore and to retake to herself, by the arbitrary act of proclamation, the right of absolute veto, and to take from the Legislature any control or restriction of her powers as to that.

Under the constitution of 1874, the one which was set aside and supplanted by the revolution of 1887, the right of suffrage was limited, and consequently the right of holding office, to every male subject of the island. Every male subject of the Hawaiian Islands of a certain age and with certain qualifications, not necessary to be considered here, was an elector, and no one else. The evils to which I have alluded, and which were remedied in the constitution of 1887 (which, I confess, was revolutionary in its character, but long acquiesced in), procured the introduction of a clause into that constitution by which every male resident of the island, of Hawaiian or American or European birth, of a certain age and possessing certain property qualifications, became entitled to the right of suffrage, and became entitled to the right to hold office.

Now that provision, concerning which I will not descant here, meritorious and protective in its character to all the material interests of the island, was proposed by the Queen to be taken away by a revolutionary proceeding in 1893, and the right of suffrage and the right to hold office were to be revested, as under the constitution of 1874, only in the male subjects of the island, the vastly large proportion being of native Hawaiian blood. That proceeding took from the great interests which have sprung up there every security which they had. It took away the right to limit taxation, and vested the power to tax without limit in a half reclaimed horde of semi-barbarians. It took away the dearest right which a man in any constitutional government can have—the right to protect himself by his suffrage. It limited it exclusively to others. There is not a government on earth, constitutional in its form, where the people have the right to exercise the elective franchise, where such people would not rise in revolution, and have not repeatedly risen, for instances of encroachment less flagrant, and who would not be justified in so doing by the earnest sympathy, if not by the active assistance of the people of other nations.

I can not refrain, Mr. President, from the expression that here throughout I am talking on behalf of men and women who are of American blood and birth or of American descent. This is no

abstract question in that regard. They built up the islands. They caused the influences of civilization to fall upon them for more than sixty years. They Christianized them. They reduced the language to form and put it into printed speech. They invited American industries, American wealth, and American people to those shores. They established and fostered self-government. They drafted their laws; and it is upon them, people of our own blood, inhabitants and citizens of islands dedicated by a long system of policy to ultimate annexation to the United States, that the attack of the present Administration is made, by processes which many of us think are unconstitutional, and which are certainly irregular and without precedent.

Under the constitution of 1874 the nobles, who constituted one-half of the Legislature, were appointed by the King for life. Under the constitution of 1887 they were elected for six years, one-third going out at intervals of two years, as is the case with the Senate of the United States. That was proposed to be taken away, and the power of the Queen to appoint for life as nobles one-half of the Legislature was in this unconstitutional form to be re-established and revested in the sovereign. The full effect of this usurpation is apparent when it is considered that the Legislature of that Kingdom sits as one body. The Queen thus purposed to appoint one-half of that Legislature for life.

The cabinet under the constitution of 1874 was appointed and was removable by the King. Under that of 1887 it was removable only upon a vote of want of confidence, and no sovereign written act whatever could have any validity without the signature of one member of that cabinet. That provision was to be abrogated by this revolutionary act of the Queen, secret in its inception, sprung with sudden force upon the public mind when she, surrounded by troops and having gathered around her a turbulent Hawaiian mob, attempted to commit an act of usurpation which was contrary not only to her general duty as sovereign, but was violative of the oath which she took at the time of her coronation.

The judges under the constitution of 1874 were appointed by the King for life. The judicial tenure was thus stable, not subject to the mutations of popular caprice nor to the whims of the sovereign. The proposed constitution of 1893 provided that they should be appointed by the sovereign for six years. The succession to the throne was carefully limited in the constitution of 1887. By this arbitrary act she added two persons to the line of succession, those failing who stood before them in the line.

I have stated the provisions of the proposed constitution of 1893 as nearly as they can be ascertained. Up to a very recent time no copy of that constitution could be obtained. It vanished at the time of the failure to promulgate it and did not reappear until very recently, as I find one in the documents which have been laid before the Senate. It is certified to in the most guarded manner by Parker and others as to being a copy and as to the changes which it was to effect.

Mr. President, as I have said, on Saturday it was resolved to appoint a committee of public safety. This was done at a meeting at which two of the Queen's cabinet ministers were present and had taken part. But before I proceed to discuss that branch of the subject let me call attention to a fact which to my mind all throughout has had great significance. When the Queen took occasion to attempt to promulgate the constitution on Saturday, the 14th day of January, Minister Stevens was not in the islands, nor was there any United States ship of war there. The Boston, with Mr. Stevens on board, had been gone to Hilo for about ten days, and the time of return was uncertain. It seems to me that the Queen and those who were conspiring with her took advantage of the absence of the Boston and of the American minister, thinking that the situation would be more advantageous for the consummation of this revolutionary act than if the minister or the ship of war were present.

Mr. PLATT. The revolution was not anticipated by them before leaving?

Mr. DAVIS. When the ship went away no such thing was suspected. No idea or hint had come from sea or shore to any person that any revolutionary act whatever was in design or course of perpetration.

Mr. SHERMAN. The old cabinet was in existence.

Mr. DAVIS. The old cabinet, as is suggested, was in existence—known, I believe, as the Wilcox ministry—one in which the country had a great degree of confidence, and one which, as I have remarked, was voted out because it was felt that none of its members would sign either of those twin iniquities, the opium and lottery bills, and one voted in that it was known would sign them. Mr. Stevens returned on Saturday. The Boston sailed into the harbor of Honolulu on Saturday at about 11 o'clock.

Mr. PLATT. On what day of the month?

Mr. DAVIS. On the 14th of January—this same day. Neither those who had decided to create a revolution nor the Queen nor any of her adherents, it is apparent, had any knowledge as to when the Boston would return. It can not be, and it has not been, charged against Mr. Stevens or the memory of Capt. Wiltse that in the preliminary acts by which the revolutionists irrevocably committed themselves to revolt, they had any lot or part whatever.

Mr. HOAR. Or that they knew when the Boston was coming back.

Mr. DAVIS. Or that the revolutionists or anybody knew when the Boston was coming back. Mr. Stevens's daughter was an invalid. He was away caring for her health. I say before the Boston had returned to the port the revolution was under way, and firm and resolute men with our blood in their veins; yes, and Englishmen, and Germans, too, and Portuguese, Norwegians, and French, had resolved that they would rise in their might and majesty against this corrupt dynasty and depose and overthrow it forever. It is in vain to argue by special pleading that Mr. Stevens did not, as a matter of fact, find this revolutionary situation there when he returned, and that it was not one which required his immediate action if he obeyed the dictates of duty as imposed by international law, or if he obeyed the positive instructions which were then upon file in his office from Mr. Bayard.

Mr. CULLOM. And by following precedents?

Mr. DAVIS. And by following out repeated precedents in the history of our diplomatic relations with those islands. Of course, when the Boston came into port with these forces looking each other in the face, the one side resolute and determined and the other cowed, with no action latent in them and no resolve to act except by mob violence breaking out upon impulse, it became a matter of importance to every citizen, irrespective of his connection with either side, to know what in the certainty and inevitable character of the impending troubles the action of the Unied States forces was to be. It was known that they had landed twice before during revolutionary times. Accordingly, a delegation of the committee of safety was appointed to wait on Mr. Stevens to ascertain the disposition of the United States minister and what would be his action in regard to the landing of troops. He undoubtedly knew the situation. The town is a little town of 20,000 people. The island is but 600 miles square, turbulent as the volcano in one of the neighboring islands. Every noise is heard and every sight is seen by everybody.

The American interests there were vast and the American population numerous. The matter undoubtedly came with force and suddenness upon Mr. Stevens's mind the moment he touched the shore in landing from the Boston, at about 11 or 12 o'clock on that Saturday. The committee waited on Stevens, and I will read from the testimony of Mr. Smith the substance of what they reported he said.

Mr. CULLOM. Is that in the testimony accompanying Blount's report?

Mr. DAVIS. Everything that I am speaking about is in the testimony which Mr. Blount has submitted as corroborative of and as a foundation for his report.

At 8 o'clock in the evening another meeting of the committee was held at the Thurston House. Thurston stated that Stevens had said that the United States troops on board the Boston would be ready to land any moment to protect the lives and property; and as to the establishment of a provisional government, he would of course recognize the existing government, whatever it might be.

If he had taken down a work on international law from the shelf and read it, he could not have stated the abstract principles any more justly or correctly.

Mr. GRAY. Whom is the Senator now reading from?

Mr. DAVIS. I am reading from my abstract of the testimony of Mr. Smith, page 489. Thurston stated to Stevens the proposition that was under consideration, and he asked Stevens what his attitude would be. Stevens told him whatever government was established and was actually in possession of the Government building, the executive departments and archives, and in possession of the city, that was a *de facto* government, proclaiming itself as a government, and would necessarily have to be recognized.

I say, Mr. President, that that is a general principle of law which could not be stated better and never has been stated more exactly by text-writer or commentator. Time after time in the history of our diplomatic relations that has gone out as the standing instruction of our Government in regard to revolutionary transactions, especially upon this hemisphere.

What was Mr. Stevens to do under these circumstances? The revolution was on. It had been resolved to depose the Queen. All civilization was back of the revolt. The passions of the natives were excited. Lives had been threatened in the very throne room of the palace. Preceding history was full not only of warnings, but of imperious monitions to action. Any action taken

there without some restraining force would inevitably result in danger and perhaps destruction to American life and property. Why should he have acted differently from the manner Mr. Merrill acted in 1889, or differently from what was done in 1874 when the election of King Kalakaua was being conducted, and a native force of insurrectionists broke into the legislative hall and there inflicted personal violence upon the members because they, the assailants, favored the cause of Queen Emma?

Mr. President, supposing the marines had not been landed and this revolution had progressed, as most assuredly it would—for the men at the back of it were determined men, and I say they had the force to carry out their intention—suppose the marines had not been landed and the result had been bloodshed in the streets of Honolulu, that the lives of American men, women, or children had been taken away, or arson had lit the sky with its red glow, or property had been destroyed, how instantly the American people, officially and unofficially, would have risen up in condemnation of his negligence!

Mr. Stevens was not without instructions here. If he consulted the records of his legation he found a letter from the premier of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration, Mr. Bayard, to Minister Merrill of July 12, 1887. It is to be found in Executive Document No. 1, Foreign Relations, 1887, page 520. It will be observed that this dispatch was written about the time, either after, or in immediate apprehension of the troubles and insurrections which had culminated in enforcing from King Kalakaua the constitution of 1887. Mr. Bayard recites the necessity for the strictest vigilance. Mr. Merrill had written to Mr. Bayard stating the precarious condition of things there, the latent turbulency and unrest, and had requested instructions what to do in case that happened which actually happened in July and which actually happened in the year of grace 1893.

Mr. Bayard recites in his dispatch the necessity for strict vigilance by those charged with the care of the rights of American citizens, as well as the rights of the United States under treaties, regrets recent domestic discords, and states that the interests of American citizens, which have grown up under the extension of commerce between the United States and Hawaii, must not be jeopardized—meaning, as I construe it, must not be put in peril, but must be protected by precautionary action in advance of actual assault, or attempt; this is the fair construction of that language—must not be jeopardized by internal confusion in the Government of those islands, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that these interests are not imperiled or injured, and to do all things necessary for their just protection.

That is very comprehensive language written by the Secretary of State to Mr. Merrill at the time when the events which afterwards took place were feared—nothing must be jeopardized or imperiled or injured. He states that the Department can give only general instructions, which may be communicated to the commanding officer of the naval forces, "with whom you will freely confer in order that such prompt and efficient action may be taken as the circumstances may make necessary." Then he concludes as follows:

While we abstain from interference with the domestic affairs of Hawaii in accordance with the policy and practice of this Government, yet obstruction to the channels of legitimate commerce under existing treaties must not be allowed, and American citizens in Hawaii must be protected in their persons and property by the representatives of their country's law and power, and no internal discord must be suffered to impair them. Your own aid and counsel, as well as the assistance of our Government vessels, if found necessary, will therefore be promptly afforded to promote the reign of law and respect for orderly government in Hawaii.

I maintain, taking into consideration the situation as it was when Mr. Stevens returned to the port of Honolulu, that those instructions of Secretary Bayard's vindicated and were a direction to do all that Mr. Stevens did, and to say that because in doing that, in protecting American citizens, he incidentally, and as a collateral consequence, made the sustaining of royalty more difficult than it otherwise would have been by preventing bloodshed and havoc in the streets, is to attach all importance to the incidental and particular and to leave out of all account the general and conclusive object that was to be attained.

These, Mr. President, comprise principally the events of Saturday, sketched at more length than was perhaps necessary, but sketched, I think, with substantial accuracy from the material furnished by the testimony taken by Mr. Blount.

We come now to Sunday, and we find Colburn and Peterson still in collusion with Thurston and the others. I refer to the testimony of Colburn, on page 30, who says in effect that the next morning, Sunday, January 15, at 6 a. m., Thurston came to Colburn's house and wanted him to go with him to Peterson's house. Upon their arrival there Thurston said that he represented a committee of safety, who had held a meeting at his house on Saturday evening and decided to send him to us with a proposition that Peterson and Colburn should depose the Queen. Thurston gave them the names of the committee of thirteen, and said that the desire of this committee was that you two depose the Queen and declare a provisional government.

What did the ministers do? Did they rise up in their might and loyalty and endeavor to secure the arrest or even the rebuke of Mr. Thurston? Not at all.

We told him that we would have to take the matter under advisement and would inform him of our conclusions later on.

This proposition, treasonable as it is claimed, was made on Sunday, when there was not a United States marine on the island, and when it is asserted by the royalists in the United States and elsewhere that all-sufficient physical force and military power were in the hands of the Queen's Government; was made to these cabinet ministers, who said that they would have to take it into consideration, and would inform the revolutionists of their conclusions later on. If they thought they had the physical force to suppress or check that which to their knowledge had been resolved upon, and which to their knowledge was being carried on, why was it not employed? It was not employed, Mr. President, and these considerations and suggestions were received thus favorably for the simple and only reason that they knew that the monarchy was powerless, and that it had broken down in substance and effect.

On the same day, at a meeting at Mr. Thurston's house, a message was received from the cabinet that the ministers would like to meet the committee of thirteen, whose names had been given to Colburn and Peterson.

To show how much force and power there was behind the Queen's Government, adequate in any degree to prevent that which afterwards came to pass, I call attention to the statement of Robert Wilcox, (on page 539 of the report), a trained military man, who conducted the revolution of 1889. Speaking of Sunday he says in substance that on Sunday he was called on by Colburn, who wanted him to assist the Government, who said that Thurston had requested him to sign a document requesting the ordering of the Boston's marines on shore and to proclaim the Provisional Government. Colburn called again in the evening and wanted Wilcox to go down to the Government building. Several people were there consulting over the situation. Marshal Wilson was there. Wilson decided it was proper to arrest the committee of safety.

Mr. PLATT. Was that after the troops landed?

Mr. DAVIS. No; it was the day before. This was on Sunday. The troops landed at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon.

Wilson, the only resolute man who appears upon the side of the Queen, was there with full knowledge of the facts and of the names of the committee of public safety, and he decided and held that it was proper to arrest that committee.

They asked my opinion—

It is Wilcox who is testifying—

I said the only thing was to suppress them before they made any progress. They said the revolutionists were going to have a mass meeting. Then they decided to have a meeting of the supporters of the Government in the square right opposite the Government building, and some one talked about proclaiming martial law, and stop all the rebels and riots, and all that sort of thing; but Paul Neumann said—

He is one of the leading advocates of the Queen and her trusted representative—

it would not be necessary; it would only create friction. I told Paul Neumann that if there was any bloodshed the Government would be responsible for taking such a weak stand. Paul Neumann said there was a document to be read there to detarone the Queen—

That was at the mass meeting—

by the opposition party. He said, "That is no treason." I said, "If that is not treason, we had better give up the whole thing."

Here, on Sunday, with full knowledge by the Queen's government and all her ministers that the committee of safety had been appointed; that the Queen was to be deposed, and that a proclamation to that effect was to be read at the mass meeting, as then intended; with not a show of force up to that time back of the Provisional Government; with all the public arms in the hands of the Queen's Government; with the educated military officer, Wilcox, then adherent to the Queen, sent for to come into their councils—under all these circumstances the Queen's advisers met and declined to make any civil arrests; they decided that it was unnecessary to proclaim martial law, because it would produce friction. They decided to do nothing whatever except to call another mass meeting.

Finally Paul Neumann, the lawyer and attorney of the Queen, who has held her letters of attorney, who represented her in Washington, as I am informed, declares that all this proceeding which they had been discussing is not treason. Then they were advised by the only military man on the island on either side, if that was not treason they had better give up the whole thing.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator ought to add one more thing, that Wilson, who was the marshal and had charge of the police, was there.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Wilson was the marshal, as the Senator

suggests, and had the entire control of the police force, 60 in number; and he was there, as I have stated. He had, in addition to that, 75 of the Queen's guard, a trained body of men. Repeated meetings of the committee of safety had been held in Mr. Smith's office and elsewhere, and that fact was well known. Three constables could have effected the arrest of the entire committee in a time when the Government had any power. It was not attempted.

I say that Government had broken down, and these pretexts, officially and otherwise set forth, that this power of the Government, otherwise invincible, broke down at the presence of United States troops, is absolutely and flagrantly contradicted by concurrent facts from the time and many hours before a United States Government marine was in sight of the island.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator allow me to ask him whether I understand him to say that on Sunday there was not a United States Government marine in sight of the island?

Mr. DAVIS. I do.

Mr. GRAY. The Boston was in the harbor.

Mr. DAVIS. I beg pardon. I did not for the moment remember that.

Mr. GRAY. The Boston arrived at 10 o'clock on Saturday morning.

Mr. FRYE. There was not a marine on shore.

Mr. DAVIS. There was not a marine on shore. The Boston had arrived—and I am very much obliged to the Senator from Delaware for correcting me.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator will pardon my interruption. I know he wants to be accurate.

Mr. DAVIS. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. Wilson, in a statement on page 552, states that he proposed to the cabinet on Sunday to arrest the ringleaders of the plot at once.

What I have said is a résumé, and hardly that—a few scattered suggestions of fact as to what took place on Sunday. Two days had passed away since this revolution was more than brewing; it had been in full progress.

Coming now to Monday, the 16th of January, Mr. Waterhouse testifies as to the mass meeting of 2 p. m. on Monday, that after the mass meeting the committee of safety met and decided to take possession of the Government. There was still another meeting on Monday, when they planned what should be done on Tuesday. After the meeting on Monday, Mr. Carter took the request of the committee of safety to Mr. Stevens.

Without going into this testimony as fully as I had intended, I make the statement here that in all the interviews which were held with Mr. Stevens by the committee of public safety, and also by the Queen's ministers—for the applications to Mr. Stevens were not confined to one party—his invariable assertion was that he would land troops to protect American lives and property, and every attempt to draw him by declaration or intimation into a pledge or understanding, express or implied, that he would support the Provisional Government failed to elicit anything of that kind from him. He stated in reply to all such inquiries the abstract principle of international law, reiterated over and over again in our diplomatic history, that the Government *de facto* would be the one that would be recognized. He had no authority to stay this revolution; he had no authority to support this reeling, toppling monarchy. He did have the right, and it was his duty, if either revolution or monarchy created a situation which, in the language of Mr. Bayard, "imperiled American interests," to land the troops and to thus prevent those interests thus imperiled from being injured. If the Queen's Government had by a course of action created a situation which made the exercise of that right by Mr. Stevens necessary, she can not complain if, by her own act thus creating occasion for the exercise of that necessary right by Mr. Stevens, such exercise by him incidentally and collaterally may have had some effect toward sweeping away the throne which she herself had thus put in jeopardy.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator does not admit that?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not admit that it did—that his action had that effect. I maintain that it had not. I shall come to that in due time. The testimony here is abundant that the revolutionists were able to protect themselves, and that the Queen's Government was powerless to stay the execution of their purpose.

I may say here, for fear that I forget it in a more appropriate connection, that the testimony is concurrent that the Provisional Government expected to have some trouble, and it is abundant, as I have stated, that they did not rely upon the United States troops and that they were able to take care of themselves. This revolution would have gone on if not a marine had ever set his foot on the island of Oahu. I shall demonstrate, I think, before I get through, that all the talk of intervention or of implied duress by the United States troops by reason of their position is the merest fallacy, a far-drawn argument to support what I think was a foregone conclusion.

As illustrative of just exactly what the attitude of Mr. Stevens was—and contemporaneous records of this character are of much greater value than the testimony of any witness whose recollection may be distorted by want of full retention in memory or by prejudice—I desire to read at length Mr. Stevens's letter to Capt. Wiltse, and Capt. Wiltse's order to Lieut. Swinburne:

UNITED STATES LEGATION, *Honolulu, January 16, 1893.*

SIR: In view of existing critical circumstances in Honolulu, indicating an inadequate legal force, I request you to land marines and sailors from the ship under your command for the protection of the United States legation and the United States consulate, and to secure the safety of American life and property.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. STEVENS,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States.

Capt. G. C. WILTSE.

This request to Capt. Wiltse is limited by its very terms to the protection of the legation and the securing of the safety of American lives and property. Acting upon that, Capt. Wiltse issues to the executive officer, Lieut. Swinburne, the following order:

U. S. S. BOSTON, SECOND RATE,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, January 16, 1893.

SIR: You will take command of the battalion and land in Honolulu for the purpose of protecting our legation, consulate, and the lives and property of American citizens, and to assist in preserving public order.

Great prudence must be exercised by both officers and men, and no action taken that is not fully warranted by the condition of affairs, and by the conduct of those who may be inimical to the treaty rights of American citizens.

You will inform me at the earliest practicable moment of any change in the situation.

Very respectfully,

G. C. WILTSE,
Captain, U. S. Navy, Commanding U. S. S. Boston.

Lieut. Commander W. T. SWINBURNE,
Executive Officer, U. S. S. Boston.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has been speaking continuously for several hours. Would he prefer to yield now and continue to-morrow?

Mr. DAVIS. I should prefer it.

Mr. HALE. Then, unless there is some business to intervene, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

REPORT OF UTAH SCHOOL COMMISSIONER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORMAN in the chair). Before putting the motion of the Senator from Maine, the Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the sixth annual report of the commissioner of schools for Utah Territory.

The communication was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and forty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 11, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1894.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Otis B. Spencer, of Colorado, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Denver, in the State of Colorado, to succeed Henry G. Heffron, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Stephen P. Slocum, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for the district of Newport, in the State of Rhode Island, to succeed John H. Cozzens, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Thomas W. Lamb, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for the district of Brunswick, in the State of Georgia, to succeed John H. Devereaux, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

Theodore H. Holck, to be postmaster at Grundy Center, in the county of Grundy, and State of Iowa, in the place of Charles J. Keiter, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

W. L. Farrar, to be postmaster at South Paris, in the county of Oxford and State of Maine, in the place of Franklin Maxim, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Charles R. Henry, to be postmaster at Au Sable, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan, in the place of James A. Perry, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

James McNamara, to be postmaster at Alpena, in the county of Alpena and State of Michigan, in the place of Thomas White, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Alfred E. Haven, to be postmaster at Faribault, in the county of Rice and State of Minnesota, in the place of Eden N. Leavens, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Hettie J. Foose, to be postmaster at Kosciusko, in the county of Attala and State of Mississippi, in the place of Rasselas Boyd, deceased.

John W. Mason, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Audrain and State of Missouri, in the place of Eugene C. Burkhart, removed.

David H. Mock, to be postmaster at Webb City, in the county of Jasper and State of Missouri, in the place of Ellen M. Dodge, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Robert C. Albright, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey, in the place of William T. Brown, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Garrabrant R. Alyea, to be postmaster at Rutherford, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey, in the place of Charles Burrows, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Frank K. Avery, to be postmaster at Phœnix, in the county of Oswego and State of New York, in the place of Joshua M. Williams, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Lyman S. Coleman, to be postmaster at Castile, in the county of Wyoming and State of New York, in the place of Edward A. Pierce, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

C. Leonard Lewis, to be postmaster at Naples, in the county of Ontario and State of New York, in the place of Frank W. James, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

James H. Quinlan, to be postmaster at Flushing, in the county of Queens and State of New York, in the place of Elisha F. Harris, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Patrick Reiley, to be postmaster at West Troy, in the county of Albany and State of New York, in the place of T. T. Woodward, whose commission expired January 9, 1894.

Andrew McTigue, to be postmaster at Far Rockaway, in the county of Queens and State of New York, in the place of Thomas Henderson, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Charles E. Kinder, to be postmaster at Miamisburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio, in the place of Emanuel Schultz, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Jacob Stief, to be postmaster at Carey, in the county of Wyandot and State of Ohio, in the place of James A. Gibbs, resigned.

Thomas A. Butkiewicz, to be postmaster at Nanticoke, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George T. Morgan, resigned.

Thomas B. Gillouly, to be postmaster at Ridgway, in the county of Elk and State of Pennsylvania, in place of James H. Hagerty, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

John Julian, to be postmaster at El Paso, in the county of El Paso and State of Texas, in the place of James A. Smith, removed.

Ed E. King, to be postmaster at Brownwood, in the county of Brown and State of Texas, in the place of Marion Mullins, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Robert M. Crawford, to be postmaster at Mineral Point, in the county of Iowa and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Sidney E. Shepard, whose commission expires January 16, 1894.

Fergus F. Green, to be postmaster at Shawano, in the county of Shawano and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Christopher Hill, whose commission expires January 16, 1894.

Daniel P. Gallivan, to be postmaster at Clintonville, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of David L. Clinton, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Denis T. Walsh, to be postmaster at Ansonia, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of Morris Drew, whose commission expires January 16, 1894.

William H. Burks, to be postmaster at Sullivan, in the county of Sullivan and State of Indiana, in the place of James H. Clugage, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

V. C. Hanawalt, to be postmaster at Logansport, in the county of Cass and State of Indiana, in the place of Daniel W. Tomlinson, whose commision expired January 8, 1894.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1894.

SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

William N. Hailmann, of La Porte, Ind., to be superintendent of Indian schools.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John W. Ferguson, of Minden, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Lincoln, Nebr.

POSTMASTERS.

William M. Kintner, to be postmaster at La Junta, in the county of Otero and State of Colorado.

Samuel A. Cunningham, to be postmaster at Golden, in the county of Jefferson and State of Colorado.

Frank P. Hobbs, to be postmaster at Wolfboro, in the county of Carroll and State of New Hampshire.

Charles Spinney, to be postmaster at Goodland, in the county of Newton and State of Indiana.

Eugene Lewis, to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Hancock and State of Indiana.

Benjamin F. Sonnenstine, to be postmaster at Wadsworth, in the county of Medina and State of Ohio.

Joseph W. Falknor, to be postmaster at Covington, in the county of Miami and State of Ohio.

Frank M. Parker, to be postmaster at Hillsboro Bridge, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.

John G. Schwegman, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana.

Patrick Roach, to be postmaster at Harbor, in the county of Ashtabula and State of Ohio.

James L. Carson, to be postmaster at Wapakoneta, in the county of Auglaize and State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 10, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by Rabbi Edw. N. Calisch, of Richmond, Va.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled an act (S. 439) for the relief of David R. Gottwals.

WITNESS FEES IN UNITED STATES COURTS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for fees of witnesses in the United States courts for the current fiscal year; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CONGAREE RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to House resolution dated December 15, 1893, information relating to the necessity of deepening the 2 miles of the Congaree River below Columbia, S. C.; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

MISDEMEANORS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting sundry letters from the United States attorney for the Indian Territory relative to the method of trying misdemeanors now in force in the Territory; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

REIMPORTATION OF HORSES AND CATTLE FROM MEXICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owner of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time before May 1, 1894, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate thereto.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. PASCHAL, who is not just now in his seat, being in attendance upon

a committee, desires that the House concur in the Senate amendment, and I make that motion for him.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the preamble.

Amend the title so as to read, "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico, to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from the date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles, which were severally referred as follows:

An act (S. 1377) for the relief of William Hendershott, of Butteville, Oregon—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

An act (S. 69) to grant to the State of Oregon townships 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 south, in ranges 5 and 6 east of the Willamette meridian, in the State of Oregon, for a public park—to the Committee on Public Lands.

An act (S. 79) to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife—to the Committee on Public Lands.

USE OF THE NAVY AT HAWAII.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Naval Affairs on the resolution offered on December 21 by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] asking for information from the Secretary of the Navy concerning Hawaiian affairs. I will state that under the rules the report should have been made yesterday, but the House took a recess before there was an opportunity to present it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can submit the report, but no action can be taken on it except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. DOCKERY. I object.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that it lie on the Speaker's table without losing its privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do I understand the Chair to rule that this is not a privileged report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not so rule.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I refer the Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not rule that the report was not privileged. It is privileged.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I refer the Chair to page 519 of the Manual, where he will find a ruling of the House that the fact that a privileged report is not made on the day prescribed by the rule does not cause it to lose its privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated that the report is privileged.

Mr. BOUTELLE. In what does the privilege consist, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The privilege consists in the right under the rules to call it up for consideration; but the House has modified and altered its rules by a rule adopted a day or two ago, providing for a special order, which order does not permit the Chair to entertain any motion except one of those mentioned in the order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But this is not a motion. This is a report which comes back as a privileged matter, and comes up by force of its own inherent privilege outside of the ordinary rules of procedure.

The SPEAKER. The motion would necessarily be to agree to the report.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But I understand that the report comes up by reason of its own inherent privilege, and must be disposed of.

The SPEAKER. It can not be disposed of at this time under the order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. We are proceeding to do a great many things here that do not appear in the order.

The SPEAKER. Nothing whatever.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, the Chair has already transacted other business here this morning.

The SPEAKER. It is provided for in the order. The Clerk will report the special order so that the House may understand this matter. The Chair calls attention to the first part of the order, which defines what must be done daily.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That after the passage of this resolution the House shall meet each legislative day at 11 o'clock a. m. That beginning to-day without intervening motion, except conference reports and reports from the Committee on Rules, the Journal shall be read, business under clause 1 of Rule XXIV shall be disposed of, the Speaker shall call the committees for reports, and then the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) "to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. This order, it will be observed, provides that—

beginning to-day without intervening motion—

Now that cuts off every other motion—

except conference reports and reports from the Committee on Rules, the Journal shall be read—

That has been done—

business under clause 1 of Rule XXIV shall be disposed of—

That is, clearing the Speaker's table, which has just been done—

The Speaker shall call the committees for reports—

That was about to be done—

and then the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then the Chair rules that this matter can not be called up?

The SPEAKER. It can not be called up now; but it does not lose its privilege——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Where does it go?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I ask that it lie on the Speaker's table.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will not my colleague on the committee [Mr. CUMMINGS] ask unanimous consent to take up and adopt this unanimous report?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I did ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. DOCKERY. I object

Mr. BOUTELLE. This is a unanimous report from the committee.

The SPEAKER. The matter does not lose its privilege, but can be called up when the pending order of business is disposed of.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call up the question of privilege pending, which the Chair presented to the House a week ago—the resolution setting forth that the Executive has invaded the rights and privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair will be forced to direct the call——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Before the Chair rules I would like to make a suggestion. I desire to make a point of order. I have been looking into this question with some little care——

Mr. CUMMINGS. Do I understand that the report of which I had charge lies on the table without losing its privilege?

The SPEAKER. The report does not lose its privilege, and can be called up at any time when the special order is out of the way.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That carries it over until January 29?

The SPEAKER. Until the operation of the pending order has terminated.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And it will not terminate until January 29.

The SPEAKER. It will not.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Now I call up this question of privilege; and I make the point of order that neither the House by any rule nor the Speaker by any ruling can divest this body of any of its constitutional functions. The function here involved in the pending question of privilege is one which does not rely upon any rule, but is based upon the fundamental organic law of the Government, a provision that is absolutely and obviously essential to the maintenance of republican institutions, viz, that the House of Representatives shall be an independent coördinate branch of the Government, and shall at all times be in possession of the power and opportunity to protect its existence, its honor, and its privileges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair will see that in the nature of things, if we are to continue as a republican government with coördinate branches, and if this House is to continue to be what the Constitution made it, a coördinate branch of the Government of the United States, with its coördinate privileges and powers, it can not be possible that by the adoption of any mere rule as to consideration of a bill the constitutional function and privileges and duties of the House not specified in this rule can be put in absolute abeyance, be practically abrogated for more than three weeks while the House is in session.

Mr. Speaker, suppose that the Committee on Rules in preparing this rule had inadvertently or otherwise omitted to take note of the fact that during the period embraced in its operation—a period of more than twenty days—it would become the constitutional duty of the House to participate in the counting and declaration of the electoral vote. Of course, so far as any inherent power of this rule is concerned, the Speaker, ruling that he is absolutely bound hand and foot, as it were, by the specific terms and provisions of this rule, would have to deny the right to proceed to the performance of that duty, as he has denied the right to consider any other matter of high privilege.

But it can not be possible that if during a period which the House had thus assigned for the consideration of a tariff bill, it should be found that the time had arrived for the execution of the duty of the House to participate in counting and declaring the electoral vote, the Chair would hold that by reason of the adoption of such a rule for the consideration of a matter of business, the constitutional right and function of the House with reference to the counting of the electoral vote would be set aside; that the House could not take part in the counting of that vote; that the statutes of the United States providing for executing the constitutional determination of the succession to the Presidency of the United States would be rendered nugatory, because the House by the adoption of a special rule or order for the consideration of a tariff bill had provided that nothing outside of the matters specified in that rule could be entertained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one more suggestion. Suppose the Executive of the United States, in the pursuance of the policy which the Executive has inaugurated, and that is now in process of being carried forward in Hawaii, should deem it necessary to use the armed forces of the United States? On the 3d day of December, the Secretary of State, in a letter of instructions to the United States minister in Hawaii, informed him what the Administration desired him to do to displace the Government, but for the first time put in the qualifying phrase that armed forces could not be used without the authority of Congress. Now, clearly on the face of the instructions the minister of the United States in Hawaii was authorized by the Executive to go forward in the attempt at the restoration of the Queen to the full extent that he could carry out that policy without using armed forces, and the implication gathered from the instructions is that when he reaches that point the action of Congress, if necessary, would be invoked to authorize the use of the armed forces of the United States.

Now, does the Speaker of the House hold that by the operation of the rule under which we are now acting it is possible, if the conditions now existing in Hawaii should be shown by to-day's or to-morrow's advices to have reached a point where it is impossible to carry out the policy of the Administration without the use of the armed forces of the United States, and the President should send a message to Congress asking for power in this particular to declare war, does the Speaker then hold that the mere operation of this rule prevents the House of Representatives from exercising its high constitutional functions?

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to demand the regular order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine was making a statement of his view on this question.

A MEMBER. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why this impatience? The White House clock has not struck this morning.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Maine——

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may be kindly indulged for a moment, I wish to say, if the gentleman from Maine desires to offer an affront to a fellow-member on the floor of the House, I would advise him to do it in a more marked manner—something that can be taken notice of.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Oh, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. TRACEY. I have never attempted to use the slightest discourtesy to the gentleman from Maine. Now, if it is not my privilege to rise here and make a parliamentary inquiry without being insulted, I would like to be informed of the fact.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York is hurt by what I have said I withdraw the jocular remark. If he is so sensitive that he can not accept a piece of pleasantry of that kind, I withdraw the remark. I supposed that he would see it was merely a joke.

Mr. TRACEY. It is not pleasant to hear such language.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I withdraw the remark. I had no intention, of course, of wounding the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine that the House of Representatives acts, of course, through and by a majority of its members.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope that gentlemen on the other side will preserve order while the Chair is ruling on this question so that he may be heard.

The SPEAKER. The House acts by a majority of its members. A majority of the House has determined, by the adoption of this rule, that they will attend only to the business marked out in this rule until they shall have disposed of the pending revenue bill. Now, in order to provide for any emergency which might arise, the Committee on Rules, in reporting this order of business to the House, and the House in adopting it, have provided that the reports from the Committee on Rules may be in order at any time pending the operation of this rule, for without such a provision it is doubtful whether that would even have been in order. So that there can be no trouble about the House binding itself. A majority of the House is responsible to the country for the manner in which it transacts the public business; it is responsible for the maintenance of the honor, the dignity, and the integrity of the proceedings of the House, so that a majority can determine on their responsibility what business shall be transacted.

Mr. BOUTELLE. If the Chair pleases, do I understand the Chair to mean that that whole matter is to be determined and controlled not by the House itself, but by the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Rules represents the majority of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. All matters coming before the House of Representatives go to the committees, which are organized by the majority, which committees represent the majority of the House, and are supposed to be responsible to the wishes, views, and purposes of the majority of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But does the Chair hold that the Committee on Rules is the entire repository of the control and defense of the privileges of the House?

The SPEAKER. When the House of Representatives, by a majority vote, determine that they will pursue a certain order of business, not to be interrupted except by a report from the Committee on Rules, the Chair understands that they have reposed in that committee discretion and judgment as to whether or no they shall make a report.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Chair kindly rule on the point of order that I made, that it is not in the power of the House itself, or of any committee of the House, or of the Speaker, by any ruling to divest the House for one moment, or for an hour, or for three weeks, of its constitutional functions?

The SPEAKER. That question does not arise. There is no such purpose; no such intention.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, Mr. Speaker, suppose the President sends a message here, setting forth certain conditions; for example, that the United States minister is obstructed in carrying out his instructions, that the British marines are already on the shores of Hawaii, and that it is necessary for us to land troops there to carry out the Administration's policy. Now, does the Speaker hold that because we are operating under a rule that has bound us until the 29th of January, that the House can not consider that message? I am not speaking now of the Committee on Rules, because we can not control the volition of the Committee on Rules. Under the ruling of the Chair the House can not even instruct the Committee on Rules, can not even take cognizance of the matter, and order the Committee on Rules to present any subject for consideration. Suppose that the three members constituting the majority of the Committee on Rules, individually or officially, were indisposed or physically unable to act on such a matter, does the Speaker hold that thereby the House of Representatives in its collective capacity is estopped by this rule from taking any action for the exercise of its constitutional function of declaring war? It certainly can not seem possible——

The SPEAKER. Of course no such question has arisen.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I present the question. I call the question up now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman now to raise that question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But if the Chair please, the very question is precipitated by the resolution now pending. It declares that the rights of this House are invaded by the Executive, by his own statements. Now, it makes no difference as to the degree, if the privileges of this House are invaded to the slightest degree by the Executive, the principle is exactly the same as if every right of the House were invaded. My resolution sets forth—and the Speaker has recognized it as involving a question of high privilege—that to-day this House is not in the full exercise of its powers, by reason of a usurpation on the part of the executive department. Now, it makes no difference, Mr. Speaker, as to the operation of these rules, or as to the duty of the House, whether this usurpation is a little one or a big one. It makes no difference whether it goes to one degree or another; and just exactly as it is impossible to conceive that this House has bound itself so that it can not act upon a call of the Executive to declare war, even if it were to enable the Government of the United States to repel invasion, so I insist that it is impossible that this resolution or question of privilege can be out of order.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Has not the Chair already ruled that the gentleman is out of order and not entitled to be heard further?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the gentleman will not be discourteous.

Mr. McMILLIN. There has been no discourtesy.

Mr. BOUTELLE. When the Chair is willing to listen, I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] can very well continue to keep his seat until I have finished.

Mr. McMILLIN. Well, if it comes to that, I will have the right the rules give me. The Chair has decided the question and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has not appealed. He is out of order, and I make the point of order against him.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair has not ruled upon the point made.

Mr. McMILLIN. I so understood from the Chair. I understand the Chair to state that he had decided the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has expressed an opinion. The Chair thinks——

Mr. McMILLIN. Then the gentleman's only remedy is by appeal.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, now, you need not instruct me on that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks under the order adopted by the House the Chair must submit to the House only that business which is provided for in the order. Now, so far as the immediate question is concerned—that called up by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE]—the gentleman from Maine himself can not dispute the power of the House, if it had been considering the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine, to postpone its further consideration until the 29th day of January or until the 15th day of February.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But if the Speaker please——

The SPEAKER. The House might have done that by a vote. The Chair understands this order to be not only that that proposition, but every other proposition not provided for in the order is postponed until after the House has disposed of the revenue bill which is now pending before it. That is the whole question, as the Chair understands it. The Chair is forced, then, to direct the Clerk to call the committees for reports.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the Chair permit me to call his attention to his statement of a few days ago? I want to remind the Chair that he distinctly stated that if consideration was voted down at one time it might be because on that day the House did not want to consider it, and that on another day the House might want to consider the question. There is no analogy between the question of consideration and the refusal to submit the question of consideration. I am perfectly willing to submit this question to the consideration of the House. My protest is against the Chair refusing to permit the House to act upon this question in anyway, and that he is thereby absolutely depriving the House of the right to exercise its own privilege.

The SPEAKER. Of course the Chair must take the responsibility, subject, as stated the other day by the gentleman from Maine, to the criticism of the House. The Chair must take the responsibility of executing the orders of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain the appeal.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Under what rule does the Chair refuse to entertain the appeal?

The SPEAKER. Because there is no provision in the order to entertain any motion at all. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to make a motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair does not recognize any appeal now. When will an appeal be in order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be in order.

The Clerk proceeded to call committees for reports.

POST LIGHTS ON YORK RIVER, VIRGINIA.

Mr. WISE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4697) to authorize the establishment and maintenance of post lights on York River, in the State of Virginia; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NONRESIDENT PENSIONERS.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1138) to repeal so much of a proviso of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," and approved March 1, 1893, as relates to the payment of pensions to nonresidents who are not citizens of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees for reports. Under the order of the House heretofore made the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. HAINES. I rise, Mr. Speaker, in order to present this petition [pointing to an immense bound petition], and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted at this time to present the remonstrance from the citizens and collar and cuff operatives of the city of Troy, N. Y. It contains 69,817 protests, 50,465 of which are from citizens of the city of Troy and vicinity, who pray that the tariff be not changed so far as it affects the reduction of tariff on collars, cuffs, and shirts.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask that the petition be read. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. That can not be without unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a motion that at the end of this discussion the gentleman from New York be permitted to take possession of this petition. It is my understanding that it is in accordance with his wishes.

Mr. REED. That is all right. You can insult anybody in this House now, because privilege exists no longer.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman can make remarks when he desires, but I make this request with the approval of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PICKLER. I rise to a point of order. I make the point of order that no motion is in order.

The SPEAKER. None is in order without unanimous consent.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from Nebraska makes a motion.

The SPEAKER. It requires unanimous consent to make it. The Chair had announced that the House would resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, but recognized the gentleman from New York because he stated that he desired to call attention to petition.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. That can not be entertained at this time. The House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill the title of which has been read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 335) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation, in Montana, under the homestead and mining laws, for educational and other purposes;

A bill (S. 411) for the relief of Samuel Collins; and

A bill (S. 901) for the relief of the owners of the schooner Henry Tilton and of personal effects thereon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments concurrent resolution relative to the personnel of the Navy, etc.; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

Also, that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892; in which concurrence was requested.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole to consider a bill raising revenue. Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the argument is made that we are a tax-ridden people, and that we are paying much more for articles of consumption and apparel than we would were the principles of the Democratic party to prevail. There is no article manufactured in this country to day in sufficient quantities to meet or nearly meet the requirements of the consumers that is not cheaper than it was when we depended upon the foreign manufacturer. I defy any Democrat in this House or out of it, in America or in England, to successfully controvert this statement. In the discussions in this House which resulted in the compromise measure of 1832 this argument, which the Democrats now so strenuously contend for, was as loudly proclaimed then.

Mr. Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, who was a consistent protectionist and a true lover of his country, met these objections by a number of illustrations demonstrating the fallacy of the then Democratic position, and showed conclusively that under the

protective laws of 1824 and 1828 all articles that were covered by adequate protective duties were being sold in the American markets cheaper than they were when we depended upon the importer and the foreign manufacturer for them. In a report to the House he said:

The soundness of this objection, as applying generally, for such as it is used, may be well tested by a few familiar examples: cut nails were formerly from 10 to 12 cents the pound; there is a specific duty on them of 5 cents and, under this duty, competition has brought down the price to 6 cents the pound, which is but little more than half what they formerly cost.

According to the objection, this duty may have been a reasonable one when first imposed, but is an odious tax when, under its protection, we can get nails for nearly one-half the former prices. Supposing the duty to be a "tax" in the sense generally used, we ought to get them for 1 cent the pound if the tax should be taken off; but it will be difficult for us to believe this because, under a lower rate of duty, and when our principal supply was from foreign workshops, we were obliged to pay 10 and 12 cents for what our workmen now turn out for 6 cents.

Lead formerly cost from 6 to 8 cents the pound, the duty is 3 cents specific, and the present price is far below the former. Common window glass formerly cost from $10 to $14 the box; it is subject to a specific duty of $3.50 per 100 feet, and is now selling from $4 to $4.25 the box. Brown sugar formerly cost $14 the hundredweight; it is subject to a specific duty of 3 cents the pound, and the present price is about $7 or $7.50 the hundredweight, but again specific. Twelve years ago bar iron sold at Pittsburg for $190 to $200 the ton. Under the protection of a specific duty the price has fallen to $100 per ton. Hoop iron was $250, and is now $120. Sheet iron was sold for $18 the hundredweight, and is now $8.50.

Cotton bagging has also a specific duty; the price was formerly 26 cents, and is now 16 cents the yard. The minimum duty on coarse cotton goods is in effect a specific duty of 8¼ cents the square yard; the price was formerly 20 and 25 cents; the like goods, or rather goods of a much better quality, are now furnished for about 8 cents the yard; so that if the protecting duty of 8¼ cents is a "tax" to that extent, we ought to get the fabric for less than nothing if the tax should be repealed. But in truth the people are not taxed in these cases, unless it is by having their supplies furnished by American workmen, in many instances, at one-half the price they were formerly taxed with for similar articles when our market was controlled by foreigners.

Mr. COOMBS. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. COOMBS. The gentleman has stated, as I understand him, that hoop iron is offered at $1.20 per hundred pounds.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I am reading what Mr. Ingersoll said was the price of hoop iron in 1833; showing that under the protection that was given to that product the price had fallen from $2.50 to $1.20.

Mr. COOMBS. It is $1.20 per hundred pounds to-day. It is offered at that price in large quantities. I would remind the gentleman that the duty upon hoop iron is $1 per hundred pounds. Now, does not the gentleman realize that this great fall is due to no other cause than to the extraordinary and ruinous competition which the McKinley bill has brought into the market, and does he not see, therefore, that the McKinley law, instead of benefiting the manufacturers, is ruining them?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the McKinley law could not have ruined anything in 1833. [Laughter.] The point that I am presenting here is from a report that was made by Mr. Ingersoll, a member of the Ways and Means Committee in 1833, showing that by putting a proper import duty upon hoop iron, which had been selling when we were dependent upon the foreign manufacturer for $2.50, the price had been reduced at the time this report was made to $1.20. And, Mr. Chairman, every other article that has been properly and adequately protected will show like gratifying results in the reduction of price.

This statement of Mr. Ingersoll illustrates the workings of protective tariff legislation. Instead of its being a "tax" upon the people, it is the means of their procuring all of the necessaries of life much cheaper than it would be possible for them to procure them when we were wholly dependent upon foreign manufacturers. Familiar illustrations can be given by examining the ledgers and books of any firm or corporation which has been engaged in mercantile business for a period of thirty, forty, or fifty years past. At any of the free-trade periods in the history of our country the prices of articles have been higher than at other times when the Government has been under the control of a political party which favored adequate and ample protection. In 1837, a period when free-trade Democracy controlled this Government, the ledger of a prominent mercantile house shows the retail prices of eighteen different articles, as follows:

Calico, per yard	$0.37½	Iron, per pound	$0.12½
Unbleached cotton	.25	Coffee mills	3.00
Bleached cotton	.33½	Lamb's wool hose, per pair	1.25
Jeans	1.75	Yarn, per pound	1.75
Coal shovels	1.35	Gingham, per yard	.44
Cast steel, per pound	.31½	Pins, per paper	.12½
Spool cotton	.12½	Water buckets	.75
White lead, per keg	4.25	White flannel, per yard	1.25
Shoe tacks	.12½	Needles, per paper	.12½

These articles, many of them, are 80 per cent cheaper to-day than they were then, and there are none of them that are not 50 per cent cheaper than they were in those free-trade days.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the gentleman claim that that reduction has been caused by protection?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I will answer the gentleman. He asks me if I claim that this reduction has been caused by protection. Protection is the primary cause. If we were merely an agricultural people there would be no invention in machinery in this country, and the reduction in prices has been brought about in part by stimulating the inventive genius of our people as well as by the aid that has been given to the establishment and maintenance of these industries by judicious protection. A splendid illustration of this was given before the Ways and Means Committee during the hearings that were accorded to the public when the present bill was under consideration. A witness engaged in the carpet industry came before the committee and spoke of a kind of carpet which had cost formerly, when we depended upon the foreign manufacturer, about $6 a yard, but to-day that article is sold in the American market for $1.50 a yard. How has that reduction been brought about? In this manner:

First, by perfecting and improving our machinery. In the case about which I am speaking, an ingenious Yankee boy was employed in the coarser work in the mills which were engaged in the manufacture of carpeting. This boy, who had come from the farm, and whose inventive genius would probably have lain dormant during his entire life if there had not been mills and factories here where he could find a field for the stimulation and development of the natural bent of his mind, went into this mill and soon saw that improvements could be made in the machinery that was used, by means of which the carpet could be made much cheaper, and, by the result of his inventive genius together with the protection that was afforded to the manufacture by our laws, this kind of carpet has been brought down in price from $6 a yard to $1.50 a yard. Now, in the main the same thing is true of every other article that has been produced under our protective system.

Mr. BRYAN. Does that reasoning apply to the reduction in the price of farm products, which have been protected, and which have gone down in price under protection?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman, that a little later on I will show him that the reason why farm products have remained as low as they are, is because the American farmer has not been properly and adequately protected. For example, the gentleman is in favor of putting wool on the free list. My colleague from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] in an argument upon this floor in the last Congress showed to this House and to the country that wool in North Dakota was selling for 10 cents a pound more than it brought in British America, and that, were it not for the protective duty upon wool, the flocks which were being herded and developed in North Dakota would have been wiped out of existence, the capital which the farmers and herders had put into that business would have been destroyed, and they would have been driven back to raising wheat and corn.

Mr. BRYAN. Are we to understand, then, that the tariff reduces the price of manufactured products, but raises the price of agricultural products?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will not be responsible for what the gentleman from Nebraska understands. If he will quietly listen to my argument I will endeavor to prove to him before I close that a protective tariff law is as beneficial to the farmer as it is to any other class of American citizens.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further. It would take too much of my time to yield to all these interruptions.

The iron and steel industry shows a remarkable reduction in prices under proper protection. In 1866 a ton of pig iron cost $46.87. This is a product that for some years now has been under a protection ample in character to develop that industry in this country. The product in 1866 was 1,205,666 tons; in 1890 it had increased to 9,202,703 tons, and instead of costing $46.87 per ton, this increased product was furnished at an average of $18.40 a ton, a decrease in price of 61 per cent. In 1867 railway bars, better known as steel rails, sold for $166 per ton. Our production that year aggregated 2,277 tons. In 1890 that industry, under the tariff laws that have been maintained by the Republican party, produced 1,957,366 tons at an average price of $31.75. The same product at the present time can be purchased in the market for $26 per ton. Here is a decrease in the price of steel rails of 84 per cent, while the increase in the production, or volume of the business has been 85,862 per cent. In 1866, 17,000 tons of ingot steel were produced in the United States, while in 1890 4,272,610 gross tons were produced here, an increase in the volume of production in this industry of 25,033 per cent. These figures ought to satisfy the most skeptical of the wisdom of maintaining a legislation that will show such phenomenal results.

Not only has the consumer been enabled to procure these products at these enormously reduced prices, but more than three hundred thousand men have found employment at good wages to

develop the various materials that are used in the production of pig iron, steel ingots, and steel rails.

The wealth that has been developed in this industry has built churches, founded schools, endowed libraries, and created thriving cities. The population that is directly and indirectly supported by the development of our iron and steel industries is numbered by the millions. Railroad transportation and freights have been reduced by reason of the rapid and enormous decrease in the price of steel rails and other iron and steel that have entered into the construction of the great lines of railway that span our country and make such cities as San Francisco and New York near neighbors. The reduction in the price of other productions which have been amply protected under Republican administration and Republican law, give almost as flattering results as these which are briefly set forth here. An assorted crate of China ware in 1852, under the revenue duties that were then in force, cost the American merchant $95.30.

In 1890, under a protective duty of 55 per cent, an assorted crate of white China ware, superior in quality, could be purchased for $46.30, a reduction in price, under Republican protection, of 52 per cent. While the Democratic party was in power, and maintained their free-trade doctrines, no bunting was manufactured in this country. The price paid for foreign labor, and the character of the machinery used in this country, was such that no manufacturer in America dared invest his capital, and while our soldiers and sailors were winning glorious victories during the late civil war and bringing imperishable renown to the American Army and the American Navy, they were fighting under flags that were made from bunting manufactured in England.

The Republican party placed adequate duty upon this article, and within twelve years from that time 13,000 looms were weaving bunting in the United States. Hundreds of honest men, who had fought under the flag, were engaged in the business of weaving material from which the glorious emblem of our country is made, and bunting now is sold for $18 that cost $25 when we depended upon the foreign manufacturer, a reduction, as you will see, of 28 per cent.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I will.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman was speaking a moment ago of china and crockery ware——

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And he stated, as I understood, that in 1855 a crate of crockery ware cost $90 and over.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And that under our protective laws fostering the manufacture of crockery in this country it could be bought in 1890 for $47 a crate?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Forty-six dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, I will ask my colleague first whether the wage of that industry in this country is larger than wages abroad?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Vastly higher.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Secondly, is it not true that there has been no labor-saving machinery introduced into the making of crockery, so that this cheapening of over one-half in the cost of this article to the American consumer comes from the competition in the manufacture of crockery in the United States?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement. There has been no improvement of machinery in this respect; the result is due to competition among home manufacturers. While the cost of labor has been higher, the price of the product has been reduced, as shown by figures which I have given to the House.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I will.

Mr. HUTCHESON. In view of what the gentleman has just said I would like to know why it is not to the disadvantage of the manufacturer to continue a system which stimulates at home a competition that drives down the price of the product from $90 to $46 per crate? How do you encourage existing manufactures by fostering a policy which so stimulates the industry at home as to make a reduction of something like 50 per cent in the price of the product?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. One of the reasons is this: By reason of the high wages which we pay to our laboring people in this country they are enabled to live in better condition than the laborers in any other country in the world. They are the large consumers of every product that is manufactured; and by reason of the extended consumption the manufacturers are enabled to accept a smaller profit upon a crate of crockery ware than if the consumption were more limited. From the grand total they realize the profit necessary for the maintenance of the industry.

Mr. COOMBS. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I have already yielded several times, and in justice to other members I can not yield further.

The spool-cotton industry is another illustration of the benefits of protection and the decrease in the price of the product under well-regulated and graduated import duties.

Prior to 1861 nine-tenths of the spool cotton used in the United States was manufactured abroad and imported here. The price charged by the importer to the American consumer was 47½ cents per dozen of spools. At this time the same product was sold in the English market for 26 cents per dozen of spools. Without competition in the American market from American producers, the foreign manufacturer was charging the American consumer 83 per cent more for the same production than he was charging the consumer in England. The Republican party placed a duty equal to 21 cents per dozen of spools on this production, and it has remained practically at that figure up to the present time. As a result $25,000,000 have been invested in that branch of the industry alone, and the price has been reduced from 47½ cents for each dozen of spools containing 200 yards of cotton thread to 38 cents per dozen of spools, a reduction of 20 per cent in the price, and instead of getting nine-tenths of this product abroad, as was required under Democratic free-trade times, the American manufacturer now furnishes more than nine-tenths of all the spool cotton consumed in America.

What demonstrates to my mind, and I think will satisfy the country, that there would have been no reduction in the price to the American consumer had it not been for our protective tariff laws, and the development of this industry in America, is that during all this time, from 1861 to the present, there has been no reduction in the price of spool cotton in England, where the manufacturers there have for more than thirty-two years controlled the market, and not only has there been no reduction, as a fact the English consumer is paying 28 cents a dozen for what he paid only 26 cents a dozen thirty-two years ago.

These figures must satisfy even the most prejudiced minds that in this production a tariff is not a tax, and that if there should be such a reduction in the import duties as would enable the foreign manufacturer to glut the market here at ruinous rates, and drive the American producers out of this branch of the business, that they would again, after having obtained control of the American market, restore the old prices that they had in the good old Democratic days, and thus reimburse themselves for all the sacrifices they would make in reëstablishing themselves in the control of the American markets.

I give a table, prepared by Mr. Atkinson, of West Virginia, showing the retail prices on many articles in common consumption. The first column shows the prices in 1857, near the close of the last free-trade period in this country; the second column gives prices in 1889, a year before the McKinley bill became a law. The next column gives prices in 1890, and the last column the prices that were charged after the McKinley law was in full force and its effect was being felt upon these industries.

Articles.	1857.	October, 1889.	October, 1890.	October, 1891.
Ax	$1.49	$0.93	$0.92	$0.88
Binding twine, per pound			.14½	.11
Blankets, per pair	6.83½	4.23	4.09½	3.70
Blue shirting, per yard	.17¼	.11½	.11	.09½
Boots	4.76	3.27	3.07	2.78½
Calico, per yard	.14½	.07½	.06½	.06
Carpets, per yard	1.30½	.77½	.72½	.66½
Cotton gloves	.34½	.24½	.22½	.19½
Cotton hosiery	.47	.27½	.25½	.20½
Cotton knit goods	.98	.52½	.46½	.41½
Cotton thread	.09½	.05	.04½	.04½
Crowbar, per pound	.11½	.07½	.06½	.06½
Drawing chains	1.28½	.71½	.65½	.58½
File	.42	.27½	.24	.20½
Fork, 3-tined	.99½	.56½	.53½	.46½
Flannel, per yard	.70	.39½	.37½	.34½
Fruit cans, per dozen	3.00	.72	.65	.54½
Gingham, per yard	.22½	.10½	.10½	.08½
Hand saw	2.43½	1.62½	1.53	1.39
Hoe	.85	.48½	.43	.37½
Hemp rope, per pound	.21	.14	.14½	.11½
Linen, per yard	.83	.48½	.47	.42½
Mowing machine	121.15	56.98	52.60	47.10
Nails, wire, per pound		.06	.04½	.03½
Nails, iron, per pound	.06½	.05½	.03½	.03
Oilcloth, per yard	.84	.38	.35½	.31
Overalls	1.20½	.83	.79½	.70½
Pearl buttons, per dozen	.22½	.11½	.11½	.18½
Pins, per paper	.11½	.06½	.06½	.05½
Plow	20.12½	14.37½	13.93½	12.92½
Rake, horse	41.25	22.56	21.24½	19.48
Rake, hand	.61½	.34	.30	.26
Reaper, binder	247.85	142.36	129.85	115.96½
Rubber boots	4.63½	3.10½	3.00	2.75½
Salt, per barrel	2.30	1.75	1.65	1.35½
Shoes	5.84	3.45	3.15	3.06
Sheeting, per yard	.12½	.08	.07½	.07½
Shovel	1.47	.97½	.93½	.84
Spade	1.44½	.93½	.95½	.89½
Starch, per pound	.13½	.09½	.09½	.09½
Straw hat, good	1.75	1.28	1.25	1.19

Articles.	1857.	October, 1869.	October, 1890.	October, 1891.
Straw hat, common	$0.44	$0.31	$0.28	$0.22½
Sugar, granulated, per pound	.19½	.09½	.09½	.05½
Sugar, brown, per pound	.16½	.08½	.08	.04½
Sugar bowl	.61	.38½	.37½	.32½
Scythe	1.22	.85½	.74½	.68½
Tin dipper	.25	.12½	.12½	.10½
Tin milk pail	.75½	.46½	.43½	.39½
Tin milk pan	.37½	.18½	.17½	.15½
Ticking, per yard	.35½	.20	.18½	.17
Wagon	130.00	95.00	90.00	75.00
Washboard	.41	.24½	.24	.22½
Washtub	1.20	.70½	.65	.65
Wheelbarrow	2.23	1.65	1.60	1.40½
Wooden pail	.45	.24½	.22	.20½
Woolen clothing	24.00	16.75	14.50	14.25

Statement showing the prices of farm implements, hardware, etc., in 1880 and 1890.

	1880.	1890.
FARM IMPLEMENTS.		
Self-binder	$315.00	$130.00
Steel-beam walking plow, 14-inch	28.00	14.00
Riding cultivator	45.00	25.05
Mowing machine	85.00	50.00
Wood pumps	15.00	6.00
Farm wagon	85.00	50.00
Two-seated spring wagon	100.00	75.00
HARDWARE.		
Barb wire, per pound	.10	.04
Fence staples, per pound	.10	.05
Iron nails, per keg	6.00	
Steel nails, per keg		2.80
Plain wire, per pound	.05½	.03½
Horseshoes, per keg	8.00	4.50
Mattock and handle	1.40	.85
Wrench	.75	.40
Shot, per pound	.12½	.08
Iron, per pound	.05	.03
Four-tined fork	.75	.50
Lantern	1.50	.75
Milk pans, per dozen	2.25	1.00
Post auger	2.25	1.25
Chains, per pound	.22	.12
File	.05	.25
Wheelbarrow	2.25	1.65
Cistern pump	4.25	2.25
Universal wringer	7.00	3.00
GROCERIES.		
Sugar, granulated, per pound	.12½	.07
Kerosene oil, 150 test per gallon	.25	.13
Salt, per barrel	2.25	1.25
Flour, per cwt	4.50	3.50
Coffee, Java	.33	.33
Coffee, Rio	.25	.25
Canned tomatoes, per can	.15	.10
Soda crackers, per pound	.10	.06½
Soap, per cake	.07	.05
Crockery	(*)	
DRY GOODS.		
Unbleached muslin, per yard	.08	.06
Calico, per yard	.07	.05
Gingham, per yard, unbleached	.12½	.10
Worsted dress goods, per yard	.15	.12½
Carpets	(†)	
General reduction on stock of dry goods	(‡)	

* 25 per cent reduction.
† 23 to 33 per cent reduction.
‡ 25 to 33⅓ per cent reduction.

These figures show a steady and gradual reduction in the price of all articles that have been properly and adequately protected for a series of years, and show, too, that the McKinley bill instead of increasing the price of commodities to the consumer has decreased it, and that to-day there is no article of common consumption which is manufactured in this country in any large quantity that is not cheaper than it was before the passage of the McKinley bill. The facts here presented ought to satisfy any person who is open to reason that the system of protection to American industries and American labor, as advocated and practiced by the Republican party, is beneficial to all people alike.

This reduction of the price of the manufactured article to the consumer has not been brought about by any reduction in the wages of those who have been engaged in their manufacture and production.

The condition of the laboring man at the close of the Harrison Administration was never better in the whole history of our Government. There was not an idle man in the country. The demand for employment was such that a common day laborer was receiving from $1.75 to $2 per day, and the skilled mechanic was receiving from $2.50 to $10 a day. The report of the Finance Committee of the Senate, made on the 3d day of March, 1892, gives a most gratifying summary of the condition of the laboring people of this country.

I can not in the time that is given me for this discussion enter into a detailed statement of the condition of these wage-workers in the different industries in which they are and have been engaged; but the result of the investigation that was instituted by the Finance Committee of the Senate, to secure statistics of the course of wages and earnings of the laboring people of this country for a series of years, is one which must be gratifying to every loyal American. It shows conclusively that the standard of life has been improved; that the average of wages has been increased, and that the condition of the laboring man at the close of the Harrison Administration was such that the President in his last annual message to Congress said with great truth:

> There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or wages were as high, whether measured by the currency in which they were paid or by their power to supply the necessaries and comforts of life.

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], in his argument yesterday, undertook to show that the price of labor had not increased in this country during Republican administration. I confess I was surprised at the statement, and no doubt my surprise was shared by other members of the Republican party. I had supposed that if there was one thing which had been conclusively settled by statistics in this country it was that the condition of the laboring man had been improved under Republican administration and protective laws. I had supposed this question to be beyond debate. But, inasmuch as my colleague saw fit yesterday to challenge the statement which had been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] I desire to call attention to a statement of Mr. Atkinson, of Massachusetts, one of the ablest statisticians of this country, a gentleman who is in sympathy with the Democratic party in their tariff-reform movement, who is himself a pronounced free trader, but a man who has too much honesty of intellect to misstate the facts or draw illogical conclusions from the statistics presented to him.

What is the statement of Mr. Atkinson? He says that from 1865 down to 1892, when his statement was made, there had been a gradual upward movement in the prices paid to labor—not only unskilled labor, but in the wages of skilled mechanics throughout the country. Mr. Atkinson says that from 1880 to 1890 this increase averaged from 10 to 40 per cent; and not only this, but during all this time when the Republican party under the policy it has maintained all these years was insuring increased wages to the laboring man, the prices of the products that he consumed were gradually decreased; so that at the time when Mr. Atkinson gave this statement to the public in the Forum of May, 1892, the condition of the laboring man had never been better. I trust that in view of this declaration of Mr. Atkinson we shall hear no more from the Democratic party in this House or throughout the country upon this labor question. Any man who has investigated this matter sufficiently to give an intelligent opinion must agree with the conclusions that have been given to the public by Mr. Atkinson.

Those who favor free trade have as one of their stock arguments that protection is maintained at the expense of the farmer. No speech has been made in this House in the discussion of this question since I have had the honor to be a member of this body that has not in some manner referred to the hard lines of the farmers, and insisted with a good deal of vehemence that they received no benefits under protective tariff legislation, while they were required to pay more for all machinery used on their farms and the products consumed upon their tables than they would if free trade were the order of the day. The hard lot of the farmer is found more in the imagination of these free-trade orators than in the facts of history.

It is true that in some localities, owing to local causes largely, farmers now have and in the past have had serious struggles in life; but the great mass of the farmers of America are not the suffering people they are painted by our Democratic friends. Their condition as compared with the farmers of free-trade England is infinitely better. They have made steady advancement in wealth, and the improvement in their home conditions is apparent to anybody who is familiar with this class of our American citizens. I have lived with them and been one of them and I know whereof I speak. Had I the power I would like to give a faithful picture of the condition of the farmers of this country from 1846 up to the time that the Republican party came into power and compare it with an equally truthful picture of their condition at the present time.

Under Democracy and free trade at the time I mention there was no money in the country; there were no markets for the products of the farm; and no means were possessed by the tillers of the soil to purchase more than the scantiest necessities of life. The log house and the straw shed were the improvements that covered the family and the small amount of stock that had been

gathered upon the farm. I can remember in Illinois, when both our National and State governments were under Democratic control, that a farmer with a hundred and sixty acres of the richest land that God ever blessed man with, would not produce enough, when reduced to money under free-trade prices, to pay his taxes, support his family, furnish himself with a new suit of clothes, and his wife a calico dress.

In those days there were no carpets on the floor, no pictures on the wall, and no books in the home, and the rudest kind of furniture was all that could be afforded by even the most fortunate ones among the farmers. The soil yielded abundant crops, but there was no market for the corn, wheat, and other cereals raised. The strictest economy was the order of the day. The girls and boys in the family were all required to engage in the hardest kind of manual labor to help their parents eke out their humble existence; while three months' schooling in the winter season at a cross-road schoolhouse, reached sometimes by almost impassable roads, was the extent of the educational advantages that were given. The good old Democratic days, mentioned as so favorable to the farmer, always bring to my mind the picture of privation and distress through which the farmers of Illinois were compelled to pass during the period it was under Democratic free-trade control.

The people of Illinois early took advantage of the tariff legislation that was given the country by the Republican party, to establish manufactories there which have increased and multiplied in number, diversified the labor of our people, and furnished a certain and sure market for all of the products of the farm. The log house of free-trade days has given place to beautiful frame houses with all of the modern comforts and conveniences of life. Rugs and carpets cover the floor of the sitting room and the parlors; while the walls have been adorned with pictures which not only delight the eye, but improve the mind; books and magazines are found upon the table; organs and pianos attest the musical culture of the household; the scanty schooling that was given the children in the early days has now given place to our splendid public schools of to-day, where the farmer boys and girls are not only taught the common English branches, but are given an education that enables the boys to engage in business, adopt any of the learned professions, and compete for all of the prizes of life, on an equality with those who have heretofore been regarded as the most favored in our land; while the girls, under our present system of education, are so taught that they are enabled to qualify themselves to fill any position in life, not only with credit, but with a grace and ease of manner that is an honor to their sex.

Political economists teach us what practical experience has demonstrated; that the nearer you can bring the producer and the consumer to each other, the better it is for both classes. If the farmers of Illinois and the great West had no market for any of their products west of the Alleghany Mountains their condition would be much more unfavorable than it is at the present time. The true theory of government is to diversify our manufacturing industries and distribute them in a manner so that the products of the farm will be consumed by the employés in the factories, and farmers can become the customers of these factories that create the home market for the products of the farm. Wherever this has been done, not only has the condition of the farmer been improved by securing better prices for his products, but he has been enabled to purchase all of the necessaries and comforts and many of the luxuries of life cheaper than when he depended upon a distant or a foreign market.

The great State of New York serves as a good illustration of the principle for which I here contend. There was a time, and that not very long ago, when New York, from the wonderful fertility of her soil, supplied all of the States to the east of her with wheat; yet such has been the remarkable development of manufacturing industries in that Empire State that now she is enabled to supply only a portion of her own people with the wheat that is annually consumed within her borders. The rapid development of manufacturing industries in that State furnished a better market for the products of the farms in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois. As these industries have increased in this country and extended to the States which are now large consumers and small producers of agricultural products, they have built up beautiful and thriving cities within their borders. Statistics show that the prices of all farm products range higher in manufacturing States than they do in purely agricultural States. This arises from the superiority of the home market over that of a distant or foreign market.

For example: New York is the greatest manufacturing State in the Union: it is a great agricultural State as well. Nebraska is a fine agricultural State; but, unfortunately, up to the present time has not developed manufacturing industries within her borders in sufficient quantities to furnish a good home market for the products of her farms. What is the effect upon the prices of agricultural products in these two States? Corn in New York sells for 100 per cent more than it will in Nebraska; wheat for 38 per cent more; rye for 76 per cent more; oats 94 per cent more; barley 44 per cent more; Irish potatoes 100 per cent more; hay 100 per cent more. The average selling price of these farm products is nearly 80 per cent higher in New York than in Nebraska.

Mr. BRYAN. Do not the farmers of the Eastern States have the advantage of the freights which have to be paid on the crop from the West; and is it not natural to expect that wheat will be higher in Massachusetts than in Illinois and Nebraska?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's statement answers itself. The point I make is that as a State develops manufacturing industries, and as an increased number of people engage in such industries they become the consumers of the products of the soil and thus the price of such products is raised. My remarks further on will be a complete answer to the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it not true that the State of Illinois while first in agriculture is third in manufactures, and that Chicago is the second manufacturing city in the Union?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. That is true; and, Mr. Chairman, further on in my remarks I shall give a splendid illustration of the benefits of the protective system to the farmer, by referring to the city of Chicago.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman indulge me with one more interruption in this connection?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman state whether the price of agricultural products is higher in New York to-day, with all of the increased manufactures in that State, than it was twenty years ago?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I will not speak of to-day, because we are under a Democratic Administration and are experiencing what free trade is. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I will say that during the Administration of Mr. Harrison, with the single exception of wheat, they were all higher, infinitely higher.

Let me give a different illustration to demonstrate the benefits of a protective tariff to the farmer.

Prof. Dodge, of the Agricultural Department, has given a good deal of attention to statistics on this question, and from his study and observation has divided the States of the Union into four classes or groups; the first class is where the per cent of the population of the States engaged in farming is less than 30 per cent; the second class is where the per cent is over 30 and less than 50 per cent; the third class is where the farmers number over 50 per cent and are less than 70 per cent of the aggregate population of the States; and the fourth class is where the farmers number over 70 per cent of the population of the States. In the States comprised in the first class, Prof. Dodge tells us that the value of land per acre will average $38.65; in the second class it will average $30.55; in the third class $13.53; and in the fourth class $5.18.

These statistics are prepared by Prof. Dodge for no partisan purpose; they are given to illustrate the condition of the farmers in the various sections in the Union. They furnish a most instructive lesson. Why is it that the land in Pennsylvania or New York is worth on an average of $38.65 per acre? It is because those States have stimulated capital to invest in manufacturing industries, and thousands of men are given employment in mills, factories, and foundries who live upon the products of the farms of those States. They have a market at their own doors for everything that is raised in the field or in their gardens. Their profits are not eaten up by middlemen or railroad transportation; and the result is that no more thrifty, successful, or independent class of citizens can be found in the world than the farmers in these two States.

Who are the poor farmers, and where are they found? They are found in the sections of the Union where the States are given up almost wholly to agriculture; they are found in localities where the market for the products of their farms is hundreds if not thousands of miles away from the places where they are produced. Another illustration is given by Prof. Dodge which still further demonstrates the benefits of protective tariff legislation to the farmers of America. In the grouping of the States which I have just given he further shows the value of products per capita to the individual cultivator. His statistics show that in the first group of States, where the population engaged in farming is less than 30 per cent, that the value of the products of the farm per capita to individual cultivator averages $457, in the second class it averages $394, in the third class $261, and in the fourth class $160; in other words, a man engaged in agriculture in any of the first group of States, for the same labor in the cultivation of the same number of acres, will make 185 per cent more than the individual cultivator in the States where over 70 per cent of the population is engaged in farming.

These facts ought to satisfy even a British free trader that agriculture is more profitable where it has a market at the door of the farmer for all that he raises on his farm. A remarkable illustration of the truth of this is furnished in the aggregate of the manufacturing and agricultural products of Cook County, Ill. As appears by the census of 1890 Cook County yielded in that year farm products valued at $4,437,140; and manufactured products valued at $664,567,923. The farmers of Cook County, Ill., can not afford to raise wheat, corn, rye, and barley. Why? Because by the diversity of industries in that county so large a population has been developed there that the farmer finds it profitable to engage in what is known as truck farming.

This diversification of farm industry is only possible where manufacturing industries are established alongside or near the farms. Take wheat at an average of 75 cents per bushel, and the yield at 18 bushels per acre, a fair estimate in Illinois, it would require 328,677 acres of land to cultivate, as we used to cultivate land in the good old Democratic free-trade times, to produce in value the products that are raised on the few acres devoted to agriculture in Cook County under the conditions that have been developed and exist under Republican administration and protective tariff legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these figures demonstrate what I started out to prove, that the farmer is benefited as much as the manufacturer or any other class of citizens, by the maintenance of a system of protection that will give such splendid results as we see in New York, Pennsylvania, and in Illinois, and I can say to my friend from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] that if that great and rich State will adopt the policy that has prevailed in Illinois for now more than a generation, the city of Omaha will become a rival of Chicago, and the farmers of the State of Nebraska will find as rich a market for their product in the cities of Omaha and Lincoln as the farmers of Illinois now find in the great city of Chicago.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman allow me to say that the cities of Lincoln and Omaha have grown more rapidly in the last ten years than any manufacturing city in the East.

Mr. MERCER. I desire to say that the cities of Omaha and Lincoln are becoming manufacturing cities very rapidly.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Let me give another illustration of the benefits of the protective tariff to the farmer, drawn from the county in which I reside. Kane is about 40 miles from the city of Chicago. I can remember when that county was given up entirely to raising wheat, corn, and other cereals, when these productions were taken in a farm wagon and drawn to the city of Chicago, and there sold at prices that would hardly pay for a barrel of salt that a farmer could take back to his home. To-day, by the development of these industries along the Fox River, which runs through this county, and the development of the city of Chicago, there are $3,600,000 annually paid to the farmers of Kane County for milk alone, an industry that could not exist under any other conditions than those conditions which have grown up under a protective tariff system in this country.

When the McKinley bill was under discussion in the House and before the country, much ado was made over the effort on the part of the Republican party to protect the farmers on the various farm products, including cattle and horses, from foreign importations; and we were charged with a desire to mislead this worthy class of citizens when we asserted that they would receive a direct benefit by this check upon importations from Canada, Mexico, and other foreign countries. Democratic newspapers and Democratic speakers contended that the amount of farm products of every kind, including cattle and horses, which were imported into this country was so small that it was not and would not be felt by the farmers. I have with some pains gathered statistics on this point, and I find that in that, as well as its other provisions, the McKinley bill wisely and justly placed high duties upon further importations on all products in which the farmers of the country are most interested.

As illustrating this, I desire to show that in 1888 there were 62,411 head of horses imported and sold in the markets of this country. On this item alone the farmers were deprived of the sale of more than 60,000 horses. This importation in 1888 is only a fair average of the annual importation for five or six years preceding the adoption of the McKinley law. The average importation of beef cattle into America prior to the enactment of the McKinley law aggregated 88,000 head. The United States Wool Growers' Association estimates that by a proper protection of the wool and sheep industry the farmers of this country could increase their flocks by more than 60,000,000 sheep.

Prior to the passage of the McKinley bill in the House there were 8,259,538 bushels of potatoes imported annually into this country, and in 1888 there were imported 1,942,864 bushels of beans and peas and 100,269 tons of hay, 7,000,000 pounds of hops, 55,000 bushels of buckwheat, 1,583,941 bushels of flaxseed, 16,000,000 dozen eggs annually; $54,230 worth of sauerkraut, $4,100 worth of peanuts, $2,564 worth of sweet potatoes; 200,000 barrels of turnips, besides cabbage, cauliflower, and other vegetables which our Eastern farmers can raise at much greater profit than they can wheat and other cereals. It has been estimated by competent and careful authority that if our own farmers were properly protected, so that they could produce all of the farm products imported, some of which I have enumerated, they would require nearly 70,000,000 acres of land for that purpose.

The farm products of this country are all consumed here except about 10 per cent, and, excluding cotton and tobacco, it is estimated that we do not export of agricultural products to exceed 5 per cent; but, on the basis of sending abroad nearly 10 per cent of all farm products, the amount that we annually export does not require over 44,000,000 acres of land to produce—26,000,000 acres of land less than is required to cultivate and produce what was imported into this country prior to the enactment of the McKinley law. These figures show that it is as important to the farmer to be protected from Canada, Mexico, and other foreign countries as it is to protect our cotton, wool, and iron industries. I trust that in the future those who make a study of this great subject will cease their declaiming against protective tariff legislation upon the ground that it is against the interests of the farming and producing classes. Henry C. Carey, the great protection writer, gives us the idea that there is a perfect harmony of interests among all the different classes of producers in this country; you break down the protection to one, and you impair the whole edifice; you maintain all of the parts in their relative positions, and you have a structure not only beautiful in its symmetry, but grand in its proportions; a structure which has brought the most marvelous results in this country that have been witnessed or experienced in any nation since time began.

When the Republican party came into power the wealth of this country aggregated $16,159,616,068. Under the fostering influences of Republican protective legislation, that wealth has increased in the thirty years of Republican rule 288 per cent. If we judged of the benefits of the system by grand totals alone, here is an increase in wealth that should paralyze the tongue and silence the lips of every opponent of American protection.

Our Democratic friends have endeavored to ridicule protection out of existence by charging that it was only asked in the first instance on behalf of "infant industries," and that the larger the infant has grown the more nourishment he requires, and that if a halt is not declared somewhere his demands will be so great that the very life of the parent will be taken in giving nourishment to the child. If they are to treat of protection in this figurative style, they should at least give a truthful picture. The infant industry is not the cormorant they would have us believe; but a ray of sunshine that is let into the hearts and homes of the laboring people of America; a ray that reinvigorates the hopes and ambitions of all American citizens, and gives promise of that social well-being and industrial independence which alone can insure the happiness and improvement of the race.

As an argument of ridicule it has its place in the Democratic arsenal from which to draw ammunition to meet the claims of the friends of the American system; but protection is neither asked nor given on that theory. The productions of America do not need protection against those of England or any other foreign country because the industries are younger, but as is well said by an eminent writer on political economy—

> They are asked for because the industries in America are carried on under a higher civilization, a civilization in which the human element in production is more expensive than it is in other countries.

It goes without saying that the factory hands and wage-workers in America are better housed, better clothed, and better fed than in any other civilized country in the world. They receive for the same number of hours of labor a much higher rate of wages, and they are thus enabled to live in better style, and give better advantages to their families than like workers in any other country. If this question were a contest simply between American machinery and capital, and that of foreign machinery and capital, I grant you there would be no reason in maintaining import duties for the protection of either. This question has resolved itself into one of labor, and the contest that is being waged by the Democratic party to pass this Wilson bill is a war upon the laboring class of America.

No person can dispute the proposition that where the foreign competitor has as perfect machinery as we have in this country, with capital that can be secured at a lower rate of interest, that we must have discriminating import duties of a sufficient amount to make the difference between what is paid for labor here and labor abroad; or else there is a discrimination against the American manufacturer in favor of the foreigner. No man who has his capital invested in manufacturing industries in America can afford to come to Congress and ask to have legislation enacted

for his special benefit, where he will receive rights and privileges that are not enjoyed by other citizens.

When he asks, however, to have an import duty upon articles that are brought from abroad and sold in the markets here that he is manufacturing sufficient in amount and character to make up for the difference between what he pays his employés, and what his foreign competitor is paying, he is not asking for any special privileges or benefits, and is only demanding what should be accorded without argument to any man or set of men who may be willing to invest their capital in enterprises that will give employment to the vast army of unemployed men in this country to-day.

In the interests of civilization that country which has accorded the highest privileges to the laboring classes, and where you find their social conditions the best, should be made the standard on all industrial questions; and in the contest between the laboring classes of such a country, and one of a lower grade of social standing or civilization, the contest should be made equal by legislation which will protect those living in the superior, from their competitors living under inferior social conditions. For example: The laboring people of America are living under better social conditions than like employés in England. It costs the English employé less to live than it does the American. If we have no protection in our commercial intercourse with England, the English laborer will not be elevated to the standard of the social condition of the American laborer, but the American laborer will be degraded to the social condition of the English workman.

A still more marked illustration can be found in our commerce with Japan. The Japanese Government in many respects is a progressive government, but her people work for less than one-tenth the amount for which the American laborer should be asked to give his services. In the silk industries, and in many others, the Japanese are as expert in operating machinery as the English or American laborer. Now, in any industry that is carried on by the aid of machinery in Japan of a like character to any that we have in this country, the Japanese manufacturer has an advantage over the American manufacturer to this vast difference in the pay roll of his employés. I trust there is no Democrat in this House, or in this country, that would be willing to see the American laborer or mechanic degraded to the condition of the Japanese laborer.

How, then, are we to maintain our manufacturing interests, and how are we to give employment to thousands of laboring men unless we maintain a protective tariff duty sufficient in character to make up for this difference in the wages paid in the two countries? Some enthusiastic free trader may say that if the Japanese manufacturer can furnish these products cheaper than they can be furnished in America, it is the part of wisdom to yield the markets to the Japanese manufacturer and importer. But if this were done what would be the result? Fifty-three thousand people who are now engaged in manufacturing silk would be thrown out of employment, and either made a charge upon the public for support or else they would be compelled to seek employment in some other calling.

The next industry that would likely be attacked would be our cotton industries, and the 221,000 people that find employment there would follow the fortunes of those engaged in the silk industry; and thus one industry after another would be destroyed by this low-priced labor abroad, and pauperism would be increased in America. These hundreds of thousands of workmen who under this kind of competition would be driven out of employment, would cease to be consumers of the products of the farms, and instead would be competitors of the farmers in the cultivation of the soil. The disastrous effect of this upon the markets for all farm products can not be estimated. The Democrats say that the markets of the world will then be open to the American farmer; but I ask them what market will be open for the wheat of the American farmer?

Under existing conditions there are now practically only two European governments who furnish any market for the wheat that is grown in America—England and Belgium. Within the last few years Russia, India, and Roumania have become sharp competitors in the English and Belgian markets on wheat and other farm products. With their cheap labor and cheap lands, they will in the future drive the American farmer out of all European markets, as the Japanese laborer, under the conditions of free trade, would drive the American laborer from our mills and factories. An honest and a candid consideration of the true interests of all of the people of this country, leads to the logical and inevitable support of protective tariff laws.

In the discussion of this subject people are liable to forget that the primary object of import duties is to raise money to pay the expenses of the Government. With our rapidly increasing population and growing importance in all departments of Government, we year by year increase the necessary expenses incurred in maintaining the Government. Four hundred and sixty million dollars are required annually to pay the expenses of the Government. This makes, as you will see, a daily expenditure of more than $1,260,000. If we are to remove the duties upon all products that have given us the marvelous success that has marked the career of this country under Republican administration this vast sum of money must be collected by some kind of internal or domestic taxes.

The cutting down of import duties under the present bill does not lessen the amount of money that must be raised to support the Government. One would infer from the talk that is so freely indulged in by the Democratic members of this House that the reduction of about $70,000,000 that is made upon import duties in the bill now under discussion is that much money saved to the taxpayers of this country. Not so. That amount of money is taken from the foreign manufacturer and the foreign importer, and is an added burden to the American citizen. For weeks after the schedules relating to import duties were prepared by the Committee of Ways and Means, they wrestled with the great problem as to how they could tax American products, American industries, and American citizens in a manner to raise this large amount of money.

I have grown weary listening to the talk of the friends of this bill about the burdens of taxation. One would suppose from arguments they make that they regarded taxation as an evil, and that it is something that has been imposed upon the people of this country by this terrible monster known as "import duty." The facts and figures which I have already given have demonstrated the falsity of their position; but I wish to take issue with those who deride and cry out against all taxation. Like any of the blessings that have been bestowed by a kind Providence upon the human race, it may be misapplied and become an engine of evil; when properly considered and administered it results in the social, spiritual, and intellectual improvement of our people.

The only interest the public have in taxation is, that the taxes assessed shall be economically collected and wisely expended. I have already shown that to support the Government, regardless of which political party is in power, requires the expenditure of more than $1,260,000 per day. It is important in the collection of this large sum of money that methods should be adopted that will bring this revenue into the Treasury of the United States at the least expense; and it is still more important that this daily sum of money be wisely expended. A government differs but little in this respect from the proper administration of one's home affairs. It has been truthfully as well as eloquently said, that the home is the unit of government.

To the average citizen there is a time of intense application, rigid economy, and a denial of many of the pleasures and luxuries of life; but as he advances along the highway of life and accumulates property the love and affection he bears for his wife and children lead him into the expenditure of larger sums of money in providing for their comfort and convenience and social and educational improvement. That he spends more money under these conditions than when he started in life is no evidence that he has grown extravagant or wasteful; or that he has deteriorated in any of the relations that go to make up the good citizen, but just the contrary is true. If he is a progressive, highminded, and Christian citizen, his greatest delight is in surrounding himself and his family with the superior advantages that his accumulated wealth will warrant.

A collection of such citizens makes the township or the municipal government; and the same reasons that have actuated the citizen in providing these superior comforts and advantages for his own home, will prompt him to expend the public money in the building of schoolhouses, the improvement of streets, and all matters that relate to a well-ordered town or municipal government. When this principle is extended from the few hundred people, or the few thousand, as the case may be, who form the small municipality, into the 67,000,000 who form this great Republic, we can readily see that the people's great interest lies, not in the amount of money that may be raised for public purposes, but that whatever sum is raised shall be, as I have stated, economically collected, and then wisely expended.

It is the duty of this Government to maintain a Navy commensurate with the dignity and character of our people. This, of itself, requires a large expenditure of money. In the interest of humanity it is important to establish and maintain a life-saving service with proper light-houses, and all the attendant improvements that modern civilization has developed for the protection of those who go down to the sea. When we turn our attention to the interior of our country, we can then see how the people can be benefited by proper mail facilities, by the construction of public buildings, in improving the great rivers that are freighted with the commerce of our country, and in making expenditures upon the Great Lakes and upon the harbors that dot our Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Another great expenditure that some cry out against, but which I think is the chief glory of our Government, is the millions of dollars of money that is annually expended in the way of pensions to the veterans of the late war. Grand and noble men who, in the great crisis of our National Government, left the comforts of life and the endearments of their firesides and dedicated their lives to the service of their Government should in their old age be properly and adequately protected by this Government which their services saved from disruption and destruction.

There are many other subjects which I might enumerate where the public money could be wisely expended. I have indicated enough here to show that a proper system of internal improvements and governmental expenditures not only enriches our country, but gives employment to vast numbers of what might otherwise be idle men. Our Government is formed and maintained for the benefit of the people. This is the principle upon which the Republican party has ever acted. Those who cry out against all taxation and the expenditure of money for public improvements seem to hold that the people are not interested in the Government and that the less money that is expended by it is wise statesmanship.

A poor and miserly government can represent no different spirit among its people. Such a government crushes out all feelings of patriotism and all pride in national honor. No country ever acquired or maintained an honorable position among the nations of the earth where such a spirit prevailed among the people and controlled the actions of its legislators. This Government has attained its proud position, not by practicing the back-action miserly economy that is preached by some of the leading and distinguished members of the Democratic party, but by administering its affairs upon broad and liberal principles.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have under consideration, if it becomes a law in the form in which it is now presented to the House, will deal a deadly blow to that spirit of improvement which has not only characterized our National Government for more than a generation, but which has extended to and controlled the action of the individual citizen. This bill, if it becomes a law, is a long step toward that free trade which has been the dream of the visionary and the hope of the foreign manufacturer. The condition of the people of this country during the summer and fall which have just passed is but an earnest, in my judgment, of what we shall experience if this vicious measure is enacted into a law.

I am amazed that men who ought at least to be familiar with the hardships and privations, the want and the hunger, that will be the lot of the working people of this country if the friends of this bill are successful in their efforts in making it the law of the land, should feel bound by fealty to their party to give it their support and their votes. Our country should ever be above party consideration, and the rights and the best interests of our fellow-citizens should never be placed in the scale against party expediency. Believing these principles as I do, I am but discharging a duty that is imposed upon me by my constituents in opposing this measure and in doing what I can to challenge the attention of the House and the country to its dangerous character. I voice not only the sentiments of the people who have repeatedly honored me with a seat on this floor, but I believe, also the sentiments of the great majority of the people of this country when I say that I trust it will never become a law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PASCHAL].

Mr. PASCHAL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state, in relation to the joint resolution (H. Res. 93) which was reported this morning for the concurrence of the House in the Senate amendments, that when it was presented I was absent at a committee meeting. I had intended to ask the concurrence of the House in the amendments, and had spoken to my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON], who kindly looked after the matter. I wish simply to explain where I was at the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we of the Democratic party went before the country in 1892, asserting that the existing tariff was wrong in principle and unjust in operation; declaring the policy of protection a fraud and robbery; charging it with creating trusts, stifling commerce, throttling industry, causing enforced idleness, lessening wages, impoverishing labor, and creating a few monstrous fortunes, and pledging ourselves to abolish it if the American people gave us authority. They did give us authority, and then our haste to repeal oppressive taxes subsided, and instead of flying at the throat of protected barons and robber trusts the great Democratic party began, as it were, to wag its tail and look for crumbs.

It was the duty of a party coming into power on such pledges and at such a conjuncture to have proceeded without a moment's delay to the radical revision of the tariff. If Mr. Cleveland had shown the sagacity and courage the situation demanded the ink would not have been dry on the commissions of his Secretaries ere Congress would have been called into extra session to relieve the country of its burdens of taxation. But instead of that we proceeded to rest on our laurels and divide the spoils, and the nation was treated to the spectacle of a President and a Congress having power to remove crushing burdens, devoting their energies to the discussion of personal claims to petty places.

The first clear duty having been neglected there came the opportunity of the extra session. It was the imperative need of the Democratic majority to have been prepared with a tariff bill by the time the silver question was settled, so that instead of adjourning we might at once have gone to work upon it, and by this time have had it through the House and far on its way in the Senate, thus saving, at least as far as we are concerned, all these weeks of disastrous delay and uncertainty. But again, General Timidity led the Democratic hosts, and again we procrastinated.

And as the climax of all this delay come the shameful days we have just passed through, in which the House has stood paralyzed because, despite our overwhelming majority, we Democrats would neither furnish a quorum to be counted nor count the one that was really present. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I, for one, am a convert to the doctrine that we should count men as present who are here. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Fifty-first Congress applied that rule to us when we were in the minority. We should now follow it, and show that the Democratic party have ingenuity enough to devise for themselves a way of counting a quorum, if they do not like the way of the gentleman from Maine. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

It is not merely that we have yet done nothing. It is that we have done nothing where we had promised much. The worst possible situation of business is not that of a high tariff, but that of a high tariff threatened with certain but indefinite reduction. This is the situation our delay has for nearly a year imposed on the country. Up to the present, thanks to our inaction, the victory of the Democratic party in November, 1892, has worked evil, not good. The McKinley tariff still exerts its strangling power, and worse than the McKinley tariff is the depressing effect of the uncertainty as to what tariff will succeed it.

While we have been fiddling Rome has been burning. While we have been seeking offices and peddling offices the very disasters that we predicted from Republican misrule have come upon the country. Who shall sell stamps at Stringtown Cross Roads and who shall play ambassador at the court of Italy have been settled, but the burning question of the tariff is yet at sea and in the dark. And now when, after the Christmas turkey and the New Year wine, we meet to consider at our leisure what shall be done to carry out the mandate of the people given us almost a year and a half ago, the cry of distress goes up from all parts of the land, and American citizens by the hundred thousand are being fed by charity to prevent starvation.

But at last the committee charged by this House with the duty of bringing in a bill for the abolition of a system which the majority of us have declared a fraud and a robbery, have been heard from. They have given us a Democratic report and a Republican bill. "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau." [Laughter.]

"The American people," say the committee, "after the fullest and most thorough debate ever given by any people to their fiscal policy, have deliberately and rightly decided that the existing tariff is wrong in principle and grievously unjust in operation." And then the committee go on to present to us a bill based upon this same wrong principle and perpetuating this same grievous injustice—a bill for which they have taken the McKinley bill as a model, and of which the best that can be said is that it is the McKinley bill shaved down; or a redistribution of the spoils of protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am like the man who *could* eat crow. I will vote for this bill if I can get nothing better. But I do not like it. That it does contain some good points is true. The McKinley bill contained some good points; it put raw sugar and some other things on the free list. This bill goes further, and puts wool, coal, iron ore, and undressed lumber on the free list, and in so far makes some show of redeeming our pledge to abolish protection. This is its little sprinkle of saving salt, which commends it to me. Even if it were a proposition to re-enact the McKinley bill, with the single exception of free wool, I would still vote for it if I could do no better, for every addition to the free list is a step towards free trade; every break in the link of protected interests lessens the power of the league of plunder to further squeeze the people.

But, though I might vote for this bill with pleasure if it came from a Ways and Means Committee representing a Republican House, I am disgusted and dismayed that it is presented by a

Democratic committee to a Democratic House, as representing their idea of what the Democratic party, with all branches of the Government in its hands, proposes to do for a suffering people.

Put before a Republican House by a Republican Ways and Means Committee it would fitly represent the idea of "protection amended by the friends of protection." But proposed by a Democratic Ways and Means Committee to a Democratic House, as representing the idea of an Administration elected on a platform declaring protection an unconstitutional fraud and robbery, it is an evasion of promise and a political blunder of the gravest kind, a confession that the Democratic party lacks courage and honesty. [Applause from the Republican side.] It will not satisfy protectionists, for your protectionist is as bitterly opposed to you if you cut down his protection a little as if you cut it out altogether. It will not satisfy free traders, for it no more acknowledges the free-trade principle than did the McKinley bill. Perhaps it may satisfy what are called tariff reformers, but if this is a tariff reform bill I am all the more rejoiced that I am not now and never have been a tariff reformer. I am only a plain free trader. [Laughter.]

I am satisfied that this bill does not really represent the views and wishes of the chairman. He evidently has reluctantly consented to it from two considerations: first, the number of Democratic protectionists on the committee who could not be induced to join in a more radical measure; and, second, the fear that such a measure could not pass the Senate. For the first he is not responsible, but as to the second I think he has made a mistake. It is not our business to consider now what the Senate will do. The bill that passes this House ought to represent the judgment and wishes of this House. If the Democrats of the Senate refuse to join with us in carrying out the Democratic pledges let them take the odium.

No man could make the speech that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee made here the other day, no man could portray the iniquities of protection so vividly as he did, and yet heartily indorse this bill. It was a great speech. Oh! Mr. Chairman, if we could only adopt the speech instead of the bill, how much better it would suit me. [Laughter.]

As it now stands the central idea of this bill is protection—the taxing of all the rest of our people for the benefit of a particular class—the manufacturer, that is to say, the capitalist. From A to izzard this privileged class has been kept carefully in view, and in all reductions of duty care has been taken that it should not be deprived of any substantial part of its un-Democratic privilege of taxing the rest of the community. The result is a bill so protective that it would have startled Hamilton or Clay. A bill which, taken as a whole, will give to the manufacturers of this country a more substantial protection: will allow them to make greater profits at the expense of their fellow-citizens than the bill of 1883, and in many cases more than the McKinley bill. In fact, if I did not know better, I should be obliged to suppose that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and his fellows of the minority had hypnotized the majority and written the bill for them, and were making a pretense of opposing it in order to induce the Democrats of this House to accept a Republican measure under the delusion that it was a Democratic one. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. On the contrary, I called the attention of the committee to that very bad break the first time I got a look at the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Then I must relieve the gentleman of all responsibility. This bill does put wool and coal and iron ore and undressed lumber on the free list. For that I render thanks, and this part of the bill I will heartily support. But men do not eat or drink or wear or shelter themselves with wool, or coal, or iron ore, or undressed lumber, and the forms into which these natural products must be changed before they can be used by the consumer are in this bill carefully taxed. Blankets or clothing, steel rails or bicycles, lumber manufactured into the forms in which it is fitted for human use, or the articles for the manufacture of which coal supplies power are *not* put on the free list. Its reductions on articles the consumer can use are, so far as I can see, mere nominal reductions, which still leave the people a prey to the trusts.

We can not abolish trusts by laws condemning them and providing for their legal prosecution; we can only abolish them by abolishing the monopoly on which they are based, and where they depend on the tariff, as most of them do, by putting on the free list every article in which we have reason to suppose a trust has been or is being formed. [Applause.] Yet our committee seems to have taken the trusts under its special care, and in this bill to have been as careful not to hurt them as though it had been organized by and for them.

One trust this bill will hurt, but the exception proves the rule. For this is a trust so outrageous, so clearly created by a duty levied for the purpose of enabling it to pocket millions, that the committee could hardly ignore it. That is the sugar trust. For its special benefit the McKinley bill, which properly made raw sugar free of duty, imposed a tax of half a cent a pound on refined sugar, a tax that yields to the Government some $80,000 a year and to the Havemeyers and Spreckels over $20,000,000. What does the committee do? Abolish this tax? Deprive the sugar trust of $20,000,000 a year these hard times? No; it cuts the tax in half, and leaves the trust only the power to tax the people $10,000,000. Could the committee have more forcibly emphasized its tenderness to trusts if it had left intact to the Havemeyers and Spreckels the full amount of the McKinley gift to them?

The only reason I have heard given why the bill reported by the committee should not have made refined sugar free is that the whole force and power of the sugar trust would then have been exerted against the bill. And this fear of irritating the trusts seems to run through the bill. I can see no trust that it has struck at, or at all injured, except this sugar trust. The nominal reductions made on many articles still leave so high a duty as to close our market to foreign importations and secure to combinations of American manufacturers as full power to squeeze the American consumer as they have under the present tariff. The whisky trust and the steel rail trust, the cordage trust and the bicycle trust, the lead trust and the starch trust—in short, the whole brood of vampires which rob the people through the agency of the Government by means of the tariff are left free to pluck the tariff-bound American consumer. He has no lobby to represent him; he has only his Congressman, and from the way some of these Congressmen are pleading for an increase of duty on special articles I must confess that from my standpoint some of these consumers are very poorly represented. [Laughter.]

Take steel rails, of which I happen to know something, as I am a manufacturer of steel rails. I appeal to the Democrats of the House to join me in putting steel rails on the free list. The present duty on steel rails is $13.44 per ton, which is estimated to be equivalent to 50.44 per cent ad valorem. The committee have reduced this to 25 per cent. This seems like a great reduction. But it is only nominal, for 25 per cent is all the steel rail trust want. It is as good to them as 1,000 per cent, for it is practically a prohibitory duty.

Steel can be made here as cheaply as anywhere else in the world, and would not now be imported, save in exceptional cases, even if there were no duty; while the tendency of invention and improvement is in favor of the United States as against Europe. The steel made into rails in this country is from native ore. What pig metal, billets, and blooms are imported are used entirely in other iron and steel manufactures. Now it costs less than $2 a ton to make steel rails from blooms, including straightening and punching. On to-day's market steel blooms are selling at less than $17; steel rails should therefore not bring over $19. They did fall nearly to that price a few weeks ago, during a temporary break in the steel rail pool. But that pool was quickly reorganized, and the price of steel rails was put up and is now maintained at $24 a ton; so that by virtue of the duty which keeps out foreign rails, the pool is compelling the users of steel rails to pay them 25 per cent more than a fair price.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman speak now from the attitude of a steel rail manufacturer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I do. Our mill makes about one-thirtieth of all that are produced in the United States.

This new steel rail pool is composed of seven manufacturers, headed by Carnegie, who absolutely control the product of more than one-half of the rolled steel produced in the United States, and who have combined together to pay other large manufacturers heavy annual sums to close their works, discharge their men, and make no steel.

Now, observe, the 25 per cent duty of the committee's bill is just as good to the steel rail pool as the greater nominal duty of the existing law, and will enable the pool to keep the price up to the highest point that they deem safe. For, with a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem, steel rails can not be imported from Europe and sold in competition with the pool at $24 a ton, the highest price it now chooses to ask. So that the nominal reduction made by the committee is actually no reduction at all. It will not add 1 cent to the income of the Government. It will not reduce 1 cent the price of steel to American users of steel rails, and it will not diminish by 1 cent the profits of the Carnegie pool. Hence Carnegie's satisfaction, expressed the other day, when about to sail. It is true that if the proposed reduction had come earlier it would have been of some benefit to the American consumer, for the present duty of $13.44 a ton enabled the steel-rail pool up to a recent time to keep the price of steel rails higher still. But a greater internal competition, caused by reductions in the cost of production, has of itself compelled them to come down

to $24 a ton, and a duty of 25 per cent will enable them to maintain that price as snugly as does the McKinley law.

Mr. DALZELL. Is the gentleman a party to the steel rail trust?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I am not; but whether I am or not would make no difference. Outside of this Hall, as a steel manufacturer, I might be perfectly willing to enter a trust, but I will not defend trusts here. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not manufacture steel rails under the protection of one hundred and two patents taken out in the name of Arthur J. Moxham?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I am very glad the gentleman gives me an opportunity to answer that question. I could not have brought the matter in this debate otherwise. Our steel rails are not protected by a single patent. We had at one time several patents covering steel rails. Upon two of them the courts, very wisely I think, decided against us; and the others relate to sections that have gone out of fashion. If steel rails were put on the free list to-morrow, we would be open to the competition of the world upon every pattern we make.

Mr. DALZELL. I do not want to intrude upon the gentleman, but if he will allow me I would like to ask another question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Go on.

Mr. DALZELL. Is not Arthur J. Moxham president of your company?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. He is.

Mr. DALZELL. Has not Mr. Arthur J. Moxham one hundred and two patents covering the manufacture of steel rails and various appliances in connection with steel rails?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I think the gentleman underestimates the number of patents that Mr. Moxham has taken out. I think they number nearer two hundred. Not one of these on the process of manufacturing rails has been taken out abroad, and consequently would not interfere with the making of rails in England or Germany, and so could not interfere with English or German manufacturers in bringing into this country rails made in competition with us. I will repeat, that two concerns in this country infringed on several patents that we thought we had on rails and in the infringement suit we were beaten—I think rightly.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Is not the gentleman paying his workmen to-day in scrip?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I will answer that question and as many more as you may ask. In Johnstown, where our mill is located, we have been paying for years in wages 30 or 40 cents a day more than our neighbors. I do not say this with the view of arousing any sympathy or claiming any credit. We did it not because we loved our men better than others loved theirs, but for the plain business reason that it paid us to do this. We had the pick of the men. To-day we are paying for common labor $1.50 a day, while our neighbor, the Cambria Iron Company, member of the steel-rail pool, is paying 85 cents a day. We do this because we believe that we get a better return by paying $1.50 a day than we would if we paid 85 cents.

Now, we are not paying our men in "scrip." During this panic we found that our customers, the street railroad men, had plenty of bonds, but no money. After consultation with the Cambria Iron Company and others, from whom we bought some of our materials, we agreed to take our pay in bonds. We then called our men together and said, "We have this opportunity to make some rails by taking our pay in bonds. We will do this if you will take two-thirds of your pay in the same thing we are paid in, and we will pay you one-third in cash. Will you go on this way, or shall we shut down?" Our men, after we had withdrawn from the meeting, decided unanimously that they would like to go on at the old rate of wages, taking one-third of their pay in money and the other two-thirds in that form in which we took all of our pay, namely, in bonds. [Applause, and cries of "Good!" on the Democratic side.] As a result of this arrangement we have issued to our men some twenty or thirty thousand dollars of what you call "scrip," but what is really the evidence of their interest in these bonds. The first series of these certificates has already been redeemed at par. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask the gentleman whether that scrip is not to-day at a discount at Johnstown?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. That can not be possible, because the first series was redeemed to-day at par.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. Does he deny the existence of the steel rail pool?

Mr. DALZELL. I do deny the existence of a steel rail trust.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, you make no quibble on the word "trust," or "pool?"

Mr. DALZELL. There was a combination between the steel rail manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Go on, I will wait for you.

Mr. DALZELL. There was a combination between certain steel rail men, which was broken up by the refusal of a large number of firms to go into it, and it fell of its own weight. There was no condition in it for keeping up prices, and as a matter of fact the prices continued to fall from the time of the formation of the trust until its termination. The prices of rails steadily fell all the time; and in addition to that——

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Go on.

Mr. DALZELL. A large proportion of the steel rail mills to-day are in the hands of receivers. The gentleman knows that to be a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. But you deny that there is a pool?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, here is a copy of a contract with the Maryland Steel Company, which proves its existence. (See Exhibit A at close of remarks.) [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, in the Iron Age, the official organ of the steel producers, in the issue of November 16, 1893, page 880, you will find a synopsis of the agreement forming the old steel rail pool. At Baltimore the other day, on the 22d day of November to be exact, in the circuit court room No. 2, there was a petition presented by the Maryland Steel Company, asking the privilege of selling 300,000 tons of steel rails at $25 a ton to one Robert F. Kennedy. The contract was presented in legal form. Here is a copy (Exhibit A, above referred to), which anybody can inspect for himself. It has a condition that in case Kennedy fails to take the rails each month he shall pay a dollar a ton, or about a thousand dollars a day, as a forfeit. This is the real point in the contract, and shows the existence of the pool. It is in reality not a contract for making rails, but a contract not to make rails.

Now, I have been endeavoring to discover who this Mr. Kennedy is. I find he is a large stockholder, director, and member of the executive board of the Cambria Iron Company, a rival concern to the Maryland Steel Company. He is also secretary of the board of control of the present steel rail pool, which went into existence about the 22d of November last. Mr. Kennedy, the secretary of this pool, makes a contract with a rival concern at Sparrow's Point to pay them about $1,000 a day to close up their mill and make no steel. The effect of retaining a duty of 25 per cent on steel rails, as the committee propose, will be to perpetuate the pool. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This Sparrow's Point mill, I understand, is in the district represented by my friend, Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. He should feel some interest in a contract which would discharge the workmen in his district.

But that is not all. At Steelton the Pennsylvania Steel Company, really the same concern as the Sparrow's Point establishment, get from the pool $80,000 a year to stop making steel rails above 50 pounds to the yard.

As to the breaking of the pool, it seems that the Maryland Steel Company was not considered very reliable by the other members of the pool, who suspected that it was underselling the pool rate, which last spring was $29; therefore Mr. Carnegie broke the price and carried it down to about $21.80. This went on but a short time, and then the new and present pool was organized.

Mr. DALZELL. I am not prepared to deny the statement the gentleman makes, for I have no personal knowledge of the facts, and am therefore bound to accept his statement. But if that be true, I want to say to him that I reprobate trusts just as much as he does, and will coöperate with him in any proper way for their suppression.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I shall be glad to have the coöperation of the gentleman. As far as I am personally concerned I am a thoroughgoing monopolist [laughter], and would be willing, outside of this Hall, to take advantage of any of the bad laws that you put upon the statute books; but I will not defend them here. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Structural iron and steel have been treated in the same way as rails. A 35 per cent duty has been left on them, which is more than enough to permit the steel pool, of which again the Carnegie concern is the leading member, to compel American builders to pay them the highest price they could safely ask if the importation of structural steel and iron were absolutely prohibited. It is but mockery to call such changes in the tariff reductions. So with the lowering of the duty on bicycles from 45 per cent to 35 per cent. This lower rate will suffice to keep out foreign bicycles, except for those to whom price is no object, and will enable the bicycle trusts or pool to continue to deprive hundreds

of thousands of American boys of the opportunity to avail themselves of an innocent, invigorating, and useful amusement.

From the standpoint of a free trader, or perhaps even from that of a tariff-for revenue man, the Wilson bill is some improvement on the McKinley bill. But it is a very small one. The committee have not even been consistent in striking out specific duties, those devices for compelling the poor to pay more than the rich, and they have slavishly copied many of the tricks and devices which interested parties had put into the McKinley bill, in some cases, doubtless, without the knowledge of the author himself. Such, for instance, is the little trick about the rebinding of books, which was shorn of its effects in the McKinley bill by the decision of our courts. It appears again in the Wilson bill, so fixed as to pass the courts. Governor McKinley in a recent speech in Ohio denounced free traders as theorists and tariff tinkers who had got their knowledge out of books. No wonder he wanted to tax books. But what could have induced the scholarly chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, a Democrat and a book lover, to not merely continue the odious McKinley tax on books, but to make it worse, so that under the provisions of his bill a man who has a few stitches put in the binding of an old book may be taxed at the rate of a dollar and a quarter on a five-dollar book that he might otherwise import for nothing.

But it is useless now to take up the time of the House with details. I propose at the proper time to offer some amendments to the bill, in the effort to get some of the protection out of it and some real reduction of taxes into it. As I have said, I will vote for this bill so long as a shred of reduction is left in it; but I object to its whole spirit, to the timidity and cowardice that breathes through it, to its tenderness with trusts, and its reluctance to reduce protection.

Mr. Chairman, the concession that there can be any vested right in the privilege of taxing the many for the benefit of the few, and that those who have profited by robbing the people must not be shorn of their unjust power too quickly, is a denial of the first principle of Democracy. The admission that there could be any injury to the country were we to abolish protection too quickly is the admission of the Republican charge that the mere talk of reforming the tariff has already brought disaster. Either protection is good for the country or it is bad. If it is good, we can not have too much of it. If it is bad, we can not cut it off too quickly or too entirely.

To admit that there is any good reason for keeping up one tariff tax other than that of raising revenue; to admit that there is any special business or interest entitled to consideration in reducing taxes, is to stultify the Democratic position; it is to admit that we are wrong in attempting to reduce the tariff at all.

This is the illogical position in which the committee have put themselves. They have made a logical and political mistake in listening to the pleas of the beneficiaries of protection, and instead of the simple, clear-cut measure they might have proposed had they tried only to carry out the Democratic platform, they have been worrying themselves with the attempt to discover what reductions could be made with the least harm to private interests.

Can you stamp out fever without lessening the profits of doctors, nurses, and undertakers? Can you stop robbery without withdrawing the hand of the robber from the pockets of the robbed? The committee ought not to have listened to the advice to deal carefully and tenderly with protected interests, and we ought not to. We should not have begun the fight against protection unless we were ready to carry it to the end. The Republican way of making a tariff is simple. It is to impose on the people whatever tax is asked for by any one who says such a tax would benefit him. The true Democratic way of amending a Republican tariff is equally simple. It is to abolish every tax any private interest wants to maintain. For where private interests object to the remission of a tax, it is certain that the Government is not getting all that that tax costs the people.

That you can injure industry and hurt labor by abolishing tariff taxes too quickly and too completely, I deny. You will injure monopoly and hurt trusts; but you will stimulate industry and give labor relief. Take the business in which I am interested. If you put steel rails on the free list, as I intend to move, you will not shut up mills; on the contrary, you will open them, for the steel-rail pool can then no longer, out of the extra profits the tariff gives it, afford to pay for keeping mills idle. There will be greater activity and a greater demand for labor in the making of rails. And so with structural steel. But the benefit will not end there. The men engaged in making steel rails and structural steel are but a handful compared with those engaged in laying rails and erecting buildings and bridges, and even they are few, compared with the men such erections set at work. You will lessen the profits of some of us steel manufacturers, but you will stimulate industry, give idle labor a chance for employment, and so tend to raise wages.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman ought to make it clear as to the cost of steel rails as long as he has entered into that subject. I understand the gentleman to say that the raw material for the steel rails costs $16 a ton and that it costs $2 a ton to make steel rails. Does the gentleman include in that the interest, wear and tear, repairs on plant, etc., or is it simply what it costs in the mill after the mill was constructed to make the rails?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. The gentleman has not quoted me quite correctly.

Mr. WALKER. I did not intend to misquote you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I know that. What I said was that the price of blooms was $16.50. In the process of manufacturing steel rails, the bloom is the product immediately preceding the finished rail, and from the bloom to the rail it costs $2 a ton. That includes all the items the gentleman names. But it does not cost Mr. Carnegie that much, because he does not start with the bloom. You protectionists talk about the reduction in the price of steel rails from $100 a ton down to the present price. That was not due to the tariff, but to the inventions of such men as Bessemer and the inventors who followed him, which enable the manufacturer to day to start with the ore and coke in the blast furnace, and with one heat run it through into the converter, and from there to the ingot, and from there to the bloom, and finish it into a steel rail without stopping once to reheat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. Do you know how many mills there are in the world that are making steel rails substantially in the same manner as the Carnegie works are making them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I suppose in this country there are but two. There were three, but one is now closed by the pool. That is the Sparrow's Point Mill I have spoken of. The Cambria Iron Company are changing their mill; and since you have brought me into this discussion, I will say that we are about to change our mill, and will do it whether you put steel rails on the free list or not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. I still want an answer, if it is within the gentleman's knowledge, how many mills there are in the world that are making steel rails substantially as Mr. Carnegie is making them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I think probably he has the best mill in the world, but there are six or eight——

Mr. WALKER. How many would there have been if it had not been for protection? This industry has had the benefit of protection, and under protection Mr. Carnegie has advanced the manufacture of steel rails in all the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Do you believe that is the result of protection?

Mr. WALKER. Yes; I believe it as much as that you and I are talking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Do you believe that our custom-houses made the inventions? Why, Bill Jones made most of the inventions for Carnegie; and if Bill Jones were living to-day he would repudiate your idea. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. I hope the gentleman will allow me one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. WALKER. I will ask the gentleman whether Bill Jones had the capital to develop his patents, or whether the capital of Mr. Carnegie did not develop and make available, in cheapening the cost of steel rails, the patents of Bill Jones. Can not he prove that by Bill Jones?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Bill Jones was no myth. He was one of nature's noblemen. Bill Jones was one of the men who stood side by side with us in relieving the people after the Johnstown flood, and he helped in that when rich men were shirking. [Applause.] Bill Jones furnished the brains and Carnegie furnished the money that made Carnegie's mill what it is to-day. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, what is true of steel is true of all industries. If we could abolish the whole tariff on the 1st of February I do not believe there is a single manufacturing industry that would close. On the contrary, all that were not purely exotics, kept alive by taxes, would be greatly stimulated. Foreigners would want more of our products, and foreign markets would be open to our goods. Wheat would bring more to the grower, and labor would bring more to the laborer, and the masses of our people would want and could pay for more manufactured goods. You can not depress industry and impoverish labor by remitting taxes; that is done by imposing taxes.

Manufactures need no protection. It was not manufacturers who settled this country, and were the pioneers of its Western growth. It was farmers. Import duties on what is received in exchange for farm products shipped abroad are equivalent to ex-

port duties on those products. If you want to help manufactures repeal them. Let the farmers be prosperous and manufactures will thrive. It was not the tariff that made Cleveland and Toledo and Cincinnati and St. Louis and Chicago manufacturing centers. No seaboard tariff could protect them. It was the growth of the western agricultural population.

Of all the nonsense talked against the reduction of tariff taxes, the claim that they benefit the workingman is most transparent. The effect of these taxes is to increase the price of everything that the workingman sells his labor for, since the money he gets is only the medium with which he obtains what is the real object of his labor. Granted, which is only true in a comparatively few cases, that such taxes increase the profits of his employer. Do employers pay larger wages when they get larger profits? I do not [laughter], and even philanthropists do not.

Take Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who gives like a prince out of the millions the tariff has enabled him to take from his fellow-citizens. He gives like a prince from his more than princely income, but he does not raise wages unless he has to. Before he started for Jerusalem a few days ago, he utilized the tariff to reestablish the steel-rail pool and pay other manufacturers to shut up their works and throw their men out of employment; then a general cut in wages was made in all his great establishments; and then he announced himself ready to give as much as $5,000 a day to feed the unemployed in Pittsburg—a place that, if there were any truth in the theory that protection is good for labor, ought to be a very paradise for workingmen. Now, which is best for labor, plenty of charity soup-houses or plenty of employment? There is the question between protection and free trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why should we fear free trade? Why should we talk of it as some deadly drug of unknown power that can only be introduced slowly into the social system? Is not this the greatest free-trade country in the world? If a foreign enemy were to cut the railroads between Pennsylvania and New York, or blockade the lake trade between Ohio and Michigan, would we listen to those who told us that we must be careful not to reopen freedom of trade too quickly.

All this talk about injuring industries and depriving workingmen of employment by reducing taxes too fast is protectionist talk, and the true place for the man who believes it is in the Republican party. We heard it all before election, and if we did not believe it then, why should we believe it now? The majority of American voters did not believe it then, or Mr. Cleveland would not be in the White House, and we would not have a majority here.

Mr. Chairman, there is no use in my wasting effort on gentlemen like the signers of the minority report who still think a tariff an invention for taxing foreigners, and that the way to raise wages is to let employers impose what taxes they want to. But I wish to address myself directly to my fellow Democrats.

I believe the result of the next election hangs on the action of this House in this matter. We Democrats were sent here as the result of what the committee have truly styled the "fullest and most thorough debate ever given by any people to their fiscal policy." We met the Republicans on this tariff question and defeated them. All that the trusts and rings and protected interests could do against us was done, but we triumphed so overwhelmingly that for the moment the Republican party seemed to be destroyed. What would be the result of a similar election to-morrow? The November elections have told us we would be beaten out of sight. And the reason of this is that we have done nothing to redeem our pledges or shown any disposition to do so.

The time may have passed very pleasantly with us, meditating on what we should do after awhile, and listening to gentlemen who tell us how dreadful it would be if we did not keep on paying the bounties and maintaining the war ships and supporting all the useless officials the Republicans saddled us with, and how even still more dreadful it would be if we were too quick in cutting off Republican taxation, and were to happen to cut off more than the people who have to pay it like. But with wheat at 50 cents a bushel and soup-houses in every city, the masses who feel the burden are in no mood for delay. It is only a matter of months now when the elections will be on again. If we do not want to be politically swamped we must act quickly and act strongly.

I am far from asserting that the bottom cause of the present distress is the tariff. It is something greater than that—it is the monopolization of land, the natural opportunity of all employment, the natural prerequisite of all wealth, and such distress must recur again until we come to the only true mode of raising revenue, the only full free trade—the single tax. But a quick and sharp reduction of taxation and breaking down of the trusts and monopolies that have grown up from the Republican tariff will give large present relief and start again the wheels of industry. The people who elected us demand some measure of relief; not something cautious and slow, but something quick and large. Our danger is not in reducing taxes too far and fast; it is in not reducing them far enough and fast enough. It is the part of political sagacity for us to cut off taxes so quickly as to make the head of every trust in the country swim.

It is bad politics to ignore the friends who voted for you in order to please enemies who opposed you. That is what the majority of the committee have done in reporting such a protectionist bill. What have they gained by their "moderation"? Simply the sneers of the minority. Every Republican member will oppose their bill; every Republican paper will denounce it; every ring and trust will fight it just as strongly, just as bitterly, just as persistently as they would oppose the bill that I would like to introduce. That bill would be short and simple. It would read:

SEC. 1. All import duties and corresponding internal-revenue duties are hereby abolished, and all officials engaged in collecting such duties are hereby discharged.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to sell all custom-houses and revenue cutters, and pay the proceeds into the Treasury.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

Such a bill would excite no more protectionist opposition than this poor, timid, little Wilson bill will. But it would not be sneered at, and it would arouse a mighty support, that this bill can not get.

Such a bill as that I do not hope for now, but if we want to see another Democratic victory let us stand up to the platform of our party, and retaining what free list the committee have proposed, add to it such things as steel rails and bicycles, and strike out all the protection they have filled into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is political folly for us to be timid about cutting down protection. The men who beseech Congress not to reduce duties will only laugh at our concessions and hate us as much for a reduction of 1 per cent as for that of 100 per cent. They represent the class we defeated in 1892. We fought them like lions on the stump and defeated them then. Why should we like lambs listen to their appeals for a longer time to rob our constituents, in order to put part of the money in the next Republican election fund, as they surely will do? It is political folly for us to be timid about cutting down protection. If we do not do that so quickly and decidedly as to give the masses relief no Democrat will again for many a day fill the Speaker's chair or occupy the White House. We will be beaten, and will deserve to be beaten.

Mr. Cleveland missed the golden opportunity to give quick response to the popular will by not calling us together to abolish protection on the day of his inauguration. The serious question is whether it can now be done in time to have effect before the next election. If it can not, the Democratic party will lose one branch of Congress if not two, and will begin its travels into the wilderness again, to stay there, I hope, till a party having the courage of Democratic conviction arises.

In the timid course we have hitherto pursued, and that is outlined in this bill, we are estranging the men who in every doubtful State and district hold the balance of power. One important body of these men, important in their growing numbers and more important in their intelligence and influence—the single-taxers—you can count on supporting you so long as they can not get a more radical party; for they support, not men nor parties, but a principle. Yet they dislike a whitewashed protectionist more than they do a thorough-going one, and will turn against a timid Democracy the moment they can get a real Democrat to vote for. And there is a great class whom you can not count on—those who have no settled conviction on the tariff question, many of whom voted for you in 1892 because they felt a deep wrong somewhere and wanted a change.

Now, in hesitating to carry out the party's pledges, in admitting that we must go slow and easy in abolishing protection, and that disaster would follow if we cut away too much taxation, you are showing them that Democrats do not believe what the Democratic platform said, but do really believe what the Republican platform said. Can you wonder that, as the November election indicated these men will believe the Republicans—that the suffering and distress are, as they assert, the result of the Democratic victory, and the next change they seek will be to send us to private life?

I know that there are many Democrats here who are not in sympathy with the Democratic platform, and are at heart protectionists. The part of political wisdom for them is to go over to the Republican party where, in the struggle now beginning over economic issues, they really belong. But while they remain with the Democracy they must share its fate; and whether they may deem it politically wise or foolish for the Democracy to have begun this fight against protection, they must certainly see that the only safety now is in going forward.

But at the worst there are some of us who believe what we have professed, and to whom Democracy means nothing if it does not mean free trade. Let us at least stand together to cut the protectionism out of this bill. If we can not succeed, we can at least show our hands. There is political destruction in timidity. The only political safety is in courage. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman has given us the bill that he would like to enact, repealing all the present revenue laws; will he be kind enough now to give us also the brief bill he would put in their place to raise revenue for the support of the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Oh, yes. I would put the tax upon the monopolization of natural opportunies; upon land values irrespective of improvement—the values which are created by the community and which the community have the first right to. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know it is a long way from a protective tariff to the single tax, but I want to make the start. Of all the known methods of raising revenue the worst is a tariff, and of all tariffs the worst is a protective tariff.

The best of all taxes is the one I have indicated—the single tax. I will vote with you, gentlemen, on every step between the worst and the best. If, on the way, you want an income tax, I will vote for it, though I do not like income taxes. But any tax on what men have is better than a tax on what men need. [Applause.] Any tax on wealth in any form is better than a tax on consumption in any form. I am far from charging that our present difficulties—this great depression through which we are passing—is due to the acts of either political party. I do not believe that the tariff cuts anything like the figure in this distress that people generally give it credit for.

We have to look further than that to find the cause, for there is no civilized country on the globe, except perhaps New Zealand, where the single tax has been begun, that is not suffering at this time from depression. We must look further than tariffs. But the measure I would propose in answer to the gentleman from Illinois would go to the heart of this world-wide question, would solve the labor problem—it is the single tax. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

EXHIBIT A.

1.

This agreement, made this 21st day of November, A. D. 1893, by and between Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, and F. W. Wood, receiver of the Maryland Steel Company, party of the second part, witnesseth:

Whereas the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, is desirous of purchasing of the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, 300,000 tons of first quality railway bars of present standard sections, none of which shall weigh less than 50 pounds to the yard and of the weights and patterns as the said party of the first part shall hereafter, from time to time, during the continuance of this contract determine, and the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, is desirous of selling the same to the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part.

Now, in consideration of the premises and a further consideration of $1, in hand paid by each of the parties hereto, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, it is hereby agreed as follows:

First. That the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, hereby purchases of the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, and the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, hereby sells to the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, the said 300,000 tons of first quality (their present standard sections) the railway bars of 50 pounds to the yard and upwards, at the price or sum of $25 per ton (2,240 pounds) upon the following terms and conditions:

Second. The deliveries of the said railway bars shall be in twelve equal monthly portions of 25,000 each, and said delivery shall commence in January, 1894, and continue in like monthly portions of 25,000 tons per month till the completion of this contract. The said Robert F. Kennedy agrees to pay for the said monthly shipments or portions of 25,000 tons at the rate of $25 per ton, as follows: One-half of said price to be paid in advance when and as he shall furnish specifications and shipping directions for said bars, and the remaining one-half of said price upon the 10th day of the month next succeeding the month in which said bars are delivered.

Third. The said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, shall on or before the 1st day of December, A. D. 1893, and on or before the first day of each succeeding month, up to and including November 1, 1894, furnish the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, with written specifications and shipping directions for the 25,000 tons of railway bars that is to be furnished under this contract during the month next succeeding the month on which such notice shall be given (it being the intention that the party of the second part shall have at least one month's notice of the specifications, etc., on each month's shipments previous to the month in which delivery is to be made) and in case the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, shall neglect or fail to furnish such specifications and shipping directions as aforesaid, on or before the first day of the respective months, as herein specified, then, in every such case, this contract shall be considered as abrogated in so far as it relates to the purchase and sale of 25,000 tons of railway bars purchased and sold for delivery in the month next ensuing the month in which notice should have been given, as aforesaid, on the first day thereof. It being understood that this default of notice shall apply to the whole 25,000 tons which is to be delivered in any month and in every case of the failure by the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, to give to the party of the second part the notice of specifications and shipping directions as hereinbefore provided, then the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, shall be considered in default of his contract for the month for which he so fails and on the tenth day of the month next ensuing the month for which he so fails to give notice of specifications, etc., as aforesaid, he, the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, shall pay to the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, the sum of $1 per ton upon the 25,000 tons of railway bars on which he, the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, shall be in default, as aforesaid, and upon the payment of the said $1 for each ton of railway bars so in default, then this contract shall be construed as having been fully carried out by both the parties hereto up to the last day of the month (and including the same) for which settlement and penalty for default has been made.

It is to be understood, however, that if the said Robert F. Kennedy, party of the first part, shall fail to make payment on the 10th day of the month next ensuing the month for which he has failed to give notice of specifications, etc., as aforesaid, or if he shall fail to make payment on the 10th day of the month succeeding the month in which any deliveries shall be made of railway bars under the terms of this contract, then in such case the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, shall have the right to cancel this contract, and upon his written notice given by the said party of the second part, to the party of the first part, of his, the said F. W. Wood, receiver, party of the second part, election to so cancel this contract by reason of the failure of the party of the first part to comply with these conditions, this contract shall determine, cease, and end, and immediately thereupon shall be due and payable by the said party of the first part, to the party of the second part, a penalty equal to $25,000 per month for each and every month intervening between the month for which the last settlement had been made under this contract and the month of January, 1895, which penalty shall at once be collectable.

Fourth. In consideration of the payment herein provided to be made the party of the second part hereby agrees not to manufacture, during the continuance of this contract, any railway bars of 50 pounds weight to the yard and upwards, except such as he manufactures under this contract for the party of the first part.

Fifth. If the said party of the first part shall well and truly pay to the said party of the second part the contract price of $25 per ton for all railway bars delivered in accordance with his specifications and shipping directions, or shall pay all penalties that may or shall accrue under this contract, for default in not furnishing specifications and shipping directions, then in such case all further liability under this contract shall cease and end.

Sixth. This agreement shall be binding upon the executors, administrators, successors, or assigns of the parties hereto.

In witness whereof the said parties hereto have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year aforesaid.

Signed, sealed, and delivered in the presence of—

——— ———. [SEAL.]
——— ———. [SEAL.]

2.

EARNSHAW VS. THE MARYLAND STEEL COMPANY.

In circuit court No. 2 of Baltimore City.

To the honorable the judge of circuit court No. 2 of Baltimore City:

The petition of Frederick W. Wood, receiver in the above cause, respectfully shows:

I. That he has been offered the contract filed herewith, by which said contract the Maryland Steel Company would dispose of 300,000 tons of steel rails during the year 1894, in monthly deliveries of 25,000 tons, at the price of $25 per ton, delivered free on board at Sparrows Point.

II. That there would be a profit on said contract much greater than in any other manner the works for the manufacture of steel rails could be carried on by the plant of the Maryland Steel Company.

III. That it would be greatly for the interest of all parties of the Maryland Steel Company, either as creditors or as stockholders, that the said contract should be entered into by your petitioner, and he prays your honor to pass an order in the premises authorizing your petitioner to execute said contract.

And as, etc.

J. ALEXANDER PRESTON,
Attorney for Petitioner.

FREDERICK W. WOOD, *Receiver.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a justice of the peace of said State in and for said city, this 22d day of November, 1893.

GEORGE MCCAFFRAY,
Justice of Peace.

Ordered by the court, this 22d day of November, 1893, that Frederick W. Wood, receiver of the Maryland Steel Company, be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to execute the contract filed herewith as part of this petition, and marked "Exhibit R. F. K."

PERE L. WICKES.

Mr. DALZELL was recognized.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] proceeds, Mr. Chairman, I understand that he may desire a little more time than would be accorded to him under the arrangement, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak without limit.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, the election of 1892, which resulted in the ascendency in all branches of the Government of the Democratic party, worked a political revolution in this country. It stripped of power the party whose rule has been coincident with the most brilliant chapter in our history, and to whose liberal and progressive policy we owe the most beneficent results that have been achieved in the onward march of the Republic.

On the other hand it clothed with authority a political party that during this generation has known nothing of the responsibilities and has had none of the experiences of governing, and whose retirement from power a third of a century ago is inseperably connected with the attempted overthrow of the Constitution and dismemberment of the Union, in order to build an empire upon the corner-stones of slavery and free trade. In the light of recent and existing events it is impossible of belief that this revolution was the result of careful thought and deliberation on the part of the American people.

No sooner had the smoke of partisan conflict risen, and the result of their action been revealed to them, than a crisis ensued, amongst the most appalling in our economic history. All our industries suffered immediate collapse, trade, foreign and domestic, became paralyzed, the ghost of distrust stalked threatening in all the avenues of commerce, and fear fell on all men, rich and

poor alike. As a people we walk to-day in the valley of desolation.

Furnace fires have gone out, and fires upon humble hearthstones as well, while throughout all our borders factory and workshop and the various implements and appliances of industry remain idle and unused. Hungry and homeless men and women and children, hopeless of the future, shivering amid the blasts of winter, appeal to a benevolence that taxed to its uttermost can not make satisfactory answer. Worse even than that, if possible, the desperation of the unemployed nerves some of them to the open advocacy of political doctrines at war with the canons of civil freedom, threatening the stability of social order, and presenting problems whose solution call for all the resources of a wise, conservative, and patriotic statesmanship.

DEMOCRATIC INCOMPETENCE.

To these complications that disturb our peace and make us fearful of the future, must be added the fact that the doubts engendered by Democratic accession to power have been justified and aggravated by experience of Democratic rule. In the few months that the dominant party has held the reins of Government it has proved itself conspicuously incompetent to deal with a single important question presented by the responsibilities of civil administration. The Executive, with an ignorance of the limitations of his office, inexcusable in an intelligent American citizen, has usurped the functions of Congress, not to meet any exigency or for any justifiable end, but to undertake, and miserably fail in, a foreign policy which would be grotesque if it were not contemptible. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A member of his Cabinet, trained in an environment which, whatever his character may be, necessarily disqualified him for any position that has to deal with the men who saved his country, has demonstrated how unfair the policy of the Democratic party can be in its hostility to the Union soldier.

This House has been organized on the basis of *antebellum* days, so that the section of country which is least familiar with American industries and enterprise dominates the policy of the nation, while it doles out as of yore to its servile Northern contingent the crumbs that fall from the party table. [Applause.]

In this deplorable condition of things, clouds and darkness all around us, what do those who rule our destinies propose by way of relief?

AN INFAMOUS BILL.

A tariff bill that if enacted, I predict posterity will pronounce the most infamous legislative crime of our history. Instead of relief it brings aggravation. To the manufacturer whose idle capital is bringing him no returns, whose plant disuse is depreciating, and whose income has been sadly narrowed or entirely cut off, it offers the deceptive lure of free raw materials and the *ignis fatuus* of the world's markets, while it strips him of the ability to compete in any market and be just to his employés. To the farmer it offers instead of protection an enlarged competition from abroad in the products of his farm; instead of a vast and growing home market, a market abroad in which his increased surplus can not but degrade prices.

To the cry of the laboring man clamoring for work at American wage rates, to the end that he, his wife and his children shall live like Americans, its brutal answer is, lower wages or war with your employer. And for the empty American Treasury, depleted beyond the power to meet current expenses, what relief? Oh, shame to tell it! further depletion by reducing national revenues by from seventy to one hundred million dollars per annum. To be made up how? By an issue of bonds in time of peace; by laying on the backs of the American people, now of all times least able to bear them, direct taxes never heretofore in all our experience sought to be justified save amid the roar of cannon and the clash of arms.

UNNECESSARY: ADEQUACY AND BENEFICENCE OF EXISTING LAW.

If this bill, instead of being a monstrosity, were wise in its provisions, its enactment at this time would be unwise. Under the most favorable circumstances, even in prosperous times, a revision of our tariff laws inevitably unsettles business, and requires a general readjustment to meet new conditions.

Why, then, I ask, in the present exigency, in this period of distress and uncertainty, induce further complications by change of our revenue system? Is it the part of wise statesmanship to ignore its surroundings and blindly push to legislation in the abstract, merely to exploit a theory; or should it in imitation of a beneficent power "temper the wind to the shorn lamb"?

Does any necessity exist for the enactment of the law proposed? I answer emphatically, no. The existing tariff law meets all the demands of the Government and of the people, and in its relation to national prosperity has proved itself the wisest ever written upon our statute books. It has been maligned, abused, purposely misrepresented and misunderstood. But no intelligent man willing to give its operation honest examination will be misled into condemning it.

It has fully answered every object intended by its framers and justified in all particulars the wisdom of its enactment. The reason for its passage was a surplus in the Treasury. While other nations were seeking objects to tax, we were seeking subjects for exemption. So wisely were its schedules devised that our revenues were reduced so as adequately to meet our needs, but not beyond the limit of safety. Its opponents predicted that it would ruin our foreign trade. Their predictions have been falsified. Under its operation our foreign trade has increased to enormous proportions—proportions never before dreamed of in the history of the nation.

While our imports in 1890 were $789,310,409, they were in 1891 $844,916,196, an increase of $55,605,787; and in 1892, $827,402,462, an increase over 1890 of $38,092,053.

While our exports in 1890 were $845,293,828, they were in 1891 $872,270,283, an increase of $26,976,455; and in 1892 they reached the enormous sum of $1,015,732,011, an increase over 1890 of $170,438,183. And with this immense trade our free list has been the largest in our experience. The percentage of free imports in 1891 was 54 per cent.

Under no previous tariff was any such proportion of free imports known. Under the tariff of 1824 our free imports amounted only to 5¼ per cent; under the tariff of 1833 only to 24¼ per cent; under the tariff of 1842 only to 20¼ per cent; under the low tariff of 1846 to but 12 per cent or thereabouts, and under the tariff of 1857 to only 18 per cent. Prior to the election of 1892, and the threat that it implied of tariff reduction, there had been fewer idle men, more work at remunerative wage rates, more happy homes, contented people, and better attended schools than were ever known in any previous period of our career as a people.

Under the fostering care of this wise law new industries have sprung up, enlarging the field for both capital and labor, substituting home for foreign goods, and pouring into the channels of our own trade, to the enrichment of our own people, millions of money that theretofore had gone abroad, to the enrichment of other peoples. I shall not go into this matter at length, but choose only for illustration a single example.

Had it no other monument the American tin-plate industry would alone forever proclaim the wisdom and beneficence of our existing tariff law. The establishment of that industry has multiplied the opportunies for thousands to enjoy the advantages belonging to the social conditions of our American life.

The production of American tin plates in the first quarter of the establishment of the industry ending September 30, 1891, was 826,922 pounds; in the quarter ending June 30, 1893, less than two years after, 39,543,587 pounds, or forty-eight times greater in that quarter than in the first. Has the industrial world ever known a more magnificent tribute to the beneficence of law than that?

And withal, under the provisions of this law prices to the consumer have been cheapened. Read the evidence given before the Ways and Means Committee in the two weeks so grudgingly given to the discussion of the industries of seventy millions of people. Capitalist and laborer, Democrat and Republican, even the importers, all agree to the proposition that prices have been lowered under the tariff act of 1890, while wages have been maintained.

Let me quote to you the testimony of an educated and intelligent English free trader traveling in this country. I refer to Mr. Lascelles Carr, editor of the Western Mail, published at Cardiff, Wales.

He says:

The more I see of this wonderful country and the further my inquiries reach, the more satisfied I am that it is the paradise of the workingman, and especially of the working woman. Wages are high and the cost of living comparatively low. The margin between the amount of money necessary for a bare subsistence and the ordinary wage rate is larger than anywhere else in the world. If a workingman and his wife and family were content here to live as they live in England, they could save money very rapidly. But they are not so content. Except in the matter of house accommodation their circumstances are in every respect better than are those of their English brethren; they eat better and more varied food; they dress better; they have at least as good means of education and other sources of intellectual and social recreation. They are free from any sense of the indignity of labor. Class distinctions are practically unknown.

In another letter, he says:

I have several times alluded to the condition of the workingman in this country. The further my inquiries extend the more convinced I become that the real truth of the matter is that in this country a workman earns nearly twice as much as he would in England, and the cost of his living, except in the matter of rent and clothing, is about the same. Even in the matter of clothing the difference is not great, except in so far as it is brought about by the general use of much better clothing by the artisan in this country than in England. As for the rate of wages prevailing here, the waiter at my table to-night told me he was an Englishman who had settled in America for ten years. His earnings, he said, were double what they were in the old country, and whereas his wife, a forewoman in the scarf department of Messrs. Morley, in London, earned 25*s.* a week, here in Philadelphia, in a similar capacity, she earned $10 (over 40*s.*) a week, and had all Saturday and one other afternoon in the week to herself. What nonsense to compare the

condition of this family with that of an ordinary waiter in England, and say the Philadelphia man is worse off because he has to pay 5s. a week more rent! It is true he does pay an increased rent here, but what does that matter when, as a matter of fact, he lets off enough of his house to leave him rent free.

Mixing as I have done of late amongst all classes of Republican workmen and manufacturers; having witnessed the phenomenal prosperity alike of capital and labor; informed as I have been of the extent and strength of the enormous interests created by the American policy of protection, I can not help realizing the fact that those of our English people are living in a fool's paradise who believe that the result of the recent Democratic victory in this country, although based on the cry of tariff reform, will result in any measure that will open the markets of the United States to the manufactured goods of England or the continent of Europe. There is no American statesman living who dare precipitate such a national economic crisis. It would not be reform—it would be revolution.

Revolution, and so the chairman of the committee characterized this bill in his speech opening this debate.

But to continue, Mr. Carr further says:

I am, as you know, a convinced free trader. Protection is to me an economic heresy, the fraud and folly of which are capable of mathematical demonstration—demonstration as absolutely convincing as that by which the solution of a problem in Euclid is arrived at. And yet throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent one is almost daily brought face to face with solid, indisputable facts that seem to give the lie to the soundest and most universally accepted axioms of political economy.

Let me give you just one example. Under the shadow of a stringent protective tariff the manufacture of paper was commenced in the United States. Paper is still subject to a heavy import duty. According to our theories that ought to enhance its price to the consumer in this country. As a matter of fact the New York newspaper proprietors buy their "news" at a less price than that at which it could be supplied to them in London, and some of the paper mills in New Jersey are actually exporting paper to the old country. Unless it can be shown that this paper industry would have grown up without the aid of a protective tariff it is futile—nay, it is an impertinence—for an outsider to say that the Americans have acted unwisely in taxing themselves for a few years in order to establish in their midst a great industry, giving occupation to a great quantity of highly paid labor. And it seems to me that this set of facts and the arguments based on it apply to many of the other industries which are assuming such colossal proportions throughout the length and breadth of the land.

This gentleman called on the President of the United States. With respect to this call he relates, amongst other things, this incident:

When one of the newspaper correspondents told the President chaffingly that I had come from Wales to look for some of the tin-plate works which the Republican party declared to have been established under their protective tariff, he replied, "Well, Mr. Carr, when you do find them be sure and let me know their exact location, for we have been searching for these tin-plate works for some years now and have failed to find them."

If the President's Secretary of the Treasury had promptly made public the reports of the Government agent charged with the returns of this industry the ignorance of the President would not have been so dense and conspicuous. But there are none so blind as those who will not see. Let me illustrate.

I have a letter from a constituent of mine. He is an humble man who earns his bread in the sweat of his face. He writes me:

In the Transportation Building at the World's Fair, Chicago, there is an exhibit of fine harness from the factory of Woods & Son, St. Ives, Hunts, England, upon which I noticed a large show card reading, "These are duplicates of the harness made by our firm for Mr. Grover Cleveland, the President of the United States." It was impossible for me to read this card without a protest in behalf of American products and manufacturers, considering the above advertisement at our present crisis an insult to the American mechanics. Have we no hides or barks or tanneries, malleable iron foundries, silver-platers, or harness-makers in this country? I know that the President and the Democratic party have not been able to discover a tin-plate factory up to date, but there is no earthly excuse for them when it comes to leather and its products.

Any man chosen by the suffrages of the American people to be their Chief Magistrate who can not find as the product of American skill and American labor good enough harness for his horses, but must go to England therefor, would not be able to see an American tin-plate factory, though it covered an hundred acres of ground. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I shall not pursue this subject any further. I submit that, having regard to all the requirements of a tariff law in its relation to governmental revenue upon the one hand, and in its relation to national and individual prosperity on the other, the proposition must stand as established that no necessity exists for interference with our existing law.

If, then, I am right in saying that under present conditions it is unwise to pass this bill, and if my proposition is proven that no material governmental or popular interest calls for its passage, we are brought face to face with the inquiry: Upon what ground can its passage be asked for or justified?

PROTECTION CONSTITUTIONAL.

It is claimed by the Democratic majority that it came here by virtue of a demand upon the part of the American people that the doctrines of the Chicago platform of 1892 should be embodied in legislation, and that this bill meets that demand. Is that true?

The language of the Chicago platform on the subject of tariff is very explicit. It says:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only.

In the light of the majority's claim and of this party declaration, I propose now briefly to address myself to two questions:

First. Is protection unconstitutional?

Second. Does this bill propose a tariff for the purpose of revenue only?

One would suppose, in the light of our history, that the question as to the constitutional power of the Federal Government to levy duties for the protection of American interests was not an open one. Nothing short of the declaration by a great party in its national platform to the contrary would justify an argument on the subject. And in the limited time allowed here for debate I can not hope to do more than state, and briefly refer to, some of the propositions in support of the constitutionality of protection, and quote a few only out of the almost innumerable authorities upon the subject.

I submit the following propositions:

1. The American Union was founded originally to secure industrial protection.

2. The right to secure it was an original right in each of the individual States as inherent in those States as is the right of self-defense in the individual.

3. Without any intention to abrogate such right it was ceded to the General Government when the Union was formed.

4. The power to secure it is expressly included in the taxing clause of the Constitution.

5. It is just as expressly included in the power to regulate commerce.

6. Contemporaneous construction of the Constitution by its makers proves its existence.

7. A century and more of its exercise adds to the proof.

8. The opinions of all our statesmen, with scarcely an exception, from the beginning till now affirms it.

9. And so do the decisions of our highest tribunal, the Supreme Court of the United States.

We owe our national existence to the necessity of protection for our home industries. Long before any American of the eighteenth century had dreamed of an independent nation on this side of the Atlantic, the necessity for relief from the industrial thraldom of Great Britain had made itself apparent. The story of the American Revolution is primarily a story of revolt against industrial wrongs. Pursuit by the colonists of that simple economic law which induces a man to utilize his own, not to buy, beg, or borrow when he possesses, was forbidden by the English Parliament in the selfish interest of English products. English by blood, and heirs of English traditions, we come well by our protective policy. The long and brilliant story of British conquest and British wealth illustrates on every page persistent and vigorous protection to her home industries.

From 1699 forward, British legislation was directed to the stifling of native industries in the American colonies, and resulted at last in the American Revolution. We could not abide that we should not be allowed to develop our own resources and become our own manufacturers. I can not better sum up the whole matter than it is summed up in the words of Daniel Webster:

If we go back—

Said he—

to the history of the Constitution, and of the Convention which adopted it, we shall find that everywhere, when masses of men were assembled and the wants of the people were brought forth into prominence, the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one Government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union, from New Hampshire to Georgia; regard to be had in laying this duty to the protection of American labor and industry.

I defy the man—

He continued—

in any degree conversant with history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, to say that this was not a leading, I may almost say, the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it could never have been adopted.

The demand for protection was the motive for the new constitution. Prior to its adoption the right of protection existed in and was exercised by the individual States. My own State of Pennsylvania, as early as 1785, passed a protective tariff act, and in the light of the experience of to-day there is wisdom to be found in its preamble. It says:

Whereas divers useful and beneficial arts and manufactures have been gradually introduced into Pennsylvania, and the same have at length risen to a very considerable extent and perfection, insomuch that during the late war between the United States of America and Great Britain, when the importation of European goods was much interrupted and often very difficult and uncertain, the artisans and mechanics of the State were able to supply, in the hours of need, not only large quantities of weapons and other implements, but also ammunition and clothing, without which the war could not have been carried on, whereby their oppressed country was greatly benefited and relieved.

SEC. 2. And whereas, although the fabrics and manufactures of Europe and other foreign parts, imported into this country in times of peace, may

be offered at cheaper rates than they can be made here, yet good policy and a regard for the well-being of divers useful and industrious citizens who are employed in the like making of goods in this State demand of us that moderate duties be laid on certain fabrics and manufactures imported, which do most interfere with and which (if no relief be given) will undermine and destroy the useful manufactures of the like kind in this country, for this purpose, etc.

The whole doctrine of protective tariff as the Republican party advocates it to-day is contained in that preamble.

Mr. BRYAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. DALZELL. Seventeen hundred and eighty-five. The introduction into this country free of duty of those things with which we do not compete and the protection of the home market and the home producer by levying duties on those things that we do or can make here. From that day to this Pennsylvania has never swerved in her loyalty to that principle. In 1785 she was found following after the banner of protection, and she is found following after it to-day. Only a few days ago, in a State election, where no national issue was necessarily involved, but where the people of Pennsylvania believed that their voice might be potent in this House with respect to the great issue which it was then considering, she rolled up the magnificent majority of nearly 138,000 for the party of protection, and I venture the prediction that within a month, when she comes to select a Congressman-at-large to take part in our deliberations here, her majority testifying her continued loyalty to the cause will reach well towards 200,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is impossible of belief that the Colonies gave up such power as that of protection to the Federal Government, and that that Government does not now possess it. Let me quote an authority upon this subject that no Democrat will call in question.

Andrew Jackson said:

The object of the tariff is objected to by some as unconstitutional. * * * The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct.

Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case; this indispensable power thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution is in these words:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

In terms, then, Congress has express power to tax by means of impost duties. This power is either limited or unlimited—that is to say, it is either an absolute power to levy duties, or it is a power to levy them with the limitation that they shall be to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Whether the grant of power be limited or unlimited will not in this matter affect the result. If the power be an unlimited one, then, in accordance with the principle laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Loan Association vs. Topeka [20 Wallace, 655] "in determining for what objects taxation can properly be employed, regard may be had to the practice of the Government as tacitly ratified by the acquiescence of the people; and uses that have customarily been treated as public in England and the United States by successive legislatures may be presumed to deserve the character which they have so long borne, unless they are manifestly at variance with the letter and spirit of the Constitution."

The question then is, whether at the time of the adoption of the Constitution any other object than the raising of revenue was recognized as the legitimate function of tariff duties. To this there can be but one answer. Tariff duties have been by all nations, from time immemorial, recognized as an available and proper means to regulate commerce. They have been used as a means of retaliation in trade between various nations, as a means of reciprocity, as a means of prohibition, and for the accomplishment of various ends. It is matter of history that in our relations with Great Britain, the power of the English parliament to levy taxes was recognized by the colonies so long as the taxes were regulations of commerce; when they were levied for revenue then the Revolution followed.

Nor does it make any difference that the power in question may be held to be limited by the terms "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare."

Upon what principle shall it be determined that the only way to provide by taxation for the common defense and general welfare is by limiting its amount to the bare purposes of revenue? I quote from Judge Story on this subject:

May not the general welfare in the judgment of Congress be, in given circumstances, as well provided for by prohibitory duties, or by encouragements to domestic industry of all sorts? If a tax of one sort, as on tonnage on foreign vessels, will aid commerce, and a tax on foreign raw materials will aid agriculture, and a tax on imported fabrics will aid domestic manufactures, and so promote the general welfare, may they not be all constitutionally united by Congress in a law for this purpose?

If Congress can unite them all, may they not sustain them severally in separate laws? Is a tax to aid manufactures, or agriculture, or commerce, necessarily, or even naturally, against the general welfare or the common defense? Who is to decide upon such a point? Congress, to whom the authority is given to exercise the power? Or any other body, State or National, which may choose to assume it?

Whether, then, the power to lay impost duties be, under the Constitution, absolute or limited by the terms of the grant, in either event it may be constitutionally exercised, not for the purpose of raising revenue only, but for such purposes as in the judgment of the legislative body to which its exercise has been intrusted are necessary for the common defense and general welfare.

It may be urged, however, that the power is restricted to such specific objects as are contained in the other enumerated powers.

But the answer to this is that many of these enumerated powers have other objects and other means to effectuate them than revenue. Here again I quote Judge Story:

Revenue may be one mode, but it is not the sole mode. Take the power, to "regulate commerce." Is it not clear, from the whole history of nations, that laying taxes is one of the most usual modes of regulating commerce? Is it not, in many cases, the best means of preventing foreign monopolies and mischievous commercial restrictions? In such cases, then, the power to lay taxes is confessedly not for revenue. If so, is not the argument irresistible that it is not limited to purposes of revenue? Take another power, the power to coin money and regulate its value, and that of foreign coin: might not a tax be laid on foreign coin for the purpose of carrying this into effect by suppressing the circulation of such coin, or regulating its value?

Take the power to promote the progress of science and useful arts; might not a tax be laid on foreigners, and foreign inventions, in aid of this power, so as to suppress foreign competition, or encourage domestic science and arts? Take another power, vital in the estimation of many statesmen to the security of a republic—the power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; may not a tax be laid on foreign arms, to encourage the domestic manufacture of arms, so as to enhance our security, and give uniformity to our organization and discipline?

Take the power to declare war and its auxiliary powers, may not Congress, for the very object of providing for the effectual exercise of these powers, and securing a permanent domestic manufacture and supply of powder, equipments, and other warlike apparatus, impose a prohibitory duty upon foreign articles of the same nature?

If Congress may, in any or all of these cases, lay taxes, then, as revenue constitutes, upon the very basis of the reasoning, no object of the taxes, is it not clear that the enumerated powers require the power to lay taxes to be more extensively construed than for purposes of revenue?

Of course, if Congress has the power to tax for the purposes of protection, the question as to the wisdom or expediency of its exercise is a political and not a judicial question. As Chief Justice Marshall said in the case of McCulloch *vs.* Maryland, 4 Wheaton:

Where the law is not prohibited, and is really calculated to effect any of the objects intrusted to the Government, to undertake here to inquire into the degree of its necessity would be to pass the line which circumscribes the judicial department and to tread on legislative grounds.

But whether protection be defensible or not under the taxing clause of the Constitution it is clearly so under the clause which gives to Congress the power to regulate commerce.

Such has been the opinion of most of our distinguished statesmen from Washington's time until the present, and such has been the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in a number of cases. No clearer or more convincing exposition of this proposition has ever been made than was made by James Madison, one of the framers of the Constitution, in letters written by him to J. C. Cabell, on September 18 and October 30, 1828.

I have no time for anything more than a mere summary of his position. He says:

It is a simple question under the Constitution of the United States whether "the power to regulate trade with foreign nations," as a distinct and substantive item in the enumerated powers, embraces the object of encouraging by duties, restrictions, and prohibitions the manufactures and products of the country. And the affirmative must be inferred from the following considerations:

1. The meaning of the phrase "to regulate trade" must be sought in the general use of it: in other words, in the objects to which the power was generally understood to be applicable when the phrase was inserted in the Constitution.

2. The power has been understood and used by all commercial and manufacturing nations as embracing the object of encouraging manufactures. It is believed that not a single exception can be named.

3. This has been particularly the case with Great Britain, whose commercial vocabulary is the parent of ours. A primary object of her commercial regulations is well known to have been the protection and encouragement of her manufactures.

4. Such was understood to be a proper use of the power by the States most prepared for manufacturing industry while retaining the power over their foreign trade.

5. Such a use of the power by Congress accords with the intention and ex-

pectation of the States in transferring the power over trade from themselves to the Government of the United States.

6. If Congress have not the power it is annihilated for the nation; a policy without example in any other nation.

7. If revenue be the sole object of a legitimate impost and the encouragement of domestic articles be not within the power of regulating trade, it would follow that no monopolizing or unequal regulations of foreign nations could be counteracted, etc.

8. That the encouragement of manaufctures was an object of the power to regulate trade is proved by the use made of the power for that object in the first session of the first Congress under the Constitution, when among the members present were so many who had been members of the Federal Convention which framed the Constitution, and of the State conventions which ratified it; each of these classes consisting also of members who had opposed and who had espoused the Constitution in its actual form. It does not appear from the printed proceedings of Congress on that occasion that the power was denied by any of them. And it may be remarked that members from Virginia in particular, as well of the anti-Federal as the Federal party, did not hesitate to propose duties, and to suggest even prohibitions, in favor of several articles of her production. By one, a duty was proposed on mineral coal in favor of the Virginia coal-pits; by another, a duty on hemp was proposed to encourage the growth of that article; and by a third, a prohibition even of foreign beef was suggested as a measure of sound policy.

Many other suggestions are made by Mr. Madison in support of his position, but what I have read will sufficiently indicate the ground upon which he stood.

I might cite the opinions and arguments of many other distinguished statesmen whose authority on this subject ought to be conclusive. But I refrain. He who in the face of what I have already produced will still adhere to the doctrine of the Chicago platform could not be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

With respect to the attitude of the judiciary on this subject, it remains to be said that—

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Head Money Cases, 112 U. S., 580, fully sustains the views advanced by Mr. Madison.

In 1882 Congress passed "An act to regulate immigration," which imposed on steamship companies a tax of 50 cents a head for every foreign passenger brought into the United States from any foreign country. The constitutionality of this act was assailed by certain steamship companies which refused to pay, on the ground that such a charge could not be levied under the taxing power. The act was not passed for the purpose of raising revenue, but to restrict immigration and aid poor immigrants out of the funds realized. The Supreme Court held, in an opinion to which there was no dissent, that the statute was a valid exercise of the power to regulate commerce, and therefore constitutional and binding. To the same effect are many other cases that I might cite, but this one covers the whole field of controversy. If under the power to regulate commerce Congress may restrict or prohibit, by the imposition of a money burden, the immigration of human beings, he would be a bold man who would deny that Congress has the power to restrict or prohibit by the same method the importation of merchandize.

PROTECTION A MEANS OF INDEPENDENCE.

The importance and value of the taxing power and its applicability to other purposes than raising revenue are made very clear by a report of Mr. Jefferson made in 1793, when he was Secretary of State. He was called upon by Congress "to report the nature and extent of the privileges and restrictions of the commercial intercourse of the United States with foreign nations, and the measures which he should think proper to be adopted for the improvement of the commerce and navigation of the same." In his report, which will be found at length in the first volume of Wait's State Papers, page 424, he shows that in our commercial relations with European nations some of them discriminated against us with respect to one article and some with respect to another. He then goes on to say:

Such being the restrictions on the commerce and navigation of the United States, the question is, in what way they may best be removed, modified, or counteracted? As to commerce, two methods occur: (1) By friendly arrangements with the several nations with whom these restrictions exist; or (2) by the separate act of our own Legislature for countervailing their effects.

After discussing the desirability of regulation by friendly arrangement, he says:

But should any nation contrary to our wishes suppose it may better find its advantage by continuing its system of prohibitions, duties, and regulations, it behooves us to protect our citizens, their commerce and navigation, by counter prohibitions, duties, and regulations also. Free commerce and navigation are not to be given in exchange for restrictions and vexations; nor are they likely to produce a relaxation of them.

Mr. Jefferson then proceeds to lay down certain principles which "being founded in reciprocity, appear perfectly just and to offer no cause of complaint to any nation."

He recommends:

That where a nation imposes high duties on our productions, or prohibits them altogether, it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs, first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition with our own of the same kind; selecting next such manufactures as we take from them in greatest quantity, and which at the same time we could the soonest furnish to ourselves or obtain from other countries, imposing on them duties, lighter at first, but heavier and heavier afterward as other channels of supply open. Such duties having the effect of indirect encouragement to domestic manufactures of the same kind, may induce the manufacturer to come, himself, into these States, etc.

* * * It is true we must expect some inconvenience in practice from the establishment of discriminating duties. But in this, as in so many other cases, we are left to choose between two evils. These inconveniencies are nothing when weighed against the loss of wealth and loss of force which will follow our perseverance in the plan of indiscrimination. When once it shall be perceived that we are either in the system or in the habit of giving equal advantages to those who extinguish our commerce and navigation by duties and prohibitions as to those who treat both with liberality and justice, liberality and justice will be converted by all into duties and prohibitions. It is not the moderation and justice of others we are to trust for fair and equal access to market with our productions, or for our due share in the transportation of them, but to our own means of independence and the firm will to use them.

It is thus apparent that in 1793 Thomas Jefferson not only believed in the constitutional power of Congress to impose tariff duties, not for the purposes of revenue only, but even to the extent of prohibition, and that he regarded this power as "a means of independence" in our commercial and navigation interests.

And it is further more apparent, it seems to me, that if he were here to-day he would be an earnest opponent of the repeal of the reciprocity clause of existing law, and the surrender without reciprocal advantages of our markets to the coal and other products of Canada and the ores of Cuba, Africa, and Spain.

NOT A "TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY."

But to advance a step further, let us concede for the purpose of the argument that "the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only;" then this bill, already shown to be objectionable because of present industrial conditions, uncalled for by either governmental or popular necessity and destructive of revenue, is indefensible on the ground of its unconstitutionality, for it is not a bill for revenue only, but a bastard protection bill. Whatever evils the protective system has, it has without having any of the advantages of that system.

What is a tariff for revenue only? I will tell you what it is not. It is not such a tariff as beggars the Treasury. It is not such a tariff as reduces the national income so as to compel a prosperous people to borrow money in time of peace for the ordinary current expenses of government. It is, on the other hand, characteristically and conspicuously such a tariff as will raise revenue. Revenue to the sacrifice of all other considerations is, as its name signifies, its supreme aim, object, and purpose. Its constitutionality from the standpoint of the Chicago platform rests upon its being designed to raise revenue and to do nothing else. The bill under consideration does not propose such a tariff. It is a retreat from the manly, if mistaken, declaration of the Chicago platform. It is a legislative repudiation of the pledges of the party on the faith of which that party says it came into power.

There is not a Democrat in this House who can not decline to vote for it on the ground that it fails to answer the professions of his party.

I am not the keeper of any man's conscience but my own, but I venture the suggestion that no Democrat who believes that protection is unconstitutional, if there be any such, can vote for it without violating his convictions and stultifying himself in the face of the whole American people.

The characteristics of a revenue tariff have been well defined by Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury under President Polk, and the high priest of the doctrine of revenue tariff. This bill violates every principle laid down by him as characteristic of such tariff. In his report to Congress in December, 1845, he said:

The only true maxim is that which experience demonstrates will bring in each case the largest revenue at the lowest rate of duty, and that no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue. The revenue from ad valorem duties last year exceeded that realized from specific duties, although the average of the ad valorem duties was only 23.57 per cent, and the average of the specific duties 41.30 per cent, presenting another strong proof that the lower duties increase the revenue.

Scan the schedules of this bill and show me a single one that will bring, under the rate of duties proposed, the largest possible revenue. Is it the chemical schedule? Why, thirty of its leading articles have been put on the free list, and a quarter of a million of revenue thrown away. Is it the wool schedule? Why, wool itself has been put on the free list, while the manufacturer is still protected by a duty reaching to 40 per cent. Is it the metal schedule? Why, iron ore that gave us last year over a half a million of revenue is put on the free list, and tin plate bears a duty equal to about 40 per cent.

But why press these questions to which there can be no reasonable answer? Manifestly, if revenue be the object at the lowest rates of duty the primary subjects of taxation are those things that we do not produce and yet must have.

Do you find any duty in this bill on tea or coffee or sugar? There are no sources of revenue so sure as these. Why are they not taxed? They are the necessaries of life, and a tax on them will certainly raise revenue. Has the getting of votes anything to do with

the framing of a tariff bill? If so, I warn you, gentlemen of the majority, that in the opinion of the poor man the exemption of his breakfast table will not compensate him for the deprivation of his opportunity to labor under such conditions as to earn American wages.

I have said that this bill violates every principle laid down by Secretary Walker as constituting a tariff for revenue only. I repeat the assertion. It does not raise revenue. It does not in any case impose the lowest duty that will raise the greatest amount of revenue.

It has a free list of large proportions. Will you tell me what right a revenue bill has with a free list?

Let me answer you in the language of that great Democratic daily, the New York Sun:

Free raw material or free anything is out of the question in a constitutional revenue tariff. A free list is as impossible under the Democratic platform as a prohibitory tax. Revenue is the supreme principle and revenue only to be exacted from the whole field of importation without omission and without favor. The reformers have been proclaiming earnestly for years past that any other than a revenue tariff robs some one, and now the Democratic platform says the same thing. What any Democratic statesman therefore thinks individually of the free raw-material principle can have no more standing before a Democratic Congress or a Democratic Administration than advocacy of highway robbery direct and simple.

The tariff must be for revenue only, without humbug, backsliding, or delusion. Otherwise the people will say the Democracy is a fraud.

They have already said it; Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa have said it in tones so loud and deep that all the world has heard, and every intelligent Democrat understands. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A SECTIONAL BILL.

One of Secretary Walker's maxims was "that the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section." This bill can make no truthful pretense to conformity with that maxim.

Copper ingots are raw material and free, but pig iron is dutiable at 22½ per cent ad valorem as a manufactured product. Tennessee rough marble is protected by a duty of 40 cents per cubic foot, but Massachusetts rough granite is free as a raw material. Combed wool is dutiable at 25 per cent, but combed silk is free. Cleaned South Carolina rice is dutiable at 1¼ cents per pound, but sawed shingles and lumber from Maine are made free. Binding twine is free, while bagging is taxed. Agricultural implements are free, while the steel from which they are made bears a duty.

Cotton ties, one of the last finished products of steel, seem to be raw material and go untaxed, while the hoop iron of which they are made is subject to duty. The Southern planter is paid a bounty on his sugar, and protection is provided the sugar trust on its refined product.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman allow me right there?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. McMILLIN. Who imposed the bounty that you complain of on sugar?

Mr. DINGLEY. You do not take it off.

Mr. DALZELL. The Republican party, when in control, pursuaded by evidence that a bounty for a certain number of years would result in enabling our people to raise sugar in this country in quantities sufficient to meet our wants, provided a bounty which saved to the taxpayers of this country some $60,000,000 a year in the way of taxation.

Mr. COOMBS. How did it save it?

Mr. DALZELL. The difference between the taxes and the amount of the bounty. Anybody could see that. The duty on sugar was a revenue duty, and hence a tax on the consumer. The Democratic party now, instead of standing by its principle that bounties are unconstitutional, simply cuts the bounty in half, and, without any hope of establishing the industry, makes a gift to the sugar-planters of this country of the bounties that they are to realize for the next eight years to come. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Was there ever a more sectional bill? Was there ever such a bundle of palpable absurdities presented to a body of intelligent men seeking their suffrage?

And yet gentlemen on that side of the Chamber will march up and vote to put upon the statute book of their country these very absurdities, and do it without a blush.

I need pursue this subject no further. The committee itself confesses that this is not a revenue bill. It says, in its report, speaking of the bill: "It no more professes to be purged of all protection than to be free of all error."

Why, then, ask us to vote for a bill confessedly, under your theory, beyond the constitutional power of Congress to enact? You will find the answer in that same report, and its ingenuousness gives away the whole of the Democratic case. Because it is no part of our reform to "imperil or curtail the existence and prosperity of great interests that do exist," says the committee. That is to say, according to the committee, the existence and prosperity of great interests depends on protection; their reform if carried into execution according to their platform would destroy them. That is good Republican doctrine to which I subscribe.

THE CALAMITY TARIFFS OF 1846 AND 1857.

The committee appeal for vindication of their wisdom in framing this bill to our experience under the tariffs of 1846 and 1857. The committee say in their report:

The history of American industry shows that during no other period has there been a more healthy and rapid development of our manufacturing industry than during the fifteen years of low tariff from 1846 to 1861, nor a more healthy and harmonious growth of agriculture and all the other great industries of the country.

If there is one subject above another about which it seems impossible for tariff reformers to tell the truth it is that which relates to the tariff of 1846. With one acclaim they describe the period from 1846 to 1861, in the words of a certain college professor, as "our golden age." The majority of the committee join in trumpeting the fallacious assertion.

Our golden age, indeed! No darker or more disastrous period ever cursed our experience as a people. Two things are characteristic of that period—one the amazing exceptional opportunities that it had for prosperity, the other the amazing failure of even these exceptional opportunities to save it from disaster. Look for a moment at its elements of good fortune. The Mexican war was one, increasing as it did many fold governmental expenditures and pouring money lavishly into all the channels of trade.

The Irish famine was another, creating as it did an artificial demand for our breadstuffs. The Crimean war was another, unsettling as it did the markets of England, France, and Russia, and making room for the products of our shops and fields. Still another, more dazzling than all the rest, was found in the fact that in the ten years, from 1850 to 1860, we took from the mines of California $1,100,000,000 of gold. Thus on every hand powerful circumstances conspired to crown us with abounding prosperity, but powerful as the circumstances were they could not in the end resist the blight of a revenue tariff.

I shall not ask you to take dogmatism for proof. I am willing to submit my case upon conceded facts and the testimony of witnesses whose competency and honesty can not be called in question. I call as one of my witnesses President Millard Fillmore. In his annual message to Congress December 5, 1851, he testifies thus:

The value of our domestic exports for the last fiscal year, as compared with those of the previous year, exhibit an increase of $43,646,322. At first view this condition of our trade with foreign nations would seem to present the most flattering hope of its future prosperity. An examination of the details of our exports, however, will show that the increased value of our exports for the last fiscal year is to be found in the high price of cotton which prevailed during the last half of that year, which price has since declined about one-half. The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,701,921 in 1847 to $25,051,373 in 1850, and to $21,848,653 in 1851; with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year.

The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of the country by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestably that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

President Fillmore does not agree, you will observe, with the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. Whether he or they had the best opportunity to form a correct judgment is a question that I leave with you.

In the following year, 1852, President Fillmore enlightens us further upon this subject, and I beg your considerate attention to this. He says:

Nothing has since occurred to change my views on this important question. Without repeating the arguments contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject.

The first is the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it is coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased.

In the second place, as our manufacturing firms are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost. Thousands of honest industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer to that extent is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus produce.

Our golden age, indeed!

I call as my next witness President James Buchanan. His testimony is five years later than President Fillmore's. In his annual message to Congress in December, 1857, President Buchanan testifies thus:

The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandmen. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and in all the elements of national wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of all kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

Here again, as you will observe, our witness and the majority of the Ways and Means Committee fail of agreement.

Things seem to have grown worse; for, three years after, on December 14, 1860, President Buchanan adds to his testimony thus:

Panic and distress of a fearful character prevail throughout the land. Our laboring population is without employment, and consequently deprived of the means of earning their bread. Indeed, all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men.

I call as my next witness that grand old philanthropist, Peter Cooper, of New York, whose honesty and sincerity and ability no man will impugn. He says:

Once more, in 1846, however, did the serpent—properly represented by British free traders—make his way into Paradise, and now a dozen years elapsed, in the course of which, notwithstanding the discovery of California mines, money commanded a rate of interest higher, as I believe, than had ever been known in the country for so long a period of time. British iron and cloth came in and gold went out, and with each successive day the dependence of our farmers on foreign markets became more complete. With 1857 came the culmination of the system, merchants and manufacturers being ruined, banks being compelled to suspend payment, and the Treasury being reduced to a condition of bankruptcy, nearly approaching that which had existed at the close of the free-trade periods commencing in 1817 and 1834. In the three years that followed labor was everywhere in excess; wages were low; immigration fell below the point at which it had stood twenty years before; the home market for food diminished, and the foreign one proved so utterly worthless that the whole export to all the manufacturing nations of Europe, as I have already stated, amounted to but little more than $10,000,000.

I call as my next witness one who in his lifetime was an honored colleague from Pennsylvania. The Hon. William D. Kelley says:

The years 1860 and 1861, and from 1857 to the autumn of the latter (a free-trade period), was one of the darkest periods ever seen by the laboring people of America. Not one out of five skilled workmen of the country was steadily employed. In Philadelphia the builders of a street railroad advertised for 250 hands at 50 cents a day, and over 5,000 applied, a majority skilled artisans out of work. A rolling mill, to save its skilled workmen from open pauperism, built a turnpike, and their expert hands broke stone on it for 50 cents a day rather than become paupers, and many could not be employed even in these ways.

Now, let me add to this testimony the figures that show the failures in number and amount that took place in the years 1857 to 1861, inclusive. Here they are:

FAILURES.

Year.	Total number.	Per month.	Per week.	Per diem.
1857	4,932	411	95	13
1858	4,225	352	81	12
1859	3,913	326	75	11
1860	3,676	306	71	10
1861	6,993	583	134	19
Total	23,739			

LIABILITIES.

Year.	Total amount.	Per month.	Per week.	Per diem.
1857	$291,750,000	$24,312,500	$5,610,577	$799,315
1858	95,749,000	7,979,083	1,841,327	262,326
1859	64,394,000	5,366,167	1,238,346	176,422
1860	79,807,000	6,650,583	1,534,750	218,649
1861	207,210,000	17,267,500	3,984,808	567,700
Total	738,910,000			

And while American manufacturers and merchants were thus going down, and American labor was pauperized, the national debt was climbing at the rate of nearly $15,000,000 per annum. Here are the figures:

1857	$28,699,831.80	1860	$64,842,287.80
1858	44,981,881.80	1861	90,580,873.70
1859	58,496,837.80		

One of my own constituents, Hon. B. F. Jones, says:

The tariff of 1846 drove into bankruptcy 90 per cent of all those engaged in the manufacturing of iron in Pennsylvania. Abram S. Hewitt wrote in 1849: "Of fifteen rail mills only two are in operation, doing partial work, and that only because their inland position secures them against foreign competition for the limited orders of neighboring railroads, and when these are executed not a single rail mill will be at work in the land."

"Employment of workmen was greatly diminished, resulting in extremely low wages for those so fortunate as to secure it. In this city of Pittsburg, famed for the industry and frugality of its citizens, as well as the skill and genius of its mechanics, thoughtful men, with strong arms and willing hands, were reduced to idleness and want. These worthy people were compelled to accept the charities of the more fortunate, and get from the soup stations, established for the purpose, sustenance for themselves and their families, and this at times when the products of the farm were absurdly cheap in Pennsylvania; when, in the Western States, corn was burned for fuel and other grain remained in stacks from year to year unthrashed. These dire consequences were not confined to the iron interests, but affected all branches of industry alike throughout the country. The Government was brought to the verge of bankruptcy by the same cause.

And I want to say in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], who says that under our theory Pittsburg ought to be the paradise of the workingman, that under protection it is his paradise; but that even Pittsburg, renowned for the industry and frugality of its citizens, is no more able now than it was in 1857 to withstand the withering blight of a revenue tariff. [Applause on Republican side.]

Upon the array of testimony and figures that I have presented, "strong as proof of Holy Writ," I submit to the unprejudiced judgment of the American people that the revenue period—1846 to 1861—was the most disastrous in our history; and I submit at the same time the question, whether they are willing to tempt fortune by the adoption of a measure worse than the tariff law of 1846, because more illogical, framed as it is by men who blindly deny the patent facts of history and put dogmatism for proof.

NECESSARY RESULTS OF THIS BILL.

Now let us test this proposed law in the light of our experience under this act of 1846.

The President of the United States informs us in his message that he is—

satisfied that the reduced tariff duties provided for in the proposed tariff legislation, added to the existing internal-revenue taxes, will in the near future, though perhaps not immediately, produce sufficient revenue to meet the needs of the Government.

President Fillmore tells us that the effects of the law of 1846 were twofold: (1) The large importation of foreign goods drained us of our currency; (2) home competition with cheap foreign labor bankrupted our manufacturers, and turned loose our laborers to tramp the highways and fill our almshouses and prisons.

Like causes produce like effects. This law must inevitably work the same result.

The general average of duties under this bill, the committee says, is about 30 per cent. According to the statement of the committee, the duties realized in 1892 would have been $65,407,900 less than those realized, had the proposed law then been in effect. In 1893 the duties realized would have been $75,707,784 less.

To realize the same amount of duties then, if this bill be enacted into law, as was realized in 1892, under existing law, our imports must be increased to the extent of $218,026,333; to realize the same amount as was realized in 1893, they must be increased to the extent of $252,359,280.

Will you tell me what would be the effect of thus increasing our imports? I will tell you. It will, in the first place, take just that amount of gold out of the country to pay for these imports. It will, in the second place, substitute just that amount of foreign manufactures for American manufactures. It will close as many American mines, furnaces, mills, factories, and workshops as contributed that amount to the home market, and doom to idleness just as many American laborers as kept those mines, furnaces, mills, factories, and workshops in operation. This is not a matter of rhetoric or speculation or guessing; it is a plain matter of figures, open to the comprehension of the plainest intellect outside of a tariff reformers. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

If my argument thus far has proceeded upon a proper basis, I have shown that the bill under discussion, besides being a bill to rob the Treasury, is untimely, not justified by any necessity; unconstitutional, as measured by the standard of its promoters, and therefore a false pretence, and not a bill for revenue only, but a bastard protection bill, which does not protect. And I have further shown by what seems to me to be unanswerable proof that our previous experience under low tariffs contains a warning against subjecting ourselves to a repetition of such experience. I now advance a step further to show that it is in all its aspects a pernicious bill, dangerous to the public interests, a step backward in tariff legislation. It introduces into our revenue system as its basis ad valorem in the place of specific duties.

Mr. MORSE. Except in spots.

Mr. DALZELL. Except in spots; but the general character of the bill makes it an ad valorem bill. Of course, where it suited the convenience of the committee or some of the friends of the committee, there are specific duties.

Mr. MORSE. Large Democratic contributors have specific duties, as, for instance, a chocolate manufacturer in Massachusetts.

Mr. DALZELL. That may be so.

Mr. MORSE. That is so.

Mr. DALZELL. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the bill is an ad valorem measure, and, in the light of history nothing is more indefensible.

PERNICIOUS AD VALOREM SYSTEM.

An ad valorem duty is a tax assessed at a certain per cent on the dutiable value of the merchandise, fixed at the port of export, while a specific duty is a tax assessed at a certain sum by weight or measure without reference to value.

Theoretically but little objection can be urged to ad valorem duties, but all experience has shown, both in this country and in all others, that they are incapable of levy with any fairness

in practice. This is a subject, therefore, about which it is useless to reason. We can only rely, so far as practical results are to be accomplished, upon the testimony of those who have had experience.

I know of no statesman in American history, of any party or political creed, who has advocated ad valorem duties with the exception of Robert J. Walker, and Robert J. Walker, as an authority, is buried in the grave of the unfortunate tariff of 1846.

Ad valorem duties have been condemned as impracticable by Hamilton, Gallatin, Crawford, and Van Buren; by Benton, Buchanan, and Webster, Meredith, and Daniel Manning; and by the unanimous verdict of foreign statesmen.

The committee claims that they were approved by Henry Clay, and that they worked satisfactorily under the tariff of 1846. In both particulars the committee is contradicted by the proofs. In a speech made by Daniel Webster in 1846 in the Senate, in which he denounced ad valorem duties, he said:

In every Administration, from that of Washington down, a contrary system has always prevailed; and the desire of those who have successfully formed and administered the laws in this respect has been uniformly to carry the principles of specific duties as far and as fast as circumstances allowed. That I take to have been the policy of the Government from the first, and it has been the sentiment of all connected with the Government, so far as I know. I ought, perhaps, to make an exception in the case of Mr. Clay. I said here the other day that I had never heard a public man advocate a system of ad valorem duties. The newspapers say (perhaps correctly) that I was mistaken; that Mr. Clay made remarks favorable to that idea in the year 1842. I was not in the Senate at that time, and I did not know that such sentiments had ever been expressed by him, and if they are correctly reported I am very sorry that such was the case.

At this point Mr. Crittenden arose and said:

Will the Senator pardon me while I interrupt him for a moment in order to offer an explanation? Mr. Clay's remarks had reference solely to home valuation.

And Mr. Webster continued:

Ah, that explains the whole matter, and it is a great relief to my mind.

So far, therefore, as Mr. Clay is concerned he does not sustain the committee. Nor is it true that ad valorem duties were found other than unsatisfactory under the tariff of 1846. Such is the testimony of Secretary Manning, Mr. Cleveland's first Secretary of the Treasury, who ought to be an authority here. He says:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestably, they are even notoriously inherent in that system. One advantage, and perhaps the chief advantage, of a specific over an ad valorem system is in the fact that under the former duties are levied by a positive test, which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in possession of the Government, and according to a standard which is altogether national and domestic.

That would be partially true of an ad valorem system levied upon "home value;" but there are constitutional impediments in the way of such a system which appear to be insuperable. But under an ad valorem system, the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousand miles away, and under circumstances most unfavorable to the administration of justice. One hears it often said that if our ad valorem rates did not exceed 25 or 30 per cent undervaluation and temptation to undervaluation would disappear; but the records for this Department for the years 1817, 1840, and 1857, do not uphold that conclusion.

To the same effect and equally explicit is the evidence of James Buchanan, in a speech made in the Senate in 1842:

I am not only opposed to any uniform scale of ad valorem, but to any and all ad valorem duties whatever, except where from the nature of the article imported it is not possible to subject it to a specific duty. Our own severe experience has taught us a lesson on this subject which we ought not soon to forget. I can not refrain from adverting to some of my reasons for this opinion. Our ad valorem system has produced great frauds upon the revenue, whilst it has driven the regular American merchant from the business of importing and placed it almost exclusively in the hands of the agents of British manufacturers. The American importer produces his invoice to the collector, containing the actual price at which the imports were purchased abroad, and he pays the fair and regular duty upon the invoice. Not so the British agent. The foreign manufacturer in his invoice reduces the price of the articles which he intends to import into our country to the lowest possible standard which he thinks will enable them to pass through the custom-house without being seized for fraud. And the business has been hitherto managed with so much ingenuity as generally to escape detection. The consequence is that the British agent passes the goods of his employer through the custom-house on the payment of a much lower duty than the fair American merchant is compelled to pay. In this manner he is undersold in the market by the foreigner, and thus is driven from the competition, while the public revenue is fraudulently reduced.

Again, ad valorem duties deprive the American manufacturer of nearly all the benefits of incidental protection where it is most required. When the business of the country is depressed, as it is at present, and when the price of foreign articles sinks to far less than their cost, your duty sinks in the same proportion, and you are also deprived of revenue at the time when it is most needed.

Our own experience, therefore, ought to have convinced us that whenever it is possible, from the nature of the article, we ought to substitute specific for ad valorem duties. These continue to be the same upon the same articles, notwithstanding the constant fluctuations in prices. They afford a steady revenue to the country, an equally steady incidental protection. When commodities are usually sold by weight or measure, you may always subject them to a specific duty; and this ought always to be done.

Let us, then, abandon the idea of a uniform horizontal scale of ad valorem duties, and whether the duties be high or low let us return to the ancient practice of the Government. Let us adopt wise discriminations; and, whenever this can be done, impose specific duties.

Without undertaking to theorize, I will give you testimony the weight of which you can not but appreciate. Here is the testimony of Mr. Benton:

The introduction of the universal ad valorem system in 1833 was opposed and deprecated by practical men at the time as one of those refined subtleties which, aiming at an ideal perfection, overlooks the experience of ages and disregards the warnings of reason. Specific duties had been the rule—ad valorems the exception—from the beginning of the collection of custom-house revenue. The specific duty was a question in the exact sciences, depending upon a mathematical solution by weight, count, or measure; the ad valorem presented a question to the fallible judgment of men, sure to be different at different places, and subject, in addition to the fallibility of judgment, to the chances of ignorance, indifference, negligence, and corruption.

All this was urged against the act at the time, but in vain. It was a piece of legislation arranged out of doors—christened a compromise, which was to save the Union, brought into the House to be passed without alteration, and was so passed in defiance of all judgment and reason by the aid of the votes of those—always a considerable percentum in every public body—to whom the name of compromise is an irresistible attraction; amiable men who would do no wrong of themselves, and without whom the designing could do but little wrong. Objections to this pernicious novelty (of universal ad valorems) were in vain urged then; experience, with her enlightened voice, now came forward to plead against them.

The act had been in force seven years; it had a long and a fair trial; and that safest of all juries—time and experience—now came forward to deliver their verdict. At this session (1839-'40) a message was sent to the House of Representatives by the President, covering reports from the Secretary of the Treasury, and from the Comptroller of the Treasury, with opinions from the late Attorneys-General of the United States (Messrs. Benjamin F. Butler and Felix Grundy), and letters from the collector of the customs in all the principal Atlantic ports, all relating to the practical operation of the ad-valorem system, and showing it to be unequal, uncertain, unsafe, diverse in its construction, injurious to the revenue, open to unfair practices, and greatly expensive from the number of persons required to execute it.

The whole document may be profitably studied by all who deprecate unwise and pernicious legislation; but a selection of a few of the cases of injurious operation which it presents will be sufficient to give an idea of the whole. Three classes of goods are selected—silks, linens, and worsteds—all staple articles, and so well known as to be the least susceptible of diversity of judgment, and yet on which, in the period of four years, a fraction over $5,000,000 had been lost to the Treasury from diversity of construction between the Treasury officers and the judiciary, with the further prospective loss of one million and three-quarters in the ensuing three years if the act was not amended.

The document, at page 44, states the annual ascertained loss during four years' operation of the act on these classes of goods to be: In 1835, $614,356; in 1836, $847,162; in 1837, $463,090; in 1838, $428,237, making in the four years $2,302,845; and the Comptroller computes the annual prospective loss during the time the act may remain unaltered at $800,000. So much for silks; now for linens. The same page, for the same four years, represents the annual loss on this article to be: In 1835, $370,785; in 1837, $303,241; in 1834, $516,988; in 1838, $226,375; making the sum of $1,411,389 on this article for the four years; to which is to be added the estimated sum of $400,000 for the future annual losses if the act remains unaltered.

On worsted goods for the same time, and on page 45, the report exhibits the losses thus: In 1835, $409,329; in 1837, $299,391; in 1836, $416,832; in 1838, $249,590; making a total of ascertained loss on this head in the brief space of four years amount to the sum of $1,285,142, with a computation of a prospective loss of $500,000 per annum while the compromise act remains as it is.

Such were the losses from diversity of construction alone on three classes of goods in the short space of four years, and these classes staple goods, composed of a single material. When it came to articles of mixed material, the diversity became worse. Custom-house officers disagreed, Comptrollers and Treasurers disagreed, Attorneys-General disagreed. Courts were referred to, and their decision overruled all. Many importers stood suits, and the courts and juries overruled all the officers appointed to collect the revenue.

The Government could only collect what they are allowed. Often, after paying the duty assessed, the party has brought his action and recovered a large part of it back. So that this ad valorem system, besides its great expense, its chance for diversity of opinions among the appraisers, and its openness to corruption, also gave rise to differences among the highest administrative and law officers of the Government, with resorts to courts of law, in nearly all which the United States was the loser.

In the face of a century of experience condemnatory of this system, in the face of the emphatic opinion of every statesman familiar with the subject likewise condemnatory of it, we are asked now to abandon the ancient landmarks and follow these new knights of the windmill in their illusionary chase after the markets of the world.

I have no fears, whatever this House may do, that the saving common sense of the American people can long be tied to the impracticable.

FREIGHT RATES AND WAGES.

There are two subjects essential to be considered in the framing of a wise tariff law, the subject of wages, and that of transportation under existing conditions, in utter disregard of both of which the pending bill is framed. And this may be said to be one of its chief characteristics. Any fair competition between foreign products and our own depends upon an equalization of conditions. To give the foreigner substantial advantage is to destroy competition with him on the part of our own citizens and subject us to foreign monopoly, just as to enact prohibition is to subject us to the possibility of home monopolies. The advocates of protection do not demand anything more than that conditions be equalized so as to enable us to compete in our own markets at rates just to our own capital and labor.

The national platform of the Republican party simply asks "that on all importations coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be duties levied equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home." Even the Democratic platform as originally reported to the Chicago convention recognized this important principle. It said:

That when custom-house taxation is levied upon articles of any kind pro-

duced in this country, the difference between cost of labor here and labor abroad, when such difference exists, fully measures any possible benefits of labor.

But this declaration the convention refused to adopt, and, in the line of the refusal, the bill under consideration wholly ignores the interest of Americans in the matters of freight rates and wages. He who takes no account of steam and electricity and the kindred neighbor-making factors of our modern life leaves out of his calculation one of the most important elements from a practical point of view of our present industrial conditions. Formerly distance and time had a substantial bearing upon the question of protection. When our first protective tariff bill was framed, ocean freights had a potent influence in fixing its figures. In 1792 transatlantic trade was carried on in small vessels of slow movement and the cost of transportation was very large.

Now, vessels of immense capacity and wondrous speed carry cargoes swiftly and at little cost. A bushel of wheat can be carried to-day from New York to Liverpool for 6 cents. One hundred years ago, therefore, natural protection of American products of an important character was afforded by the ocean; a fact recognized by Alexander Hamilton, who, in his famous report on manufactures in 1791, said:

The great distance from Europe imposes very heavy charges on all fabrics which are brought from there, amounting to from 15 to 30 per cent on their value.

Protection from this source has almost entirely ceased, and the duties now necessary represent only the legitimate means employed to preserve the original protection.

Freight rates by land have fallen as they have upon the ocean, but land and water rates still maintain their relative differences, as they always must. Hence the foreign manufacturer dealing across the ocean with New York has an advantage by way of freights over the inland American dealing with the same point.

Let me illustrate. An order for a hundred tons of pig iron can as readily and as quickly be given from New York to Liverpool, England, as it can to Birmingham, Ala. When given it will be as speedily filled, in all probability by vessel from abroad as by freight train at home. But the freight from Liverpool to New York may be nothing, if the iron comes as ballast, as it very frequently does, while the freight from Birmingham will be $4 per ton by rail and water, and by rail alone $5.50 per ton, a difference in favor of the foreigner on that shipment, you will observe, of from $400 to $550.

The foreigner may have to pay a shilling a ton, say 23 cents; in that event his advantage is the difference between 23 cents and $4 or 23 cents and $5.50 on each ton of his cargo, amounting in the one case to a difference of $337, and in the other to a difference of $527. But let us assume that the foreigner pays 5s., which is an extreme rate, equal to $1.15. Then he will have an advantage over the lowest inland freight rate of $2.85 per ton, or $285 on his entire cargo. The foreigner, therefore, has an advantage of from 35 to 100 per cent, as the case may be, over the domestic manufacturer in the matter of freights. He has an advantage in the matter of wages of 100 per cent.

This bill gives to the pig-iron manufacturer of Alabama a protection of 22½ per cent on his product, while freight rates and European wage conditions have given his foreigner competitor a protection of from 135 to 200 per cent. Surely I need not stop to ask the question, is this fair? My statement can be answered by the advocates of this bill in only one of two ways. Either they must deny my facts, and that they can not with truth, or they must say European pig iron is cheaper than American, and we should cease to make pig iron and rely upon the foreign product.

Are you ready to do that? Aside from any question as to rendering useless American mines, sacrificing American furnaces, American labor and capital, are you ready to subject yourselves to European monopoly of a product that lies at the foundation of the great iron and steel industries of the United States? I might pursue this illustration and offer you the same kind of proof as to many other articles as to which foreign rates have an important bearing—as, for example, steel rails, structural iron, and iron and steel manufactures of many kinds—but I refrain for the present, because in the discussion to follow this general debate I shall have opportunity to go into the subject more at length. I satisfy myself now with adding to these remarks a statement as to home and foreign freights, which I will print as an appendix to my remarks.

And now as to the subject of wages. The pending bill is a direct blow at labor in two ways—first, in its putting upon the free list raw materials (so called); and, second, in failing to provide for duties that are protective upon manufactures the products of labor.

The majority call iron ore a raw material, and yet our last census report shows that 38,227 persons were engaged directly in getting it out of the ground, and that $15,500,000 of wages were paid to them.

The majority call coal a raw material, but its mining during the last census year gave employment to 299,559 men, and the wages paid them aggregated $109,130,928.

Is it a small matter to bring this industrial army into competition with the ill-paid miners of other climes? Surely not.

But there is no such thing as raw material.

I must not stop to attempt a discussion at length of that which needs no demonstration, namely, that in all the world where man exists there is nothing in use which can truthfully be called raw materials. Robinson Crusoe found raw materials in his ocean isle, but in the absence of his labor they would have remained such, and he would have starved. The fruit on the tree, tempting and luscious, has no value until there is added the labor of its plucking.

In this great universe where no atom is added or lost in the general sum, the single and only source of wealth is labor. Let me illustrate briefly. What is a steel rail? That piece of metal which with its fellows binds the continent, yokes State to State, and makes one our Eastern and Western seas? It stands for human labor. It is the last finished product of three rude stones in the hill—a black stone, coal; a red stone, ore; a white stone, limestone. The value of a ton of steel rails in the hill is not to exceed $1.50 to $2.00. Human labor opens the mine to the sunlight; human labor releases the stone from its place; human labor loads it onto the cars, built by human labor, that human labor transports over highways constructed by human labor to the great mill built by human labor, at the instance of capital, which is but human labor stored up, and thence through all the various needed processes human labor adds value until the finished rail results, 90 per cent or more human labor, and worth many times the value of the elements of which it is composed.

This the elemental factor in all civilizations is the factor that this bill would strike down. And remember that American labor has a place all its own, apart in its character, value and results from that of any other country under the sun.

Elsewhere it is a question of dollars and cents; with us in the great Republic, founded on manhood suffrage, it is not a question of money alone; it reaches beyond the domain of dollars to homes and hearthstones and into the domain of morals and government.

There is not a single industry in which we compete with our fellows across seas in which our laborers do not reap richer rewards than their fellow-toilers abroad. All reliable statistics show this to be a fact; all reliable testimony shows it.

Read the testimony of the men asking us for fair play before the Ways and Means Committee, and then read the schedules of this bill and you can not fail of the conviction that the subject you are dealing with to-day is in the last analysis the subject of American labor.

If I had time I would read you this testimony, but I have not. Let me give you a sample only to show with what seriousness and pathos these men approach the subject.

Phillip Hagan, of Youngstown, Ohio, an ironworker, said to the committee:

I am from Youngstown, Ohio. There are five large firms there which make wrought iron exclusively. Every one of those firms employs union labor, and we always agree pretty well together; but as regards that I have nothing to say. The men working with me in our town have asked me to come here, 400 miles, and say to you gentlemen that if the tariff is reduced their wages will be reduced. This is their bread and butter. That is honest.

In regard to imported workmen, if you go into that I am imported. I was not born under the Stars and Stripes. I did not have the say-so as to that. I can tell you that I know what it is to work under free trade. I stand here to say that I worked for 20 cents a day. I had to go to work before I was 9 years of age. That deprived me of any part of an education.

As soon as I got a very limited education, enough to enable me to understand that labor in America was protected, I went to an English gentleman and discussed the matter with him, and he said to me, "The American people are not such fools as to reduce their tariff. Young man, go there." Consequently I came here, and received the benefit of it for several years. With this extra money which I made I was enabled to give myself some instruction. It was a struggle for existence over there. Here I was able to raise my family. Gentlemen, are you going to wipe it out? For God's sake, do not do anything of the kind; it is a great advantage to have citizens who are good, intelligent citizens, and if you deprive them of education they will never be good citizens.

I could stand here and talk for hours for the 6,000 men in Youngstown, Ohio. They beg of you not to reduce the tariff on bar and wrought iron. We have had current prices for years. I wish to tell you the difference between the puddlers in England, when I worked there, and the prices now. I went to work for 10 hours a day for 20 cents. When I advanced to the position of boiler in a furnace I received 5 shillings per day. I was getting 6 and 6 pence in 1869.

* * * * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. What was the difference between the wages there and here of the same grade of work?

Mr. HAGAN. It was $2.60. I received there for puddling $1.20, or 5 shillings for 3,000 weight; and here I received $3.80 for 2,750 weight. I went up with the market. That is the present price. I have realized higher wages before. We have the highest in the country; there is none higher.

And so I might multiply testimony on this subject, but I refrain.

The truth is, that it is not worth while to trouble ourselves in discussing the question as to whether protection is the cause of high wages. The vital question is, Will the removal of protection reduce wages? That is the issue to be faced. The answer is so plain as to admit of no controversy. So far as the men

producing so-called raw materials are concerned, it will doom them to idleness, except such a small proportion as may find work in producing coal and ore for places far inland.

If the foreigner gets his raw materials as cheap as the home manufacturer, and he gets them cheaper; if he pays his workmen less wages than are now paid here, and he does; if he has an advantage in freight rates, and he has; it amounts to a mathematical demonstration that this bill dooms the American wage-earner to one of two things: idleness or lower wages.

Mr. Chairman, I have dwelt at greater length than I had intended in the discussion of this bill. I have necessarily left many subjects untouched. I have not pointed out even, all the important reasons why the bill ought not to pass. It ought not to pass, primarily, because it is a fraud on the Treasury. It ought not to pass because it is an abandonment of the principles of our fathers and of the practice of all our previous history in the collection of our revenue mainly through customs. It paves the way for direct taxation, and the introduction to the homes of our citizens of that most odious of all men—heretofore a stranger—the Federal taxgatherer. It ought not to pass, because there is no necessity for it. It ought not to pass, because it is inconsistent with the theories that were urged as an excuse for it. It ought not to pass, because it introduces a system that makes fraud easy, puts a premium on perjury and deceit, and invites impositions upon the Federal Treasury. It ought not to pass, above all things, because it is a direct blow at labor and a step toward the degradation of the American workman. Make no mistake; the interest of the manufacturer in a tariff is only the interest that every good citizen has in general prosperity. The manufacturer can take care of himself.

It is the men whose capital is their skill and their brawn that you are assaulting. There are few manufacturers; the workmen are many. Upon their broad shoulders rests the stability of the State. In their hands is the ballot. It is they who, in the last analysis, shall make the laws and rule the Republic for good or ill. Their sons shall sit in our places. Their cause is the cause of public morals, of education, of invention, of advancement in every useful art, of peace and good order—in a word, of progress or its failure. You may triumph for a brief hour, but no longer. The American workingmen will not be deceived. They will bow to no theories. They will not be swerved from the iron logic of facts. They know that protection has been their pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night. They will never cease to follow it till the end be reached and protection shall be the settled policy of the Republic. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

STATISTICS RELATING TO FREIGHT RATES.

Rail and water freight rates on Southern pig iron from Birmingham to points below.

	Per ton.
Baltimore:	
Rail and water	$3.86
All rail	4.26
Philadelphia:	
Rail and water	4.01
All rail	4.87
New York:	
Rail and water	*4.01
All rail	5.50
Boston:	
All rail	5.90
Rail and water	*4.36
Rail and water, via Providence	4.86
Providence:	
Rail and water	4.36
All rail	5.90

*These rates, if added to selling price of pig iron at Birmingham, will give approximate selling price in New York and Boston.

SOUTHERN PIG-IRON FREIGHTS.

[New York Iron Age.]

The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company have issued new rates of freight on pig iron from Southern furnaces to points in the Middle and New England States. The new rates take effect June 22, 1893, and are for carload lots of 17½ tons of 2,268 pounds. The rates from the Birmingham, Sheffield, and Chattanooga districts to some of the more important points are as follows:

To—	From— Birmingham district.	Chattanooga district.	Sheffield district.
Albany, N. Y	$5.30	$4.80	$4.05
Allentown, Pa	5.09	4.59	4.84
Ansonia, Conn	5.90	5.40	5.65
Baltimore, Md. (all rail)	4.26	.....	4.36
Bethlehem, Pa	5.09	4.59	4.84
Birdsboro, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Boston, Mass. (all rail)	5.90	5.40	5.65
Braddock, Pa	4.40	3.90	4.15
Bridgeport, Conn	5.90	5.40	5.65
Burlington, Vt	5.90	5.40	5.65
Cambridge, Mass	5.90	5.40	5.65

SOUTHERN PIG-IRON FREIGHTS—continued.

To—	From— Birmingham district.	Chattanooga district.	Sheffield district.
Camden, N. J	$5.02	.....	$5.12
Catasauqua, Pa	5.09	$4.59	4.84
Chester, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Coatesville, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Conshohocken, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Dover, N. H	5.90	5.40	5.25
Easton, Pa	5.09	4.59	4.64
Elizabethport, N. J	5.50	5.00	5.25
Elmira, N. Y	4.90	4.40	4.65
Fitchburg, Mass	5.90	5.40	5.25
Germantown, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Ithaca, N. Y	4.65	4.15	4.40
Jersey City, N. J. (all rail)	5.50	5.00	5.25
Lancaster, Pa	4.66	.....	4.76
Lebanon, Pa	4.47	.....	4.57
Lynchburg, Va	3.36	.....	3.46
Newark, N. J	5.50	5.00	5.25
New Haven, Conn	5.90	5.40	5.65
Norristown, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Norfolk, Conn	5.90	5.40	5.65
Oswego, N. Y	4.65	4.15	4.40
Paterson, N. J	5.50	5.00	5.25
Philadelphia, Pa. (all rail)	4.87	.....	4.97
Pottstown, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Reading, Pa	4.87	.....	4.97
Roanoke, Va	3.36	.....	3.46
Rochester, N. Y	4.42	3.92	4.17
Seneca Falls, N. Y	4.65	4.15	4.40
South Bethlehem, Pa	5.09	4.59	4.84
Sparrows Point, Md	4.36	.....	4.46
Steelton, Pa	4.41	.....	4.51
Troy, N. Y	5.30	4.80	5.05
Waterbury, Conn	5.90	5.40	5.65
York, Pa	4.42	.....	4.52

SOUTHERN FREIGHTS.

[From New York Iron Age.]

The East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Railway have issued Supplement No. 4 to Tariff No. 28, applying on pig iron in carloads of 17½ tons minimum, from Southern furnaces to points north, east, and west, to take effect June 1, 1893. The rates between some of the more important points are as follows:

To—	From— Chattanooga.	Birmingham.	Sheffield and Florence.
Allentown, Pa	$5.03	$5.28	$5.38
Altoona, Pa	5.43	5.68	5.78
Bethlehem, Pa	5.28	5.53	5.63
Birdsboro, Pa	4.62	4.87	4.97
Blandon, Pa	4.65	4.90	5.00
Catasauqua, Pa	5.03	5.28	5.38
Coatesville, Pa	4.62	4.87	4.97
Columbia, Lancaster County, Pa	4.32	4.57	4.67
Conshohocken, Pa	4.62	4.87	4.97
Duncansville, Pa	5.43	5.68	5.78
Easton, Pa	5.28	5.53	5.63
Fullerton, Pa	5.03	5.28	5.38
Glasgow, Pa	4.62	4.87	4.97
Harrisburg, Pa	3.88	4.13	4.23
Lebanon, Pa	4.22	4.47	4.57
Leesport, Pa	4.65	4.90	5.00
Lewistown, Pa	5.43	5.68	5.78
Millville, N. J	5.08	5.33	5.43
Pencoyd, Pa	4.62	4.87	4.97
Phillipsburg, N. J	5.28	5.53	5.63
Pottstown, Pa	4.62	4.87	4.97
Pottsville, Pa	4.67	4.92	5.02
Scranton, Pa	5.43	5.68	5.78
Steelton, Pa	4.16	4.41	4.51
Trenton, N. J	4.92	5.17	5.27
Wrightsville, Pa	4.32	4.57	4.67

Cost of iron and steel under proposed Wilson tariff, delivered at Pacific, Gulf and Atlantic ports.

[Compiled by A. R. Whitney & Co., 29 Broadway, New York.]

	Per 100 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.
Average rate of freight from Pittsburg to—		
Pacific ports	$0.48	$10.75
Gulf ports	.40	8.96
Atlantic ports	.20	4.48
Actual rate of freight from Pittsburg to—		
Pensacola, Fla	.50	11.20
New Orleans, La	.38	8.52
Charleston, S. C	.22	4.92
New York, N. Y	.18	4.03
Boston, Mass	.20½	4.59
Rate of freight from Antwerp and Liverpool to—		
Pacific ports	£0.14	3.40
Gulf ports	£0.10	2.44
Atlantic ports	£0.05	1.25

Comparative statement of effect on prices of different manufactures of iron and steel, American and foreign, under Wilson and McKinley tariff bills.

Articles.	Free on board, foreign ports.		Proposed Wilson duty.		Foreign. Adding freight to— Atlantic ports.	Gulf ports.	Pacific ports.	Free on board, Pittsburg.		American. Adding freight to— Atlantic ports.	Gulf ports.	Pacific ports.	Present duty.	
	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	At $4.88.	Ad valorem.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per pound.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Per pound.	Per ton of 2,240 pounds.
Beamed up to 20 feet deep: Angles, teas, channels, shapes	£4.00.0	$19.52	*Per cent.* 35	$6.83	$27.60	$28.79	$29.75	*Cents.* 1.5	$33.60	$38.08	$42.56	$44.35	*Cents.* .9	$20.16
Billets	3.00.0	14.64	25	3.66	19.55	20.74	21.70	.....	16.50	18.90	.....	27.25	.5	11.20
Rails	3.15.0	18.30	25	4.58	24.13	25.32	26.28	.....	24.00	24.80	33.60	34.75	.6	13.44
Boiler plate	5.10.0	26.84	30	8.05	36.14	37.33	38.29	1.7	38.08	42.56	47.04	48.83	.8	17.92
Bars: 1 by ¼ and larger	5.00.0	24.40	30	7.32	33.97	34.16	35.12	1.3	29.12	33.60	38.08	39.87	.8	17.92
Smaller than 1 foot wide or ¼ thick	5.00.0	24.40	30	7.32	33.97	34.16	35.12	*1.5	33.60	38.08	42.56	44.35	1	22.40
Rounds and squares: ¼ and larger	5.00.0	24.40	30	7.32	33.97	34.16	35.12	*1.4	31.36	35.84	40.32	42.11	.9	20.15
Less than ¼ down to $\frac{5}{16}$ for rounds	5.05.0	25.62	30	7.68	34.55	35.74	36.70	*1.5	33.60	38.08	42.56	44.35	1	22.40
Rounds less than $\frac{5}{16}$	5.10.0	26.84	30	8.05	36.14	37.33	38.29	*1.6	35.84	40.32	44.80	46.59	1.1	24.64
Hoops: Thinner than No. 10, not thinner than No. 20	5.15.0	28.06	30	8.40	37.71	38.90	39.86	1.7	38.08	42.56	47.04	48.83	1.1	24.64
Thinner than No. 20	6.00.0	29.28	30	8.78	39.31	40.50	41.46	1.9	42.56	47.04	51.52	53.31	1.3	29.12
Cotton ties	5.00.0	24.40	Free.	Free.	25.65	26.84	27.80	1.35	30.24	34.72	39.20	40.99	1.3	29.12
Black sheets: No. 12 G	6.00.0	29.28	35	10.25	40.78	41.97	42.93	1.65	36.96	41.44	45.92	47.71	1	22.40
No. 16	6.05.0	30.50	35	10.68	42.43	43.62	44.58	1.80	40.32	44.80	49.28	51.07	1	22.40
No. 18	6.15.0	32.94	35	11.53	45.72	46.91	47.87	2.00	44.80	49.28	53.76	55.55	1	22.40
No. 20	7.05.0	35.38	35	12.38	49.01	50.20	51.16	2.20	49.28	53.76	58.24	60.03	1	22.40
No. 21 to 24	7.15.0	37.82	35	13.24	52.31	53.50	54.46	2.30	51.52	56.00	60.48	62.27	1.1	24.66
No. 25 to 27	8.15.0	42.70	35	14.94	58.89	60.08	61.04	2.40	53.76	58.24	62.72	64.51	1.4	31.36
Galvanized: No. 20	10.05.0	50.02	30	15.00	66.27	67.46	68.42	2.05	68.32	72.80	77.28	79.07	1.75	39.20
No. 24	10.15.0	52.46	30	15.84	69.55	70.74	71.70	3.20	73.92	78.40	82.88	84.67	1.85	41.44
No. 26	12.05.0	59.78	30	17.93	78.96	80.15	81.11	3.50	78.40	82.88	87.36	89.15	2.15	48.16
Galvanized corr., No. 24	10.15.0	52.46	35	15.84	69.55	70.74	71.70	3.30	73.92	78.40	82.88	84.67	2.15	48.16

* Average.

Rates of freight for coal and iron.

[London Iron and Coal Trades Review, November 24, 1893.]

	Newcastle or Sunderland.	Newport, Cardiff, or Swansea.		Newcastle or Sunderland.	Newport, Cardiff, or Swansea.
	s. d.	s. d.		s. d.	s. d.
Aden		9 6	Genoa	6 3	6 6
Alexandria	5 0	5 6	Gibraltar	6 3	6 4½
Alexandrofsky	2 6		Glasgow		6 9
Algiers	5 6	6 8	Gothenburg	4 6	5 3
Almeria		8 6	Halifax		5 1½
Ancona	7 6	7 0	Hamburg	5 0	6 0
Amsterdam	4 2		Havannah		7 9
Bahia	15 0	13 6	Havre	5 6	6 0
Barbadoes		8 0	Holtenau		7 6
Barcelona	7 6	10 0	Hongkong		20 0
Bari	8 0	9 0	Huelva	6 0	5 9
Bastia		7 3	Iquique		17 6
Bayonne	5 9	4 9	Jamaica		6 9
Bilbao	4 10½	4 10½	Kertch		17 6
Bombay	9 0	9 7½	Kiel	5 6	6 0
Bordeaux	4 3	5 0	Kjoge	5 0	
Boulogne	4 3	5 3	Korsoer	5 0	
Brest		4 4½	Kustenjende		5 9
Brindisi		5 6	La Rochelle		6 6
Bremerhaven		5 3	Las Palmas		6 6
Buenos Ayres		16 6	Leghorn	6 3	6 0
Cadiz	6 0	7 0	Libau	4 9	
Caen	5 6	6 3	Lisbon	6 6	5 9
Cagliari	7 0	6 3	London	5 0	5 0
Callao		15 3	Lubeck	5 0	7 6
Cape Good Hope	15 0	14 6	Madeira		7 0
Cape Town	17 6		Malta	5 0	4 3
Cape Verd		6 9	Malaga	6 6	8 6
Carthagena	8 6	9 3	Marseilles	6 9	6 8
Catania	5 9	7 3	Martinique	12 6	10 6
Cette	5 6	8 6	Maritius		17 3
Charente		5 0	Messina	6 3	6 0
Cherbourg	5 3	4 9	Milliaza	7 3	
Cienfuegos		16 0	Montevideo		14 0
Civita Vecchia	5 6	6 3	Nakskov	5 0	
Colombo		13 0	Naples	6 6	7 1½
Constantinople	6 3	6 6	Newhaven		4 6
Copenhagen	4 4½	5 6	Nieu Diep	5 4½	4 0
Corfu	7 9		Newfairwater	4 7½	5 1½
Corunna	6 7½		North Norway	4 1½	
Cronstadt	3 9	6 0	Nyborg		5 0
Danube		9 3	Odessa	5 0	6 6
Demerara	14 0		Oporto	6 6	6 3
Dieppe	4 6	5 0	Oran	6 3	7 9
Fairwater	4 6	7 0	Padang		16 6
Gefle	4 9		Palermo	7 3	7 0

Rates of freight for coal and iron—Continued.

	Newcastle or Sunderland.	Newport, Cardiff, or Swansea.		Newcastle or Sunderland.	Newport, Cardiff, or Swansea.
				s. d.	s. d.
Panama		20 3	Santos	18 0	23 0
Para		15 0	Savona	5 9	5 9
Penang		16 0	Seville	6 9	7 3
Pernambuco		15 0	Singapore		12 0
Pillau	4 6		Smyrna	6 6	8 6
Piræus	6 9	6 3	Spezzia	7 0	6 3½
Plymouth	6 0	4 6	Stettin	4 9	
Portland		4 6	Stockholm	4 3	5 4½
Puerto Rico	16 0	18 6	Sulina	8 3	8 6
Port Said		6 6	Swinemunde	4 3	5 3
Reggio	7 3	9 3	Syra	6 3	7 0
Reval	4 9		Tarragona	9 6	10 0
Rio Grande do Sul		33 6	Teneriffe		8 0
Rio de Janeiro		14 3	Tonning	50 0	
Rochefort	4 10½	6 6	Torre Annunziata	6 8	6 9
Rochester	3 6	3 7½	Trelleborg	4 0	
Rosario		24 6	Trieste	8 1½	5 6
Rouen	7 0	7 6	Trinidad	14 6	10 7
Sables	5 9	5 6	Trouville	5 0	
St. Catherines		22 6	Tuborg	5 0	
St. Jago de Cuba		9 6	Udevalla (rails)		8 0
St. Lucia		7 6	Valencia	8 0	9 0
St. Malo	5 3	6 3	Valparaiso	18 0	
St. Nazaire	6 6	5 6	Venice	7 6	8 0
St. Petersburg	4 6		Vigo	6 6	6 0
St. Paul de Loando		17 6	Wismar	4 0	
San Francisco		12 0			

[Extract from letter from a prominent firm of importers.]

NEW YORK, *December 11, 1893.*

In regard to the freights you ask for, would say the average freight on iron ore from Bilbao and other points in Spain is 5*s.* per ton to all ports here. The freight on pig iron varies from nothing to 5*s.* per ton. The freight on beams is 10*s.* per ton at the outside, and have been brought here from Antwerp for 5*s.* The freight on rails is very low, and can always be gotten for half the amount on beams, say 5*s.* per ton. The freight from Liverpool and foreign points to Galveston, Charleston, Savannah, and New Orleans is governed by the return freight, and you might say the same of San Francisco, but we have had wire rods shipped at Antwerp and taken around to Puget Sound (a new town of Everett, where we have a nail factory) for 10*s.* and 6*d.* per gross ton, a full cargo of 2,000 tons. The average freight to San Francisco from foreign ports is 20*s.* for small lots; if you charter a vessel you can get as cheap a rate as we have had to Puget Sound.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I was so greatly edified by the arguments which, floated by his logic and elevated by his rheto-

ric, were scattered about this Chamber about this time on yesterday by my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], the leader of the Republican minority on this committee, that I could hardly restrain myself until this moment from uncorking some of the oil of consolation I had ready to pour into the wounds of which he was complaining. I could hardly sleep when I thought of the tears bedewing his pillow as he dreamed of the disaster awaiting the iron and wool interests of his beloved State of the two peninsulas. I am sure he will thank me when I assure him that the only trouble about the iron mines to which he referred so feelingly yesterday is that there has been found in the Lake Superior region in these United States of America, in the great Messaba Range, iron ore which they are now digging up with steam shovels and throwing direct into the cars.

So that all of his great fleet upon the lakes will continue to prosper; iron ore will become cheaper than ever before; Michigan and the country adjacent to Lake Superior will continue to supply the people of this country, and nobody will be hurt except the people who unfortunately have invested in other iron mines, which new American iron mines have competed out of prosperous working. And if the gentleman had but thought for a moment, sir, he would have remembered that even in consideration of those mines, which he now mourns as about to be driven from activity, the freight from the seaboard westward is such that if the ore from Cuba and from Spain were landed free of duty, for nothing, at the ports of New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, it still would be unable to compete.

I was almost inclined to believe, as he spoke so feelingly of the wool industry, that there might be something in the trouble that he so strenuously predicted. But, sir, if it is true that the standard wool of that part of the country, or even of West Virginia and Ohio, is to-day bringing, as he states it is, and I have no doubt he is correct, 25 cents a pound, then he is to be congratulated upon the fact that the steady decline in the price of wool we have had ever since the McKinley bill was passed has at last come to an end, and that we may look forward for a rise instead of a decrease in the price.

A MEMBER. The price has increased two cents and a half now.

Mr. WARNER. Exactly, and the gentleman will feel better, I am sure, when he hears of it. He referred to the fact that we had had a great slaughter of sheep throughout the United States. I had the pleasure on this floor two years ago to quote from the report of the Republican Secretary of Agriculture, showing that there had been no increase under the McKinley bill in the prosperity of the sheep-growing industry in any State in this country, except where such increase had been had in the raising of sheep for mutton instead of sheep for wool; and I take it that a part, at least, of the slaughter to which he so feelingly referred is an evidence of the extent to which McKinley prosperity has fed us with more and better, and I wish I could say, with cheaper mutton.

It is also a fact, sir, which it may be pertinent to cite in this connection, that irrespective of the extent to which our wool product has been increased in the amount taken from pelts of slaughtered sheep, there has been cut from the backs of sheep in this country more wool during the past year than in any other year of the last nine or ten; showing, if my friend's figures are correct, that instead of bemoaning a bad condition of the wool-growing industry, he should be congratulating us that, with the prospects before the country for the past year of somewhat more of use in this country for the wool products of this country, the wool-growing industry has thrived.

THE HEARINGS BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

I am sorry, sir, that such pleasant tasks as these are not to be the only ones upon which I must engage to-day; for, sir, I have completed the weary perusal of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and as I waded through them I have been more and more impressed by the humiliation of knowing that such was the representation or misrepresentation that the manufacturers of this country had permitted to be made before a committee of Congress as to their intents and their wishes! From page after page of that record the white hand of wealth reaches out from its carriage door to clutch for a greater share of the pittance of the poor. On page after page of that record, fraud stalks so thinly disguised that the horned head shows above, and the cloven foot sticks out beneath; and when you have gotten through with that perusal, if you feel as I did, you long to go out into the street and touch elbows with professional men, with carters, with street car drivers, with the great army of self-respecting, self-supporting labor, who are not here asking Congress to tax other people to hire them to carry on a business which they swear, to start with, is unprofitable. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"The beggars are coming to town"—mighty few in rags, mighty few in shags, but mostly in velvet gowns. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] Look at them. Here is the Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Company, which comes and tells you that it has built up a business in thirty years, involving six millions present investment, and 65 acres of buildings, and then gives you a list of every single article that they manufacture, showing that it is sold here 40 per cent higher than other people can buy it abroad; and then asks you to continue that tax upon our manufactures in order to protect that thirty-year old infant industry. Why, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] referred to the first tariff act passed by the United States Congress, he recalled what I might have otherwise remembered, that it started off with the preamble to the effect that, "Whereas somebody has been doing something in Pennsylvania," etc. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, after an hundred years, it seems to me it is time to start out with another preamble, "Whereas the people of the whole United States want to stop supporting Pennsylvania." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have the ultramarine-makers coming before the Committee on Ways and Means and actually offering as an inducement for the imposition of a higher tariff upon their wares, that if we will give them so high a tariff that they can continue to supply the American market at 11 cents a pound, they will contract to sell so much abroad at 9 cents a pound as to double their product and give more employment to American labor. You have the California quicksilver miners coming before the committee and meeting, right there in the committee room, the color men of New York to whom they have charged 10 cents a pound more for their quicksilver than the rate at which they are exporting it from New York docks to supply the color-makers of Europe.

You have Mr. Wharton, the representative of the great iron and steel combine, with more frankness than men generally in this connection, who admits upon the record that they did have a "combine"—in his mild way, "something approaching" an arrangement to regulate the output and maintain the price. That gentleman proceeds to explain as a reason for not disturbing settled conditions that it takes millions of money and years of time to build up an iron or steel plant; and then, within the next half hour, he insists upon it that it does not make much difference if too high a duty is put on, since there is nothing to stop anybody from going into competition.

He also admits upon the record that the workmen in the iron and steel industries are better cared for and better paid in Europe than they are in this country; and then caps the climax by appealing to the committee in a separate communication after his first hearing, asking that the duty on ore be reduced. That is for the benefit of the Bethlehem Iron Company and the Pennsylvania Steel Company, in which he is a large stockholder. You have heard the words of the poet on the blessing that was asked by the man whose charity as well as his piety commenced and ended at home:

O Lord, bless me and my son John,
His wife, and my wife;
Us four, and no more.

It ought to have been signed "Wharton." [Laughter.]

The tin-plate Ananias appeared before us [laughter], and after he had gone through with the same old, old story about how the Britisher had raised the price of tin plate upon us every time that we did not have a tariff to protect us, and how it is much lower now on account of the tariff, he was forced to put it on the record that the price of tin plate had steadily declined during the time that we did not have any protection, that it reached its lowest period just before the McKinley act went into effect, and that it had been getting higher ever since under American "protection," that was to bring down the price of tin plate.

In cutlery a gentleman appeared before the committee and stated, and I have no doubt stated the truth, that knives could be bought in Germany just as good as those he sold for $3 at less than $1.40; and then he asked you to protect him, on the ground that he had given his labor an increase in wages of between 5 and 33 per cent. Now, I happen to know something about that very wage increase. He was one of those men who when the claim was made that the McKinley bill had not resulted in any increase of wages advertised himself as an example of the employers who had raised wages on account of the McKinley bill. I sent a special agent, a trustworthy man, for whose statement I am willing to be responsible, directly to the town in which this great wage increase had taken place and asked him to secure me the facts. Here they are:

This is a concern manufacturing pocket and table knives, employing from three hundred to four hundred men. After Mr. Cleveland's election, or sometime in the early part of 1885, there was a general reduction of wages all through this concern amounting to from 7 to 10 per cent, more nearly the latter. In the fall of 1885 the works entered upon a season of activity such as they had not known for years before. During the campaign of 1888 it was freely promised by the management that if Mr. Harrison was elected a sub-

stantial increase of wages would immediately follow. However, no steps were taken for a long time to fulfill the promise. Meanwhile the men growled very audibly and the whole town talked about it. But in April, 1892, the management announced that the increase would be made, and called in the workingmen individually and arranged the new scale with each one. The new rate of wages, however, affected only the pieceworkers, that is, about two hundred and twenty-five out of the whole number of employés.

This increase is estimated to average about 7 per cent for the number affected by it, which would be equivalent to something like 3½ per cent for the entire establishment. A further advance was obtained three or four weeks ago by the grinders in the establishment, numbering about thirty, who are members of a very close and powerful union, and who demanded an advance, threatening to strike if it were not granted. How much they actually got is not known, as it is kept secret by the union, but it has been said that they demanded an advance of 12½ per cent and compromised on an advance of 10 per cent.

If delaying until this Presidential campaign the fulfillment of promises made in the last one, and then coming to time only when workmen have arranged to strike or when forced by labor organization, is McKinley generosity, here is a case.

The leading maker of metallic bedsteads, claiming that there are five or six hundred persons employed in this industry, wants a duty of 45 per cent left to protect his labor; and illustrates the happy lot of his workmen by citing as an illustration one who last year hired a cottage by the seashore for the recreation of his family during the summer season, and this summer took them on a trip to Europe, and wound up by admitting that the price of bedsteads was falling faster in England than here.

The cane sugar advocates of a sugar bounty admit that if they do ultimately supply the country, as they promise, it will result in the Government paying $80,000,000 a year to encourage the cultivation of an area of less than 60 by 50 miles.

From Western New York and Pennsylvania come farmers who believe that growing tobacco is so much more desirable for the community than raising food that they should be hired to do it at the expense of those who manufacture and use their product.

The Suffolk County farmers have asked that the wage-earners of New York be made to pay more for their potatoes and cabbage; and to cap the climax ask that the farmers of the rest of the country be compelled to buy Suffolk County cabbage seed, whether they like it or not.

The maccaroni makers of New York City are so patriotic that they want to tax their neighbors' food 2 cents per pound, while they themselves are selling it in the West Indies and Central America to the poor people there at free-trade prices.

The makers of fast-black hosiery, who have built up a flourishing industry without any protection whatever, beg for protection now, for fear that foreigners will improve processes faster than themselves.

From Waterford, N. Y., comes the knit-shirt maker, who says that the foreigner will sell for $2.25 a shirt "as good" as he sells for $4, and that it would be a great injustice if our people were allowed to get from any one else than himself just as good clothes as they have now at half the price.

The oil-cloth makers, having procured an exorbitant tariff on the ground that their printing was done by hand, and then having turned out their men in favor of machines, now beg that they receive for money and machinery the "protection" that three years since they asked for flesh and blood.

Mr. Theodore Justice, a wool-broker of Philadelphia, asks us to tax the American people so that the railroads can get 3 cents a pound freight and he 2 cents a pound commission for selling dirty wool, which he claims is only worth 1 cent a pound. He tells a pleasant romance about our prices always being double that of foreign wool when we had adequate protection, and how wool declined in price only 3 per cent in the United States, while it declined 26 per cent abroad—conveniently forgetting that every farmer here knew wool had declined from 10 to 20 per cent each year since the McKinley bill took effect; that wool had failed to rise here in 1889, though it rose abroad from 6 to 10 cents, until it was higher there than it was here; and that in the circular of Mr. Justice's own firm for December, 1889, he informed his customers that Australian wools were worth abroad more than 30 cents a pound unwashed.

From Yonkers come the most extensive carpet manufacturers in this country, who have used their advantages under patents, just expired, to monopolize the American market, and who now want the tariff kept up in order that they may continue to charge what they please here, though they admit that they are arranging to market their goods outside at free-trade prices—and, at the same time, explaining that they do not want free wool, because they use so little of it that it would be giving an advantage to those who make better carpets and use two and one-half times as much wool to the yard.

From New York come the note-paper and envelope men, who admit that they have flourished and built up their business with no protection whatever, but who urge most logically that they be given some, so that they can share the plunder of which heretofore they have had none.

Our pearl-button friends now appear and admit that the McKinley duties are too high; do not deny that their old stories of convict labor in Austria were false; admit that just as soon as they could after the McKinley bill had passed they got their work done by convict labor here; but on their assertion that they are telling the truth now, and will behave themselves in the future, they ask for a prohibitory duty until, as they admit they will do, they can improve their machinery so as to turn adrift most of those now employed.

The climax of cheek is reached by the coal men of Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland, who ask that the Government make the whole seaboard—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, Savannah, San Francisco, and Portland—pay more for its coal, and claim that this is all for the sake of labor. On cross-examination they admit that it costs no more to mine coal in their own mines than in Canada; that the total amount their miners receive is less than one-half the present duty; that they are exporting largely abroad, even to Canada itself; that it is the railroads that are really interested; that these latter are carrying coal for export cheaper than for our home consumption, and that the highest price of all is charged the unfortunate people who live near the mines and right on their own line, and hence are absolutely at their mercy.

The North Carolina kaolin men urge that their clay is so good that they ought to have a tariff to teach us the good taste to use it, and the New Mexico wool-growers urge that their wool is so dirty and worthless that they need a tariff to make us use it. [Laughter.] The Virginia coal miners say that coal is so close to the ground and easy to get out that we ought to have a tariff; and the Missouri lead miners say that their lead is so far down and so hard to get out that they must have a tariff. [Laughter.] The cement men want us to help them because they are so near by, and the borax men want aid because they are so far off. The sugar men who four years ago rolled their eyes in holy horror at a sugar bounty, while they pleaded for a revenue tariff on sugar, are now urging that we retain a bounty that is all expenditure and no revenue. The Alabama iron ore owners want to cut off return cargoes of Cuban ore, and thus tax the Alabama coal export trade with freight both ways; and Virginia coal men propose to make cotton pay double freight from the whole South and Southwest in order to keep them from getting coal cheap; and the National Maccaroni Company asks for a tariff, not to raise the wages of American labor—as it expressly explains—but to employ the foreign labor that may come in.

Such a muster of selfishness and hypocrisy has never before disgraced the halls of the Capitol since the McKinley bill was framed; and, seen against such a background, a halo floats about the head and a saintly glory beams from the face of that honest silversmith of Ephesus who pleaded with his fellow craftsmen to keep out the Christian religion in order that they might retain the profitable trade that they had developed in silver idols and shrines.

WHAT THE REAL MANUFACTURERS WANT.

But, sir, I wish here and now to enter a protest on the behalf of the real industries of the country against the forging of their names and the perversion of their views by the self-appointed agents who have rushed forward to misrepresent them. My district, sir, is one of the leading manufacturing districts of the country; and of manufacturing establishments within it, as to which I have had opportunity for special inquiry, there are at least 250. With each of these, since the general tenor of the Wilson bill was known, I have corresponded in order to ascertain just what were the interests of this most important portion of my constituents. The largest single interest in this district is perhaps that of piano-making; and from not a single one, so far as concerns the special interests of that business, has aught but approval come; though in more than one case the proprietors are Republicans and protectionists so strongly wedded to the faith, that they are willing their own business, about which they do know and as to which they know the tariff does not help it, should be taxed in order to benefit somebody else in some way, they can not explain how.

Next in order perhaps come the wall-paper manufactories. All of them but one are in a trust to keep up prices and monopolize the American market. The one man outside who is fighting the trust is the largest manufacturer in that line of the trade, and employs more men and on the average pays better wages than any other. He writes me that the Wilson bill will benefit the wall-paper business by cheapening its raw materials; and that we need not hesitate to enact absolute free trade so far as wall paper is concerned. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The brewers, possibly, are the next most important employers of labor—perhaps even more so than some one of those I have already named; and from no one of them have I received other than commendation of the Wilson bill in its effect upon their business. In my district is one of the greatest carpet manufactories of the country, employing thousands of hands, and they are protesting most vigorously against the passage of this bill.

I have, however, looked somewhat into the matter, and though I frankly admit that their industry has been discriminated against as compared with the outrageous protection given to the woolen industry of New England, yet I firmly believe that if the Wilson bill is passed there will be more wage-earners than ever before employed at manufacturing carpets in my district, and that if this is not the case it will be because—as it is reported—that the firm have already arranged to go out of business rather than lose the chance of disposing of real estate whose value has become too great to be profitably used in that business when better accommodations can be secured at half the money. There are extensive jute and flax mills in my district. The protection the Wilson bill proposes to leave them is totally inadequate when compared with that accorded to New England textile manufacturers in general; and here is perhaps the one case, unless it is in the line of fine harness, where, though I do not believe it will happen, I have no doubt of the sincerity of the employers' fear that some lines at least of their business may be crippled by the passage of the bill in its present shape.

I could go on, sir, for a whole afternoon in thus running over the bead-roll of the American industries that are scattered in all parts of my district; but the result would be the same. In the majority of the cases the Wilson bill offers them decided advantages as compared with present conditions. In the remaining instances, where the gain to the country is certain, the loss to the few exceptions is problematical. But the almost universal feature of the correspondence that has been showered upon me—the word that I receive from every quarter—is that prompt action is most essential to the prosperity of my district, and delay the worst of disasters that is feared. The one demand upon which all are agreed is that we shall as promptly as possible put into law the Democratic policy in regard to tariff.

The manufacturers of my district, sir, Republicans as well as Democrats, have almost universally depended, not upon the tariff, but upon their business tact, their intelligence, and enterprise to make a living. Many of them have wagered upon Republican success by investing in directions in which they know they must depend upon a protective tariff. But they are disposed neither to keep on whining at the result of a year ago last November nor to expect the Democratic party to pay their bets against it. They want to know what we propose to do; and they will accept it joyously in most cases, resignedly in some, determinedly in all, ready to do their best to increase the prosperity of the industries in which they are engaged, to give more and more employment at better wages to the workingmen of the district, and to do more and more every year in the future, as they have done more and more every year in the past, to make of their section of the great city of New York an honor to the country, whether under Democratic or Republican rule. They ask no favors; they expect tariff reduction; all of them want to be put as quickly as possible in such a position that they can safely go ahead and develop whatever of opportunity the future may have in store for them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

WHAT WAGE-EARNERS WANT.

It may, however, be said, and rightly said, that their interests are not those which should be first consulted, and that the great mass of the people, the wage-earners, or those dependent upon them for support, should first be consulted. Well, Mr. Chairman, they have been consulted. There is not a part of the Union where labor organizations and mutual aid associations are more numerous, or more effective, or more intelligently directed than in my district. There is no place where every economic question connected with the effect of protection or free trade upon the demand and the reward for labor has been more fully discussed than among the wage-earners for whom it is my privilege to speak. And they, sir, with even greater unanimity than that shown by their employers—for among the latter are some who still claim that their advocacy of protection is for the sake of their wage-earners, but among these very wage-earners there is no one who believes such nonsense—the busy hands and the active brains of my district are eagerly waiting for the time when this bill shall become a law, and urgently praying that this be as quickly as possible. If you will only put it upon the pages at once you need bother about nothing else. We have free trade in labor now—the one thing that they have to sell, and they know perfectly well that the nearer we get to free trade in the goods they make and that they and others have to buy, the greater amount of these goods will be used, the greater will be the number of men required to make them, the more steady will be their employment, and the higher their wages.

INDUSTRIAL PAUPERS.

When there is presented to them a plea for some pauper industry they have a way of looking at it, sir, which has been as interesting to me as it has always been conclusive to them. They are acquainted, sir, with the workings of our immigrant law. They see the squadrons—even regiments—coming down the gang plank to compete with them in their several callings. They see the immigrant inspectors taking notes of one after another, and making step aside from those who are allowed to land those who for one reason or another are suspected of being unable to take care of themselves and liable to become a charge upon the country. They know what then takes place, and they approve of it. If the intending immigrant is not able to convince the officials that he is not likely to become a public charge he is unceremoniously packed home by the same steamer that brought him, to continue to curse the land which has endeavored to dump him upon us. It will not do for him to say, "Why, sirs, I have heard that you want men to develop this great country, and if you will only tax yourselves to give me, say one-half or two-thirds of what is necessary to support me, I will try to earn the rest of my livelihood."

No, sir; the only condition upon which a human being is allowed to land in this country is that he shall show to the satisfaction of those who are put at our ports to ascertain that very fact, that he is able to support himself and will probably do so. Not that he shall earn half his living or three-quarters of it, but that he shall presumably earn all his living; certainly that he shall not start out with the prospect of being a public charge. And that, sir, is just the sort of a law that my constituents approve. They are willing to go to any reasonable liberality in permitting to come here and compete with them or rival them in building up this great country every self-respecting man capable of self-support under our standards of civilization. But they want no other; they will tolerate no deadbeat immigration. And to them, sir, it seems that this great principle ought to be carried still further. It seems to them that when a capitalist, a man who has money to invest, comes here and asks permission to go into business, the one condition upon which he should be allowed to do it is that he can and will pay his own way. They have no sympathy, sir, with the capitalist who offers to condescend to do business in this country provided this country will tax itself in order to enable him to make profits. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They don't believe, sir, in deadbeat industries any more than they do in deadbeat men; and if there is any one thing that is more contemptible in their eyes than a poor wreck of humanity endeavoring to drag along existence at the expense of his fellow-men, it is a dead dollar trying to earn dividends for its owner out of the taxation of its fellow-citizens. They know, sir, that it is not profitable to increase the number of our citizens by admitting those among us whose support will be a constant burden to others. They have never been able to see, sir, why it was not just as unprofitable to admit industries which start out with the assertion that they are not self-supporting and propose to become a public charge from the beginning. They believe, sir, that as to nine-tenths, say ninety-nine one-hundredths, of the industries that are now in operation here, the impetus given them by cheaper raw materials, by greater opportunities for export, will so increase their prosperity as to make immaterial what becomes of the insignificant number, which on inspection turn out to have been helpless paupers and a drag upon our general prosperity. They are not frightened, sir, by the threats that this or the other industry will leave our shores or discharge its workmen. They have heard just that sort of stuff before, and they have seen such predictions falsified by the event. If, however, in some cases it shall turn out to be as those who are engaged in them fear, if whenever the support of taxation upon others is withdrawn from them they find that they can not make a living here, then all that workingmen of my district have to say is this: "If you are going away, go and God speed to you, for the quicker you go the better we will be off; if you are going to die here, die, and we will plant flowers over your grave; for your room is worth more than your company." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

ATTEMPTS TO DEADBEAT THE SEABOARD.

There is another respect, sir, in which opposition to this bill has attracted considerable attention among my constituents. They have seen one after another of the protectionist leaders come before the Ways and Means Committee and avowedly ask that this bill be defeated in order that our seaboard, and especially the eastern seaboard, and especially New York City, may be deprived of the advantages that God has given her and that they, my constituents, have been aiding to improve. They know perfectly well how they come to be on Manhattan Island, where there is neither a lumber forest nor an iron mine, nor a coal mine, nor an acre of ground that produces aught of what they manufacture. They know it is because at that point, on account of its facilities for commerce, can be most cheaply and promptly marshaled the materials with which they work, and that from that point, on account of these same facilities for commerce, the products of their labor can be most promptly and advantageously marketed all over the world. They see the

quicksilver miners of California demanding a duty of 10 cents per pound in order to enable them to charge the New York color-makers just that much more than they charge those of England and Europe, and they tell me not to let them thus levy blackmail upon New York City.

They see the coal miners of West Virginia deliberately urging that unless the tariff be kept up our manufacturers will be able to get their coal more cheaply from Canada than they do now from West Virginia; and again their message is to me, "Don't let the West Virginia coal men deadbeat New York." They have heard that the iron-ore producers of Pennsylvania and Alabama have asked that New York be made to pay tribute to them in the higher price of every bit of raw material she now uses in her great manufactures of iron, and they say to me, "Don't you let self-supporting New York industries be taxed one penny to build up beggars elsewhere." They see one contemptible plea after another filed by men who admit that they have a natural monopoly of the interior of the country, and who now come begging Congress to cut off the advantages that our forefathers gained for us by settling near the seaboard; and they say to me, "Don't you connive at, don't you permit, legislation that will tend to shut up the harbor and port of New York." We are not alone in this regard. Boston and Providence and New Haven and Philadelphia to an increasing extent and Baltimore and Charleston and Savannah and New Orleans and Galveston and San Francisco and the Northwest Pacific ports are all of them explicitly mentioned in these hearings as sections of the country, the natural advantages of which those who have appeared in opposition to this bill propose deliberately to destroy.

It can not even be claimed that this policy will help the interior of the country. No one is so innocent as to believe that in the hands of men who thus avow such motives, the part of our country which is not by the seaboard will be safe from their extortion, except to the extent that rivalry in their own markets may compel them to be reasonable. For this, sir, if for no other reason, it seems to me absolutely essential to that part of our country which is within a few hundred miles from the seaboard, and scarcely less so to our whole country, that by giving greater freedom to trade we give less opportunity to monopoly, whether in the interior of our country or at the seaboard.

THE DEFECTS OF THE WILSON BILL.

It must not be understood, however, that I am in favor of all the provisions of this bill. As to the inconsistencies I have referred to, while I trust some of them may yet be remedied, yet they involve questions of detail rather than of principle. Important as they are to individuals whose interests I shall take occasion to represent in every fair way, if my colleagues differ with me in opinion I can still respect their intent.

But it is impossible to speak thus leniently of all the defects of this bill. As to some of them, if any one feels worse than I do that they find place in a bill submitted by a Democratic committee to a Democratic House, it is because his capacity for grief is greater than is mine.

WOOLENS.

In the first place, sir, it is proposed to give New England the relief that she ought to have in free raw materials, free coal, free iron, free lumber, free wool, free trade, or a reduced tariff upon nearly every material that she uses; and yet it is proposed to leave upon her principal industry, that of wool manufacturing, duties which are not merely scandalous in amount, but far beyond those which upon any consistent theory, even of protection to labor, can be for a moment defended. The duties proposed are generally 40 per cent upon the classes of woolen goods most used. As to all of these, with free raw materials given them by this very bill, a revenue tariff of 25 per cent—under which I believe a larger revenue would be collected than under a prohibitive rate—would be most generous protection.

Not merely this, sir, but the claim that the higher rates suggested will produce more revenue is not even made, while even from a protection standpoint higher duties than 25 per cent can not be justified, and can not even be argued for, except upon abandonment of nearly every economic position they have of late so stoutly defended. I will advert to but one, though a conclusive proof of this. The American Cotton and Wool Reporter is not merely one of the greatest—perhaps the leading—trade journals in the country, but it is the undisputed organ of the wool trade. It has long been discussing this question of the rate of duty, and its most complete presentation of the case was made by a well-posted gentleman by the name of Edward D. Page, whose article was so well received that it was afterward reprinted and given wide pamphlet circulation. His first position, which he supported by facts which no protectionist has attempted to question, was that the wool manufacturers of this country would prefer the total abolition of the specific duties, provided that they could have their raw material free and an actual net protection of 25 per cent—and, by the way, this statement of his is quoted almost verbatim from the manifesto of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers addressed to the Revenue Commission in 1866.

Mr. Page also explains that it is simply ridiculous to claim that this percentage would not have more than compensated for the wage rate of labor. He, however, argues that they should have a higher rate of protection, and the following are the points which he makes in support of it—each one damning by its advocacy the cause in which it is urged. His first position is that—

> Manufacturers are now in the position in which a child would be if, having been brought up by a rich father in the belief that a knowledge of arithmetic was unnecessary, he was suddenly and without preparation compelled to earn his living as a clerk. I fear that many of them do not realize even now how much improvement and economy is to be accomplished by making their goods from a mixture of the stocks most exactly suited to the qualities the goods are to possess, instead of the makeshifts which our meager market has hithertofore afforded. * * * It can not be denied that the virtue of prohibition of the use of two-thirds of the wools of the American manufacturer during thirty years of tariff discrimination has deprived him of the knowledge necessary to success in this important branch of the manufacture.

This is just what tariff reformers have all along claimed. This is just what the protected manufacturers have all along denied; and now, admitting that they have taxed us for a generation against our protest, with no better result to themselves than to make them incapable of doing business, they propose that we shall compensate them for the injury they have thus done themselves and us as well. There is no pretense of protection to labor here.

Mr. Page also suggests that the mill owners are under a disadvantage on account—

> of the taxes which mill-owners have been obliged to pay, not to the Government or to the people, but to the proprietors of American mines and steel furnaces.

Precisely what tariff reformers have all the time said. But these wool manufacturers of New England have constantly asserted that we were mistaken, and that under protection the American public, including themselves, were being more cheaply served by manufactured goods than would have been the case under free trade. They now admit that they were not, and that we told the truth, but coolly ask that an additional 5 cents be added to the profits which they are hereafter to receive in order to recoup to them their share of the taxation which against our protest they forced upon us all, and which they propose that we shall still continue to pay.

But Mr. Page is not through. He urges that—

> a third adverse condition is the result, not so much of the tariff, as of the condition of mind that makes class legislation possible.

And he actually proposes that another 5 cents be added to the protection upon woolen goods in order to make up to the woolen manufacturers the damage caused by the state of mind in which they have kept so much of the country for so long a time. It is these three items, in addition to the 25 per cent, which it is admitted is far more than sufficient to make up the difference in labor cost, that the manufacturers of New England have asked that we be taxed to pay—5 per cent because they have grown so lazy while living upon our savings that we ought to support them while they are learning to work; 5 per cent more in order to recoup to them the proportion which they have paid of taxation which they and their coadjutors have extorted from us; 5 per cent more on account of the state of mind into which by their misrepresentation and demoralization of Government functions they have gotten themselves together with the rest of the country. This, added to the 25 per cent, makes 40 per cent, and indicates pretty fairly the sources from which have come the suggestions that the Ways and Means Committee have adopted in reference to the woolen schedule, and the kind of arguments by which alone it can be defended.

I know, sir, that there are men on this floor, too, who tell us that if the Wilson bill is passed some wool-manufacturing establishments will fail. But I have heard such things before. You will remember that during the campaign of 1888 our protectionist friends made great capital of the fact that after having been in bad condition for many years, the campaign year in which the Mills bill was being discussed witnessed the failure of fifty-seven concerns in the wool trade, involving liabilities of $3,637,000. We were told that all this came from the fact that the mere discussion of the question had scared the woolen business to death, but that if Mr. Harrison were elected, general confidence would take charge of the demoralized battalions, and that every wheel of industry would be set running. In my own district, sir, within a few days after election had shown that protection was safe for years to come, the wages were reduced in the one establishment employing the most workers in wool, and within one year from that date there had gone into liquidation seventy-two concerns, with liabilities of $10,500,000; all of which showed how much more damaging it was to the wool business to have confidence

restored under Harrison than to be scared to death by the Mills bill.

Of course I do not mean to claim that the election of Mr. Harrison did this. The trouble lay far deeper, and is the trouble that is now spreading dry rot amid so large a proportion of the woolen mills of New England; that if a committee of the manufacturers themselves were to take the matter in hand they would close up at once, whether the Wilson bill or the McKinley bill is to rule, a large proportion of the mills on the ground that as business concerns they have no right to existence. The trouble with this industry is that it has become one too largely run by grandsons, but to which the grandfathers, long ago of blessed memory, contributed the last ounce of business enterprise that made it a prosperous one. The trouble is that while wages are not so much higher in Europe as to justify even a 10 per cent tariff on the total cost of the goods, there are too many cases in which a sinecure treasurer, a member of, and nominated by, the family that owns a large proportion of the stock, is paid a large salary which he does not earn, and in which those owning smaller blocks are permitted to load the accounts of the company by similar charges. The cases are too many where plants, which sound sense would not have permitted to exist, have been erected at enormous cost, and instead of being charged off to profit and loss, are still held as the basis over which it is attempted to stretch dividends that they do not earn.

No tariff can help troubles like these. If it were raised to 100 per cent it would simply encourage them to hold on a little while longer, and involve them a good deal deeper in disaster when they found that their shrewder neighbors had forestalled their opportunity. There is no rivalry more demoralizing to legitimate business than that of bankrupt concerns like these. There is no employment more discouraging to the laboring man than that furnished by such institutions, just enough to keep him alive and hold him from leaving to better himself, and not enough to keep him prosperous or to afford decent support for his family. The quicker their demoralizing existence is ended the better it will be for every good business man, for every competent workman, and for every self-supporting American citizen. You can not adjust the tariff so as to save them. Even if you could they are not worth saving. It is simply impudent that we should be asked to try it. Twenty-five per cent upon the great mass of woolen goods is so much more than enough to make up for the total amount of labor involved that nothing but the fact that we need revenue as badly as we do, and that such is the rate which will probably produce the most revenue, can for a moment justify the extortion; and no consideration of which I am aware can for a moment excuse our attempting to go further, as is proposed by this bill. And when it is proposed, as this bill proposes, to give New England cloth-manufacturers free raw materials and 40 per cent duty on their product, and to give New York clothiers raw materials taxed 40 per cent and but 45 per cent duty on their finished product, the mere statement of such a proposition is enough to impeach it.

Of course, I understand that the duty being on the whole product really gives a margin for protection in each case far beyond that indicated by the figures. But after every allowance is made the case is one of the greatest favoritism of New England manufacturers against the great merchant tailoring trade of New York City, the most important industry of that metropolis, the one in which more men are employed than in all the woolen mills of New England combined.

SUGAR BOUNTY.

Again, sir, I note that it is proposed to continue the bounty now paid to the sugar-planters for a term of eight years under a gradually decreasing schedule. I am unaware, sir, of any principle upon which we can ask that the farmers of this country shall be taxed in order to hire sugar-planters to do business. I am not aware, sir, of anything so especially elevating or moral about the business of sugar-raising, when compared with that of wheat or cotton raising, as to justify our taxing all engaged in these great industries in order to hire men to raise sugar; and as a Democrat, sir, I have never seen any justification for our Government taxing its people to hire anybody to do anything outside of the Government service. If to the offensiveness of a bounty system in general it were possible to add, this has been done in the features which characterize this.

I shall omit mention of the beet-sugar and sorghum-sugar and the maple-sugar steals, which are too insignificant to be mentioned in the same day with the cane sugar atrocity. During the year ending June 30, 1893, we paid in sugar bounties $9,375,000, of which nearly $8,600,000 was paid to 535 men in Louisiana alone, an average of between sixteen and seventeen thousand dollars to each—this when our Treasury is bankrupt, when this Administration has been put into power upon a promise to relieve the people from taxation. I know it is proposed to mitigate it. But how? Even if the production did not increase—and no one who is posted has claimed that it will not do so for the next four or five years—the result of this bill, if passed in its present form, will be to give $35,000,000 to less than 600 men—for it is not proposed to encourage new investments in expectation of the bounty—nearly all of them residing in a small portion of a single State, thus putting the Democratic seal upon that much of a Republican crime that we have universally denounced, and this at a time when we are searching every highway and byway for additional revenue, and have pending before us a report of the Secretary of the Treasury advising us of a deficit of $50,000,000 within the current year, and begging permission to run the Government further into debt to meet it. [Applause.]

I have referred, sir, thus somewhat at length to the wool tariff and to the sugar bounty because I have appreciated that they were perhaps those defects of this bill in which the people were most interested. Among the many minor ones there are, however, two others in which I have a special interest, because, sir, the beneficiaries are not merely the most ideally undeserving of any into whose coffers tariff taxation has ever been poured, but they do my own city the honor of doing the most of their business within it, and thereby have put upon myself a peculiar duty, as it is a peculiar pleasure, to drag them out to light and ask this Democratic House not thus to insult Democracy. I refer to the Standard Oil Company and to the American Sugar Refining Company, known as the Sugar Trust. Between the lines of this bill can be recognized the fine Italian hand of each.

STANDARD OIL PROTECTION.

In its present shape the Wilson bill reimposes the present duty upon oils the product of any country which levies a tariff upon American petroleum.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from New York knows that that was put in the bill after it was reported to the committee.

Mr. WARNER. I am entirely aware of that.

Mr. REED. The reason I called the gentleman's attention to the fact was to show that it was the deliberate judgment of the committee which he was condemning.

Mr. WARNER. The gentleman, of course, knows what his own deliberate judgment is, and he may be competent to speak for the committee, but in my opinion it was one of the most hasty things they ever did. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Well, but the fact that they put that provision into the bill after having left it out, would seem to show that they acted with deliberation.

Mr. WARNER. The gentleman may speak for himself and for the committee, but——

Mr. REED. Oh, I am not speaking for the committee. We were not allowed to speak even in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARNER. I will not dwell now upon the point that—as this section is drawn—the whole of the present duty would be reimposed, no matter how slight the duty imposed upon American oil, no matter whether that duty is a discriminating duty or not; but what I specially call attention to is this, that, in order to protect the company which has constantly used its monopoly here to crush out rival dealers and keep prices here at such point as it pleased, while it was exporting oil all over the world at lesser rates, this bill, after McKinley reciprocity has been kicked out with contumely, proposes to renew the principle of reciprocity in favor of the most grasping, extensive, and pitiless monopoly that the world has ever known, and to do this in regard to an article as to which our own product is so great that we must export a large proportion of it, and therefore can use the contingent tariff only as a means to make American citizens pay more than foreigners for the article produced here. I listened to the able speech of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when he introduced this bill, and I heard no defense of this provision. I am rather glad that I did not, for I am sure that it indicates that he at least is willing that at the proper time amendment shall be had which shall relieve the Democratic party from the imputation of having spurned reciprocity when applied to the numerous other interests which—I believe undeservedly—it was intended to serve, at the same time that it has revived it in favor of the one organization on the round globe least entitled to it.

RECIPROCITY FOR THE SUGAR TRUST.

Strangely enough, sir, the sugar trust has been aided in the same way. Given their raw material free—as they have it—and there is no country in the world where the refiners can produce a ton of refined sugar so cheaply as in the United States. They have, however, enjoyed for the past few years a protective duty of one-half of 1 cent upon their finished product, and they have used that duty most persistently and pitilessly to pay themselves dividends upon watered capital, to keep the wholesaler squeezed between the vice of legislation on the one hand and trust manipulations on the other, with the result—although raw sugar is admitted here free, although manufacturing of sugar

costs less here than in any other civilized country—of taxing the American public on an average of three-fourths of a cent to a cent per pound higher for their sugar than is paid by even the alleged to be downtrodden proletariat of diabolical Great Britain. And now, sir, instead of striking off this protective duty and leaving the sugar trust to earn its own living, a Democratic Congress has compromised with the enemy and offers them for the future half the blackmail that they have heretofore been permitted to levy.

I know there is an excuse given for this, but the trouble is that the excuse is worse than the deed. It is said that the rebate given by other nations on sugar export is such as practically to amount to a bounty for export, and that the quarter cent is not more than a fair offset to this. If this is not reciprocity, I should like to know what it is. What is the difference in principle between taking off a tariff, provided that your neighbor will do the same, and putting on one as retaliation for his imposing an export bounty? Is there any reason why the reciprocity of the McKinley bill should be given the cold shoulder, and this new member of the same family be invited to sit by the Democratic fireside? Even if the question of principle were not involved, is there any earthly reason why, if France and Germany and Austria are foolish enough to hire their producers to give us cheap sugar, we should keep our people from accepting the benefaction? Yes; there is just one reason. It would hurt the sugar trust. And that is the reason and the only reason upon which can be justified the retention of this one-fourth cent duty upon refined sugar.

The true policy, Mr. Chairman, if Germany is fool enough to spend money to give our people cheap sugar, is to let her do it and give our people the advantages Great Britain now monopolizes. By so doing she has built up her sugar-using industries until her consumption, largely for manufacture—since the average individual probably does not use a greater amount there than here—is 20 per cent higher per capita than that in our country, and she has become the world's center of the great manufactures in which sugar is an important factor. I will give one example: In Western New York, through a district of which the little town of Dundee is perhaps about the center, is the one region in all the world that is most advantageous from all points of view for the raising of small fruits, certain limited districts in Scotland and others in the neighborhood of London being its only rivals. We have had dear sugar; England has had cheap sugar. England welcomed for her people the cheap sugar that Germany and Austria and France denied theirs. As for ourselves, in the interest of the sugar trust the same sugar has been barred from our ports. The result is that wherever you go in the civilized world you will find English and Scotch jams and preserves, until the business of making them now ranks among the great industries of the United Kingdom.

There are several obstructions in the way of our jam manufacturers. There is a tariff on their tin if their goods are put up in tinware, and another upon pottery if their product is marketed in jars. But the chief item, from half to three-fourths of the total weight of the finished goods, is made up of sugar; and it is the higher price of sugar that has so effectually barred us from the markets of the world. It is folly to talk about a rebate. That is given only upon imported goods, and under certain stringent conditions, so that in by far the greater number of industries it is an absolute dead letter. It is so in this, and the result is that, with every advantage over Great Britain of supplying the world's markets with jam and the different forms of small fruit preserved in sugar, the fact is that in Dundee, N. Y., you will find used in considerable proportion the jams and marmalades that are put up at Dundee, Scotland; and all this to help the American sugar trust.

SUGAR TRUST EXTORTIONS.

But, sir, these sugar trust extortions are too fruitful a subject to be exploited at this time. How undeserving is it of consideration: how worthless are the statements which it asks you to believe may be illustrated by brief reference to the Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, a periodical which for many years has been the statistical authority for the sugar trade, and which, within the past few years, has been bought up body and soul by the sugar trust, until it is now scarcely more than an obedient echo. It is professing apprehension lest under the Wilson bill 20 per cent of our refined sugar shall be imported from abroad, and enforces its inference that the margin is very close now by noting that the imports of fine sugar during 1893 were greater than during the year previous. By reference to the statistics given in the same paper, I find that the total amount of the refined sugar imported into this country during the past year was less than 15,000 tons; while from figures also in this same paper I find that the United States consumption of refined sugar was at the rate of 1,800,000 tons per annum; in other words, the imports of refined sugar were less than five-sixths of 1 per cent of the total consumption and could scarcely have represented more than the import of special and prepared grades used for confectionery purposes; so that to attempt to cite them as evidence of danger from foreign competition is impudence rather than argument.

Again, this sheet volunteers the information, that during the past year centrifugals—that is, the sugar trust's raw material—have averaged 3.68 cents per pound, while granulated—its product—has averaged 4.84 cents per pound—a margin for refining of 1⅛ cents per pound. It is then added, in gratuitous mendacity, that such was the average margin during the time when sugar refining was carried on under free competition before the existence of the trust. This is the last issue of this valuable periodical for the year 1893. On one of its pages is given a summary of statistics for the past ten years. Upon turning to it I find a most ideal falsification of its own statement just quoted. From the figures published by this same journal during the past ten years, and now quoted as authentic, it appears that in 1884 the prices of centrifugal and granulated sugar were 5 5/8 and 5¾ cents, respectively, leaving a margin of but nine-sixteenths—a little over one-half a cent. In 1885 the prices were 6¼, and 6 7/8 to 6¾, respectively, leaving five-eighths of a cent for refining.

In the next year the corresponding figures are 5¾ and 5 11/16, leaving a margin of less than five-eighths. But during the last three years the figures stand: For 1891, centrifugals, 3.375 cents, and for granulated, 4 cents, or just five-eighths of a cent margin; for 1892, 3.44 cents and 4.60 cents, respectively, or 1⅛ cents, and for 1893, 2.875 and 4.10, leaving a margin of nearly 1¼ cents; showing that, so far from cheapening prices, the sugar trust has exacted more than twice the margin between its raw materials and its products, normally secured under fair competition.

You may say, why, then, complain of the duty of one-fourth of a cent? I will tell you why. The sugar trust now controls not merely the production, but the distribution of refined sugars in this country. The margin of profit in handling sugar is far less than a quarter of a cent to the wholesalers. So long, therefore, as you give this much leeway the sugar trust, without expense to itself, can cut the feet from under anyone who attempts to market other sugars in this country; and so long as this situation continues no one dare to compete with it here, and it is left to extort from the monopolized market any bonus they please.

How indecent—how pitiless is their practice in this regard—can best be appreciated by looking over the figures during the time of the cholera scare in 1892. It is true that in August and September of that year the price of centrifugals raised from 3⅞ to 3¾ cents per pound—this on account largely of the fact that beet-sugar exports from cholera-infested ports were then impracticable. But the sugar trust not merely raised its price of refined sugar in advance of its necessities to use high-priced raw sugar, but maintained the advance in large measure until the February following, though centrifugals meanwhile had fallen to 3⅛ cents. In other words the trust, shielded by tariff taxation, has exploited not merely the possibilities of oppression of the jobbers through whom their product is distributed, but has utilized the opportunity of pestilence abroad and apprehension at home to extort an additional bonus from an already outraged public. [Applause.]

BUT PASS THE BILL.

I hope I have indicated, sir, somewhat of the amendments to which, it seems to me, this bill should be subjected in the House. But, sir, whether amended or left with all its imperfections upon its head, I hope it may be promptly passed; and I have already indicated somewhat of the urgent reasons which inspire this wish. I do not understand that in voting for it we are assenting to a compromise with protection. We are rather carrying the outworks in order that, getting possession of them, we may train the guns we shall have captured upon every corner of the citadel that is still left standing. [Applause.]

It is with such an expectation, sir, that I expect to vote for this bill. It is in the confidence that with each position carried the next one will be taken more easily, that I am glad to join in the advancing march, even though the music to which we step is not as inspiring as that which I should like to hear played. As it stands the bill is as much better a bill than the Mills bill as that was than the Morrison bill which preceded it; but it is not as far ahead of them as will be in advance of this one the next proposal for a settlement of this question. Let us do as my friend from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] has suggested; let us amend this bill to make it more Democratic; let us crowd into it more instances of fulfillment of the pledges which year after year we have renewed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But in any case let us reassure a waiting nation by putting it into definite form as a law at the earliest moment possible. It is not within my power to depict—it would not be worth the minutes of delay it would cause should I attempt it—the reaction of prosperity that is sure to follow its enactment. The very

fact that for the last six months the remains of Republican misrule, added to the suspense of waiting for Democratic action, have in large measure paralyzed our industries and discouraged investment and enterprise, has left fewer oversanguine plans to be wrecked, has made more urgent the demand for everything that busy fingers can make, has made more conservative and safe the foundation upon which, when once we start forward, freed from all shackles by which our agriculture, our manufactures, and our commerce have heretofore been bound, we shall go forth in the name of the great Yankee nation, conquering and to conquer—opening the world as our oyster, reaping greater and greater advantages, as we shall be more free, each to do that which is most profitable to him, and shall more and more exploit our opportunities to deal with other nations, compared with which our natural resources, our ingenuity, and our enterprise give us the advantage. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is no reason why self-supporting and self-respecting men should heed the shrill clamor of those who croak disaster. You will recall how, when Cœur de Lion escaped from his Austrian prison, and the news came westward to his kingdom, the people-devouring courtiers that stood about the usurper John turned pale and passed about the word, "The devil has broken loose." But through the length and breadth of England the same news was passed as a holiday benediction from village to village and from church to church until to the humblest subject it came as a glad cry, "The true king is coming again to his own." And so in the general downfall of the protective system, which the obstinacy of its beneficiaries is fast preparing, their startled cry, "The free-trade devil has broken loose," will be lost in the glad answer of a reënfranchised nation, "The people is coming again to its own." [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. COOMBS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WARNER. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PENDLETON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a sketch on each article that I desired to give.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the pending session be extended until 6 o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLANCY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] does not desire it.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the pending session be continued until 6 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] asks unanimous consent that the recess be not taken to-day until 6 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. BRETZ. I object. I understand that the gentleman from New York does not desire the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will discharge the duties of the Chair at the evening session; and, without objection, it being within five minutes of the hour, the Chair will declare he House in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. BRETZ. Before that is done, I would like to know whether the time of the gentleman from New York has expired?

The SPEAKER. That is in Committee of the Whole, and the Speaker is not informed as to the status of the time allowed. The House will be in recess until 8 o'clock this evening, the evening session to be devoted to general debate only on the pending bill.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes) the House was declared in recess.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 p. m., Mr. BROOKSHIRE in the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is in session for debate only upon the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which has just been read, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the pending bill.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats upon the floor of this House were elected and commissioned by their constituents to relieve them of the staggering burdens of taxation and to reform and revise the tariff laws which have imposed these burdens upon them for more than thirty years. In doing this it is proper that the schedule imposing duties should be uniform throughout the whole country; but, so long as we have to raise such an enormous amount of taxes by impost duties, it is evident that, incidentally, there will be benefits conferred upon different interests and different sections.

It was impossible for the Committee on Ways and Means to have reported a bill to this House that would have met the approval of all the members. We had an illustration of that last night, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. HAINES] stated that if this bill passed there would not be from his district another Democratic member for a long time, or perhaps never. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, if to carry out Democratic principles or Democratic policies is to defeat a would-be Democratic Representative from that district, the Democratic party ought to hail the result with both pride and joy, because if we are to have a member from that district claiming to be a Democrat, yet who allies himself with the Republican party and seeks to obstruct legislation, it would be better for the Democratic party and for the country to have a Republican, and let the responsibility be charged to a Republican.

As I have already said, it is not probable that this bill will meet the individual views of every Democratic member of this House. It does not meet mine. For instance, the bill retains a duty upon all finished products of iron and steel which, in my judgment, exceeds the revenue limit, while it proposes to put coal and iron ore on the free list. This I believe to be a mistake. While I would not advocate or vote for an amendment retaining the duty at the rates fixed by the McKinley act, I should support, and I will support, an amendment placing a duty of 40 cents upon those two articles. But I want to state further, that if this House should refuse to adopt that amendment I shall still take pleasure in supporting the bill as reported from the committee.

Another objection I have to the bill is that instead of repealing the bounty on sugar at once and absolutely, it proposes to do it gradually, so that it will be several years before that illegal and unconstitutional feature of the McKinley act is abolished. The Congress of the United States has no more authority to pay a bounty to the sugar-growers of Louisiana and other sections of the country than it has to pay a bounty to the wheat-grower, the tobacco-grower, or the man who raises hogs, mules, cattle, or anything else.

The income tax feature which, as I understand, is to be provided for by an amendment, proposes to levy 2 per cent upon all incomes above $4,000. In my judgment that tax should be graded; beginning at a certain rate and increasing as the size of the incomes increased.

I understand also that there is to be an amendment adding 10 cents a gallon to the tax on whisky. I believe that article already carries all the tax that it can legitimately bear, and that a higher tax upon it will be an inducement to go into illegal traffic, so that perhaps the Government will not receive even as much revenue from it as it gets at the present rate.

Mr. Chairman, this is a land dedicated to human rights and liberty. There is no place so fit for freedom as that where nature is most prodigal in her bounty. Such a land is ours. There is in the grandeur of her mountains, the grace of her valleys, the sweep of her plains, and the majesty of her lakes and rivers, inspiration for the noblest attainments within all the range of human endeavor. What a magnificent estate is embraced in citizenship here! How inestimable is the birthright to such a soil as ours! How precious the inheritance of life under a flag that floats never lowered over a nation consecrated to equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none!

Gentlemen may speak lightly of the Constitution of the United States and may be attempted on occasion of partisan excitement to take its sacred name in vain, but in every time of vicissitude it is our pillar of fire by night and our pillar of cloud by day. It is the grandest charter of civilization known to man. It is a book of revelations to all the nations of the earth. Let no man attempt to take from it or add to it.

In this spirit, Mr. Chairman, I approach the discussion of this question. Here in the outset, permit me to digress enough to say that if I have any pride of association, any pride of nativity, it is that I was born in a land and among a people against whom

it can never be said that they were not devoted to the Constitution. Tennessee was the home of Andrew Jackson, who fought, suffered, and bled for his country even in the tender years of his childhood, and he and other sturdy pioneers were first to blaze the westward way of civilization, when they crossed the Alleghenies and risked their all among innumerable wild beasts and swarming tribes of savages. There they laid the foundation stones of proud and splendid commonwealths upon the enduring bedrock of popular liberty. They were devoted to it—these pioneers of the Pioneer State—and pioneers, too, of a Western breeding place for freedom that shall yet give to the world its best lessons in self-reliance, aggression against injustice, and submission to no law that does not conserve to the preservation of the peace and happiness of the community.

By the verdict of all contemporaneous intellect they understood that their Constitution was the paragon of schemes for righteous civic advancement. Its vital principle was live and let live; trust men and you will make them trustworthy. So it was like Andrew Jackson to be ever a resolute defender of his country; like him, when with his riflemen at New Orleans, he hurled back in humiliated defeat the proudest army of veterans that England could call to any field; like him, from the day he felt in his sensitive boyish flesh the cold steel of British bayonets and defied their worst.

Of the tariff Andrew Jackson thought much and said no little, but nothing he said or did is against the evidence of his fidelity to the Constitution.

Let us mark the sentiments of his farewell address, which can not too often be repeated for the purposes of this deliberation:

The corporations and wealthy individuals—

He said—

who are engaged in large manufacturing establishments, desire a tariff to increase their gains. Designing politicians will support it to conciliate their favor and to obtain the means of profuse expenditure for the purpose of purchasing influence in other quarters. Do not allow yourselves, my fellow-citizens, to be misled on this subject. The Federal Government can not collect a surplus for such purposes without violating the principles of the Constitution, and assuming powers that have not been granted. It is, moreover, a system of injustice, and, if persisted in, will inevitably lead to corruption and must end in ruin.

The truth and import of these warnings are significant now that we come to contemplate the result of thirty years of Republican high tariff and legislation for "corporations and wealthy individuals." What Jackson said was said when the country was very young, when much was heard of the plea that our "infant industries" should be protected. Surely after so many years of partiality the infant has grown big enough to pay traveling fare. Let him pay as other folks do who ride on our train of progress. He has imposed on good nature so long that he has become a great lubberly deadbeat, and ought to be kicked off at the first stopping place to make room for suffering families that not only pay their way, but want room to lay down their baggage.

Nobody pays more to ride than the farmer; let us, at least, give him a living chance.

He belongs to the most conservative class of our people.

He is the first to rally to the defense of the country in its hour of trouble and the last to give it trouble. As much as has been the complaint by him, as much as he has grown restive by the disappointments of party association, as much as he has realized and spoken of his deprivation of the rightful fruits of his toil, as much as he has expressed his impatience with the lawgivers of the time, he has not half told the story of his wrongs. His note of discontent is as the sigh of the breeze to the howling blast that comes from the little class that enrich themselves by despoiling him whenever they conceive that their interests are threatened.

Why, just look at the true inwardness of the panic of 1893! How small a part has he played in it! And when the restoration of confidence comes in its fullness, how large a share he will take in the renewed maintenance of the national credit! If ours were not so largely an agricultural country—if we did not depend upon three of our products, such as wheat, cotton, and corn, even how insignificant a factor we would be in the commerce of nations! So long as we have a soil that yields abundance for ourselves and gives us plenty to furnish the rest of the world in bread and meat and clothes we are naturally strong, and should by the might of these very resources be preeminent and transcendent in the credit of the nations.

Give the farmer a living chance. He provides the first necessities of life, and if he have enough and to spare, in God's name let him exchange it freely for something that his neighbor has and does not need. To deny that opportunity, to use the taxing power against it, is worse than robbery. Robbery does not deprive the victim of a living chance after the act that violently takes away. It is more decent than taking from him who hath not to give to him who hath.

The robber's victim may go ahead by talent and industry and accumulate what will sustain and comfort him; but the law that makes the farmer pay out of his toil constant and unrequited tribute to the power that manipulates wealth is inhuman, cruel, exhausting, and everlastingly wrong. He may not apprehend the civilized brutality of direct taxation; he may not fully comprehend any of the mysteries of indirect taxation; he may not understand how the execution of the statutes for the purpose of raising revenues for the Government weighs heavily upon his energies; he can not fully understand—because he has not the prompt and true statistics at hand—whither and how far from him is going the lively evidence of his labor; but he goes on, year in and year out, living under unequal and oppressive laws, enduring and suffering, with only the grain of comfort vouchsafed to all the harshly tried of this world, that the "Lord loveth whom He chasteneth."

We would be blindly recreant to our duty as their representatives if we failed to do everything for the preservation of the constitutional rights of our farming and laboring people that it is possible for us to do. Over $500,000,000 annually of the farmers' products are exported, going to contribute to the enhancement of our national credit. This Government owes the farmer a debt large enough to render trivial all the mischief of his mistakes, and, opposed to class legislation as I am, I say that if we are going to pay off our obligations at all, let us make the farmer what he deserves to be, the preferred creditor of the Government. How can we best help him to his just deserts? It can only be done by going to and following without variation the guidance of the Constitution we are sworn to support. We can not have too often recur to us that the purpose of that instrument was to guarantee to us our liberties, property, and lives.

One of the greatest financiers this country ever had was Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, twelve years of whose public service was spent as Secretary of the Treasury, twice under Jefferson and once under Madison. He had counseled with these men in the days when all our industries were young and infantile indeed. Here is the sum of his long life of reflection upon the idea of a protective tariff as he saw it in 1832.

Let it be recollected that the system is in itself an infraction of an essential part of the liberty of the citizen. The necessity must be urgent and palpable which authorizes any government to interfere in the private pursuits of individuals, to forbid them to do that which in itself is not criminal, and which everyone would most certainly do if not forbidden. Every individual in every community, without exception, will purchase whatever he may want on the cheapest terms within his reach. The most enthusiastic restrictionist, the manufacturer most clamorous for special protection, will each individually pursue the same course and prefer any foreign commodity or material to that of domestic origin, if the first is cheaper, and the law does not forbid him. All men have ever acted on the same principle. It is impossible that they should universally act in the same manner, unless it were to their interest to do so.

The tariff system is founded upon the principle that what is true of all men individually is untrue when applied to them collectively. We can not consider the adherence of enlightened nations to regulations of that description but as the last relic of that system of general restrictions and monopolies which had its origin in barbarous times. If the corn laws are the most odious of those protecting monopolies, it is because they enhance the price of that which is still more essentially necessary than sugar, salt, clothing, or fuel; and we may safely predict that their repeal will be the first result of an improved representation of the people.

"An improved representation" of the people. Ah, Mr. Chairman, we have reached a time, I fear, when we need an "improved representation" of the people. Are we but the servants of an Administration? Mere mediums of barter for petty office, the pliant tools of political interests wholly selfish and heartless? When I look over the history of legislation and its precedents for the last thirty years, and the record that has recently been making in this House, I almost shrink from the answer to the question.

Have members been truly representative of the people? When they come here upon certain promises and pledges, and by the grace of generous trustfulness of an innocent people become invested with the proud privilege of being their representatives and agents, can it become them to turn a deaf ear to the voice of the people's needs and listen only to the advice of any *man* who would have true representatives believe *he* is wiser in his generation than they? Call it demagogy or what you please, when my community, my people commission me to do certain things for them that are in my power to do, and I pledge them, impressing them that my whole nature is in sympathy with their wants and aspirations, I say I would be deserving of the uttermost depths of degradation, which is the ultimate retribution for treachery, if I should fail to keep my promise or disappoint them by a single vote. Why should a Representative have to explain to his people any vote that he has cast here? His record ought to be so clean, and it ought to be so clear as it relates to their interests that it will speak for him without the confusion of explanation or the humiliation of apology.

I heartily subscribe to the straight and honest declaration of the national Democratic platform that the Republican protective tariff is robbery. It is robbery because it is in violation of the fundamental principles of equitable taxation. It is robbery

because it has taken public money, unnecessarily exacted by import duties, from the pockets of the people and applied it to private ends and selfish purposes. The Republican party has not only broken its repeated promises, which it began to hold out to the people, with the enactment of the so-called war tariff, to reduce and revise taxation, but it has increased their burdens and has gone on in this matter as it has in others in all the long generation of its opportunities, strewing its tracks with signals of brazen disregard for the Constitution and the reserved rights of the people.

That the tariff is a tax has at last been admitted by all fair and intelligent minds in every country on the face of the earth. The contrary is asserted only by those who are either blinded by prejudice or wedded to convictions that have their origin in avarice that harbors no concern for the real welfare of the whole people.

Judge Thomas Cooley, in his Principles of Constitutional Law, says:

Constitutionally a tax can have no other basis than the raising of revenue for public purposes, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imports, therefore (a tariff tax), the purpose of which is not to raise revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the benefit of some home manufacturer, may well be questioned as being merely colorable, and therefore not warranted by constitutional principles.

The Democratic party has called this system of taxation "robbery," and so has it been termed by Republican courts.

In the case of The Loan Association *vs.* Topeka, 20 Wallace, the court says:

To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law, and is called taxation

What a formidable instrument for evil is this power of taxation! How fearful may become its oppressions, when, under its cloak, is concealed the hand that can take tribute from all the people for private purposes! That can go about into the homes of the poor and take from them half their necessities—and for what? Not that the Government is in any extremity of want or danger, but simply to buy more leisure for the rich, and supply more of the luxuries for which their appetites by long indulgence have become as vitiated as they are insatiable; it is for the maintenance of a policy that can mean nothing short of a centralization of wealth so powerful that it can buy Legislatures and sway Congresses from sworn duties.

It is a burning shame that in this great Republic nearly three-fourths of its wealth is in the hands of nonproducers, and that the producing millions are compelled to go on helping to swell this monstrous corruption fund out of the meager rewards of their daily toil. We have come dreadfully near the danger line, Mr. Chairman, when less than 40,000 men may manipulate more than half the riches of our land against the good of more than 70,000,000 sovereign citizens.

The tariff is a tax, and the consumer pays the tax. This truth has dawned upon the minds of a vast majority of the voters of this country. Even the party that so long contended that the foreigner paid the tax is being forced by practical exposures of the fallacy to admit the truth. In the future discussions of the tariff question the advocates of protection will be driven to other arguments than these. On that assumption I shall discuss this question, hoping that we are to be met fairly by our opponents and the issue squarely joined.

The prime object and essential duty of this discussion is to ascertain whether there be a tariff which is levied for a public purpose or for private gain. No tax can be rightfully or lawfully imposed, if the intent be to promote the private enterprises of individuals. This is a fundamental principle of our Government; and it matters not how much a protective tariff may create wealth in any given community by some special industry, the Government does wrong to aid that industry and is utterly at variance with the guaranteed right and the natural right of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and yielding equitable contribution to the expenses of the Government.

The Government has no right and it justly does not belong to it to assume to control, direct, or point out a business policy to any lawful industry. The Government has nothing to do with the mere matter of finding employment for individuals. It has done its whole duty in assuring them life, liberty, and the safe pursuit of happiness. It leaves them to choose their own vocations, to engage in any legitimate pursuit, holding to any religion or politics, untempted by promise of reward to one class that may not be the privilege for the asking of another class.

Only when the object of the tax to be levied is for a public purpose can it lawfully be levied and collected. Because the tariff is the less objectionable form it does not limit the application of this plain and simple maxim of the Government. It applies with the same force to indirect taxation that it does to direct taxation, and indeed, if it were proper, ought to be more inviolate as to indirect or tariff taxes because the latter more immediately and generally affects the wants of the common people. In all cases the tax can not be rightfully levied and collected except for the sole use of the Government. That, with the insistence upon honest and economical administration, is the Democratic doctrine. I rejoice that it is so plain that no sane man may make a mistake about it, and I rejoice the more because it is the gospel of hope to all the people.

So, any law that takes from the people any more money than is necessary for the legitimate expenses of the Government, is dangerous extortion and outrageous robbery of the people under legislative decree. The Republican party claims, insists, and practices this, that the Federal Government and Congress are imperial and omnipotent; that they have the right to tax the people to any extent; that they have the right to lay tribute on all the people for the benefit of a few; to lay with one hand the power of the Government upon the property of the citizen and with the other bestow it upon the creature of special favor.

If the Constitution does not guarantee to the people any limitations or restrictions upon the power to tax them, then this is far from a republican form of Government, and in reality the worst sort of despotism, which must lead to the decay of our manhood and the destruction of our independence. I deny such a power or right. If the Government can levy and collect a single dollar for any other than a public purpose, then it can levy fifty billions of dollars and collect it for the benefit of private individuals, and thus at a single blow bankrupt and ruin the country. To say this thing can be done is to hold to what is unholy, unjust, and unauthorized by the Constitution, and a monstrous usurpation of the rights of the whole people which have been expressly reserved to them.

I challenge any man to show the contrary in the Constitution, either in terms or implication of terms. Under our form of government the people are entitled to a fair race in life, with no governmental interference with any individual liberty. Tyranny and barbarity can not live in the land where such a principle is in full force. The people have a right to demand and require that they shall carry the least possible burdens of government, and to enjoy the largest degree of personal liberty compatible with the common protection of life and property. Having the right of local self-government, they should wage unceasing war upon centralization of power in all its forms and guises, certain that this course alone will preserve their liberties and perpetuate their institutions.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to speak with patience or equanimity in the presence of such wrongs as the present infamous McKinley law was framed to perpetrate. It is not only unconstitutional, but in its operations upon the body of the people it is like a vampire whose revolting greed would drain the last drop of precious human blood. [Applause.]

Congress has no power or authority—even by the plea of the welfare clause of the Constitution—to cause any man's business to prosper at the expense of another man, no matter what his occupation or however beneficent his purposes. The emissaries of paternalism, whom we always have with us, insist that this doctrine admits of no national progress. Mr. Chairman, we would better stand still than go forward on any path that restricts the liberties of the people. We would better go backward to the days when the pioneers had to fight the savages than yield now to the insidious and dangerous tendencies of these times.

Centralization and paternalism swept the might and splendor of the old Roman republic into a maelstrom of shame, dishonor, and destruction. Thanks to the wisdom and inspiration of our forefathers, our Republic is founded upon safer and juster principles. We have the same laws, the same Constitution for all our domain, the sovereign right of local self-government for all our people, privileges that are our mainstay and hope. These the Republican party would take from the people, because it is the party that attempts to centralize all power in the hands of a few by centralization of the wealth of the nation, as I have said before on the floor of this House. If I were asked how they have done it, I have to answer:

First, by illegal, unequal, and unjust taxation.

Second, by vicious and arbitrary legislation on financial questions.

Third, by allowing common carriers or transporters to rob the masses, in violation of every principle of equity and right.

Fourth, by dishonest appropriations of the people's money.

Mr. Chairman, we should not forget that the Revolution of 1776 was caused by the exactions of centralized power in the British Government in the imposition of unjust taxes. The Republican party by gradual encroachments, and the accretions incident to its practices, has so warped the growth of the Federal Government that the very purpose for which it was founded has

become obscured, and is in danger of becoming in the minds of the people a mere memory, as is now the glory of the old Roman republic in the hazy intellects of the lazzaroni that mope in the sun on the banks of the Tiber. It is time for the people of this country to call a halt on the march of centralization and paternalism here, and retrace the way back to the true meaning of the Constitution.

The distinction between the reserved and delegated powers is important to bear in mind. It is contained in the tenth amendment to the Constitution, to wit:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

This is a Government of granted and enumerated, not of original, powers. The Congress of the United States is not omnipotent, and can never be so long as the people remain independent, self-reliant, and free. This is a Government of given and normal powers. In 1 Wheat, page 304, Justice Story said:

The Government of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication.

Chief Justice Marshall held in 9 Wheat, page 1, that—

This instrument contains the enumeration of the powers expressly granted by the people to the Government.

Chief Justice Story held the same thing.

Supposing all parties should agree that this construction was true, but that it would be a good thing to so amend the Constitution as to allow the levying of taxes for other than public purposes, what do you think the answer would be? It would be overwhelming from all over the land. It would say to the powers of paternalism and centralization: "No; you have robbed us already too long; there shall be no more submission by us to tariff monopoly. Our cause is equality, justice, and freedom from financial oppression."

As the Representatives of the people we have no right to go for excuse or authority where the Constitution is silent. Our powers are clearly defined, and to go beyond them would be sheer usurpation and bad faith, which should visit upon us certain political damnation.

What a sweet morsel to the advocates of protection is the worn and abused "welfare clause" of the Constitution! They have no right to rest their consciences, to tie the elasticity of their guilty compunctions around this innocent clause, and parade it as authority for class legislation. That clause has been unmistakably construed, and the construction is almost universally accepted as correct. As so construed it reads:

Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises [in order] to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and welfare, but all duties shall be uniform throughout the United States.—*Article I, section 8, Constitution of the United States.*

There is no lawyer who will not concede that to be the true exposition. There are three branches embraced in this clause. First, laying and collecting taxes; second, paying debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare; third, a qualification on this power given in the first clause of the sentence. It would be absurd to think that the men who gave us the Constitution, the grandest and bravest document on civic government ever conceived or written by man, would have interjected as a substantive power the words contained in the second clause of the sentence, and in the third qualified the first.

We are not left to rely alone upon these clear constructions, given since the adoption of the Constitution; but I beg the indulgence of the House while I read from the forty-first number of the Federalist while this very clause was under consideration by the Convention. Mr. Madison said:

Some who have not denied the necessity of the power of taxation have grounded a very fierce attack against the Constitution on the language in which it is defined. It has been urged and echoed that the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties and imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare" of the United States amounts to an unlimited commission to exercise every power which may be allowed to be necessary for common defense and general welfare. No stronger proof could be given of the distress under which these writers labor for objections than their stooping to such a misconstruction.

The same misconstruction which Mr. Madison criticised as unworthy and unfounded before the adoption of the Constitution is the identical construction and meaning that the Republican party is attempting to give it now. For representatives to take any other view than that held by Mr. Madison and sanctioned by the courts is a reflection either upon their intelligence or upon the integrity of their purposes. Mr. Madison also says:

Had no other enumeration or definition of the power of the Congress been found in the Constitution than the general expression just cited, the authors of the objection might have some color for it, though it would have been difficult to find a reason for so awkward a form of discretion to legislate in all possible cases. A power to destroy the freedom of the press, the trial by jury, or even to regulate the course of descents or the forms of conveyances, must be very singularly expressed by the terms "to raise money for the general welfare."

Who knew and loved the Constitution better than the first President who was guided by its glorious precepts? Gen. Washington, in the serenity of his declining years, gave to his beloved country his Farewell Address, a paper fit for the first pages of deathless fame. That address, which is the crowning glory of the illustrious life of the "Cincinnatus of the West," it will do now to read and study again and again. The solid and enduring wisdom of its conclusions, the warmth of its devotion to country, the majestic height and purity of its sentiments are but weakly and coldly symbolized even in yonder lofty marble pile that seems to lift its snowy peak as though reaching through the chaste air of heaven to join the glory of the stars.

How reverently and solemnly Washington spoke of the Constitution. Thinking of all that party has done to distort its beneficent intent, or that has strained its constructions to serve any other purpose than that of the whole people, I am reminded of this that he said:

One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus undermine what can not be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of government as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing Constitution of a country; that facility in changes upon the credit merely of hypothesis and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion.

Another thing he said in that address, proper for all Administrations to bear in mind, particularly upon occasions of such unrest and excitement as attended the extraordinary session of this Congress, with one coördinate branch playing the inexorable to another coördinate of this Government, is this:

It is important likewise that the habits of thinking should inspire caution in those intrusted with its (the Government's) administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism.

There are notes of prophetic admonition in these sayings which no party or representative of party in any capacity can afford not to heed.

Leaving for the moment the discussion of the constitutional bearing of the Republican protective tariff, I can not refrain from expressing a measure of my opinion of the policy of that party toward the people whom it is my duty faithfully to represent. I give my verdict on the evidence of history and not on the fair promises and alluring declarations of that party.

A Democrat on the floor of this House, in a moment of partiality for his enemies, and of exuberant loving kindness for those who have despitefully used him and his people, said of the Republican party in a speech here, "it is a party confessedly of great achievements." The eulogy comes from so remarkable a source and in such questionable shape that I will speak to it, even though I may not conscientiously subscribe to the amiable damnation of so faint praise. Let us attend to the achievements of the Republican party to see if we can not learn a lesson or two. I give my heart and mind to the principles of the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the framers of the Constitution and the defenders of it for the people's sake, the party under whose wisdom and patriotism this Republic has grown from colonial insignificance along one line of poorly defended coast, across a continent to another ocean, and embraced a domain of matchless and mighty resources, and of imperial magnificence.

The darkest and saddest periods of the history of this grand Republic have been endured under Republican Presidents, Republican Senates, and Republican Houses of Representatives. In every one of these régimes the Republican party has trampled the Constitution under its feet. It has opposed the vital, conservative principles of this Government. If it has performed any "great achievements," if it has by any act or policy invested itself with any degree of moral grandeur, I confess it has never been demonstrated to my mind either by the statesmen it has boasted or the laws for which it is responsible. I am not prepared to assume the grotesque attitude toward the Republican party of praying: "Lord I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

I have all charity for and no malice against persons; but I have no patience with the policy of the party that in all the years of its career has been one of persistent, unchanging, and unabated enmity to the peace and welfare of my people. I am not around wooing statesmanship in the Republican quarter. No, Mr. Chairman—

> The smiles of knaves
> Tent in my cheeks; and schoolboys' tears take up
> The glasses of my sight! A beggar's tongue
> Makes motion through my lips, and my arm'd knees,
> Who bow'd but in my stirrup, bend like his
> That ha'n receiv'd an alms! I will not do't,
> Lest I surcease to honor mine own truth,
> And by my body's action teach my mind
> A most inherent baseness.

[Applause.]

When the enormous taxation was imposed, ostensibly to pay the cost of the war, the Republican party promised the people

that they should be relieved of its burdens as soon as peace came. Is there a gentlemen who can point to any "great achievements" in this direction? Every Congress since the war has witnessed the violation of those pledges, so that we now have cumulative evidence of that party's villainy in an average increase of taxation by from 41 to 65 per cent. Why, gentlemen, it has been as though war with all its anguish and horrors, its tears and blood, its ruin and desolation still darkened our homes. But the war that has been prolonged in this country has been more than a "thirty years' war" of cruelty against innocence, wrong against right, selfishness and avarice against the reserved rights and welfare of the whole people.

If the Republican party relieved anybody by legislation immediately after the war, it was the plutocrat; for they relieved the rich of the embarrassment of the tax collector by taking off $206,436,886.55. If the taxes on monopolies and wealth had been retained but a few years, the national debt would have been paid long ago, and the relieved people would not now have to witness the spectacle of a set of arrogant and impudent national bankers and manufacturers presuming to come here to dictate to the people's representatives. The millions of income tax alone would soon have discharged the entire public debt.

The Democratic platform declares for the same principle embraced in the Walker tariff. The theory of this law means four things: First, the highest rate of tariff taxes upon the luxuries of life; second, the lowest rate of taxes upon the necessities of life; third, that the law should be so administered as to bear equally on all classes and all sections of the country; fourth, that the rate should be no higher than was necessary to meet the expenses of the Government honestly and economically administered.

This was a just and fair tariff law. There never has been a period in our history when it was easier for the wage-earner to make a living for himself and family, because under the operation of that tariff the cost of the necessities of life reached the lowest point, and the dollar that a man earned went into his pocket to stay there or to be used, if he preferred, to buy books or purchase any of the luxuries within his reach. Mr. Blaine said this was the golden era of our prosperity. "Then the average rate of taxation was 19 per cent, while under the McKinley tariff, which Mr. Blaine vehemently denounced, the rate is 40, 60, 80, and in some instances 100 per cent. Mr. ALLISON of Iowa said in 1870, while a member of this House, that the tariff of 1846, "although confessedly and professedly a revenue tariff, was, so far as all the great interests were regarded, as perfect as any that we had ever had." On the same occasion he declared himself in favor of a 20 per cent reduction on the then existing rates.

Show me anywhere a benefit that the high protective tariff has conferred, and I will name it to you as something which has no rightful kinship with the Constitution or any principle of equal and exact justice, a creature that, like Thersites—except in honesty of admission—is bastard, "loves bastards, is bastard instructed, bastard in mind, bastard in valor, and illegitimate in everything."

Mr. Chairman, we have never had a national exhibition or exposition of our products of the farm, the shop, the mine, the mill, or of the genius of our inventions, but we amazed the world and gave to mankind new information of earth's resources and new ideas of labor-saving devices, just as we have done this year at Chicago. We have never engaged in these things, I say, but that to all intelligent foreigners who looked upon the evidences of the rich stores of our natural bounty and the shining accomplishments of American ingenuity it presented occasion at once for astonishment and inward ridicule of the policy that so powerful and blessed a people needed governmental aid in any direction of industrial advancement.

I rejoice in any success that the World's Fair at Chicago has met, even though I opposed the appropriation for it in the last Congress. I opposed it, Mr. Chairman, for the same reason that determines me to support the repeal of any law that uses the money of the people for other than a public purpose and contrary to the organic law. The conception of the enterprise was as laudable as the show has been grand and gratifying to American pride: but it was an undertaking that should rather have appealed to the patriotism and individual efforts of our citizens, who were amply able to make it a success, than to the Government, and to take the money that belongs only to all the people, many of whom are poor to privation. There was no more authority for the act than there is now for us to provide the mayor of Chicago with money to secure employment for the 125,000 idle workmen in Chicago, many of whom are the recent employés of highly protected industries. It ought to apply to governments as well as to individuals—

> Neither a borrower nor a lender be;
> For loan oft loses both itself and friend,
> And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.

Mr. Chairman, honest people look with suspicion upon a man who being able to take care of himself continually eats bread from the sweat of his neighbor's brow. So it should be with our industries. Feeding the overgrown babies with Government pap is repugnant to every manly instinct. To what does this policy tend? Debasement, injustice, mockery of honest effort, and wanton waste of the precious fruits of honest toil.

The late Justice Miller said in a decision, part of which I have already cited:

> If it be said that a benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactures, the same may be said of any other business or pursuit which employs capital or labor. A system of artificial government protection leads the people to too much reliance on government. If left to their own choice of pursuits they depend on their own skill and their own industry. But if government essentially effects their occupations by its systems of bounties and preferences, it is natural when in distress that they should call on the government for relief. Hence, a perpetual contest carried on between the different interests of society—agriculturists taxed to-day to sustain manufacture, commerce taxed to-morrow to sustain agriculture, and then imposition on both agriculture and manufactures to sustain commerce. And when government has exhausted its invention in these modes of legislation it finds the result less favorable than the original and natural state and course of things.

He could hardly conceive of a policy worse than that which would place the great interests of this country in hostility to each other; a policy which would keep them in constant conflict, and bring them every year to fight their battles in the committee rooms of the House of Representatives.

Henry Clay said long ago in the Senate:

> No one, Mr. President, in the commencement of the protective policy ever supposed it was to be permanent.

The protective Whig President, Fillmore, in his message to Congress in 1850, used this plain and direct language:

> A high tariff can never be permanent. It will cause dissatisfaction and will be changed. It excludes competition and thereby invites the investment of capital in manufactures to such excess that when changed it brings distress, bankruptcy, and ruin upon all who have been misled by its faithless protection.

Now, which shall we legislate for? A class of a few hundred of manufacturers, whose only participation in politics is to corrupt the ballot box, or for the seventy millions of our citizens. The former have been receivers of goods stolen from the people by the Republican party. Let them suffer the penalty of complicity in the offense, let the consequences be what they may. Even Andrew Carnegie, the richest beneficiary of high protection in the land, has confessed at last that he has had enough; that if the people want tariff reform they should have it.

> It may not be; it can not last,
> The visions of enchantment past,
> Like frostwork in the morning ray,
> The fancied fabric melts away.

Let me cite you some of the late "great achievements" of the Republican party, as I find them told in Republican protective tariff newspapers. I take some from the New York Press, one of the most ardent protectionists of them all, a paper which in an editorial of recent date utters the blatant falsehood that under the Republican protective tariff "wages have grown higher in every calling, both in amount and purchasing power," and that "the popular standard of comfort and of intelligence has steadily risen." Yes, gentlemen, if there is a grain of truth in that statement it is that the standard of popular intelligence has risen, for it rose in its might last November a year ago and declared that the murderous robber Tariff must die.

But here are those news notes. They are taken from a column headed, "The World of Industry."

> Cincinnati furniture hands are still out.
> Fall River textile workers will resist a cut.
> Fall River idle spinners receive financial aid from the Union.
> Boston hoisering and portable engineers want higher wages.
> Idle Poles and Italians visited the Buffalo poormaster and demanded work.
> A Buffalonian suggests the building of State roads to give work to idle men.
> New Bedford speeder tenders struck against a cut of 18 per cent.
> Gompers has informed Governor Flower that the workingmen want work, not advice.
> A Pittsburg ironworker, after hunting work two months, was sent to the penitentiary as a tramp.

We are told by our Republican friends that such "achievements"—these "short and simple annals of the poor"—are merely the result of apprehension that this Democratic Congress is going to play smash with the tariff. Do you not think that a system that could in any emergency bring so much discontent, distress, ruin, and misery ought to be destroyed root and branch?

But let us see about how the protected industries fared immediately after the McKinley act was passed, and when every branch of the Government was in the hands of the Protection party. The act passed October 4, 1890. Strikes, lockouts, and reductions in wages followed almost daily from October 16, 1890, in over three hundred instances, as the files of the daily newspapers of the period will show up to July 1, 1892. The reductions ranged all the way from 3 to 60 per cent. It is a fact that

has already been established, that the only increase in wages has been by industries not affected by the McKinley act.

The Senate subcommittee on the tariff investigated the subject of wages from October 1, 1889, to July 1, 1891. Senator Carlisle, in speaking of the report of the committee, uttered a cardinal truth in this:

> The man who wants to employ labor does just what is done by every other man who wants to procure anything, he gets it at the very lowest rate at which the law of supply and demand will enable him to get it, tariff or no tariff. The employer pursues the same course, whether he is in a free-trade country or a protective country.

A popular protective tariff lie is that under protection we have had great demand for labor, wages have been high, and money cheap. I agree with Mr. Henry George that—

> The direct object and effect of protective tariff is to raise the price of commodities, but men who work for wages are not sellers of commodities, they are sellers of labor. They sell labor in order that they may buy commodities. How can an increase in the price of commodities benefit them?

The poor, idle wage-worker, locked out of the protected industry, when he comes to buy the protected commodity has more reason than any being I know to ask, in his sad bewilderment, "In God's name, where am I?" There are in this country more than two million men idle who are willing to work and can get no work. This is one of the greatest of the "achievements" of the Republican party. If it does not lead to general bread rioting, it will be because the intelligence of the people counsels patience until the Democratic Congress goes to their relief and wipes off from the statute books the most infamous and infernal laws that ever cursed a free people.

Along with those laws have been all those which have been continually striking at silver and stabbing the credit of the people, all to bring this country to the single standard of gold. Woe is the day when it shall drive the money of the people from their hands! Poor old deserted Timon, wandering to the woods, where he expected to find "the most savage beast kinder than mankind," found a piece of the cunning metal, and said, as he held it in his hand:

> Gold? yellow, glittering, precious gold? No, gods,
> I am no idle votarist. Roots, you clear heavens!
> Thus much of this, will make black, white; foul, fair;
> Wrong, right; base, noble; old, young; coward, valiant.
> Ha! you gods! why this? What this, you gods? Why this
> Will lug your priests and servants from your sides;
> Pluck stout men's pillows from below their heads:
> This yellow slave
> Will knit and break religions; bless the accurs'd;
> Make the hoar leprosy ador'd; place thieves,
> And give them title, knee, and approbation,
> With senators on the bench.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party has always been steadily on the side of the people in financial legislation. Here is history:

In 1863, when the vote on the bill providing for the charter of national banks was taken, the Democrats voted 6 to 1 against it. The Republicans voted more than 2 to 1 for it. In the House the Republicans voted for it 75 to 22, and the Democrats 42 to 3 against it. On April 14, 1864, what was known as the supplemental banking bill was before Congress. It was a repetition of the evils of the charter act, and was to extend and foster the national banking system. The Democrats in the House voted solidly against it, 65; the Republicans voted 80 for it and but 1 against it. In the Senate the Democrats voted 7 against it and none for it; the Republicans voted 30 for and 2 against it.

In March, 1869, when the act to strengthen the public credit was before Congress, only 1 Democrat voted for it and 34 against it, while 96 Republicans voted for it and only 12 against it; in the Senate the Republicans were 42 for it and 7 against it. The Democratic Senators voted solidly no. Bonds made payable in greenbacks were made payable in coin by the act. On March 29 Mr. MORGAN, Democrat, offered a resolution to exempt salt, tea, coffee, sugar, matches, and tobacco from taxation, and to tax bonds. The resolution was defeated by the Republicans, the Democrats voting solidly for it and the Republicans solidly against it.

Thus the Republican party voted invariably against taxing the bondholder and in favor of taxing the necessaries of life.

In 1880, when the act to refund greenbacks into coin bonds was pending, an act that increased the burdens of the people $500,000,000, the Democrats in the House voted solidly no, 54; the Republicans voted only 2 no and 139 for it. In the Senate the Democrats were solid against it and the Republicans solid for it.

There were seven minor amendments made in the Senate which necessitated a conference committee. When the House committee was announced Mr. Brooks called attention to the fact that the committee was composed of Republicans only. Mr. Blaine answered: "It is not essential that it should not be." Thus a set-up committee of the House of Representatives agreed upon the bill as it was finally passed.

In July, 1870, when SHERMAN'S proposition to increase national bank circulation $54,000,000 was pending, no debate was allowed. A vote was taken; only 4 Democrats voted for it and 44 against it, but it passed by Republican votes. Mr. Randall offered a substitute which proposed to take up national-bank notes and issue $300,000,000 in greenbacks in their stead, and upon this substitute the Democrats voted—noes 6, ayes 41; the Republicans—ayes 10, noes 105. At the same time Mr. MORGAN, Democrat, offered in the Senate a substitute which provided for repealing the national-bank act and substituting $400,000,000 in greenbacks in their stead, with full legal-tender qualities for national-bank notes. The Democrats voted aye and the Republicans no by the same overwhelming majority.

The manner in which silver was demonetized in 1873 has been fully made known to the country. It was done by a Republican Congress in the interest of the bondholders of the country, whose bonds thus became payable in gold, and made the debt of the country harder to pay.

On July 10, 1882, a bill to extend the charter of national banks, known as the Carp extension bill, passed the House by 110 ayes to 79 nays. On this vote there were Democrats voting for it only 11, the rest, 99, being Republicans. Against it, Democrats 76; Republicans 3. While this bill was under consideration, Mr. BLAND offered a substitute for it, which provided for issuing Treasury notes for bank notes. It was defeated by Republican votes, 68 Democrats and 3 Republicans being for it, against 19 Democrats and 119 Republicans against it!

On December 19, 1878, Mr. Fort moved to suspend the rules to pass a bill declaring the standard silver dollar a legal tender, and preventing discrimination against it; but, failing to get the required two-thirds vote, it was lost. The vote stood, for it, Democrats, 106; Republicans, 45. Against it, 16 Democrats and and 73 Republicans.

On April 8, 1888, on a bill providing for the free coinage of silver, there were voting for it 96 Democrats and 30 Republicans. Against it, 68 Democrats and 95 Republicans.

The bill that passed the House November 5, 1877, providing for free coinage, received 97 Democratic votes and 67 Republican. Against it, 10 Democrats and 24 Republicans. In the Senate the bill was amended, striking out the free-coinage feature, and making it a limited-coinage bill: On that substitute there were 16 Democrats and 33 Republicans for it, and 18 Democrats and 4 Republicans against it: On the passage of the amended bill, 25 Democrats and 23 Republicans voted for it, and 7 Democrats and 14 Republicans against it.

On June 5, 1890, on the question of adopting a rule to prevent debate and amendments to the bill providing for the purchase of silver bullion and issuing coin notes, a vote that showed exactly how the two parties stood on the subject of free coinage at that time, there was only 1 Democrat voting for it and 119 Republicans; voting against it, 106 Democrats and 11 Republicans. On the final passage of the bill there were for it 112 Democrats and 23 Republicans; against it, 22 Democrats and 130 Republicans.

The record shows that every law on the statute books complained of by the people was put there by the Republican party against the votes and over the protest of the Democratic party.

The people are familiar with the methods adopted by the Republican party and a minority of the Democrats, by which the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law was effected. But I rejoice that of all the Democratic members in the House from the South only about twenty lent themselves to the scheme to further the policy of the Republican party to contract the currency and destroy silver as one of the standards of value as money in this country; and of our Senators from the South all but about six stood by the record and declarations of the Democratic platform in favor of a bimetallic standard and against the policy and right of Congress to displace silver as one of our standards of value as money, which was guaranteed to the people in the Constitution of the United States.

A party of great achievements, indeed! It was begotten by fanaticism, and its first success in life was the triumph of accident and the luck of a minority of the people. It has lived as long as it has by grace of opportunity to deceive the people, whom it has robbed for thirty years. There was not a statute enacted by it touching the rights of local self-government that was not designed to perpetuate its hold on power rather than to promote the "general welfare," about which it prates so much. By force and by fraud, by bargains and by bribery, by flagrant and continued violation of laws even of its own creation, it fastened itself upon the body of this people and has left them suffering from disorders so deep-seated and alarming that it must require the utmost wisdom and ingenuity of legislation to give them any certain relief. Its system of financial and tariff legislation has made the rich richer and the poor poorer and more numerous; it has created and maintained a pension system that it has permitted to become

so honeycombed with rottenuessas to cause the brave and honest soldier to be ashamed of the degeneracy of his countrymen.

Mr. Chairman, the war between the States is over, but I have heard with surprise, during the present debate, many of the gentlemen who oppose this bill as hotly engaged in reviving its dead issues and refighting its bloody battles as they were fought from 1861 to 1865 by the boys in blue and gray. If that war settled anything, it settled that this is an indestructible Union of sovereign States, under one Constitution, with one bill of rights for the Federal Government and another bill of rights for the States, distinct and separate in their respective spheres, but both conforming to the broadest principles of freedom and justice. When the last banner of resistance to the Union was furled, it was furled in good faith. The Southern people reentered upon the duty of allegiance to the Union and began anew their share of contribution to the common destiny of all the States and all the people with the same honesty of purpose as did the soldiers of the North when they returned triumphant to happy homes that had not been desolated by war.

The bitterness and the animosities of the strife have long ago faded from the breasts that in 1865 heaved with heartsickness at the sight of a land of ruined homes. No money, property devastated everywhere, and everywhere beset by a multitude of a suspicious, an ignorant and an inferior race, the Confederate had little left but the rags he wore and his integrity. How well he has taken his place in the ranks of faithful citizenship and applied himself to honorable and industrious effort I need not attempt here to demonstrate.

Speaking as one of them, and for all I know of those who fought for what they believed even unto death was right, I declare we join hands with patriotic citizens from whatever quarter of the compass of our land in preserving untarnished the genius of American institutions for the fullness of all time. I say we stand for the Constitution and just laws under it, and I oppose a violation of it in the administration of the pension laws with the same earnestness that I devote to any purpose which I believe to be right.

We have under the pension system 856,000 names on the roll, thousands of which ought not to be there, and to pay all of whom the people are taxed $150,000,000 a year, a tax which must be increased under the act of 1890 to meet inevitable additions to the roll. Millions of this money goes to foreigners who came to this country, not because they were in love with our institutions, but for the amount of money they were to receive as bounty in addition to pay for services: they were foreigners who were not citizens of this country, and who never made an attempt to become such. The pension rolls should be so revised as to strike from them the names of every one of these aliens, and thus far, at least, relieve the people of a burden they are not in any sense of justice or honor bound to bear.

There is another class of pensioners who should be treated likewise. They are the men who joined the Army, who went not for patriotism but for the mean and paltry lucre of the substitute hirer.

Mr. Chairman, my people and the Southern States have to share the burden of this enormous taxation, receiving in return for the money that comes through this channel to our States the most insignificant benefit that it confers upon the circulation of the community. The eleven Southern States which seceded pay an average of $50,000,000 annually to keep up pensions. This, divided among the voting population of those States, shows that the qualified voter would actually pay in this taxation more than he pays in poll tax which entitles him to vote. In my State the qualified voter would pay nearly twice as much as he has to pay in poll tax.

I believe I truly represent my people when I say I protest against giving pensions to aliens, bounty-jumpers, and deserters, but all honor, real benefits, and good purposes of the system to every soldier who while fighting for his country received a wound or contracted disease in the discharge of his duty, disabling him from self-support.

Another one of the "achievements" of the Republican party in the line of unlawful payments of pensions was in the practice of paying the rich widows of deceased Presidents $5,000 a year as long as they live, the widows of deceased judges of the United States Supreme Court $10,000 as a donation, and those of generals of the Army $2,000 per annum. I can conceive of no privilege or immunity that these widows should possess superior to that of the widow of the poor private who gave up his life resisting the high tide of the Confederacy on the flaming heights of Gettysburg or who fell to molder in an unknown grave in the thicket of Chickamauga. The country that practices this, especially such a Government as ours, with its inhibition of class legislation against special privileges, is neither just, decent, nor magnanimous to those who have suffered for it.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt there are members in this House better versed in the various theories of the tariff and their instructive elucidation than I, gentlemen who may be more ready and skilled in debate, and adroit and entertaining in the conclusions they draw from hopeful premises; but if I am halt and lame in discussin, I will be sure and swift in acting up to the letter of what I told the people who sent me here and what I say to you now.

I have had, and shall have, little to do with the theories of the prosecution of the party of "great achievements." I confine myself mainly to the law and the evidence. The Republican party has outraged justice and violated the laws that protected my people in other years in the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I appear for every one of the victims of these wrongs, rich or poor, white or black, strong or weak, sanguine or depressed. Like many another part of the land and the people that inhabit it, we have suffered most for lack of the necessities of life upon which the taxes fall heaviest. If there are any luxuries down there, they are mostly in the visions of the future, when our great stores of mineral resources shall be developed.

Mr. Chairman, there is distress all over the 3,000,000 square miles of this land, wherever there is a toiler and wherever there is a sympathetic ear to listen to the story of human want and sorrow. Mark this, there is wheat and corn in our country, more than enough to feed all our people and have abundance to spare; yet there are thousands of American people suffering almost to starvation. Wheat and corn rotting, weevil eaten in the barns; men, women and children hungry on the streets and on our storm-washed and pestilence-plagued shores! Million-dollar stone and marble palaces building at Newport and in picturesque nooks of the Hudson. Enough money spent in building and maintaining pleasure yachts alone to buy a million bushels of wheat. Men in throngs, howling like maniacs for work with which to buy bread for wives and children at home.

These things have occurred in our country, and are occurring now, Mr. Chairman.

To my mind one of the most wonderful "achievements" of the Republican party has been the effrontery with which it has gone on telling the afflicted country that everything was all right, when in fact everything was all wrong. Republican Presidents in their messages to Congress were wont to congratulate the country upon its progress, and Republican politicians have harped upon the growth of the United States—poor, pock-marked daughter of protection. Republican conventions have always "pointed with pride" to any channel that floated boodle their way, and always "viewed with alarm" any symptom of revolt against the deviltry of the party which was the result of courageous Democratic agitation against Republican compounded rascality.

It is really one of the marvels of the age that this country has advanced so rapidly under so heavy a handicap as has been put upon it by unwise rulings. Let us take a glimpse into the bewildering mazes of results that have been the dispensations of Providence rather than the decrees of Satanic power. The general prosperity has been affected from time to time by numerous causes, some favorable and some unfavorable.

An enormous public debt, incurred in a few months, was paid off with unparalleled rapidity; paper money was issued and redeemed after a long struggle; vast sums were borrowed abroad and repaid on a proportionate scale after the crashes of 1873; railways were built over thousands of miles and with magical swiftness of enterprise; great areas of virgin forests and of arable fertile tracts were opened to settlement; more of the splendid riches of our mineral resources were discovered and developed; the arts and sciences advanced in all directions, revolutionizing many branches of industry and supplying new comforts and luxuries; with all this there came an extraordinary immigration, and I believe, finally, that the excesses of our high import duties would have operated with frightful force but for the rapid improvement both in the means of communication and the methods and vehicles of rapid transportation on land and ocean, annihilating so much of time and space that it could but be a very material and important factor in the growth of the United States as a whole.

But if wealth has been added to the sum of the nation's treasures; if the bulk of the money credited to our people in the balance of nations has been augmented, it has been with the enrichment of small classes and the impoverishment of large masses. The manual laborers of the country, who have constituted its real and genuine wealth-producers, have suffered while the nonproducers have prospered.

Without the fruits of the wage-earner's toil, we would have gained nothing. With them, under such laws as we have to endure, we have received scarcely a benefit that has not come from rare inventive genius, which is always born out of the necessities and wants of striving mankind.

Ex-Senator Ingalls, of Kansas, when he was in the Senate, a "statesman," not "without a job," said in a speech, in January, 1891, much to the grave concern of his Republican colleagues:

By some means, some device, some machination, some incantation, honest or otherwise, some process that can not be defined, less than a two-thousandth part of our population have obtained possession, and have kept out of the penitentiary, in spite of the means they have adopted to acquire it, of more than half the accumulated wealth of the country.

That was all true, as it was fine in the sweep and procession of its polysyllables. It is true of the conditions now, "only more so," but I do not see any mystery involved in the process of defining the cause of the serious condition of things so deep and baffling as to require the use of terms so fanciful as those Mr. Ingalls employed. Read again the Democratic indictment of the Republican party for the imposition of its robber tariff, and its vicious financial legislation, employing the most mighty and insidious agencies for the depreciation and degradation of the people's silver money, and you will find such a summing up of "achievements" as will leave no cloud of doubt upon your understanding.

But Mr. Ingalls told more truth when he added on the same occasion:

That is not the worst. It—

This collossal concentration of wealth—

has been chiefly acquired by men who have contributed little to the material welfare of the country, and by processes that I do not care in appropriate terms to describe.

And he said, too:

A financial system under which one-half of the wealth of the country, derived from the bounty of nature and the labor of all, is owned by a little more than 30,000 people, while 1,000,000 American citizens, able and willing to toil, are homeless tramps, starving for bread. A social system which offers to tender women the alternative between suicide and begging is organized crime, for which some day unrelenting justice will demand atonement and expiation.

The explanation of the saddest pictures of our times, seeing nowhere else under heaven to look for it, I read between the lines of the statute books for the last thirty years; I read it in the narrow, dingy precincts of Wall street; in the mysterious recesses of Lombard. I glean new hints of robbery, wrong, and oppression in the marble halls of Andrew Carnegie's castle in Scotland, and I hear the voice of heartless exultation over power purchased out of honest sweat and blood in the crack of the coachman's whip lashing the steeds that draw this American lord afield in the land that gave to humanity the poet who said:

The rank is but the guinea's stamp—
A man's a man for 'a that.

We need not go into argument or array of figures to show that improved machinery and appliances to fields of industry have contributed materially in lessening the cost and measurably easing the burdens of labor; we need not dwell on the fact that one man can by these agencies produce as much now as half a dozen could a few years ago, reducing the cost to the manufacturer in proportion and cheapening production any more than we need to point to the fact that we now have electric lights in our cities where formerly we had tallow candles, questioning if this advancement has not been one of the "achievements" of the Republican party.

There are published in the foreign edition of the Mail and Export Journal advertisements by 166 American manufacturing firms whose goods are protected by the tariff. The articles are to be delivered on board ship at New York at the prices I shall name. I copy from the prices of the advertisements of the same manufacturers in the American and foreign editions of the paper:

Articles.	Foreign price.	Home Price.
Advance plow	$9.00	$18.00
Hay tedder	30.00	45.00
Mower	40.00	65.00
Horse rake	17.00	25.00
Cumming feed-cutter No. 3	60.00	60.00
Ann Arbor cutter No. 2	28.00	40.00
Ann Arbor cutter No. 1	16.00	28.00
Clipper cutter	9.50	18.00
Lever cutter	4.25	8.25
Cultivator	22.00	30.00
Sweep	60.00	90.00

It will be seen that the average excess of the home price of these home manufactured articles is nearly 60 per cent more than the foreign price. And yet we excel the world in the manufacture of these implements of husbandry. Such are results of the "achievements" of Republican greatness.

I have also before me the export edition of the Engineering and Mining Journal for May 3, 1890, containing advertisements of agricultural and other implements for the foreign trade, with discounts on the American price to foreign customers. The following will be sufficient:

Agricultural implements, S. L. Allen & Co., Planet Junior No. 2 seed drill, $9; discount, 30 per cent. Combined drill, cultivator, rake plow, etc., $12; discount, 30 per cent. Fire-fly single wheel hoe, cultivator and plow, $5; fire-fly hand plow, $2.50; discount, 30 per cent, free on board at New York.

Plows.

Oneonta clipper, reversible iron-beam cutter	$14.00
Oneonta clipper, reversible iron wheel and cutter	15.00
Oneonta clipper, reversible cutter	15.00
Oneonta clipper, reversible iron beam and cutter	16.00

Discount, 30 per cent.

Rakes.

22-teeth rake	32.00
26-teeth rake (25 per cent discount)	34.00
Waldron's pattern, oiled	8.50
Silver steel, painted	8.50
Western Dutchman, bronzed	9.00
Fine cutlery steel, full painted	10.00
All steel, full polished	11.00

Grain scythes.

Waldron's pattern, oiled	11.25
Silver steel, painted	11.25
Clover, oiled	11.25
Clipper, bronzed and painted (discount, 40 and 10 per cent)	11.50

Anvils.

Eagle anvils, weighing 100 to 800 pounds, 10 cents per pound: discount, 10 and 20 per cent.

Then follow pistols and rifles manufactured by Colt and Smith & Wesson, with a discount to the foreigner of 10 and 25 per cent. Also table and butcher knives, scissors, spoons, forges, drills, duck and twine, electrical appliances, explosives, mills, boilers, flue cleaners, augers, wrenches, vises, black tools, jackscrews, pails, watercoolers, washtubs, keelers, milk pans, lamps, miners' tools, etc., on which the discount to foreign purchasers ranges from 10 to 70 per cent.

In the face of all this we are told by the advocates of high protection that this enormous leap in the increase of tariff taxes made by the McKinley law, was made necessary in order to enable our home manufacturers to sell their products at home, in competition with foreign manufacturers, who make and sell like products in our markets. I propose to demonstrate the falsity and unreasonableness of this claim by reference to a few other items.

In The Carpet and Upholstery Trade Review of November 15, 1893, we find the following advertisement of a shipment and sale of American Axminster carpeting:

3*s.* 3*d.* the yard.
Made and laid free. Honestly worth 5*s.* 6*d.* the yard.
Lovely for bedrooms.
Lasting for drawing rooms.
Reliable for dining rooms.

A. R. Dean invites the public to see these extraordinary carpets at once, as there will certainly be a quick sale.

A. R. Dean has secured the rights of all the best designs of these Axminster carpets for Birmingham.

No others firms in Birmingham have got these carpets—direct from the American agents—neither can they procure them, as they are private to A. R. Dean.

The patterns and designs and colorings are splendid—second to none. The majority of them have been brought out by British work people.

Please note the price—3*s.* 3*d.* the yard, made and fitted free. Worth 5*s.* 6*d.*

A. R. Dean,
The leader of the carpet industry,
Bull street and Corporation street.

Which shows that this particular kind of carpet sells in foreign countries and to foreign consumers for 3*s.* 3*d.*, or 79 cents per yard, while the English product of like quality and grade sells at home at 4*s.* 3*d.*; so that the American product is sold at 25 per cent over the English article in English markets. This, too, after paying all freights and commissions. Yet with this and other well-authenticated instances of the same state of affairs staring them in the face, the Republican party still insists on keeping up this tax on the common people to enrich their pets and favorites. The same English journal, commenting editorially on the condition of her markets, mentions heavy consignments of fine American carpeting to several European countries, and says the low prices at which it is placed has completely disorganized the European markets.

But this does not show the worst phase in the practical workings of the tariff. It prohibits all foreign competition and enables these monopolists to sell at their own figures—these articles of prime necessity to our own people at their own prices, and they do not scruple to do so. A quotation which I insert below from an American price list of the same date of that taken from the English Trade Review last quoted shows that our American manufacturers and dealers sell to American consumers the same carpeting at the price of $2 to $2.25 per yard:

Wiltons, 5-frame	$2.00	Extra superfine	$0.90
Brussels	1.02½	C. C. extra superfine	.90
Manchester (stouts)	.87½	Saxony rugs, 4-4 each	7.00
Axminster	1.35	Saxony rugs, 30 inches each	5.00
Kandahar	.72½		

[Applause.]

This is from the public price list of American manufacturers and dealers, and shows that an American consumer pays from 200 to 300 per cent more for this same article, of like grade and quality, than the foreigner has to pay for it—and that, too, after freights and charges have been deducted.

It is difficult to conceive of a greater crime—I use the word advisedly—against the rights and liberties of this American people than they suffer under the operation of this infamous class legislation embodied in the present McKinley tariff act. It forces the common laboring element of our country, which is its most vital part as a nation, to pay tribute to the few rich monopolist class, the manufacturers; but under its protecting care, as we have demonstrated, these favored infants and wards of the Government are able to ship their products into the markets of all Europe and place them in fatal competition with like articles produced by the so-called pauper labor of those countries.

Is it any wonder then that these pauper laborers, finding themselves deprived of work at any price, should at once seek the country where work would seem to be so plentiful? Let the statistics of our immigration bureau answer this question. Thousands and tens of thousands of the poorest of the population of Europe have flocked to our shores since the present tariff bill went into effect, whose starving condition compelled them to get work at merely nominal rates, thus displacing a like number of our own native citizens, and enabling the unscrupulous manufacturer to make a horizontal cut in wages, owing, as he states, to a stringency of the times. Its real cause lies deeper. It is owing to an oversupply of cheap foreign laborers, that he has ready at a moment's notice to step into the place of the native workman, who finds it impossible to live at the reduced wages, while a Swede, a Norwegian, or a Italian or Chinaman will keep fat and save money to send out of the United States to his pauper family across the sea.

No feudal lord of the middle ages ever wrested from his vassals, under color of law, his fines and fees than do our unscrupulous manufacturers from their helpless fellow-citizens their sweat-earned wages; and no proud baron was more secure in his outrageous robbery when within his strong castle's walls, with drawbridge raised, than are our shrewd and conscienceless manufacturing autocrats behind the hitherto impregnable fortress known as the McKinley bill and encased in the proof armor of their combines and trusts.

I would like for some well-informed gentleman on the other side to tell me, Mr. Chairman, where the 9,000,000 farmers of this country get any benefit out of such Republican "achievements." According to the latest and most reliable statistics, the farmers are not making a cent of profit. No wonder, when they are not only swindled by extortionate taxation but directly discriminated against by the men to whom they are yielding tribute, and this, too, on the prices of the implements and tools they use, as well as upon the necessaries of life, all going to swell the coffers of the allies of the swindlers.

Yes; this country has grown, remarkable as it is, under a Republican protective tariff. But take any two periods, one of a low tariff and the other under a high-tariff system, and then let us see which shows the greater percentage of growth. The increase of the value of farm lands from 1850 to 1860 was $3,333,469,586, or a yearly rate of increase over $337,000,000; total increase from 1860 to 1880—twenty years—$3,552,051,769, or a yearly rate of increase of less than $178,000,000. Ten and a half per cent increase for the low tariff ten years and only 2½ per cent increase for the high tariff twenty years, yet in these twenty years the population has more than doubled. From 1850 to 1860 our agricultural exports increased yearly 25 per cent, under a free-trade tariff; the average increase for thirty-two years since has scarcely been 3 per cent.

And how have the 9,000,000 dwellers and tollers on our farms fared during these thirty-two years? The answer comes out of the blight and gloom of mountains of mortgaged indebtedness, and the achievements of the Republican protective tariff that steals from the farmer the moment he opens his eyes to life until they are closed in a tombless grave. A tariff, forsooth, to give him a home market, when he is more dependent than he ever was upon a foreign market! In 1860, under a free-trade tariff, 170,000,000 bushels of wheat were grown in this country, and the farmer had to export only 2½ per cent of the crop. In other words, he had use or market at home for 97 bushels out of every hundred.

In its very comprehensive article on the agricultural resources of America, the Encyclopedia Britannica concludes that if the resources of our farm lands alone were developed, they would furnish food to a number "five times as great as the entire mass of human beings upon the globe!" Never shall the honest delvers in this most fruitful garden of the earth by any vote of mine be taxed to their hurt on a single necessity or comfort of life. But they have suffered, and they are asking us for relief.

Why, we had a few millions of chattel slaves in 1860 who did not lack for food, clothing, and shelter, and the common comforts of life, as do now millions of white American slaves to the system of purse-proud plutocracy that lives in castles on land and floats in palaces on water. It is a plutocracy that crowds us with tramps, threatens us with anarchists, and that would laugh if one-half the people were driven to ruin, desperation, and suicide. It thinks it can go on importing its pauper labor, so loudly anathematized by Republican press and oratory, and so eagerly welcomed by Republican mine and mill owners; but the day of wrath will come as surely as that language may pronounce the doom of remorseless murder. Accursed be the spirit that robs, and not only robs, but inflicts long-drawn-out torture upon humanity!

We need not go deep into the subject, Mr. Chairman, to learn how heavily we in the Southern States are taxed on articles of prime use and necessity, and how all classes there, white and black, where industry is diversified little beyond the cultivation of the soil, pay tribute to the rule of Republican "achievement."

One of the great staples of the South, in the production of which a large majority of our farm labor is employed, is cotton, that must be picked, ginned, and baled before it can get to market. Besides a tax on the machinery of the gin, there is an unnecessary and exorbitant tax on the hoop iron with which the cotton is baled, as well as on cotton bagging, which consumes all the profits. On this item I adopt the eloquent words of Senator VOORHEES of Indiana, who though living in a State that produces no cotton is broad and patriotic enough to appreciate our needs and sympathize with us in our adversity:

> For the proposed startling increase of duty on iron hoops for baling cotton, or cotton ties, as they are commonly called, there is not even the excuse of a desire to protect some manufacturer in getting rich out of the daily toil of men, women, and children, white and black, in the South. There is not a cotton tie manufactured in the United States, and this tremendous leap in the tax on that article appears simply as an unworthy piece of sectional malice aimed at a people laboring faithfully, bravely, patiently, and loyally, and often under the most trying circumstances, to do their whole duty as American citizens.

And this industry, Mr. Chairman, is one in which the laborers are almost exclusively negroes, a majority of them voters for the Republican tickets and comprising the strength of what is left of the Republican party in the South. God pity the poor deluded creatures! Taxed on nearly everything they have on this earth, and the fruits of their hard labor reduced to so pitiful a minimum that three-fourths of them are far worse off for the necessities and comforts of life than they were as chattel slaves. The party that clamors for their rights, and wails that the white man of the South denies them opportunities of progress, practices as palpable a hypocrisy to them now as it did when, just after the war, it told them it went to war expressly to free them. But their white fellow-citizens in the South share with them the burdens of taxation, and more, they paid from January, 1869, to January, 1893, $12,455,469 for the education of the negro race, my State alone paying $1,037,946 of this amount, which is more than any Caucasian people on the earth have done for the negro.

A gentleman on the other side during the discussion of the elections bill gave vent to the remarkable theory that the white people of the South deprived the negro of his vote because they wanted to hold him down and keep his labor cheap. That there is not the semblance of truth in the idea goes without even calling a black witness to prove. It is the white people of the Republican party that hold the negro down and keep his labor cheap. The Republican party taught the negro, through Republican carpetbaggers, his first lesson in politics, and that was one of such foul corruption as never entered his wildest suspicions and superstitions about his white Democratic neighbors. Republican dispensers of office never gave him an office save with the notion that it might chagrin or humiliate some white Southern Democrat, and the negroes of the North never knew what it was to receive honorable recognition at the hands of any party until it was accorded them by a Democratic Administration.

The false pretenses, the massive deceit, and the grinding oppression of their laws upon the humble labor and deplorable ignorance of the negro constitute the crowning infamy of Republican "achievement." The manacles he wore in 1860 are as jeweled bracelets to the flesh-cutting shackles that Republican protection has fastened upon his limbs. He needs a new emancipation. He wants a freeman's reward for a freeman's labor. If he ever gets it, it will be through the Democratic party enacting laws that will enable him to sell his labor for all the commodities he needs, and more than are included in his simple wants.

Let us take the iron ball and chain from his feet and make him a free man indeed.

Mr Chairman, in proportion to population, perhaps the people of the South more than any other have use for tin. It is an article about which the people of the whole country have been shamefully swindled and humbugged in a way that was enough to make the most incredulous ashamed of the gullibility of human beings.

The tin plate tariff has been a tax without any excuse in any principle of protection, even, because there never has been in this country a tin-plate establishment that was not a howling failure from the very start. Let us see. In 1862 the duty was 25 per cent; in 1872, 15 per cent; in 1875, changed to 20 per cent; in 1883 to about 30 per cent, and in 1890, by the McKinley tariff, a duty of 2.2 cents per pound, or 70 per cent, was imposed. A tax of over $15,000,000 per annum.

Why, we manufacture 1,800,000 boxes of tin into 600,000,000 cans, to hold the products of the field, orchard, and medicinal waters. We pay for this stillborn babe of protection over $2,000,000 per year. Therefore that appreciable amount of money either goes into the garbage heap or into the remorseless bowels of our rich few. With all of this wrong I leave the subject, contenting myself with the reflection of John Quincy Adams, made in 1832, that the doctrine that the duties on imports cheapen the price of the article upon which they are levied conflicts with the first dictates of common sense.

There is nothing so much the matter with this country as to require such enormous protection for our iron and steel manufactures. We lack nothing of the component parts of the highest and finest forms of products. For many years the manufacture of iron and steel has been in that part of the country where the natural conditions were not of the best. For a long time Massachusetts led, and now, although Pennsylvania is in the van, her place must soon be taken by other States more capable of cheaper production. Look at the scale of progress for the past ten years and see what Alabama and Tennessee have done, against all sorts of adverse circumstances, including greater remoteness from the markets than the Eastern shops and mines and mills.

These States teem with metallic treasures, and ask no privilege but to live and let live. Their development would be sure to result in benefit to the whole country. To enact any law to delay it would be against the interests of all the people. Take my State and Alabama. We have iron ore of the best quality and in the greatest abundance, coal almost incalculable in quantity for forge and furnace, limestone for fluxing, and the best timber, stone, and marble for mining and building convenient, durable, and beautiful. Interest will overcome prejudice, break down all barriers whether they be savage or civilized, and capital will come where enterprise can pursue its lively course the whole year round without interference either by winter's cold or summer's heat.

And, Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from the richest mineral district in the South, perhaps, in quantity, variety, and accessibility of ores, and intrinsic value, or to be found in the United States, and representing the most populous Congressional district in Tennessee, I desire to say something as to coal and iron.

I favor reducing the duties to a revenue basis, first, because every political principle I prize is inimical to class legislation, and for the imposition of a protective tax for protection's sake on the consumer of these useful articles is certainly of that kind. It is in opposition to the spirit and letter of that instrument which I venerate more than any other emanating from the intelligence of man, the Constitution, which I hold second in importance only to the revealed law of God.

My vote has never been recorded, since my public service began, for any measure which embodied the sophistry of "protection for protection's sake." It will never be given for such a measure. But, while the Third Congressional district of Tennessee extends from the Blue Ridge on the east across the Cumberland on the west, including large areas of both these mountain ranges, from every fissure and gulch of both stands out in plain view the finest and richest coal and iron strata, and while it borders on the mineral laden districts of Western North Carolina on the east and Northern Georgia and Alabama on the south, its interior is dotted with thousands of other industries—agricultural, manufactories of cotton and woolen goods, furniture, etc.—which should all be considered and given fair play in our legislative action.

Of those engaged in the production of coal and iron some desire the retention of a tariff on iron and coal, while others advocate that they come in free.

In the issue of the Chattanooga Times for Sunday, December 3, 1893, in an interview covering nearly two columns of that paper, Hon. W. M. Nixon, a native of Tennessee and a citizen of Chattanooga, who is connected with most of the furnaces in the Chattanooga mineral district, and whose furnace at Gadsden, North Alabama, is making an output of 80 tons of iron per day, says:

The Wilson tariff bill is in strict accord with the Democratic platform, which was indorsed by a majority of the voters of Tennessee, and is not a mistake in any sense. * * * There is no probability of the importation of coal into the United States, unless it be from Manitoba and Australia into the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, which can not be supplied from the States, not even from Colorado, on account of the great distance and expensive transportation East of the Rockies there is nothing to fear from free coal. The United States exported in the year 1892, 831,045 tons of coal to Canada in competition with coal from Nova Scotia and the balance of the world. We also exported as much more to other countries, our total exports of coal in 1892 being 1,757,137 tons, * * * which was sold in competition with the entire world. * * *

Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Alabama all export coal against the competition of the world. * * * and furnish coal for our Navy and Merchant Marine wherever vessels touch on the Atlantic coast, and this business is enormously increasing each year. This coal is supplied to railroads in South America and other countries. Alabama is building up enormous coal and coke export business through southern ports to the West Indies, Mexico, and Central and South America. Southern coal operators require more reciprocity in trade with the countries with which they deal and return cargoes for their vessels than protection against foreign coal. Coal operators certainly do not want an import duty on coal to enable them to charge higher prices inside the United States than they sell it to foreigners.

While I think we should have a small duty, as hereafter explained, I want to say, "There speaks the patriot." There spoke the lover of the laboring people of his own country and friend of the freezing families of those who consume the product of his mines. If all those who have, through moneyed influence, procured the enactment of invidious protection laws had been actuated by this Christian spirit, how much it would have mitigated the sufferings of the people—how much lessened the ill-gotten gains of the more unscrupulous class of operators, who count their millions of profits made by "charging consumers at home more than they required foreigners to pay for their goods," and how many dark stains would never have appeared on our public records that now deface them

Again, Mr. Nixon says:

Very little ore of the South is sufficiently low in phosphorous for steel-making purposes, under present steel manufacturing processes, without additional manipulation. The steel ores of the United States which can be used under present conditions are west of the Alleghanies. Ores east of the Alleghanies require a mixture of Lake Superior, Cuban, or Mediterranean ores to make steel. This was announced publicly a few days ago by a vice-president of one of the largest steel mills in the United States. The foundry ores which can be used under present conditions come from the Lake Superior district, Alabama, Tennessee, and Virginia. Cuban and Spanish ores worked alone make Bessemer or steel iron, not foundry iron. This Cuban and Spanish ore is of entirely different character from the foundry ores of Alabama, Tennessee, etc.

Then, of course, as demonstrated above, it would not materially come into competition with our native ores, but, as Mr. Nixon further says:

If this Cuban and Spanish ore could be brought into the South as cheap as it is claimed it can be, after the removal of the duty, it can be used in combination with Alabama and Tennessee ore and produce a better grade of foundry iron, and dispense with the low-grade mill iron which is just now the bane of Southern furnace men. Cuban or Spanish ore mixed in proper proportion with Alabama and Tennessee ores would produce a Bessemer iron at lower cost than Northern furnaces can make it from Lake Superior and Pennsylvania ores.

Even after the removal of the duty of 75 cents per ton, foreign ores are not so cheap, as the import statistics of 1892 show. There was imported for the first quarter of 1892, 683,227 tons valued at $1,583,497, or $2.30 per ton at foreign port, exclusive of freight or duty. For the year 1892, we imported 806,585 long tons, value $1,795,644 or $2.23 per ton at foreign port. For the first nine months of 1893, we imported 487,179 tons, value $847,962, or $1.90 per ton at foreign ports. We imported from Spain in 1892, 236,959 tons, valued at $843,847 or $1.62 per ton at Spanish ports. From Cuba we imported in 1892 397,115 tons, value $618,232, about $2 per ton at Cuban ports. These prices do not alarm operators of Southern ore mines, who are delivering ores of standard quality at 50 to 75 cents per ton free on board cars. The superior management of American miners, and more economical methods of handling their material has never permitted foreign ores to penetrate a distance of 100 miles from the coast.

If abolishing the duty increases the importation of Cuban ore, which is of good quality, is near us, and can be cheaply transported by coal vessels returning empty, reduces the American methods, it will furnish return cargoes for our returning coal vessels from the West Indies, etc.; it can then be cheaply delivered to Alabama, Tennessee, and Virginia furnaces, and in combination with our cheap native ores produce just the grade of iron we want, and at lower cost than in any district in the United States. Grant that the removal of the duty on Cuban and Spanish ore starts up Eastern furnaces near the coast, they will not produce a grade of iron competing with Southern iron.

Even if they make foundry iron and reduce the market of Southern furnaces to this extent, the same conditions will enable the Southern furnaces to more than make up the loss * * * by access to this cheap free ore * * * and would enable and force the South to manufacture its furnace product into articles now coming from the North, which we buy at prices enhanced by freights and manufacturer's profits.

Besides—

Says Mr. Nixon—

southern furnace men and mine owners are skimming the cream in assembling the cheap material and manufacturing the iron only sufficiently to prepare it to be shipped to other manufacturers who get in the profitable work upon it. This system has already exhausted the cheapest or most easily mined ore in the Chattanooga district, and the end is in sight at Birmingham. Ten years will make cheap ores very desirable—foreign or otherwise.

The broad and liberal views here advanced show not only that the vast multitude who buy and use coal and iron products, but that even the business interests of mine owners and furnace men

will be advanced by the liberal policy which has always been advocated by the Democratic party, not only in the South but even on the Northern Atlantic coast and in New England. Further, the gentleman thinks that—

The proposed tariff modification will prevent the steel rail trust, which has throttled that industry so long and almost suspended railroad building, from maintaining unwarranted prices as they have heretofore, and put an end to many other trusts and combinations in the iron and steel manufacturing line.

I hope that this last consummation, so devoutly to be wished for, may be attained through the operation of the legislation of the Democratic party to be enacted during the present term of Congress, and that the people of the iron district I represent may be, through the same medium, promoted from being the "hewers of wood and drawers of water" in the iron industry and become the manufacturers of the finished articles in iron and steel industries, with facilities and capital not only to supply their home consumers, but to enter the markets of the world as fearless competitors. Give them untrammeled access to the best markets in which to sell and the cheapest in which to buy what they do not produce, and what need have the people of this country, so rich in resources, to apprehend from competition with the known commercial world.

I am not for putting a cent of duty on iron and coal for protection's sake, and would not attempt to add a duty of 40 cents if the present bill had cut down the duties on the manufactured articles to a proper revenue limit. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that so long as we raise so much money from import duties or tariff taxes there is obliged to be incidental benefits to different interests and different sections of our country resulting from legislation. This incidental benefit ought to be uniform, and as near as possible distributed equally and without partiality among the several interests and sections. The finished products of the East and Middle States have duties on them which in my judgment exceed the revenue point, and I think it but fair under these conditions to leave a small revenue duty on coal and iron to even up and equalize things. But, Mr. Chairman, if I can not get this I will vote for the bill anyway, as it is much better than the present illegal McKinley law. And I notify all the balance of the sections that no proscription can keep the manufacturing interest of the South down. If you make our coal and iron free, you will make us your successful competitors in the manufacture of all finished products. This will enlarge our field. It will give more men work and at better wages, and what you imagine will be a handicap may be the means of our early and full development.

Where the most iron is, go to it and dig it out if you must have it. Where the conditions are most favorable for manufacturing, go there and fashion the things that will answer best the demands of utility. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the McKinley law taxes all the necessities of the people to such an extent that the burden has become more than they can bear. Shall I give my vote to heap burdens upon them, or shall I let them go on and not protest while their scanty means go to the protected luxury, idleness, and debauchery that enlists tramps, fires anarchists, raises the red flag of communism, makes skeletons and nakedness and unshriven death?

One of the most outrageous and contemptible performances of the Republican party, one of its greatest "achievements," is the sugar bounty. They threw a tub to the Southern whale with this bounty on sugar. The Louisiana sugar-growers are paid a bounty of 2 cents a pound, enabling them to make fortunes in favorable crop years by an act of Government wrongfully and unlawfully granted. Not only that, but the Republican party has been mean enough to stain the gift with partiality to the beet-sugar growers in other sections, allowing the machinery used in beet-sugar manufacture to be imported free of duty, and requiring the Louisiana sugar-makers to pay a tax on their machinery.

The brave people of Louisiana ought to spurn such favors. There is no earthly semblance of authority for the law; no possible sense in the policy. This bounty cost us about $12,000,000 per year, and the law granting this bounty ought to be absolutely repealed and at once. We can not afford to indulge any part of this crime for eight years or for any length of time. Sugar is grown in but limited sections of the country. It has always been a revenue-producing commodity. It is one of the commonest essentials of the tables of our 65,000,000 people. It is bound to come here, and we may tax it lightly and get a good revenue, that the consumer will readily pay, if relieved of the staggering burdens that are put upon his other necessities, the taxation of which is not for purposes of raising revenues.

There are four or five thousand growers of maple sugar in New York and Vermont who, for the least bit of labor, get under the bounty law almost as much as the whole business amounts to. The man who raises wheat, corn, oats, hogs, chickens, watermelons—anything, in short, that the farm produces—is as much entitled to a bounty as the sugar-grower of Louisiana, the beet-sugar grower of California, or the maple-sugar grower of Vermont; but no class has a right to tax all the people to pay their bounties. It is one of the meanest things of which the party of "great achievements" is guilty. It is like the common sneak thief that seeks to attract attention to something across the street while he steals the contents of the wayfarer's pocket. It is one of the numerous bastards of the robber tariff.

As I have plainly said before, I am in favor of a graduated income tax that will force the wealth of the country to take up some of the burdens of taxation from which it has so long escaped, thus relieving the shoulders of the people of the weight of this much at least of what has almost pressed their faces into the dust. Why should large incomes of the rich few escape bearing its part of the pensions and other burdens which are bearing so heavy on the people.

If it is not possible to dispense with the dangerous banking system, which has always been the servant and friend of monopoly, trusts, and combines, amend the laws so that the currency may be increased and put into circulation, and let the national banks stop with the expiration of their charters and then let the Government cease to delegate this power to private corporations that may—as they have recently done—prostrate at will the business of the town community and reduce the rural environments to distress and almost hopelessness, by contracting or inflating the currency to conform to speculative conditions elsewhere.

The Government of the people alone should have the privilege of issuing notes to circulate among the people. The banks may receive deposits and discount notes, but they have no right within the intent and purpose of this Government to flourish at the expense of the people who pay the taxes that enable them to exist.

In short, I am in favor of Government privileges to nobody, and I shall vote that way all along the line. We are constantly told that we have the greatest banking system known; but we have recently seen that system leaguing with the agencies that make money dear instead of convenient, obeying and harking to calamity cries, forsooth, by the rich against the poor. If we talk about taking the tax off State banks, which is eminently right, we are warned about the fate of the wild-cat banks of other days.

Mr. Chairman, as far as concerns comparison of the two systems, and the influences they engender, I would prefer the wild-cats to the cowardly hyenas that dig in the graveyards of the hopes of my people. I venture to say that during their existence the wild-cat banks as a whole, in proportion to the capital employed, did more good for the convenience of the people, and were more honestly managed, than the national banks; that where one dollar of State-bank money was lost, ten dollars of money in national banks have been sunk.

I give you now some statistics that I have used before. If they are not exactly up to date they will, I am sure, be borne out by the latest Government authority. We pay as gratuity to manufactories, $4 for every $1 of import taxes. Figure it out for yourself, and you must be amazed to find out what Republican achievements in tariff legislation have cost us for the past thirty years. It is an amount that is nearly one-half the present value of all property in this country, which is $63,000,000,000, one-half of which is owned by about thirty thousand people against 65,000,000.

It may be interesting to know how much of the amount of tariff taxes we have been forced to pay under Republican legislation for the last thirty years, and what part of these taxes went into the Treasury; what has been the amount of increased profits which the protected manufacturers have been able to collect from us and put in their pockets of greed by means of their protected goods.

The two sums added together will be the total cost of our tariff taxation for thirty years. The amount of tariff taxes collected into the United States Treasury during this time is found in the last Statistical Abstract of the United States prepared by the Bureau of Statistics (No. 14, page 14). By adding up the column back to 1862 we find the amount to be $5,175,972,313.83. To find out the whole cost to this country of that tariff taxation, we must now add to this sum the increased profits or tribute which our protected home manufactures have made out of us. This tariff has enabled them to monopolize this country for the sale of their goods.

How much are these increased profits so paid by the people of this country to these petted and protected barons by reason of this tariff taxation? Experts and statisticians tell us that for every dollar we pay as import taxes we have paid from $2 to $5 increased profits to these protected home manufacturers. Taking the middle estimate—$4—as correct, and four times $5,175,972,313.83 makes $20,703,889,255.32, and these two sums added

together give us the stupendous amount of $25,879,861,569.15. This is what the Republican legislation on the tariff has cost the people in the last thirty years.

And subsidies, Mr. Chairman. What are Republican achievements in that direction? They have robbed the people of millions to give to rich corporations to build ships.

Go look in the harbor of New York. Scores and scores of luxuriantly appointed yachts and pleasure vessels costing from $15,000 to $200,000.

There is no earthly excuse for subsidies in our policy, and certainly no warrant in our Constitution. Sum up all the ships that enter and clear in the ports of Great Britain. Her ships coming and going outnumber those of all the vast world combined. It is simply because she has no embarrassing restrictions and gives to her merchant marine no special favors.

Her free fleets carry competition everywhere and bring to her little island treasures enough to make England the creditor nation of the world.

We need freer trade, free ships, free exchange of our abundant commodities, and we ask no advice or favors of the rest of the world either as to our policy of taxation or our system of finance.

And now in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I shall give my vote to the pending bill, not because its details meet my approval altogether—far from it, but solely because it is estimated that under its operation the common people pay in the aggregate as taxes, which go into the Treasury, $76,000,000 less than they do under the McKinley law, and estimating that it will likewise save them four times that amount, which they would otherwise be compelled to pay to the monopolists, thus saving the toilers of the nation $304,000,000 annually, quite a neat sum to protect them from hunger and cold. After carefully examining the bill I laid it down with disappointment, for many radical reforms were needed that are not made, and, as stated, I only give it my support because of its aggregate net results and because it at least recognized the principle of taxation for revenue only and is a start in the right direction. Its weakest point is not in a much greater and sweeping reduction on all the raw material for textile fabrics, but on everything the common masses are compelled to buy and consume, in providing economically for their own and their families' wants, and especially all the manufactured articles.

The committee, in my opinion, should have heeded the voice of the people in preparing their schedules, and the first thing they should have considered is, "How much revenue can be raised by a reasonable tax on the surplus incomes of our people." The details of the measure to be modeled after those most approved by practical experience of our own and other enlightened governments. Only the committee should not have failed to put a tax on all incomes of $5,000 or over. After having approximately ascertained the net sum to be thus realized, then the tariff on all the common necessaries of life should have been abolished and whatever deficiency would be left should have been raised by a duty on the luxuries of life. But Mr. Chairman, we think we are coming to the true standard and test of Democracy, and I believe and trust that at an early day of this session of a Democratic Senate and House of Representative such a measure as I have indicated will be introduced as an amendment to this bill and enacted.

The weak attempt at a dodge of this measure as advocated by the best political economists of the times, and demanded by the intelligent people of the country by recommendation of an income tax on corporations alone is too palpable and must fail. What is a tax in a corporation as such except a tax on the consumer of its products when applied to a great industrial corporation, such as water, gas, coal, iron, and even railroad companies? No, sir; give us the straight tax on all incomes of individuals and corporations which exceed $3,000 to $4,000 and let the per cent of tax increase as the income increases, and I shall feel we deserve the approval of our Democratic constituents.

Typical of its progress among our people, I quote you these sentences from a Republican who used to edit a newspaper in Arkansas—the Arkansas Republican, published at Little Rock. He became disgusted in the last campaign, and here is his valedictory:

> We must confess—very well-informed and candid men will confess that the Republican party compared to what it once was has become the mere plaything of partisan tricksters, of few brains and smaller hearts, traders in politics for personal aggrandizement, for purposes of plunder and pelf alone, indeed has become literally a den of thieves, recalling what Christ said to the money-changers, who trafficked in turtle doves for gain, "Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise."

I have tried to arraign the long-continued, and, as I conceive, unconstitutional policy of the Republican Administration preceding the advent to power of the Democrats on the 4th of March last. To show that notwithstanding the great blessing of Providence, the wonderful opportunities it had to equalize the vastly growing wealth and prosperity of the country among all its classes of people, it has unlawfully, wrongfully, and feloniously filched from the poor classes of our people and made their labor nonproductive of a competency, and at the same time transferred the legal rewards of honest workmen into the capacious pockets of our overgrown millionaires; has persistently and openly burdened one section beyond its capacity to bear and heaped favors on another section and class, and done all this under the forms of law and the cover of the catchword "protection," and yet, Mr. Chairman, boiling with indignation as such a shameful state of affairs justly excites, I was humiliated at the opening remarks of one of our Democratic members when at the late extraordinary session of Congress, and with the purpose, no doubt, to catch the Republican voter for the measure then pending before Congress, he said:

> When the gavel of the presiding officer descended upon the desk of the House on the 4th of March last, and members of Congress returned to their homes, they found the country blessed with universal prosperity.

It is a commentary on the results of thirty years of almost absolute Republican rule to which I want to record my earnest dissent. The condition of the body politic at the time specified was like the system of a man who has for months breathed the poisonous atmosphere of an infected locality, the effect of which left the patient in a disordered and sick condition, which will require the efforts of skilled physicians to restore to a healthy, normal state. The symptoms are to be found in an almost bankrupted Treasury, mountains of indebtedness, homes covered with mortgages, half their money destroyed, a great financial upheaval, a vicious civil-service law which grants to individuals a life tenure to office, and which violates the very genius of our free institutions, and the wholesome doctrine of rotation in office, the improper and ruinous pension system, the unequal and unjust distribution of appointive offices, to whom are paid annually millions of dollars out of the taxes of the people. And of this vast benefit the West and South are proscribed as they are in everything else, the Northeast getting at least two-thirds of these offices, and yearly sending these millions home to swell the vast fund of the East, and thus help to centralize all the money of the nation in this section. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, the great party of equal and exact justice to all men and special privileges to none, is the physician the people has called to remedy these things. Shall we be equal to the task? The action of this Congress will answer the question. In the President's message we find thirty years after the war, in time of profound peace, the improper and undemocratic recommendation for the power to issue and sell bonds of the United States, and thus increase the interest-bearing debt of the people in this way, and to lay a foundation for the perpetual continuance of the infamous and undemocratic system of national banks. This should receive such an emphatic, withering rebuke at the hands of a Democratic House and Senate that no other man will ever dare put such a poisoned deformity to the lips of true Democratic Representatives. That it is unwise—yea, wrong—no Democrat can gainsay.

It is only one of the plays of the powerful money combination to overwhelm the people and to finally destroy the ancient standard of gold and silver. It will not do to insist that bonds ought to be sold to increase our gold reserve, for we must concede that it is impossible for us to maintain more than our distributive share of the world's money—gold. And such as does come to us in the course of trade will not stay, if bought with bonds, if it exceeds this.

Others may do as they like, but as for myself I shall do all in my power to prevent the consummation of this crime against the interest, rights, and liberties of the people.

To meet this deficit let us coin silver, and if necessary empower the Secretary to issue Treasury notes redeemable in coin. In this way we can meet the demand without increasing the interest-bearing debt upon the people.

I have the highest hopes for the United States, and especially the part I expect my people to play in persuading a return to the immortal principles of our Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, the tottering honors of office for me do not carry a bubble's weight in the balance against my readiness and determination to serve my people either for what I believe is right and justice to them, or resist for them what I am convinced is wrong and oppression. I speak and I shall always vote to the line of that conduct. I have suffered with them and I have rejoiced with them. We have been companions in triumph and hand in hand in sorrow and defeat. Their interests and my honor are one. Their generous hearts and manly confidence have endowed me with this trust, and brief as it may be, rather than betray them, even by the connivance of my silence, I would prefer to quit this honorable place and go to my home among them, though an alternative were to have the highest office or wear the brightest crown of public opinion at the hands of other people. [Applause.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this bill deserves careful thought and consideration. I have no doubt but what the advocates of this measure are sincere and earnest in their advocacy of the same. I am sure they will not impugn our sincerity and honesty of purpose in opposing the measure. The opposition of the Republican and Democratic parties on the issue now before the House is not new, accidental, or arbitrary. It is historical and fundamental. The Republican party at its birth was consecrated to the cause of protection. As a party it has always declared that it is the bounden duty of the Government to develope and sustain our manufacturing interests against foreign competition, to protect the interests of laboring men of all classes, to enforce a policy intended to secure them employment and a proper remuneration for their toil.

The Democratic party by its history and principles has been for more than half a century committed to free trade, and in favor of a system which always degraded labor. True, it has been guilty time and again of trimming, straddling, and falsifying on this question in its efforts to climb into power and place, but back of its duplicity it has a deep-seated purpose. Its history, carefully and impartially read, will determine its position for those who wish to know the facts. In the Democratic national convention of 1848 it proclaimed to the people of the United States the "noble impulse given to the cause of free trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842." In its platform of 1856 it declared: "The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world"; and this is what it means by its declaration in the Chicago platform of 1892, "a tariff for revenue only."

The Wilson bill now under consideration brings the issue squarely before the country whether the American system of protection as taught and enforced by the Republican party for the past thirty-two years shall continue to be the business policy of the country, or whether we will adopt a free-trade policy, a system which has cursed and put a blight on every nation put under its baneful influence.

Mr. Chairman, the day has gone by for either free trade or protection to depend for support upon the theories of political economists. If they stand at all it must be on foundations made from the history and records of our own as well as European governments, in their march of national progress during the century now coming to a close. We no longer need the aid of college professor or political economist who lack practical knowledge of the world and its toiling millions to aid us in coming to an intelligent conclusion on the measure now under discussion. All we have to do is to study the facts gathered from the industrial history of our own and other nations.

The tariff question is not, as many suppose it to be, an abstruse and difficult subject. The principles involved are plain and clear. This question so full of interest has for almost a century entered into the homes and daily life of our people. Let us look at this question as it affects governments, especially our own country. If we take the facts of the past, they will aid us to understand and comprehend the present, and legislate for the future welfare of our people.

The Republican party "refuses to reject the teachings of a century's experience during which protective revenue tariffs have an equal chance to exhibit the result of their operations and their relative effects upon the material interests of the country."

HISTORY OF TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Our Government at its beginning was substantially without manufactures, and almost dependent on a nation 3,000 miles across the ocean. English solicitude in relation to our manufactories is of early date. In 1717 the House of Commons declared "that the erection of manufactories in the colonies tended to lessen their dependence upon Great Britain." The board of trade and plantations in 1731 and 1732, in pursuance of an order of the House of Commons to inquire into the industrial affairs of the plantations, charged that in New York, New England, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, in the colonies northward of Virginia, "the colonies" had fallen into the manufacturing of woolen and linen cloth; that they raised flax and hemp, which they manufactured into "a coarse sort of cloth, bags, traces, and halters," to supply the domestic demand; that they had established woolen mills for domestic manufactures, and that linen and cotton for shirting were made; that they "manufactured brown hollands for women's wear," and that the Assembly of Massachusetts had voted a bounty of 30 shillings for every piece of duck or canvas manufactured in the province; that great quantities of hats and leather were manufactured and exported to Spain, Portugal, and the West Indies; that in Massachusetts they had set up a paper mill; that they had established iron works, six furnaces and nineteen forges, and one slitting mill for the manufacture of bar iron and of "cast iron or hollow ware," all sorts of "iron for ships," and "a manufactory for nails;" and that they built many brigantines and small sloops, "which they sold in the West Indies."

Parliament passed severe, preventive laws to crush all infant industries in the colonies. One of the great wrongs against our forefathers in colonial days was the determined and persistent resolve of the mother country to prevent the establishment of various industries and keep us poor and dependent upon England. This interference led our forefathers to declare for national independence. So we find that English solicitude for our great industrial and manufacturing enterprises is of early date, from 1777 up to and including the year 1893. Great Britain has been persistent and constant in her efforts to paralyze and cripple the industry and degrade the workingmen of America by propagating in our land (using the Democratic party as their agent) British free-trade principles. From 1861 to the present time the Republican party has stood like a mighty and strong bulwark against British free traders and has compelled them to keep "Hands off!"—our protective system.

Although the breaking down of our great protective system would be of much interest and benefit to the French, German, Swiss, Italians, and Russians, yet we do not now hear and never have heard of any plans of France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, or Russia for an offensive intermeddling with our policy of protection. England alone all along the years of the century of our existence as a Republic has been offensively interfering with the domestic affairs of our people. The Republican party during the late war and ever since has entered its solemn protest against English intermeddling.

During the debate in extra session of the Fifty-third Congress, on the repeal of the purchasing clause of the silver bill known as the "Sherman law," our Democratic friends in favor of free coinage eloquently appealed to the members of the House not to legislate according to the wishes of the English people; that the time had come to call a halt and say to England, "Hands off!" My eloquent friend from Nebraska, Mr. BRYAN, who is now supporting this bill, in a burst of eloquence said, "Are we bond or free?" and then made the following impassioned appeal in referring to English intermeddling with our legislation on money matters:

> Suppose we try bringing her to terms by action. Let me appeal to your patriotism. Shall we make our laws dependent upon England's action and thus allow her to legislate for us upon the most important of all questions? Shall we confess our inability to enact monetary laws? Are we an English colony or an independent people? If the use of gold alone is to make us slaves, let us use both metals and be free. If there be some living along the eastern coast—better acquainted with the beauties of the Alps than with the grandeur of the Rockies, more accustomed to the sunny skies of Italy than to the invigorating breezes of the Mississippi Valley—who are not willing to trust their fortunes and their destinies to American citizens, let them learn that the people living between the Alleghanies and the Golden Gate are not afraid to cast their all upon the Republic and rise or fall with it. [Loud applause.]
>
> One hundred and seventeen years ago the liberty bell gave notice to a waiting and expectant people that independence had been declared. There may be doubting, trembling ones among us now, but, sirs, I do not overestimate it when I say that out of 12,000,000 of voters more than 10,000,000 are waiting, anxiously waiting, for the signal which shall announce the financial independence of the United States. [Applause.] This Congress can not more surely win the approval of a grateful people than by declaring that this nation, the grandest which the world has ever seen, has the right and the ability to legislate for its own people on every subject, regardless of the wishes, the entreaties, or the threats of foreign powers. [Applause.]

Let me add to what he has said, that out of "12,000,000 voters more than 10,000,000 are waiting, anxiously waiting for the signal which shall announce the" commercial, financial, and industrial "independence of the United States." "This Congress can not more surely win the approval of a grateful people than by declaring that this nation, the grandest which the world has ever seen, has the right and ability to legislate for its own people on every subject," and to declare for and maintain a protective policy, as well as a financial policy, which will bring to our people happiness and prosperity, "regardless of the wishes, the entreaties, or threats," of a Government, mightiest of all nations, whose "drumbeat, following the sunrise, encircles the globe."

TARIFF ACTS.

From the adoption of the first tariff act of 1779 and the levying of the war tariff of 1812, twelve additional tariff acts were passed generally increasing the rate of duty and adding to their protective power. The second tariff act was approved by President Washington on July 4, 1789. This act declared in no uncertain sound the doctrine of protection and the imposition of protective duties. The Senate gave it a unanimous vote, and the House of Representatives adopted it by four-fifths of its members voting for the bill. At the time of its passage both the Senate and the House contained a large number of men who had helped to frame and give a proper construction of the Constitution. The unquestioned result of these protective tariff acts had been to stimulate the growth of all the material inter-

osts of the United States. So marked was the result that it attracted the attention of foreign governments.

President Washington, in his annual message of December, 1795, made the following statement: "Our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures are prospering beyond former example" and "every part of the Union displaying indications of rapid and various improvement." In his message of December, 1796, he urged upon Congress "the necessity of accelerating the establishment of certain useful manufactories by the intervention of legislative aid and protection."

President Jefferson, in his message of December, 1801, said: "There is now reasonable ground of confidence that we may safely dispense with all internal taxes." Dispensing with all internal taxes and relying upon tariff duties for "support of the Government and the payment of the public debt," was Mr. Jefferson's idea of a correct financial policy to raise revenue. President Cleveland and the leaders of the Democratic party of to-day reverse this policy in the Wilson bill now under consideration, by decreasing the revenue from the tariff duties $75,000,000 below the demands and "the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered" by themselves. This deficiency is to be made up by increasing internal taxes, levying a direct tax on our own people, at the same time reducing the tax on foreigners. Do the Democratic party stand upon and do they give allegiance to the principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson and exemplified by Madison and Jackson, as they declared they would do in the Chicago platform of 1892?

Mr. Jefferson, in his message of December, 1807, advised Congress of the condition of the United States Treasury and of the surplus in the same over and above what was needed "for the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered," and said:

> There will still ere long be an accumulation of money in the Treasury beyond the installment of the public debt which we are permitted by contract to pay. The question, therefore, now comes forward, to what other object shall these surpluses be appropriated and the whole surplus of imports after the entire discharge of the public debt, and when purposes of war shall not call for them? Shall we suppress the import and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactories?

He was not afraid of a continuance of a protective policy, because it brought a large surplus to the Treasury.

Rather than have a healthy industrial system which was adding wealth to the nation and a large surplus to the Treasury destroyed, he answered the question in the negative and opposed a reduction of tariff rates. Mr. Jefferson, in his next message of December, 1808, in referring to the surplus in the Treasury, said:

> The accumulation of the surplus of revenue beyond what can be applied to the payment of the public debt, whenever the freedom and safety of our commerce shall be restored, merits the consideration of Congress. Shall it lie unproductive in the public vaults? Shall the revenue be reduced? Or shall it not rather be appropriated to the improvement of roads, canals, rivers, education, and other great foundations of prosperity and union under the powers which Congress may already possess.

When Mr. Jefferson delivered this message to Congress in December, 1808, the surplus in the Treasury amounted to $14,000,000, equivalent on the mere basis of population to a surplus to-day of $180,000,000, and equivalent on the basis of relative national wealth of the two periods of 1808 and 1893 of about $540,000,000. Mr. Jefferson advised adding to tariff rates to raise revenue, and the abandonment of internal taxes. Mr. Cleveland, in his message of December 5, 1893, advised this Congress to reduce tariff rates, even if such reduction causes a deficiency in the Treasury, and to levy internal taxes on incomes of corporations.

Mr. Jefferson as early as 1808 anticipated trouble with England. He had recommended the "embargo." Early in 1812, when it became evident a war would soon be waged by England against the United States, Congress passed a tariff bill in the highest degree protective, all existing duties were doubled, and 10 per cent was added to this rate upon all importations coming into our ports from foreign countries. This act was signed by President Madison July 1, 1812. Three years of war followed, and notwithstanding we had to maintain an army and shoulder the disastrous influences produced by the war, at the end of the struggle we were as a nation greater and richer than when the war began. In all our industrial pursuits we had made giant strides.

From 1779 up to 1816, when the high-tariff act of 1812 expired by its own limitation, under the protection afforded by acts of Congress our young Government prospered far beyond the expectations of the most sanguine advocates of a tariff policy to afford protection as well as the raising of revenue. Up to this period in the history of our Government we had not met with one of those, "mysterious but well-known periodical crises" the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the author of the bill now before us, told us about in his letter published in the New York Press December 10, 1893. He further stated in said letter in relation to the present industrial crisis now upon us as follows:

> Everything goes with a great swing, but suddenly we plunge into some hidden pitfall and ruin and disaster are piled around us.

Up to 1816 we had moved along in our growing prosperity in all our material interests "with a great swing" when we as a nation "fell into the hidden pitfall" dug, as I will try to show you, by the free traders in the passage of the low-tariff act of Congress of 1816. Up to this time there had been but little opposition to tariff legislation. All the acts I have mentioned prior to 1816 were passed without a division of party lines. The first struggle between the advocates of free trade and the advocates of protection began with the passage of the low-tariff act of 1816. The men who opposed this tariff bill for "revenue only" predicted that its enactment into a law would bring ruin and financial bankruptcy to our people. Disaster and widespread desolation followed its enforcement.

Permit me to quote from the speeches of two distinguished statesmen, delivered in Congress during its sessions of 1823 and 1824, giving a vivid as well as an accurate account of the condition our people were brought to by this vicious legislation. Mr. Clay said:

> The general distress which pervades the whole country is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestible character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by successive unthrashed crops of grain perishing in our barns for want of a market; by the alarming diminution of the circulating medium; by the universal complaint of the want of employment and a consequent reduction of the wages of labor, and above all, most every description of property in the nation has, on an average, sunk not less than about 50 per cent within a few years. It is most painful to me to dwell on the gloom of this picture. But I have exaggerated nothing. Perfect fidelity to the original would have authorized me to throw on deeper and darker hues.

Col. Benton, a Democrat of national fame, in the same debate, paid his compliments to the low tariff act of 1816 in the following words:

> No price for property or produce, no sale but those of the sheriff and the marshal. No purchasers at execution sales but the creditor or some hoarder of money. No employment for industry, no demand for labor, no sale for the products of the farm, no sound of the hammer but that of the auctioneer knocking down property, stop laws, property laws, replevin laws, stay laws, loan-office laws, the intervention of the Legislature between the creditor and the debtor; this was the business of the Legislature in three-fourths of the States of the Union. No medium of exchange but a depreciated paper, no change even, but little bits of foul paper marked so many cents and signed by some tradesman, barber, or innkeeper; exchanges deranged to the extent of 50 or 100 per cent. Distress the universal cry of the people. Relief the universal demand, thundered at the doors of all legislators, State and Federal

What a faithful and accurate description of the present condition of the country! President Cleveland in his message of August 7, 1893, says that the unfortunate state of affairs now hanging over our people was brought about by the following cause:

> I believe these are principally chargeable to Congressional legislation touching the purchase and coinage of silver by the General Government.

From 1816 to 1823 there was no "Sherman silver law" for the purchase and coinage of silver by the Government. But they did have the free-trade act of 1816. Since the 21st of August, 1893, we have had no law for the purchase and coinage of silver by the Government, the act being repealed on that day. Yet the pathway of ruin, disaster, and bankruptcy is broader and longer than it was prior to the 21st of August, 1893. Where we had twenty idle and hungry workmen we now have a hundred.

Therefore President Cleveland was in error when he stated that the purchase and coinage of silver by the Government was responsible for the unsatisfactory condition of the business of the country. We can, however, find the real cause in the election of a free-trade President by a free-trade party on the 8th of November, 1892, and their elevation to the full and complete control of every department of the Government on March 4, 1893. The mere threat of this party that it would wipe out all tariff legislation which gave protection to our industries, has brought our country to the same deplorable condition it was in in 1823, as described by Mr. Clay and Col. Benton under the hurtful influences of the act of 1816. Relief from the terrible condition our people found themselves in by the enactment of the low-tariff act of 1816 came through the enactment of the protective tariff act of 1824.

This act received the active and influential support of Col. Benton, Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, James Buchanan, Richard M. Johnson, Gen. Samuel Houston, and other prominent Democratic leaders in the Senate and House—men who did not believe in the position taken by the men who have undertaken to shape the destiny of the present Administration, that protecting our manufacturing and industrial pursuits was unconstitutional. They were men whose broad visions and far-reaching and comprehensive minds raised them on all questions relating to the business affairs of our people far above the low-lands of partisanship. The passage of the act of 1824 increased our

native exports, revived and widened the scope of our commerce. Crops again brought good prices in our markets; men again found employment at fair wages; the hammer of the forge and the humming of the spindles once more made music for busy workmen. It brought prosperity and contentment to the farmer, the manufacturer, the shipbuilder, to the mechanic and day laborer. For four years this universal prosperity continued to increase. Its influences had been so beneficial to the country, and the doctrine of protection had been so well vindicated, Congress passed another tariff bill in 1828 imposing still higher duties, and through it enforced the protective system with more vigor and zeal. The fathers of the Democratic party gave this measure their unqualified support. This act levied on wool a specific duty of 4 cents per pound and an ad valorem duty of 40 per cent, with a provision that at the end of two years it should be increased to 50 per cent.

SOUTH CHANGES TO FREE TRADE.

Shortly after the enactment into a law of the tariff act of 1828, the South for the first time began to show an aggressive and active hostility toward tariff legislation of a protective character. For some reason they had come to the conclusion that manufacturing could not be successfully conducted in the South; that free labor in the North and slave labor in the South were antagonistic to each other; that the slave would become discontented at the great advancement free labor was making in the North; that the independence and comfortable surroundings of the Northern workmen would eventually so affect the slave labor as to make it worthless and at last wipe slavery, as an institution, out of existence as an unprofitable thing.

Mr. Calhoun and other statesmen from the South, who had formerly stood by the principle of protection, began to see the change coming over their section, as well as the changed interests of the South. They established a policy to sell their cotton, rice, and tobacco in the highest foreign markets, and to receive back from foreign markets, at the very lowest prices obtainable, all manufactured goods and necessaries of life needed for their use. Upon African slavery in the South was founded the opposition of the Democratic party to the doctrine of protection. Hon. James G. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, says:

Just then and just there began also the change of the Northern Democratic party on the tariff, and of Northern "doughfaceism" on the question of slavery. Free trade and the extension of slavery formed a national partnership, and were thenceforward made the corner stones of Democratic policy.

The intense feeling that had been aroused in the breasts of the Southern people on the question of levying import duties high enough to afford protection became so strong that it caused President Jackson to finally cast the weight of his Administration against the interests of the North and in favor of the free-trade dogma (so lately embraced by Calhoun, McDuffie and other leaders of the South) by a strong and lengthy statement in his fourth annual message sent to Congress in December, 1832, and by his indorsement of the compromise act of 1833. The first reduction of tariff of 1828 was effected by the act of 1832.

I would most earnestly urge the Democratic members of this House from the North, East, and West, representing rich agricultural and manufacturing districts, to read the speeches made in the famous tariff debate of 1832, by such men from the South as Gen. McDuffie of South Carolina, Bell of Tennessee, Clayton of Georgia, Garnett and DeJannette of Virginia, because the same motives and the same reasons which moved these men in their opposition to the North and its prosperity under a protective policy are exactly the same motives and reasons that animate and dominate the Southern Democracy in their solid advocacy of the Wilson bill. The plain-spoken, eloquent reformers from the Southland for a low tariff in that debate had the full and unwavering courage of their convictions.

Some of them stood ready to urge their States to go out of the Union, as they afterward did in 1861. The same spirit which filled the people of the South in 1832 with jealousy and dissatisfaction toward the people of the North, growing out of the tariff issue, fires the Southern heart to-day as much as it did in 1832. Gen. McDuffie was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and was the author of the tariff act of 1832. His position on the committee made him the leader of the free traders. He was a great lawyer and a man of splendid oratorical powers. He made two of the most powerful speeches ever delivered in the Congress of the United States in favor of free trade. It is said of him when "seen with the pack of his passions in full cry, he was indeed a mighty hunter, whose cause no ordinary arm could oppose."

Edward Everett said of him at the close of the debate on the tariff act of 1832 that he was "second to none" of the illustrious sons of the South; that he wished to see him in the highest office of the Government, although there was "none high enough to add to the honors of his name." Mr. Chairman, I have called especial attention to this illustrious statesman from the South for the reason that I desire to call the attention of the House to some portions of his speech and the speeches of his colleagues, so that I may present clearly the position of the Southern Democracy on the issue now before us. The free-trade battery is pointed the same way in 1893 as it was in 1832, masked now, unmasked then. The same arguments, with some coloring and shading, are being made in 1893 as were made by Gen. McDuffie and his colleagues in 1832. The South had no sympathy in 1832 for our great industrial interests in the North; they have none in 1893.

Mr. McDUFFIE (pointing to the marble statue over the main entrance to the House, now Statuary Hall, representing the Muse of History, seated in the winged car of Time, recording events as they fly). Said the record which history shall make up may present the issue between two great contending parties.

So the record which history has made up presents to-day the issue once more between the two great parties now contending for the control of the affairs of the nation and its vast and vital interests. In his speech Gen. McDuffie said:

It can no longer be disguised that there does exist under the unjust and oppressive legislation of Congress a radical hostility of interests between the two great subdivisions of this Confederacy. Strike protection to the earth, never to rise again. The ingenuity and wickedness of man could not devise a scheme more perfectly adapted to impoverish and desolate the Southern States and enrich the Northern States by their spoils.

Against what is it that the manufacturers clamor so loud for protection? They desire to be protected against a fair, equal competition with productions of Southern industry. Involve it, mystify it, disguise it as you may, to this complexion it must come at last. The real invaders against whom this clamorous uproar for protection is raised are the planters of cotton, tobacco, and rice. These are the true rivals of the Northern manufacturers.

His favorite illustration, to show why Northern labor under a protective policy should not be paid higher wages than the slave labor was paid in the South, was this: "He supposed the case of two partnerships, one producing woolen goods in Rhode Island and Connecticut, and the other raising cotton in South Carolina, which was taken to England and exchanged for a cargo of woolen goods, which was then brought back to Charleston, Richmond, or Savannah, in which ports it encountered the competing cargo of woolen goods made in Rhode Island and Connecticut, and shipped coastwise from the North. On the cargo of woolens from across the ocean there was a duty of 40 per cent; on one down the ocean, none. The planting company (raising cotton in the South) will realize from the productions af their honest and lawful industry in their own peculiar market (meaning foreign markets) $20,000 less than the manufacturing company (North) will receive for the same quantity of their products of same quality." He knows that the $20,000 was the difference in wages paid to the workmen in making both cargoes. Our American skilled labor received $20,000 more than the unfortunate and pauper laborers of England.

Mr. Garnett of Virginia made the following complaint about Northern workingmen. I wish I could burn it into the memory of every workingman of the North who votes to keep the Democracy in power; because the South holds the same opinion of them to-day. He said:

It is the free labor of the North which now controls the press, the bar, the schools, and pulpit. It is the free labor of the North which has invaded the sanctity of God's altar and compelled its ministers to acknowledge its divinity by dethroning Jehovah and worshiping Beelzebub. It is the free labor at the North which has invaded the highest judicial tribunal of justice, destroying its prerogatives and teaching men to despise its decrees. Sir, it has so shattered the framework of society that society itself exists only in an inverted order at the North. Capital at the North for a long time waged an unequal contest with labor. It looked then to the Government, and found that impotent for aid. For momentary security it seemed to sympathize in the objects of the fanatics and to point to the institutions of the South as fit objects for attack.

"Restore the peace and harmony which this system [protection of Northern labor] has destroyed," said Hayne of South Carolina, "and I will consent that every manufacturing establishment shall be razed to its foundation which has been built up and can only be sustained by this accursed system." "Were there no black slaves in the United States," said Niles, in a sentence which summed up a volume, "there would be no opposition to a protection of the labor of white freemen." The friends of protection openly declared it was their purpose to prevent the laboring men of the North from going down on a level with the slave of the South and pauper labor of Europe.

Mr. McDuffie and his colleagues challenged their right to elevate the workingmen of the North up to a higher plane than the one occupied by the black men of the South and of the poorly paid toilers of Europe. They proposed to sell or trade the products of their slave labor for goods in foreign markets made by the men and women whose daily wages were not sufficient to keep them from absolute want and distress and to bring these cheap goods to America without paying any more duties on them than was absolutely necessary to support the Government. All this was to be done without any regard to protecting the free white labor of the North. That is again the issue now before us between the same sections of our country, "involve it, mystify it, disguise it as you may."

In order to give more emphasis and strength to the position I have just stated, I will quote another statement made by Mr. McDuffie:

The aggregate—

Said he—

of all the other elements of price, except the wages of labor, is decidedly less in England than in the United States. Does it not follow with demonstrative clearness that in free competition for the market of the United States the wages of manufacturing labor in the Northern States must be reduced at least as low as the wages of the same labor in England.

Again he says:

I never will consent that the price of their [meaning laborers of the North] labor shall be enhanced to an unnatural price by the disguised appropriation of one-third of the proceeds of Southern labor for their use and benefit.

The declarations of Gen. McDuffie, reiterated and confirmed by his Southern colleagues, gave the keynote to the free-trade argument of 1832, and secured the passage of the act of 1832, reducing the duties laid under the high tariff act of 1828. The intense feeling aroused in the South by the debate of 1832 caused great alarm within the ranks of the friends of protection. Henry Clay and other Whig leaders were afraid that the South would enter into a rebellion against the Government, and in order to satisfy the South Mr. Clay brought into the Senate the compromise bill of 1833, which provided for a biennial reduction of duties on all foreign imports which should exceed 20 per cent on the value thereof of one-tenth of such excess up to 31st of December, 1842, when the residue of such excess should be deducted.

Once more in the history of tariff legislation a great wrong had been perpetrated against our people. Under the protective act of 1828 the workingmen of the North had steady and profitable employment. The enforcement of the compromise tariff of 1833 began to be felt in 1834, when the first reduction had been made, and in 1837, the year following the election of Mr. Van Buren to the Presidency, another panic came upon the country. The devastation following it beggars description. No words could be employed to truthfully paint the scene of desolation it brought in its path. Wreck of private fortunes, ruin of great manufacturing corporations, banks closed; thousands upon thousands of idle workmen were found parading the streets, having printed upon their banners, "We must have bread or blood."

The universal ruin of all kinds of business called into existence the bankruptcy act of 1841. If the Wilson bill becomes a law my friend, Col. OATES of Alabama, will have no trouble to pass a bankrupt bill before this Congress adjourns. The effects produced by the act 1833 caused a revolt in the Northern wing of the Democracy. In the Presidential election of 1840, the Democratic party was swept out of power by an indignant and outraged people, as they will be again in 1896 if this bill becomes a law. [Applause on the Republican side.] In 1836, when Mr. Van Buren was elected President, his Whig opponent, Gen. Harrison, carried but seven States, receiving 73 electoral votes. So emphatic was the rebuke the Democratic party received for forcing on the people their destructive free-trade dogma that in the Presidential election of 1840 Mr. Van Buren carried but seven States, receiving only 60 electoral votes.

The Whig party, as soon as the Departments of the Government had passed into their hands, carried out the demand for a protective tariff by the enactment of the high-tariff law of 1842. At once a phenomenal activity of all manufacturing and commercial business interests set in. Prosperity took on new life, and by 1844 the nation was once more well on the pathway to wealth and happiness. The terrific defeat of the Democratic party in 1840, the general revival of all industrial pursuits under the fostering influences of the high-tariff act of 1842, as well as the strong sentiment existing against tariff legislation for "revenue only" compelled the Democracy in the memorable Presidential campaign of 1844, between Mr. Clay and Mr. Polk, to take a position in favor of the doctrine of protection.

Mr. Polk, to save himself and his party from defeat, wrote a letter in which he declared that protection should be continued to our manufacturing and other industrial pursuits. Mr. George Dallas, a citizen of Pennsylvania, was on the ticket with Mr. Polk for the office of Vice-President, as an earnest of their purpose to enforce the collecting of duties as laid under the act of 1842 and to prevent its repeal. Mr. Dallas wrote a letter in which he pledged himself, if elected, he would, as the presiding officer of the Senate, in the event a tie vote occurred in that body on a bill to repeal the act of 1842 vote against repeal. Many men now living, and some of them members of this House, will remember the fact that upon the banners of the Democracy, carried all through the North in the campaign of 1844, was written, "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of 1842."

Upon these pledges Mr. Polk and Mr. Dallas were elected, and once more the Democracy was returned to power. The Hon. Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi, was made Secretary of the Treasury, and under his direction the low-tariff act of 1846, including a section repealing the high-tariff act of 1842, was framed. This measure received all the support the Polk Administration could give it, and by a large vote from the South, contributed by the free-trade Democracy, aided by their Democratic henchmen from the North, it passed the House of Representatives. In the Senate the vote was a tie, and Mr. Dallas, without even an apology for his rank perfidy, cast the deciding vote in favor of the act of the act of 1846, and also in favor of the repeal of 1842.

Depression again followed. However, the downward tendency was to a considerable extent checked, a panic prevented, and the predicted destruction of our industrial pursuits delayed by certain events, or rather incidents, following the enactment of the Walker tariff of 1846. Shortly after President Polk had signed this measure, within eighteen months, war was declared against Mexico. This war caused an expenditure of about $160,000,000 in addition to the ordinary expenses of the Government. Then followed the great famine in Ireland, giving us a large export trade in flour, grain, pork, and breadstuffs, bringing back to our people vast sums of money. Before the famine had come to an end the European revolution of 1848 destroyed trade and manufacturies to a large extent throughout the continent, and gave our people a large field and demand for exports, bringing enormous sums of money into the American trade market.

In the latter part of the same year gold was discovered in California. From the Eastern States thousands of men wended their way to the land of sunsets and gold. Very soon the yellow metal flowed back across the Rocky Mountains into the business marts of the old States. New industries sprang into life. It gave a sufficient stimulus to all our commercial and industrial pursuits to make them satisfactory and healthful up to 1854. During this year the gold yield began to fail, and the impetus it had given to our business over the country was more than supplied by the great war between England, France, and Russia on the shores of the Black Sea. This terrific contest was waged for two years, during which time our tradesmen and manufacturers exported largely, and had a ready and profitable market for their goods and wares.

Peace was declared in 1856. France and England once more started the fires in their furnaces. The wheels and looms of their factories were again put in motion. Russia again sowed and reaped her grain. Within a few months after the close of the war Russia, France, and England were shipping their products into our markets. In 1857, the causes I have mentioned which contributed so largely to the welfare of our trade had come to an end. The Democratic party attributed all of the prosperity to the Mexican war, the famine in Ireland, the European revolutions, the discovery of gold in California; the war between the three leading powers of Europe had brought to our country the effects of the low tariff act of 1846. In pursuance of this belief they passed the tariff act of 1857, further reducing the low duties laid by the Walker tariff of 1846. We were once more put squarely into competition with the cheap labor of Europe. Free trade was given another fair chance to demonstrate its influence for good or evil. The result of the operation of this act was in the highest degree fatal. It took effect July 1, 1857.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. If I remember correctly, the House of Representatives elected in 1856 was Republican, and Nathaniel P. Banks of Massachusetts was elected Speaker.

Mr. MAHON. I will not dispute with the gentleman as to that, but he means Whig, not Republican. But whether the act came from a Whig or from a Democratic House, that tariff act of 1857 was passed in the hope that this country could sustain herself; but before President Buchanan had been inaugurated——

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. When did the Congress that was elected along with President Buchanan meet? Was there a special session called?

Mr. MAHON. I do not remember. I suppose it met in the December following the election.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. That Congress, unless there was an extra session, did not meet until the 1st Monday in December, 1857, I suppose.

Mr. MAHON. I suppose not.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. And the panic, if I am historically correct, began long before December in that year, with a Whig or Republican Congress in power.

Mr. MAHON. No, sir. It was not a Republican Congress; it was a Whig Congress, and one-half of it was from the South. But whether that was a Whig Congress or a Democratic Congress, the panic did not come until after the tariff act of 1857. President Pierce signed the act of 1857 on March 3, 1857. Panic came on about September 1 following.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Does the gentleman say that the low tariff act of 1857 was passed before the 1st of December in that year.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. And does not the gentleman know that the panic began in September, 1857?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir. It did commence after the President had signed the tariff act of 1857, and if you read the history of your country you will find that true.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I am only asking you for information, but I do not think you are correct.

Mr. MAHON. I think I am. That was an act reducing the Walker tariff, and after that another panic struck this country which swept everything before it like a tornado.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MAHON. I have very little time.

Mr. WARNER. Only a short one. I was about to ask the gentleman whether, having read the history of his country, he would not agree with me on this point, that the tariff of 1857 was passed in view of the then approaching crisis; that it was framed with a view to remedy the cause of the crisis; that the only trouble about it was that it did not go into operation soon enough, and that the moment it did go into operation the wheels of commerce started up again and we had general prosperity until the breaking out of the war?

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that no man in this country ever dreamed in 1857 that the Southern people would so far lose their judgment or their reason as to break out into open rebellion against the Government. And I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] that the first tariff act made by the Republican party was the result of the action of the people of Pennsylvania, who in 1860 elected Andrew G. Curtin governor of the State. Read the message of President Buchanan in 1857–'58. It is the exact counterpart of the message sent to this House by President Cleveland in August last. It is the same story told by Col. Benton and Henry Clay in 1824; the same story that was told in 1843. Mr. Buchanan recommended tariff legislation to increase the revenues of the Government, but a Democratic Congress absolutely refused.

The result was they went out of power, the National Treasury was bankrupt, our men were idle, our industries paralyzed, and the Government of the United States was begging money at the rate of 12 and 16 per cent in the markets of the world, and refused at that.

In the mean time the Republican party had grown up out of the ashes of the old Whig party, and in 1860 that party put Abraham Lincoln upon its ticket, and in the old State of Pennsylvania we fought that campaign upon the doctrine of protection. What was the result? Although under the Democratic régime from 1844 to 1860 with but little interruption we had been under a low tariff, the people of this country turned the Democratic party out of power. But before Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated the Morrill tariff bill was passed. James Buchanan, from the great protective State of Pennsylvania, was President, and, with all his shortcomings and failings, let it stand as a monument to his credit that he signed that bill.

As to the act of 1857, during the time that law stood upon our statute book, the country was in a state of panic and business depression. President Buchanan, in his message sent to Congress in December following the passage of the act, described the condition of the country. He said: "With unsurpassed plenty in all the elements of national wealth, our manufactories have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want." Mr. Buchanan appealed to his Democratic Congress to so legislate that prosperity might return, but he appealed in vain. Hon. Howell Cobb, Mr. Buchanan's Secretary of the Treasury, in his report of December 1, 1857, and his report of 1858, discussed at length the "disastrous revulsions in trade and commerce."

During Mr. Buchanan's Administration in 1857, 1858, 1859, up to December, 1860, the Government was a steady borrower of money to meet its ordinary expenses, and at the end of Mr. Buchanan's Administration the National Treasury was bankrupt, and its credit impaired. Little did the Southern Democracy and their servile allies from the North care about the condition the country was in. They had enlarged their slave territory by the acquisition of Texas and the purchase of Mexican territory. They were grasping after more power to enable them to cope successfully with the free States. The South was plotting a rebellion against the Government. Another Presidential election was near at hand; the people of the North were aroused; they determined that the free traders and slave-holding element of the South should no longer force their free-trade theories on them.

The South was determined to do so, or if they failed in retaining their control of the Government the Southern States would secede and set themselves up as an independent government. A government where no import duties would be laid except for revenue; a government where a laboring man, white or black, would not be permitted to wear the mantle of manhood and self-respect; a government where the free labor of the North could not destroy their cheap slave labor, and by so doing wipe out slavery as an institution. That which Mr. McDuffie and his Southern colleagues anticipated in their speeches in the famous tariff debate was near at hand. He spoke of open rebellion; he argued that the "South must not yield an inch or an ell to the encroachments of free labor and protection."

> My deep and deliberate conviction in the face of all the miserable cant and hypocrisy with which the world abounds on this subject, that any course of measures which shall hasten the abolition of slavery by destroying the value of slave labor will bring upon the Southern States the greatest political calamity with which they can be afflicted, for I sincerely believe that when the people of those States shall be compelled by such means to emancipate their slaves they will be but a few degrees above the condition of slaves themselves. Yes, sir, mark what I say, when the people of the South cease to be masters by the tampering interference of this Government, direct or indirect, they will assuredly be slaves. It is the clear and distinct perception of the irresistible tendency of this protecting system to precipitate us upon this great moral and political catastrophe that has animated me to raise my warning voice that my fellow-citizens may foresee and, foreseeing, avoid the destiny that would otherwise befall them.

The South was determined to nationalize slavery and force it into the free Territories and States. This new party, called the Republican party, opposed this movement. The Republican party elected Abraham Lincoln President. The South had lost. The Democratic party was once more disowned by the people of the North and turned out of power. The rebellion so long predicted followed. The Republican party promptly repealed the low-tariff act of 1857, and passed the Morrill high-tariff act of 1861. Under the benign influence of this act, which was signed by President Buchanan before he retired from office, over and above a great and cruel war, in which battles were fought before which the battles of Alexander, of Hannibal, of Cæsar, and of Napoleon "pale their ineffectual fires;" over and above a war costing the Government almost countless millions of money, and the loss of nearly a half million of men, who went down in the hell of battle in order that the best government God ever looked upon might be saved from destruction at the hands of the free-trade Democracy of the South; over and above the destruction of the loss of the trade of the eleven seceded States, the Government grandly, yes, magnificently sustained itself. [Applause on the Republican side.] The devastation of war was repaired. From 1861 up to 1890 the Republican party by various tariff acts maintained and enforced the principle of protecting our industrial pursuits, which brought to us as a nation wealth and prosperity. Prince Bismarck, in a speech delivered by him in the Reichstag, May 12, 1882, paid the following tribute to protection. He said:

> The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern time. The American nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterward disbanded its army, found work for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, given labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within the territory, and still by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt. Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

In the Fifty-first Congress, 1890, the McKinley bill was passed, and from the day it became a law, up to 8th of November, 1892, the growth of our prosperity was unprecedented in all our history. [Applause on the Republican side.] The marvelous onward movement of the great business interests of the country was so well and fully described in an article lately published in the Manufacturers' Journal that I beg leave to quote a portion of same. "Never before were the protected industries so continuously employed as during the period" from 1890 to the fall of 1892, "and never was the amount of product so large.

The volume of traffic exceeded all precedent. The aggregate payments of the clearing houses were the heaviest upon record; and the aggregate railroad earnings were the largest. The dimensions of our foreign trade expanded farther than ever before, both the exports and imports being greater than any heretofore recorded. We made in 1892 1,000,000 tons more pig iron than in 1891, our product of 1892 exceeding that of Great Britain by about 2,000,000 tons. The output of Bessemer steel ingots was the largest in the history of the industry, and the steel rail production exceeded that of 1891 by more than 200,000 tons. The consumption of iron by the people was several hundred thousand tons greater than in any previous year.

The prosperity of a nation may be fairly estimated by the consumption of wool. This nation now consumes one-third of

the world's gross product. In 1892 the American wool clip exceeded that of 1891 by nearly 26,000,000 pounds, and the domestic consumption of wool increased in 1892 by 59,000,000 pounds. We grew more wool than at any time since 1883; we imported more than in any recent year, and we consumed more woolen fabrics while importing $24,000,000 worth less than in 1891. The high tariff increased the domestic clip, increased the imports of raw wool, put every American mill into profitable operation, so that manufacturers and laborers were fully employed and caused no advance worthy of mention in the prices of the fabric. This industrial activity was accompanied by conditions of unusual stability among producers, for the number of commercial failures was smaller than in any year since 1882.

These facts supply the proof that last year the prosperity of the American people touched high-water mark. With less idleness, greater employment of capital, larger domestic trade, larger foreign trade and unprecedented creation of wealth, there were better wages for workmen, a smaller amount of disaster, a closer approach to industrial independence, a richer development of natural resources and a lower range of prices for consumers than the nation has known since its foundation. The year 1892, in truth, was the banner year of the well-being of the Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

No logic is so cogent as the logic of facts, and the facts indisputably show that the most highly protected nation of the world is the nation forming only about one-eighteenth of the population of the earth, which has the largest manufactured product, which owns more than one-half of the railroads of the world, which spins one-fourth of the cotton, consumes one-third of the wool, uses three-fourths of the tin plate, one-third of the coffee, one-third of the copper, and one-half of the world's product of iron and steel; which surpasses all competitors in the production of steel rails and offers the lowest rates for transportation over those rails; which pays the highest wages to labor, and which is the only nation that ever paid more than $1,000,000,000 of debt within thirty years. The progress made during those thirty years of continuous protection has been far greater than that accomplished during the whole of the preceding seventy years, and we confidently affirm that the movement forward was due, more than to anything else, to the persistent adherence of the American people to the policy of protecting their industries from unequal European competition.

It is defiant of reason to contend that these wonderful results were attained in spite of supposed hindrances offered by protection. No nation, whatever its natural opportunities, could make headway at such a pace while persistently permitting unsound economical principles to control its policy. At the close of the year 1892 the United States was the leading manufacturing country in the world. We had in the magnitude of our industrial operations outrun all other governments on the face of the globe. President Harrison's message of December 4, 1892, fully confirms this statement. We have just laid the foundation. In natural resources we are richer than all of Europe. We have barely touched our mineral wealth. Permit the McKinley law to control the business policy of this Government for the next ten years and our greatness as a great producing and manufacturing nation will be almost incomprehensible.

When prosperity was well mounted,
She let go the bridle, and soon came
Tumbling out of the saddle.

THREE GREAT FACTS.

Mr. Chairman, from our history and experience on the tariff question who will be bold enough to deny that three great facts have been proven beyond all controversy:

First. That a low tariff has never brought prosperity to our country. But, to the contrary, large importations of products of pauper and poorly paid labor have always destroyed our industries, agriculture and manufacturing suffering the most, throwing out of employment our American wage-earners.

Second. That we never recovered from the panics following low tariff until we enacted a protective tariff. That is the second proposition.

Mr. BLANCHARD. And both wrong. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAHON. Well, you may prove it when I am through. Give me sufficient time and I can satisfy you on that point.

The high-tariff act of 1824 lifted the country from the effects of the low-tariff act of 1816. The high-tariff act of 1842 relieved the country from depression caused by the compromise tariff of 1833. The high-tariff act of 1861 brought us back from bankruptcy produced by the low-tariff act of 1857.

Third. From the time Mr. Calhoun and the other leaders of the Southern Democracy compelled, willing or unwilling, the Northern wing of their party to be submissive to their wishes, they have always insisted and demanded that all protective tariff laws should be repealed, even though repeal would bring ruin and disaster to all Northern interests. In the enforcement of this demand the Democratic members of Congress (with but few exceptions) from the North have helped them in destroying the welfare and happiness of the people they represented.

To-day we find Mr. Cleveland and his party following the old paths of the South, as well as its instincts, in their efforts to destroy the McKinley bill and destroy the last shred of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Can anything be clearer than the fact that the solid Democracy of the South are to-day placing their opposition to protection on the same ground on which they have stood since 1832. Their views, interests, and sentiments yet live. The agricultural products of the South are yet the same. Negro labor is just as essential as ever to the raising of cotton, rice, and tobacco. The black population is yet subordinate, if not slave. Congress enacted laws to give the ex-slave the rights of a freeman and a just measure of political power. These laws are set at naught by the Democracy of the South. The black man has no real voice in the government of the Southern States. Who are the governing class of the South? They are Democrats, and not only so, but solid in their cohesion and adherence to their old policy of free trade.

To further strengthen my position that the Democracy of the South hold the same faith on the tariff question now as they did in 1832, I desire to show with what accuracy fifty-six years later, when the Mills bill was before Congress, in 1888, the same arguments made in 1832 by Mr. McDuffie and his colleagues were repeated by the Southern advocates of the Mills bill. Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi, in his speech of May 13, 1888, cited Southern authority for the assertion that "there is no new South" and that the term is a misnomer and a myth. It would seem difficult, in respect to the tariff question, to find a "new South." Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi, in his speech of May 9, 1888, said: "As has been stated long ago" (no doubt referring to debates of 1832 and 1833), "and I but repeat an argument founded upon the 'Rock of Ages' as far as its truth is concerned, when you impose unjust taxes upon imports you, by construction, impose unjust taxes upon exports"—meaning cotton, rice, and tobacco.

Mr. BOATNER of Louisiana, in a speech on the McKinley bill, said:

It is utterly impossible that the imposition of a tariff tax can do the person in whose favor the tax is imposed any good, that it can give him any advantage, unless at the same time it impose a corresponding disadvantage on some one else; and I say, sir, that the cotton-growing States of the Union ever since 1865, ever since the adoption of the protective tariff system, have been compelled to contribute to the East and the West nearly all or all of the profits of their labor by reason of the protective system, from which they have derived no corresponding benefit, either directly or indirectly.

Same old doctrine: to lower the tariff the South will grow richer just in proportion as the North, West, and East is made poorer.

Clayton of Georgia, in speaking of Northern workmen and farmers, put the Southern side with much frankness when he said:

It follows, then, that the farmer who gets a market for his pigs and potatoes, his onions and leeks, and a thousand other things that can not be carried to Europe, is well able to bear the tax upon consumption on what little he does not make himself, because he has an increased means of supply by reason of this market erected immediately at his door. It follows, also, that the laborers at the factories can willingly bear the tax of consumption, because without this employment they would be cut off from the means of support. Without this business they would have to fall back upon the agricultural pursuits; and having no market for their productions they would have to experience finally a loss of labor from a glutted country. Indeed, the whole system is an artfully devised plan to find a market for small productions and employment for paupers.

What stronger arguments can be produced to induce members of this House from the North, West, and East, regardless of their political affiliations to vote with their own people by voting against this measure. I appeal to the Democratic members who represent great manufacturing and rich agriculture States, to do as the members from the South are doing. Stand by your people, your section, and your convictions on this question, which so largely enters into their everyday life.

Constituents of many Democratic members from the North are anxiously asking, where are our members on the tariff question. I can best answer this inquiry by an old story, no doubt you all have heard. An English gentleman went to India to hunt tigers. After an absence of several months, a cablegram reached his family in London announcing the fact, that the Englishman during a hunt had been killed by a tiger, and that his body had been shipped home on a certain steamer. The casket arrived in due time, was taken to his home and opened, and to the surprise of his family all the coffin contained was a large tiger with a bullet hole through its head. His wife supposing a mistake had been made, sent a dispatch asking what had been done with the body of her husband. The answer came back. "You will find it inside of the tiger." So I answer, you will find the Northern Democratic members of Congress inside the stomach of the free-trade Democracy of the South. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side].

I want to compliment our Southern friends for the bravery and courage shown by them, in standing by what they believe to be for the best interest of their people and their section of country. They have in solid phalanx so stood on the tariff issue from 1832 to 1893, a period of over sixty years. They have voted for it in the halls of Congress. They have fought for it on the battlefields of the rebellion. Although defeated and impoverished in the great struggle, we find them here to-day with solid ranks trying to secure in the peaceful halls of legislation that which they failed to secure with the sword. I admire such devotion to one's own people and country, even if the principle they contended for is radically wrong. These people, once convinced of their error—and I hope the day is not far distant when they will see the light—no power could swerve them from adopting the system of protection.

Neither spoils of party nor any other base consideration could move them from the right or left away from their convictions and a policy they believed would be for the good of their people. Let me say to you, brave, gifted, hospitable, and generous people of the sunny South, we of the great North, West, and East, want you to share with us our prosperity, given to us by protection, a principle in every respect eternally right. Let me repeat, the issue now under consideration is a sectional one, made so by the South, hide it away as you may.

The South against the North, East, and West. The South once more making an effort to revolutionize the economic surroundings of the Government, and by so doing bankrupt two-thirds of our manufacturing establishments and cripple the other third, prevent the building up of new enterprises, and bring millions of workmen and those dependent upon them to idleness and want. [Applause on the Republican side.]

EFFECTS OF THREATENED REPEAL.

The industrial census taken by the American Tariff League, 684 reports from 44 different States, tabulated up to September 4, 1893, shows the following results: Number of hands employed November 9, 1892, 169,423; number employed September 4, 1893, 67,660; weekly wages paid to wage-earners November 8, 1892, $1,762,288.30; wages paid September 4, 1893, $549,436.94. Decrease in labor since November 5, 1892, is 60½ per cent; decrease in wages since November 5, 1892, is 69 per cent.

State.	Reports.	Hands employed.		Weekly wages.	
		Nov. 5, 1892.	Sept. 2, 1893.	Nov. 5, 1892.	Sept. 2, 1893.
Alabama	7	1,009	526	$11,142.55	$2,393.56
Arkansas	4	270	212	1,800.00	1,608.00
California	4	375	345	8,374.60	8,251.00
Colorado	3	675	326	16,820.00	4,630.00
Connecticut	39	9,909	5,435	91,226.26	37,441.29
Delaware	2	1,401	889	13,282.00	8,068.00
Florida	4	37	1	294.60	8.10
Georgia	5	720	4	3,840.00	36.00
Idaho	1	25	19	225.00	136.80
Illinois	38	17,971	6,822	202,305.88	86,410.47
Indiana	27	2,711	1,188	24,639.89	8,791.69
Iowa	13	187	116	1,749.46	969.32
Kansas	17	691	165	6,311.27	1,489.57
Kentucky	4	393	71	3,179.00	490.70
Louisiana	1	125	50	750.00	300.00
Maine	13	2,340	928	18,186.07	6,395.02
Maryland	1	50	15	415.00	112.50
Massachusetts	44	16,788	8,620	127,103.68	44,808.68
Michigan	21	10,914	2,402	163,908.58	20,797.29
Minnesota	10	2,996	961	45,887.93	8,925.41
Mississippi	3	25	25	100.50	62.40
Missouri	20	1,131	578	12,204.08	5,488.00
Montana	3	3	1	63.00	17.50
Nebraska	6	524	515	5,449.50	5,332.50
Nevada	1	150	20	3,600.00	720.00
New Hampshire	10	8,992	1,148	66,016.86	7,957.60
New Jersey	23	5,662	2,462	68,490.81	26,527.97
New York	77	13,581	6,627	114,473.24	44,844.49
North Carolina	8	205	72	913.20	252.60
North Dakota	5	49	34	525.00	311.70
Ohio	90	28,838	7,483	284,035.76	69,059.62
Oregon	3	425	280	6,504.51	2,355.00
Pennsylvania	56	21,977	9,710	218,693.62	94,502.24
Rhode Island	15	4,734	2,121	34,379.19	9,718.74
South Dakota	4	74	10	379.20	115.20
Tennessee	10	216	119	1,680.90	958.92
Texas	5	38	31	325.80	275.00
Utah	10	459	173	7,472.00	2,162.30
Vermont	7	2,281	1,703	20,265.69	13,809.70
Virginia	12	551	305	3,521.10	2,305.22
Washington	2	562	105	10,980.00	1,885.50
West Virginia	26	6,132	2,289	64,656.70	16,419.54
Wisconsin	12	1,650	146	24,400.35	983.92
Wyoming	2	1,518	1,510	22,510.50	11,258.10
Total	684	169,423	67,660	1,762,288.30	549,436.94

Decrease in labor since November 5, 1892, is 60½ per cent.
Decrease in wages since November 5, 1892, is 69 per cent.
Decrease in business since November 5, 1892, is 47.2 per cent.
Number of hands out of work is 101,763.
The loss in total weekly wages is $1,202,851.36.
Average decrease in the rate of wages is $2.35 per week.

This exhibit shows that where 169,423 hands were employed during the week ending November 5, 1892, there were but 67,600 hands employed in the same business during the week ending September 2, 1893, or that 101,763 people, representing 60½ per cent of those employed last year, were out of work at the beginning of last month.

Turning to the question of wages, we find that where $1,762,288 were paid out during the week ending November 5, 1892, there were but $549,437 paid out during the week ending September 2, 1893, a loss of 69 per cent in the disbursement and circulation of money at the beginning of last month as compared with the week previous to the election of President Cleveland and a Congress pledged to the overthrow of our protective tariff.

Besides a loss of $1,202,851 every week in disbursements for wages, as reported by our six hundred and eighty-four correspondents, we also find that there has been a decrease of 47.2 per cent in the volume of business transacted in the different counties in which our correspondents live. It further appears that where the average amount of wages earned by each person working during the week ending November 5, 1892, was $10.43, the average wage rate last month was but $8.08 for each person working, thus making a decrease of $2.35 in the average weekly earnings of each person.

These are the main facts deduced from our industrial census. They show exactly what our manufacturers, wage-earners, wholesale and retail dealers, farmers, and others are deriving through the election of a party, in full control of our national affairs, that is pledged to the overthrow of protection. The details are given as follows:

Bradstreet reports show that—

there are wage-earners in enforced idleness at the present time numbering more than 810,000, and that there are dependent for support upon these idle employés of industries and other establishments more than 1,956,000 persons.

The report embraces cities from the different sections and States of the country, and may be regarded as the official census. The central western States report the greatest number of unemployed, viz, 227,340, with 443,319 persons dependent upon them. New York and New Jersey are second, with 228,250 unemployed and 563,760 dependent. The figures for Pennsylvania's return are 151,500 unemployed and 449,200 dependent.

A notable fact on a glance at the returns is that in the total of unemployed the Southern States report the least number, 42,065.

A great many of these idle wage-earners are not to blame for their enforced idleness. Some are to blame in so far as they voted for the Democratic candidate for President last November.

REDUCTION OF WAGES.

If the bill now under consideration becomes a law, how can we again rebuild the fires in our forges, put our spindles and looms into action, bring back life and activity into all industrial interests, give employment to all our idle men, boys, women, and girls, and at the same time compete with the ill, low paid labor of Europe. There is but one open doorway. We must reduce the wages of our American wage-earners, and as a result surround them with the same conditions which to-day is the lot of the poor laboring elements of Europe.

Mr. WILSON, the author of this bill, in an interview with Col. C. H. Banes, of Philadelphia, when Mr. Banes called his attention to the fact "that the reduction contemplated would fall most heavily upon the laboring classes," Mr. WILSON'S reply was to the effect that as our workmen are better housed, clothed, and fed, they could do more work for the same wages than foreigners. (Interview published in Philadelphia Ledger.) The workingmen of the North are under no obligation to Mr. WILSON and his free trade party for the comforts with which they are surrounded.

Manufactured goods which will be imported into the United States in large quantities under this bill will come chiefly from Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, and Scandinavia. In these countries over 31,000,000 men and women are engaged in manufacturing and mining pursuits. The average annual income of these millions is less than $4 a week, or $200 a year. Unless they emigrate to the United States they have no hope to rise from the condition to which they were born.

The official returns of these countries bring out the astonishing fact that over 8,000,000 persons, a number exceeding one-fourth of the industrial population, are returned as paupers, and that annually the taxpayers, already burdened with the immense cost of imperial armies, have to pay the enormous sum of $150,000,000 to prevent these people from dying of starvation. Of this amount free-trade Great Britain alone contributes over one-third, or $50,200,000.

Thomas Hanlon, D. D., president of Pennington Seminary, a gentleman of much learning and culture, in an article published in the Trenton State Gazette, wrote about the working classes of Europe as follows:

I have just returned from Europe, having visited England, Belgium, Germany, and Scotland. I gave special attention to the conditions of the laboring class. I made inquiries personally from many sources as to wages in all departments of manual labor. I took pains to know for myself the condition of the laboring classes as to their habitations, their clothing, their food, and their education, and the results of these careful observations is a feeling of sadness for the laboring classes of Europe which I never had before, and which no one can have unless from personal observation for himself.

For all this hard toil and these long hours each day the wages paid were scarcely half of what is paid to our laboring classes. This is true of all kinds of labor in Europe. It is sometimes said that while wages in Europe are low the living is very cheap. They do live cheaper than we do. The poor creatures can not do otherwise. They live in the plainest manner. You rarely find a bit of carpet on the floor of even what they call their spare

room. Their tables contain very few dishes of food. Meat and butter are luxuries rarely enjoyed by the workingman in Europe.

I turned my back upon Europe with feelings of sadness for the toiling millions of those lands, and my face toward this, my dear old country, feeling that our land is the earthly paradise of the laboring man.

I do not wonder that every ship from these lands is heavily weighted with strange passengers for these hospitable shores. I also felt more than ever before that it is a sacred duty of every American citizen, by voice and by vote, to perpetuate to the laboring man in this land the preeminent position which he in this country of all other countries in the world enjoys. It will indeed be a sad day for the laboring man when, by the vote of the American people, the blessings of American protection to labor shall give place to the pauperizing competition of free trade.

Gerald Massey, son of a poor English workingman, knew the feelings of the class from whence he sprang, and could utter them in impassioned words. He said:

Press on! a million pauper foreheads bend in misery's dust;
God's champions of the golden truth still eat the mouldy crust;
This damning curse of tyrants must not kill the nation's heart;
The spirit in a million slaves doth pant on fire to start,
And strive to mend the world, and walk in Freedom's march sublime,
While myriads sink heartbroken, and the land o'erswarms with crime.
"Oh God!" they cry, "we die, we die, and see no earnest won!"
Brothers, join hand and heart, and in the work press on!"

When these unfortunate people can raise money enough to escape from their bondage "their tracks are all one way," over the Atlantic to our shores. Last year over 600,000 of these half starved and destitute people landed at American ports, 118,000 coming from the British Islands, where free trade has ruled for forty years. Within the last twenty-five years over 10,000,000 of these toilers have found a home in the United States. Tempted to come here by high wages, free schools for their children, and the comforts and happiness to be obtained under the American protective system. To the land of high tariffs all come. From the land of high tariffs none go back. The American laborer never has any inclination to seek employment in another land. If it be true, as so often asserted, that a protective tariff robs the poor man as well as the rich one, we can come to but one conclusion, and that is, all foreigners who come to our shores willingly submit themselves to an outrage and oppression and our native born poor men never try to escape from it.

Mr. Chairman, we are ready to chain our workmen to the anvil and forge, to bury them in our mines, to house them up in our great mills and workshops at such wages without hope. Are we, sir, willing to bring their labor into competition in the same markets with the cheap labor of 31,000,000 of workmen in Europe?

The American workmen during the last twenty years, under Republican Administrations and high-tariff legislations, have received higher wages, have saved more money than the workmen of any other nation.

Edward Atkinson, an eminent authority among free traders, in an article in the Boston Herald of May 12, 1892, said:

Ten to 20 per cent advances in wages since 1890. The skilled laborer has secured the highest rate of earnings ever known in this or any country, and he can also buy more for a dollar.

In the Forum for May, 1892, the same writer declared:

Wages have advanced steadily. General wages were higher in 1890 than in 1880 by from 10 to 40 per cent, according to the grade of workman.

H. V. Poor, another high authority, lately said:

With the increase of wages and the fall of prices, a day's work brings to the laborer twice the amount of comforts and necessaries of life than it did fourteen years ago.

That our workmen on the day Mr. Cleveland was elected President were the best paid, the best housed, best fed, best clothed, and the most intelligent wage-earners in the world is beyond all controversy.

For comparison of wages in Europe and America I submit the following:

What protection does for the American wage-earner.

Industries.	General average weekly wages paid to all employés.	
	Massachusetts.	Great Britain.
Agricultural implements	$10.25	$6.85
Artisans' tools	11.80	4.89
Boots and shoes	11.63	4.37
Brick	8.63	4.16
Building trades	14.99	7.21
Carpetings	6.08	4.11
Carriages and wagons	13.80	4.89
Clothing	10.01	6.71
Cotton goods	6.45	4.63
Flax and jute goods	6.46	2.44
Food preparations	9.81	7.72
Furniture	11.04	7.96
Glass	12.28	6.93

What protection does for the American wage-earner—Continued.

Industries.	General average weekly wages paid to all employés.	
	Massachusetts.	Great Britain.
Hats, fur, wool, and silk	$11.01	$5.51
Hosiery	6.49	4.67
Liquors, malt and distilled	12.87	12.66
Machines and machinery	11.75	6.93
Metals and metallic goods	11.25	7.40
Printing and publishing	11.37	5.52
Printing, dyeing, bleaching, and finishing cotton textiles	8.67	4.94
Stone	14.39	8.58
Wooden goods	12.19	5.67
Woolen goods	6.90	4.86
Worsted goods	7.32	3.69
All industries	10.31	5.86

It will be seen from this table that the average wages to all employés for the twenty-four industries considered in Massachusetts was $10.31 a week, while that for Great Britain is $5.86 a week—the wages in Massachusetts thus being nearly double the average weekly wages paid in the same industries and to the same class of employés in Great Britain.

	Per week in—	
	Scotland.	United States.
Cop winders	$3.51	$8.31
Twister tenders	2.37	6.87
Reelers	3.39	8.47
Inspectors	3.03	7.12
Skein spoolers	2.79	7.67
Spoolers	2.67	8.70
Gross parcelers	4.20	9.51
Second and section hands	7.37	13.50
Bleachers (women)	2.27	6.00
Bleachers (men)	5.80	12.00
Dyers	5.53	9.06
Total	42.93	97.27

One hundred and twenty-seven per cent higher in United States.

In England, under free trade, blacksmiths get $1.05 per day. In America they get $2 per day.

In England, under free trade, the average daily wages of carpenters is $1.28. In America they get $3 a day.

In Liverpool, under free trade, street-car drivers get $6 per week. In Philadelphia they get $12 per week.

In Sumatra, under free trade, day laborers who raise tobacco get 25 cents a day. In America they get from $1 to $1.25 per day.

In England, under free trade, the average daily wages of machinists is $1.20. In America it is $2.50.

In England, under free trade, the average daily wages of painters is $1.20. In America it is $2.60.

In England, under free trade, English bricklayers get about $1.20 a day. In America the American bricklayer gets about $3 a day.

In Wales, under free trade, the furnacemen employed in the making of tin plate get $1.75 per day. The furnacemen employed in the tin-plate works of Pennsylvania get $3.50 per day.

In Wales, under free trade, the blacksmiths employed on Welsh tin plate receive $1.32 per day. In Ohio and Pennsylvania the blacksmiths employed on American tin plate receive $3 per day.

In England, under free trade, the average daily wages of brass founders is $1.25. In America brass founders receive $2.50 a day.

In Saxony (according to the Weser Zeitung), an able-bodied weaver can not get more than $1.50 a week. In America they get $8 a week.

In Germany harness-makers receive $3 a week. In America they receive $6 a week.

In Italy women work in the field for 12 cents a day. In America the same labor would command 60 cents a day.

In Germany agricultural laborers receive 25 cents a day. In America they receive from 75 cents to $1 a day.

In India the farm laborer, during harvest time, receive 7 cents a day. In America the farm hand, during harvest time, gets from $1.25 to $1.50 a day.

In Italy farm laborers receive from 16 cents to 20 cents a day.

The wage-earner, white or black, of our great agricultural and manufacturing States in the North and West has always exercised his rights of citizenship. He walks among his fellows with all the dignity of manhood. Honest toil and labor elevates him in the respect and esteem of all our citizens. His wife and children wear good clothes. The churches and schools open their door to his family and children. Books and newspapers are found in his home. He does not crave for wealth, for that is not essential to his happiness. But he does want steady employment, fair wages, and the ordinary comforts of life. Sirs, you may take all these things from him for a short time, but you can never reduce him to the level of the workmen of the South or Europe.

A LARGE DECREASE IN BUSINESS.

As to what effect this Democratic invasion into our protective system has had upon the business of the country since President

Cleveland was inaugurated on March 4, 1893, the bank clearings report to Bradstreet gives us the following result:

Month.	1893.	1892.
April	$4,918,819,872	$5,066,679,405
May	5,244,502,329	5,014,020,107
June	4,524,607,767	4,915,758,398
July	4,137,669,864	4,627,501,773
August	3,346,213,938	4,513,163,512
September	3,311,635,037	4,779,281,710
October	3,983,596,363	5,470,307,243
November	4,051,057,546	5,443,235,918
Total	33,518,104,716	39,829,951,070

It appears that since the beginning of the month after the present Administration took control of the affairs of the nation there has been an aggregate loss of business in the circulation of money that exceeds $6,300,000,000, almost a loss of $800,000,000 monthly.

RECIPROCITY.

One of the greatest achievements of the Republican party was accomplished during the closing days of the Fifty-first Congress, by the adoption of section 3 of the McKinley tariff law. I refer to the reciprocity clause. The measure now under consideration will repeal the same, and with its repeal all of the advantages secured in the trade markets of the countries we have made treaties with will be destroyed. Reciprocity was advocated and adopted at the request of a Republican who while living held the esteem and affections of the American people; a statesman who in his day stood upon the highest pinnacle of fame; a man whose matchless public services will remain an object-lesson to the patriots of abiding government in this and each succeeding age.

The Presidential office would have added nothing to the gigantic stature of his statesmanship. His majestic head towered above its fellows "like a snow-crowned summit of the Andes." I refer to the late Hon. James G. Blaine. If there is a Democratic member of this House who questions that Mr. Blaine is not entitled to the gratitude of our people on this subject I would beg to call his attention to the following editorial from the New York Sun, which is high Democratic authority. The Sun said of him:

But if Blaine had done nothing else to engrave his name indelibly upon American annals, his title to gratitude and honor at his country's hands would be made secure by his connection with the programme of reciprocity between all the independent commonwealths upon this hemisphere; a programme which he invented, interpreted, commended to his fellow citizens, and which he lived to see adopted over a large part of the New World.

[Applause.]

This measure has received from the people a hearty support. From the moment of its introduction there was sent to Congress from every important city in the United States, from associations of farmers, manufacturers, and producers, a large number of memorials and petitions signed by members of all political parties praying for its adoption. Democratic statesmen in Congress, without reason or a decent argument to sustain them, voted to a man against it. Their opposition drew from Senator HALE the following sarcastic declaration:

It is but another illustration of what the world has seen for thirty years, that upon plain business propositions touching the common good of the country and everyday life and prosperity of the people, upon which, if anywhere, there should be no party division, the Democratic party selects the darkness rather than the light for its standing ground.

After the measure had become a law, in an unpatriotic spirit responsible Democratic statesmen and newspapers did all they could to prevent treaties being made. However, notwithstanding their opposition, treaties were made with Spain in behalf of her colonies, Cuba and Porto Rico, with Brazil and other governments. From all the facts obtainable as to the benefits derived from this measure in the short time it has been in existence I believe it to be the best law in relation to our trade and commerce ever enacted by the American Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

AD VALOREM.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the imposing and collecting duties on imports under the ad valorem method, and I now desire to enter my solemn protest against this feature of the bill. A great many articles in this measure now under specific duties in the McKinley law are changed to ad valorem duties. It can have no other effect than to still further weaken and lessen protection by undervaluation.

Another fault with ad valorem duties is that they are lowest when goods are cheapest and protection is most needed, but specific duties are then highest in proportion to costs, and help the home maker to keep the home market when it is most hard pressed, and to employ home labor at American wages, and invest in improved processes of manufacture.

Another objection to this system is this: Our manufacturers will have no fixed basis upon which they can afford to make goods. The ad valorem method always was a fraud upon our revenue, a fraud upon our manufacturers, and a fraud upon American labor. England is anxious for this country to adopt the ad valorem method, and Mr. Cleveland and his advisers and followers are willing to comply with England's request, no matter what the result may be to our people.

Mr. WILSON, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, says specific duties lead to greater frauds than the ad valorem method. This is a most remarkable statement when we consider it is made by men who never had any experience whatever in the collecting of import duties. If I am correctly informed, the ad valorem system has been abandoned by most of the commercial nations of the globe. The experience of our Government is against the adoption of this method; specific duties have been recommended by every Secretary of the Treasury with the exception of Hon. Robert J. Walker.

Mr. Chairman, if the House will indulge me for a few moments longer on this matter I will quote from the reports of the Secretaries of Treasury what they said.

Secretary Gallatin, 1801:

In order to guard as far as possible against the value of goods being underrated in the invoices, it would be eligible to lay specific duties on all such articles now paying duties ad valorem as may be susceptible of that alteration.

Secretary Dallas, 1816:

Articles imported to a great amount should rather be charged with specific duties upon their weight and measure, in order to guard against evasions and frauds, than with ad valorem duties on their value.

Secretary Crawford, 1817:

It is certainly prudent to diminish as far as practicable the list of articles paying ad valorem duties.

And he submitted a list of 124 enumerations to be transferred to the class of specifics. In 1819 he submitted another list.

Secretary Meredith, 1849:

Experience has, I think, demonstrated that, looking exclusively to the revenue, a specific duty is more easily assessed, more favorable to commerce, more equal, and less exposed to frauds than any other system.

Secretary Bristow, 1876:

Another remedy, and the most effective which could be adopted for correcting the evils of the appraisement system, is the substitution, so far as practicable, of specific for ad valorem duties. The change would work a great reduction in the amount of labor requiring the knowledge of experts. The entire process of ascertaining duties would be more simple, certain, and safe. Opportunities for collusive undervaluation would be greatly lessened, and if errors were committed they could not, as to specific rates and amounts, be accounted for except upon the supposition of culpable negligence or actual fraud; whereas, in respect to ad valorem duties, an error of judgment may readily be assigned as a sufficient explanation.

Secretary Sherman, 1878:

While not recommending a general revision of the tariff at the present time, it is deemed important that upon some articles the ad valorem duties now assessed should be converted into specific duties. As a rule specific duties are to be preferred to either ad valorem or compound rates, and in any future revision of the tariff it is hoped that Congress will give preference to this system of imposing duties as far as practicable.

Secretary Manning, in a report to Congress, said:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices or by undervaluation or by any other means under an ad valorem system will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestibly, they are even notoriously, inherent in that system. One advantage, and perhaps the chief advantage, of a specific over an ad valorem system is in the fact that under the former duties are levied by a positive test which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in possession of the Government. But under an ad valorem system the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousand miles away and under circumstances most unfavorable to the administration of justice.

One hears it often said that if our ad valorem rates did not exceed 25 or 30 per cent undervaluation and temptation to undervaluation would disappear. But the records of this Department for the years 1817, 1840, and 1857 do not uphold that conclusion.

James D. Powers, a special agent of the Treasury under Mr. Cleveland, reported:

Ad valorem rates of duty afford temptations and opportunities for fraud which can not be guarded against. Under the ad valorem system fraud has prospered and demoralized the importing trade, which has passed from the hands of American citizens into the control of men who have enriched themselves at the expense of the revenue and the ruin of the trade of American wholesale firms.

Notwithstanding the opinions of these men who had a large and practical experience in the collecting of duties under both systems, specific and ad valorem, some of them Democratic statesmen of national reputation, the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee have the audacity to recommend to the members of this House a method which has been outlawed by past experience, not only by our Government, but most if not all other great commercial nations.

HIGH TARIFF DOES NOT MAKE HIGH-PRICED GOODS.

The Republican party deny that protection robs our people by compelling them to purchase manufactured goods and agricultural products at high prices. Our past and present experience

demonstrate beyond all dispute that a protective tariff has steadily lowered the price of articles in common and necessary use.

In the debate in Congress in 1870, on the bill offered by Gen. Schenck, which *inter alia* fixed the duty on steel rails at $28 a ton, the Democratic members manifested great fear that the proposed duty would be so high that it would to a large extent cut off the importation of foreign steel rails, thus depriving our railroad companies of the opportunity to buy the steel rails that they would need, except the few made in this country, and which were sold at an enormous cost. At that time steel rails were selling in this country at $110 a ton, and the average price at which they were sold during the whole of the year 1870 was $106.75. The duty of $28 took effect on the 31st of December, 1870, and it did not produce any of the evil effects predicted for it by the Democracy. On the contrary, it wonderfully increased the production of steel rails at home, and it so reduced their price that every steel rail made in the United States since has cost our railroad companies an average of less than $50 a ton, whereas the price was $110 a ton in 1870.

Under the present duty steel rails are sold as low as $24. Protection produced competition, and competition reduced prices in the manufacturing of steel rails. This same decline in prices followed all articles manufactured from iron.

A CONTRAST THAT CONVINCES.

I hold in my hand a tabulated statement of the retail prices of articles in common use, giving the price paid in 1857, near the close of the last free-trade period; also, the prices in 1889, a year before the McKinley bill passed, and prices in 1890, and the prices for exactly same articles in 1892.

Average prices on these under Democratic and free-trade administration in 1857	$10.14
Average prices under Republican protection, 1892	5.71
Difference in favor of a Republican policy	4.43

These "averages" will hold good on all (with but two or three exceptions) articles in the McKinley bill having protective duties levied upon them.

Cost of 1,000 articles for the "home" and "farm" under Democratic administrations, 1857	$10,140
Cost for same articles under the McKinley protective tariff, 1892	5,410
Difference in favor of McKinley tariff over free-trade acts of 1857	4,730

A CONTRAST THAT CONVINCES—ARTICLES IN COMMON USE.

The first column shows prices in 1857, near the close of the last free-trade period; the second column gives prices in 1889, a year before the McKinley bill passed; the next column gives prices in 1890, while the last column gives present prices.

A COMPARISON OF PRICES.

Values of articles in common and necessary use during different periods, showing the fall of prices under protection.

Articles.	Prices under— Democrats, 1857 and prior.	Republicans, 1889–'90.	Republicans, 1891–'92, after McKinley act.	Differences in favor of protection and Republican policy.
1 Ax*	$1.49	$0.95	$0.88	*$0.61
2 Blankets	6.85	4.23	3.70	3.15
3 Blue shirting	.17	.11	.09	.08
4 Boots	4.75	3.27	2.78	1.97
5 Calico	.14	.07	.06	.08
6 Carpets, per yard	1.30	.77	.66	.64
7 Cotton hose	.47	.27	.20	.27
8 Cotton-knit goods	.98	.56	.41	.57
9 Cotton thread	.09	.05	.04	.05
10 Crowbar, per pound	.11	.07	.06	.05
11 Drawing chains	1.28	.71	.58	.70
12 File	.42	.27	.20	.22
13 Forks	.99	.56	.46	.53
14 Flannel, per yard	.70	.50	.34	.36
15 Fruit cans, per dozen	3.00	.72	.54	2.46
16 Gingham, per yard	.22	.10	.08	.14
17 Hand saw	2.42	1.62	1.39	1.04
18 Hoe	.85	.48	.37	.48
19 Hemp rope, per pound	.21	.14	.11	.10
20 Linen, per yard	.83	.48	.42	.41
21 Mowing machines	121.15	56.98	47.10	74.05
22 Nails, per pound	.08	.05	.03	.05
23 Oilcloth, per yard	.84	.38	.31	.53
24 Overalls†	1.20	.83	.70	†.50

*On first 23 articles—"ax" to "oilcloth."
†On second 23 articles—"overalls" to "woolen clothing."

A COMPARISON OF PRICES—continued.

Articles.	Prices under— Democrats, 1857 and prior.	Republicans, 1889–'90.	Republicans, 1891–'92, after McKinley act.	Differences in favor of protection and Republican policy.
25 Pins, paper	$0.11	$0.06	$0.05	$0.06
26 Plow	20.12	14.37	12.90	7.22
27 Rake	.61	.34	.26	.35
28 Reaper and binder	247.85	142.36	115.96	131.89
29 Rubber boots	4.83	3.10	2.73	2.10
30 Salt, per barrel	2.30	1.75	1.38	.92
31 Shoes	5.84	3.45	3.06	2.78
32 Sheeting, per yard	.12	.08	.06	.06
33 Shovels	1.47	.97	.80	.67
34 Spades	1.44	.96	.84	.60
35 Sugar, granulated	.19	.09	.05	.14
36 Sugar, brown	.16	.08	.04	.12
37 Scythe	1.22	.85	.68	.54
38 Tin dipper	.25	.13	.10	.15
39 Tin milk pail	.75	.46	.39	.36
40 Tin milk pan	.37	.18	.15	.22
41 Ticking (per yard)	.35	.20	.17	.18
42 Washboard	.41	.24	.22	.19
43 Washtub	1.20	.70	.65	.55
44 Wheelbarrow	2.23	1.65	1.40	.83
45 Wooden pail	.45	.24	.20	.25
46 Woolen clothing	24.00	16.75	14.25	9.75
Averages	10.14	5.71	4.73	5.41

These "averages" will hold good on any given 1,000 articles in United States.

Average prices under Democratic and "Free-trade" Administrations	$10.14
Average prices under Republican and "Protection" Administrations	5.71
Difference in favor of Republican policy	4.43

Democratic averages, $10.14.
Republican (McKinley tariff) averages, $4.73. In favor of McKinley act, $5.41.

Cost of 1,000 articles for the "home" and "farm" under Democratic Administrations	10,140.00
Cost of 1,000 articles for the "home" and "farm" under Republican (McKinley tariff) Administrations	5,410.00
Difference in favor of McKinley tariff	4,730.00

Facts like the ones I have cited are worth more to a man when he wishes to come to an intelligent and correct conclusion than a wagon load of theories concocted and hatched in the brains of men who have no practical knowledge of the subject, and who refuse to accept facts given by men having an actual experience in such matters. I defy the chairman of the committee reporting this bill, or any member on the other side of this House who intends to vote for it, to show that the statement I have made in relation to prices is not true.

PROTECTION AUTHORIZED BY THE CONSTITUTION.

I now come to the place where no one but a Democratic statesman of the present day should stand. To him the ground is sacred. If trod by Republican feet, it would be a desecration of the worst sort. Nevertheless duty impels me to do so. The construction of the Constitution. From this instrument the statesmen now guiding the present Administration draw the sledge-hammer argument against the doctrine of protection. They say, admitting the fact for the sake of the argument, that protection has always brought wealth, prosperity, and contentment to our people, it can not be the business policy of our country, because it is unconstitutional. To quote them correctly, I now read from the Democratic platform, adopted at Chicago in 1892:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

There could be no more positive declaration made against every form of protection.

With amazing frankness they tell us that they stand on all constitutional questions where Jefferson and Jackson stood, and in the same platform say that Jefferson and Jackson were wrong in their construction of the Constitution on the doctrine of protection.

The Constitution of the United States, as construed by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Buchanan, Clay, Webster, Benton, and other illustrious statesmen, some of them founders of the Democratic party, expressly authorizes protection to our industries. In support of this position I will quote from distinguished men, who are held as high authority by my

Democratic friends on all constitutional questions. Washington, when President, believed that the Constitution gave Congress the authority to protect our manufactures. The second act passed by the First Congress had the following preamble:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported. Be it enacted, etc.

This bill was signed by Washington July 4, 1789.

Mr. Jefferson, in his second message, said:

To cultivate peace, and maintain commerce and navigation in all their lawful enterprises, to foster our fisheries, as nurseries of navigation and for the nurture of man, and to protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances—these are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves.

I will now read from President Madison's special message, May 23, 1809:

The revision of our commercial laws, proper to adapt them to the arrangement which has taken place with Great Britain, will doubtless engage the early attention of Congress. It will be worthy at the same time of their just and provident care to make such alteration in the laws as will especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture.

Gen. Andrew Jackson, in 1824, wrote:

It is time that we should become a little more Americanized, and, instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own.

I now again read from Gen. Andrew Jackson's letter to Dr. L. H. Coleman, of Warrenton, Va., dated June 12, 1824, published in Niles' Register, page 245:

Heaven smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. That same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. "If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us we deserve not the continuation of His blessings. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals, lead, iron, and copper, and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the grand materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our own manufactories and laborers may be placed on a fair competition with those of Europe.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Andrew Jackson, December 7, 1830, in his second annual message as President of the United States, said:

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the Federal Government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable restriction relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case; this indispensable power thus surrendered by the States must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people,

James Madison, in 1828, said:

A further evidence in support of the constitutional power to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade—an evidence that ought in itself to settle the question—is the uniform and practical sanction given in that power, for nearly forty years, with a concurrence or acquiescence of every State government throughout the same period, and, it may be added, through all the vicissitudes of party which marked that period.

Mr. John Q. Adams, in 1832, in a report from the Committee on Manufactures, said:

And thus the very first act of the organized Congress united with the law of self-preservation, by the support of the Government just instituted, the two objects combined in the first grant of power to Congress; the payment of the public debts and the provision for the common defense by the protection of manufactures. The next act was precisely of the same character—an act of protection to manufactures still more than of taxation for revenue.

Daniel Webster, the great expounder of the Constitution, in a speech at a mass meeting at Albany, August 27, 1844, said:

The term [protection] was well understood in our colonial history, and if we go back to the history of the Constitution and of the Convention which adopted it, we shall find that everywhere, when masses of men were assembled and the wants of the people were brought forth into prominence, the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union from New Hampshire to Georgia, regard to be had in laying this duty to the protection of American labor and industry. I defy the man in any degree conversant with history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, to say that this was not a leading, I may say almost the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted.

The Southern wing of the Democratic party are perfectly willing to violate the Constitution by affording protection to sugar, rice, and tobacco, articles used daily by the working classes of our country, and compel the consumer to pay this tax. "It makes all the difference in the world whose ox is gored." These articles are produced in the South. Not so long ago they were guilty of a flagrant violation of the Constitution, when they plotted treason against the Government and attempted to destroy it. It took the Government with all its military power, with all its wealth, four long years to save the Constitution. It was saved, purified, and made more sacred than ever by being washed in the blood of thousands of brave men from the North.

The Northern wing of the Democracy have had for many years the constitutional rabies. Every measure proposed and advocated by the Republican party to suppress and put down the rebellion was unconstitutional. All laws passed since the war by Republican Congresses for the uplifting of the nation and the betterment of our people were unconstitutional. Sirs, any legislation so adjusting and regulating our great industrial interests in favor of the working classes, giving to them work and bread, is not unconstitutional. If the Constitution does forbid such legislation, then, sirs, the time has come to make a new one. Some one has said, "So tender is the Democratic party in its love for the Constitution they love it better than its enforcement." They love the reaper better than the crops; the marriage certificate better than the wife, I really believe. Let us personify the party, that he would let his wife go and save his marriage certificate.

Imagine a married couple on shipboard in a great storm, the man rushing around the deck crying, "Save, oh! save my marriage certificate!" and his wife going gurgling to the bottom of the sea. Why, a practical Republican would put a life-preserver around his wife and his arm, too, let his marriage certificate go to the devil, and float safely to shore. To-day finds us in the midst of great business and commercial storm. The "ship of State" is being roughly tossed on the waves of distress. Listen! a shriek comes out from the darkness. It is the Democratic party, running around the deck of the old ship, crying out, "Save, oh! save, oh! save the Constitution!" at the same time all our commercial and business interests are going down to the bottom.

In answer to the statement so frequently made by the friends of this measure, that a majority of the people of the United States, at the polls on 8th of November, 1892, declared that all protective tariff legislation was unconstitutional and that it is now the bounden duty of the present Administration to enforce their wishes by appropriate legislation, I want to say that a majority of the voters did not indorse this plank in the Democratic platform of 1892:

Grover Cleveland, Democrat, for President, received	5,566,533
Benj. Harrison, Republican, for President, received	5,175,577
J. B. Weaver, People's Party, for President, received	1,122,045
John Bidwell, Prohibition, for President, received	279,191
Simon Wing, Socialist, for President, received	21,141
Total vote cast	11,964,537

These figures show that Mr. Cleveland fell short 1,031,471 votes of a majority of the popular vote.

Mr. Harrison carried the great manufacturing States of the North and West by a majority of 400,000 over Mr. Cleveland.

SOUTH NEEDS PROTECTION.

Why should the South continue to adhere to the free-trade heresy? She can, if she will, manufacture more and produce it cheaper than the States of the North and West:

Its singular advantage is in the variety of its resources—lands on the coasts and river bottoms of wonderful fertility, fitted for cotton, rice, and sugar; and plains, and mountain valleys, and hills, yielding wheat and corn and grass of finest quality, wait to be tilled; fruits, from the orange to the peach and apple, can be produced; swift streams are ready to serve man by turning many water wheels; large rivers can be navigated far up to the interior; great mines of iron and copper, beds of coal and quarries of stone wait to be opened; vast forests stand ready to serve human needs; spacious bays and noble harbors are along thousands of miles of coast, on ocean and gulf, and the mild, yet salubrious, air of its upper valleys favors vigor of body and mind. Such variety of resources and advantages can hardly be found in a similar extent on the globe.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

The rivers of the South have been during the past centuries running in waste to the sea. To your rivers and creeks "harness" cotton factories, iron mills, machine shops, looms, spindles, and water-wheels. Open up your hills, rich in ore deposits. Let the smoke of forge and furnace ascend from every valley. Utilize your great forests. Fill your streets with a busy, hustling, active people. Attract skilled artisans and capital to your States to build and operate great manufacturing establishments and populate your cities, towns, and villages. Manufacture that which you need for your own consumption and for importation; thus you will save the cost of transportation from distant markets. Enrich your soil, and with the raising of more varied crops you can give employment and good wages to all your unskilled labor, white and black.

The Republican party has always legislated for the industries of the whole country. It is now ready and willing to give pro-

tection to the iron and coal districts of Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia; to the sugar and rice regions of Louisiana and South Carolina; to the orange orchards of Florida. Instead of sending your raw cotton into strange markets and receiving in return for it but $250,000,000, under a protective system erect great cotton mills, manufacture your raw cotton into thread, muslin, cottonades, etc., send out the product of your mills and bring back to the cotton States $750,000,000 in place of $250,000,000. This will put $500,000,000 more in circulation, make money plenty, your banks stronger. It will put new blood into your commercial life. In a few years you will be knocking at the doors of Congress asking for a duty on your cotton as well as on your sugar, rice, and tobacco. A new cotton superior to the cotton of the South has been since 1885 finding its way into the American market. Egypt sends to the United States a goodly part of her crop.

I now quote from the American Industries:

In 1885 America bought in the Liverpool markets 3,800 bales of Egyptian cotton, and in the succeeding three years a trifle more each season, until the trade amounted to 10,470 bales in 1889. Then wide-awake brokers in Boston and New York arranged for direct shipments, resulting in an importation in 1890 of 23,790 bales; in 1891, of 25,673 bales, while last year's shipments aggregated 36,755 bales, and for this year of grace the figure will be several points better than 40,000 bales.

Think of it! America buying cotton in Egypt! Is it like carrying coals to Newcastle? To the uninitiated it may be, but not so to the enterprising factory owner in Massachusetts or Connecticut. With its silky staple from an inch to an inch and a half long, he can, with Egyptian cotton, make underwear and hosiery and a dozen other things requiring a smooth finish and high luster that he could not make from American cotton alone.

Whenever the South is willing to join hands with the North and West, and together enforce the policy of protection, you will become a great and prosperous people.

The people of the North and West are not a jealous people. They want to see the South become a great and powerful people in the commercial and industrial world. Come, let sectionalism go. Let us be Americans and stand for America's industries. Jefferson said:

We must now place our manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. Experience has taught me that manufactories are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort. The doors of wisdom are never shut.

The free-trade Administration now in power may do as Mr. Watterson of the Louisville Courier Journal, the great champion of free trade, said it would do when he declared:

On lines perfectly clear and broad the new Administration and the new Congress will begin to remove the house that has been condemned. Time will be given its occupants to get out; to remove their effects; and then, starting with the roof, the Democratic party will proceed to raze it, story by story, to the ground, and when the rotten foundations are reached to remove them preparatory to the erection in its place of a free-trade temple.

If you do so it will not be long until the temple of protection will be rebuilt and the party which occupied it for a third of a century will come back to live in it once more.

The party of protection still lives and moves. The lifeblood coursing through its veins is the great respect it has for the right. Its determination to vindicate the honor and integrity of our nation on land or sea, at home or abroad, its defense of American industries and American wage-earners, has brought to its support the convictions and conscience of the people of the North, East, and West. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Just as long as it stands as the friend and champion of our great industrial interests and toiling millions of wage-earners of all classes, just so long will it as a party remain fixed and rooted in the hearts and affections of the American people.

Last November it started on its march to make further conquests. The free-trade party will in 1896 be again defeated and humiliated as it was at Appomattox in 1865. An outraged and indignant people will once more place the Republican party in power, and keep it in power until the free-trade Democratic party, "whose only mission has been to lie in cold obstruction across the pathway of the nation," has done like Jacob of old, "gathered up its feet into the bed and yielded up the ghost." [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the citizens of Kansas believe in giving all the protection needed to American manufactures and the American laborer, but ask protection for the products of the farm.

The laboring men of this country should be fully protected by the passage of a bill further restricting immigration, so as to exclude from the shores of this country all pauper, contract labor, vicious, and criminal classes. And all immigration laws should be strictly enforced.

There is no use of protecting the American citizens against the importation of the products of cheap labor while leaving the gates wide open for the admission of these classes.

There is no justice in protecting the manufacturer and refusing to protect the products of the farm.

Such products of this country as can be produced, either by the American manufacturer, the American farmer, or the American laborer, in quantities to supply the wants of the American people, should be protected. By this bill you place the products of the farm upon the free list under the pretext of giving free raw material, but protect many manufactured articles when it will benefit a Democratic district. This measure leaves the American farmers at the mercy of the foreign producer, and yet you pretend to be surprised at their complaint.

The farmers know full well what effect "free trade" or "tariff for revenue only" has had upon the farming and other industries of this country; they know that when tried it has been disastrous, not only to them but to every class.

They know the effects of the compromise sliding scale of 1833 and the Walker tariff of 1846.

They have no desire to pass through the hard times that followed the enactment of those measures, or to continue the distressing conditions that now exist by reason of the threats to change the present tariff laws.

Speaking of the Walker tariff of 1846, President Fillmore, in his annual message in December, 1851, said:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,701,921 in 1847, to $21,848,655 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year. The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country, by increasing the demand and raising the price of our agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestibly, that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

The farmers have had a little experience lately, that is enough to satisfy them that the policy of protection is a benefit to them and that a reduction of duty upon farm products is an injury.

There are four counties in the Fourth Kansas district in which sheep were handled with profit to their owners, and a benefit to the State, up to 1883; in that year there were 24,632 sheep in Woodson County, 33,861 in Greenwood County, 34,763 in Coffey County, and 52,496 in Butler County; their owners employed quite a large number of men, many acres of grazing lands were utilized, and there was a home market for the products of the farms in each county.

The reduction of the duty upon wool paralyzed this growing industry, and the number of sheep in these four counties decreased to 62,000 in 1890.

Under the benefits of the increased duty upon wool in 1890, this industry began to revive; but to-day, because of the fear that wool will be placed upon the free list, sheep are a drug upon the market, and there are no purchasers for the wool our farmers have on hand.

With unfriendly legislation you take from these farmers what little they have invested and destroy an industry that with proper protection would not only be profitable to them, but a lasting benefit to our great and growing State.

There are 389,629 sheep in Kansas to-day; in 1883 there were over 1,000,000; and while the most of our State consists of the very best of farming lands, yet we have many acres adapted to sheep-raising.

What is true of the sheep industry in Kansas is also true of it in other States where sheep are being raised.

Having had no experience in this line, I desire to have read and printed as a part of my remarks the following letters:

YATES CENTER, KANS., *October 11, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter of the 4th instant, in regard to the price of wool and stock sheep, I sold my stock sheep last year at $2 per head and unwashed merino wool at 16 cents per pound. This year I get no offers for my sheep, and wool-buyers do not come to buy any wool. Most of the farmers have their wool on hand yet. The few who did ship theirs can not sell it in the market, and it is held at their expense.

All this disaster in the sheep and wool industry is due to Democratic free-wool scheme. Free wool is sure death to the wool industry of this country.

The damage resulting from hides being on the free list, the farmer and ranger not only lose the price on the hides of their fallen stock, but every beef that is sold is from two to three dollars less in value on the account that hides are almost worthless.

The losses of these two industries are so great that I am not able to make even like a fair estimation.

I can not see why the farmers of this country, who have no pooling combines and trusts and must pay nearly all the taxes, shall have no protection on their industry; even the manufacturer of woolen goods, with his improved machinery of this day, is more able to compete with the European industry than the farmers and wool-growers of the United States are with such countries as Australia, South Africa, etc., who need not feed during the winter, and have cheaper laborers and pastures.

Truly yours,

WM. STOCKEBRAND.

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, *Washington, D. C.*

LEON, KANS., *October 28, 1893.*

FRIEND CURTIS: Yours of the 4th received, and I will answer the best I can. Two years ago I sold my wool in the district for 18 cents. Last year they told me that Cleveland would be elected and we would have free wool, and I had to take 15 cents. This year it would bring on the St. Louis market about 5 cents; but I have not sold for I can not think that our law

makers will rub out of existence this great industry by putting wool on the free list.

They call wool raw material, while in fact it comes as near representing labor, and being the product of labor, as does the wagon I drive on my farm or the clothes I wear. A pound of wool is produced by a year of constant care, and corn and hay that is manufactured by the sheep into wool.

I have no way of getting at the loss to our county, but it will be great, for the flocks of this county have given the people a better market than the shippers could make, besides receiving the crops in out-of-the-way sections.

I think hides were placed on the free list in 1872, since which time we have lost from one to two dollars on every head; a fair cowhide would weigh, say, 60 pounds; would sell from 5 cents to 6 cents green; now we get from 1½ cents to 2 cents if extra good.

What have the farmers done that they must be cursed by having in power such men as Cleveland, Mills & Co., who are willing to place our business at the mercy of Australia and other cheap labor countries, while they protect the manufacturer and his labor.

I saw sheep sell for 50 cents on the 14th day of September on foreclosure sale that one year ago were worth $3; and this low price was caused by the prospect of free wool; I have been keeping sheep for twenty-four years.

When the McKinley bill passed, I thought the question settled. I stocked up with sheep and owe some on them: it would take all now to pay for the few. I am 45 years old, with a familily, and out of a job, if Cleveland is allowed to have his way and give us free wool. I have 3,100 sheep and might realize from their sale $3,100; they are extra fine. Two years ago they would have brought $4 per head or $12,400. I believe that Cleveland through his free-wool doctrine has cost me over $9,000. I am but one of many.

Truly, yours,

H. M. COTTON.

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, *Washington, D. C.*

LATHAM, KANS., *November 17, 1893.*

DEAR FRIEND: I have been busy and delayed answering your inquiry about the price of sheep and wool.

It is discouraging enough, I assure you, and the most prejudiced Democrat in the county can date the decline of value from the advent of the present Democratic Administration.

As an illustration, last year our wool netted us 16 cents per pound; this year the best offer we can get on the same quality of wool in St. Louis is 8 cents, or 6 cents net after deducting freight, insurance, commission, and storage; a net loss of 10 cents per pound, or a loss of $7,000 on 70,000 pounds of wool.

Sheep have depreciated correspondingly. In the summer and fall of 1892, a year ago, feeding wethers sold in this county at from $3 to $4 per head, stock sheep and breeding ewes at from $2.50 to $3.25; this summer and fall feeding wethers have sold at from $2 to $2.50, and practically no sale at any price for stock sheep, ewes, and lambs.

To sum the matter up, during President Harrison's Administration of four years, Butler County wool sold at from 15 cents to 18 cents per pound; sheep at from $2.50 to $3.50 per head, and was considered good property; now prices are driven away down below the cost of production. How long the business can stand it I do not know; not long in any event, for such a sweeping and destructive depreciation will destroy in a few months what it has taken years of labor to accumulate.

This county has had from sixty to seventy-five thousand head of sheep that yearly consume 200,000 bushels of corn, thousands of dollars of rough feed, employed thousands of dollars of capital, and paid a large amount of money into the county treasury in the way of taxes, and even another year of present prices and it will be a thing of the past.

You can imagine how I have learned to fear and hate the Democratic party when I tell you that, in the last twelve months of this senseless depreciation, my brothers and I have lost over $15,000; simply a loss of value gone and no one benefited thereby.

Yours truly,

BERT ANDERSON.

CHARLES CURTIS, *Washington, D. C.*

By this bill you absolutely destroy this great industry in the United States; you rob the farmers of the money and property invested, and no benefit to the American people will result from it.

With proper protection the sheep industry would soon be one of the greatest in the country, giving employment to thousands of men, causing the investment of millions of capital, utilizing millions of acres of land, and in a few years American sheep-growers would be able to supply the American market with every grade of wool needed.

For my part I will never vote to tear down this industry, but will vote to build it up.

Cattle-raising is one of the greatest industries in this country, and the farmers and stockmen who are engaged in it are entitled to such protection as will give them the American market for cattle and their products.

We have in the State of Kansas 2,685,815 head of cattle, and of course are interested in this question.

In 1872 hides were put upon the free list in hopes that the people would be furnished with cheaper boots, shoes, and leather. While there has been some reduction in price in these articles, yet it is mostly due to improved machinery and competition; but there has not been a sufficient reduction in price to justify the further keeping of hides upon the free list.

There was a time when it paid the farmer and stockman to take hides to market for sale, but now it pays but little if anything.

Years ago the cow or steer that died from the effects of the Western blizzard was not a total loss, for the hides were worth something; but now it does not pay for the skinning and hauling to market; yet if you look at the list of articles imported free of duty you will find that in the last seven years we have imported hides and skins, other than fur skins, of the value of $176,777,739, or of the yearly average value of $25,253,962, and the amount is increasing every year.

The farmers and stock-raisers would be glad to see a duty placed upon hides, and there should be one.

We have imported fewer horses since the duty was increased by the act of 1890, as is shown by the following: We imported horses of the value of $4,868,862 in 1889, $4,840,485 in 1890, $3,265,254 in 1891, $2,455,868 in 1892, and $2,388,267 in 1893.

When horses are decreasing in value; when the farmers are anxious to obtain a market for the few they have; when the use of the electric and cable car lines is decreasing the demand for them, this is too great a value to import.

The farmers of Kansas who own 1,000,594 head of horses would be pleased for an opportunity to supply some of the demands that is filled by the importer.

In justice to the farmers the duty should be so fixed on all horses, except those imported for breeding purposes, as to allow them to supply the demand.

A comparison of the amount of eggs imported a few years before 1890 with those imported since will show what a benefit the placing of a duty upon eggs has been to the farmers. The following figures speak for themselves: In 1889 we imported eggs of the value of $2,418,976, in 1890 of $2,074,912, in 1891 of the value of $1,185,595, in 1892 of the value of $522,240, and in 1893 of the value of $392,973.

Up to a few years ago there was not enough poultry and eggs sold in the State of Kansas to justify keeping an account of them, but in 1891 the farmers of Kansas realized from the sale of this product the sum of $2,559,297, and in 1892 the sum of $2,679,280, and egg depots have been established in numerous towns and villages in the State.

The farmers will not thank you for returning eggs to the free list, but will condemn you.

With the large hay fields of this country there is no excuse for the importation of a single ton.

With proper protection the farmers would have their hay market increased nearly a million dollars each year.

The duty imposed by the McKinley bill caused a small decrease in the importation of hay, and no doubt did much to cause the farmers to pay more attention to this paying industry.

In Kansas the farmers produced hay of the value of $4,062,546 in 1891, and the amount was increased to the value of $8,232,251 in 1892. Hay pressing is now quite extensively followed in many of the counties, and carload after carload is shipped East every year.

There is absolutely no excuse for the importation of so vast an amount of the products of the farm as are imported yearly into this country, and the American farmers are simply robbed of the market to which they are just entitled, and the passage of this measure will greatly increase the importation of farm products.

Secretary Morton, in his last report, says:

> The time will surely come when, under the favorable condition of soil and climate which this country possesses, a very large share of the agricultural products now imported will be raised by American farmers.
>
> Our large imports of hides, fruits, nuts, and wines, aggregating the average of over $60,000,000 annually, could be all produced in this country.
>
> A considerable share of the fibers, including wool and silk, and no doubt a large portion of the tobacco now imported, could also be produced in the United States.
>
> This is true, likewise, of sugar.

He might have added that this time will never come if the policy of the Democratic party is adopted.

The State of Kansas has grown up since the war and during a period in which this country has been enjoying the benefits of the American system of protection; and, being an agricultural State, I invite your attention to the following tables, which show what it can produce and how great it has developed during that period:

STATE SUMMARY—1892.

Table showing the total acreage, amount and value of field crops, and the value of the products of live stock.

Crops.	Acres.	Product.	Value.
Winter wheat.....bushels..	3,820,013	70,035,980	$38,534,426.92
Spring wheat.....do....	209,816	4,520,926	2,157,335.11
Corn.....do....	5,603,588	138,658,621	42,889,849.01
Oats.....do....	1,559,049	43,722,484	11,140,224.70
Rye.....do....	239,173	4,042,513	1,697,057.35
Barley.....do....	138,226	3,842,964	1,407,983.08
Buckwheat.....do....	4,818	62,808	47,106.00
Irish potatoes.....do....	80,147	4,257,504	3,438,042.45
Sweet potatoes.....do....	3,502	300,000	330,000.00
Castor beans.....bushels..	11,087	81,987	102,483.75
Sorghum.....	169,105	.....	*1,935,341.00

*Sirup and forage.

Table showing the total acreage, amount and value of field crops, and the value of the products of live stock—Continued.

Crops.	Acres.	Product.	Value.
Cotton.....pounds..	666	145,300	$10,171.00
Flax.....bushels..	171,517	1,245,555	1,058,721.75
Hemp.....pounds..	47	32,900	1,645.00
Tobacco.....do....	371	22,600	22,260.00
Broom corn.....do....	75,398	34,016,950	1,105,550.87
Millet and Hungarian.....tons..	275,029	493,648	1,974,592.00
Timothy	576,315		
Clover	127,994		
Blue grass	114,027	700,613	8,503,065.00
Alfalfa.....tons..	62,583		
Orchard grass	5,232		
Other tame grasses	56,440		
Prairie, under fence.....tons..	4,955,197	2,374,479	8,232,251.00
Totals	18,360,240		119,588,106.00
Wool clip.....pounds..		1,345,787	28,783.79
Cheese.....do....		540,609	59,466.99
Butter.....do....		27,705,466	4,155,819.90
Animals slaughtered or sold for slaughter			35,280,273.00
Milk sold other than that sold for butter and cheese			450,212.00
Poultry and eggs sold			2,579,280.00
Garden products marketed			672,231.00
Horticultural products marketed			1,064,368.00
Wine manufactured.....gallons..		241,232	241,232.00
Honey and beeswax produced..pounds..		543,862	108,772.40
Wood marketed			100,410.00
Total			45,060,849.08
Grand total	18,360,240		164,648,955.08

Table showing the number and value of live stock in Kansas January 1, 1893.

Stock.	Number.	Value.
Horses	1,000,594	$55,626,845.06
Mules	92,399	6,186,220.00
Milch cows	727,080	13,450,980.00
Other cattle	1,958,785	31,772,640.00
Sheep	389,629	974,033.00
Swine	2,445,341	19,329,687.00

A careful reading of the tables showing the products of Kansas for 1892 and the amount of stock on hand, will disclose why her citizens favor a policy that will increase our home market.

It will also show that Kansas stood first in the production of wheat, second in broom corn, fourth in oats, fifth in corn, and fifth in flax. The citizens of Kansas also rank high in the ownership of live stock, standing third in the number of oxen and other cattle, fourth in the number of horses, and fourth in the number of hogs.

The citizens of Kansas have built the two Kansas Cities. "Kansas City, Kans., is the second packing and meat center on the American continent, and is the second greatest live stock marketing place in the United States." This is proved by the following tables:

Yearly receipts of live stock in Kansas City, Kans.

Year.	Cattle.	Calves.	Hogs.	Sheep.	Horses and mules.	Cars.	Value.
1871	120,827	.....	41,036	4,527	809	6,623	$4,210,605
1872	236,802	.....	104,639	6,071	2,648	13,110	9,175,071
1873	227,689	.....	221,815	5,975	4,202	14,603	9,133,399
1874	207,080	.....	212,532	8,855	3,679	13,370	8,692,337
1875	174,754	.....	63,350	25,237	2,646	9,093	6,574,473
1876	183,378	.....	153,777	55,045	5,339	11,602	7,210,033
1877	215,768	.....	192,645	42,190	4,279	13,808	9,139,047
1878	175,344	.....	427,777	36,760	10,796	16,588	7,728,999
1879	211,415	.....	588,908	61,684	15,829	20,702	10,635,231
1880	214,700	.....	676,477	50,611	14,086	22,704	14,277,215
1881	285,853	.....	1,014,304	79,024	12,592	29,089	23,595,276
1882	439,671	.....	963,036	80,724	11,716	34,068	32,660,445
1883	460,780	.....	1,379,401	119,665	19,860	45,470	35,824,499
1884	583,526	.....	1,723,586	237,964	27,163	55,227	41,145,551
1885	506,627	.....	2,358,718	221,801	24,506	63,213	39,191,940
1886	490,971	.....	2,264,484	172,059	23,188	58,934	35,349,159
1887	669,284	.....	2,423,262	209,956	29,690	67,752	43,514,050
1888	1,056,086	.....	2,008,984	351,050	27,650	74,666	55,949,004
1889	1,220,343	.....	2,073,910	470,772	34,563	85,972	59,554,276
1890	1,472,229	76,568	2,865,171	535,869	37,116	108,160	75,503,119
1891	1,270,917	76,570	2,599,109	386,760	31,740	91,456	66,063,601
1892	1,492,765	97,810	2,437,884	441,822	32,831	98,282	76,600,000
Total..	11,996,758	249,648	26,794,805	3,508,951	396,930	963,317	680,501,401

Here are the figures for each year's packing in Kansas City, Kans., since its first inception. They tell a remarkable story, indeed, of the building up of a wonderful industry:

Year.	Cattle.	Calves.	Hogs.	Sheep.
1868	4,200	.....	13,000	.....
1869	4,420	.....	23,000	.....
1870	21,000	.....	36,000	.....
1871	20,313	.....	38,705	.....
1872	30,332	.....	95,806	944
1873	45,421	.....	186,964	660
1874	40,550	.....	98,145	1,663
1875	47,949	.....	47,306	1,901
1876	62,916	.....	126,916	7,568
1877	89,201	.....	177,231	32,369
1878	43,788	.....	334,684	14,004
1879	55,530	.....	380,983	6,329
1880	49,860	.....	523,928	13,375
1881	62,145	.....	819,923	14,719
1882	80,509	.....	770,581	18,770
1883	74,000	.....	1,065,126	28,056
1884	90,991	.....	1,134,254	57,201
1885	104,196	.....	1,557,865	131,241
1886	120,556	.....	1,729,318	107,333
1887	185,690	.....	1,899,054	80,162
1888	372,925	.....	1,595,313	106,365
1889	474,885	.....	1,741,880	181,684
1890	549,391	20,862	2,805,127	196,027
1891	533,166	37,605	1,995,652	199,000
1892	699,578	56,341	1,773,004	209,241
Total twenty-five years	3,869,411	114,408	20,466,625	1,884,110

Of the 4,470,000 food animals marketed in Kansas City, Kans., in 1892 the local packers handled 2,000,000 of them, 60 per cent of the total number of food animals sold in the market.

They slaughtered 699,578 cattle in 1892, as against a total of 533,166 for 1891, the increased slaughter of cattle being 166,422, or nearly 33 per cent.

Local packers in 1892 killed and dressed 56,341 calves, as against 37,905 killed in 1891, an increase for the year of 8,736, or about 33 per cent.

Of hogs they packed 1,773,004 head in 1892, as against 1,995,652 in 1891, a decreased packing of hogs amounting to 222,648 head, less than 12 per cent.

Of sheep the number killed in 1892 was 160,317, as against 209,641 killed in 1891, a decrease of 49,324, or about 24 per cent.

Kansas does not stop with the products of the farm, but has made rapid progress in other industries which are necessary to make a great State; there are to-day within her borders 2,688 manufacturing establishments, with over $50,709,400 capital invested, giving employment to 18,500 men, and producing every year material of the value of $90,066,711.

Is not this a great showing for an agricultural State? [Applause.]

The people of Kansas would be glad to have more manufacturing establishments, but have no hope if this proposed measure becomes a law.

In addition to farm products and manufacturing establishments during this period of protection, our State with its area of 52,572,160 acres has made rapid strides in everything that it takes to make a great State; it has a population of 1,423,485, an increase of 43.27 per cent since 1880; it has property of the assessed value of $348,459,944, an increase in assessed valuation of 116.58 per cent in the ten years from 1880 to 1890.

Kansas ranks third in railroads, having 8,882 miles.

There are 9,088 public schoolhouses within her borders, and there are employed to instruct our children 11,888 teachers, to whom are paid annually $3,060,457.45; the school property of our State is of the value of $10,707,708. There are a larger number of pupils enrolled for every one hundred children between the ages of 5 and 18 years, than in any other State in the Union. [Applause.]

The above does not include the State University at Lawrence, with an average yearly attendance of 700, nor the State Agricultural College, with an average yearly attendance of 585, nor the Kansas State Normal, which now has enrolled 1,400 young men and women, nor does it include the denominational schools of Kansas, which have an annual average attendance of 7,391. There are 4,539 church organizations in Kansas, and they possess property of the value of $7,487,069.

There are vast deposits of lead, coal, salt, and zinc, that will be crippled by any "free-trade" or "tariff-for-revenue-only" measure that may be enacted into a law.

Last year Kansas furnished one-fourth of the zinc output of the United States.

Why, Mr. Speaker, there is enough salt in the State of Kansas to supply the world! [Applause.]

The salt industry of Kansas is in its infancy, and yet there is 1,250,000 barrels of common fine salt and more than 2,000,000 packages of fine dairy and table salt manufactured, marketed, and shipped from the city of Hutchinson per annum. There is a solid stratum of salt 350 feet in thickness in the vicinity of Hutchinson, and the supply of native rock salt is inexhaustible.

There are at this time supported by this industry, in the city

of Hutchinson, between five and six hundred families; there is consumed in the salt industry each year at least 170,000 tons of slack coal, which is furnished from the Kansas coal mines. Until salt was discovered at Hutchinson the average price was $2.50 per barrel by the carload; the same is now being sold at 50 to 55 cents per barrel, and bulk salt of the finest quality sells at 10 cents per hundredweight, and stock salt is sold as low as 5 cents per hundredweight, or $1 per ton.

If the present duty is retained upon salt this industry will grow and soon be one of the greatest in the country; but if the duty is reduced, as is proposed by this bill, it will be greatly crippled if not entirely destroyed, for they can not compete with the English salt, which is largely if not wholly carried free of freight until it reaches our shores, being carried as ballast.

In behalf of this great and growing industry in the State of Kansas, I appeal to the members of this House not to change the duty so as to destroy it.

Our citizens would be glad to derive the benefit from the greater development of the industries which would be productive of a home market.

They believe this country has been built up under the system of protection; that the building up of manufacturing establishments in the West would not only give us a market for our farm products, but would cause the great beds of salt, fields of coal, deposits of zinc and lead, and large stone quarries to be fully developed; that it would bring to our State a large number of citizens who would build up our cities and open up new farms; that it would give us a greater demand and our citizens would receive a better price for their products.

So Kansas has in her few years of statehood tried to induce enterprising men to build manufacturing establishments within her borders; in other words, the citizens of Kansas, having full knowledge of the rich soil, the water power furnished by our small but numerous streams, and the great mineral deposits, have been trying to fully develop our great State.

The railroads of Kansas extend to its extreme limit, and have opened up new markets for our numerous products, and have caught for us a desirable part of the great army of immigration and planted them in the heart of our State, where they have opened up large farms, and are making by their industrious efforts the land that was once considered worthless produce abundant harvests.

THE DEBTS OF OUR PEOPLE.

Yes, the people of Kansas are in debt. It could not have been otherwise; the men who settled in Kansas were young and without means, any purchases made by them must necessarily have been made on credit, but with a virgin soil and their invincible energy, the liquidation of this debt only required action.

They have acted, the soil has responded, and the debt was diminished 42 per cent from 1887 to 1890, and its entire extinguishment will be an event of the near future. Our citizens have had their misfortunes like those of other States. In every state of enterprise, push, and great development there are bound to be financial reverses. In newly opened districts all can not succeed; some are bound to fail. How could the citizens of Kansas have helped to build so many miles of railroad? How could they have built so many churches? How could they have built so many school houses and colleges? How could they have built so many comfortable homes and substantial barns? How could they have built up so many healthy and growing cities? And how could they have so rapidly developed our State and placed it among the first in the Union, in all that it takes to make a good, substantial, and great State, without the liberal use of money?

But where is the location of this debt of which we hear so much? At the time the statistics were gathered 34 per cent of it was on real estate in the western half of the State, which contains but 24.12 per cent of our population, and where settlements have been made but a few years, and most of them on public lands, a part of the State that to-day contains over 700,000 acres of untaken Government land, to say nothing of the large tract of untaken railroad land.

Then 17.49 per cent of all the debt of 1890 existed in the three counties of Sedgwick, Shawnee, and Wyandotte. These counties have 10.32 per cent of the State's population. Sedgwick County, containing the city of Wichita, has the largest indebtedness of any county in the State; Wyandotte County, containing Kansas City, Kans., is second; and Shawnee County, containing the city of Topeka, stands third; yet, any man who reads could explain this to you. We had a boom in 1887; it has passed away, and we are not anxious for another; but to-day these three cities are having a substantial growth and money invested in them is perfectly safe.

These cities have done much to build up the State; their citizens are enterprising, capable, and honest business men who are willing to risk their time, experience, and fortune in building up the west, and they have built up in these three cities 672 manufacturing establishments (as follows: Topeka, 333; Kansas City, Kans., 232, and Wichita, 107) that employ 11,954 hands, and to whom are paid annually nearly $7,000,000 in wages. These citizens, as well as those upon Kansas farms, believe that the American system of protection is better for them, the State, and the Nation than any free-trade policy that may be adopted. As in every debate for the last few years Kansas has been pointed to as the greatest debt-ridden State in the Union, and the claim has been made that the Eastern citizens were the only people who were free from debt, and without reflection upon any other State I ask the people to look at their debt record for a minute and give Kansas a much-needed rest.

There is Massachusetts, with all her years of development, with a real-estate mortgage per capita indebtedness of $144; Minnesota, with $152; New Jersey, $161; Kansas, $170; California, $200; Colorado, $206; the District of Columbia, where this great Government of ours pays out its millions every month and where members of Congress help to increase the volume of circulation on the 3d day of each month during the session, has $223; and the great and only State of New York, where it is supposed all the financial wizards of this Union live, has a real-estate mortgage per capita indebtedness of $268; yet the citizens of these States are honest; they are not repudiators; they will pay as large a per cent of their indebtedness as the citizens of any other State. Yes! as the citizens of any other Nation.

All that the citizens of Kansas ask is a fair show. They raise the products of the farm to sell, and do not believe the duty on them should be fixed so that nearly $200,000,000 worth of farm products can be imported annually and the farmers robbed of their market; they do not believe that the farm products should be placed on the free list under the head of raw material or any other pretense; they believe that the American producer should be allowed to furnish the American market with such articles as are produced in this country.

In this speech I have given you much of the true condition of the young, growing, and great State of Kansas; because her credit has been assaulted by those who should have defended it; her citizens have been placed before the world as a lot of borrowers who do not intend to pay their debts, when in truth and in fact we can boast of as large a per cent of honest people as any other State in the Union.

The men who say we can not, or will not, pay our debts, wilfully misrepresents the State of Kansas; she has been placed at the bottom of the ladder of States by those who should have lifted her to the top.

Men whose every interest demand that they should tell the truth about Kansas have wilfully, deliberately, and falsely represented her as a drone among States, and I challenge them to name a manufacturing State that has made a better showing in the last ten years than the State of Kansas; I challenge them to take the products of any agricultural State in this Union for any number of years, and place them side by side with the products of Kansas, and let the people render their verdict.

Now, Mr. Chairman, are you surprised at the citizens of Kansas being opposed to this measure when they must look to other States for a market? The merchants must have customers before they are justified in buying the products of the farm. The laboring men must have employment by which they can earn the "mighty dollar" before they can patronize the stores, and the various industries of this country must be so protected as to enable them to pay American wages and compete with industries of low-wage countries.

The citizens of no State who rely upon the citizens of another State to purchase their products can support a measure that will rob them of the means with which to buy the products upon the sale of which their prosperity depends.

This bill invades the prosperity of all classes in this country, and it seizes with a greedy hand every chance of comfort within the reach of the American citizen and presents it to the foreign competitors.

Should such an unwise measure be adopted the suffering of the people will be such as has not been experienced in years.

The citizens of Kansas are not opposed to this measure simply because it strikes a blow at the farming industry, but for a further reason that it is against the laboring men and the various industries of this country.

The farmers believe that the manufacturing and other industries should be so protected as to afford them a chance to live and pay living wages to the American laboring men.

When you rob the laboring men of their employment, you rob the farmers of their customers.

Then, again, the farmers believe in an American policy; a policy that will build up the various industries of this country, and not one that will destroy them and bring want, distress, and misery among the people.

There is no dodging the fact that any policy, no matter by what name it is known, that closes the factories of this country; that bankrupts the railroads; that destroys our great industries; that robs the laborer of employment and fills the country with a vast army of unemployed who know not where to look for bread; that robs the farmer of his market; that robs the people of confidence; that disturbs business and fills the people with want, misery and despair, is un-American and unpatriotic.

During the extra session gentlemen were quite free to ask "If England should legislate for us upon the silver question." They were surprised, and so was I, that the wishes of England were always to be consulted.

Why do these same gentlemen now advocate this measure, every line of which is more in the interest of the citizens of England than in the interest of the citizens of the United States? A measure that receives many times the praise from the English that it does from the American press.

Why do you support a measure the passage of which will make all classes in England rejoice and all classes in America weep?

I read in the Democratic platform that the American system of protection is unconstitutional, and quite a number of gentlemen who have taken part in this debate have made the same charge.

Now, I have no desire to support a measure that is unconstitutional, and so have examined the Constitution of the United States and find the following section:

ARTICLE I.

SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Surely the American system of protection comes clearly within the provisions of this section.

But in looking over constitutions I found one of what was known as the Confederate States, one section of which is as follows:

ARTICLE I.

SEC 8. The Congress shall have power (1) to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, for revenue necessary to pay the debt, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the treasury; nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry; and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform through the Confederate States.

As the American system of protection is not in violation of the Constitution of the United States, but as it might be in violation of the dead constitution of the Confederate States, I am led to the conclusion that the gentlemen who wrote the Democratic platform at Chicago had the wrong constitution before them, and that the gentlemen who have been saying so much about the unconstitutionality of the system of protection must have gotten the constitutions mixed.

I am sorry the gentlemen upon the other side having charge of this bill have been so unfortunate in the selection of its title. I fear it was selected to grossly deceive a confiding constituency.

They say it is "A bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes."

It should have been entitled "A bill to promote home idleness and home poverty as among the people of the United States, and to deprive the people of the power to provide a comfortable maintenance for themselves, or to contribute to the wealth, the greatness, and the defensive power of this nation."

For, Mr. Chairman, this bill is formulated and presented to this legislative body for enactment for the avowed purpose of taking employment away from American producers and giving it to the producers of foreign countries; thus forcing American labor into a condition of idleness and abjectness, the contemplation of which is most deplorable. And its enactment would be to take the market from American farmers, rob American laborers of employment, and assassinate American industries, and would be unfair, unjust, and cruel to American citizens. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MAHON, by unanimous consent, obtained indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 5122) to amend section 3449 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, prescribing penalties for removing any liquors or wines under other than trade names—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 5123) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes,'" approved February 24, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 5158) to define and to provide for the execution of the provisions of sections 1390, 1476, and 1480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5159) to reduce the expenses of collecting customs revenue—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A resolution requesting report from the Postmaster-General as to why he fails to obey a certain order of the Court of Claims—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A resolution for the restoration of the United States flag on the United States Capitol building at Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: A resolution for the payment of Henry G. Clement for his services rendered as clerk to the late Charles O'Neill, deceased—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WISE: A resolution to pay the widow of James R. Fisher, late assistant librarian of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to one year's salary—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): A memorial from the Legislature of Idaho, praying that certain waters in that State be drained—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BAILEY: A resolution requesting the Secretary of State to communicate to the House certain information regarding appointments made since March 4, 1893—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN: A bill (H. R. 5124) for the relief of Nelson Dalbeck—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 5125) for the relief of the estate of B. S. Hallum, Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) for the relief of Solomon Geisenberg, Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5127) for the relief of Levi M. Loewenberg, administrator of S. R. and C. W. Strong, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) for the relief of Rebecca L. Bolling, of Warren County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) for the relief of Allie V. Askew, administratrix of W. W. Neeley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) for the relief of W. S. Lum, executor of Ann Lum, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) for the relief of Rebecca L. Bolling, administratrix of Emily R. Martin, deceased, late of Vicksburg, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) for the relief of Patrick Sheehan, of Warren County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): A bill (H. R. 5133) for the relief of D. W. Massee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: A bill (H. R. 5134) to extend the patent granted to William Farr Goodwin for improvement in railway tracks and trucks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5135) to pay James L. Willett arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5136) for the relief of William W. Carson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5137) for the relief of Mary Jane Hubbard, of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5138) to pay members of certain military organizations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5139) granting a pension to Nancy Reynolds, widow of Joseph Reynolds, of Huntsville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of A. D. Rutherford—to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5141) for the relief of James Madison Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) to increase the pension of H. S. Mayhall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) for the relief of Mary A. Holland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) for the relief of James M. Clowers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5145) for the relief of Simeon H. King's executrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) for the relief of Larkin H. Penny—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) for the relief of the heirs of H. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McDANNOLD: A bill (H. R. 5148) appropriating $50,000 for improvement and maintenance of Quincy Bay, Illinois—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 5149) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be placed on the volunteer roll of Company I, Seventh Tennessee Cavalry, of the late war, the name of George W. Gill, with rank of private, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5150) for the relief of holders of certain District of Columbia tax-sale certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5151) for the relief of Thomas J. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 5152) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen H. Smith, of King William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5153) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. T. Strother, of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5154) to pension John Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5155) to place Henry Zell on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5156) for the relief of Eli G. Fleming, late captain of Company F, Fifth Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRANCH: A bill (H. R. 5157) for the relief of Mary E. Hughes, heir of D. L. Pritchard, deceased, late of Camden County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 5160) to refer the title of the heirs of Don Juan Filhiol to certain lands in Arkansas to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 5161) granting a pension to Ann Adams, dependent mother of Thomas Adams, deceased, late of Company K, One hundred and twelfth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5162) granting pension to Mathilda S. Lawler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5163) for the relief of Mary H. McReynolds and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) for the relief of D. L. Carmicheal—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) granting an honorable discharge to Jesse Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: Protest of lead miners of Missouri and other States, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Wells Branch, W. Va., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest by lithographers of New York City and Brooklyn, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the furnace owners of Southwest Virginia, W. Va., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Workingmen's Protective Union, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of citizens of Big Stone Gap, Va., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURROWS: Protest of 1,100 citizens of Western Texas, against the placing of wool on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Protest of 500 miners of lead ores in Missouri and other Western States, against the provisions in the tariff bill which prescribes 15 per cent ad valorem on lead ores and admits duty free all ores in which the value in silver is greater than that of lead—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Petition of J. B. and G. R. King, praying that the present duty on calcined plaster be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINSMORE (by request): Petition of George Glenn, of Madison County, Ark., for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of James Fanning, for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Protest of employés of Ray's Woolen Mills, of Franklin, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURBOROW: Protest of employés of Kuh, Narlean & Fischer Company, of Chicago, Ill., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employers of labor, workingmen, and others, of Chicago, Ill., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of Rawlins Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, asking that all suspended pensions be speedily adjusted, and protesting against the charge that wholesale frauds exist in increasing pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Letter from Governor Nelson, of Minnesota, touching balance of direct tax to State of Minnesota, treated as a memorial, with accompanying letter from First Comptroller of the Treasury—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FYAN: Petition of 700 persons in St. Francois County, Mo., for modification of duties on lead under the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Petition of William Farr Goodwin, for extension of patent for an improvement in railway tracks and trucks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: Protest of 118 workingmen, constituting the entire force employed in the cut-glass works of I. Hoase & Co., Corning, N. Y., against a reduction of tariff on cut glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of Winter Ball Manufacturing Company, William Harvey & Co., Warwick, Newberry & Co., manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols, and walking canes, protesting against the provisions in the Wilson tariff bill which would destroy their industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition relative to the retirement of enlisted men of the United States Army and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARE: Remonstrance of 53 citizens of Bucyrus, Ohio, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of dealers in cigars and others, of Muscatine County, Iowa, asking for the duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Scott County, Iowa, for tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Doubrawa, sr., and others, of Maquoketa, Iowa, asking for duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. J. H. Witt and others, of Davenport, Iowa, asking a duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Herman Jacker and others, of Davenport, Iowa, asking a duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Mueller, of Davenport, Iowa, for retention of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Iowa soldiers for service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ben Van Heinberg for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Reading, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Paper from Bart E. Linehan, esq., Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper from Austin McNally, esq., Cascade, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution by Dubuque Trades and Labor Congress, Dubuque, Iowa, favoring Government ownership and control of telegraphs—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Williamsport, Pa., against erecting the Government Printing Office by contract—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: Petition of certain dealers of Knoxville, Tenn., for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition to refer claim of administrator of estate of Blackmore H. Blackenship, deceased, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of L. R. Glenn and 80 others, citizens of Polk, Iowa, asking the restoration of suspended pensions and that no further suspensions be permitted until after proof of fraud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of L. R. Glenn and 80 others, citizens of Polk, Iowa, asking the enactment of an equitable service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Remonstrance of 22 citizens of Henry County, Ind., wool-growers, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 70 citizens of Rushville, Rush County, Ind., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition of citizens of New Mexico, praying Congress to pass bill to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH: Remonstrance of C. C. Davidson and 100 others, of Florence County, Wis., against putting iron ore on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Protest of the farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, their employés, and others interested in the cultivation of that product, of Snyder, Pa., against the reduction of duty on foreign wrappers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Affidavits of Timothy Curby, Francis Stephens, Isaac Pengo, and Barberry Collins, and other papers to accompany House bill 5117, to correct the military record of Frank G. Gardner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William Beheimer and 104 other citizens of Grant County, Ind., to accompany House bill 5118, granting increase of pension to Louis McCaskey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of Love & Co. and others, asking for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Resolutions adopted at a public meeting of citizens at Big Stone Gap, Va., protesting against the provisions of the Wilson bill, which proposes to place iron ore, coal, and lumber upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial and resolution of the lithographers of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, praying for a specific duty on lithographic goods, instead of the existing or proposed ad valorem duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Fifteen petitions for a reduction of letter postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Ezra Dimen and others, overseers and operatives in the Kotch Spinning Corporation Mills, New Bedford; of William Nixon and others, overseers and operatives in City Mills; of James F. Whalen and others, overseers and operatives in Sanford Spinning Co. Mill; of John J. Heron and others, overseers and operatives in the City Manufacturing Mills, New Bedford; and of Charles A. Serpa and others, overseers and operatives in mills in New Bedford, all of Massachusetts, against the passage of the proposed Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas F. O'Connell and others, overseers and operatives in the Davol Mills, Fall River; of George Allen and others, overseers and operatives in the Narragansett Mills, Fall River; and protest of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Wareham, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New Bedford (Mass.) Cotton Mule Spinners' Association, against the reduction of duties on cotton yarns and fabrics and the substitution of ad valorem for specie duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cotton Yarn Spinners of America, protesting against the cotton-yarn schedule as proposed by the Ways and Means Committee in the measure known as the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Edward S. O'Conner and other employés of Utica (N. Y.) post-office, asking for passage of House bill 56—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Petition of Jacob Mann, for reference of House bill 1506 to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of the farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, their employés and others interested in the cultivation of that product in Newington, Broad Brook, Windsor Locks, Suffield, Granby, Enfield, and East Windsor, all in Hartford County, Conn., and also of those of Ellington, Tolland County, Conn., all protesting against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers to $1 per pound for unstemmed and $1.25 for stemmed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A memorial from 53 employers, workmen, and citizens of Forsyth, Mich., protesting against placing iron ore on the free list, and affirming that such action would entail great hardships upon the people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS: Petition of Michael Keating and 26 other employés of Henry Klous, of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of R. Stafhea & Co., I. P. Tichenor & Co., A. Grossenbusch & Co., and 79 others, commission merchants and wholesale merchants of Milwaukee, Wis., asking for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 34 employés of Ramshorn Woolen Mills, Millbury, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 125 employés of Thayer Woolen Company, North Oxford, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Protest of Ellsworth McDonnell, W. L. Bell, and 55 other employés of Lewis Jones, manufacturer of hosiery, etc., at Bristol, Pa., against any legislation adverse to to the policy of tariff protection to American industries and American workingmen—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Petition of Mary H. McReynolds and others, of Colbert County, Ala., praying that the Committee on War Claims refer her claim, together with all papers submitted, to the Court of Claims, under act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of D. L. Carmichael, of Franklin County, Ala., praying that the Committee on War Claims refer his claim, together with all papers and proofs submitted, to the Court of Claims, under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of Isaac E. Wittan and 86 other employés of the S. N. & C. Russell Manufacturing Company, of Pittsfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of George W. Gibson and 27 others, farmers and tobacco-growers, of Tyringham, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Samuel Chapman and 4 others, of West Deerfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: Protest of 150 business men of Charlotte, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 11, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1893; which, on motion of Mr. MANDERSON, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 9 soldiers of the late war, citizens of Dawn, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Federal Labor Union, No. 5335, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of 700 citizens of Wilmington; of 82 citizens of Clay Township; of 170 citizens of Cleveland; of 57 citizens of Richland Township; of 17 citizens of Cincinnati, and of 50 citizens of Crooksville, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the memorial of S. W. McConnell and 88 other citizens of Gogebic County, Mich., and the petition of H. E. Hosking and 103 other citizens of Forsyth, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the St. Botolph Club, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the clause in the Wilson tariff bill proposing to place paintings and statuary on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of W. B. Allen and other citizens of Attleboro, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY presented memorials of manufacturers of green and flint glass bottles of Everett; of sundry citizens of Elk Creek; of Local Assembly, No. 22, American Flint Glass Workers, of Philadelphia; of the Philadelphia Board of Trade; of sundry wage-earners of Allentown; of cigar-manufacturers of Wells Township, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of lead miners of Missouri, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Indiana, Kansas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Colorado, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Foundrymen's Association of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against a further agitation of the tariff question; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of cigar manufacturers of Ephrata, Pa., remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of ground adjoining the post-office at Philadelphia, Pa., for increased postal facilities; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOAR presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Boston (Mass.) Society of Water Color Painters, held January 6, 1894, unanimously indorsing the free-art clause of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of Rudolph Kunath and other cigar manufacturers of Lapeer, Mich., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Winamac, Ind., praying that Robert A. Stuart, late of Companies B and C, First Regiment Delaware Cavalry Volunteers, be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a memorial of prominent citizens of Hastings, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause the settlement of the accounts of Special Agents Moore and Woodson, under the treaty of 1854, with the Delaware Indians, etc., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PLATT. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 299) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company, to report it favorably, and to submit a written report thereon. It is important that this bill should pass at an early date, but I do not ask consideration for it this morning. I ask that it may be put on the Calendar and the report printed, and I shall ask the Senate to consider it on Monday morning next. It is very essential that the bill should be considered early.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 985) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company and to confer additional powers upon said company, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 507) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels;

A bill (S. 587) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea," approved August 2, 1882;

A bill (S. 511) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of the United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 495) to establish a marine board for the advancement of the interest of the merchant marine;

A bill (S. 509) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4178, Revised Statutes, in relation to the marking of vessels' names at bow and stern, and also to provide for marking the draft," approved February 21, 1891;

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.;

A bill (S. 588) to repeal section 4145 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and to amend sections 4146, 4320, also section 1 of the act amending section 4214 of the Revised Statutes, approved March 3, 1883, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 497) to amend "An act to amend section 4400 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States concerning the regulation of steam vessels," approved August 7, 1882; and also to amend section 4414, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes, "Regulation of steam vessels," to submit a written report thereon. The committee have also instructed me to present an amendment to the bill, which I shall do and file with the bill within a day or two.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. ROACH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 175) granting a right of way to the Jamestown and Northern Railway through the Devil's Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of North Dakota, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1060) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Alsea and other bands of Indians located upon the Siletz Reservation in the State of Oregon, and to make appropriation for carrying the same into effect, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 897) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations; which was agreed to.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee of Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 694) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark, for stores and supplies taken by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion, as found by the Court of Claims, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 1412), for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs,

to whom was referred the bill (S. 1209) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1363) for the relief of Francis Scala, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1312) for the relief of the heirs of Charles B. Smith, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

INSPECTOR OF BOILER PLATES.

Mr. QUAY. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to report it favorably, without amendment. As it is a departmental bill and was passed unanimously by the other House several months ago, I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4430 of the Revised Statutes of the United State be amended by adding thereto a paragraph, as follows:

"And the Supervising Inspector-General may, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, detail assistant inspectors from any local inspection district where assistant inspectors are employed, to inspect iron or steel boiler plates at the mills where the same are manufactured; and if the plates are found in accordance with the rules of the supervising inspectors, the assistant inspector shall stamp the same with the initials of his name, followed by the letters and words, 'U. S. Assistant Inspector;' and material so stamped shall be accepted by the local inspectors in the districts where such material is to be manufactured into marine boilers as being in full compliance with the requirements of this section regarding the inspection of boiler plates; it being further provided that any person who affixes any false, forged, fraudulent, spurious, or counterfeit of the stamp herein authorized to be put on by an assistant inspector, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and shall be fined not less than $1,000, nor more than $5,000, and imprisoned not less than two years nor more than five years."

Mr. QUAY. The object of the proposed amendment of the law is very succinctly stated in the report of the Supervising Inspector-General in a paragraph which I ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

The object of this amendment is to provide for testing plate at the mills where manufactured instead of at the boiler works, and thus save the expense frequently incurred of returning plate that has been rejected to the mill, besides saving valuable time to the boiler manufacturers, whose workmen in many cases are kept idle whilst waiting for new plates to take the place of rejected ones.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CHANDLER, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 4430, title 52, of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the inspection of iron or steel boiler plates."

DES MOINES RAPIDS POWER COMPANY.

Mr. CULLOM. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1126) granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill., to report it with amendments, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated in their order.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, after the word "canal," to strike out "within 500 feet of the shore line of" and insert "along."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after the word "River," in line 17, to insert:

Provided, That the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the work herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be commenced or built.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add after section 1 the following additional section:

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within four years from the date hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. Now, let the whole bill be read as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read as amended.

The Secretary read the bill as amended, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the assent of Congress is hereby given to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company, a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a canal along the east bank of the Mississippi River, between Nauvoo and Hamilton, in Hancock County, in the State of Illinois, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a power station thereon, and to project, erect, construct, and operate, and maintain a wing dam 500 feet into the river from the head of said canal, and to make such other improvements as may be necessary within said limit for the development of water power and the generation, use, and transmission therefrom of electric energy and power at, in, and upon the Des Moines Rapids of the Mississippi River: *Provided*, That the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the works herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be commenced or built.

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within four years from the date hereof.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to state for the information of the Senate that the bill was referred to the Secretary of War and by him referred to the local engineer, Maj. Mackenzie. He reported upon it, and then the Chief of Engineers, Gen. Casey, reported to the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of War reported on it. I have all the letters here indorsing the bill as amended.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. If this is a good thing to do, what is the necessity to give the parties two years' time in which to commence the work? Is not that an unusually long time?

Mr. CULLOM. I suppose they are ready to commence work now, but generally in such cases we give a little time for the parties to get the machinery to the place and to get ready.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The bill gives them four years?

Mr. CULLOM. No; four years for the completion.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Two years in which to commence the work?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; and four years in which to complete it.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the letter of Maj. Mackenzie be read, that we may learn what he thinks about it.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well. The Senator may have all the letters read if he wishes.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have them all printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CULLOM. I will put them in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter of Maj. Mackenzie will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Rock Island, Ill., November 7, 1893.

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of Senate bill 1126, Fifty-third Congress, first session, granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to "erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill." This bill is referred to me for report by indorsement, dated Office Chief of Engineers, United States Army, November 3, 1893. (File number 4323-1893.)

The bill authorizes the construction of a canal within 500 feet of the shore line of the east bank of the Mississippi River, between Nauvoo and Hamilton, Ill., with power station, wing dam, etc. The legend attached to the map accompanying the papers provides for constructing outside embankment nearly parallel to high-water shore line, and for a width of canal of from 300 to 450 feet.

Previous to the construction of the Des Moines Rapids Canal steamboats used a low-water channel through the rock reef forming the Des Moines Rapids. Such channel is not much used at present time, boats preferring the canal at low or ordinary stages. But in case of any accident to the canal, an urgent necessity for the use of such channel might arise. Any works constructed on the east side of the river, as proposed, should not, therefore, interfere in any way with such channel; or, if they do so interfere, a new and equally good channel should be given elsewhere before the existing channel is closed.

If the proposed outer embankment is built parallel to the high-water shore line, and not to exceed 400 feet from it, it is thought there will be no such interference at any point, while if built 500 feet from shore line, as proposed by act, there might be such interference at one or two points. There are points at which the width could be greatly increased without any interference with channel.

To protect the interests of navigation, I would respectfully suggest the following modifications in the bill as proposed:

Section 1, line 6, omit the word "within."

Section 1, line 7, omit the words "five hundred feet of the shore line of," and substitute the word "along."

Section 1, line 17, add the words: "Provided the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the works herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be built."

It is suggested that a time limit, such as has been inserted in modern bridge acts, would be proper in connection with the proposed authority, and such modification is recommended, as follows:

"SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof."

Then follow with section 3:

"SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. MACKENZIE,
Major, Corps of Engineers.

Brig. Gen. THOMAS L. CASEY,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CULLOM. I will insert in the RECORD the letters of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. I will state that the Secretary of War suggested five years as the limit of time, but the committee put it at four.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letters are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, D. C., December 4, 1893.*

SIR: I have the honor to return Senate bill 1126, Fifty-third Congress, first session, "Granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill.," which was referred to this Department on November 2, 1893, and to invite your attention to the accompanying letter from the Chief of Engineers dated the 1st instant, and to the copy of the report on the bill from Maj. A. Mackenzie, dated November 7, whose views are concurred in by the Chief of Engineers.

The bill has accordingly been amended by the Chief of Engineers, who remarks that as amended no objection, so far as the interests of navigation are concerned, are known to his office to its passage. The amendments meet with the approval of the Department, except the one proposed in section 2, which provides that the act "shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof." This time seems rather short. If the work is commenced within three years and completed within five years, it will be soon enough.

The petition and tracing which accompanied your communication are herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

DANIEL S. LAMONT,
Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN *of the Committee on Commerce,*
United States Senate.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY.
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith, with its inclosed petition and drawing, the letter of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, dated November 2, 1893, inclosing, for views of the War Department thereon, a copy of S. 1126, Fifty-third Congress, first session, "A bill granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill.," with the following report:

A copy of a report upon the bill, dated November 7, 1893, by Maj. A. Mackenzie, Corps of Engineers, the local engineer officer, is also transmitted herewith, and attention is invited to his views, which are concurred in by this office.

It is recommended that the bill be amended as follows:

Section 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "within five hundred feet of the shore line of," and substitute therefor the word "along."

At the end of section 1 add, "*Provided*, That the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the works herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be commenced or built."

Change the existing section 2 to section 3, and insert a new section 2, as follows: "Sec. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof."

A copy of the bill with these amendments indicated thereon is inclosed, and as so amended no objection, so far as the interests of navigation are concerned, is known to this office to its passage by Congress.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOS. LINCOLN CASEY,
Brigadier-General, Chief of Engineers.

Hon. D S. LAMONT, *Secretary of War.*

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator in charge of the bill state what committee it was before?

Mr. CULLOM. The Committee on Commerce had charge of the bill.

Mr. BATE. What is the width of the Mississippi River where it is proposed to extend the dam 500 feet?

Mr. CULLOM. It is a mile wide, I presume, at that point. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. BATE. Are there any other dams like it above or below?

Mr. CULLOM. No, sir; not that I know of.

Mr. BATE. Is this to be the only dam of the kind in the Mississippi River?

Mr. CULLOM. It is to be the only one in that section. I do not know whether there is another anywhere else on the river or not.

Mr. ALLISON. This bill is a new matter to me, but if it does not interfere with the existing canal on the west side of the river——

Mr. CULLOM. It does not.

Mr. ALLISON. A canal which the Government has constructed at a very heavy cost and which it is now maintaining, I do not object to it. But it is a very delicate matter, it seems to me, to be granting to a private corporation an important franchise like this, which may at some time interfere with the water of the canal on the west side.

Mr. CULLOM. It can not possibly do so, because the bill is guarded so that if the dam should in any way interfere with navigation through the canal or any other channel there the act would be regarded as null and void. It is subject to repeal.

Mr. ALLISON. I know; but after a large expenditure has been made for the purposes indicated it is not an easy thing to deal with a matter of this character. However, I shall not object to the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are certain rules of the Senate, business rules, founded upon common sense. They are wise regulations drawn from experience. This important and interesting bill comes here with no written report, with riders and amendments pasted on, and immediate consideration is asked for it. I think there should have been a written report, including in it the letter from the Chief of Engineers, and that the bill and report should have been printed. I shall make no objection to the consideration of the bill at any other time, but if it is still open to objection I object to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not object to this measure. It is not an uncommon thing for the Committee on Commerce to ask for the consideration of such bills when they are reported. The report of the Chief of Engineers is here; the local engineer's report is here, and the letter of the Secretary of War is here. Everything is here, and the bill has been amended exactly according to the requirements of the Chief of Engineers and the local engineer and the Secretary of War. It is even a little more stringent in its provisions than the Secretary of War required.

Mr. HAWLEY. All that matter is very good, and it might have appeared quite properly in a report. Just as strong an argument can be made for nine-tenths of the good bills that come here; but it is the usage and the rule that there shall be a report, and that the bill as proposed to be amended shall be printed. I insist on my objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the further consideration of the bill, and it will be placed on the Calendar.

ARANSAS PASS HARBOR COMPANY.

Mr. COKE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve the Aransas Pass, to report it favorably. I am instructed by the committee to ask for the present consideration of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Aransas Pass Harbor Company, which is engaged in the improvement of the Aransas Pass under the provisions contained in act of Congress entitled "An act for the improvement of Aransas Pass," approved May 12, 1890, is hereby relieved from the conditions of said act which require the construction of said work to be commenced within one year from the date of its approval, and to be diligently prosecuted by the expenditure of at least $300,000 per annum thereafter, and to secure a navigable depth over the outer bar of 15 feet of water within three years after the date of approval of said act, and of 20 feet within five years from said date; and the said company is hereby authorized to continue and complete its work of improvement as set forth in said act: *Provided*, That work shall be resumed by the said Aransas Pass Harbor Company within six months from the date of approval of this act, and shall be diligently prosecuted to completion; and said company shall secure a navigable depth over the outer bar of at least 20 feet of water within two years from the date of approval of this act. And in the event of said company failing to resume said work within the said six months, or failing to diligently prosecute the same, or to secure a navigable depth of 20 feet of water over the outer bar within the time required by this act, then Congress may revoke the privileges herein granted in relation to said improvement.

SEC. 2. That the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COKE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1139) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass, to report it with a recommendation that it be postponed indefinitely.

The report was agreed to.

STEAMER EL CALLAO.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao, to report it favorably, and to submit a written report thereon.

As the bill provides for an American register for a foreign-built vessel, as the spirit of the law has been very much more than complied with, and as the company is in very great need of the vessel for its coastwise line, I ask the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MILLS. I think that bill had better lie over for one day. I should like to look at it.

Mr. FRYE. There is a written report accompanying the bill and there has been expended in American shipyards on that vessel as much as the appraised value of the vessel to-day. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. MILLS. One day will not be much, and we shall then have an opportunity to look at the bill. I will ask the Senator if the bill is reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. FRYE. The bill is unanimously reported.

Mr. MILLS. Then I withdraw my objection.

Mr. PERKINS. I call for the reading of the report which accompanies the bill.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator will not delay the passage of the bill for that. There was expended in American shipyards on this wrecked vessel more money than the vessel is actually worth.

Mr. PERKINS. After that statement, I withdraw the request for the reading of the report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS BŒUF RIVER, LOUISIANA.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bœuf River, in Louisiana, to report it favorably. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. Let the bill be read.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read at length for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider it.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. TELLER. I do not want to object to this bill, and I presume it is now too late to do so, but I wish simply to say that I do not believe in committees reporting their bills here and passing them immediately, unless in case of emergency. If there are any more bills of this kind, I shall feel at liberty to object to their consideration after this bill is disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1413) granting a pension to Robert Markwood, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am requested by a leading member of the bar of the District of Columbia to introduce a bill, which I ask may be read the first and second time, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 1414) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia" was read twice by its title.

Mr. HARRIS. I am not sure if the bill should not go to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Does the Senator desire it to go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. A similar bill, or practically the same bill, has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives, and it was suggested by the member of the bar who handed me the bill that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am not particular as to its reference.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall not object to the Senator's request that the bill go to the Judiciary Committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the absence of objection.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1415) to restore to the pension roll Mary B. Christopher, and grant her a pension as widow of James Bringhurst, late a surgeon of the Twenty-eighth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1416) granting a pension to John W. Starr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committeee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1417) for removing the charge of desertion standing on the records of the War Department against Bernard Brennan, late of Company H, Forty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1418) for removing the charge of desertion standing on the records of the War Department against John Scanlin, late of Company F, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1419) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernard Stueber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1420) for the relief of J. Floyd Johnston, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1421) granting a pension to Jane M. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1422) granting a pension to Mrs. Sophia Lessing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1423) to provide an American register for the steamer Goldsworthy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1424) to amend section 8 of "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Calumet River," approved March 1, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, it was

Ordered, That Joseph Hague have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate, there not being any adverse report made or action had thereon.

COLUMBIAN MEDALS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select):

Resolved, That the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial be directed to ascertain what progress has been made in the preparation and issue of the Columbian medals for which appropriation was made by section 3 of the act of August 5, 1892, and to examine into the suitableness of the design and the method of striking the medals, and to inquire whether any further legislation is necessary on the subject.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] January 3, 1894, proposing to declare as the opinion of the Senate that, pending the investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, there should be no interference on the part of the Government of the United States with affairs in Hawaii; on which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it is always to be considered in weighing testimony in this matter, and especially in considering the action of Minister Stevens, that there was as to American residents in the island a dual citizenship, that of the United States and that of the Kingdom of Hawaii. The constitution of Hawaii of 1887, which the Queen unconstitutionally attempted to abrogate, conferred upon all male residents of Hawaiian or of European or of American parentage, of a certain age and possessing the requisite property qualifications, the elective franchise and the right to hold office. The question might possibly arise, indeed had arisen, as to what the effect of such a provision would be upon the right of a citizen of the United States to be regarded thereafter as a citizen of the United States after his taking advantage of the privileges conferred upon him by the constitution of Hawaii, and whether he would be entitled to protection as an American citizen.

So far as that question is concerned it had received ample decision by the State Department, first by Mr. Frelinghuysen, whose views upon that subject are found in Senate Miscellaneous Documents of 1885–'86, vol. 10, page 177. The case arose long before the adoption of the Constitution of 1887, and was decided upon general principles. Jones was an American citizen domiciled in Hawaii; but in order to obtain the registry of a merchant

vessel under the Hawaiian flag he was compelled by the statute of the Kingdom to take an oath of allegiance to the Kingdom, which he did, and the question arose in that particular instance whether by so doing he had abrogated or could have been held to have renounced his privileges, rights, or status as an American citizen. Mr. Frelinghuysen says:

Your inquiry is as to what effect this proceeding may have upon the staust of Mr. Jones's American citizenship.

In becoming a citizen of the United States the law requires that an alien shall not only swear to support the Constitution and laws of this country, but also to renounce all other allegiance, and especially that of the country of which he may be then a subject or citizen. In the oath taken by Mr. Jones there is no such express renunciation of his American citizenship, nor do the circumstances manifest any intention on his part to expatriate himself.

It may, however, at some future time, become a question for judicial investigation in his case.

The doctrine of the executive branch of the Government on this subject is thus expressed by the Attorney-General:

"To constitute expatriation there must be an actual removal, followed by foreign residence, accompanied by authentic renunciation of preëxisting citizenship" (8 Op., 139), and this view finds support in some judicial decisions (Juando *vs.* Taylor, 2 Paine, 652).

In the absence of a direct judicial determination of the question, I do not feel disposed to deny to Mr. Jones any right or privilege pertaining to his character of American citizenship, and therefore, while the Department will not undertake to express an authoritative opinion on the effect which his course in Hawaii may ultimately have on his status in that regard, you are authorized to extend to him such protection as may be properly due to a citizen of the United States residing in and having acquired a commercial domicile in a foreign state. This protection must, of course, be limited and qualified by the liabilities and obligations incident to such commercial domicile.

But the question directly arose under the operations of the constitution of 1887, and was passed upon by Mr. Bayard. (Vol. 1, House Ex. Doc. Second Session, Fiftieth Congress, page 833.)

MR. BAYARD TO MR. MERRILL.

No. 61.] DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 30, 1887.

SIR: Your No. 134, of the 25th of July last, in reference to an oath required of foreign residents in the islands, is received.

This question was brought to the notice of the Department by Mr. Putman, in his No. 125, of the 1st ultimo, and in reply he was instructed on the 18th ultimo that citizens of the United States who take the oath of fealty prescribed by the new constitution of Hawaii remain citizens of the United States, and are entitled to be regarded and treated as such by our consular and diplomatic officers.

That such a result is contemplated by the Hawaiian Government appears evident from the last sentence of the oath, which reads:

"Not hereby renouncing, but expressly reserving all allegiance and citizenship now owning or held by me."

This Department is informed that this oath is indiscriminately required of citizens of other nations, who are nevertheless understood by their own governments to retain their own nationality of origin. Inasmuch also as this oath is a requisite condition for exercising any political privileges on the island, it is evident that a refusal on the part of this Government of the assent to taking it granted by other governments to their citizens would result in the destruction of any political power previously possessed by our citizens and its transfer to citizens of other assenting nations.

The Department, therefore, desires that you will consider the above instruction as addressed to yourself, and that you will relieve the minds of all bona fide American citizens who, while honestly desiring to retain their American nationality, are, in order to obtain the privileges necessary for a residence in the islands, obliged under local law to take an oath to support the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

I am, etc.,

T. F. BAYARD.

Mr. President, I shall proceed as rapidly as may be consistent with a very superficial examination of the testimony which is contained in Mr. Blount's report, repeating that I am limiting myself to that testimony strictly in my consideration of the events that I was discussing when the Senate adjourned yesterday. On Monday, the 16th day of January, the situation upon the island had become more critical. It was known to be such, and indeed had been recognized to be such, as it had been before, by the Queen's ministers. Accordingly, at 10 o'clock on Monday morning a meeting of the cabinet was called which resulted in the drafting and adoption of a proclamation to be signed by the Queen, stating that she would not attempt to modify the constitution of 1887 except by the methods prescribed therein. But she had gone too far. The fate of the monarchy was settled, and, although the cabinet visited the committee of public safety and showed that proposed proclamation to the committee, it was replied what faith could be put in the promises of the Queen after what had taken place? The cabinet was notified that it was too late.

It is always the case when thrones are falling under the blows of revolution that the tottering monarch offers that which he should have offered long before. If I am correct in my recollections of history, Lord Howe in the darkest period of the American Revolution sent a letter to Gen. Washington, addressing him as Mr. Washington, offering exemptions and privileges to the colonies and to the American people which for years before he had obdurately denied, and which denial had resulted in the glorious rebellion which gave us our independence. Gen. Washington's reply to those letters was the victories of Trenton and Monmouth. I am reminded by the learned Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that in that connection George III sent over commissioners, of whom I think Lord Howe was one, authorized and plenarily empowered to make those promises.

Now, on this occasion, somewhere about 11 o'clock on Monday, Mr. Wilson made his way to the meeting of the committee of public safety and told Mr. Thurston, the master spirit in this singular rebellion, where those ministers who were intrusted with the preservation of the Kingdom were associating on the most familiar terms, terms almost of intimacy, with those who were termed the plotters, that this thing ought to stop, that there would be a proclamation issued. Mr. Thurston replied that it had gone too far; that they were standing on a volcano; that they would not trust the word of the Queen. Wilson then threatened him with arrest, and Thurston defied him. That is the nearest approach to the use of physical force to repress the revolution in all these four days of intense excitement.

On Monday the committee of public safety, knowing and having been informed that the United States minister would order the troops to be landed from the ship at 5 o'clock that afternoon, found that it did not accord with the then condition of their plans and purposes, that it would be too early for what they intended to do. Accordingly, they sent to Minister Stevens and asked him to postpone the landing of the troops until the next day, and his reply was that "As a precautionary matter I have ordered the troops be landed at 5 o'clock for the protection of American life and property, and landed they will be." And they were landed at that hour. That does not look much as if the minister were playing into the hands of those who afterwards became the Provisional Government.

I have no doubt that, as on such occasions always is the case, those who were back of the revolution endeavored to make it appear that the United States authorities and troops were to be in actual sympathy with them, but the United States was not responsible for that, and this evidence can be searched in vain for any instance where Mr. Stevens did not expressly say to every attempt to put him even in an equivocal attitude in this respect that he should land the troops for the protection of American life and property. What was he to do? Suppose he had not landed the marines and the results had been as everybody feared? He would have disobeyed the standing instructions of his office; and, as I said yesterday, if the Queen by her revolutionary acts, whereby she had absolved from allegiance to her every subject who chose, had created the situation which made it necessary to land troops for the protection of American life and property, she (having created that necessity) can not complain because its necessary exercise had the collateral and incidental effect of contributing in some degree to overthrow the monarchy. That it did so contribute I deny. I merely suppose the case.

Great stress is laid in Mr. Blount's report upon the use of troops. One would think from it that a *corps d'armée* had been marshalled in the streets of Honolulu. Mr. President, 162 marines were landed, and of those 14 were musicians, 9 were officers. It can be fairly inferred from Mr. Blount's report that those troops were massed in a commanding position with refer ence to the capitol building of the Hawaiian Kingdom. But the facts are, as appear from the testimony submitted by Mr. Blount, that when they marched from the landing up to Merchant street, the principal street of the city as I should judge from the map, a detachment was left at the consular office on that street, a company of marines went to the legation, where they remained, and the remainder of the force, being the main body, the number of which is not stated, went off towards Arion Hall seeking shelter. Not being able to find it there at once, application was made for the opera house. That building could not be had. The armory was otherwise occupied, and that could not be had. At a later hour they went on beyond Arion Hall to the residence of Mr. Atherton, a place which I should judge from the map is somewhere out in the suburbs; probably obtained refreshment there, and late in the evening came back and were quartered in Arion Hall.

Mr. PLATT. At what hour?

Mr. DAVIS. I can not tell exactly; probably it was 8 or 9 o'clock.

At this point another matter in my notes attracts my attention. It is the statement or testimony of Mr. Cornwell, found on page 27. He was the minister of finance. He says in substance that on Monday, having learned that United States troops were landing, Parker and Peterson called on Stevens and requested him to keep the troops on board. Stevens replied that he had landed the troops to protect American life and property, and proposed to keep them on shore. There was a distinct announcement by the minister of the United States to the Queen's ministers, consistent with all that he had said before and with all that he said afterwards, and with all that the naval officers said or did, owing to the necessity which had been created, and which he did not create, and for which he was in no degree responsible, namely, he would land troops solely to serve the pur-

poses of that necessity, which was the protection of American life and property.

As I have stated, during the meeting of the committee of public safety on Monday, Marshal Wilson made his way to the meeting, and in his testimony, commencing on page 552, he details his interview with Thurston. I think I stated that a few moments ago, but something else took place there which is corroborated by the testimony of Mr. Waterhouse about which Mr. Wilson says nothing, namely, the threat which Wilson then made to arrest Thurston, and Thurston's defiance.

It would be inferred from the report of Commissioner Blount that everything was serene and peaceful in Hawaii on this Monday; that there was no public alarm; that this situation so universally known to everybody had not created a ripple on the placid surface of business or municipal affairs.

It frequently happens, when testimony, given under the disturbing impulse of passion and discordant views is conflicting, that some incidental, some collateral circumstance comes in, some fact proved by unimpeachable testimony and not contradicted, which settles the entire controversy. Such a circumstance is not lacking here. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Scott, on page 480. Mr. Scott testifies in substance that he was the principal of a public school in the city of Honolulu, the number of pupils being 300 white children; that shortly after school began on the morning of Monday the mothers of those children from all parts of the city came to the school in their carriages to take them away. He was so impressed by the gravity of the situation that he dismissed the school before noon. Nothing but the existence of great alarm and the prevailing sense of impending danger could have carried that impression of insecurity into a hundred separate homes that morning. The feminine instinct in that case, as it so often is, was unerring. There was danger; it was so felt.

Tuesday, the day of final action came, and Mr. Cornwell, on page 27, testifies that Tuesday "We were informed that the Provisional Government would be proclaimed that afternoon." Wilson testifies or states in substance, on page 552, that he knew on Tuesday before 11 a. m. that the committee had agreed to proclaim a provisional government; to put Chief Justice Judd or Justice Dole at the head of it, and that they were to hold another meeting at noon; that they would move on the Government building at 3 p. m. and on the police station at 4 p. m. "I immediately sent for the cabinet, but there was no sign of cabinet."

Now, here was a meeting of the committee of public safety announcing that at certain hours of that day they would seize the Government of Hawaii and depose the Queen, giving the very line of action and the place and time of it. They were holding their meetings in a place not commanded or guarded or threatened in the least degree by United States troops, or defended by any forces of their own. Here, on the other hand, was the Queen's Government, with this amount of power behind it, of which Mr. Blount talks, and yet no motion was made to put this irresistible power into operation; not one of the Queen's guards nor one of Marshal Wilson's police force was sent to arrest those thirteen men, and there was no sign of the cabinet to be found. They had vanished

> Into thin air; and what seemed corporal melted
> As breath into the wind.

The substance of Mr. Bolte's statement, found on page 249, is that at 2 p. m., Tuesday, when they arrived at the Government house, there came up others of the revolutionary party, bringing rifles and pistols. He says this was premeditated; that the committee had notified the volunteers that they would go to the Government house at 2 o'clock, and that they, referring to the volunteers, arrived before the finishing of the reading of the proclamation. The testimony shows that before that reading was finished Capt. Ziegler, a German, brought on his company, he being the first, and by the time it was through the rest were there, so that when the act by which these gentlemen announced their determination to seize on the Government of Hawaii was finished, by reading the proclamation, the military force, which it was concerted should be there at the time the committee on public safety went to the public building, had arrived. They came from the armory, a place not at all commanded or dominated by any force of United States marines upon the island. They could have been met by this vague and yet invincible and irresistible royal force of which Mr. Blount tells, and the factions could have fought it out to their heart's content, without the least interference, so long as the contest did not result in or threaten violence and danger to the lives and property of American citizens.

It could be inferred, and I think it is expressly stated in Mr. Blount's report—and such is the desire to dwell upon minute matters for the purpose of making good the attack upon the Administration of President Harrison and upon Mr. Stevens—that the committee on public safety furtively and by separate streets went to the Government building. In that he is squarely contradicted by the testimony of Mr. Waterhouse, page 47. My recollection of that testimony is that the committee of thirteen, with one other gentleman whose name is not given, making fourteen, started from the meeting place of the committee of public safety to go to the Government building, and my recollection is positive that the testimony of Mr. Waterhouse is that twelve of them went in one body, up the same street, of course, and the other two, for some reason not explained, took another street.

I infer that the twelve went up Merchant street, the principal business street of the city, upon which the police station is situated. They had no guard; no soldier went with them. The names of the committee of thirteen were known, and had been known since Monday, and perhaps before; yes, Saturday is the testimony, if my recollection serves me, and yet not one of this imposing military force which was at the back of the Hawaiian Government was invoked to stay or detain or arrest them.

Mr. Waterhouse states that they expected to meet resistance at the Government building; he had heard a report that there were 100 men there. He thinks that if the Queen's forces and the military forces had got to fighting, the United States troops would not have interfered except to protect American citizens. That was the conception of the situation which the committee of safety had when they set out for the Government building. He says that when they were going into the door of the Government building various volunteers kept coming into the yard with their rifles.

Mr. President, they took possession of that building. They found one government clerk there, making up some official figures.

Mr. Damon states in substance, on page 39, that some of the provisional troops came on the ground before the reading of the proclamation was finished. Immediately after the proclamation Dole and others met at the office of the minister of the interior, and Cornwell and Parker came up from the station house and held a conference, the result of which was that Damon and Bolte were requested to return with Cornwell and Parker to the station house (this was another of the amenities of this revolution) and recommend and urge upon the parties in power at the police station to surrender to the Provisional Government. They held a conference in the room occupied generally by the deputy marshal, at which were present Peterson, Colburn, Parker, Cornwell, Bolte, and, later, Neumann.

The President of the United States has stated in his annual message, as Mr. Blount had stated in his report, that this Provisional Government was established with the active aid of the United States minister, and by the puissant intimidation of the American troops. I have shown how they were distributed.

I say the United States troops were not drawn up in line, or at all in a menacing or military attitude or array.

Let us see whether Mr. Blount did not overlook some most important testimony as to what took place right there at the time when the Provisional Government was coming into being by reading the proclamation. If the testimony of any witness is to be regarded respecting the military situation at the time, it is the testimony of Mr. Wilcox, the military man who was educated by the Hawaiian Government in the military schools of Italy, and who at the time of this revolution was passively favorable to the cause of the Queen. Mr. Wilcox says in regard to the attitude of the troops—I can not give the page exactly——

Mr. GRAY. Who is the witness?

Mr. DAVIS. Robert Wilcox. I read this question and answer in the examination of Wilcox, on page 542:

Q. Where were the United States troops at the time of the reading of the proclamation?
A. Right behind the opera house, in a building they called Arion Hall.
Q. In the house or on the street?
A. Some inside and some outside. They took possession of that quarter.
Q. Were they formed or not?
A. No; they just guarded the place.
Q. Had they arms?
A. Yes; and one or two Gatling guns—one or two, I am sure of that.

What becomes of the claim that the United States marines were there drawn up in military array and menacing the operations of the Queen's Government or of her forces? They had been stationed at the Arion Hall because there was no other place in the city where they could find shelter, although other places had been sought for in vain, hospitality having been denied in other places.

Further, to show the utter incredibility of the report of Commissioner Blount as to the implied duress even in the presence of United States troops on that occasion, or as to what anybody had any right to expect or to fear from them, I refer to the testimony of Mr. Damon, on page 39. It seems that while the proclamation was being read, some timid soul among the revolutionists—and there are always such on occasions of that kind—

took it into his head that there was danger, and he wanted to know why they did not get protection from the United States troops; they were near at hand, but he did not see any protection particularly interposing between them and the danger which he feared. So Mr. Damon said in substance:

While the proclamation was being read, we were all nervous as to our safety. I asked one of the men with me there, "Will not the American troops support us?" Finally I asked one of the men to go over and ask Lieut. Swinburne if he was not going to send some one over to protect us. The man returned and said to me: "Capt. Wiltse's orders are, 'I remain passive; I will not support it in any way.'"

"I remain passive; I will not support in any way," was the response which the commander, Lieut. Swinburne, of the marines stationed in and about Arion Hall at the time of this transaction, made to a pressing demand for support for the personal safety of the men who were then instituting this Provisional Government. It all consists with the invariable declaration of Minister Stevens that he landed troops to protect American life and property, and that the incidental and collateral transactions might take care of themselves, provided American life and prop were not put to peril.

Is it not passing strange, Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GRAY. I am trying to follow the Senator, and I am very much interested in what he is saying. Will it interrupt him if I call his attention——

Mr. DAVIS. I am making what I regard as a close statement from notes, speaking under that disadvantage, and I would rather not be interrupted. The Senator can reply to me when I shall have concluded.

Mr. GRAY. All right. I only wanted to call the Senator's attention to a piece of testimony which he could not find.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in the testimony of Mr. Damon.

Mr. GRAY. I have it before me.

Mr. DAVIS. It will be found in the testimony which is in the record, whether I have made a miscitation or not.

Mr. GRAY. Very well, I shall not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. DAVIS. The testimony is in the record, and that is what Lieut. Swinburne said when he was appealed to to protect and care for the personal safety of the men who were then reading the proclamation for the institution of that Provisional Government.

Mr. GRAY. Who was that?

Mr. DAVIS. Lieut. Swinburne.

Mr. FRYE. Lieut. Swinburne was in charge on shore.

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. He was acting under the orders of Capt. Wiltse.

Mr. GRAY. He said "I remain passive." What else did he say?

Mr. DAVIS. He also said, "I will not support it in any way."

Mr. GRAY. I do not find that in the testimony which I have here.

Mr. DAVIS. I am endeavoring to make this statement with absolute fidelity. Of course entire accuracy can not be expected and error may creep in in a matter so complicated as this, and of course I would not interpolate anything into the record.

Mr. GRAY. No one can be more sure of that than I.

Mr. DAVIS. It was on Tuesday afternoon at about half past 2 o'clock that this appeal to Lieut. Swinburne was made. The United States troops had been at Arion Hall from a certain hour on the evening before and had probably been there over twenty hours, within 700 feet of the palace, I should think, and within a shorter distance of the Government building. Does anyone suppose that Wilson and Cornwell and Parker and Colburn and Peterson and all persons representing the Queen being up to a comparatively recent date in the Government building and within a stone's throw of these troops, could not have ascertained from Lieut. Swinburne what his purposes and orders were, and that they would not have been given the same answer which was made to the members of the Provisional Government when they supposed they were in extremity? Can anyone doubt with the activity which Wilson displayed that he had not asked that question?

Why did not Commissioner Blount, with that thread of evidence placed in his hands, follow it up and ascertain whether it was not notified to both parties there that neither one could expect the active aid, assistance, or interference of the United States military force? The conviction is borne upon my mind so forcibly that I can not refrain from repeating that I firmly believe from their action that they had that information from Lieut. Swinburne, and had it over and over again.

It is suggested to me by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that the Queen, if she had supposed that the force there was menacing her, would have made a formal inquiry as to why it was there. No question of that kind is shown to have been asked. I presume it was asked. The fact is that in the exercise of reasonable diligence, surrounded by counselors such as she had, she and they knew, and were bound to know by inquiry, what the presence of that force meant on that occasion.

Mr. President, much has been said as to the time of this recognition. As in all cases where many events are crowded into a short time, there is confusion in the testimony and some degree of conflict, but after the Provisional Government was declared, Capt. Wiltse sent his aid to see if they were in possession of the Government building. Mr. Stevens, who had a military aid, sent him to see if they were in possession of the Government building, the British minister came over to see whether they were in possession of the Government building; Mr. Damon and Mr. Bolte went down to the station house to confer with the force that was said to be there, and, coming back, they went over to see the Queen.

About 4 o'clock Parker, the minister of foreign affairs, came to the Government building, and said, "You are in possession and we can do nothing." The others had gone to the station house to recommend the surrender. Returning, as I said, they had gone to the palace to enforce their recommendation upon the Queen, two of her ministers and two members or delegates from the Provisional Government, and after some debate, some urging, the Queen yielded. About that time Minister Stevens recognized the Provisional Government.

It is said that in the letter from President Dole to Minister Stevens he states, "We have not yet got possession of the station house." But he also states, "We expect to be in possession in a few minutes." There was undoubtedly a time which elapsed between the agreement of the Queen and her cabinet to surrender the station house and the time of the actual surrender, which seems to have taken place about 7:30 o'clock.

The capitulation had been made; but, Mr. President, in my view of all the facts and circumstances which surround the transactions of this day, taking into consideration everything which had been done, it was utterly immaterial that the Provisional Government had not possession of that municipal building known as the police station house. They had taken, occupied, and possessed the very seat of government of the Hawaiian Islands; they held the capitol building of that Kingdom, the building wherein the Legislature sat, where the supreme court sat, where the offices of the ministers were, wherein all the executive functions of the Government were conducted. The Queen's government had possibly intended at one time to defend it, for when the supporters of the Provisional Government went through the building they found it vacant, it is true, as to armed men, but they found munitions of war in the foreign office. The intention, if it ever existed, had been abandoned. The Provisional Government had possession of the very center of power and domination of the Hawaiian Kingdom without resistance, and was actually negotiating with the Queen's ministers, her responsible counselors, without whom she could do no valid act, for the surrender of the last lurking place of her illusory power.

Under such circumstances as these Mr. Stevens recognized the Provisional Government. This was on the 17th, and it was recognized on the next day by the representatives of every foreign government on that island, excepting the representative of China, and he recognized it on the 19th. If there had been any irregularity about this, with this foreign influence perpetually intermeddling in the Hawaiian Islands, is it to be supposed for a moment that the recognition by representatives of the foreign powers would have been so instantaneous?

Mr. President, I have conducted this examination through the memorable four days of this revolution. My discussion of this matter, I am aware, has been inadequate. That record will yield rich mines of information to anyone who will sit down and examine it with an impartial eye. I am aware that there is testimony on both sides of this question. I have spoken solely from the evidence presented by Commissioner Blount. What I criticise is that he has ignored and has not been impressed with preponderating evidence of the gravest character, which tends to the support of his own country and his own countrymen.

The Administration of President Harrison was in judgment, and the conduct of Mr. Stevens was to be passed upon by Mr. Blount. Mr. Stevens expressly was upon trial. Mr. Blount was sent out there to test by investigation the validity and uprightness of Mr. Stevens's action. Mr. Stevens was upon the island. Mr. Blount saw him every day. According to Mr. Blount's report, Mr. Stevens's conduct was highly reprehensible, and he is indorsed in that statement by the President in his annual message. In the name of all that is fair, in the name of all proceedings that would not have scandalized even the star-chamber, why did not Mr. Blount apply to his countryman, Mr. Stevens, then on the island, for an explanation of the circumstances the evidence of which he was so industriously gathering against him?

Suppressio veri, suggestio falsi. Everything can be inferred against such a perverse and determined effort to avoid the sources of evidence.

President Dole bore a prominent part in this transaction. He, *ex officio*, as President of the Provisional Government, is the minister of foreign affairs, and he was also to be judged by Commissioner Blount. Why was not his statement taken? It would have been freely accorded. It was due to him. Mr. Blount being accredited to him, as he was by letters of credence, it was due to him; due to his character and standing, which Mr. Willis certifies are of the highest; due to his official position, that he should be allowed to make an explanation of the matters concerning which he was to be so gravely compromised by the report of Mr. Blount, to be adopted as a verity by the President of the United States in his annual message.

Thus, Mr. President, the curtain fell upon the last scene of this harlequin monarchy. The stage lords and stage ladies vanished into the mass of the population. The queen of the play laid aside her tinsel crown, put off her tawdry regalia, and reentered private life through the stage entrance. The play had had its run. The engagement, which had not been successful, was ended and the theater was to be closed. The whole proceeding throughout had been imitative. The monarchy was a spectacle. It had been tolerated by the civilized world, although frequently the performance had been rudely and forcibly interrupted by the foreign spectators. The domestic audience, heavily taxed for its support, when insulted by the actors, had repeatedly resented the indignity with violence. The practical and real took the place of this pernicious mockery. A firm government, conducted by just and able men, was installed upon the abandoned stage. The whole proceeding had been spectacular. Civilization had endured it. The lord of the demesne had for a brief period conferred his functions upon Christopher Sly. But to this general and correct appreciation of the melodrama there was one exception. As the play was ending the Democratic Administration came in as a spectator, as Don Quixote and Sancho Panza entered the puppet show in Spain. To it, as to the don, the performance was real, and, like real life, it was thought to be continuous. It saw in the mammets and puppets and in the stage queen weakness overpowered and virginity oppressed and disinherited, while Sancho, against the evidence of his senses, saw through the eyes of his master. [Laughter and applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the occupants of the galleries to the requirement of the rules of the Senate. No marks of applause or disapprobation are permitted. The Senator from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. DAVIS. And Mr. Blount was sent to the Hawaiian Islands on the chivalrous quest inspired by that delusion.

Mr. Blount was appointed on the 11th day of March, 1893. The treaty was withdrawn, I think, upon the 7th day of March, 1893. An inquiry more interesting and important than anything that I have discussed (because this Hawaiian question is fleeting; it will pass away) is whether the appointment of Mr. Blount was a constitutional appointment, in that it never received the advice or consent of the Senate.

A most important case as a precedent is immediately raised. It lays hold of the most distant future, and may affect our relations with other nations than Hawaii. The Constitution of the United States, Article II, section 1, provides as to the powers of the President:

> He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

All diplomatic officers and judges of the Supreme Court of the United States are, by express provision, out of abundance of caution, named to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Was Mr. Blount a diplomatic representative? Was he a diplomatic officer? I turn to his letters of credence, dated at Washington on the 11th day of March, in the year 1893, addressed by Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, to his great and good friend, Sanford B. Dole, the president of the executory and advisory council of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands:

> GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: I have made choice of James H. Blount, one of our distinguished citizens, as my special commissioner to visit the Hawaiian Islands and make report to me concerning the present status of affairs in that country. He is well informed of our sincere desire to cultivate and maintain to the fullest extent the friendship which has so long subsisted between the two countries—

I ask the attention of the Senate to the following—

> and in all matters affecting relations with the Government of the Hawaiian Islands his authority is paramount.

In all matters affecting the relations of the Government of the United States with the Hawaiian Islands his authority is paramount. I should be pleased to hear anyone suggest language more forcible or comprehensive to confer supreme authority in all matters of diplomatic relations in any case upon any man. No matter what Mr. Stevens may have done or what he may hereafter in his office say, I, the President of the United States, by my letters of credence to you, Mr. Blount, notify President Dole that Mr. Blount's authority in all matters affecting relations between these two Governments is paramount.

I shall not discuss the instructions to Mr. Blount, because the commission comprehends it all and is broader in some respects than the instructions. What is the use of talking about names and words and trying to draw vain distinctions here when the fact, the thing, is what we are after? Mr. Stevens was instructed, I will say, that he could continue to perform the duties of his office in all matters where Mr. Blount's authority did not conflict.

Mr. President, if this right exists in the President of the United States there is not a court in Europe where his familiar can not sit down with paramount authority by the side of a duly confirmed minister and overrule him. There is not a court in the United States where his familiar can not sit down with paramount authority beside the district attorney and control him. There is not a United States marshal empowered by virtue of his commission to execute the processes of the courts of the United States who can not be accompanied by a familiar of the President of the United States with paramount authority to overrule and control him. The President is the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. There is not a colonel of a regiment, a commander of a military division, or the captain of a man-of-war who is not subject to have appear before him the apparition of a familiar of the President of the United States with a letter giving him paramount authority to overrule and control him.

It was not without reason that the framers of the Constitution of the United States provided, in express terms, that consuls and ambassadors, other public ministers, and the judges of the Supreme Court, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. They considered most prophetically what they were doing. By the terms of the Constitution they were framing (the wisest instrument of government ever prepared by the wit of man, and laying hold of more future contingencies than any such instrument ever did), they made the President the sole point of contact and means of communication between the Government of the United States and foreign powers. Congress in either body, or together, can hold no communication with any foreign power. No governor of a State nor any State authority can do it. No individual can do it. Everything must be done through the President of the United States, who makes the treaties and appoints the ministers.

It was felt that this extraordinary power, necessarily confided to the direction of a single understanding and a single will, was susceptible of the greatest abuse; for, although the President can not declare war, he can, through his foreign policy, conducted by diplomatic officers, embroil this nation in such difficulties as to bring a foreign war upon us, and compel Congress to declare a defensive war. So vast was this power that they deemed it important expressly to say in the Constitution that the names of these officers thus appointed should be submitted to the Senate, that the Senate might know what men were being sent abroad to conduct these difficult and delicate relations. They are first named as the most important, for they precede the judges of the Supreme Court.

On the other hand, as to the judges of the Supreme Court, the framers of the Constitution considered how republics and other constitutional governments have been sapped and mined by a pliant judiciary; how, while an irregular and improper exercise of the powers of appointment of foreign ministers might affect disastrously our exterior relations, similar improprieties and carelessness of appointment in judges might result in seriously compromising everything that was internal in our system of government. Accordingly with the same care with which they provided that ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls should be named by the President to the Senate, to receive its advice and consent, they made the same provision in regard to the judges of the Supreme Court.

Section 1674 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

> Diplomatic officers shall be deemed to include ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, ministers plenipotentiary, ministers resident, commissioners, charge d'affaires, agents, and secretaries of legation, and none other.

How does Mr. Blount's commission read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota will please suspend his remarks. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business. It will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes re-

lating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota may proceed and finish his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senator from Minnesota be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAY. I rose merely to call the attention of the Senate to my understanding in regard to the bill. I understood there was unanimous consent that it should go over until 2 o'clock Monday and then be the unfinished business.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will proceed, there being no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. The word "commissioner" in the statute which I have just read, enumerating who shall be diplomatic officers, distinctly comprehends Mr. Blount, for the letters of credence read:

> I have made choice of James H. Blount * * * as my special commissioner.

He was a special commissioner, whose authority in all matters pertaining to the relations between the governments should be paramount. If special commissioner is not covered by the express language of the Constitution in its words of enumeration it is covered by the other more general clause, namely, the inferior officers to be designated by law.

To show Mr. Blount's understanding of his powers, my friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] calls my attention to his mode of signature, page 139, Executive Document No. 47, in a communication to Mr. Gresham.

Mr. GRAY. What is the page?

Mr. DAVIS. Page 139. It is always the same way, I think, "James H. Blount, Special Commissioner of the United States." This is his formal report. What was there lacking in what Mr. Blount did or in what he was empowered to do to constitute him an ambassador or public minister? He falls within the purview of the constitutional enumeration. He falls expressly within the enumeration of the statute which I have just read. In my view, in the sense of the Constitution, an officer is one who has authority to act in the name of and on behalf of the United States and by whose actions the Government may be bound. Such was Mr. Blount.

Now, Mr. President, it is said that there are precedents for this. I deny it. I say that there is no precedent in our diplomatic history that protects this flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States. He was empowered, as my friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], suggests, in his instructions given to him by Mr. Gresham, to invoke the naval and military force of the United States by virtue of his paramount official character:

> In the judgment of the President, your authority, as well as that of the commander of the naval forces in Hawaiian waters, should be and is limited in the use of physical force to such measures as are necessary to protect the persons and property of our citizens; and while abstaining from any manner of interference with the domestic concerns of the islands, you should indicate your willingness to intervene with your friendly offices in the interest of a peaceful settlement of troubles within the limits of sound discretion.

He was empowered to call into force and active operation the military force, and was also empowered to use his friendly offices for a settlement. If there is anything wanting to endow him fully with complete diplomatic character, it does not at this moment occur to me.

Mr. PLATT. What greater power has any ambassador?

Mr. DAVIS. My friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], asks me what greater power any ambassador has. None. In fact, Mr. President, it is the only instance in our history that I recollect where any President has ever undertaken to appoint an ambassador. The distinction between an ambassador and a minister as laid down in the authoritative works upon international law is that the ambassador represents the person of his sovereign, whereas the minister does not. In imperial language in these letters of credence, the President of the United States notifies President Dole that he has appointed Mr. Blount "as my special commissioner."

Mr. HOAR. I should like to call the attention of my honorable friend to the fact that the recent statute authorizing the President to appoint ambassadors expressly provides that the functions shall not be enlarged beyond the existing functions.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; of a minister or envoy. I denied a few moments ago that there was any precedent in our history which protects this transaction, even by remote analogy. I do not believe it can be found. I do not believe it ever will be again attempted to create another one. If found, it is valueless and should be disregarded. I am aware that during the debates in the Senate upon the fisheries treaty in 1888 a list of some 438 appointments alleged to be of like character was brought forward, and that has been a fetish to conjure with ever since; and yet under the examination to which it was submitted in the remarks of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] upon that treaty it lost its charm and should no longer have any efficacy. When sifted out there were but seven in all that list (minor matters, passing unquestioned at the time, and doubtless attributable to inattention) that could with even plausibility be maintained to be precedents. And even those were not, in my judgment, cases to which the constitutional provision under consideration is applicable. I shall ask leave, for the purpose of saving time and presenting that question better than I can do, to print a short extract from the remarks of the senior Senator from New Hampshire, made in the discussion of that treaty, wherein he discussed that particular subject:

> No one has ever disputed the privilege of the President to negotiate treaties, using the Secretary of State and the regularly appointed and confirmed foreign ministers for that purpose. Why, then, do the minority particularize and parade about 438 cases of that character? Simply to obscure the flagrant nature of the case now under review and censure, and to break the force of the one great and overwhelming precedent against it, to be shortly stated. In addition to these 438 cases the report gives a list of three persons appointed by the Secretary of State and a list of thirty-two appointed by the President, and specially confirmed by the Senate to negotiate treaties. But of the three appointed by the Secretary of State, two, Hughes and Bates, were already diplomatic officers, and the thirty-two are of course all precedents against the minority and not in their favor.
>
> There is to be extracted from the list of 473 only the following cases which are of any value to the minority, being those where private citizens were employed in negotiations without the prior consent of the Senate:
>
> 1. G. Morris, private agent, October 13, 1789, to ascertain the intentions of Great Britain as to the treaty of 1783, and make a treaty of commerce.
>
> 2. John James Appleton, May 12, 1825, to arrange for the settlement of claims of citizens of the United States against the Kingdom of Naples.
>
> 3. Charles Rhind, September 12, 1829, to conclude a treaty of friendship and commerce with Turkey.
>
> 4. Edmund Roberts, January 26, 1832, to conclude treaties of navigation and commerce with Cochin China, Siam, and Muscat.
>
> 5. A. Dudley Mann, March 28, 1846, to conclude with Hanover, Hungary, Switzerland, etc., treaties of commerce and navigation.
>
> 6. Benjamin E. Greene, June 13, 1849, to conclude treaties of commerce with Hayti and the Dominican Republic.
>
> 7. Isaac E. Morse, December 5, 1856, to conclude a treaty with New Granada with reference to transit across the Isthmus of Panama.
>
> What a pitiful list among the whole 473 which are set out with such elaboration in the minority report! It is sufficient to say in relation to these 7, in the face of the overwhelming precedents the other way—the 466 cases where treaties have been negotiated by officials who had been confirmed by the Senate as required by the Constitution—that they are few in number, that the negotiations were insignificant, that the precedents were never acquiesced in, and that they constitute no real authority for or justification of the marked violation of the Constitution committed by the President in appointing Messrs. Angell and Putnam without the consent of the Senate.
>
> I have stated that the object of the minority in cumbering their report with upward of 438 cases which have no bearing upon the point in controversy is simply to break the force of the one great and overwhelming precedent against them. It is impossible to resist this conclusion or a worse opinion upon the recorded facts.
>
> On page 130 the minority give the case of the Joint High Commission which negotiated the Alabama Claims treaty, and they show Messrs. Ebenezer R. Hoar and George H. Williams as appointed while private citizens two of the five plenipotentiaries by the President alone; and the minority include the five in their number (on page 105) of 438 persons appointed by the President alone.
>
> The minority, therefore, certainly thus appear to have found a pertinent precedent, especially as the High Joint Commission held its sessions, like the Bayard-Chamberlain Commission, and with similar festivities, in the city of Washington. The only objection that can be made against this precedent is that the facts are directly the opposite of those stated in the minority report. Commissioners Hoar and Williams, as well as Secretary Fish, Minister Schenck, and Mr. Justice Nelson, were nominated to the Senate and were confirmed on the 10th day of February, 1871, before they acted.

I have indicated, and others who have preceded me in this debate have indicated with an ability that I can not hope to equal, the serious consequences which are involved in this extraordinary assumption of power. The President has endeavored to break through the walls which divide our Government into departments. He has invaded the privileges of the Senate in this particular respect, and we are advised that we ought to sit silent under this attack; that we should let it pass by without criticism or protest. So far as we are concerned, perhaps, personally we might do so, but as guardians of the constitutional rights of the people we can not.

It is not the first time in history, Mr. President, that an attack upon the privileges of a Senate has been made by an Executive magistrate, nor is it the first time in history that resentment or discussion by the Senate has been deprecated. At a time in the history of the Roman Empire, when the Emperor was *Princeps Senatus*, connected somewhat with that body as the President of the United States is with this, a resolute man, a man determined to overthrow the privileges of the Senate, withdrew himself into seclusion for that purpose to the island of Capri, and as the last Administration is accused, as Mr. Stevens is accused, as the American men in that island are accused, as the privileges of the Senate of the United States are ignored, so he by a message accused and brought into question the privileges of the Senate. Discussion was to be stifled. Nothing was to be said. The few remaining arches which sustained the senatorial privileges were to be broken down with-

out question. When some one is represented by the satirist to have asked concerning the man attacked or the privilege to be overthrown, he thus said, and was answered to:

Sed quo cecidit sub crimine; quisnam
Delator? quibus judiciis; quo teste probavit?
Nil horum; verbosa et grandis epistola venit
A Capreis. Bene habet; nil plus interrogo.

My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] requests me to translate that. He does not need it, of course. But another Senator [Mr. WASHBURN] suggests that some of the rest of us do. I will not attempt to give a literal translation, but I will give an accurate paraphrase which will show its application: "Into what crime has he fallen? By what informer has he been accused? What judge has passed upon him? What witness has testified against him? Not one or any of these. A verbose and turgid message has come over from Capri. That settles it. I will interrogate no further." [Laughter.]

Mr. Blount was appointed on the 11th day of March, 1893, and he arrived at Honolulu on the 29th of April, 1893. He called on President Dole and presented the letters of credence to that "great and good brother" on the 30th day of April, 1893.

I communicated to him the friendly disposition of our Government toward him and toward the Hawaiian people. I assured him of its purpose to avoid any interference with the domestic concerns of the islands unless it became necessary to protect the persons and property of American citizens. I then offered my letters of credence.

Now, in the light of what he did immediately thereafter and what has been done since, the proprieties of language fail to properly characterize that delusive message, for he immediately proceeded, in violation of a statute of his country, which no President can dispense with, and of the precepts of international law to put himself into communication (as he wrongfully charges Stevens with doing) with an element, to wit, the royal element, which is in every way hostile to the government to which he had just presented his letters of credence, and in which he assured it of the entire friendship of the President of the United States. I refer to Section 1751 of the Revised Statutes:

No diplomatic or consular officer shall correspond in regard to the public affairs of any foreign government, with any private person, newspaper, or other periodical, or otherwise than with the proper officers of the United States.

Over and over again Mr. Blount violated that provision.

Mr. HAWLEY. He was sent to do nothing else.

Mr. DAVIS. The instructions which he had received were not the message which he communicated to President Dole. Those were concealed.

On the 30th day of March it had got out in Hawaii that Mr. Blount was there. The hopes of royalty in some way or other were excited, and a mass meeting of the Hawaiian League was held. It passed resolutions for the restoration of the monarchy and the restoration of Queen Liliuokalani, reciting that President Cleveland had sent Mr. Blount out as special commissioner. This was the next day after he arrived in the island. On the next day, March 31, he received a messenger wishing to know when it would be convenient for him to receive a committee from the mass meeting, which desired to present these resolutions. If this was not corresponding with, putting himself into communication with private persons, subjects of another power, within the prohibition of the statute which I have read, will some one tell me what would be? He avows that this raised a question whether such action would consist with a "recognition of existing authority and the policy of noninterference." (Page 6.) But he does not avow any intention of consulting President Dole on this point, nor did he consult him.

But something had to be done to smooth away the road for the audience which he proposed to give in his court to the committee of the mass meeting which was about to invoke him to aid in restoring the fallen monarchy. The American flag was floating over the government building at Hawaii at that time. It was invited to float over there by Mr. Dole's government, which we had recognized. There was no question of forcible intervention or intrusion there at all. It was properly there by the invitation of the government of President Dole, which was the only government that had any right to complain.

To make the way smooth and easy to receive this petition for the restoration of the royal power, with the inevitable effect of its raising hopes which were in direct contradiction to the assurances he had given to President Dole two days before, or one day before, on the 31st day of March, 1893, he called on Mr. Dole and notified him that he, Mr. Blount, should cause the ensign of the United States to be lowered and the troops ordered on board their ships; and he ordered Admiral Skerrit to execute such order on the 1st day of April at 11 o'clock. The flag was rightfully there. The annexation of the islands was thought to be imminent. The flag was a coming event which cast its shadow before. It was there by invitation of the Provisional Government itself. It was there under the stress of urgent and imminent danger, as appeared both to President Dole and Mr. Stevens when such request was made.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. FRYE. I desire to put in here the remarkable order which Mr. Blount gave an admiral of the United States Navy.

Mr. DAVIS. Will my friend please read it? I will adopt it as a part of my remarks.

Mr. FRYE. It is as follows:

HONOLULU, *March 31, 1893.*

SIR: You are directed to haul down the United States ensign from the Government building, and to embark the troops now on shore to the ships to which they belong.

This will be executed at 11 o'clock on the 1st day of April.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES H. BLOUNT,
Special Commissioner of the United States.

Rear-Admiral J. S. SKERRETT,
Commanding Pacific Squadron.

The history of this country may be hunted over and no other instance can be found where a civil officer or a citizen of one of our States ordered an admiral of the American Navy to haul down the flag of our Government.

Mr. DAVIS. But it is said that Mr. Blount was not an officer!

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator allow me to add that the instructions of the Secretary of the Navy to Admiral Skerrett directed him to obey the orders of Mr. Blount and placed the naval forces in those islands under the command of Mr. Blount?

Mr. DAVIS. And yet Mr. Blount was not a diplomatic officer, and did not need to have the consent of the Senate to his nomination!

Mr. FRYE. But, if the Senator will allow me, no diplomatic officer, no ambassador, no minister plenipotentiary, no officer whatever outside of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy and the regular officers of the Navy, ever made any such order, nor was ever clothed with power to make any such order; and this, I am happy to say, is the only instance ever to be found.

Mr. HOAR. Or that ever will be found.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no doubt of the exact historical truth of that statement and of the verity of that prediction.

Mr. President, this is the first time in nearly thirty years that the American flag has been lowered by an American hand under circumstances which have brought a feeling of dishonor and shame to an American heart. It is the last time in many years, I predict, that that act will be done. Although the stars thus disappeared from the Hawaiian sky, that ensign will in due time, though lowered in dishonor, eventually be raised in power.

After these orders were delivered to Admiral Skerrett, and when everything was made easy for aspiring royalism by the announcement that it was to be done (for it went out that the American flag was to be lowered and the military recalled on board the ship) Mr. Blount, in the afternoon of that day, March 31, notified the committee of the league that he would receive them at 4 o'clock, April 1, five hours after the American flag was to be lowered. What was the effect of that? All that Stevens is charged with doing by way of inciting rebellion and revolution or tumult is not the tithe of a thousandth part of that which can be inferred from the action of Mr. Blount.

When Mr. Blount came to that island everything was serene and peaceful. Everybody had acquiesced, the Queen included, in the situation. He had not been there two days before by an act a thousand times more significant than anything even Stevens is charged with, he incited all of the trouble, the rebellious feeling, the insurrectionary disposition, which for a time seemed to have been laid at rest; and then under those circumstances he notified the committee of the league (which, I think, he says somewhere in his report comprised 8,000 native Hawaiians), that the flag being out of the way, the troops off the island, I here, a special commissioner, am ready to receive you; and he says in regard to lowering the flag:

This was done in order that, when the committee called, the ensign would have been hauled down and the troops ordered aboard of their vessels, and I could state freely to the committee that it was not my purpose to interfere in their domestic concerns; that the United States troops would not be used to maintain or restore any form of government, but simply to protect the persons and property of American citizens.

But the flag that he struck was there at the request of the Provisional Government, which our Government had recognized and to which he had been accredited. He met this committee, nineteen members. They presented to him the resolutions, desiring that they be transmitted to the President of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Minnesota allow me to ask him a question? If he has it before him, I wish he would point out the request made by the Provisional Government for the putting up of the flag.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in one of the documents submitted by the President to the Senate within a few days. It is in a dispatch from Mr. Stevens to Mr. Gresham, wherein he goes on at length reciting the apprehended intrigue of the British commissioner,

the presence of an additional Japanese man-of-war, a translation of declarations of the Japanese captain, the wish and desire of President Dole that the marines should be landed—in short, giving a full and explicit reason for their presence there. Now, I can not give the page, and it is asking too much in the manner in which I am speaking to request it.

Mr. MORGAN. I beg leave to say that the act of raising the flag was in conjunction with the act declaring the protectorate of the United States Government over Hawaii. I was not quite certain whether the raising of the flag and the declaration or assertion of a protectorate were contemporaneous acts.

Mr. DAVIS. I hear the Senator imperfectly. The history of that protectorate was this, to go back to the beginning. In the first place, Mr. Stevens established a protectorate there, general in its character, while the treaty should be under consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, was that point of time——

Mr. DAVIS. I do not propose to be cross-examined.

Mr. MORGAN. No; I am asking——

Mr. DAVIS. That is just the amount of the interruption.

Mr. MORGAN. I am asking for information and seeking for information strictly.

Mr. DAVIS. The idea of the Senator from Alabama asking me for information!

Mr. MORGAN. Of course.

Mr. DAVIS. He is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and his memory and capacity to assimilate and store away all subjects are marvelous to contemplate.

Mr. MORGAN. I am asking for information, and in perfect good faith. I want to know whether the flag was raised at the time the protectorate was established?

Mr. DAVIS. Which protectorate does the Senator refer to?

Mr. MORGAN. The one that Stevens asserted over the island.

Mr. DAVIS. I can not say as to that matter of detail.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the point about which I am uncertain. I wish, however, to remind the Senator of the fact that Mr. Foster distinctly disavowed the protectorate over the island in his dispatch to Mr. Stevens, and I do not know what the flag could be doing there without the protectorate, or what the protectorate could be doing there without the flag.

Mr. DAVIS. So much for the interview which Mr. Blount had with the members of the league within two days after he landed on the island, praying for the restoration of the monarchy and the deposition of the Government to which he was accredited. Shortly afterward he received a long petition from the Hawaiian political league, another affair it seems, numerously signed, which states:

> Therefore, we submit to you our humble petition and statements, as you are in possession of vast powers in your mission to do justice to the Hawaiian people, our independence, the throne, and the Hawaiian flag; we beg you to restore our beloved Queen Liliuokalani to the throne with the independence of the Hawaiian people, as you have restored the Hawaiian flag.

That no United States minister should correspond with any private citizen is the plainest dictate of international law if it were not against the plain provision of our statute. About the 26th of April (in this case he notified Commissioner Dole of his intention) he called upon Queen Liliuokalani and took her statement, negotiated with her upon the subject, took her version of the transaction and her claims. But, as I have said, he made no attempt to take the version of Mr. Stevens or Mr. Dole. On the 31st of May he did another extraordinary act. Accredited to the Provisional Government as the lord paramount in all matters concerning the political relations between the two countries, he placed himself in correspondence with the Queen in her royal character, and with her cabinet in their official capacity; received petitions in that character and in that capacity from the Queen as Queen, from Samuel Parker, as minister of foreign affairs; W. H. Cornwell, as minister of finance; John F. Colburn, as minister of the interior, and A. P. Peterson, as attorney-general. It thus concludes:

> In view of the facts stated above, which can not be controverted, and in view of the fact that your investigations concerning the matter are shortly likely to terminate, we, Liliuokalani and her cabinet, who formed the Government of the Hawaiian Islands on the 17th of January last having surrendered that Government to the superior force of the United States of America, now most respectfully ask that you use your good offices in undoing the acts of a representative of your great country and place the Government of the Hawaiian Islands as Mr. Stevens found them. Believing that the principle of justice which has ever dominated American action will prevail in this instance, we remain,
>
> Yours, respectfully
>
> LILIUOKALANI, *R.*
> SAMUEL PARKER,
> *Minister of Foreign Affairs.*
> WM. H. CORNWELL,
> *Minister of Finance.*
> JOHN F. COLBURN,
> *Minister of Interior.*
> A. P. PETERSON,
> *Attorney-General.*

Accredited to President Dole, with letters which bore assurances of good faith, and, if I construe the language correctly, an implied wish for the stability and perpetuity of the Government over which Mr. Dole presided, Commissioner Blount entered into diplomatic relations with a deposed Queen, she signing her name in royal form and in her royal capacity and her former ministers countersigning in their official character, received a petition from her and them in her royal capacity and their official capacity, requesting him to use his good offices to overthrow the Government to which he had been accredited, a government of Americans, of Englishmen, of our own blood, presided over by a man of American birth or derivation, and to turn those vast interests, these our kith and kin, over to the barbarous and revengeful administration of a government which had been successfully rebelled against and overthrown. A more glaring diplomatic malversation never was committed; and that it is plainly in violation of the statute which I have read in the hearing of the Senate can not, I think, be controverted for a moment.

And upon this testimony, this history, these transactions, the President of the United States in his annual message states that Mr. Blount's report shows his conclusions to be true beyond all question. He states that the constitutional government of Hawaii had been subverted through the active aid of the representative of our Government, and through the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States, which was landed for the purpose at the instance of our minister. His conclusion is:

> Upon the facts developed it seemed to me the only honorable course for our Government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us and to restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our forcible intervention. With a view of accomplishing this result within the constitutional limits of executive power, and recognizing all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference, our present minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end. Thus far no information of the accomplishment of any definite results has been received from him.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to ascertain and to discuss for a moment from what source the President of the United States derived his authority to arbitrate this great question. Who made him and by what processes did he become the judge of the case between an overthrown monarchy and a republic which took its place? Much has been said about the terms of Queen Liliuokalani's abdication, but when did any falling monarch ever fail to file a caveat with contemporaries and posterity to that effect? It is addressed to no person. It was never formally accepted by anybody, and no convention has ever been made between the Hawaiian Government which Mr. Cleveland, following the example of President Harrison, has recognized or the former government of the Queen and ourselves that such an arbitration should take place.

But there is a consideration back of all this, and back of anything I have said upon this subject, which to me is decisive. What the Queen of the Hawaiian Kingdom meant and understood to be meant in the letter of abdication, was that the question of recognition was to be submitted to the United States; and I assert it as a sound legal proposition, in view and in the light of all the circumstances of this transaction, that the very question which the President of the United States has reopened here was settled when President Harrison recognized the Provisional Government. The act of recognition is all-comprehending so far as bringing a nation into existence. It is a deliberate judgment by the recognizing nation that the recognized government has a valid right to be, has come into being rightfully, and has the right to continue. It is in its very nature an irrevocable act. Who ever heard of any civilized country retracting any recognition which it had given to a foreign country? Like an executed grant, it is incapable of revocation because the right has vested and can not be taken away.

Queen Liliuokalani's protest was received at the State Department on the 3d day of February, 1893, and the treaty, I think, was not concluded until the 13th day of that month. Her representatives were here at the time. The case was heard and determined, and wisely determined by President Harrison, and it does not lie in the capacity of any succeeding Administration to open it for readjudication. And the Queen passively acquiesced in that construction of her act of abdication, and in the conclusive effect of President Harrison's recognition of the Provisional Government, until she was enticed to renew her claims by the action of the present Administration.

Mr. President, it has seemed to become a propensity to restore royalty, ignorant, savage, alien royalty, over American people. But in these days of restoring monarchies, suppose the President of the United States should conceive that President Harrison has been imposed upon, misled, by the recognition of President Peixoto, who succeeded to the fallen Empire of Dom Pedro in Brazil. The recognition in that case was prompt. Suppose the President should determine to reopen the question and to send a minister

there to stand before President Peixoto and say, "I have become satisfied that my predecessor was misled, that your Government was not established with the consent of the Brazilian people, and therefore you are required to relinquish your power to the lineal descendant and heir of Dom Pedro, whoever he may be."

If this power exists in the President of the United States, it exists in the successive Presidents to undo the act of a President who has recognized another government. The same thing might be done to President Carnot; it might have been done to President Thiers, who was the first President of the now existing French Republic. Suppose the President of the United States should take it into his head that the French Republic was wrongfully established and not with the consent of the French people, and a paramount emissary, emissary at once and ambassador, should be sent to France accredited to "his great and good friend," President Carnot, with authority over our Army and Navy, and that France were in distress, and that as an emissary he should consort with Bourbons, with Orleanists, with Bonapartists, with anarchists, with every political element of which French political complexion is composed. Suppose that then, having so consorted as an emissary, without giving those to whom he was accredited a chance to be heard, he should stand forth as an ambassador before the French President and say "the President of the United States is convinced that the French Republic was not established with the consent of the French people; a great wrong has been done. Therefore, you are required to relinquish the republican power which you now hold to the emperor of the Bonaparte family, or the king of the French, whoever he may be, of the other royal houses in the line of lineal descent."

Mr. President, many questions and illustrations of this kind press upon the mind while one is speaking, but the limitations of time do not warrant more extended remarks. They suggest themselves.

It is said we do not want colonies and that we do not need the Hawaiian Islands. I am not in favor of a colonial system such as Great Britain has, and such as France is striving for, but I want to see my country well defended, and her hold upon the enormous commerce of the future in the Pacific Ocean assured. That the Sandwich Islands were in time to be an indispensable element of the prosperity, protection, and defense of our country has been a cardinal theory with every statesman who ever sat in the chair of Secretary of State from the beginning of the question down to the present time, the present occupant excepted.

Humboldt predicted seventy years ago that the greatest maritime commerce of the planet would be carried on on the Pacific. If you take the globe and look north of the equator and then to the south of it you will see that the islands of the Pacific Ocean, except the Sandwich Islands and the Alaskan group, are south of the equator. Germany, France, and England have partitioned that archipelago south of the equator. They have hitherto kept their hands off the Hawaiian Islands. Those are the only islands of any importance north of the equator until we almost touch the coast of Asia, except the Alaskan group. They stand where commerce from the Nicaragua Canal, if it shall ever be constructed, must touch. They stand where ships from Callao and Valparaiso must touch. They stand where every ship that goes from San Francisco or Victoria to New Zealand or Australia must touch. They are 2,100 miles from the city of San Francisco. They are 2,100 miles from the midway island of the Alaskan group, an island with capacious harbors fit for a naval station. The Russian Government, our ancient and immemorial friend, is building a railway across the continent of Asia destined for a port near by; and her relations and ours have always been such that, under those circumstances, from the Hawaiian Islands, from the Alaskan islands, from San Francisco, we can make our commerce safe and dominate that waste of waters. That is the kind of acquisition and the kind of protection I want for my country, its future and its commerce.

Mr. President, this is a great question—great in its facts, great in its constituional aspect. The American people will be the judges in this controversy. They are adjudicating it now. In the midst of distress, of financial disorder which the panacea of legislative action has not cured; with the mine sterile, the shuttle motionless, the wheel still, the factory sending up neither pillar of cloud by day nor pillar of fire by night; with hunger and cold in thousands of homes; with the fear of a relentless party policy respecting financial and economic legislation which threatens to intensify all this distress into a deeper agony, the American people have paused to consider this subject, and they will settle it in the sublime tribunal of the nation's judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. TURPIE. I ask that the resolution heretofore submitted by me in relation to the policy respecting Hawaii be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. TURPIE on the 8th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That from the facts and papers laid before us by the Executive and other sources it is unwise, inexpedient, and not in accordance with the character and dignity of the United States to consider further at this time either the treaty or project of annexation of the Hawaiian territory to this country; that the Provisional Government therein having been duly recognized, the highest international interests require that it shall pursue its own line of polity. Foreign intervention in the political affairs of these islands will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, the Sandwich Islands, the site of the Hawaiian people, were discovered by Capt. Cook in 1778. They are thirteen in number, four of considerable size; the rest are smaller, some of them are mere dots on the surface of the deep. They lie near together in the form of a curve or crescent, in a genial climate within the tropics, about halfway between the two continents whose opposite shores bound the North Pacific.

At the time of their discovery the inhabitants of each were under the separate government of independent native chiefs, having a tribal polity somewhat akin to that of the North American Indians. This political condition obtained until 1790, when Kamehameha the First, who seems to have been the Cæsar of this distant island group, reduced the inhabitants of all the islands to his rule. He achieved the sovereignty of the whole, united them under one government, took and maintained the title of king, and was the founder of the Hawaiian monarchy. He died in 1824 and was succeeded by his son Kamehameha the Second, and the crown afterward descended in the regular line of inheritance until 1891, when the late queen, a lineal descendant of the first conqueror, became the sovereign by the death of her brother, King Kalakaua.

During the period from 1840 to 1845 the Hawaiian Kingdom was recognized by the United States, France, England, and other foreign powers as an independent nation; its capital became the residence of a diplomatic corps more or less numerous, and has ever since continued to be such. Much progress was made by this people under the monarchy.

The natives abandoned idolatry, adopted the Christian religion and worship, discarded the costume and customs of their former life, engaged in commerce and agriculture, gradually acquired many of the traits and usages of European civilization. At the same time the islands received a large accession of population by migration from Asia, from Europe, and especially from the United States.

The Hawaiian monarchy, absolute at first, was much modified by these internal changes. It became in later years constitutional in form, with a legislative body of two chambers, one of which is chosen by the votes of the people, a cabinet, and organized departments, with a seat of government located at Honolulu, where the first King had fixed his residence.

The personnel of the monarchy had meanwhile somewhat declined. The descendants of the race of Kamehameha did not retain its old prowess, prudence, or vigor. Dissatisfaction with the administration of public affairs was rife in 1892, especially among the foreign element of the population, which had become numerous, wealthy, and influential, and at last culminated in open revolt against the royal authority.

On the 17th of January last the Hawaiian Republic was proclaimed, the Provisional Government was organized, took possession of the public buildings, archives, and other property without resistance, and has held undisturbed possession ever since. The revolution was as bloodless and peaceable as that which deposed the Emperor Dom Pedro in Brazil, or that which brought about the fall of Louis Philippe in France and the republic of Lamartine.

Nevertheless, as it was in the instances mentioned, so in this it is a fact accomplished. This Provisional Government thus established was recognized by the American minister resident a very short time after it had been proclaimed, and the same action has been taken by the representatives of other foreign governments who maintain legations at Honolulu.

The recognition of a government *de facto* has always been accounted an act of the gravest moment.

It is an act of one power, supreme and sovereign, respecting the existence of another of a like character. It can not be revised except upon the supposition of a power paramount, which is contrary to the postulate of sovereignty itself.

It follows, then, that although recognition may be deferred, although it may be withheld for further advisement or it may be altogether denied, yet once granted it is a finality; like the word spoken, like the arrow sped, like the shot fired, it is beyond recall. Recognition may cease after it has been given, but it ceases only when another government arises and displaces the one which had before been acknowledged.

The force of the act of recognition is not at all affected by the form of the new government, or by the means which may have been used to establish it. Who has forgotten what Victor Hugo called "The crime of December," the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon in 1851, by which the republic was destroyed and the empire built upon its ruin? Yet the United States recognized the empire so constructed, and for almost twenty years continued to deal with it as the Government of France.

By the events of last January President Dole became the head of the Provisional Government. He is the recognized chief magistrate of the Hawaiian people. He is one among the rulers of the earth. He ranks in degree with the President of this Union, with the daughter of a hundred kings who sits enthroned at Windsor.

It is true the territorial extent of the new republic is not great, but its arable area is as large as that of Switzerland—the most ancient of existing commonwealths.

It very much exceeds that of Attica, the most famous republic of antiquity. Honolulu with its adjacent territory is much larger than any of the free cities with their appendant lands, which toward the close of the feudal era gave to the Teutonic race its first lessons in civil, political, and commercial liberty.

These free cities were within their own limits independent—cosmopolitan also in their population. Strangers and foreigners were welcomed to the various guilds, were admitted to the civic franchises, enrolled in the military force, lived and labored in all respects as natives. Honolulu is just such a capital, composed of many nationalities, containing an element well versed in all the arts and interests of civilization.

The adjacent lands are inhabited by a native race—docile, tractable, very amenable to law, not averse to labor, tilling a fertile soil, worthy and capable of yet greater progress. Why may not this metropolis with its adjacent lands continue to be, and rejoice in being, the free city of the Pacific; the site of a republic truly ocean-bound?

The independence of the Hawaiian nation was guaranteed by France and England as early as the treaty of 1843 in these terms:

> Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and His Majesty the King of the French, taking into consideration the existence in the Sandwich Islands of a government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations, have thought it right to engage reciprocally to consider the Sandwich Islands as an independent state, and never to take possession, either directly or under the title of a protectorate or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed.

The signatory powers have always observed and the United States has carefully respected it, though not a party to it, declaring at the same time that it constantly preferred Hawaiian independence. Thus Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, says in 1842, the year before the conclusion of the treaty which I have quoted:

> The United States, therefore, is more interested in the fate of the islands and of their Government than any other nation can be; and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government, or any exclusive privileges or preferences with it in matters of commerce.

And Mr. Bayard took the same ground in 1885, in his note to the British Government, explaining the concession of Pearl Harbor, "that this contained in its terms nothing to impair the political sovereignty of Hawaii."

Mr. Blaine made the following statement in 1891 on behalf of the Government of the United States:

> It firmly believes that the position of the Hawaiian Islands, as the key to the dominion of the American Pacific, demands their benevolent neutrality, to which end it will earnestly coöperate with the native Government.

These relations, mutual and general, between the United States, other countries, and Hawaii have been of long standing, recognized by all nations, and are in full force to-day, and they are as applicable to the new republic as to the old monarchy. Hawaiian sovereignty may have been somewhat protected by international jealousy, but it is protected yet more by international indifference. Foreign governments have shown no desire at any time to acquire the sovereignty of the islands or the corresponding duties and responsibilities which would accompany such dominion.

A very formal and elaborate protectorate on paper was established during the reign of the first Kamehameha by personal negotiation it is said between that King and George III, the King of the Hawaiian monarchy being then in London. The British Government never approved of it and never took any possession or exercised any rights under it whatever, disclaiming what they stated would be the difficulties which would meet a European power stationed there as sovereign, or even in the capacity of a protectorate.

For many months—I speak now in respect of the protection afforded by international indifference—a treaty of annexation has been pending here before this body and in this Capitol. No word of objection or dissent by any foreign power has been made thereto, and no foreign power has done so much as to ask a word of explanation. When we bought Pearl Harbor, in the Sandwich Islands, the British Government addressed a note to the Secretary of State, then Mr. Bayard, asking an explanation of the transaction; but here is a treaty pending for months, having in view the absolute annexation of the whole group to this Union, and not a foreign government has said a word or addressed a note to any officer of this Government with respect to such acquisition.

Indeed it is very clear from this unanimous attitude of silence that the civilized powers interested would, if we were content with its propriety or justice, be gratified if we should assume the sovereignty of the Sandwich Islands. They would then have, what they have not always had—a tribunal permanent and responsible, to whom might be submitted the very difficult and delicate commercial and maritime differences which often arise at the ports of these islands.

Let us believe that the same stability and permanency may be realized from the rise of the new government. The autonomy of the Hawaiian country is not only secured by treaty, guaranteed by general acquiescence, but is at this time supported by the good will and friendly offices of the whole society of nations.

There is nothing in the way of Hawaiian national advancement, there is nothing of obstruction to their peaceful and prosperous progress, except those difficulties which ordinarily make the problems of statesmanship which time and patience may solve, which a wise and just ruler may compose or overcome. No protectorate can add anything to the prestige of the new government. Annexation would erase and destroy it.

The annexation of one nationality to another necessarily destroys the nationality of that annexed—it is merged into another, it henceforth disappears from among the list of nations.

Those great writers, the international statesmen of the world who have from age to age recorded and compiled the practice and usages of nations, and have so formed that code called the law of the nations, have always represented the extinction of a nation as a misfortune, a great catastrophe, to be regretted and deplored.

Public opinion among all peoples has justified this sentiment. The extinction of Poland, though long ago accomplished, is still keenly felt. The prolonged subjugation and disappearance of Greece was for many centuries the subject of regret and sorrow, and how gladly the governments and peoples of the whole civilized world have welcomed the restoration of Grecian nationality to which we were all so much indebted, and the return of this ancient people to their former place in the circle of the family of nations. This family is not large: it only embraces now within the cycle of ordinary international intercourse about forty in number. One of the number, even the least, is missed from this illustrious society.

Hence what is called annexation, according to the usages of governments, civilized and enlightened, has been at all times accompanied not only by treaty, but by some precedent action of popular national assent and approval on the part of those to be affected by it.

Of course, one nation may lawfully acquire territory from another without such assent or action, as by purchase or by absolute right of conquest, as we ourselves acquired it from France and Mexico. But these acquisitions did not touch in any way the national life or existence of the nations from which they were made. They only changed the condition and allegiance of the portion of the countries ceded.

The peaceable or voluntary merging of one nation into another is a thing of rare occurrence. In modern Europe perhaps the instance most nearly approaching our idea of annexation was the addition of Savoy and Nice to France in 1860. At the close of the war jointly conducted by the Emperor Napoleon and the King of Sardinia against the Austrian possession and dominion in Italy, the joint victors in that contest, at perfect amity with each other and having the absolute right of conquerors, desired to readjust national boundaries and to change in some degree the map of Southern Europe; in the language of the time, "to rectify the frontier." It was therefore proposed that Savoy and Nice, provinces theretofore of the Italian Kingdom, should be ceded to France, but this was made conditional expressly upon the prior assent of the people concerned.

A plebiscite was ordered, and on the 15th day of April, 1860, an election was held in each of these provinces, the question being submitted for or against annexation to France. A very full

vote was polled, and a very large majority of the electors voted in each of the two for annexation, which was accordingly consummated, and these countries have ever since been and to-day are a part of the French domain.

The very celebrated instance in our own annals has a similar history, and is perhaps the only example of the annexation, pure and simple, of one nation by another in modern times. Texas was an independent republic. Its people by their vote—their ballots, expressed in due form through the legislative and executive departments of their government—tendered with entire unanimity the offer of annexation to the United States. I have been told that there were not fifty persons living within the vast dominion of the Republic of Texas who were opposed to annexation either during the pendency of the treaty or at the time that the fact was consummated.

The people of this country voted on the same question in its favor, determining one Presidential election upon that issue; so that the annexation of Texas received, as may be said, a double ratification and assent.

Thus, in accordance with these historic precedents, the first step, the imperative condition precedent to the consideration of the proposition of annexation, is the expressed desire and previous assent of the people of Hawaii.

Whatever may be the powers of the Provisional Government—and I grant that they are full and plenary, as those of the oldest and best established forms of polity—it can not be assumed that any government *per se*, without legislative and popular action, is authorized to conclude a treaty for its own destruction, and for the extinction of the nationality which it represents. There should be concurrent with such treaty offer an explicit prior expression of the popular will before it can rightfully become even the subject of negotiation.

The fact that this island country is weak, that they are a feeble folk, neither rich nor numerous, is only an additional reason why the Government of this nation should exhibit toward it the deference and delicacy of treatment demanded by the highest principles of justice and fair dealing.

The question is not whether Hawaii is weak or strong, whether it be powerful or otherwise; but whether its people have so lost their attachment to their own nationality as to be ready and willing to abandon their national life and being and to merge the same into ours. Let this be first determined by a free ballot of that population under their own laws. They instituted the ballot many years ago and they are accustomed to its use.

There is a native population in the islands of about 40,000. They are not illiterate; they are not ignorant. A very large majority can read and write both languages, English and Hawaiian, and they take a very lively and intelligent interest in the affairs of their own country. This is an element which on the proposition of annexation is to be consulted prior to any other; it must accompany any treaty; and any treaty which had been made without consulting this element was properly withdrawn and ought never to have been entertained.

There is another reason of the gravest character why consideration at this time of the proposal of annexation is inopportune and premature. It is believed by many, it has been extensively bruited and widely credited, that the late minister of this country at Honolulu, Mr. Stevens, was a participant in the Hawaiian revolution, aided and abetted its promoters in the formation of the new government and in the subsequent proffer of annexation.

It is quite clear that this opinion is entertained, and that it has been expressed in the most public and official manner by the present Chief Magistrate of the United States and by the Secretary of State, specially in charge of our foreign affairs and relations. Proper respect for the opinion of those in administration of the executive department of this Government must give us pause in this transaction, when it is charged that the public representative of the United States in a foreign country became the accomplice of those engaged in the design of overthrowing the government to which he had been commissioned. Such an offense is a high crime and misdemeanor against the law of nations, against the confidences and intercourse of the civilized world.

No nation, whatever may be its greatness and authority, can create an ambassador or minister. Two must concur therein. One government may send a person duly appointed and commissioned, but the government to which he is sent must receive him before he becomes such.

The act of receiving is as free and independent as the act of sending. If the government to which he is sent declines to receive him, this is no breach of amity nor cause of quarrel. The act of refusal may be with or without reasons given.

The act of reception alone fully attests and recognizes his diplomatic character. This dual condition of his creation implies obligations upon his part of a similar character. His most important and active duties are due to the country which he represents, yet he has duties more passive and negative in their kind, though of as binding obligation, to the government whereto he is sent. He owes to the government to which he is accredited, to its laws, customs, and course of administration, respectful acquiescence, deference, and assent. It is because of his presumed sense of obligation to these requirements that he is received.

Upon this subject the Nestor and father of international law holds the following language—and all writers upon that topic concur:

> The inviolability of a public minister, or the protection to which he has a more sacred and particular claim than any other person, whether native or foreigner, is not the only privilege he enjoys. The universal practice of nations allows him moreover an entire independence of the jurisdiction and authority of the state in which he resides. * * * This independency of a foreign minister is not to be converted into licentiousness.
>
> It does not excuse him from conforming to the customs and laws of the country in all his external actions; so far as they are unconnected with the object of his mission and character he is independent, but he has not a right to do whatever he pleases. * * * He must not avail himself of his independency for the purpose of violating these laws and customs. He should rather punctually conform to them although the magistrate has no compulsory power over him, and he is especially bound to a religious observance of the rules of justice. As to what concerns the prince to whom he is sent the embassador should remember that his ministry is a ministry of peace and that it is only on that footing that he is received.
>
> This reason forbids his engaging in any evil machinations. Let him serve his own master without injuring the prince who receives him. It is a base treachery to take advantage of the inviolability of the embassadorial character for the purpose of plotting in security the ruin of those who respect that character; of clandestinely injuring them, or of embroiling or ruining their affairs. What would be infamous and abominable in a private guest, shall that be allowable and becoming in the representative of a sovereign?—*Vattel*, chapter 6, title Am.

It will be observed, Mr. President, how felicitously the analogy is drawn between the position of a visitor at a private house and a public representative residing in a foreign country. They stand on the same footing, as they should; for, sir, when you approach a man's house, it may be the humblest home, and knock at the door, and are bidden to come in and enter in that manner, there is a tacit obligation, known of all men, that in coming you bring and in departing you leave your peace upon that house and upon all them that dwell therein. Persons acting differently are not counted as true men. "As spies, to see the nakedness of the land are ye come."

The minister should be a careful observer of, but not at all an actor in, the public affairs of the country where he is temporarily residing. Especially does this rule of conduct obtain in times of political commotion, in periods of revolution, either threatened or actual. He must observe thorough impartiality between hostile parties in the country of his residence. He can not rightfully take sides, much less can he take arms or use the same for or against either party. These are elementary principles of the law regulating diplomatic intercourse.

Now, it is clear from the tenor of the very curious account which Mr. Stevens has given of his official conduct in Hawaii during the recent revolution there, to be found on pages 177 to 181 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date 14th of December last, that he fully understood this law laid down by Vattel and was well acquainted with these principles.

The relation which he gives of the events of the Hawaiian revolution is manifestly not that of an enemy. He speaks in the highest terms of eulogy of the conduct of its promoters, and glows in the account of its result as having given them the best government which these islands have ever enjoyed; yet he earnestly disclaims having taken any part in this action of others which he so much commends. He is convinced, he is well persuaded, that certain persons in a foreign country may do some things, with greatest credit to themselves, which an American minister could not do and could not lawfully be concerned in.

The minister claims to have acted only as the neutral representative of a foreign friendly power. Do the facts in the case place and keep him in this position?

The first document, as far as known, ever issued by the founders of the Hawaiian revolutionary government was a letter directed to the American minister by name, signed by the members of the committee of safety, and dated January 16, 1893, before the first public step had been taken in their proceedings.

I will ask my friend from Georgia to read it for me.

Mr. GORDON read as follows:

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, HONOLULU, *January 16, 1893.*

SIR: We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that, in view of recent public events in this Kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of Queen Liliuokalani on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and the United States forces at your command for assistance.

The Queen, with the aid of armed force and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution; and while prevented for the time from accomplishing her object, declared publicly that she would only defer her action.

This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror.

We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

HENRY E. COOPER,
F. W. McCHESNEY,
W. C. WILDER,
C. SOLTE,
A. BROWN,
WILLIAM O. SMITH,
HENRY WATERHOUSE,
THEO. F. LANSING,
ED. SUHR,
L. A. THURSTON,
JOHN EMMELUTH,
WM. R. CASTLE,
J. A. McCANDLESS,
Citizens' Committee of Safety.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
American Minister Resident.

Mr. TURPIE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Georgia.

Was ever a revolution before begun with such a patent, open, notorious acknowledgment of its want of power to sustain itself? "We appeal to you, to the United States forces, for assistance. We are unable to protect ourselves. We therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces."

Why was such a message sent at all, and why was it sent to the American minister? A committee of public safety inaugurated the government of the national defense in Paris after Sedan and the fall of Napoleon, but they sent no such message to Minister Washburne.

Those who attacked the Government of Balmaceda in Chile were surrounded by armed enemies, by life and property endangered, wholly without police or legal forces. Did they send such a message as this to Minister Egan? Did Admiral Mello begin his attack upon the Government of the Republic in Brazil with such a letter to the American or any other foreign minister?

The very philosophy of revolutions is that the promoters thereof do not lack, but do have and hold, the power to protect themselves and their adherents, to discharge all the ordinary functions of government for the security of life and property, and to place the administration of affairs upon new lines of right and justice better than those of the old régime.

There is only one explanation possible of this very singular missive. The men who sent it knew beforehand that it would be received, and that their request for assistance, the assistance of the United States forces, would be granted. Minister Stevens says he received and read this letter, and that he made no response.

But in this he is mistaken. He ordered the United States marines from the man-of-war Boston, then in the harbor, to land. They landed fully armed and equipped for active service, and with a train of two pieces of artillery they were marched under the direction of the minister to Arion Hall, a strategic point near the Hawaiian capitol, the same Government building which this committee entered and took possession of the next day, and from the front steps of which they read the proclamation establishing the Provisional Government.

I have called Arion Hall a strategic point. I do so upon the authority of a very brave and skillful officer of the Navy, having long experience in the service and especially in those seas. I will take the liberty of asking my friend from Georgia to read the letter of Admiral Skerrett.

Mr. GORDON read as follows:

UNITED STATES STEAMSHIP BOSTON,
FLAGSHIP OF THE PACIFIC STATION,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, May 20, 1893.

SIR: I have examined, with a view of inspection, the premises first occupied by the force landed from the United States steamer Boston, and known as Arion Hall, situated on the west side of the Government building. The position of this location is in the rear of a large brick building known as Music Hall. The street it faces is comparatively a narrow one, the building itself facing the Government building. In my opinion, it was unadvisable to locate the troops there, if they were landed for the protection of the United States citizens, being distantly removed from the business portion of the town, and generally far away from the United States legation and consulate-general, as well as being distant from the houses and residences of United States citizens. It will be seen from the accompanying sketch that had the Provisional Government troops been attacked from the east, such attack would have placed them in the line of fire.

Had Music Hall been seized by the Queen's troops, they would have been under their fire, had such been their desire. It is for these reasons that I consider the position occupied as illy selected. Naturally, if they were landed with a view to support the Provisional Government troops, then occupying the Government building, it was a wise choice, as they could enfilade any troops attacking them from the palace grounds in front. There is nothing further for me to state with reference to this matter, and as has been called by you to my attention—all of which is submitted for your consideration.

Very respectfully,

J. S. SKERRETT,
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy,
Commanding United States Naval Force, Pacific Station.

Col. J. H. BLOUNT,
United States Minister Plenipotentiary
and Envoy Extraordinary, Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. TURPIE. Minister Stevens, in that dispatch to which I have alluded, which is placed in the record, gives a very long picturesque detail as to why Arion Hall was selected as the place for posting the troops on the evening of the disembarkation. He would have us believe that it was an accident. Mr. President, it was accident very curious; it was an accident of extreme ductility, much prolonged. This accident lasted quite a while. It continued to occur for two days and two nights, until the Provisional Government had been proclaimed, recognized, and established. Not until after that did the accident happen to cease.

These troops were landed fully armed and equipped. The committee had asked of the minister the assistance of the United States forces. This was the response. Action is stronger than ink. Mr. Stevens says he ordered the troops to land for the purpose of protecting life and property. Whose life and whose property? The life and property of those of the committee of public safety, who had engaged in the design of overthrowing the Government to which he had been accredited?

Mr. Stevens says there was for two days no government in Honolulu. If this were true it did not destroy the sovereignty of the Hawaiian people; it did not abrogate the treaty relations between Hawaii and the United States. The government is neither the people nor the nation of a country. It is only the representative of such people and of such nation. Supposing there had been no government in Honolulu for two days, did that authorize the American minister to make one, or to be concerned in its formation?

Then Mr. Stevens goes on with very lengthy magniloquence to have us infer that these two days of interregnum was a very extraordinary and unexampled thing. It is the most common, the most ordinary occurrence. Whenever revolutionary conditions obtain, it is usually much longer than two days. Within the memory of living men it has been many days in Paris, the capital of one of the chief nations in the world. I allude now to the time of the flight of Louis Philippe and his deposition, and to the fall of Napoleon after his captivity, after he was taken by the enemy.

Two days is a very short interregnum. There is always this period of political oscillation between the parties, one of whom is striving to enter and the other is striving to resist ouster from the seat of authority. It is a well-known signal of revolutionary crises. But what principle is there in international law, or what precedent is there in the action of any ambassador from any civilized country at any time for taking such a period for interference with the domestic affairs of the government where he resides? On the contrary, the law is plainly laid down that at such a period his attitude should be one of absolute, impartial indifference.

Why, sir, this interregnum is a period when that official class who hold the offices under all governments and all forms of government with elastic allegiance—even this class is at a loss. They do not find the men to report to, they do not know to whom to direct their correspondence, and the official files are lumbered with unconsidered matter until a master appears at the head of the new government, the government *de facto*. This interregnum is that period made sacred by the right of revolution, defined in the great Declaration, the right of the people at any time to alter or abolish their form of government, and to adopt another better calculated, as they may deem, to secure their safety and happiness.

Such was the right of the people of Hawaii during that very period. It was a right not to be questioned, not to be denied, not to be defeated, not to be interfered with by any American, and, above all, not to be interferred with by an American minister or ambassador.

Mr. Stevens says he disembarked these forces "to preserve the peace and public order." Is the United States charged with the duty of keeping the peace and preserving public order in all the countries to which we send diplomatic representatives by preventing civil war therein, by a display of overwhelming military force in aid of the combatants on one side or the other of such contest?

There is no rule of the law of nations which justifies or requires such an intervention by any foreign minister, or which recognizes the existence of such an international police. This interpretation of the law would involve this Government in a perpetual military crusade around the planet.

Much as I admire and confide in the skill and valor of our military and naval forces, I doubt if they would be equal to such an enormous service. Great as are the pecuniary resources of our country, they would soon be exhausted by the expenditures of such an extended campaign. The protection afforded by our ministers under such circumstances in a foreign country relates only to the life and property of American citizens—neutral, noncombatant—who may claim or be entitled thereto, or to the public property of the United States at the consulate or legation.

The maintenance of peace and order relates to the same persons, places, premises, and subject-matter. Mr. Stevens made a landing and disposition of the troops at a long distance from, and with no reference to, such persons or premises, or to any such object as their protection. Mr. Stevens said nothing about the protection of life and property of our citizens at Honolulu at the time of the disembarkation of the troops. I am not speaking now of official orders. Official orders under such circumstances are always and everywhere in the same language, in the same words. I am not speaking about that. They have forms for this. I am speaking of his conference with the members of the revolutionary committee. He said nothing at the time of that conference about the protection of the life and property of American citizens; he said nothing at that time about the Japanese invasion, the English invasion, or the urban perils by night or day in the city, to which he devotes so much space in a subsequent account of these events.

It is evident that all these are merely afterpieces of wretched pretense and of feigned profession, used as a mask to hide the grosser and more indelicate features of his official malfeasance. The troops were landed and posted with their arms and artillery within easy supporting distance of the armed followers of the revolutionary committee because the minister of the United States had previously engaged and undertaken to render this assistance.

I quote now the testimony of a witness, F. W. Wundenburg, from the report of the special commissioner of the President, which Mr. Stevens had evidently read when he sent his dispatch to the Senate. He controverts, or undertakes to controvert, a great deal in the report of the special commissioner; but he does not controvert one word of the statement which I shall read.

Mr. F. W. Wundenburg, a citizen of Honolulu, was an earnest enemy of the monarchy, a steadfast supporter of the revolution from the beginning. After the establishment of the Provisional Government of Hawaii he was tendered the lucrative position of collector-general of customs. During the early days of the republic he held for it a post of great responsibility.

This is his statement concerning the action of Mr. Stevens. I will ask my friend from Tennessee to read the part in print.

Mr. BATE read as follows:

The committee met at Mr. Waterhouse's residence, according to adjournment, at 7:30 o'clock p. m. of the same day, January 16. The formation of some sort of government was under discussion, and it was decided that a commander-in-chief of the forces supporting the proposed new government should be appointed. The position was offered to Mr. John H. Soper, who demurred, as he did not see any backing whatever to support the movement. Mr. Soper was answered by members of the committee that the American minister would support the move with the troops of the Boston.

Mr. Soper still doubted, so a couple of the committee escorted him over to the legation, which, by the way, was in the adjoining premises, and the three came back after a time, reporting that Mr. Stevens had given them the full assurance that any proclamation of the government put forward at the government building, or any other building in Honolulu for that matter, would receive his immediate recognition and the support of the Boston's men. This assurance seemed to satisfy Mr. Soper, and he accepted the position.

On Tuesday afternoon, January 17, the committee of thirteen, or committee of safety, proceeded from the office of W. O. Smith, up Merchant street, to the Government building, and read the proclamation of a new government at 2:40 o'clock, there being practically no audience whatever. As the reading proceeded a dozen or so loungers gathered, and near the close of the ceremony about thirty supporters, variously armed, came running into the side and back entrances of the yard and gathered about the committee.

At this moment the United States troops, in the temporary quarters in the rear of the Music Hall (less than 100 yards from where the committee stood), appeared to be under arms, and were evidently prepared for any emergency.

Mr. FRYE. Can the Senator give the page where that statemen will be found in the report?

Mr. TURPIE. I will cite the page. It is Executive Document No. 10, page 21. I will cite the page, and it will be found in the record, of every extract I read.

Any one, especially a public officer, who engages to support a movement before it is made or accomplished must necessarily have known the time and place and persons concerned in it, and the general object and purpose of the movement.

The assurance was given by Mr. Stevens that he would support the proclamation of the Government. It was given to the commander of the revolutionary forces. This proclamation of the Government is the instant turning moment of the rebellion, since called a revolution; it is the decisive crisis of action; it is the time when the old régime is crumbling and the new one is coming forth; it is the time when every motive of public propriety and every principle of international justice required and demanded of Mr. Stevens and of every other foreign representative in Honolulu that they should not interfere one way or the other; yet Mr. Stevens selects this very moment, the proclamation of the Government before it was proclaimed, before it was established—selects that time, saying that he will recognize it and that he will support it with troops from the ship Boston.

It would have been a very incautious thing, a very undiplomatic thing, a very perilous thing, for Mr. Stevens to have made such a statement even to an attaché of his own legation, or to an officer in the service of the United States; but for an American minister, on the one hand, to make this statement to a revolutionary officer on the other, is more than incautious, more than careless, more than reckless. It was an act criminative, with no example, fortunately having no model hitherto in the history of the United States. We shall have to go back to the middle of the fifteenth century, amongst the worst men of the worst times, to find where a public ambassador in a foreign country has made such an absolute betrayal of his trust.

It appears from the testimony of Mr. Damon, vice-president of the Provisional Government, that the officer named, Col. Soper, appeared in command of the military forces of the committee next day, and that they acted under his supervision—those are the words of the witness—that he massed them, armed, in front of the steps of the capitol, where the Provisional Government was being proclaimed. (Ex. Doc. 10, page 31.)

The American minister was thus in communication with the revolutionary commander, Col. Soper, as with the commander of the United States marines, and he thus assumed joint direction of the two forces.

The Hawiian monarchy in the one hundred and third year of its existence ceased to be, among other causes, for the reason that the American minister resident had engaged to support and did support the revolt against it with the military forces of the United States.

The inquiry as to whether the new government would have succeeded without this aid is beside the question. This interference without any authority did occur. The best disclaimer, the most absolute disavowal of it, is the rejection of the proposal for any further or closer connection with Hawaii. Let the new government, however formed, proceed in its career. Intervention against it would be at this time as unlawful as intervention in its favor was when it occurred.

It may be well to examine the statement of Mr. Stevens himself upon the point of his action in the premises.

In a great crime there is an awful power of illumination. It lights up the conscience of the offender with a glare, showing the full proportions of the offense.

Here was one in a great public office, in what Vattel calls a ministry of peace. He had without a word of warrant or of warning made and levied war upon the soil of a friendly power. He had sought to embroil the people of two nations long bound together in closest amity. He was loath, very loath, to make confession of a wrong so grievous. Yet the truth will break bounds and silence; it will not be disowned.

In his account of what occurred at the time of his proclamation of a protectorate in the name of the United States, which he asserts was done "at the request of the Provisional Government of Hawaii," he says, in speaking of the flag, "It remained up seventy-five days. During that time all had been accomplished which had been promised and expected when it was raised." (Record, December 14, page 178.)

Now, here is an instance where the heart and soul of verity is unconsciously expressed—discloses itself in the tense or time of the verb used. It is not said "All had been accomplished which *was* promised and expected," but "which *had been* promised and expected." This form of words necessarily refers to promises which had already been made before the time referred to. And who had been the promiser in this compact? Clearly he who could perform—the United States minister. And who was the promisee? The revolutionary committee and its adherents. Mr. Stevens takes this method of declaring that he had kept faith with the revolution, that no promises were broken; that none of their expectations were disappointed. What, then, had been these promises and expectations? The answer is: "All that had been accomplished." What, then, had been accomplished?

United States troops had been landed, armed, and with artillery in support of the anticipated movement on the day before the revolt. This is one of the things which had been promised and expected. The Provisional Government had been recognized by the American minister within an hour after its proclamation. This also had been promised and expected. Within two days after recognition the commissioners appointed by the Provisional Government had sailed by steamer en route for Washington, bearing with them a treaty providing for the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. A protectorate had been proclaimed, wholly without authority, to hold possession until the annexation could be consummated.

Minister Stevens says it is a very dull diplomatist who is not aware of the importance of retaining actual possession; and Mr. President, it is a very dull, unlettered, illiterate pillager who is not well informed upon the same point.

The military force, posted first near the Hawaiian capitol, remained on shore under arms during the whole period of these transactions. All these things had been accomplished, and according to the terms of Mr. Stevens's own statement they "had been promised and expected."

Mr. Stevens says he was distant two thousand miles from the United States; that there was no ocean telegraph for communication with his Government, and that he had no instructions. He had Vattel, he had the Constitution of the United States; they were lying open before him in the legation library at Honolulu.

The Constitution of his own country, which he was bound at least to respect, provided that Congress should have the power to declare war; that the President should by and with advice of the Senate make and conclude treaties. Yet this minister, without any action of Congress, or of the Senate, or of the President, made and levied war by an armed invasion of Hawaiian soil—an armed occupancy of the same for three months, made and concluded a treaty of protection, and proclaimed a protectorate, and maintained the same until it was disavowed by the home Government of his own Administration.

The military invasion and occupancy of the territory of Hawaii, the self-assumed protectorate, these insolent and lawless acts of violence, mark the man. They do very plainly show the man, but they disguise the minister in strange attire. They exploit the mission, but they expose the means of annexation—a gruesome plot, wherein illicit craft, a worse than punic faith, infidelity to the most sacred trust in the most exalted station, fill the whole drama with the pollution of their guilty presence.

In his relation of these events placed in the record of Congress before referred to, Mr. Stevens, alluding to the late sovereign of the Hawaiian Kingdom, uses, ten times, the expression, "The fallen Queen;" and again he says, "The justly dethroned Queen," and anon he mentions her as "The late immoral occupant of the throne," and yet again he speaks of "The Queen and her paramour."

Are these the choice phrases of official correspondence, or is this the polished language of diplomacy? It may be said indeed, in answer, that at the time he used these expressions he had returned from his mission and had ceased to be a diplomatist. But did this place him beyond the pale of manly civility and those amenities becoming one who had been in such a high and gracious station?

Was it necessary for any purposes of state, was it needed for the maintenance of the Hawaiian Republic or for the success of the Provisional Government, that he should recur with coarse and callous iteration to the misfortunes of the discrowned Queen, or that he should assail the listening ears of Christendom with his story of the frailty of a fallen woman? For years he had been the representative of the United States near the court of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

How well we may recollect—how well he may recall—that day when he was escorted to the palace, ushered with all courteous ceremonial into the throne room and made his bow of presentation, receiving and returning congratulations upon the renewal of diplomatic intercourse between the two countries so long bound together by closest ties of friendship. That day he saw for the first time her who was for many months to be his hostess, dispensing the social courtesies and attentions due to his high position as a privileged and favored guest.

Was no voice borne inward to him from afar, no whisper of remonstrance touching these cruel reproaches against the perchance erring daughter, descendant of a once mighty race, saying, "Oh, not from you—not from you should come this vilest of accusations against woman!"

We need not resort to inference for a just estimation of the minister who indites dispatches of this tenor and fashion. The official character is self-depicted, self-described. Who would attempt to touch, to mar, or to amend this full-length, faultless, perfect portrait of the international spy, ingrate, and outlaw, drawn in all the dark profusion of its native hues.

Ages ago, Mr. President, the great Grecian moralist had written the story of the inhospitable visitor. How a husbandman, one bitter cold winter day, found in his field a serpent stark and frozen. Kindly he took it up in his hands, carried it to his home, laid it upon the hearth before the blazing fire. The wife and children gathered piteously around the stranger. They watched it slowly revive in the genial warmth. They saw it move and turn and fold and twine till, fully coiled, it sprang with poisoned fangs upon the throat of the husbandman, who fell down dead and swollen. Stunned with the sudden horror of the scene, the survivors looked eagerly about them to descry the author of this fatal mischief. The reptile guest had crept away.

Wherefore, upon candid judgment of the facts set forth in the papers submitted to us on this subject, it will be concluded that at this time we can not favorably consider either the treaty or the project of annexation.

That decent respect for the opinions of mankind which we have cherished from the beginning of our history forbids it, warns us to stand afar off from this temptation. The United States can not afford to incur the suspicion of profiting by a public wrong so abhorrent to the principles of national justice.

Granting that the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands may be ever so desirable, it must be attained in a different manner. It does not become the character or dignity of the great Republic that we should wrest from a comparatively weak and defenseless people their place and name among the nations of the earth by stealth, by means of diplomatic finesse, or by any process of furtive legerdemain or gilded larceny sprung from the bandit maxim, miscalled the policy of success.

No success can attend such a scheme of spoliation. When we desire to enlarge our national domain by the acquisition of territory in the Hawaiian Islands or elsewhere, it must come to us in the open hand, with the palm clean, pure, untainted, or if it do not come and is taken, it will be taken by the strong arm, with sword drawn in the eye of day, as lawful prize of war against a public enemy. Then shall the flag, our flag of the Republic, float as oft before, in pride and glory over many a stricken field, won in battle for the just—for the just, the free, and the brave.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the views of the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections on the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes, and ask that they may be printed. An order of the Senate was made that the views of the minority should be printed in connection with the majority report. I find, however, that the majority report has already been printed, and to avoid delay I request that the views of the minority be printed separately as Views of the Minority, Part 2 of Report No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). The Senate has already ordered that the views of the minority shall be printed with the majority report, but the majority report having been printed, the Senator from New Hampshire now asks that the Senate order that the views of the minority be printed separately as part 2 of the report. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

KANSAS AND ARKANSAS VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1266) to extend and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, A. D. 1891, to report it without amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read at length for information.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1891, be, and the same are hereby, extended for a period of three years from February 24, 1894, so that said Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway shall have until February 24, 1897, to build the first 100 miles of its said additional lines of railway in said Territory.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN on the 10th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay the necessary expenses of the investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, including mileage and lawful fees for attendance of witnesses, and the employment of a stenographer, in pursuance of Senate resolution of December 20, 1893, out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 12, 1894, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1894.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONER.

John W. Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS.

Henry J. Connell, to be postmaster at Belding, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan.

John Johnson, jr., to be postmaster at Bedford, in the county of Lawrence and State of Indiana.

Flavius A. Hart, to be postmaster at Oberlin, in the county of Lorain and State of Ohio.

Frisby B. Logan, to be postmaster at Yuma, in the county of Yuma and Territory of Arizona.

Arthur F. Watson, to be postmaster at Cheboygan, in the county of Cheboygan and State of Michigan.

Eugene E. Douvelle, to be postmaster at Manistee, in the county of Manistee and State of Michigan.

Adam R. Ebert, to be postmaster at Hammond, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Ossian H. Cook, to be postmaster at Pendleton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Thomas J. Davis, to be postmaster at Springdale, in the county of Washington and State of Arkansas.

William D. Covington, to be postmaster at Lehigh, in the county of Choctaw, Ind. T.

Edgar A. Smith, to be postmaster at Converse, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana.

David A. Fawcett, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lagrange and State of Indiana.

Charles A. Downer, to be postmaster at Northville, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan.

George M. Deady, to be postmaster at Bad Axe, in the county of Huron and State of Michigan.

Jacob Baar, to be postmaster at Grand Haven, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan.

Arthur J. Flynn, to be postmaster at Caledonia, in the county of Houston and State of Minnesota.

George S. Stout, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Missaukee and State of Michigan.

John Fanning, to be postmaster at Albion, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan.

James Elliott, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

Edward W. Renkin, to be postmaster at Hooper, in the county of Dodge and State of Nebraska.

Charles E. Hill, to be postmaster at Malden, in the county of Dunklin and State of Missouri.

Charles E. Critchfield, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio.

Allen T. Cowen, to be postmaster at Batavia, in the county of Clermont and State of Ohio.

William Bleckner, to be postmaster at Oak Harbor, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio.

Charles A. Wyckoff, to be postmaster at Celina, in the county of Mercer and State of Ohio.

Proctor E. Seas, to be postmaster at Orrville, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.

James E. Montgomery, to be postmaster at Van Wert, in the county of Van Wert and State of Ohio.

John M. Carroll, to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hill and State of Texas.

Albertis E. Parmenter, to be postmaster at Scotland, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota.

Edward M. Young, to be postmaster at Gambier, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio.

Henry G. Ellsworth, to be postmaster at Barron, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin.

Dollie F. Thompson, to be postmaster at Pittsburg, in the county of Camp and State of Texas.

William H. Dickson, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Red River and State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 11, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SCHOOLS IN UTAH.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting the annual report of the commissioner of schools for Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Education, and ordered to be printed.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of findings in the cases of the following-named persons against the United States: J. S. Hays, John Higgins, W. G. Saxson, deceased; John Stafford, deceased; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read twice and referred as stated:

A bill (S. 411) for the relief of Samuel Collins—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 335) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation in Montana under the homestead and mining laws for national and other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SCHOONER HENRY R. TILTON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 901) for the relief of the owners of the schooner Henry R. Tilton and of personal effects thereon.

Mr. FIELDER. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be allowed to lie on the Speaker's table temporarily, a bill of similar purport having been favorably considered by a committee of this House.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, this bill will lie temporarily on the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following concurrent resolution of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the Report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1893, 1,500 copies of Part I in quarto form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 900 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and 2,800 copies of Part II in octavo form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,200 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. This resolution is identical with one which has been reported by the House Committee on Printing. It is the usual resolution for the printing of the report of this bureau. I ask that the resolution be now considered by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution; and it was adopted.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the House resolution (with Senate amendment) relative to the appointment of a committee of the House and Senate to consider the personnel of the Navy.

Mr. MEYER. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be permitted to lie on the Speaker's table.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the resolution been amended by the Senate?

The SPEAKER. It has been. If there be no objection, it will remain temporarily on the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

SUBURBAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. COMPTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5102) making appropriations to provide for the construction of county roads and suburban streets in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and hereby is, appropriated out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, one-half to be charged against the revenues of the District of Columbia, the sum of $43,000, to be used by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the construction of country roads and suburban streets, as follows:

For grading and regulating Sixteenth street northwest extended, Prospect street, Crescent street, Central street, and Meridian and Ontario avenues, Meridian Hill, $10,000;

For grading and graveling Twelfth street extended, from University Heights to Austin street, $8,000;

For grading and graveling Pennsylvania avenue extended and Branch avenue, $10,000;

For grading and graveling Sherman avenue from Grant avenue northward, $10,000;

For grading and macadamizing M street extended, between Twelfth street and Trinidad avenue, $5,000: *Provided*, That the money hereby appropriated shall be expended by contract, or otherwise, as said Commissioners may deem most advantageous to the public interests.

SEC. 2. That the money hereby appropriated shall be immediately available.

The following proposed amendment was read:

In line 11, strike out the words "Meridian and Ontario avenues" and insert "Meridian avenue north of Morris street, and Ontario avenue."

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to make an inquiry in regard to this matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman will proceed, the right to object being reserved.

Mr. KILGORE. Are the improvements provided for in this bill within the limits of the city of Washington or outside of those limits? Most of them, I understand, are outside.

Mr. COMPTON. They are outside the limit of the city proper.

Mr. KILGORE. So I understand. Then, in addition to that, the prime motive which inspires this bill is that disposition to have the Government dispense charity. This appropriation is to be made as a matter of charity, and that people out of employment may be able to find work in carrying out the provisions of the bill. Is not that the inspiration?

Mr. COMPTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, conditionally I will answer yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And the proposition is to limit the day's labor to six hours a day, in order that the appropriation may be spread out among a larger number?

Mr. COMPTON. That is a question for the Commissioners to determine.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; and they ask that authority and will have it under the bill. Now, I object to the consideration of the resolution, because the House adopted in the last Congress a general policy about the improvements of streets and highways in this District and outside of the city limits which was to operate in the future, and that policy was to charge the expense one-half to the District of Columbia and the other half to the owners of the abutting property. This resolution does not provide for that. It is a reversal of the general policy adopted by the law; and the further objection that it is an appropriation for charitable purposes. No question of charity ought to enter into such legislation.

I object to its consideration.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is this proposition before the House for general debate?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Maryland allow me a moment?

Mr. COMPTON. I respectfully submit to my friend from Texas that he is absolutely unfair in making a statement here touching this matter on its merits and then refusing to hear a statement in support of it.

Mr. KILGORE. I have stated my objections, but I did not refuse to hear any statement the gentleman desired to make in support of it. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Perhaps the gentleman from Texas will waive the objection he makes, subject to the action of the Speaker on the point of order.

Mr. KILGORE. What point of order?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. If the gentleman will consent that we take the proposition up subject to the point of order to be determined by the Chair.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the point of order?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. As I understand it, that it comes within the provisions of the act providing that the property owners of the District of Columbia, owners of property abutting on the proposed improvement, shall pay half of the expenses.

Mr. KILGORE. But the point of order would not prevent the House from reversing that principle if it saw proper. I merely suggested that that was the condition of affairs, but did not make the point of order.

Mr. COMPTON. The gentleman from Texas has seen fit to present certain reasons to the House why this should not be considered, and I ask leave to have an opportunity to reply to what the gentleman suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to be permitted to say something in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas upon this proposition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, this is not an act of charity in any sense of the word. It is not a bounty. This bill simply proposes to make available at once an amount for certain purposes, which amount, to be used for said purposes, will be provided for in the regular appropriation bill for the service of the District of Columbia.

Now, the gentleman from Texas talks about charity. Mr. Speaker, he knows, this House knows, everybody knows, that an extraordinary condition of things exists to-day. Business depression exists not only here, but all over the country, and I might say throughout the civilized world. And the gentleman knows, and every other gentleman of this House knows, that it is the part of wisdom, justice, and true statesmanship, by legislation, to relieve that condition as far as possible whenever it is within the power of the legislative branch of the Government to do so.

This is no new proposition. I have on my desk six or eight precedents for just exactly the same appropriations under exactly the same conditions as that we propose to make to day.

Now, in reply to the gentleman as to the assertion that the policy of the Government has been changed by virtue of the act approved March 2, 1892, I beg to say that if the gentleman will turn to that act he will find that every provision of it looks to future acts of Congress in appropriations for the improvement of outlying streets. I hold in my hand a communication from the President of the Board of Commissioners in this District, which, if the gentleman will allow me to read, will show him that every street or road which we propose by this appropriation to repair has already been laid out long ago under different acts previous to that adopt d in 1892.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the date of the laying out of these streets?

Mr. COMPTON. I can answer that by reading from a letter which I have received from President Ross, of the Board of Commissioners.

Sixteenth street NW. extended, from Florida avenue to the north line of Morris street, in 1871. This street was widened in 1892, in pursuance of special authority granted by Congress (volume 26, page 1068).

Prospect street, Crescent street, Central street, Meridian and Ontario avenues, in 1867.

Twelfth street extended, from University Heights to Austin street, in 1887.

Pennsylvania avenue and Branch avenue, in 1891.

Sherman avenue, in 1868.

M street extended, between Twelfth street and Trinidad avenue, 1888.

None of these highways were laid out under the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1893, to provide for a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of cities.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. ROSS,
President Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The gentleman will see that this was done from 1871 down to 1891.

Mr. KILGORE. My statement was that it was only in the last Congress that the policy of legislation on this subject was changed.

Mr. COGSWELL. That policy applied to new streets.

Mr. COMPTON. That policy refers to streets hereafter to be laid out.

Mr. KILGORE. Outside of the city limits, as I understand, and there is no more reason why it should apply to the extension of old streets than to the laying out of new ones.

Mr. COMPTON. But the act to which you refer expressly provides that it shall apply to streets hereafter to be laid out.

Mr. KILGORE. Have you the act before you?

Mr. COMPTON. I have not, but I have read it two or three times, and read the estimates very carefully. It has no reference whatever to streets already laid out.

Mr. FUNK. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that if this bill passes, I desire to introduce a resolution instructing the chief architect to at once take measures to commence the public building at Bloomington, Ill., for which there was an appropriation made two years ago, in order to give employment to the unemployed workmen there who are now in destitute circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] to object to the consideration of the bill, so that it is not before the House. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports, but no reports of a public character were presented.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING THE SESSION.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions to sit during the sessions of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MARSHALL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bœuf River in Louisiana.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title XLII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao; and

A bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

THE TARIFF.

And then, pursuant to the order heretofore adopted, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) "To reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to give notice that as there are a great many members who desire to speak upon this question, in order not to be invidious in regard to anyone, I propose, if I am present, to object in the future to any extension of time to anyone.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao; and

A bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right without giving notice.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I just want to give that notice.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this Congress is the first Congress, and this year is the first year for thirty-five years, when the Democratic party has had the power to put on the statute book any statute, or to take from it any statute put thereon; and it comes to the discussion and legislation of these great questions under the most adverse circumstances.

Thirty-five years are more than a generation. The education of so many years is inwrought into the very mental structure of a nation; and during those years every form of paternalism has been adopted and approved, defended and advocated in the press, on the stump, in the halls of colleges, and at the fireside; so that the generation which is now about to take command has been raised and educated unconsciously to the belief that in some way, under some power, the General Government must lead in all enterprises, must aid in all industrial activities, must be the great banking institution of the country. To it must all turn who are desirous of doing anything in even the most circumscribed locality. From it must all persons who enter into enterprises seek aid, and on it must men rely for support and assistance.

The theory of the Democratic party is precisely the converse. We believe that governments came after men solely to protect them in their rights of liberty, in their enjoyment of property, for the due administration of the law, so that justice might be done, a closer union accomplished, and each, according to his thrift, his intelligence, his capacity, and his advantages, obtain the reward which he deserved.

And yet when we come to make practical these principles we are met with all sorts of aphorisms, and into our teeth is thrown the account of the growth which during these past thirty-five years has been so marvelous in this rich and new country of ours; and we are put upon the proof that such a revolution as we favor could accomplish any good.

And then underneath this, which is probably the most adverse circumstance, there are incidental, and possibly I may call them accidental circumstances, that render every step more troublesome. We are met with a depleted Treasury. Taxation is necessary to supply the deficit in that Treasury. The sources of supply have been dried up by adverse legislation. Our legislation upon the currency question has given to the country a profound and widespread uncertainty, which is always followed by business instability. Paralysis of private enterprise accompanies emptiness of the public Treasury; and every reform is met by the plea that we need the money, that we must find some other source of taxation; and the sneers of our opponents are probably the most effective argument which we have to meet, that in raising revenue under a bill designed for that purpose we are actually creating a deficit; and yet, in spite of these disadvantages, we have some very great advantages. The very prostration of industry gives us an opportunity to look at this whole question with somewhat wiser and calmer eyes than if all wheels were in motion and all furnaces were aglow.

We see around us some of the results of the opposite policy. I do not mean to say that high tariff has produced this paralysis in and of itself; but for some reason the country is in distress, and for ten months or more that distress has been growing. I am usually an optimist; but I do not see any sunshine for to-morrow in our industrial horizon. I see no reason why the distress of to-day shall not continue through the winter and spring months, until harvest comes again, when kindly nature furnishes something that we may sell abroad. When public confidence is likewise restored and our manufacturers begin operations more fully we will, of course, come back again to prosperous days. But, now in these unprosperous days, we in Congress have the opportunity of studying American industries in distress, American labor paralyzed, and we can better understand why this is and what is the remedy therefor.

There never was a time when the American people could turn their attention with more acute and painful interest to these great economical questions. In every household men embarrassed by debt and unoccupied by labor can turn to wives whose morrow is full of gloom and discuss from the heart rather than the head what is the matter and whence shall come relief. These debates may be dry and prosy here, the statistical tables may lengthen themselves out into weary figures, but in the home of the poor and unemployed all over America, aye, even in the parlors of the well-to-do and comfortable, they assume shapes which are full of life and pathos, and enchain attention; and to-day all over America they are asking at our hands to do something. What that something shall be is not so important in the extent to which it goes as it is the direction in which it goes.

In the Forty-eighth Congress, that great tribune of the people, my friend and leader, William R. Morrison, of Illinois, whose name I never speak without affection and a certain degree of reverence, began this fight over again, by that tariff bill which has been sneered at by the capitalists and unlearned, but which was modeled after the tariff reform measure of the great Robert Peel. A division in the Democratic party prevented its adoption. In the Forty-ninth Congress he changed front, with a courage that was equal to his patriotism and with a knowledge of the subject which has not been surpassed, came to the conclusion that the foundation of all tariff reform was free raw material, so that the manufacturers of America could find a permanent market wherever their fabrics might be needed; and he introduced through the report of the committee a bill based on free raw wool.

Under the lead of that vigorous and stalwart Democrat, Samuel J. Randall, the Republican party and a minority of the Democratic party prevented consideration of that bill; and it looked as if tariff reform had been blocked. It was predicted in this House by one of its most obscure members that the vote against consideration by this House was a vote of intense consideration in the country; that when we abdicated our right of consideration of the question of taxation the people, in their sovereignty and individual capacity, would take up the question and consider it for themselves. At the beginning of the Fiftieth Congress, the President of the United States, who had not known much of these questions, but who had become educated under the great responsibilities of that august office, sent in his celebrated tariff message, and under the lead of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, this House did pass a tariff bill insufficient, inadequate, but in the right direction. Those who prepared it were the most willing to admit that it was not all that it ought to be, but it was a continuance and a further attempt to carry out the purposes of the Morrison bill.

It was based upon simple principles of untaxed raw material, untaxed necessities of life, lower duties on finished fabrics, and an attempt to restore to Congress the right to tax and take it away from the manufacturers outside of this Hall. We lost the

election in 1888, and then immediately there was a sublime spectacle presented to the world. The defeated party became the aggressor. The victors were put upon the defense. Our antagonists saw that the current of popular opinion had not stopped, and this House, under the lead of the Republican party and with the aid of the Senate and the President, for the purpose of settling this question against popular opinion, of preventing popular judgment from undertaking to enact tariff legislation, not only passed the McKinley act, but admitted new States and undertook to settle this question. Thank God, no question is ever settled wrongly!

In the development of human history and human civilization there is no settlement that is wrong; and in 1890 the Democratic party again took possession of this House. Whether we may not have been as determined as we ought to have been is a question that has now passed into history. We kept alive the agitation. We went to the people upon the principles involved and we won at the last election and won for the first time in thirty-five years a President, a Senate, and a House. And in accordance with the general popular judgment, my friend, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, whom I love much as a younger brother, was put at the head of the Ways and Means Committee. That committee was enlarged. It was made to represent every section of the country. Five of its members had helped to frame the Mills bill. The others had been active and prominent in legislation. They have presented us a bill in which they have gone farther than the Mills bill, farther than the attempt of the Fifty-second Congress, not so far perhaps as I would have gone, for until yesterday I considered myself the most ultra free trader in this House. [Laughter.]

My friend and kinsman, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, who was born in my district, and is worthy of his parentage, who spoke here yesterday, perhaps goes one step farther than I would go, but that may be because he is some years younger than I, and the conservative influence of twenty years has not had its effect upon him. [Laughter.] Until yesterday I considered myself on the outpost of the free-trade Democracy, and therefore I can afford to say that I am not satisfied with the Wilson bill. It does not represent all of my views. There are things in it that I would have been glad had been omitted. There are omissions from it that I am sorry were not supplied. I would like to have seen the bounty on sugar repealed. I would have given almost anything to have seen tin plate put upon the free list.

Even if we had to put a little more tax on whisky, or a little larger tax on income, or something more on matches, I would like to have seen tin plate, which is the very foundation of so many industries, which is that particular material that turns the waste of the farm, of the sea, and of the rivers into the rich products upon which people feed during the winter, and gives assistance to men in more different vocations than any other material. I would have been glad to have seen no duty in that bill higher than 30 per cent. But, take it all in all, it is a step in the progressive advance by which such reformation has to be made. It is not for the advance guard—not even for the great body of the army, that we are to frame our legislation. The timid, the halting, the doubtful, the uncertain, are our brethren. The conservative is our colleague; those who feel a divided duty deserve our consideration. They represent constituencies. We depend upon voting. We can not reverse the decisions of thirty-five years immediately.

Great interests clamor at our doors; they have influence. Great industries think they will be hurt; they have friends. Therefore it is not so much a question of how much we ought to do in the end as it is a question of how much we can do with the assistance of our friends, with the support of our party, with the approval of the conservatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And for one I am willing to remit that question to this committee, composed of eleven gentlemen from every section of the country, who for five months have given it their earnest and undivided attention. For myself I am willing to keep, as I have kept in every speech that I have made upon this floor, my own personal record clear. I am for ultimate free trade. I am for the possession of the oceans by free ships, freed from all the navigation laws which now hamper and embarrass us.

I am for taking possession of the great, long seacoast and making it fruitful by annexing thereto the billows which unite and do not divide us from other countries. There is no extent to which men can go to which I am not willing to go with them. But, on the other hand, I am willing to lag side by side with my brethren who agree with me on general principles. We are a country of sections, and I am willing to let Louisiana, with her sugar cane, and the Northwest, with her attempt at sorghum and beet sugar, come and be heard, and to be tender with them, so that they may not feel that we have slaughtered them.

I am willing that Connecticut, with her tobacco and various districts with their peculiar interests, be heard in our councils—that we try by mutual concessions to keep together our party; for it is by our union that we are to carry this reform to its termination. And when I look at what we have done in eight years, when I look back and see how we were in 1884, and how we are to-day—when I see a Democratic Senate at the other end of the Capitol, a Democratic House here, a Democratic President in the White House—when I stand on the very eve of the day when the election laws are to be wiped from our statute books—when I see sectional animosities obliterated and the lines which divided us wiped out—I am willing to be more conservative than I otherwise might be, as I recall that it is for one country composed of diverse sections that a national party, compact and consolidated, is to govern in the coming years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And therefore, I say to those Democratic friends of mine who do not agree with all the provisions of this bill, we can either heartily and cordially sustain it or frankly point out our objections, and thus by mutual concession and patriotism reach an agreement. For myself, it would obtain my earnest advocacy if it had nothing else in it than free raw wool.

I have heard it sneered that this bill does not raise revenue. Mr. Chairman, no bill for taxation can have for its single object the entire amount of revenue that is needed. We need $460,000,000 per annum. Where shall we get it? When we come to answer that question practically, other and most important considerations come in. Industries must not be unduly taxed; activities must not be improperly encumbered with burdens. There must be other considerations than the mere amount of money that can be raised on any particular subject of taxation. We must have a prosperous community. That lies at the foundation of all inquiry. The community which is prosperous can pay taxes easily. That community which has paralyzed industry can pay no taxes easily. What, therefore, is the amount of burden that any particular section or any particular industry can bear, is a more important question than the amount of money that can be squeezed out of it.

We are a nation divided, roughly speaking, into two great classes of laborers—those who are engaged in manufacture, and those engaged in agriculture. We must, therefore, in laying our taxes see to it that both of these great classes are made prosperous. Our factories are purchasers from our agriculturists: they are sellers to our farmers. We must, therefore, devise a system by which the farmer gets a fair price, and by which he gives a fair price. He must have a market in which to sell; he must have a prosperous man from whom he can buy at a fair price. There must be an interchange by which the material men sell to a prosperous manufacturer from whom they can readily and profitably purchase. So that at the very foundation of all inquiry about taxation is the question, what is that system of taxation which will make our manufacturing enterprises successful? How can our fires be lighted? How can our wheels be put in motion? How can our products find a market? And I believe that the committee has found the true answer—untaxed material for the laborer to put his sweat into.

I need not go over the argument so admirably put by the chairman of our committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia], that the higher wage necessarily accompanies the lower price. The very progress of civilization may possibly be put into the apothegm that it has been a series of lowering prices and increasing wages. It is the paradox of economical truth that the lower the product sells for in times of prosperity the higher is the wage of the man who makes the product. Cobden never said a wiser thing than that prosperity based upon plenty is permanent prosperity; based upon scarcity it is always precarious. The amount and quality make the true test of the wage. The quantity and quality of the product give the amount that the laborer gets. The higher the skill, the higher the intelligence; the higher the capacity, necessarily the higher the wage and the greater the quantity and the finer the quality.

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARSH. Is the converse of the gentleman's proposition true, that the lower the wages the higher the product?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. As a rule, it is not so in our day, because the lower the wages the meaner is the product; and the want of good quality gives to it a certain lowness of price. And therefore——

Mr. MARSH rose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Let me answer. Therefore, the low-priced labor is itself incapable of making a high-priced article; for he who has to buy that fabric of low-priced labor buys an article that is necessarily inferior.

Mr. MARSH. What does my friend think about the costly and magnificent shawls which are made in India? Does he call them a mean and low product?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. As a rule what I have

stated is true. The gentleman forgets that comparison of price of wage is an element which is of course to be taken into consideration. As a rule the very labor which is put upon those fabrics is the highest priced labor in the community in which they are produced, and as to other labor is its superior. What I do mean to say in the light of the nineteenth century (and he who denies it is simply lagging in the past) is that the skilled laborer receives a larger share of the price of the product than ever before; that his labor is cheaper to his employer than ever before, and his product is, in comparison, lower in price than it ever was before. To the employer cheaper labor, to the toiler better wages, to the consumer lower prices. This is the necessary result where the bases of supply and demand have untrammeled play. This must be true, in the nature of the case, if unwise and selfish legislation does not obstruct. It is so in spite of our foolish legislation to an extent that has given much comfort and happiness. I care not what you call it. You can now go from Portland, Me., to California on the best-equipped railroads, with every appliance, for a mere song compared with what it once cost. The comforts of life are in ordinary times everywhere in the hands of the skilled laborer; and to him no tariffs give anything. Take the locomotive of Baldwin, the sewing-machine of Singer, the implements and instruments of Rhode Island, the watches of Waltham; wherever brain and skill enter into the necessity of the fabric, it goes everywhere without regard to tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Wherever there are skill and intelligence, there is a constant cheapening of the article and a constant rise in the price of wages. And this is a truth now so well established that no gentleman who prides himself on any learning or intelligence will undertake to dispute or deny. Vanderbilt discovered it when he bought a railroad run down, and which could not make money at 6 cents a mile on its passenger traffic. He put millions of dollars in it, charged 2 cents a mile for passenger traffic, and by this means made a great fortune. Stewart discovered it when he made a multiplicity of sales at small profits, gaining a great fortune, instead of large profits on small sales. The mills at Lawrence understand it, when on millions of yards of calico one-third of a cent a yard gives them a profit, an amount so small that it seems to be scarcely appreciable, but when counted by the millions it makes enormous dividends for the men who understand that intelligence and skill combined with quantity and quality are the representatives of fortune. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us understand, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that when we give to these men untaxed material, we are giving them what is necessary to conquer the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, we forget that we are legislating for seventy or seventy-five millions of people, soon to be one hundred and fifty millions. We forget that we have the richest, the most fertile land, and the finest advantages nearly in the world. Our rivers run silently to the sea, when they ought to be melodious with the sound of commerce-bearing steamers. Our forests are mere solitudes, when they ought to be rich with factories today; and the reason that they have not been established is because we have chained American labor to the wheel of high tariff, and have given the commerce of the world to the British Government. [Applause.]

To-day 12 per cent only of our carrying trade is under our own flag. Do as England did forty years ago, free our shipbuilders from the embarrassments of tariffs, turn the ores of the world and the forests of the world over to the enterprise of our people, and you will find that Cramp with his genius will soon be making ships that will carry our flag, without subsidy or deadheadism, to every part of the world. The principle that lies at the foundation of this bill, as it is at the foundation of all our enterprises, is: No man has a right to avoid paying his share of our burdens, and no one has the right to confiscate from the poor man's pocket a single cent for the purpose of helping him to bear his burdens. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us for once understand that principle and practice bracketed together bring wealth in their train. These will give us safe markets; and this, Mr. Chairman, is not theory. We have seen it tried. We have free raw material in certain things, and they have always prospered. Ninety per cent of our industries are untouched by the tariff and have always prospered. It is only when we come to those things which are burdened with tariff exactions that we find they can not carry themselves with the same degree of success. I do not mean to say that it does not give a certain market. Indubitably inside of the circle, within the barrier, the shark can fatten himself on the smaller fish. But if you give the same shark the wider market, being an American shark, my judgment is that soon he will feed as well or better on the foreign fish than he now does on the home fish in the American market. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have not the slighest prejudice——

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to ask the gentleman who he alludes to when he speaks of the "American shark."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not mean to hurt his feelings, at any rate. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he considers that a proper answer to an entirely candid question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Well, the gentleman and I will not quarrel about whether it is or not, as I have but little time.

What I call the American shark is the representative of those gentleman who took advantage of the peril and distress arising from a great war; who solemnly came into this Congress and in the name of patriotism burdened American labor; who, when things began to assume their ordinary shape and substance, repealed such laws as created internal-revenue taxes, and increased the burdens of tariff taxation; those gentlemen who, in the secrecy of the conference committee chamber in 1883, passed a bill that had not received the approval of either House of Congress; those gentlemen who, in the Fifty-first Congress, by modes and methods I care not to describe, wrote a new bill, writing into it the provisions that would enrich themselves: those gentlemen who have purchased ballot boxes, who took the seat from William R. Morrison by bribery—those are the gentlemen of whom I speak. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I do not mean to include therein my venerable friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman now allow me one further question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I have not time to yield for a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. WALKER. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky to yield.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Does the gentleman desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WALKER. I do.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I will listen to it.

Mr. WALKER. Being an American manufacturer, and being one of the gentlemen who helped make these tariffs, I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he includes me in the number?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If you are within the description that I gave, it is with exceeding great regret that you have drawn your own picture. I did not do it. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] I have said nothing, Mr. Chairman, that was personally offensive to anybody. I trust that nothing I shall say will be held personally offensive. If I have overstepped what would seem to be the bounds of the kindest discussion of these questions, no man regrets it more than I, and surely my sensitive colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has no reason to be offended at what I said.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you go through that great city of Boston, when you see her great buildings, when you see even her schools of charity, and when you go deeper and find that they are based on the tariff on copper, the tariff on this article and on that, you can not help having in your heart a certain feeling of regret that those princely fortunes did not rest upon the golden rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, instead of upon the principle of getting out of others something for which you gave nothing in return. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, regretting this episode in this economic discussion, I resume.

I represent a district largely agricultural. It is to the interest of my district that taxation should be so laid that labor should be profitable; for it is only when labor is profitable that the agriculturist can sell his product at a good price. I represent a section, nearly all of whose products have their price fixed in a free-trade market. The 9,000,000 bales of cotton which are below me do not represent so much money, my colleagues from the Northern States, I beg you to remember. In each bale of cotton is written the peace of the white and the black race, is written the friendship of those two races. In it is enwrapt the education of their children, the development of that country, the hope of its future. The price of that bale is fixed at Liverpool.

Is it unjust for those people to ask that when they come to commute that price, when they want clothing for their children and food in their houses, when they want homes and education, that the price of the things they buy shall not be fixed in a high-tariff market, but that they may commute their labor, which is represented in the cotton bale, into the comforts of life, which are represented by various materials that shall not be taxed 46 to

190 per cent out of the cotton on the one hand, to pay for what they need on the other hand? Can you not give us better than that? Our tobacco, enough of it exported abroad for some of certain qualities to have their prices fixed abroad. Our wheat has its price fixed in Liverpool. Is it asking too much that you give to the grower of wheat, cotton, and tobacco, the same market in which to buy as that in which he sells? When I use the words "The same market" I do not mean the same locality, the same walls, I mean it in the higher sense of a market in which the same prices are to be given.

Where is a man's market, my colleagues? Is it where he buys or where he sells? I sell cotton at Liverpool, and I buy at New York. Which is my market? That in which I have sold my product or that in which I spend my money? If they be precisely alike, with the same laws, the same burdens, the same taxation, it makes no difference: but if in the one I am tolled on my purchases, and in the other I am burdened on my sales, I have the loss of both markets and the advantages of neither.

Now, I plead for a home market in its true sense. I plead that the sweat which is necessary to make a home comfortable shall buy where it sells, on the same basis and under the same advantages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is what this bill does.

There is another provision in this bill which, if it was left alone and everything else in it met with my disapproval, I would cordially vote for it. It is the change from the specific to the ad valorem mode of assessing taxation. I know that it is now considered scientific for a specific duty to be laid, for in the present vocabulary of our friends scientific taxation means that under the cover of which there can be a large profit diverted from the Treasury into the pockets of the manufacturer; but the ad valorem system, with certain defects incapable of being applied to everything, is a just, reasonable, and impartial mode of taxation, and I would be inclined as a legislator to tax nothing that could not be taxed according to the ad valorem system.

The answer to the question as to how it can be done without difficulty is one that presupposes that the legislative will can not be intelligently expressed, and official duty can not be intelligently performed. There is no mode of taxation that an honest and intelligent official can not carry out, and that a legislature with brains can not formulate into a statute. It is a mere sham, a pretext for obtaining fraudulent undervaluation; this whole idea is conceived that specific taxation is necessary. The enemy of high tariff is undervaluation in the dishonest importer, substitution and adulteration in the dishonest manufacturer. I do not mean to say that all American manufacturers do adulterate their goods, but I do mean to say—and I think I proved it in the last House in the little speech which it did me the honor to listen to on the wool question—that the shoddy and adulterating manufacturers of the North had always made money when the real wool manufacturers had not.

I am not going into that question again to-day; but the ad valorem mode tends to the discovery of false valuation, and therefore aids the honest importer, and secures better chance for fair competition by the honest manufacturer.

I find my time slipping away, and the question has been put to me, If you pass this bill, where shall we get our revenue? For one, I am glad that it makes a deficit. It is no obstacle to my support that the expenses of the Government outrun a reasonable tariff taxation. I am glad we have reached the point when we have to assort our taxation under the necessities of a deficit. Where can we raise them? How can they be made lighter? From what sources shall we find them with least burden to the community?

These are questions for the country to take up and answer. These are questions that the Democratic party should solemnly, seriously, and intelligently consider. Where shall we find our revenue? With 70,000,000 people, with so rich a country, with so many sources of wealth, where shall we find it? Left to me, I would probably have found it not where this committee has found it. I would have repealed the bounty on sugar. I would have temporarily restored a part of the duty on sugar. I would have increased the duty on spirits, on cigarettes, on cosmetics, and on various other luxuries; but I am ready to go with them in the experiment of an income tax; I am ready to try those systems of taxation that build up no industry at the expense of another; that burdens no man for the benefit of a rival; that can be taken off without anybody crying that it destroys industries; where it shall be a tax, and nothing but a tax; where it shall not be obscured with the glamor of activities; where it shall not be confused with the cry of laborer's wages.

I want to reach the day when taxes are taxes which, laid by the American Congress, can be relieved when there is no further necessity for the revenues derived from them; when we shall have burdens as burdens, contemplated as burdens, lightened when our revenues allow them to be lightened. Call it income or succession tax, or tax on spirits, or tax on any other thing, I want it to come, as far as possible, as well considered taxes of themselves, isolated from embarrassing relation to industries; when they will be nothing but taxes, and will have no other consideration than the amount of revenue necessary for the support of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having taken more time than I expected, I have only to add, I came to Congress eight years ago with the hope that the time had come when economic questions could be discussed dispassionately. I have avoided as far as possible, altogether I hope, a discussion of sectional questions. Whatever may have been my past, I look solely to the future, unto a country in which my children and your children are to work out the destinies of the greatest people in the world. I believe in the success of federated republicanism. I saw the confederation of Canada formed from separate provinces, and I hope to live to see the day when it and we will be united in some organic union that will wipe out customs lines from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Columbia. [Applause.]

I hope to live to see the day when the continent will be one for freedom, and in that day our children will look back upon these discussions as we look back upon some of the old discussions about the relations of the union of church and state, or the question of slavery. We have free speech, free thought, free locomotion, and beyond that, we will have free trade. We will recognize that the primal curse "by the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat thy bread," is the primary right of mankind; that the right to labor, the right to work, the right to support his family, carries with it the right to spend the fruits of his labor wherever he wants to, for whatever he pleases, according to his own will. This is freedom; that he who works has the freedom to work for whom he pleases without burden, to spend its recompense where he pleases, for what he pleases. And this is the mission of the Democratic party. We are the friends of the laboring men; aye, we are the artisans of toil, in whose name we have taken possession of sovereignty, for whose benefit we labor, whose freedom we will secure, and when the end shall come, in humble homes that name will be the sweetest that can be uttered. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDS Mr. Chairman, when the bill under present discussion was first reported I expected to remain silent and leave the arguments upon it to other gentlemen of this House, but I am one of those who believe that in this greatest of legislative bodies there should be no shrinking; that every member should be a man of decided opinions with the courage to express them, and having carefully studied the economic questions now before us, I believe it to be my duty to myself and to the people of the great district which I have the honor to represent upon this floor, to give the reasons which will direct my votes upon the pending measure.

The measure before us has long agitated the country and is bounded by party lines. One's convictions on the tariff question determines to a great degree the party to which he belongs. If a man believes in a high tariff he is a Republican, while if a man believes in levying only an amount sufficient to defray the expenses of the Government "economically administered" he is, on that point at least, a Democrat.

But we must not forget the main question before us. It is not one of protection or free trade. It is that of tariff reform. That was the battle-cry of the Democratic party in 1892. That was the demand of the people as expressed at the polls that year, and that is the doctrine that this Congress is called upon to enforce by appropriate legislation.

Believing in an economic administration of the Government, and that only an amount of revenue should be taken from the people necessary to that end, having a majority in both branches of the National Legislature, and an Executive of correct opinions on this question who has so forcibly shown that he has the courage to assert his convictions, now is the time to act.

The people of this country for many years have been unnecessarily burdened with taxation, especially indirect taxation, and seeing the Republican party in virtual control of the tariff barons they turned to that great party for relief whose wards have ever been the common people—the great masses who form the great bone and sinew of a nation.

Working with that due caution and deliberation becoming this great body, aiming not merely to change the tariff, but to reform it, bringing to bear the learning of those who by special study have come to be considered authority on the subject, studying the effects of high and low tariff in other countries as well as in our own, comparing the conditions under different tariff acts, not losing sight of other modifying factors, we will not be justly subjected to the appellation of "tariff tinkers," and the acts we shall pass while not, perhaps, perfect, will stand the test of time, and insure to the people a measure of prosperity that can not exist either with a very high or a constantly changing tariff.

THE QUESTION STATED.

A revenue tariff is constructed with the object of raising the required amount of revenue at the minimum cost to the people, but with no reference to reducing importation. A protective tariff has for its primary object a reduction or prohibition of importation for the purpose of favoring the home producer, thus lessening, and in some cases entirely cutting off, revenue.

To accomplish the object of a protective tariff only such articles as are produced both in our own as well as in foreign countries are assessed, and in this way the consumer is forced to pay more for any given article, for he will either be obliged to buy the foreign article at a price enhanced by the duty or buy the home article at about the same price. The price of the protected article being raised to correspond with that at which the imported article is sold, the home manufacturers thus receive the benefit of the protective tariff.

But a strictly revenue tariff being raised principally from articles that are only produced abroad, the increase of price by tariff goes into the national Treasury and not to individuals or corporations. None of our revenue tariffs have, however, been strictly confined to this class of articles. The best example of a purely revenue tariff has existed in Great Britain for thirty years; £100,000,000 annually being collected from sixteen articles, five of which yield 98 per cent of the whole.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT.

Before the Declaration of Independence it was resolved by a vote of Congress, April 6, 1776, to throw open the ports of the thirteen colonies to the trade of the world. In the language of Bancroft, "absolute free trade took the place of hoary restrictions." After the Declaration of Independence, during the war, and time of the Confederation, there was little restriction placed upon foreign exchange. A treaty of alliance and commerce was made between France and the United States in 1778, the basis of which was "the most perfect equality and reciprocity." Our Government endeavored to have some provision concerning commerce embodied in the treaty of 1783 with England, but failed to accomplish it.

During the revolutionary war many industries were started for the purpose of furnishing our people with articles formerly obtained from England, whence our supply was cut off. When the war closed these manufactories feared that they could not endure the competition of England, and if ever protection was needed it was at this time. Yet we find that in 1789 we had manufactories of iron, glass, paper, leather, flax, hemp, copper, hats, sugar, and cloth, which had become strong and prosperous, notwithstanding ten years of English competition, and entirely without protection or legislative assistance.

When the first Congress convened the first question brought to its consideration was how to raise money for the payment of the public debt. The necessity of levying duties on imported goods was conceded, but protection was the controverted point. Some thought it better to pay direct bounties or premiums from the Treasury rather than make the duties protective or prohibitory, and thus the idea of a revenue tariff preceded that of a protective tariff. However, when this our first tariff bill was passed it had an avowed protective principle. It intended to secure a prosperous start to our infant industries. It was a very mild bill, the duties on the whole list averaging about 8 per cent, and it was to end in 1796; but instead of ending in seven years it lasted twenty-seven years and underwent seventeen modifications.

This brings us to 1816. During the latter part of this period, the nonintercourse act and the war of 1812, by shutting our ports to foreign goods, greatly stimulated domestic manufactures, and to perpetuate these industries the tariff of 1816, sometimes called "the Calhoun tariff," and which is generally said to mark the beginning of a distinctly protective policy, was passed. Its highest rate of duty was 20 per cent, and this increase over previous acts was caused by the heavy interest on the public debt incurred by the war.

After the crash of 1819, a stronger popular movement for protection set in than had been known before. This demonstrates a disposition, always prevalent in the popular mind after a financial crisis, to seek in legislation a remedy for its consequences.

At this time the interests of the different sections began to be manifest, and the protective movement was strongest in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky. These were the great agricultural States and felt most keenly the loss of a foreign market for their products and were desirous of a home market. New England was divided, and the South having changed its views since 1816, was now strongly against protection. The clashing of the different sections caused the failure of the bill for increased duties of 1820.

A protective tariff was passed in 1824, carried mainly by the Western and Middle States, party lines having nothing to do with the question. At this time the manufactures of cotton goods were in such prosperous condition that they did not desire increased protection. John Randolph said in the debate upon this bill, "The merchants and manufacturers of Massachusetts and New Hampshire repel this bill, while men in hunting-shirts and deer-skin leggings and moccasins on their feet want protection for home manufactures." And this prosperity and firm establishment of cotton manufactures was due more to the introduction of the power loom than to protection, for notwithstanding the continued protection, they were never in so prosperous a condition before.

Although the encouragement given the woolen manufactures was very moderate, yet, after the crisis of 1819, this industry also developed, and the introduction of machinery had about the same effect upon it as upon the cotton manufactures, and during the period from 1821 the number of woolen factories greatly increased, especially in New England. Thus we find that both the cotton and woolen manufactures were firmly established and in no need of protection some years before 1828. Yet in that year the strongest and most complicated protective tariff bill so far framed was passed.

What was accomplished for cotton and woolen manufactures by the introduction of machinery, including the power loom, was, some years later, accomplished for iron manufactures by the discovery that anthracite coal could be used in the blast furnace. A patent for this process was taken out in 1833, and was in extensive use before 1836, leading to a rapid increase in the production of iron.

Thus in the development of these three great industries we see that other factors besides tariff enter into the question of their growth. The tariff of 1828, called the "tariff of abominations," did not long continue in operation. Some of its provisions were changed in 1830, and another tariff act was passed in 1832 doing away with the objectionable features of the "abomination tariff," making the protection about the same as in 1824. But public opinion was adverse to even so modified a form of protection, and in 1833 the compromise tariff act was passed. This bill provided for a gradual reduction of duties to 20 per cent. It went into effect, popular sentiment in favor of protection disappeared, and the compromise tariff lasted for nine years.

The tariff of 1842, called the "Whig tariff," was strongly protective, and was a purely political measure. It lasted but four years, when the tariff of 1846 was passed by the Democrats. This tariff, called the "Walker tariff," from the fact of its having been framed by Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury under Polk, is often spoken of as a free-trade measure. It was not, although it discriminated between articles that could and those that could not be produced in our own country. It was a revenue tariff with incidental protection. In this tariff the theory was proved to be true that moderate duties yield large revenues. It produced so large a revenue that in 1857 there was found to be a surplus in the Treasury; and for this reason all parties were agreed to a further reduction of the tariff. This is said to be the first tariff legislation since 1816 that was not affected by politics.

The Walker tariff lasted fifteen years—longer than any tariff in the whole history of the country—long enough to demonstrate the effect of a revenue tariff upon the condition of the country. Though new tariff acts were passed frequently, they all, from 1816, had been protective in principle. And in making a comparison of the condition of the country under the two kinds of tariff we may consider the time from 1816 to 1833 as one continued period of protection. That the result of the comparison is in favor of the period under revenue tariff can not be denied. That this was the most prosperous period of our history has been acknowledged by both parties from that time to the present.

The tariff of 1846 produced such good results that, as we have seen, by 1857 the Whigs were willing to unite with the Democrats and vote for a still further reduction. They saw the great prosperity of the country and were honest enough to acknowledge the low tariff as its main cause. That other factors also entered into this condition, we do not deny; but that they were only secondary is abundantly proved by the fact that both parties acknowledged the tariff as the cause. Let me quote from some prominent men on the other side. Senator (afterwards Vice-President) Wilson, in a speech in the Senate in 1857, when the proposition to reduce the tariff of 1846 was pending, said:

I wish to say to the Senate and the country, that the Commonwealth I represent has a deep interest in the modification of the tariff of 1846 by this Congress. They are for the reduction of the revenue to the actual wants of an economical administration of the Government; for a free list embracing articles of prime necessity we do not produce; for mere nominal duties on articles which make up a large portion of our domestic industry, and for such an adjustment of the duties on the products of other nations that come in direct competition with the products of American capital, labor, and skill, as shall impose the least burdens upon that capital, labor, and skill.

And in the same speech he said:

We of New England believe that wool, especially the cheap wools, manila, hemp, flax, raw silk, lead, tin, brass, hides, linseed, and many other articles used in our manufactures can be admitted duty free, or at a mere nominal

duty, without injuring to any extent any considerable productive interests of the country.

Mr. ALLISON, in this House, March 24, 1870, said:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect as any that we have ever had.

Mr. Garfield said in this House in 1878, in answer to the charge that the year of 1860 had not been one of prosperity:

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity. Yet, to suit a theory of finance, we are told that 1860 was a year of great distress and depression of business, equaled only by the distress of the present year. I hold that the facts I have recited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace, but of very general prosperity in the United States.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, says:

The tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition.

Money became more abundant after the year 1849. Large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for a time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased, not only among the people, but among protective economists, and even among manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented Presidential candidates. Much more testimony of the same kind might be adduced, but I deem this sufficient for the present.

But this prosperous condition was not to last. A Presidential election was coming on, and the Republican party, wishing to curry favor and obtain votes from States where the protective principle was strong, introduced a bill increasing import duties. This, known as the "Morrill tariff act," passed the House in the session of 1859 and 1860, but did not pass the Senate until the next session. The most important changes made by the Morrill bill were increased duties on wool and iron, and a substitution of specific for ad valorem duties. In 1861 the civil war began, and immediately were the import duties again increased. We need not follow the various steps of tariff legislation; suffice it to say that it taxed our resources to the utmost to furnish funds to carry on that war.

In 1862 two important acts were passed. The first of these was an internal-revenue act, by which specific taxes were imposed upon the production of iron, steel, leather, paper, coal, oil, etc., and an ad valorem duty upon manufactured articles; a general income tax upon railroads, express companies, and licenses were required for many kinds of business. On July 14 of the same year a tariff act was passed for the avowed purpose of compensating the manufacturers and producers for the internal revenue they were forced to pay. This was a protective measure, and levied heavier duties than was necessary even to offset the heavy internal taxes. As the war continued more money had to be raised and more internal-revenue and tariff taxes were consequently levied.

The most important of these acts were passed in 1864. Three revenue acts were passed at the same time. The first provided for an "enormous extension of the internal tax system." The second for an increase of duties on imports corresponding to and compensatory for those of the first act, and the third authorized a loan of $400,000,000. Everything was taxed and to the utmost. The average rate on all dutiable wares was 47.6 per cent, and on some articles 50, 60, and 100 per cent.

The passage of these acts was made possible only by the state of the public mind regarding the war, and that the protectionist element had control of the Legislature. It would be supposed that the country would have been relieved of such enormous burdens as soon as possible after the war, but such, unfortunately, was not the case. The internal taxes were gradually reduced, and by 1872 all those for which compensatory duties had been enacted were abolished. No one but the Government had any interest in their continuance. But the import duties which were mainly, it was claimed, to compensate for the internal taxes were continued. Not only so, they were increased, and are to-day the foundation of our present tariff system.

The protected interests had derived so much wealth from this measure that they would not willingly let it go. On the other hand the reconstruction problem, as well as the great suffering and sorrow brought to many homes, made the people less alive to these abuses than they should have been; and very unfortunately so for, at so early a period, they might have been corrected. When the matter was agitated in a mild way the demand was appeased by reducing the duties on what are called revenue articles; that is, such goods as are imported but are not produced in our own country; thus reducing the Government's income while not interfering with the gains of the manufacturer who it is plain is only interested in the duties on the protected articles that he produces.

In 1871 and 1872, when the surplus revenue, after paying all appropriations and the interest on the public debt, amounted to a hundred million dollars annually, the people became more earnest in their demands for a reduction of import duties. Consequently, a bill was introduced in this House by the Ways and Means Committee, which, in the words of the chairman, was intended merely "to divest some industries of the superabundant protection which smells of monopoly, and which it was never intended they should enjoy after the war." This bill provided for a reduction on wool, woolens, and cottons of 20 per cent, pig iron $1 a ton; coal, salt, and lumber, tea and coffee, and in fact almost all dutiable articles, were to pay less.

This bill, it is hardly necessary to say, was bitterly opposed by monopolists; but finding that the tariff reformers were much in earnest, it was deemed expedient to yield a little rather than to arouse too much opposition; consequently, a bill was passed which had been introduced in the Senate, providing for a 10 per cent horizontal reduction. Mr. John L. Hays, secretary for many years of the Wool Manufacturers' Association and president of the tariff commission of 1882, was here at the time of the passage of this act as agent for the wool manufacturers. He claims, in a speech delivered shortly after, to have been the author of "this wise and foresighted policy." The tariff reformers, not so "wise in their generation," thought they had gained the victory if they had not received all they asked for, and were quiet for a time.

Without following up this history in detail, we will say: the act of 1872 was repealed in 1875, thus putting us back to the war tariff again, and as no tariff act was passed in the next eight years, we find the war tariff of 1864 in operation in 1883. After the resumption of specie payments in 1879 there was a general revival of business and an increase of imports causing a corresponding increase of revenue. After 1879 the surplus revenue averaged over $100,000,000 annually. This state of affairs caused another demand for revenue reform. The Government being in the hands of protectionists, a tariff commission of their own ilk was appointed to examine into and report upon the subject.

This was like a jury trying a case in which each juror had great financial interest—and all the interests being on the same side. You all know how the tariff bill based upon the report of this commission was put through. It is not necessary to enter into the details of this bill; it is a part of our current history.

Its general character may be inferred from a letter written by the president of the tariff commission, John L. Hays, shortly after the passage of the act.

This letter was published in the Wool Manufacturers' Bulletin. He says:

Reduction in itself was by no means desirable to us; it was a concession to public sentiment, a bending of the top and branches to the wind of public opinion, to save the trunk of the protected system. In a word, the object was protection through reduction. * * * We wanted the tariff to be made by our friends.

In this act the tariff on some things, as wheat, corn, oats, beef, pork, hams, bacon, lard, cheese, and butter, was not changed. On barley it was lowered at the request of the brewers. On silks there was a reduction from 60 to 50 per cent, pig iron from $7 to $6.72 a ton. On cheap cotton goods, which we export in large quantities, there was a reduction. On those we import the duty was increased. The same may be substantially said of woolen goods. On the finer qualities, as dress goods, the duty was increased; on coarser qualities, which we did not import because the duty was prohibitory, it was slightly lowered, but still left high enough to be prohibitory. On wool the reduction was so slight as to amount to nothing.

Thus we see that the tariff of 1883 was still a high protective tariff; in fact, it was substantially a continuation of the war tariff. It was just such a piece of legislation we would expect under the circumstances then existing. To reduce the average per cent upon the whole schedule, the duty was lowered on some articles, but, as we have seen, in doing this the class of goods and rate of reduction were so selected as to accrue to the advantage of no one; further, though the condition of the Treasury and the sentiment of the people demanded a general reduction, yet the duty was increased on many articles where, from a protectionist standpoint, such increase "would do the most good."

As was foreseen, this farce reform bill, neither relieved the people of the burden of indirect taxes nor prevented the accumulation in the Treasury. Consequently, the very next year, 1884, a bill was introduced looking to a real reform of the tariff; but the same element that passed the bill of 1883 was still dominant in Congress, and this attempt at reform was a failure. The same may be said of the bills of 1886 and 1887. The constant agitation of the subject, however, showed how alive were the people to the existing wrong. Had the act of 1883 even in part corrected the conditions which it proposed to correct, the country would have settled down to quiet, and to a measure of prosperity commensurate with the relief so given.

In 1890 the protectionists assumed a bold front and passed the most radical protectionist tariff in the history of the country.

For it there was neither the pretext that the country needed revenue nor that an overtaxed people needed compensatory duties. Yet the rates were as high and in some cases higher than when both these conditions obtained. This law is still in force and working great injury to the country, first, by restricting commerce and diverting revenue from the public Treasury into the coffers of corporations; second, it fosters monopolies and trusts, and these, by limiting production, work the double injury of depriving the laborer of work and heaping up high prices to the consumer. That a high protective tariff is a boon to some classes we can not deny; but laws should be enacted for the people of the whole country and not for a class. It is a benefit to the manufacturer of protected articles. It enables him to amass millions, and by combines and trusts to control the commerce and business of the country like an autocrat.

MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS.

This bill will sound the death knell of monopolies and trusts, monster evils begotten by protection and organized to prevent competition in furnishing the people the necessaries of life, thus making those articles decrease, and robbing the people by enhanced prices for the benefit of a few. The agitation of this bill began at once to affect the stocks of these infamous concerns, whose organization was against the best interests of the people, whose existence was against public policy, and which under the fostering influence of a high protective tariff grew and flourished, defying the people, defying legislation, and defying the courts.

A trust has been defined as "a combination to restrain competition among producers, formed by placing the various producing properties (mills, factories, etc.) in the hands of a board of trustees, who are empowered to direct the operations of production and sale as if the properties were all under a single ownership and management."

Active foreign competition being shut out by a high protective tariff, the different firms and companies who had heretofore competed with each other, by this cunningly devised scheme, kill competition, arrange prices to suit themselves, and regulate production according to demands at their extortionate price.

The first was the Standard Oil Trust, formed in 1869 by a combination of refiners of crude petroleum in Ohio and Pennsylvania. Next, branches of the iron and steel trade combined and formed a trust, and next came the great "American Cotton-Oil Trust." So closely had this hydraheaded monster wrapped his slimy folds around the industries of the American people, that by 1888 it had almost completely in the hands of trusts, petroleum cottonseed oil, and cake, sugar, oatmeal, pearl barley, straw, board, castor oil, linseed oil, school slates, oilcloth, whisky, rubber, steel, steel rails, steel and iron beams, nails, wrought-iron pipe, iron nuts, stoves, lead, copper, envelopes, paper bags, paving pitch, cordage, reaping and binding and mowing machines, thrashing machines, plows, glass, and shortly white lead, jute bagging, lumber, shingles, friction matches, felt, lead pencils, cartridges and cartridge shells, watches and watch cases, clothes-wringers, carpets, coffins and undertakers' supplies, dental tools, wall-paper, sandstone, patent leather, and other articles.

The very purpose of these organizations has been to advance prices and check competition, thus placing the people at the mercy of these combinations, which have reaped enormous profits at their expense. A burning iniquity, a tax for the benefit of the few upon the whole people; a wrong which would be impossible of consummation save under a high protective tariff. Take, for example, the linseed oil trust formed in January, 1887. The price per gallon of linseed oil rose from 38 cents to 52 cents, and was kept up during 1888. Thus every person having painting done paid to the members of this trust for every gallon they used 14 cents over and above the sum he would have paid if competition had been freely allowed; and estimating the consumption of linseed oil at 30,000,000 gallons a year, the trust so increased the price that it took from the people four and half million of dollars per annum.

One of the most noted, also, of these concerns is the sugar trust, whose very life will be taken by this bill.

It was supported by a duty of one-half per cent per pound on fine sugar, which practically prohibited importation.

During the year 1892 the total amount of revenue from this source was $76,000, showing that the American trust controlled the market by the aid of the McKinley tariff, and had an absolute monopoly. As a result the various refineries were put into the trust at inflated valuations and the price of sugar increased, so as to compel the people to pay dividends upon fictitious property. The protective duty levied upon refined sugar was used to increase the price, hence making the consumer pay this tax, none of which was received by the Government, but all of which went into the coffers of the holders of trust stock.

Sugar can be refined more cheaply here than in England and needs no protection. The refiners can therefore control the American market without any protective duty whatever, but under this system, which lays tribute upon the great body of the people for the benefit of the few, this wrong was brought into existence and it is now demanded by the Republican party that it be perpetuated. It was not until 1887 that public attention was completely aroused concerning these organizations, but they have gone on defiantly believing that by working upon passion and prejudice they can continue their work of reaping ill-gotten gains.

Only a little while ago, in the face of the fact that the Wilson bill would become a law, the Bethlehem, the Carnegie, and the Illinois companies, manufacturers of steel rails, agreed to pay the Pennsylvania Steel Company $400,000 as the estimated profits of one year if it would close and keep closed during the twelve months of 1894 the great works at Sparrows Point, Md.

What for the laborers in the mills at Sparrows Point, the interests of whom these gentlemen ostensibly desire to guard so well? It is enough for them that in the face of this contemplated legislation these three mills can afford to pay the profits of another's works if it remains idle and noncompetitive an amount equal to the total earnings of a large number of employés. The railroads will pay for the rails, the people will pay the railroads. The 4,000 employés of the Maryland Company can go, while the wealthy members of the steel trust who have amassed their fortunes under the cry of protection to American labor will add to their ill-gotten wealth. And now these trusts—the white-lead trust, the whisky trust, the sugar trust, the coal trust, and all the others of this infamous band of plunderers of the people, are opposing this bill and endeavoring to prevent its passage unless it shall be so tinkered as to still permit these leeches to feed upon the public. There should be no wavering in the Democratic line. Now is to be struck the first real blow at the life of monopolies, which will not yield without a struggle, but to whom the people must no longer be compelled to pay tribute in order that the wealth of the nation may be accumulated in the hands of a few. [Applause.]

WOOL.

It is claimed that this product of the farmer especially needs protection; that unless a heavy import duty is levied on foreign wools the article can not be profitably grown in this country. This subject demands careful examination at our hands, to the end that we may determine whether or not this assertion is supported by facts. I deem it my duty to stand with my party and to vote in accordance with the views of the majority; for if each of us insisted that some particular view of his own must be incorporated in this bill ere it received our votes, it could never become a law. But let us examine the subject.

If protection benefits the wool-growing industry, then it must follow: First, that the higher the duty levied upon foreign wool the higher will be the price received by the farmer for the home-grown wool. Second, that wool-growing becoming more profitable under a high protective tariff, the number of sheep would be increased not only absolutely, but relatively to the increased population. If wool-growing were a more profitable business under a high tariff than under a low tariff, each flock master would increase his number of sheep, and persons not before in the business would enter it. That the first of these propositions is not borne out by facts, and that the price of wool has constantly increased under a low tariff and decreased constantly under a higher tariff, is shown by the following table taken from the special report on "History and present condition of the sheep industry of the United States," published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. To this table, showing the price of wool from 1824 to 1890, I have added the price for the last three years, bringing it up to date.

Year.	Price.	Year.	Price.	Year.	Price.	Year.	Price.
1824	$0.53	1842	$0.42	1860	$0.50	1878	.45
1825	.43	1843	.30	1861	.40	1879	.35
1826	.43	1844	.30	1862	.50	1880	.55
1827	.32	1845	.40	1863	.68	1881	.49
1828	.30	1846	.35	1864	.78	1882	.46
1829	.45	1847	.40	1865	1.00	1883	.43
1830	.35	1848	.38	1866	.65	1884	.40
1831	.60	1849	.30	1867	.53	1885	.33
1832	.55	1850	.40	1868	.43	1886	.34
1833	.41	1851	.40	1869	.50	1887	.38
1834	.60	1852	.38	1870	.46	1888	.35
1835	.50	1853	.56	1871	.46	1889	.36
1836	.60	1854	.47	1872	.72	1890	.37
1837	.63	1855	.35	1873	.68	1891	.35
1838	.42	1856	.38	1874	.54	1892	.32
1839	.40	1857	.50	1875	.56	1893	.32
1840	.45	1858	.33	1876	.52		
1841	.45	1859	.52	1877	.43		

From 1846 to 1860 we had the lowest wool tariff in the history of the country. And during the last three years of this period wool was practically on the free list, all but the higher grades

being admitted free. Although in this period there was one bad year (1858), arising from a panic in the money, market which brings down the average, yet during these fifteen years medium wool brought an average of 41 7/8 cents per pound. And during the three years that I have mentioned, omitting the panic year, wool was 50 cents, and in 1859 52 cents per pound. This is more than the average price for the last fifteen years, and much higher than any year since the McKinley tariff has been in operation. Would not the wool-grower be willing to exchange the prices under the McKinley tariff for the average of 41 7/8 cents per pound, under a low tariff, or even for the 50 and 52 cents per pound when wool was practically on the free list?

In a letter from the Manufacturers' Club, Phialdelphia, to the Ways and Means Committee, under date of September 4, 1893, we find this acknowledged in the following sentence:

Wool, for example, is much lower now than it was in 1890, or than it was even so recently as one year ago.

What magnanimity on the part of these manufacturers! They claim that the duty on woolen goods is to compensate them for the higher price they are obliged to pay for wool on account of the duty upon it. Yet this very letter from which I have quoted is written to persuade the Committee on Ways and Means to continue the present duty on manufactures, while at the same time it acknowledges that they get this raw material cheaper than when it was on the free list; asking that the duty on imported woolens be kept up in order that they may keep up higher prices.

Verily, the manufacturer is not extravagantly bedecked with the jewel consistency. But if he were, perhaps he would not live in a luxuriant mansion, surrounded by servants, and ride in his beautiful carriage driven by liveried coachmen, while the wages of the toiling laborer whom he pretends to love so well are from time to time cut down even to starvation point. And the farmer, whose prejudices he endeavors to enkindle against the party which is his best and truest friend, gets lower prices for his products and pays higher prices for the wares of the manufacturer.

One would hardly expect that under any circumstances, in peace, wool would reach the high prices of war times, when the demand was so great to supply our immense armies with clothing and blankets. Yet, in 1867, the duty on wool was so far increased above that of the war as to be 50 per cent on clothing and combing wool. Yet the price continued to fall, until 1872, when a 10 per cent horizontal reduction was made in the tariff. And as will be seen by the table wool immediately went up and remained high until 1875. In that year the tariff act of 1872 was repealed, putting us back to the high tariff of 1867. Again wool fell and has decreased to the present time. The slight reduction of 1883 can not be responsible for this. For the decrease, with the exception of one year, 1880, was as steady before as after that date; nor did the increased duty of 1890 put any check to the steady fall.

I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, that a clear examination will furnish conclusive proof to the unbiased mind of the correctness of this proposition, that a protective tariff does not increase the price of wool.

In examining my second proposition we must consider the sections of country east and west of the Mississippi separately, as entirely different conditions are found in regard to the wool-growing industry. West of the Mississippi are great tracts of land that can be had at little cost, and Government land that can be used free.

In many sections whole flocks live out of doors all winter without other food than the pasture provided by nature. And where shelter and food are provided for the most severe weather, it is done at a comparatively small cost. Consequently, very large flocks can be kept and wool grown at a profit when the price is so low as to be ruinous to the industry where different conditions obtained. That the number of sheep has increased in this section is natural. East of the Mississippi, however, the number of sheep has greatly diminished.

In the work on Sheep Industry, from which I have already quoted, we find on page 696 that in this section, notwithstanding the enormous increase in population, there were two million less sheep in 1890 than in 1860. And in my own State, Ohio, one of the most important wool-growing States in the Union, there has been a falling off of one-third the number of sheep during the high-tariff period, although the population has increased during that time over 1,000,000. This falling off can not in any way be due to overproduction. It is estimated that we consume annually about 6,000,000 pounds of wool, while we produce less than 3,000,000. In 1878, after ten years of high tariff, Ohio, Michigan, and all the great wool-growing States, had only about half as many sheep as they had in 1867. Before 1867 the number of sheep had been increasing more rapidly than our population. Since then the reverse has taken place.

Again, we are told by manufacturers that some of the best grades of goods can not be made from wool produced in this country, and some not from any one grade of wool; and if the manufacture of such articles should be attempted in disregard of this fact the result would be a mere imitation, something we all despise, and needing no expert to detect. In a reprint from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter of an article by Edward D. Page, of New York, I find this subject discussed. Mr. Page, speaking of woolen manufacturers, says:

I fear that many of them do not fully realize even now how improvement and economy can be accomplished by making these goods from a mixture of the stocks, most exactly suited to the qualities the goods are to possess, instead of the makeshifts which our meager market has hitherto afforded.

He further says:

I have been shown in an English manufacturer's wool house a mixture or blend of no less than fourteen distinct and different varieties of wool, from which he made a simple fabric in which at home not more than two or three qualities are used. Each of these fourteen varieties was found to lend some desirable peculiarity to the fabric, perceptible only in the finished piece, or else to economize the cost. And I was told that the blend used had been substantially the same for thirty years. The goods manufactured from it were perceptibly superior, in selling qualities, to our own.

Some of these qualities are durability of color, fineness, and softness of finish—all very desirable qualities. Although the import duties are very high on these fine qualities of woolen goods, those who can pay high prices will have them. And we can easily understand that if we could import wool free we could buy as much of these fine wools as we desire, thereby making these beautiful fine goods in our own country, and being able to sell them at such prices that many if not all could afford to wear them. This would be a great advantage and great saving to the consumer. And as our home-grown wools could by mixing with the imported wools be used in a greater variety of fabrics, a home market would be created for more than is now produced, and "the flocks would increase on a thousand hills."

An increased demand would increase the price, and the farmer would be benefited in a twofold manner. Nor would the manufacturer be left to suffer. True, he would not be able to charge such high prices, but he would sell more goods at home and could export them and find an abundant market where he would not have to pay duty. He would not make money so fast, but he would make it honestly. A great weight would be lifted from his conscience that has rested there, for lo, these many years. And we certainly would be doing the greatest good to the greatest number.

Here leaving this subject, let me quote from a few authorities. Senator SHERMAN said in 1883:

In the table which I have now before me, it is shown that in 1867 the price of wool was 51 cents a pound; in 1870 it was 46 cents a pound; in 1876 it was 43 cents a pound; in 1880, which was an abnormal year, 48 cents a pound. But to-day I am told that these wools are sold in Ohio at from 35 to 40 cents a pound. So the result of protecting the wool-growers has been, as it has been in all industries, to gradually reduce the price of domestic wools.

Again he said:

Under the operation of the tariff of 1867 the price of wool has gradually gone down. This was the result of the policy of protecting (?) the wool-grower—to gradually reduce the price.

Senator FRYE, of Maine, a protectionist, said:

Domestic wools have come down in price from the time the tariff of 1867 was enacted until to-day.

In short, foreign wools are imported not to compete but to combine with ours, and unless the manufacturer can get a higher price for his product he will pay less for our wool, and when foreign wool is purchased to be mixed with our wool, if foreign wools cost more, ours will bring less.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *September 13, 1893.*

SIR: If you want to suit this mill, kindly put wool and all raw materials on the free list. Should this be done, we are willing to have the tariff on manufactured goods gradually reduced 25 per cent, which is sufficient. This country can never compete successfully with European manufacturers until it gets free wool.

The proper thing for your committee to do is to act quickly and settle the matter for a year or two, and whether or not you reduce the tariff the mills will start up, as they will know what they have to figure on.

Yours, respectfully,

BECKMAN & CO.

And, as showing the methods of some gentlemen, I incorporate in my remarks the following letter from one of my constituents:

CHILI, OHIO, *January 6, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a copy of a petition sent me by Messrs. Justice, Bateman & Co. No doubt the House of Representatives will be flooded with such by signers. I concluded to send you it in blank. This house is doing a wool commission business, but of late years have connected politics with it. They are well known by all shippers of wool. They have made a fortune in wool, but mostly at the expense of shippers. They contributed heavily to the election of Ben. Harrison in the campaign of 1888, and were connected with John Wanamaker in raising the $600,000 campaign fund, and when confronted with the foregoing statement never denied the same. It appears they desire to control the Democratic party as well as the Republican party, only through other means. It is my earnest wish and desire that the Democratic Representatives in the House, as well as the Senators in the Senate, will not go back on the Democratic platforms, which are for reform of the ta iff, and have been so ever since 1876, when Samuel J. Tilden was elected on a tariff-reform platform. It is my opinion that all this howl now made about the revision of the tariff and the lying idle of woolen manufactories is to intimidate the Representatives of the people in

order to continue the mulcting of the masses for the privilege of classes. Although you have been steadfast in your past action, and supported the Administration in the repeal bill, and we have not the least doubt you will support and vote for tariff reform, I did not think it amiss to express the sentiments which I did, and believe every true Democrat around this neck of the woods will indorse.

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN LORENZ.

Hon. J. A. D. RICHARDS.

SHODDY.

But there is a wicked, insidious enemy that interferes with the price of wool, while at the same time it deprives the American people of the substantial woolen clothing which they are entitled to, and that is shoddy. The manufacturers of woolen goods gave some very interesting testimony—I do not say spontaneous and voluntary—on this subject before the Ways and Means Committee last fall. Among other things they disclosed the fact that under the high protective tariff, before the McKinley bill was passed, there was 1 pound of shoddy used in so-called woolen goods to every 4 pounds of wool; since the passage of the McKinley bill there is 1 pound of shoddy to every pound of wool, four times as much as before.

Thus the McKinley tariff, while it compels the manufacturer to pay higher prices for foreign wools necessary to blend with our domestic wools to make the better grade of cloths, and by its duty on woolen goods enhances the price of proper clothing, it invites the manufacturer of shoddy to the field. And instead of placing upon the backs of the people the pure, healthy product of the sheep, clothes them with shoddy made from the ground-up rags of the slums of the earth. These makers of bogus wool stand in mortal fear of the era of free wool.

From 1870 to 1890, under the protecting care of Republican legislation, they enjoyed prosperity, but since 1890, when, under the McKinley act, foreign wools necessary to mix with our own were driven away and our people compelled to wear such kinds of dear clothing as could be contrived from our wools, or from old rags ground up and wove and stuck together in the form of shoddy. The business of these gentlemen has been a bonanza. Need I say to the American farmer that if clothing is made from wool instead of shoddy it is better for the wearer, and also for the wool-grower? Cheap real woolen goods would destroy this iniquitous business, and the maker of this spurious stuff would rather hear the rolling of thunder or the sound of cannon than the bleating of a lamb.

It has even been said that one of these conscienceless mortals once actually blushed when he discovered a sheep looking him in the face. Yet, as showing which policy is aider and abettor of their business, we find in 1888 seventeen rag and shoddy dealers issuing a circular, which was distributed by the Republican national committee, asserting that free wool would entirely ruin their business, declaring against the "free-trade" party of Grover Cleveland and for Harrison and Morton. Their election was declared "to be indispensable to the maintenance of our business;" and now, in a petition to this Congress, wherein they protest against the placing of wools on the free list, they have the effrontery to declare that the number of plants engaged in the shoddy business "is nearly one hundred, with a combined capital of millions."

I say to this House, "choose you this day whom ye will serve," the maker of shoddy, who deprives the American farmer of a proper price for his wool by manufacturing cloth from ground-up and woven rags, and who cheats the people by placing upon the market this stuff now constituting a large part of our clothing, or will you serve the cause of common honesty, call a halt in this iniquitous business, and by proper tariff legislation give our farmer a better price for his wool and our people a better kind of cheap, warm, woolen clothing. If there be one of the children of this Republican system more unlikely than the others, Shoddy is the ugliest brat begotten by that foul parent, High Tariff. View the offspring of your pet: monopolies, combines, trusts, pools—Shoddy. [Applause.]

COAL.

Coal is a necessity to our domestic and manufacturing uses, and great is the store of this fuel laid up for our use in bygone ages, and yet this boon to civilization, this needed article, is virtually in the hands of monopolies.

Each year there is used in the United States about 120,000,000 tons of coal, which, at an average price of $4 per ton, is nearly $500,000,000 or more than $8 per annum for every man, woman, and child in the country.

The enormous coal fields are widely distributed, productive mines being in operation in many of our States. Anthracite coal, however, only occurs in a limited area in Pennsylvania, but the deposit is of wonderful richness. The total area of these fields is about 300,000 acres, of which about 200,000 acres are owned by a few (seven) railway corporations. These companies directly, or through subsidiary companies, control the market, carry on mining operations, carry the coal to market and sell it.

Many years ago these seven companies formed the famous anthracite coal pool by which they agreed to maintain a uniform selling price at all important distributing points where two or more of the companies carried competition—cities within an hour's ride of the miners were compelled to pay as much as those hundreds of miles distant, and while this pool is a thing of the past on account of the passage of a law in Pennsylvania making their acts illegal and punishable, there is a secret agreement between these companies to-day, and where two or more roads meet the same prices for coal are quoted. Hundreds of thousands of people of the North and Northwest must pay for coal, this necessity of life, whatever the managers of a single corporation demand.

We have seen the Missouri Pacific Railway Company working through subsidiary companies, encircling the coal fields of Missouri, Colorado, and the Indian Territory, and compelling private operators to sell coal at the company's prices in the market; the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy; the Denver and New Orleans; the Union Pacific, and the Denver and Rio Grande Railway Companies reaching out for the Colorado, and the Union Pacific, the Chicago and Northwestern, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, reaching out for the Wyoming coal fields. While the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, having a monopoly on the Pacific coast, from time to time kept prices at San Francisco just below the point at which it was profitable to import Australian coal.

We have seen the Hocking Valley and Toledo Railway Company in Ohio grasping the great Hocking Valley coal fields of the State. The coal of Alabama seized by the Louisville and Nashville, and the Norfolk and Western Railroad Company and Chesapeake and Ohio seizing the coal fields of West Virginia.

These facts go to show that the consumers of coal are at the mercy of corporations.

Let me quote from an article by Henry D. Lloyd in the North American Review, June, 1886:

Last July Messrs. Vanderbilt, Sloan, and one or two others out of several hundred owners of coal lands and coal railroads, met in the pleasant shadows of Saratoga to make a binding arrangement for the control of the coal trade. "Binding arrangement," the sensitive coal presidents say, they prefer to the word "combination."

The gratuitous warmth of summer suggested to these men the need the public would have of artificial heat at artificial prices the coming winter. It was agreed to fix prices, and to prevent the production of too much of the raw material of warmth by suspensions of mining. In anticipation of the arrival of the cold wave from Manitoba, a cold wave was sent out all over the United States from their parlors in New York, in an order for half-time work by the miners during the first three months of this year, and for an increase of prices. These are the means this combination uses to keep down wages—the price of men, and keep up the price of coal—the wages of capital. Prices of coal in the West are fixed by the Western Anthracite Coal Association, controlled entirely by the large railroads and mine owners of Pennsylvania. The association regulates the price west of Buffalo and Pittsburg and in Canada.

Our annual consumption of anthracite is now between 31,000,000 and 32,000,000 tons. The West takes between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 tons. The companies which compose the combination mine, transport, and sell their own coal. They are obliterating other mine-owners and the retailer. The Chicago and New York dealer has almost nothing to say about what he shall pay or what he shall charge, or what his profits shall be. The great companies do not let the little man make too much. Year by year the coal retailers are sinking into the status of mere agents of the combination, with as little freedom as the consumer.

Combination is busy in those soft-coal districts, whose production is so large that it must be sent to competitive markets. A pool has just been formed covering the annual product of 6,000,000 tons of the mines of Ohio. Indiana and Illinois are to be brought in, and it is planned to extend it to all the bituminous coal districts that compete with each other. The appearance of Mr. Vanderbilt last December in the Clearfield district of Pennsylvania at the head of a company capitalized for $5,000,000 was the first entry of a metropolitan man into this field.

Mr. Vanderbilt's rôle is to be that of producer, carrier, dealer, and consumer all in one. Until he came the district was occupied by a number of small companies and small operators, as used to be the case in the anthracite fields in the old days. But the man who works himself, with his sons, in a small mine, cutting perhaps from 20 to 40 tons a day, can not expect to survive the approach of the Manhattan capitalists. The small Clearfield producers, looking at the fate of their kind in the anthracite country, greeted Mr. Vanderbilt's arrival with the question, "What is to become of us?" "If the small operator," said one of the great man's lieutenants, "goes to the wall, that is his misfortune, not our fault."

And this kind of misfortune has, alas, overtaken many poor

men that the supply might be kept down, even to the extent of creating a coal famine, with all its concomitant horrors for the poor; for a coal famine is always so managed as to happen in the severest winter weather, and when added to insufficient shelter and insufficient clothing it brings untold suffering. We have heard each party arraign the other for closing public works and putting out the fires of the furnaces, thus depriving the laborer of work.

But what shall be said of the man who "puts the fire out" on the poor man's hearth in the dead of winter regardless of the half-clad sufferer, who perhaps has crawled from her bed of rags to hover over the few scanty coals? And all that the price of coal may be raised in the interests of a Vanderbilt, thus taking the few pennies that should have bought a loaf of bread as the additional price of a pail of coal. Anyone who has visited the poor quarters of our large cities during a coal famine, and I hope many of you have, and seen the wretched, starved creatures buying coal by the pail or half pail know that the picture of their sufferings can not be overdrawn. And in the interest of such, I ask you to do away with a tax that makes possible a monopoly, which is the most grievous of burdens to the already overburdened poor.

The testimony taken before the Ways and Means Committee shows that it is only the operators of the Eastern coal mines that fear competition in case the duty is removed from coal. And the only coal dealers they mention as competitors are those of Nova Scotia and Canada. Yet it is brought out in the testimony of these men that their mines supply coal to Canada in face of the duty of 67 cents per ton we pay for selling coal in that Dominion. Also, that these same coal dealers, who are so afraid of competition with Nova Scotia coal, claiming that they can barely hold their own with the duty of 75 cents per ton, and if this duty were removed the competition would be ruinous to their business—these same coal dealers were forced to admit in their testimony that they ship their coal all the way to Cuba, where it comes into direct competition with Nova Scotia coal, where it pays no duty. And that this competition is successful and the trade profitable to American dealers is evidenced by the vast amount they ship to Cuba every year.

If this can be done, after paying freight for such a long distance, as a matter of course it can be done at home. And the claim that the wages of the miners will have to be reduced is all buncombe, calculated to excite the sympathy of the uninformed. They claim that the cost of coal is mainly labor; that being the case, Canada and Nova Scotia coals cost as much as ours, for their miners, it is acknowledged in the testimony of these operators, receive the same wages as do our miners. These being the facts in the case, free coal can work no injury to the miners and laboring men. The extensive operator of the Eastern coal fields will not reap such large profits, and will not be able to limit the output and increase the price and deprive the miner of work at his own sweet will.

I append a report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce made to this House on June 10, 1892, which is as follows:

[House Report No. 1630, Fifty-second Congress, first session].

INVESTIGATION OF RAILROADS COMBINATIONS.

June 10, 1892.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WISE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted the following report (to accompany Mis. Doc. ——):

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have considered a resolution, a copy of which is hereto subjoined, offered by Mr. Stout, in the House of Representatives, on the 12th of February last, and referred to them, and respectfully report:

That while that resolution may be inaccurate in some of its statements, it furnishes sufficient grounds for an inquiry by Congress into a transaction which probably vitally affects the interests of the people of the United States. It is very generally and confidently alleged throughout the country; it is asserted in suits at law and bills in equity pending in the courts; it is currently believed on the exchanges, in which such things are most narrowly watched, that a combination of the three leading anthracite coal roads, the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company, the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, together with the companies which these several roads control, and a combination of this combination with the Port Reading Railroad Company and other transportation and producing companies have been effected; and that these combinations are for the purpose of creating a monopoly in the production and transportation of anthracite coal and to control its price in the market; that the market price has already been advanced without any other excuse than to further the interests of the monopoly (and this at a season of the year when the consumption of anthracite coal is at its minimum), and that said combinations propose to advance the price still further from time to time.

And as it is apparent that State legislation or action is insufficient to cope with these combinations, extending as they do, if they exist, over several States, and constituting a menace to all the people of the United States, it is of vital importance to ascertain (1) whether the alleged combinations, or any similar combinations exist; (2) whether any law of Congress and particularly whether "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies" (chapter 647 of the Supplement to the Revised Statutes) have been violated by the companies and collateral companies said to form, or which may be found to form, the said combinations; (3) what additional legislation in such case, on the part of Congress, may be necessary, expedient, and proper: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or such portion of them as they may specially designate for the purpose, be empowered and directed to investigate, at the earliest practicable moment, whether the alleged combinations of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company, the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and the Port Reading Railroad Company, or any combination between any of these roads and any other roads or canals or producers of coal, for any illegal or improper purpose, exist, and, if such combinations do exist, the effect thereof on the production, transportation, distribution, and price of anthracite coal, and upon commerce among the several States, and to report to the House any and all facts in relation to the subject-matter of the investigation which the committee of investigation herein provided for may ascertain, and to make such recommendations as the said committee may agree upon; and that said committee be authorized to sit during the session of the House or during the recess of Congress, and at such place or places as it may find necessary; to employ a clerk or stenographer, to administer oaths, issue subpœnas, compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them, and compel the production of books and papers; and that a sum, not to exceed $10,000, sufficient to pay the expenses of the committee herein provided for shall be immediately available and payable out of the contingent fund of the House on the order of the chairman of said investigating committee; and all vouchers for any such expenditures shall be likewise certified to by the chairman of said investigating committee.

The subjoined is a copy of a resolution offered in the House of Representatives on the 12th of February, 1892, by Mr. Stout, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"FEBRUARY 12, 1892.

"Mr. Stout submitted the following; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Whereas the Reading, Lehigh Valley, the Jersey Central, Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railways, operating lines in different States, and representing a nominal capital of $600,000,000, the plant of which could be duplicated at one-half the sum, have combined their capital: Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be requested to investigate the facts of the case and report whether such consolidation should not be prohibited by national law; and whether a bureau of interstate transportation should not be organized, headed by a Cabinet officer, known as the Secretary of Commerce.

"Attest:

"JAMES KERR, *Clerk*."

The subjoined is a letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission in reply to an inquiry addressed to that Commission by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as to whether the Commission has entered upon any such investigation as is contemplated in the resolution of Mr. Stout, printed herewith:

"INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"*Washington, March 31, 1892.*

"*The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,*
House of Representatives:

"SIR: Your communication of the 29th instant, inclosing copy of proposed resolution directing your committee to investigate and report concerning the recent consolidation of the Philadelphia and Reading with other railroads, and requesting to be informed whether this Commission has entered upon any investigation of such consolidation, is received.

"The act to regulate commerce does not give the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction of matters which relate only to dealings between railroad companies and have no bearing upon the rights of the public to impartial treatment and reasonable and equal charges in the transportation of interstate commerce. The magnitude of the railroad deal referred to is calculated to arouse grave apprehensions of resultant injuries to the public welfare, but until the attention of the Commission is called to some contravention of the interstate-commerce law, caused or made possible by the combination of railroad interests, no grounds appear to exist upon which an investigation of the consolidation could properly be instituted by the Commission under that law."

IRON.

At the beginning of the war, we had iron ore among unclassified articles, upon which a duty of 10 per cent was assessed. But as no ore was imported either then or during the war, we find the rate remained the same up to 1870, when it was raised to 20 per cent. As soon as it began to be imported to some extent, it attracted the attention of the protectionists; who were looking for new fields, and the duty was raised in 1883 to 75 cents per ton, which was about 35 per cent ad valorem. But to present this branch of the subject clearly and concisely, I can not do better than to quote from the testimony of the president of the Pennsylvania Steel Company before the Ways and Means Committee, when Mr. McKinley was chairman of that committee and they were taking testimony with a view to reform the tariff:

The demand for free ore, in my judgment, can now be presented from a commercial standpoint, which can not fail to convince all fair-minded persons that innumerable benefits to our country would follow, without working harm to a single interest which is legitimately connected with the production of American ore, iron, or the products proceeding therefrom. To systematize this permit me to present the following facts:

First. That only ore which is suitable for the manufacture of steel is ever imported; and if competing at all, can only compete with the like quantity of domestic production.

Second. The whole quantity of ore suitable for Bessemer pig iron which it will be possible to produce in this country during the year 1890 will not exceed 5,000,000 tons. This estimate includes every ton of ore that can be raised by hook or crook. Three and one-half millions tons of pig iron, it is estimated, will be required to supply the wants of the steel manufacturers in this country during the present year. To manufacture this amount of pig iron, 6,500,000 tons of iron ore of suitable quality will be required. One and one-half millions tons of Bessemer steel ore must therefore be imported into this country by our steel manufacturers, or their works will remain idle one-fourth of the year.

He further says that one-half million tons will come from Cuba, where the mines are owned by an American company; and that the importation of this ore is the direct means of securing the exportation to the West Indies and South America of

American coal, as return cargo in the steamers which bring the ore to this country:

In 1889 the export of American coal has been almost equal ton for ton to the importation of iron ore. There is no reason why, by using these steamers, this country can not so develop her coal business in the West Indies and South America that she will absolutely drive English coal out of those markets. One million tons will be imported from the Mediterranean and the three hundred and fifty steamers that will be required to bring that quantity of ore to this country will leave our shores laden with wheat, cotton, and corn, carrying this outward cargo more cheaply on account of the freight received for bringing the iron ore.

He says further:

Practically the whole of the imported iron ore is used in the furnaces located at or near tidewater. Seventy-five cents per ton on these ores represents the cost of hauling one tone of ore 100 miles. Removing this duty, therefore, only enables iron ore to enter 100 miles farther into the linterior than it does to-day. On the other hand, it will enable my company as exporters to go 800 or 1,000 miles by sea to compete with our competitors abroad.

The condition of the supply and demand for Bessemer steel raw material has not materially changed in this country for the past five years. This country has never since the introduction of the manufacture of Bessemer steel imported less than 25 per cent of the material consumed in the manufacture of the steel output, and the prospect for the future, judging by the past, is that the national growth of the country will keep pace with and probably more than absorb the increased output of native steel raw material arising from the new developments that are and have been constantly projected. It used to come here in the form of pig iron, but as this country increased her furnace capacity the steel manufacturer now seeks to bring it here more and more in the form of ore.

That is, all the ore we import is of a kind of which we do not produce enough to supply the demand of our immense iron and steel trade. Not only so, but being brought here as ore and made into pig iron by our furnaces, is thus supplying more work for the American laborer. And Joseph G. Butler, of Youngstown, Ohio, in his testimony before the same committee, says that if it were not for the great development of the pig-iron industry in this country he does not know where we could get our pig iron. "We could not import a ton." Yet at the same sitting, in answer to a question, he says:

I say the present tariff does not cut any figure.

And again:

We want this tariff on everything we can produce in this country. We do not want to import anything.

Yes; and wants the tariff on pig iron, of which he says we can not import a ton. What does he want tariff to protect in this case? Very evidently he wants the tariff to protect high prices. As to steel rails, none are now imported: the duty is as prohibitory as when it was $17 and $28 a ton. The cost of transportation of steel rails is from $2 to $4 a ton. All the difference above this transportation cost is caused by the tariff tax. In 1891 the price was $8 higher in this country; last year the price was $12 higher. If steel rails were admitted free of duty they would not, owing to the cost of railroad transportation, be used, excepting near tidewater.

WAGES.

One of the most important, if not the most important, question of the tariff controversy is that of wages. The great majority of the population in all countries belong to some branch of the laboring class. That the prosperity of a country largely depends upon the condition of this class is a self-evident fact. Were all of this great class employed at remunerative wages, this one fact would conduce more to the prosperity and happiness of the world than all other conditions combined. There would be no poverty, and, best of all, no strikes and no lockouts. But to this Utopian condition we never can expect to attain. Of all the factors entering into the wage question I believe the most potent factor is supply and demand. Where there is more work to be done than there are laborers to do it, there will wages be extremely high, as in the case of the opening up of some new field in a distant part of a country, as in the early history of our Western mines.

When the supply equals the demand, a normal condition, then wages will become lower; and when the supply exceeds the demand then there will be fierce competition and wages will be reduced. We find that in our own country wages have always been high. This is owing to our vast domain and to the fact that there have always been new enterprises developing, such as the opening of mines, building of canals and railroads, reducing vast tracts of wild lands to agricultural purposes, building new towns and cities, etc. Lately the advocates of protection have claimed that we owe it to their policy that wages are higher in this than in some other countries.

This assertion would not be worth noticing were it not for the fact that many persons will believe a bare statement without proper proof to back it up. But high wages have existed in our country regardless of the rate of the tariff. Whether it was high or low has made no difference, with the exception that in the protected industries the owners of such works will sometimes lock out their workmen because, not that they refuse the higher wages protection makes, but because they refuse to submit to reductions—they lock them out and employ the so-called pauper labor imported from other countries. If protection caused wages to be higher, then in those countries where protection exists we would always find wages to be higher than in those countries having a low tariff or free trade. But that this is not the case is shown by the following table, taken from the report of the United States Tariff Commission, volume 2, page 2388:

Occupation.	Protection.		Free trade.	
	Germany.	France.	Belgium.	England.
Bricklayers	$3.45	$4.00	$6.00	$8.12
Masons	4.00	5.00	6.00	8.16
Carpenters	4.18	5.42	5.40	8.25
Painters	4.60	4.90	4.20	7.25
Plasterers	4.35	.....	5.40	8.10
Blacksmiths	3.90	.....	5.40	8.12
Cabinetmakers	4.95	.....	4.80	7.70
Dyers	3.30	.....	.....	7.00
Weavers	3.00	.....	.....	5.49
Grinders in glass works	4.87	.....	.....	10.92
Common laborers	2.60	.....	3.00	5.00

This table shows that the weekly wages paid by free-trade European countries is much above the wages paid by European countries in which a protective tariff exists. But it is neither fair nor honest to say that because of protection the wages in this country are higher than in a free-trade European country, and when the statement is made that wages are higher here than in England, where free trade exists, it ought also to be stated that they are still further above the wages of France and Germany, where protection exists. Mr. Powderly says that one good labor organization does more to keep up wages than all the protective tariffs in existence, and Mr. Frick, in his testimony before the tariff commission, acknowledged that tariff has nothing to do with the question of wages.

It was the boast of the Republican party that the passage of the McKinley bill would increase the wages of the laborer. Where and when have they been increased? Has not the manufacturer, instead of the workman, derived all the benefit to be had from this law? Now, Republican speakers and Republican writers, during the campaign of 1888, proclaimed their love for the laborer. They loved him with a love passing that of David and Jonathan, and their chief desire in keeping the Democratic party from power was, that they might do something for him. All that they asked for their guardian-angel duties was, that the workingman might be benefited. The workingmen flocked to the polls and voted for Harrison and Morton, and having performed what they considered their part of the arrangement they sat down and waited for the Republican bosses to throw open the gates of the Garden of Eden and invite them to walk in.

Harrison and Morton were elected, and the McKinley bill, increasing duties to so high a figure that every wage-earner in the land was taxed, was enacted. The manufacturer counted his increased profits by thousands, but no increased benefits came to the laborer. In 1892 these same wage-earners arose in their might and rebuked the party that had thus betrayed them. The cry of tariff reform was in the air, but these nabobs were not to be so easily defeated. Jacob when hungry sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, and how easy to crush out the very life of the laborer by pinching hunger. To-day, under the pretence that if the tariff is interfered with they can not compete with foreign markets, they send the honest workman, from whose toil they have grown rich, to tramp the streets for employment and to want for food. Meanwhile, American manufactured goods, made by these same workmen, are sold in Europe cheaper than in America.

An instance of the love of these gentlemen for the workingman was illustrated not long since at the Havemeyer Sugar Refinery in Brooklyn. A committee of the firemen requested that during the heated term of three or four months they might be allowed to work eight hours a day instead of twelve. The heat is so unbearable that last year in that refinery over 500 men were overcome by it and about 100 died. It is a veritable slaughter house, and the only way to save the men from death is to allow them shorter hours during the hot weather. But how was their request met?. By a refusal. What if eight hours were enough in that seething hell of heat to exhaust the stoutest man; what cared these protected gentlemen for the long line of funerals, and the widows and orphans they were making. These men must work and die while the American people protect the trust and put millions each year into its coffers.

The McKinley bill abolished the duty on raw sugar, and thus gave the trust free raw material, but, at the same time left a protection of one-half cent per pound on refined sugar, which enabled it to extort just so much from the pockets of the people.

When it is remembered that a difference of one-sixth of a cent per pound in favor of the trust takes $2,500,000 from the pockets of the people each year, we can form some estimate of its power for evil.

The McKinley tariff does not protect labor. It enters from foreign lands without restriction. Its importation is free, and is a menace to the standard of wages and to the continuance of employment. The manufacturer protests against the introduction of any goods from abroad to compete with his, or which might be bought by his laborers at a lower price; but he demands that the laborers from all the earth may be brought in free and dumped at American factories and mines, and in front of workingmen's homes, so that when increased wages are demanded or reductions resisted these raw recruits may step in and fill the places of the old hands. This importation of labor forces wages downward while a high tariff, combines, and trusts produced thereby, force the price of goods upward. In this way wage-earners are deprived of the recompense they would otherwise receive, and from their hard-wrought earnings are compelled to pay extortionate rates for articles of everyday consumption.

The protection of labor is in organization, and every workingman well knows that throughout the country there has been a systematic effort to throttle labor organizations in order to effect the diminution of wages at the pleasure of the employer, whose alleged love for the wage-earner is a sham and a fraud. Have wage-earners already forgotten that at the time of the passage of the McKinley tariff act they were told it would bring them higher wages; that after it became a law, while the manufacturer profited immensely, determined effort was made to take the life of labor organizations; how wages were cut down, and how the earth of Homestead drank up the lifeblood of the laborer who resisted the attempt to crush out the right of American laborers to protect themselves?

AD VALOREM AND SPECIFIC DUTIES.

The champions of monopoly and high taxes attack us because we are friendly to the levying of ad valorem duties, and to hear them shout in horror one would suppose that it was a new device of the present Congress. Specific duties group a number of articles together and charge upon the cheaper as much as upon the more costly, thereby taxing the poor man upon his cheap article as much as the rich man upon his luxury. They tax by the yard, pound, or gallon, compelling the poor who use cheap goods to pay as much taxes as the rich who use dear goods. They tax cloth that costs 50 cents per yard the same as cloth that costs $5 per yard. It is equivalent to taxing land the same price per acre whether located in the heart of New York or Chicago or on the Western prairie.

When the same specific duty is collected on a low-priced as on a high-priced yard, pound, bushel, or gallon, it is self-evident that the consumers of the low-priced goods are paying an undue amount of taxes. Tariff should be charged on what a thing is worth. Those who are able to pay a higher duty and purchase the higher-priced goods, should pay more than the poor man upon his low-priced goods.

Upon this subject, Henry Clay, in a speech made by him in 1842, after nine years' experience under the compromise tariff of 1833, said:

> What are the other principles of the act? First, there is the principle that a fixed ad valorem duty shall prevail and be in force at all times. For one, I am willing to abide by that principle. There are certain vague notions afloat as to the utility and necessity of specific duties and discrimination, which I am persuaded arise from a want of a right understanding of the subject. We have had the ad valorem principle practically in force ever since the compromise act was passed, and there has been no difficulty in administering the duties of the Treasury on that principle.
>
> It was necessary first to ascertain the value of the goods and then to impose the duty upon them, and from the commencement of the act to this day the ad valorem principle has been substantially in operation. Compare the difference between specific and the ad valorem system of duties, and I maintain that the latter is justly entitled to the preference. The one principle declares that the duty shall be paid upon the real value of the article taxed; the specific principle imposes an equal duty on articles greatly unequal in value.
>
> Coffee, for example (and it is an article which always suggests itself to my thoughts), is one of the articles on which a specific duty has been levied. Now, it is perfectly well known that the Mocha coffee is worth at least twice as much as the coffee of St. Domingo or Cuba; yet both pay the same duty. The tax has no respect to the value, but it is arbitrarily levied on all articles of a specific kind alike, however various and unequal may be their values. I say that in theory, and according to every sound principle of justice, the ad valorem mode of taxation is entitled to the preference. There is, I admit, one objection to it; as the value of an article is a matter subject to opinion, and as opinions will vary, either honestly or fraudulently, there is some difficulty in preventing frauds. But, with the home valuation proposed by my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. SIMMONS], the ad valorem system can be adopted with all practical safety, and will be liable to those chances only of fraud which are inevitable under any and every system. What has been the fact from the origin of the Government until now?
>
> The articles from which the greatest amount of revenue has been drawn, such as woolens, linens, silks, cottons, worsteds, and a few others, have all been taxed on the ad valorem principle, and there has been no difficulty in the operation. I believe, upon the whole, that it is the best mode. I believe that if we adopt a fixed rate ad valorem wherever it can be done, the revenue will be subjected to fewer frauds than the injustice and frauds incident to specific duties. One of the most prolific sources of the violation of our revenue laws has been, as everybody knows, the effort to get goods of a finer quality and higher value admitted under the lower rate of duty required for those of a lower value. But if the duty were laid ad valorem, there could be no motive for such an effort, and the fraud, in its present form, would have no place.

But even under the McKinley bill more than two hundred and fifty ad valorem duties are levied. In the schedules of "Miscellaneous manufactures of leather," "Leather and manufactures of," in the button industry, in the wood-pulp industry, in Schedule L, pertaining to the silk industry, in Schedule K, relating to wool and manufactures thereof, we find the levying of ad valorem duties.

THE AMERICAN FARMER.

Goldsmith wrote long ago:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.
> Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
> A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

It is admitted by all economists that the prosperity of the agricultural class is essential to the welfare of a country; and history teaches that neglect of agriculture has been the cause of the decay of the most powerful nations. That it has been the foundation of our own prosperity is proven by a glance at our early history, and in all the stages of our growth we need only to inquire into the condition of our farmers to ascertain if the nation is in a prosperous condition.

This is illustrated by what occurred in 1880 and 1881. There was a complete stagnation in manufacturing and commercial industries, and more than one million mechanics and laborers were thrown out of employment, and in their destitution and consequent misery they took to tramping in search of work.

But crops were good, although prices were not what they should have been, yet the farmers were enabled to relieve the depressed condition of the whole country. Can as much be said of the prosperity of any other class? Manufacturers have had many years of prosperity; so have the owners of extensive mines; but can we say that the prosperity of either of these classes has assured the prosperity of the whole country, much less rescued it from such conditions as existed in 1880 and 1881? The prosperity of these only redounds to the interest of the few.

For the prosperity of the farmer two things are necessary—good crops and good prices. For the first, a bountiful Providence has done all that is necessary. With our vast acreage, each one who desires it can have an abundance of land to till, and the diversity of climate allows of such variety of products that each may choose the line of agriculture he prefers, and be sure that in most years, if he does his part, he will have abundant harvests. But the prices are not so assured; they belong neither to the domain of Providence nor do they depend upon the ability and industry of the farmer. But that something exerts an influence over prices is conceded by all; and by a very large majority, if not by all, that something is believed to be legislation.

True, the Government can not fix a price for any certain articles: but by proper legislation it can remove such restrictions as hinder their regulation by the natural law of supply and demand, and repeal or reform such laws as require the farmer to bear the burden of or be taxed for the interest of other classes. But that such burdens are a great impediment to the prosperity of the farmer is illustrated by comparing the statistics of a manufacturing with those of an agricultural State, taken from the United State census report:

> These will show that the aggregate wealth of the State of Pennsylvania in 1850 was $313 per capita and that of Illinois was much less. During the low-tariff decade from 1850 to 1860 the State of Pennsylvania increased her aggregate wealth to $487 per capita, while the State of Illinois increased hers to $509 per capita. From 1860 to 1870, under the high protective tariff, when by action of Government the exchangeable values of her main products were enhanced from 40 to 50 per cent, the State of Pennsylvania increased her wealth to $1,081 per capita; while the State of Illinois, whose exchangeable value of products was regulated in foreign markets, increased hers only to $835 per capita, and during the following decade of high protection for the Pennsylvania product that State increased her wealth to $1,250 per capita, while that of the tributary State of Illinois increased to only $1,005 per capita.

Let me call your attention to the opinion on this subject of some leading men of both parties. Joseph Medill, editor of the Chicago Tribune, the leading Republican paper of the Northwest, says:

> Where, then, is the remedy from the heavy burden of a 50 per cent tax on the necessaries of life, both imported and domestic? There is only one element or class able to remove it, and that Samson is sleeping in the lap of Delilah and will not awaken. I, of course, mean the farmers—the plundered, unprotected twenty-five million of geese-like farmers who permit themselves to be plucked of almost every feather by a hundred thousand "protected" monopolists.
>
> While the plowmen act like Issachar's ass and crouch between two

burdens, both will be kept on their backs. The fabricants live focalized in the cities and plot and scheme for the promotion of their selfish interests and bring their united lobby influence to bear on members of Congress; whereas the farmers live isolated and scattered and can not or do not combine in defense of their interests. Hence they are unprotected, unrepresented, and unconscious of what keeps them poor. They are captivated by the specious cry of "protection to American industry," though they get none of it, and of the value of the "protected" home markets to them, as if protected monopolists eat any more than other men.

The president of the National Farmers' Alliance, Mr. L. L. Polk, said before the United States Senate Committee on Agriculture, April 22, 1890:

We protest, and with all reverence, that it is not God's fault. We protest that it is not the farmer's fault. We believe, and so charge, solemnly and deliberately, that it is the fault of the financial system of the Government—a system that has placed on agriculture an undue, unjust, and intolerable proportion of the burdens of taxation.

It is the present system of taxation that has been cheapening not only farm products, but the price of land itself. If it exists much longer is there not danger that the prediction of the New York State assessors will come true? And—

In a few years you will see the present owners of farms in many instances tenants on them. The cities are prospering, though. New York City has added $50,000,000 property to its real value the past year; Brooklyn, between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000; Buffalo, $5,000,000; Rochester, between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000.

The following is taken from the United States census reports:

Of the total wealth of the country in 1850 the farmers owned nearly $4,000,000,000, or more than one-half. In 1860 the farmer's share was still one-half. In 1880, though half the population was still on farms, his share of the total wealth was $12,000,000,000, or a little more than one-fourth. That is, while the agricultural half of our population increased their wealth $4,000,000,000 the other half increased theirs $23,600,000,000; and this immense amount is mainly in the hands of a few millionaires and not distributed among the many, as is the amount belonging to the agricultural class.

Every farmer knows that he is more prosperous when he has enough products of his farm to exchange for all the clothing, groceries, and other necessaries his family may need for the year than when he has to draw the money out of the bank to pay for them, or give his note in case he has no money in the bank. Now, our country has to buy many things from other countries that we do not produce, and when we pay for them "in trade," as the farmer would say, we are more prosperous than when we have to pay for them with money. That is, it is a mark of national prosperity when, instead of paying for our imports with gold, we pay for them in exports of agricultural products, manufactured articles, etc. It follows that the commercial policy that admits of the most exports is the most conducive to the prosperity of the country. History shows that our exports are always larger under a low tariff than they are under a high or protective tariff.

Between 1850 and 1860, under low tariff, our agricultural exports increased 25 per cent yearly. Since then, under protective tariff, they have increased only 3 per cent yearly. In the same low-tariff decade manufactured articles increased 171 per cent; and only 20 per cent in the next twenty years under protective tariff.

The exports of the manufacturers have largely increased, while the exports of the farmers have largely decreased.

These "infant industries," receiving from 40 to 250 per cent protection in the home market, are willing to sell abroad without any protection whatever, and at a lower price. They furnish their agricultural machinery and carriages and other articles to Europe and Australia at prices competing with the nations of the world, underselling them at a fair profit, while they charge the American farmer as much more for their goods as they charge the foreigners as the tariff will permit.

England exported to American countries south of us in 1880 $51,285,000, while our exports to the same countries were $3,899,400. Let us reflect what prosperity the reverse of these figures would bring us.

Not only is there a greater demand for our products under a low tariff, but better prices. We have shown that wool was made higher under a low tariff. From 1842–1846, under protection, wheat was 82 and corn 48 cents; 1846–1850, low tariff, wheat $1.10, corn 57 cents. After twenty-five years high protection, in 1887, wheat was 70 and corn 39 cents; the price has become lower and lower every year until the present time, under the McKinley tariff, it has reached the bottom.

But the duty being removed or reduced on manufactured articles the farmer would buy them much cheaper. In the following tables the articles are taken that would be needed by a farmer commencing on a farm with everything to buy. These tables were compiled by Mr. Lieb in 1888 from market reports and merchants' price lists, and particular pains has been taken to avoid exaggeration, the amount of tax being rather under than over estimated.

Table showing prices of commodities with protection, without protection, and manufacturers' tax.

	Prices with protection.	Prices without protection.	Manufacturers' tax.
MATERIALS FOR FARMHOUSE.			
Domestic manufactures.			
6,000 feet joists and scantling	$78.00	$66.00	$12.00
5,000 feet flooring	80.00	60.00	20.00
1,200 feet common boards	15.60	13.20	2.40
3,500 feet siding	77.00	70.00	7.00
12,000 shingles	30.00	25.80	4.20
25 doors and windows	150.00	130.00	20.00
450 feet base-boards	12.60	11.60	1.00
Front stairs	45.00	35.00	10.00
Plaster, lime, hair, and lath	161.00	131.00	30.00
182 feet cornice	92.00	85.64	6.36
Paint	50.00	30.00	20.00
Glass	25.00	18.00	7.00
Total	816.20	676.24	139.96
MATERIALS FOR BARN.			
3,000 feet siding	75.00	69.00	6.00
1,500 feet rafters	22.50	21.00	1.50
300 feet sills	4.00	3.40	.60
300 feet stringers	4.00	3.40	.60
150 plates	2.00	1.70	.30
400 posts	7.00	6.20	.80
2,000 feet sheeting	35.00	31.00	4.00
1,300 feet upper floor	33.00	30.40	2.60
2,500 feet lower floor	25.00	20.00	5.00
1,600 feet lower joists	20.00	16.80	3.20
1,300 feet upper joists	16.00	13.40	2.60
2,000 feet bin lumber	50.00	46.00	4.00
16,000 shingles	48.00	42.00	6.00
200 pounds nails	6.00	3.50	2.50
Hardware	5.00	3.00	2.00
Total	352.50	310.80	41.70
FENCING.			
Outside.			
22,000 feet fencing lumber	440.00	396.00	44.00
2,000 fence posts	200.00	160.00	40.00
200 pounds fencing nails	6.00	3.50	2.50
2 pairs hinges	2.00	1.00	1.00
Inside.			
5,000 feet fencing lumber	100.00	90.00	10.00
1,000 fence posts	100.00	80.00	20.00
100 pounds fencing nails	3.00	1.80	1.20
2 pairs small hinges	1.50	1.00	.50
2,000 pounds barbed wire	12.00	6.00	6.00
500 pickets	5.00	4.00	1.00
300 feet, planed 2 by 4	7.00	5.60	1.40
150 feet, planed, 12-inch lumber	2.50	2.00	.50
20 sawed posts	5.00	3.50	1.50
Total	884.00	754.40	129.60
FARM MACHINERY.			
1 wagon	75.00	60.00	15.00
1 reaper	350.00	275.00	75.00
1 mower	150.00	130.00	20.00
3 breaking plows	45.60	35.00	10.00
3 double cultivators	45.00	30.00	15.00
1 harrow	10.00	8.00	2.00
1 hay rake	25.00	20.00	5.00
1 wheat drill	50.00	35.00	15.00
1 corn planter	25.00	20.00	5.00
1 fanning mill	25.00	20.00	5.00
1 feed cutter	15.00	12.00	3.00
1 wheelbarrow	5.00	4.00	1.00
1 grindstone	3.00	2.50	.50
Total	823.00	651.50	171.50
FARM IMPLEMENTS AND SUPPLIES.			
3 sets double harness	100.00	75.00	25.00
2 halters	2.00	1.50	.50
3 bridles	3.00	2.25	.75
2 saddles	20.00	14.55	5.45
2 hoes	1.50	1.20	.30
1 spade	1.00	.70	.30
1 garden rake	.50	.30	.20
3 pitchforks	4.60	3.00	1.60
1 scythe	3.00	2.25	.75
1 hatchet	.50	.35	.15
2 saws	2.60	1.25	.75
1 drawingknife	1.00	.65	.35
2 pumps	20.60	16.00	4.00
1 ax	1.00	.75	.25
1 log chain	5.00	3.00	2.00
6 pairs trace chains	6.00	3.00	3.00
3 doubletrees and whiffletrees	2.50	2.00	.50
1 brush	.50	.38	.12
1 curry comb	.20	.15	.05
2 files	.50	.36	.14

Table showing prices of commodities, etc.—Continued.

	Prices with protection.	Prices without protection.	Manufacturers' tax.
FARM IMPLEMENTS AND SUPPLIES—continued.			
20 seamless bags	5.00	3.75	$1.25
1 scoop shovel	1.50	1.00	.50
1 basket	1.00	.70	.30
Total	181.70	134.09	47.61
HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE.			
1 heating stove	15.00	10.35	4.65
1 zinc	1.00	.60	.40
6 joints pipe	.60	.34	.26
2 glass lamps	1.50	1.03	.47
2 rattan rockers	7.00	5.18	1.82
6 wooden chairs	3.00	2.22	.78
50 yards carpet	40.00	30.00	10.00
10 square yards oilcloth	5.00	3.56	1.44
3 bedroom sets	75.00	55.55	19.45
1 clock	4.00	2.96	1.04
6 window shades	3.00	2.07	.93
12 towels	4.00	2.96	1.04
1 pair scissors	.50	.37	.13
3 spring beds	15.00	10.00	5.00
3 wool mattresses	15.00	9.09	5.91
6 pairs wool blankets	18.00	11.25	6.75
50 yards sheeting	10.00	7.50	2.50
1 dozen comforts	12.00	10.00	2.00
2 looking-glasses	5.00	3.12	1.88
3 coverlets	3.00	2.25	.75
2 comforts	2.00	1.54	.46
Total	239.60	171.94	67.66
KITCHEN FURNITURE.			
1 cook stove	30.00	18.00	12.00
1 lot cooking utensils	3.00	2.07	.93
2 iron kettles	2.00	1.30	.70
1 copper kettle	3.00	2.07	.93
6 sheet-iron pans	6.00	3.52	2.48
1 lot iron cooking utensils	2.00	1.30	.70
6 ash buckets	.75	.44	.31
1 joint stovepipe	.60	.35	.25
1 table	5.00	3.70	1.30
6 chairs	3.00	2.22	.78
1 dozen knives and forks	3.00	2.22	.78
2 dozen spoons	2.00	1.48	.52
1 butcher knife	.50	.37	.13
1 coal-oil can	.50	.34	.16
6 flatirons	1.50	1.00	.50
1 wash boiler	1.25	.73	.52
2 tubs	1.50	1.11	.39
2 pails	.60	.44	.16
1 churn	1.00	.74	.26
6 crocks	1.20	.96	.24
2 washboards (zinc)	.70	.42	.28
2 dozen dishes, assorted	10.00	6.45	3.55
2 tablecloths	3.00	2.22	.78
2 lots glassware	3.00	2.07	.93
1 glass lamp	.50	.34	.16
Total	85.60	55.86	29.74
HOUSEHOLDER'S WARDROBE.			
1 work suit	7.00	4.73	2.27
1 good suit	20.00	13.52	6.48
1 overcoat	15.00	10.15	4.85
2 flannel shirts	1.80	.86	.64
2 flannel drawers	1.50	.86	.64
1 wool hat	3.00	1.71	1.29
6 wool socks	2.00	1.14	.86
1 wool cap	1.00	.57	.43
1 pair boots	5.00	4.00	1.00
1 pair shoes	3.50	2.80	0.70
1 pair rubber boots	3.00	2.40	.60
1 pair suspenders	.50	.36	.14
1 pair buck gloves	1.00	.63	.37
1 pair wool gloves	.50	.29	.21
1 wool scarf	.50	.29	.21
1 rubber coat	3.50	2.69	.81
1 umbrella	1.00	.66	.34
3 linen handkerchiefs	1.00	.74	.26
1 silk tie	.50	.33	.17
1 razor	1.25	.83	.42
1 pocketknife	1.25	.83	.42
1 shaving brush	.35	.26	.09
1 case shaving soap	.15	.11	.04
1 neck comfort	.50	.29	.21
4 cotton shirts	3.00	2.25	.75
2 pair cotton drawers	1.00	.69	.31
Total	78.70	53.99	24.71
HOUSEWIFE'S WARDROBE.			
2 calico dresses	2.25	1.75	.50
3 calico aprons	.50	.40	.10
2 woolen dresses	16.00	9.40	6.60
2 balmoral skirts	3.00	1.90	1.10
2 cotton skirts	1.50	1.25	.25
2 suits flannels	3.00	1.71	1.29
2 suits cotton underwear	2.00	1.42	.58

Table showing prices of commodities, etc.—Continued.

	Prices with protection.	Prices without protection.	Manufacturers' tax.
HOUSEWIFE'S WARDROBE—continued.			
3 pairs cotton hose	1.00	.71	$0.29
3 pairs wool hose	1.50	.90	.60
1 woolen cloak	12.00	8.11	3.89
1 woolen shawl	6.00	3.21	2.79
1 woolen hood	1.25	.71	.54
1 straw bonnet	1.00	.77	.23
2 pairs shoes	4.00	3.20	.80
1 pair rubbers	.50	.40	.10
1 parasol	2.00	1.60	.40
1 veil	.70	.46	.24
5 yards ribbons	.50	.33	.17
3 linen collars	.50	.38	.12
3 pairs linen cuffs	.60	.46	.14
3 linen handkerchiefs	.75	.55	.20
1 tuck comb	.25	.18	.07
1 tooth brush	.35	.27	.08
1 pair wool mitts	.50	.29	.21
1 pair gloves	1.25	.78	.47
Total	61.90	40.14	21.76
TWO BOYS' WARDROBES.			
2 work suits	10.00	6.76	3.24
2 good suits	30.00	20.70	9.30
2 overcoats	30.00	20.70	9.30
6 flannel shirts	6.00	3.42	2.58
6 white shirts	4.00	3.25	.75
4 pairs wool drawers	4.00	2.28	1.72
6 pairs wool socks	2.00	1.14	.86
2 wool hats	4.00	2.28	1.72
2 wool caps	2.00	1.14	.86
2 pairs boots	8.00	6.40	1.60
2 pairs suspenders	1.00	.72	.28
2 pairs rubber boots	7.00	5.60	1.40
2 pairs rubber shoes	4.00	3.20	.80
2 pairs wool mitts	1.00	0.67	.33
2 pairs buck gloves	2.00	1.25	.75
2 silk neckties	.50	.33	.17
4 linen handkerchiefs	1.00	.74	.26
2 neck comforters	1.00	.67	.33
Total	117.50	81.25	36.25
TWO GIRLS' WARDROBE.			
4 calico dresses	3.00	2.50	.50
4 calico aprons	1.00	.85	.15
2 alpaca dresses	18.00	10.60	7.40
2 wool dresses	8.00	5.00	3.00
2 balmoral skirts	3.00	1.90	1.10
4 cotton skirts	3.00	2.00	1.00
4 suits flannels	5.00	2.86	2.14
4 suits cotton underwear	4.00	2.13	1.87
6 pairs cotton hose	2.00	1.42	.58
6 pairs wool hose	3.00	1.80	1.20
2 woolen cloaks	30.00	20.28	9.72
2 woolen shawls	10.00	5.33	4.67
2 woolen hoods	2.00	1.20	.80
2 straw hats	2.00	1.54	.46
4 pairs shoes	8.00	6.40	1.60
2 pairs rubbers	1.00	.80	.20
2 parasols	3.50	2.80	.70
2 veils	1.50	1.00	.50
12 yards ribbon	1.20	.80	.40
6 linen collars	1.00	.77	.23
6 pair linen cuffs	1.20	.92	.28
2 round combs	.30	.22	.08
6 handkerchiefs	2.00	1.48	.52
2 pairs wool mitts	1.00	.57	.43
2 pairs gloves	2.00	1.25	.75
2 toothbrushes	.50	.39	.11
Total	117.20	76.81	40.39
DOMESTIC SUPPLIES.			
Sugar	1.00	.62	.32
Tea	.50	.50	----------
Coffee	.50	.50	----------
Molasses	.50	.40	.15
Salt	1.00	.74	.26
Vinegar	.50	.37	.13
Rice	1.00	.43	.57
Soda	.25	.14	.11
Soap—castile	.25	.16	.09
Wire clothesline	2.00	1.00	1.00
Starch	.25	.13	.12
Carpet tacks	.25	.14	.11
Nails	.50	.37	.13
Thread	1.60	.45	.35
Needles	.25	.20	.05
Pens	.10	.07	.03
Ink	.10	.07	.03
Paper	.10	.08	.02
Pins	.10	.08	.02
Hairpins	.10	.07	.03
Glycerine	.50	.30	.20
Total	10.75	7.08	3.67

Table showing prices of commodities, etc.—Continued.

SUMMARY.

	Total amount without manufacturer's tax.	Manufacturer's tax.	Amount paid on account of the tax.
MATERIALS FOR PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS. *a*			
Materials for house	$676.24	$139.96	$816.20
Materials for barn	310.80	41.70	352.50
Materials for fence	754.40	129.60	884.00
Total	1,741.44	311.26	2,052.70
FARM MACHINERY AND SUPPLIES. *b*			
Farm machinery	651.50	171.50	823.00
Implements and supplies	134.09	47.61	181.70
Total	785.59	219.11	1,004.70
FURNITURE. *c*			
Household furniture	171.94	67.66	239.60
Kitchen furniture	55.86	29.74	85.60
Total	227.80	97.40	325.20
ARTICLES OF DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION. *d*			
Householder's wardrobe	53.99	24.71	78.70
Housewife's wardrobe	40.14	21.76	61.90
Two boys' wardrobe	81.25	36.35	117.50
Two girls' wardrobe	76.81	40.39	117.20
Domestic supplies	7.08	3.67	10.75
Total	259.27	126.78	386.05

a Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 18 per cent.
b Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 28 per cent.
c Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 43 per cent.
d Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 49 per cent.

A careful study of these tables and a comparison of them by the farmer with his own account books will serve to enlighten him why the manufacturer has constantly grown richer, although his works were often idle on account of strikes and lockouts, while he, though toiling early and late and living very frugally, has constantly grown poorer, and was perhaps driven by dire necessity to put a mortgage upon his farm.

THE LATE ELECTIONS.

But it has been said by gentlemen on the other side of this House that at the elections last fall the Democratic party was overwhelmingly defeated, and hence that the people at the polls have repudiated that reform of the tariff which they so earnestly demanded in 1892. That the Democratic party was defeated in 1893, I admit; that the people have abandoned their demands for tariff reform, I deny.

Mr. Chairman, let us as Democrats look the situation squarely in the face and inquire the cause of that defeat.

The first reason was the continuance of Republicans in office who all their lives had worked for the destruction of the Democratic party. All over this land there are townships where the sole boon asked by the sturdy Democrats is that they be permitted to receive their mail from a Democratic postmaster; but this boon is denied and the Republican appointee, who has cursed and attempted to destroy from year to year the party which they loved so well, still holds rule at the post-office where he keeps hanging on the walls pictures of his party leaders. Look around you; a year has nearly past since the present Administration came to power, and a Republican who found especial delight in removing hundreds upon hundreds of the brightest and most active Democrats from office, solely because they were Democrats, is still the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service. When we remember that within 30 days after the inauguration of President Harrison on March 4, 1889, every division superintendent of the Railway Mail Service in the United States was a Republican; that between March 4 and August 30, 1889, more than two thousand Democratic postal clerks were removed for purely partisan reasons, while most of those who remained in service during the Harrison Administration were reduced in grade to make room for Republican clerks of inferior qualifications, can you wonder at the apathy of Democrats?

Another reason for the result of those elections was an ill-advised order of the Commissioner of Pensions whereby pensioners were suspended without notice. This can not occur again owing to legislation of the present Congress, and were it in our power the first cause of trouble which I have stated would be speedily remedied.

Again, a financial crisis had been brought about by evil legislation at the hands of the Republican party, and the dire effects of which had been predicted by Democratic leaders. A hungry man has no heart to reason from cause to effect, and many blamed the Democratic party for the calamity which had been brought upon the country by the Republicans.

No general can win a victory with troops in sympathy with the enemy, and an administration to win complete success should have officers and men desirous of its welfare.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

may be defined to be a piece of legislation which enables Republicans to oust Democrats from office during a Republican Administration, and to retain Republicans in office during a Democratic Administration. Looking to the Pension Office we find 1,300 Republicans to 247 Democrats, and 412 ladies. Four-fifths of the members of the board of review are Republicans, and two-thirds of the board of revision are Republicans. In the medical division we find 85 Republicans to 26 Democrats, and 30 ladies, and as these Republican bodies move along with a snail's pace in the adjustment of claims, while the old veterans who followed their country's flag to the battlefield, ready to die if need be for the Stars and Stripes they love so well, many of them war-scarred, broken in health, diseased, in actual want, watch and wait in great anxiety for the pensions due them.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic majority in this House was sent here upon the issue of tariff reform, and every Democrat who deserts his party now relinquishes the chief principle of Democracy. The Democratic party must not fail the people. Four years of the prior administration of our party placed in the Treasury an available surplus of over $60,000,000. The annual revenues were nearly $100,000,000 in excess of the Government's needs. We had accumulated $98,000,000 of gold above the reserve of $100,000,000. Business flourished and labor was well employed. The Republican party came to power. It passed the bullion-purchasing act of 1890, which in one year sent $68,000,000 of our gold to Europe, decreased the free gold in our Treasury at the end of Mr. Harrison's term to $970,000, and the evil effects of which have almost bankrupted the country.

These are fearful, turbulent, angry streams into which the Republican party has carried our National Government, but if we act as faithful pilots and steer the Ship of State free from the dangers that surround her, the threatening rocks and shoals will be passed in triumph, and we shall glide with renewed vigor upon the ocean of happiness and prosperity. Then may we sing the song of an American poet:

Sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY Mr. Chairman, the title of the pending tariff bill is a misnomer. It purports to be a bill to provide revenue. It is in fact, however, a bill to abolish revenue. It proposes to surrender seventy-six millions, more than one-third of the revenue derived from customs.

The party which is responsible for it has, in season and out of season, denounced the Republican tariff policy which has been in force for thirty-two years, as one which sacrifices revenue in order to maintain protection of home industries. The Democratic party, now in possession of full power for the first time since 1860, proposes as a substitute a so-called revenue tariff which sacrifices revenue in order to overthrow protection.

Moreover, this surrender of seventy-six millions of revenue from customs is proposed at a time when the Secretary of the Treasury, representing the party in power, officially informs Congress that for the next fiscal year nearly every dollar of revenue that might be expected from customs duties, without change of existing laws, will be required to meet the ordinary expenditures of the National Government,—the internal-revenue tax on tobacco, cigars, and whisky being substantially sufficient to pay pension obligations,—and when any reduction of revenue from customs will assuredly leave a deficit. Instead of a tariff for revenue only, what is proposed is in fact a tariff for a deficiency only.

Such a wholesale reduction of revenue from customs duties is proposed, indeed, in the face of the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury that in the first six months of the present fiscal year there has been an actual deficit of more than thirty-seven millions, to be increased to more than sixty millions in the balance of the year, brought about, in my judgment, by the industrial and business depression caused mainly by the distrust and disturbance induced by the anticipation of just such revolutionary tariff legislation as this bill seeks to enact into law.

Six years ago a distinguished Democratic leader, then and now occupying the exalted position of the Presidency of the United States, justified far less sweeping and revolutionary tariff legislation than this (which was most emphatically condemned in the national elections of 1888) on the ground that "a condition," to wit, the necessity of reducing the revenue, "and not a theory, confronts us." It might have been supposed that the reduction of the revenue sixty millions in 1890 by removing the duty on sugar so that revenue and expenditure became substantially equal—every dollar of the surplus created before the reduction of the revenue having been devoted to the payment of the interest-bearing debt—would have satisfied such a yearning for tariff revision. But it is evident from the recent message of the same distinguished Democratic leader indorsing the pending bill, as well as from the defense which its advocates make on this floor and in the majority report, that the argument which did duty so vociferously in 1888 is reversed for the present exigency. It is no longer the actual "condition," but only the "theory" often formulated in Democratic platforms that is allowed to confront the Democratic vision.

If the actual "condition" of the national finances and not a blind pursuit of a partisan "theory" controlled the course of the Democratic majority, they would hesitate long before disturbing the admirable balance between national outgo and income which existed in 1892 and 1893, under existing laws, which would have existed the present fiscal year if industries and business had not been paralyzed by the distrust caused by the anticipation of revolutionary tariff changes, and which, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, would exist in the next fiscal year and the years subsequent, in case there should be no change in our existing revenue system.

WHERE REVENUE IS SURRENDERED.

Mr. Chairman, the friends of the proposed tariff revision defend it on the ground that it reduces the taxation of the masses of the people.

This claim invites an inquiry into the character of the imported articles said to be used by the masses, on which it is proposed to reduce duties and surrender revenue. I read from the comparative tables presented by the Democratic majority of the committee, which show how much revenue has been remitted on each imported article, on the basis of the importations of last year:

On Havana and other foreign cigars and leaf tobacco	$3,303,207
On liquors	1,276,990
On laces and embroideries	3,075,779
On silks and silk plushes	3,196,631
On kid gloves and jewelry	1,2[illegible]8,797
On ostrich feathers, downs, artificial flowers, etc.	2[illegible]0,165
On opium for smoking	400,073
On plate glass and chinaware	890,240
On paintings and statuary	339,265
On perfumery, cosmetics, and fancy articles for smokers	101,250

On the assumption of the majority of the committee that all of the duty is added to make the price here, the toiling masses must be greatly relieved by the surrender of $14,112,397 of duties on these articles! [Laughter.]

But these are by no means the only imported luxuries or articles of voluntary use (on which all statesmen have heretofore thought it wise to impose the heaviest duties), where reductions have been made by this bill.

It will be observed that more than half of the woolen goods imported last year were goods of fine quality used by the well-to-do, indeed generally demanded by a class of our people of liberal means who are not content with equally good American goods at a lower price, but will have foreign goods—they are English, you know—and who are entirely willing to pay the highest duties to obtain them. Of the $21,723,788 of revenue surrendered by the reduction of duties on manufactures of wool, not less than $11,000,000 is on fine woolens of this character, which, under the circumstances of their importation and use, are practically articles of luxury or of voluntary use, and are therefore articles on which the highest duties should be retained.

A very large proportion of the imports of manufactures of cotton, on which the bill proposes to remit $3,448,020 of revenue by a reduction of duties, is fine and fancy cottons in the nature of articles of voluntary use; and the same may be said of many imported articles in other schedules on which duties are reduced by this bill.

Not far from $70,000,000 of the $76,000,000 of revenue surrendered by this bill comes from articles of luxury or voluntary use.

This bill also proposes to surrender $6,284,259 of the revenue received last year from the duty on imported tin plates, nearly all of which is practically now paid by the foreign manufacturer and exporter, notwithstanding the ridicule which the free-trade theorist heaps on the contention of the friends of protection that where the foreigner finds that he is in danger of losing a foreign market in consequence of the encouragement given home industries by protection, he invariably reduces his prices and thereby practically pays in part or in whole the protective duty, in order to hold his position in such foreign market.

From 1883 to 1891, during which time there was a revenue-only duty of 1 cent per pound on imported tin plate, under which no tin plates could be made in this country, the average price, including the duty of $1.08 per box, was $4.86 per box. July 1, 1891, the duty was increased 1.2 cents per pound, or $1.35 per box. Yet it is stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who has investigated the subject, that the average price of tin plate to the consumer in this country has not been raised by the increase of duty. No one claims that the increase has been over 25 cents per box. The Welsh manufacturers, finding that under the new protective duty tin plate was being successfully made in the United States, lowered their price, which had been previously fixed as they pleased, in order to meet the new competition in this country and hold their American markets, thus practically paying into the Treasury of the United States about $6,000,000. In their zeal to overthrow the protection which has already established between forty and fifty tin plate manufactories in this country, producing tin plate at the rate of many million pounds per annum, and which within five years would have furnished all the tin plate we require at reduced prices, the framers of this so called revenue tariff propose not only to cripple our own tin-plate industry, but also to surrender six and a quarter millions of revenue to the Welsh tin-plate manufacturers.

While it is more difficult to show so definitely in other schedules in which the duties have been reduced, as the circumstances enable us to do in the case of the reduction of the duty on tin plate, that there is a large class of imported articles similar to those that we are enabled to make here on account of protective duties, on which the foreign manufacturer pays a part of the duty in order to meet the new competition here and hold our markets as far as possible, yet there can be no doubt of the fact. The increase of from 10 to 15 per cent made by the tariff act of 1890 in the duty on certain kinds of fine cottons and woolens did not increase their price to consumers here. The foreign manufacturers simply reduced their prices to the extent of the increase of duty, and thus practically themselves paid all the increase of duty. No wonder they are rejoiced at the proposal of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee to remit so much of their contribution toward our revenue, not only in the woolen, but also in the cotton, metal, agricultural, and lumber schedules, and give them a better opportunity to send their goods to our markets to take the place of domestic goods.

There is remitted to Canada $1,445,983 in abolished or reduced duties on lumber and over $2,000,000 in reduced duties on Canadian animals and farm products competing with our farm products, not to mention over $8,000,000 of revenue remitted on imported wool—over $11,000,000 remissions of revenue now paid into our Treasury by foreign farmers and wool-growers seeking our markets.

Indeed, so far as I have observed, the only rejoicing over the prospect of the substitution of the pending tariff bill for the protective tariffs of the past thirty years, has been in Canada and Europe. In this country up to date the public expressions have been mainly those of condemnation.

INCREASED IMPORTATIONS EXPECTED.

Mr. Chairman, the President in his recent message and the report of the majority remark that notwithstanding the pending tariff bill would result in a loss of revenue to the extent of $76,000,000 and a deficiency even larger, on the basis of the imports of last year, yet that this would only be temporary, as the reduction of duties would, in their judgment, increase the importations, and the lower duties on increased importations would soon offset in part, and ultimately all, the apparent loss of revenue.

It is well for Congress and the people to face the results which the Democratic majority who have framed this bill avow they are laboring to bring about. They defend their policy on the ground that it is intended to so increase importations of foreign products to take the place of domestic products—for it must be remembered that duties are reduced mainly only on articles that can be produced or made here—as to make the reduced duties yield as much revenue as the higher duties which they supplant.

Have gentlemen considered fully what this means? The value of the dutiable merchandise imported last year was about $400,000,000, which paid a duty of only a million and a half less than $200,000,000, the remaining importations ($444,000,000) having been free of duty. (Parenthetically, I may remark that the fact we now import nearly $400,000,000 of dutiable goods, three-fourths of which we can and ought to make for ourselves, does not seem

to sustain the free-trade assumption that we are now manufacturing far more than our people can consume.)

The same dutiable merchandise imported under the pending bill would yield $76,000,000 less revenue. Now, in order to offset this loss, there would have to be an increase in the importations of about $250,000,000, foreign valuation, as the average duty of the pending bill on dutiable merchandise is about 30 per cent. This would be a sudden increase of 60 per cent in the importations of foreign goods which we can make here, and would necessarily suddenly diminish the demand for domestic goods and for labor to produce or make them to this extent. Do our friends on the other side—I mean the other side of this House, not on the other side of the Atlantic; they understand it and are chuckling over it—do our Democratic friends appreciate fully what disasters to all our American industries would follow such a wholesale loss of American markets?

For example, the imports of woolen goods last year were about $37,000,000, on which it is proposed to surrender a revenue of nearly $22,000,000 by a reduction of duties. Now, in order to offset that loss there must be an increase of importations of woolens to the extent of about $60,000,000, foreign valuation, which would suddenly raise the importations of woolen goods to nearly $100,000,000 instead of $36,000,000. Imagine what a wreck of American woolen mills there would be with such a loss of their home markets.

"But what of that?" exclaims the free-trade disciple. "Do you object to having $250,000,000 more wealth come into this country?" I reply, if it is wealth that we can not produce at all, or only with an expenditure of a larger amount of labor than elsewhere, and we want such products for consumption, we do not object, but on the contrary desire it. But if it is products which we must pay for and which we can and ought to produce for ourselves, and whose coming here will deprive our own industries and labor of the opportunity to produce or make here, then we do not want them to come into our market because their coming diminishes to that extent the productive opportunities of our own people.

I am aware that the free-trade school of economists affirm that it is better for us to import $250,000,000 in goods which we can make here in exchange for our exports, than it is to import a similar amount of gold or money. It is sufficient to say in reply that when gold is imported it does not take the place of goods which we ought to make here and thus injure our own industries and productive capacity, as is the result when we import such goods; but on the contrary, not only permits our industries to go on without disturbance, but also increases the capital on which production depends and adds to the basis on which our currency rests.

"But these $250,000,000 additional of imported goods will not come here unless we have an equal amount of products to exchange for them," says the free-trader, "and this implies that the labor formerly employed in manufacturing industries have gone to producing something else that they can produce to better advantage." I reply, that for a time, or until our consumptive capacity was impaired, the goods would come in excess of exports, as they did for thirteen or fifteen years before the war, in return for our gold or for our evidences of indebtedness, which would in the end lead to a collapse as it did in 1857–'58 and '59. It would be impossible also for us to all go to the farm or into the crude industries, as the free-trade programme contemplates without lowering the prices of products of these industries, diminishing the value of our production and consequently our earning and consumptive capacity. In other words, the free-trade policy would lead to disaster.

THE "MARKETS OF THE WORLD."

But ah! listen to the siren song of the President's message and the majority report! They comfort our industries with the promise, as did one of old, not perhaps of possession of the kingdoms of the world, but of the capture of the markets of the world, as compensation for the loss of so much of the markets at home.

Markets for manufactured goods? Where? How? The whole world outside of the United States imports only ninety millions of woolens, which, even if we could capture every dollar of these imports, would not compensate for the woolens that would have to be imported to supplant our own goods in our own markets in order to prevent a loss of revenue by the reductions of duty proposed by this bill. What chance do we stand to capture these markets more rapidly than we have already been doing, in the face of the fierce competition of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, and other machine-using nations with cheaper labor? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why surrender our own markets in order to capture other markets? How could this help us in competing for the markets of the world? It must be remembered that the chief reliance of every nation is its own home market. Even the United Kingdom, which on account of its contracted insular position is compelled even to wage war to capture foreign markets, sells $136 of its production of $172 per inhabitant in its home market, and only $36 in the markets of the world. And the United States, which produces $200 per inhabitant, sells $183 of this immense production, more than Great Britain exports and consumes at home, in our home markets, the best in the world.

Experience shows that under protection, which maintains our home market for our own industries, and thus increases the prosperity and consuming power of the masses, we are able to buy and import more of articles which we do not produce than we otherwise could, as well as produce more; so that the net result is a larger foreign trade and larger exports, brought about by the increase of consumption and importation of free goods which we do not produce, and the increased production caused by the encouragement of home industries. Our foreign trade has been 50 per cent more per inhabitant in the last fifteen years than in the fifteen years of revenue only tariff from 1846 to 1860. On the other hand, the increased importation of articles which we can and ought to produce for ourselves, as proposed by the pending bill, even if far less than contemplated, would result in depleting us of our gold and piling up a mountain of debt.

Undoubtedly the increase of importations, although large enough to cripple our industries and business, would not be large enough to offset the revenue lost by reduction of duties, for the reason that existing industries would struggle to meet the new foreign competition and retain the home market by a reduction of wages, and would to a certain extent succeed, thus leaving a permanent loss of revenue from customs; and, worse still, permanently diminishing the ability of our people to consume products, and permanently impairing the value of our home market, as well as the prosperity of the people.

TAXATION OF DOMESTIC INTERESTS PROPOSED.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that it is proposed to add to this bill to abolish revenue from customs another measure which, it is estimated, will raise by an income tax thirty millions, and by an increase of excise and internal taxes fifteen millions, yet all together less than two-thirds as much revenue as is surrendered by the reduction or abolition of the duties on foreign imports.

This of itself would be a complete revolution in the revenue system which has prevailed in time of peace since the foundation of the Government. The duplex nature of our Government—federal machinery for national affairs and State machinery for local affairs—unlike the British system under which Parliament legislates and authorizes taxation for local as well as national ends, which the framers of this bill are feebly imitating, demands that there should be a sharp and well-defined line of demarcation between objects of Federal and of State taxation, especially in time of peace.

The Constitution of the United States reserves exclusively to the Federal Government the right to raise revenue by the imposition of duties on imports; and up to the present hour, except in time of war or to meet expenditures like pensions made necessary by war, when excise and other internal taxes have been added, all the expenditures of the National Government have been met by duties on imports and miscellaneous receipts. So strenuous on this point was Jefferson, whom our Democratic friends claim as their political father, that when he came into power in 1801 he insisted on the repeal of the excise tax on liquors, which had been imposed by the Adams Administration to pay the expenses of the anticipated war with France, and maintained the doctrine that in time of peace Federal expenses should be met by duties on imports, and other objects of taxation left to the States. However, our modern Democrats follow Jefferson by indulging in eulogiums of him on the stump and in party organs, and ignoring his teachings everywhere else.

Thus far there has been a large number of voters of protection instincts retained in the Democratic ranks because they believed it impracticable to raise from duties on imports two hundred or more millions of revenue required annually for current expenditures of Government outside of pensions without incidentally protecting home industries, as if it made any difference whether protection was called incidental, intentional or accidental, provided protection was there. The framers of this bill propose to cut the ground from under any such lodgment for protection by deliberately changing the policy of the Government. They propose to raise only one hundred and twenty-one millions from duties on imports, and transfer seventy-six millions from external to internal taxation. The incidental protection Democrats have had their guns spiked by this bill.

Our brief experience with the income tax as a war measure showed conclusively that it is not suited to our situation, because of its inquisitorial character, the expense and difficulty of ad-

ministration, and its practical tendency to encourage perjury. If resorted to at all, it should be used by the States for State purposes, so limited as not to result in double taxation, and not for Federal purposes for peace expenditures.

The difficulties which the Democratic majority have had in devising sources of taxation of our own people to take the place of the legitimate revenue from duties on imports which they have surrendered in their warfare on protection of home industries, have been such that, so far as known, they are still thirty millions short on their own uncertain estimates, and undoubtedly much more in fact.

It is proposed to increase the internal tax on whisky from 90 cents to $1 per gallon, which it is estimated will yield $10,000,000 for the next fiscal year; but, as the syndicate that own the whisky in bond will undoubtedly withdraw substantially the entire amount that will enter into consumption in that period before the increased tax goes into effect, the practical effect of it will be to put $10,000,000 into the pockets of the syndicate instead of into the Treasury.

And as the increased tax is coupled with a most extraordinary privilege, extending the bonded period from three years to eight, its practical effect will be to grant extension of time to the whisky syndicate to that unprecedented extent for the payment of the tax on whisky—practically a loan for five years without interest,—while the whisky is aging and improving in value. Instead of being a proposition in the interest of the Government, it is in fact one to postpone the payment of the whole tax and in the interest of the whisky syndicate.

REASONS FOR HESITATION.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, as if in the present condition of the Treasury, with such difficulty of supplying the revenue which it is proposed to surrender by a reduction of duties on imports—a difficulty which can not be overcome except by most doubtful internal taxation,—the Democratic majority, even in pursuit of the "theory" which has for some years haunted them, would hesitate to overthrow an economic policy under which the country has so signally prospered for more than thirty years, especially in view of the fact that an apprehension of such revolutionary tariff changes as are proposed has already paralyzed industries and business to such an extent as to entirely or partially shut down thousands of manufacturing establishments, reduce wages, deprive millions of workingmen of employment, and bring distress and want into every community. When the Democratic national platform of 1892, in the face of the unexampled prosperity then prevailing, for partisan ends falsely declared that protection fosters no business so much as that of the sheriff, it unwittingly forecasted with accuracy what has already proved to be a sad result of the anticipation of the tariff policy which the pending bill proposes.

It might be supposed that the overwhelming Democratic losses and Republican gains in the recent elections, after six months' experience of the results of the efforts of the country to anticipate the practical application of the Democratic tariff theory to our industries—a change so extraordinary that if those elections had been for Representatives to this Chamber and had extended to all the States with corresponding results, a Democratic majority of over 90 in this House would have been converted into a Republican majority of over 50,—would raise more than a suspicion even in the minds of our friends on the other side, that the verdict of the people in 1892 was not intended to be a condemnation of the protective policy, as they have supposed, or at least was given under a grave misapprehension, of which the people have already repented.

THE DEMOCRATIC "THEORY."

Mr. Chairman, the tariff "theory" which the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, under instructions of the Democratic national convention, have undertaken to embody in the pending bill is that a protective duty on an imported article—*i. e.*, a duty which covers the difference of money cost of production and distribution here and abroad of an article which can be produced or made here substantially to the extent of our wants without natural disadvantage—is "unconstitutional" and "robbery."

This theory rests on the assumption, which runs through the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee and every speech which has been made in defense of this bill, that such a duty is a tax which increases the cost of every article to which protection is applied, whether made at home or abroad, to the extent of the duty without compensating benefit to any one but the producer or manufacturer of such article.

Now if I believed this theory to be sound—which I do not—no consideration on earth would induce me to support any protective duty. If I believed that protection was "robbery," as the Democratic majority who have framed the pending bill say they do, the only tariff measure which I could support would be one which imposed duties mainly on articles which we can not produce, like tea, coffee, etc., and which therefore must be entirely imported without possibility of any home production; and which so far as it imposed duties on articles that can be produced or made here, would place these duties so low as to give the foreigner the advantage over our home producers, and thus insure the importation mainly of such articles from abroad rather than their production or manufacture here; because the theory maintains that whenever the duty is large enough to restrict the importation of such articles and thus encourage their production here, the Government loses the revenue and the private producer practically pockets it, and much more.

And yet professing to sincerely believe that protection is "unconstitutional" and "robbery," the Democratic majority who have framed this bill, in their report, say:

> The bill on which the committee has expended much patient and anxious labor is not offered as a complete response to the mandate of the American people. It no more professes to be purged of all protection than to be free of all error in its complex and manifold details. * * * We are forced to consider that great interests do exist whose existence and prosperity it is no part of our reform either to imperil or to curtail.

Does this great tariff reform bill, then, propose to spare "great interests," gigantic "monopolies," as we have been told, "robber barons," as I have so many times heard manufacturers styled by the other side of the House, that are engaged in the "unconstitutional" employment of "robbing" the people? Are we to understand that the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, who have been for years singly and in pairs here and elsewhere denouncing protection as "unconstitutional" and "robbery," now that they are in full power take the ground that "it is no part of our [the Democratic] reform either to imperil or curtail" "robbery" of the people by some "great interests?" [Laughter.]

This astonishing suggestion can not fail to raise more than a suspicion that the gentlemen who have been denouncing protection as "robbery" can not really believe what they have been saying, for if they do they would not make themselves accessories in so grave a crime as "robbery." They have been making these reckless charges for partisan ends—in a Pickwickian sense that they did not suppose anyone, except the poorly informed, whose votes they sought, would believe.

The majority of the committee evidently appreciate the contradictory position in which they are placed, for they add:

> In dealing with the tariff, as with every other long-standing abuse that has interwoven itself with our social or industrial system, the legislator must always remember that in the beginning temperate reform is safest, having in itself the principle of growth.

The idea which runs through this defense is that the framers of this bill have begun their work of extirpating protection or "robbery," as they style it, by somewhat reducing the amount of the "swag," and that other limitations on this policy of "robbery" will come hereafter. For example, they say to the cotton-manufacturers of the United States: "You have heretofore been permitted to 'rob' the people to the enormous extent of 55 per cent of the entire consumption of domestic cottons in this country, according to our theory of the effect of a protective duty. Hereafter you must be content to 'rob' them only to the extent of 38½ per cent." And this is what is styled by the Democratic majority of the committee as "temperate reform, having in itself the principle of growth." [Laughter.]

What astonishes me is that gentlemen claiming to sincerely believe that a protective duty on an imported article similar to that produced or made here without natural disadvantage, is a tax on like domestic articles to the extent of the duty, should stultify themselves by paltering with any such measure or any such defense.

UNJUST DISCRIMINATIONS.

Mr. Chairman, an examination of the schedules of the bill shows that the objections to it go much farther than this. If it had uniformly reduced protection, or as the majority style it "robbery," all along the line, while it would have been open to serious criticism from the standpoint of the revenue-only theory, that it had only reduced what ought to have been abolished, yet it would have had the merit of treating all alike. But the bill in fact makes discriminations which are not explicable on any economic or other just basis. It preserves certain industries by abundant protection; it cuts up by the roots certain other industries from which all protection has been withdrawn. Such unequal and unfair discrimination is unjust and reprehensible, whether a tariff measure is framed on the protective or the revenue-only basis, and all the more reprehensible when it is evident that partisan, local, or personal reasons must have dictated such favors.

The marble quarries of Tennessee are by this bill protected by a certain specific duty equivalent to 24 per cent ad valorem on imported marble in rough blocks, and 41 per cent on marble paving blocks and marble sawed or dressed; while the granite

quarries of New England and the freestone, sandstone, and limestone quarries of the Middle States and the West are deprived of all protection against similar products of the cheaper labor of Canada and Scotland by having imported granite and other kinds of stone in blocks placed on the free list, and an uncertain ad valorem revenue-only duty of but 20 per cent placed on dressed or polished granite or other stone, and even finished monumental work.

Cleaned rice is protected by a certain specific duty equivalent to 83 per cent, notwithstanding it is an important article of food, while the farm products of the States adjacent to Canada are left to compete with similar products of Canadian farms cultivated by cheaper labor, with uncertain revenue-only ad valorem duties varying from 15 per cent on imported vegetables to 25 per cent on beans and peas and 23 per cent on hay, while all kinds of imported Canadian dressed meats, bacon, hams, pork, lard, tallow, eggs, and apples are placed on the free list.

Hoop iron made into cotton ties for the cotton-planter are placed on the free list, but on hoop-iron wire made into ties for Northern hay a duty of 30 per cent is imposed.

The manufacturer of so crude an article as common building brick is protected by a duty of 20 per cent on competing imported brick, and the manufacturer of hydraulic cement by a certain specific protective duty equivalent to 24 per cent, while the manufacturer of lime, who with the present duty of 20 per cent—13½ cents per barrel, which is only the difference of money cost of production—is subjected to severe Canadian competition, is practically denied all protection by having the duty on imported lime reduced to 10 per cent ad valorem, which is not over 4 cents per barrel. And the only suggestion for this reduction and consequent destruction of the lime manufacturing industry in this country which appears in the published hearings of the Ways and Means Committee is contained in a memorial of Hon. Frank Jones, the Democratic member of the national Democratic committee of New Hampshire, who informed the committee that he and his associates had invested capital in Canadian lime quarries instead of in the numerous unworked quarries of this country—presumably because the wages of labor are lower in Canada than here ($1 to $1.25 in Canada and $2 to $2.25 here)—and desired freer access to our markets.

The following paragraphs from the memorial of Mr. Jones and his associates read as though the petitioners thought they were addressing the Canadian Parliament instead of the Congress of the United States:

> The above petitioners represent that, with possibly one or two exceptions, they are all citizens and most of them residents of the United States; that they have a large amount of American capital invested in lime properties across the line at Dudswell, near Sherbrook, Province of Quebec, and at St. John, New Brunswick, consisting of lime quarries, lime kilns for the manufacture of lime, and vessels for its transportation. * * *
>
> They would call attention to the fact that after the erection of the kilns most of the expense of the production of a barrel of lime is the cost of the labor and the cordwood consumed in the burning of the lime rock. * * *
>
> Your petitioners therefore respectfully pray your honorable committee to recommend the complete remission of this duty, so that they may light up their (Canada) kilns and set to work the capital now locked up since the enactment of the McKinley law. * * *
>
> As a matter of fact, lime on the market went lower after the passage of the McKinley bill than it was before. Your petitioners will not deny the truth of this statement, but it is easily explained. * * Your petitioners aver that they themselves have still been manufacturing some lime in a small way, running some four to six kilns out of thirty, and putting said lime on to the market at a loss, for the purpose of making a price.

It seems strange to see an American citizen asking the Congress of the United States to legislate so as to encourage industries in Canada and discourage them in the United States; but this is just what this bill does, not only in this respect, but in its treatment of the lumber manufacturing industry, farm products, coal, the fisheries, etc. Indeed, what this bill grants Canada without asking any return could have been made the basis of a reciprocal agreement that would have secured the admission of many manufactured articles into Canada either free of duty or at favored rates.

THE RAW MATERIAL THEORY.

Mr. Chairman, great stress is laid in the majority report on the fact that this bill places on the free list imported articles like coal, iron ore, wool, flax, sawed lumber, granite and other stones in blocks, which are designated raw materials. This policy is defended on two grounds—first, that it will enable our advanced industries which use these articles as their materials to successfully compete with foreign producers of manufactured articles in foreign markets; and, secondly, that it will cheapen such articles to our own consumers.

By the use of the term "raw materials" it is sought to convey the impression that the articles thus designated are material objects which have sprung into existence like Jonah's gourd or been stored away by nature in the recesses of the mountains, without the use of human labor, instead of being the completed manufacture of one industry ready for a new transformation by a more advanced industry. Timber in the forest, and coal, iron ore, and stone in the hills, the actual "raw materials," are as cheap and abundant here as anywhere in the world, and the only reason they cost more here in money, not as estimated in labor, after the hand of man has transformed them into lumber, coal, iron ore, granite or sandstone blocks, is not because it requires more labor here than elsewhere to so transform them, but because that labor here receives higher wages for doing this work. This is indeed the chief reason why anything costs more in money here than abroad.

Now, what the so-called raw-material theory embodied in this bill does is to apply one principle, that of free trade, to the laborers who produce the articles thus designated, and another principle to the laborers who take the completed product of the so-called "raw materials" industry, and further advance it. This is a discrimination utterly indefensible, provided it costs more in money to produce the so-called raw materials here than abroad, on account of our higher wages for labor, as the authors of this bill assume that it does when they declare that by importing iron ore, coal, sawed lumber, wool, granite blocks, etc., free of duty, it will cheapen the articles made from them or by their use. But if this argument is sound for one class of products then it is sound for all others.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], in his opening speech in this discussion, undertook the dangerous feat of making an argument for the latitude of the Virginias and Maryland, that placing these so-called raw materials on the free list would not be a discrimination against these industries, because these articles are produced and sold in this country as low as in any other competing country. He evidently overlooked the fact that in his majority report, as well as in another part of his speech, he had contended that all these raw materials would be made cheaper to our advanced industries if they could be imported free of duty from Canada and other countries where labor is paid less wages. One or the other of his arguments needs revision.

The effort of the majority report to create the impression that free raw materials will enable our industries to secure foreign markets and thus give a larger employment to labor here, ignores the fact that their policy proposes to surrender to foreigners a large part of our own market—the best in the world—in order to engage in the chase after foreign markets already gorged; ignores the further fact that under the existing tariff any manufacturer may import, almost free of duty, materials however advanced for making articles for export; and also ignores the additional fact that even where we have the materials, as for example cotton, as cheap and even cheaper than our foreign competitors, we are able to export but comparatively few goods, in competition with foreigners—only twenty-four millions, against an export of four hundred and twenty-five millions by England—for the reason that our labor employed in making the advanced manufactures receives from 50 to 100 per cent more pay for a given amount of human effort than the foreign competitor pays.

PROGRESSIVE WAR ON PROTECTION.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding some industries have been wholly or partly protected by this bill, as well as some sent at once to the wall, yet the rule has been to so far reduce duties as to increase foreign competition and importations, leaving the domestic industries affected an opportunity to make the reduced duties protective by lowering wages, until another reduction of duties foreshadowed shall follow.

There runs through the report of the majority, and through the indorsements of it by the tariff reform or free trade clubs, the idea that this bill is only one step in the process of reduction, although made with unfair discrimination, to be followed by other steps, until all the duties shall be absolutely for revenue only, and every chance of possible protection removed. The gentleman from West Virginia was frank enough to tell us in his opening speech that, while he had treated many industries tenderly in this bill, he believed that the time would soon come when any remains of protection would be uprooted.

Indeed, the woolens schedule puts these steps into law by providing that there shall be an annual 1 per cent ad valorem reduction of the low duties provided by the bill for five years, thus at the end of that period bringing down the duties on woolen goods—the most difficult of all the textiles to manufacture—to rates varying on the face from 20 to 25 per cent for flannels and blankets and to 35 per cent for cloths and dress goods. Although no other schedule has this downward sliding scale, and woolens are therefore specially discriminated against, yet it is not to be supposed that it would have been applied in this case, where the highest duties are needed, if the purpose had not been in the early future to apply it all along the line. In this light it is amusing, if it were not so serious, to have some of the advocates of this bill arguing that it has the merit of offering stability to our industries, especially when it is remembered that for thirty-two

years there has been one continuous, stable tariff policy, that of protection.

AD VALOREM DUTIES.

But, Mr. Chairman, the reduction of duties which appears on the face of this bill has been in fact largely increased by the general adoption, except in some conspicuous instances where favors have been extended to particular industries, of ad valorem duties in lieu of the specific or mixed duties of the present tariff. An ad valorem duty, as the name indicates, is levied on the foreign price of an imported article, and as that price is in most cases practically determined by the foreign manufacturer in his invoice, as a rule such article is undervalued, and the duty thus reduced below what was intended by the law. A specific duty, on the other hand, is a fixed charge levied on each pound, yard, or other unit, and can not be avoided.

The art of undervaluation so as to reduce ad valorem duties has been carried to such an extent that honest importers have been largely driven out of the business, and imported goods are largely sold duty paid by the agent of the manufacturer in this country.

When I was in Europe last summer, an English manufacturer, who exports largely to this country, said to me that he did not care what our duties might be made if we would only make them ad valorem.

It is the judgment of well-informed manufacturers that the actual duties which will be realized by the Government in case the pending bill should become a law, so far as woolen goods, fancy cottons, and many other goods of a varied character which are made especially for our markets, would be at least 10 per cent if not 15 per cent ad valorem less than would be realized with equivalent specific duties, because of undervaluations. In other words, ad valorem duties of 40 per cent or 35 per cent, will be found no more valuable for protection or revenue than specific duties equivalent to 30 per cent or 25 per cent, respectively.

The only argument presented by the majority for the substitution of ad valorem for specific or mixed duties is that specific duties impose relatively higher duties on cheap grades of an article than on more valuable grades. There is little real force in this argument, certainly none comparable with the objections, because there is no difficulty in adjusting a specific rate to each grade which will largely overcome even the apparent discrimination when expressed in percentages. Moreover, this apparent discrimination is only seeming, not real. Percentages afford no just basis of comparison when the bases are widely different. For example, 1 is 50 per cent of 2, and only 10 per cent of 10, but notwithstanding it appears ten times as large in the latter case as in the former when expressed in percentages, yet it is exactly the same 1 in both cases.

Take the illustration given in the majority report of the duty on so-called woolen cloth invoiced at 27 cents per pound and cloth invoiced at 97 cents. The majority report states that the tariff of 1890 imposes 162 per cent duty on the cheap cloth "for poor people" and only 93 per cent on the fine cloth for the well to do, etc. Yet as a matter of fact the duty on the so-called "cheap woolen cloth" is 44 cents per pound and on the fine cloth 93 cents—less than half as much on the cheap as on the fine, instead of nearly twice as much.

But inasmuch as the majority report has made use of one exceptional import of what the majority call "cheap woolen cloth for poor people," valued at 27 cents per pound, to prop up the vicious change to ad valorem duties, it may be well to examine it more fully.

It is evident on the face that there was something peculiar about this small import of woolen cloths under 30 cents per pound, valued at only $9,000 in 1892, and only $13,000 in 1893. For if there are any wool cloths suitable for even "poor people" to wear that can be bought abroad at 27 cents per pound, it is certain that even with 44 cents per pound duty they would be imported in immense quantities. If the chairman of the committee had inquired he would have ascertained that even in England, with her low wages, a pound of woolen cloth can not be made for less than about 20 cents. That leaves only 7 cents, or not over 12 cents, for the wool; and clothing wool, even of the cheapest variety, sufficient to make a pound of wool cloth, can not be purchased in London for less than 35 cents before it goes to the mill. Certainly a pound of real wool cloth can not be purchased in England for less than 55 cents.

Yet it seems that a small quantity of so-called wool cloth was invoiced at 27 cents per pound. Certainly if this was really wool cloth the undervaluation must have been most remarkable. It does not seem to have succeeded to any extent—only once each year to give the majority of the committee a shining example. It is evident that the specific duty of 33 cents per pound was found in the way of a repetition of the job. If the cloth had been imported under the pending bill the ad valorem duty would have made the duty only 10½ cents, and this cut would have afforded a big premium for the continuation of such undervaluation.

The example cited by the majority is really an argument for instead of against specific duties.

Indeed, every Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, from Gallatin, who served in this capacity under Jefferson, to Secretary Manning (Walker alone excepted), has maintained that specific duties are essential to prevent frauds against the Government and discriminations against honest importers. The fact, however, that an ad valorem duty opens the door for a reduction of duties beyond what the law provides, and diminishes protection as prices go down in unfavorable times when protection is most needed, seems to have commended it to the framers of this bill.

Nothing can be more misleading than percentage duties on invoice value, especially in comparing duties at different periods and under different tariffs. Where the duty is specific, percentages rise with decline in values, although in fact the duties are unchanged. Indeed I notice that the protective specific duty of 1¼ cents per pound on rice, imposed by this bill, gives an equivalent ad valorem of 71 per cent duty on the imports of 1892, and 83 per cent on the imports of 1893; an apparent advance of 12 per cent ad valorem in duty by percentages when there is no change in fact. This shows the misleading character of ad valorems.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] called attention to the duty of 1 cent per pound in the tariff of 1890 on hoop iron, and informed us that hoop iron is selling for 1.2 cents per pound; pretty good evidence that the protective duty is not a tax which increases the price to the extent of the duty. Yet that duty, which appears to be 80 or more per cent in the tariff of 1890, is less than one-third the specific duty on hoop iron imposed by the tariffs of 1828 and 1830, when it was said to be only 40 per cent. I repeat, in order to show the misleading nature of ad valorem figures, that the duty on imported hoop iron under the tariff of 1828 and 1830 was 3¼ cents per pound. The tariff of 1890 reduced it to 1 cent, and yet it is made to appear by ad valorem percentages that a reduction of two-thirds has largely increased the duty. Thus notwithstanding duties expressed in specific terms have been largely reduced in the tariff of 1890 below even the earlier tariffs, yet the reductions are made to appear as increases by the use of per centage ad valorem equivalents.

EFFECT OF A PROTECTIVE DUTY.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue between the advocates of a protective tariff and the advocates of a tariff for revenue only, or British free trade (for both terms mean the same thing in tariff discussion), is as to the effect of a protective duty on the cost to the consumer of a domestic article, *i. e.*, a duty imposed on a like imported foreign article equivalent to the difference of the money cost of production and distribution here and abroad, where such article can be produced or made here substantially to the extent of our wants without natural disadvantage.

The majority report and free-trade advocates generally affirm that such a duty is a tax which increases the cost to the consumer of such domestic article substantially to the extent of the duty. The advocates of protection deny this.

Of course, there is no controversy over the effect of a duty on an imported article not produced or made here, to any considerable extent. In that case there is comparatively little or no domestic production to affect the price; and as the article must all or for the most part be purchased abroad, the cost to the consumer must be the foreign price plus the duty. The issue is entirely as to the effect of a duty on the price or cost of the domestic article which can be produced or made here substantially to the extent of our wants without natural disadvantage.

The usual course of the free trade or anti-protection disputant is to assume that such a duty is a tax on the domestic article, and without meeting the counter facts and arguments adduced by the advocates of protection, to go on from that point as if it were conceded. That has been the course pursued in this discussion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]. Sometimes the assumption is fortified by such an argument as this:

"You protectionists say that you want duties on certain imported articles which it is desired to produce or make here, because they cost more to make here on account of our higher wages, and the articles can not be made here and sold in competition with similar foreign articles admitted free of duty. If, then, the duties on foreign articles do not enable the domestic producers or manufacturers to make the prices of the domestic articles substantially that of the foreign articles abroad, plus the duty, then they fail to protect. If they do so raise the price, then they are in effect a tax on the domestic article, which does not go into the Treasury."

The fundamental fallacy of this argument is that it uses the term "cost" in its money and not its economic sense, and thus

deals with the problem as if man were only a consumer and not a producer also.

It is evident that when there is no natural disadvantage in producing or making an article here—and protection does not properly apply if there be such—then it requires no more labor to produce or make an article here than abroad; and if so, then measured in labor or service, which is the true economic measure of cost, it costs no more to produce or make any such article here than elsewhere. There can be no economic loss, therefore, in the production of such article or articles here rather than abroad.

When it is said, therefore, that it costs more to produce or make an article here than abroad because of our higher wages, it is only meant that it costs more in money—not more in labor or service, in which nearly all men ultimately pay for everything they buy. Money is only the medium of making the exchange of labor for products.

Thus, the true test of the cost or price of an article in any country is not money cost, but labor cost. When it is said that a workingman in England can buy a coat for $9 in money and that a similar coat costs $10 here, you can not determine which is relatively cheaper to the workingman or other person who ultimately pays in his labor or service, or product of his labor or efforts, until you know how much money either receives for his labor or earns by his service. When you have both sides of the equation, then you can determine which money price is relatively cheaper, and not before. If it turns out that the laborer receives $1 per day wages in England and $2 here, then the cost of the coat to the workingman in England is nine days' work, and to the workingman in the United States five days' work. In spite of the assumption of the doctrinaire who looks only at money price, that the workingman in England can buy his coat a dollar cheaper than the workingman in the United States, the fact is that the cost of the workingman's coat here in the only commodity he has to pay is only five-ninths of the cost to the workingman in England. [Applause on the Republican side].

It may be said that if such a workingman here could buy his coat abroad and import it free of duty, then he would save $1. I reply that while this would be true if only one or a few persons should be granted this privilege for the reason that a few cases like this would not disturb our economic system under which higher wages are paid here than abroad; but if everybody in this country could send the money received for wages or service or their products to England and buy such goods as are cheaper in money there and import them free of duty, instead of having them made here, then, first, American wages would soon fall to the British standard, because of want of diversification of industries and dearth of employment outside of agriculture, which would be glutted; and secondly, with such an increased demand for goods abroad and withdrawal of American competition, prices of goods there would rise. No one can have his cake and eat it at the same time. Whether the economic system of a country is free trade or protection, it must be an entirety.

Measured in labor, there is not a single article made here under protection—no matter whether the duty on a similar imported article is 30 per cent, 50 per cent, or 100 per cent—which is not cheaper here than in any other country in the world. Our free-trade friends have much to say of cheap prices of products measured in money, and never anything of cheap prices measured in labor. Products cheapened by labor-saving devices are a boon. Products cheapened by reducing the compensation of labor and by depriving the laborer of opportunities to work are a curse. [Applause.] We are having now the free-trade paradise of cheapness, and the workingman's gehenna of dearness. Prices measured in money are abnormally cheap; prices measured in labor are exceptionally dear.

These observations have paved the way for a closer examination of the workings of protective duties, which are simply duties on imports equivalent to the difference of money wages of labor production and distribution here and abroad. Such duties simply equalize the basis of competition here and abroad. The money prices of domestic products are determined by the cost of production or manufacture under competition paying American wages, and when they cost more in money than abroad it is simply because labor receives higher wages. Even if the duties are more than such actual difference of cost of production and distribution here and abroad, competition inevitably brings the money prices down to the lowest possible standard. The object of protection is not, as the free-trader insists, to increase prices, but to encourage production here by making it possible for us to compete, and the competition thus induced tends to lower prices everywhere, not by reducing wages, but by stimulating the use of labor-saving devices.

The money prices may be more here than abroad at the same time, but these money prices will be gradually reduced by the competition here, made possible only by protection, below what they were before the industries were established here, and frequently as low as abroad. But the prices estimated in labor or service, as I have already said, will always be lower than anywhere else in the world. Applause.]

Every instance in which we have applied protective duties to secure the manufacture of articles here, which had been previously imported, has thus resulted. In 1883, when we applied a protective duty to wire nails, the price was 8 cents per pound, and nearly all were imported. We were charged with a purpose to tax the people 4 cents per pound for all their wire nails, because the proposed duty was 4 cents. Yet wire nails never advanced; but as soon as we had firmly established the industry they began to decline—our competition affecting the foreign price,—and even before the tariff-reform cyclone struck the country some months ago the price had declined to less than 2 cents. And this is only one out of thousands of similar examples.

This means that our policy of providing by protective duties that competition here shall be on the basis of our higher standard of wages and higher standard of living rather than on the lower European standard, as it would necessarily be under free trade or duties lower than the difference of wages here and abroad, results in higher prosperity of the masses of our people than is found anywhere else in the world.

PROTECTION, NOT PATERNALISM.

Mr. Chairman, this policy is not "paternalism" nor "partnership of the Government in private industries," nor "class legislation," as charged by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], unless indeed the establishment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts by the Government in the several States for the purpose of increasing the industrial efficiency of the rising generation, which the gentleman and his associates advocate, is "paternalism;" or unless the improvement of the rivers of West Virginia and the harbors of the Great Lakes and of the ocean, in order to enable private citizens to navigate their boats and ships with greater efficiency, for which the gentleman and most of the members of his party voted, is "class legislation" and "partnership of the Government in private industries." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The distinction between "paternalism" and protection is as wide as the difference between giving a man an opportunity to work and doing his work for him. Paternalism dwarfs men; protection gives them the best opportunities to develop themselves. The function of good government should never be paternal, but always protective. The "let alone" theory of government, on which free-trade ideas are based, has been abandoned for the most part by practical statesmen everywhere, and there has come to be general acceptance of the view that it is the proper function, aye, the duty of government to so protect and enlarge the opportunities of its individual citizens as to enable them to use their own powers more efficiently, whether by education, restriction of temptations to vice, building highways, improving rivers and harbors, erecting light-houses, or restricting undesirable immigration which would tend to reduce wages and lower the standard of living. [Applause.]

And the protective-tariff policy, which imposes duties equivalent to the difference of wages in production and distribution here and abroad on such imported articles as can be produced or made here without natural disadvantage, in order to maintain competition here on the basis of our high wage and high living standard, and thus secure the highest prosperity of the masses of our people, is exactly in the same line.

Our protective policy simply says to the foreign manufacturer: "Before you can place the products of your cheaper labor in our markets in competition with the products of our higher wage labor you must pay into our Treasury and thus contribute to our revenue substantially the sum which you withhold from your workingmen, but which we pay our workingmen."

It will be remembered that when the tariff act of 1890 increased the average duty on woolens so as to make it more protective on the finer grades, it was assaulted all along the line by the free-trade theorists as an increase of $30 tax on every hundred dollars' worth of the woolens and the clothing of the people. The gentleman from West Virginia has repeated this assertion, entirely in line with the theory on which this bill is framed, as if facts which could have been ascertained by a study of markets rather than maxims, had not already disproved it. And yet the report of the Senate Finance Committee, based on statistics collected by Labor Commissioner Wright, showed that the effect of this increase of duty was not to advance the price of woolens—indeed the price was 5 per cent lower in 1891 than in 1890—but to reduce importations about twenty millions, and thus increase the demand for domestic goods and for labor. And the manufacturers state that, notwithstanding they received 5 per cent less per yard

for their goods in 1891 than in 1890, yet they did a more prosperous business, for the reason that it cost them less to make their goods in 1891 than in 1890, because of the larger demand, which enabled them to make more effective use of their machinery.

In other words, the increased duty which restricted foreign imports gave our own manufacturers a larger home market, made it possible for them to make their goods at a lower cost, and competition compelled them to sell them at a lower price. Yet all the gentlemen on the other side who have spoken, in the face of such facts, keep right on asserting that a protective duty is a tax which increases the burdens of the American consumer.

Ex-Senator Eaton, of Connecticut, himself a Democrat, although he would be ruled out of the new Democratic party by the framers of this bill, when a member of the House told an anecdote of a scholastic free trader that illustrates the tendency of men whose whole training has been outside of practical life, to blindly follow theories and shut their eyes to the facts of life all about them.

"A certain professor, a theorist of the first water," said ex-Senator Eaton, "came up into a large manufacturing village in my country to address the people on the tariff question. There was a farmer standing by a post in the lecture room, and the professor thought he might be a good subject to operate upon. So he said to him 'My friend, you are a farmer?' 'Yes.' 'You live here?' 'Yes.' 'Do you know these manufacturers in this village are robbing you?' 'Why, no; I do not know it. How have they robbed me? I came here ten years ago with only $500 and bought a farm for $2,500, and run in debt for the balance. I went to raising truck and selling to the mill hands. I have paid off my debt and now own my farm, free of debt. How have they robbed me?' The professor, not at all taken back, went on. 'Well, I suppose you have been a hard-working man and have lived through it. But you pay 6 cents a yard tax for the very cloth your shirt is made of. "Well," replied the farmer, "you may think so, but you can not prove it unless by Æsop's fables, for 5 cents a yard was all I gave for the cloth."

THE WAGES QUESTION.

Mr. Chairman, there are two answers which the free-trade or revenue-only advocates make to this contention of the friends of protection. First, they affirm that wages are no higher here than in machine-using nations abroad when efficiency is considered. They admit that money wages per day or week are 67 per cent higher on an average here than in England as shown by Labor Commissioner Wright's reports; but they claim that workingmen here do enough more to offset this difference.

It is sufficient to say that there is no evidence of the truth of this assumption. The only evidence ever adduced in this direction was some statistics of the relative labor cost of making low-grade cottons, in which the labor cost is very slight, at a particular time when we had introduced some improvements in machinery not then adopted abroad. In other words, they were statistics of the superior inventive genius of Americans when protection gives us the opportunity to compete on an equal plane, and not evidence of the superior efficiency of our labor. Indeed, in many industries, particularly textiles, our best skilled labor comes from Europe.

The fact that the gates of Castle Garden always swing inward and never outward is an absolute demonstration that a given amount of labor receives not only larger money wages but also larger wages estimated in purchasing power than abroad, even if Labor Commissioner Wright's statistics of piece work had not removed this fact beyond the pale of dispute. Indeed, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] charges that our protective policy has induced excessive immigration by making our wages and opportunities for poor men so attractive; leaving it to be inferred that he advocates this bill because it will diminish these wages and opportunities.

Even if other evidence were not conclusive, the fact that even with duties of 40 per cent or more on imported manufactured goods, foreign manufacturers find themselves able to pay that duty and still sell three hundred millions of dollars' worth of their products in our markets, and the further fact that our exports of manufactured goods are mainly coarse cottons and specialties, demonstrate beyond doubt that the latter pay much less for a given amount of labor in such industries than we do.

"American workingmen are the smartest in the world, and not afraid to compete with the products of the workingmen of Europe," exclaims the theorist. It is not a question of "smartness," but a question of compensation for "smartness." The American workingman receives 67 per cent more for a given amount of "smartness" than the workingman in Europe receives. What the American objects to is competition with products produced or made abroad by labor that receives 67 per cent less than he does until the beneficiary of that cheaper labor has paid our Government enough duty to even up the basis of competition. When the foreign laborer comes here, provided he comes to be an American and to gradually adopt the American standard of living—and no other immigrant should be permitted to come—he demands and receives American (not foreign) wages; and as he brings as much or more demand for products for the consumption of his family as he adds to the labor supply, his coming does not reduce wages nor injure our own labor.

THE "NATURAL CHANNEL" ARGUMENT.

The second answer of the free-trade theorists is that we should not undertake to carry on industries in which foreign producers or manufacturers have an advantage over us, but should confine ourselves to industries in which we have advantage over other countries. This is the free-trade contention of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and the contention of the majority report.

Now, if this free-trade contention referred simply to a natural advantage; if the argument of the majority report, insisting that we should not attempt to extend our industries and business to "artificial channels," referred to disadvantages of climate, soil, or other natural conditions, it would be accepted as sound. No protectionist holds that the protective policy should be applied to any industry which must be carried on here under natural disadvantages, that is, where a larger amount of labor is permanently required to make or produce a given article here than is required elsewhere, except as there may be cases where national defense demands it.

What is meant by opponents of protection, however, is not this. It is that we should not carry on any industry here in which our higher wages of labor make the product cost more in money, although no more in labor or service than elsewhere where the laborer receives less pay—this, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] tells us would be an "artificial channel,"—but should confine ourselves to "natural channels," or such crude industries, mainly agriculture, in which we have sufficient natural advantage to offset the difference of wages.

Indeed, the free-trade contention—and it is noticeable that nearly all the speeches for this bill on the other side have adopted free-trade arguments to their logical conclusion, and as such have been most enthusiastically applauded by nearly all our Democratic friends, thus showing that the Democratic party no longer disguises its free-trade policy—the free-trade contention is that where we find industries in which our higher wages of labor makes the product cost more in money (although not more in labor or service) than they cost abroad because we pay higher wages for a certain amount of labor, we should drop such industries, notwithstanding they comprise nearly all our manufacturing industries, and import such goods instead of making them here, and turn the labor which has been employed in such manufacturing industries into agriculture or the production of crude materials in which we have natural advantages. This is the policy which has been again and again enthusiastically applauded on the Democratic side. And it is seriously contended by the free-trade theorist, that this policy—which in fact would be going back where we were a hundred years ago—would give us the largest production of wealth, highest wages, and greatest consuming capacity. Perhaps the gentlemen who advocate this theory will be able to tell us what any of our farm products would be worth with such a multiplication of farmers and such an annihilation of nonagricultural consumers.

This is the free-trade idea, pure and simple; this is the advice which the British Cobdenites give us—to confine ourselves to producing raw materials and let England do our manufacturing.

It is sufficient to say in reply that any economic theory which, put into practice, would prevent a diversification of industries, and especially the establishment of advanced manufactures, is fundamentally wrong. For nothing is clearer in the light of reason or in the teachings of experience, than that people who so far multiply their pursuits as to give an opportunity for every variety of talent, and especially the highest skill, to do most effective work, take the lead in agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce. A nation with advanced industries, placed alongside the farm, produces far more per inhabitant than one which confines its industries to what free traders call "natural channels." [Applause.]

It can not be too often pressed upon the attention of the thoughtful citizen who listens to the free-trade argument that it is a loss of productive power for us to carry on industries in which the cost of production is greater than the cost elsewhere: that no protectionist proposes to do this, if by "cost" is meant cost in labor or service. What the free trader means is that we should not carry on industries here in which, while they require no more labor for production here than is required abroad, we pay higher wages for such labor. The fact that other countries pay lower wages than we do is not a natural advantage on their part; it is an "artificial" advantage, created by crowding labor to the wall, and as a result of a system in which man is left out of consideration; and the only way in which we can prevent competition through

the products of such a system coming into our markets and forcing us down to the low-wage and low-living standard of other machine-using nations, is by placing protective duties on their products, so as to place competition here on our high-wage and high-living standard basis.

PROTECTION HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of history that the most prominent incentive to the adoption of the Constitution and the establishment of a truly national government in 1789 was the necessity which was felt for such uniform regulations of commerce as would provide revenue, promote trade, and encourage new industries, and thus free us from our industrial and commercial subjection to England, arising mainly from the fact that we raised the raw materials and she developed them into manufactured products.

One of the first acts passed by the first Congress under the Constitution, in response to the popular demand, was a tariff, whose title was an act to raise revenue "and encourage manufactures."

The act received the warm approval of Washington, Madison, and Jefferson. The same Jefferson whom our Democratic friends claim to be politically descended from, was one of the fathers of protection, one of the original advocates of the policy of so adjusting duties as to "encourage manufactures," a policy which the framers of this bill now tell us is "unconstitutional," as well as "robbery."

The idea of the fathers who framed the Constitution, and passed the first protective tariff to encourage manufactures as well as raise revenue, was that the prosperity of the country, of all classes, demanded that we should not confine our labor to what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] calls "natural channels," the crude industries and agriculture to which the people of a new country first address themselves, but should apply protective duties with a view of diversifying our industries and establishing manufacturing industries—"artificial channels," as the free trader thinks.

To be sure, the average duties on all imports (as there were few free goods then) of the various tariffs enacted up to the close of the first term of Jefferson were only 22½ per cent, but at that time the slow and expensive means of transportation across the Atlantic afforded a large measure of protection in itself, and the industries to be introduced in those early days were only those for the manufacture of the coarser articles adapted to a new country. These duties were subsequently increased as experience showed necessary. In 1821 the average duty was 36 per cent, and in 1830 it was nearly 49 per cent on dutiable goods. The important fact to be considered is that the framers of the Constitution, who may be supposed to have had some knowledge of the scope of that instrument, not only held that protective duties are constitutional, but that they are a wise measure of public policy.

WHAT THE FATHERS THOUGHT.

The fathers did not consider the objection, even then urged, that the adoption of protective duties to secure the establishment and maintenance of manufacturing industries would be "class legislation," or the "partnership of the Government in business," to be anything but chaff, unworthy of a moment's consideration.

They argued that the introduction of manufacturing industries in this country and the diversification of pursuits would be, as it has proved, a benefit to the industries already existing, and especially a benefit to agriculture, and to all our people.

They regarded the whole people as an industrial unit. They held that manufacturing industries would benefit the farmer by preventing so large a concentration of labor in agriculture as would greatly increase the surplus for export, and thus reduce the foreign price, and by giving him a larger home market and better prices; for whatever the farmer sells at home escapes the heavy charges of transportation. They saw by faith what those who will open their eyes can to day see by actual vision, that farming pays much better when manufacturing communities are set down by the side of the farms.

They knew, what some of their descendants are blind to, that the carpenter and mason, as well as some other industries, are protected by natural conditions which forbid the importation of what they work on, but that their wages and their prosperity, as well as that of the farmer, could not rise above the wages and prosperity of the workingmen and consumers in other industries that would be open to competition with the products of the cheaper labor of Europe, without protective duties. Hence they reasoned, and reasoned correctly, that protection concerned all.

PROTECTIVE PERIODS ERAS OF GREATEST PROSPERITY.

And our experiences since have only demonstrated the wisdom of the judgment of the fathers. Our periods of highest prosperity have always been those in which the protective policy has been maintained.

The contention made now and then by opponents of protection, and repeated in the report of the majority, that the revenue-tariff period from 1846 to 1860 witnessed the greatest progress of our manufacturing industries and was the golden era of the nation, has no basis except rhetoric, and even more deceptive percentages, to stand upon.

The simple fact told by the census is that in the decade between 1850 and 1860 the value of our manufactured products increased $765,000,000, or $16 per inhabitant; and in the decade between 1880 and 1890, under protection, $3,146,000,000, or $29 per inhabitant, or nearly twice as fast in the latter as in the former. The value of our manufactured products rose from $1,885,750,000 in 1860 to $8,515,500,000 in 1890. And the growth in volume was much greater than this, because the price of manufactured goods has been reduced 25 per cent since 1860.

The majority report speaks of the revenue tariff period between 1846 and 1860 as one in which our woolen industry signally flourished. The figures of the census, however, show that at the close of this period in 1860 the value of our manufactures of wool was only $68,750,000, or $2.10 per inhabitant, against $344,250,000, or $5.50 per inhabitant, in 1890. In other words, the increase per capita in value of our woolen industry under protection was one and a half times as much as the entire growth from the first settlement of the country.

The value of the wealth accumulated by the people of this country in the thirty years between 1860 and 1890 under protection was nearly four times as much as was that accumulated in the two hundred and forty years from the landing of the Pilgrims to the election of Lincoln. The wealth of this country in 1860 was only $514 per inhabitant; in 1890 it was $1,000 per inhabitant. The contention that the wealth in the possession of the workingmen is no greater than thirty years ago is disproved by the returns of the savings banks, which show a large increase in average deposits, as well as by the increase of 68 per cent in the purchase power of wages.

In the thirty years from 1830 to 1860 there were built in this country only 30,603 miles of railway. In the thirty years from 1860 to 1890 there were built 106,512 miles of railway. In the decade between 1880 and 1890 there was built in the United States nearly four times the mileage of railway that was built in the decade between 1850 and 1860.

A better test still of the wisdom of any economic policy is its effect on the welfare of the masses of the people.

It has been said that the consumption of iron in any country is the infallible test of its material progress. Apply this test to the revenue and protective eras of the United States and to Great Britain. In 1860 the United States consumed only 61¼ pounds of iron per inhabitant, the most of which was imported, while Great Britain consumed 173 pounds per inhabitant.

In 1892 the United States consumed 335 pounds of iron per inhabitant, five times as much as in 1860, nearly all of which was made in this country, while Great Britain consumed only 275 pounds per inhabitant.

Wages increased 60 per cent in money and 68 per cent in purchase power between 1860 and 1890 under our protective policy, and less than one-third as much in Great Britain.

In 1850 one day's work of a weaver in this country would buy 8¼ yards of standard sheeting; in 1860 it would buy 10 yards, and in 1891, 27 yards. But in 1891 one day's work would buy only 20 yards in Great Britain.

In the revenue decade between 1850 and 1860 one day's work of an ironworker would buy 50 pounds of bar iron; in the protective decade between 1880 and 1890 100 pounds, while in the latter decade in Great Britain one day's work would buy only 75 pounds.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and others who are now trying to revise history by affirming that the revenue tariff period between 1846 and 1860 was the most prosperous era of the United States, overlook the fact that there are gentlemen living, some of them in this Chamber, whose memory goes back to those days, and who themselves experienced some of the evil results of that tariff policy, which were deferred for a time by the Mexican war, the gold discoveries in California, and the Crimean war, but finally burst with tornado force upon our country in 1857–'58–'59. I suggest to these gentlemen that they take down the musty volumes which contain President Buchanan's messages to Congress in December, 1857 and 1858, and reread his pictures of the sad condition of our industrial and financial interests in those years, which our free-trade friends tell us were the "golden era" of our history. And the tarnished character of this "golden era" will be made strikingly apparent if they will also reread the official reports of the almost ineffectual efforts of the National Government in 1860 to borrow money to meet a deficiency in the Federal Treasury even at 12 per cent interest.

It is sometimes charged that protection is selfish and unchris-

tian and antagonistic to the dictates of a broad philanthropy. If so, then the family relation, ordained by God, in which the head is admonished to care first of all for those placed in his charge, is selfish and unchristian. If so, the nation, also divinely ordained, whose primary duty it is to make the most of its own people, and in that way do the most for mankind, is selfish and unchristian. No family and no nation may do injustice to others. Protection does no injustice to others. It is no injustice to anyone for this nation to say to others, "For the highest well-being of our people we maintain a high wage and a high standard of living, and in order to maintain this competition for our markets must proceed on the basis of our wage and living standard. If you choose to maintain a lower wage and a lower standard of living you can do so for yourselves, but when you seek our markets, we ask that you pay into our Treasury as a duty a sum which shall place your competiton on the basis of our high wage and high standard of living." This is not only just, but eminently Christian and philanthropic. Indeed, we hope that the influence of our example may lead other countries to adopt our high wage and high standard of living, under which the masses of our people have become the most prosperous on the face of the earth.

LABOR COST OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. Chairman, there is one defense of the pending bill which I must not pass by. "After all," say its advocates, "there is enough average duty left by this bill—30 per cent—to fully cover the difference of wages of labor here and abroad in production and distribution."

This is an after thought, and entirely inconsistent with every other argument that has been put forth in antagonism to protection. More than this, the fact is not as claimed. If it be true, then this bill is open to the same objections from the other side that are made against our protective tariffs. No; the authors of this bill well know that they have not been as inconsistent as that.

In the first place, of course the claim is not true as to the products of industries which have been placed on the free list. And no one will contend it is true as to the large number of industries whose competing foreign products are to be admitted with a duty of only 10 to 15 per cent.

Even as to those industries whose competing foreign products are to be admitted ultimately at from 25 to 35, and in a few cases 40 per cent ad valorem, which will not exceed a specific duty equivalent to more than 25 to 30 per cent in the case of textiles, the duty will not be equal to the difference of wages in production and distribution here and abroad.

While the labor cost of manufacturing textiles, for example, averages about 25 per cent of the domestic valuation and 33 per cent of the foreign valuation on which duties are imposed, yet this 33 per cent only includes the manufacture after mill and machinery are completed and the supplies and materials furnished. It does not include the labor in building mill, machinery, and harnessing power, nor the labor on materials and supplies, nor the labor in transportation, selling, etc. Ex-Congressman Abram S. Hewitt, a practical manufacturer, stated to the Committee on Ways and Means a few years ago that 90 per cent of the cost of every manufactured article (not simply 25 per cent) is labor; and when this labor receives nearly double here for a given amount of effort than is paid in England, it is absurd to talk about a duty that will practically be only 30 per cent, placing on an even basis an English and an American industry manufacturing an advanced article.

When it is borne in mind that $32,000,000 of fine cotton goods were imported last year in the face of a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem higher than is proposed by this bill; $37,000,000 of woolens in the face of a duty 20 per cent ad valorem higher; not to mention more than $200,000,000 of other manufactured goods in the face of a duty 15 per cent higher, it is clear that even those higher duties could not have been much, if any, in excess of the actual difference of money cost of production and distribution here and abroad.

REDUCED DUTIES MEAN REDUCED WAGES.

As a matter of fact, with the exception of certain instances in which some industries have had special and exceptional favor, the duties fixed by this bill will in practical administration prove not to be protective on the basis of the wages that existed in this country one year ago. They are not intended to be protective. They will necessitate a reduction of wages in order that our industries may compete with foreign industries whose products are to be admitted to our markets at lower rates of duty.

What has already taken place in the reduction of wages throughout this country in consequence of the necessity imposed on industries to anticipate the large reduction of the duties on competing foreign imports, ought to be a complete answer to the contention of the free-trade theorists that protective duties have had nothing to do with increasing wages 60 per cent estimated in money and 68 per cent estimated in purchasing power since 1860, as shown by Labor Commissioner Wright's statistics; or that duties may be reduced below the protective point without lowering wages. An ounce of experience is worth more than a ton of theory. But in this case our sad experience since it became evident that there is to be a revolutionary tariff change, weighs many tons.

"Wages are made by demand and supply and not by protective duties," exclaim the opponents of protection. In one sense wages are made by supply and demand if all the elements affecting supply and demand are taken into consideration; but supply is affected by the standard of living and many other conditions, and demand by the extent of the diversification of industries and the consumptive capacity of the people. Where the industries of a country are confined to agriculture and a few crude industries, as they were everywhere in this country seventy years ago, and as they would be now if we should give up manufacturing industries and import our goods from abroad, the demand for labor is restricted and wages comparatively low. But when under the policy of protection we began to send less and less of our raw materials to Europe to be manufactured for us there, and to establish manufacturing industries here, the demand for labor increased, our productive and consumptive power multiplied, and wages began to increase as estimated in money, and even more as estimated in purchase power. In other words, our protective policy has maintained and increased wages by enlarging the demand for labor and so multiplying pursuits as to give each man the opportunity best adapted to his tastes and capacity, and by increasing the consumptive power of the people.

There ought to be nothing clearer to any thinking man than that when thousands of industries are being carried on here and employing labor which is paid from 50 to 100 per cent more than in England for the same amount of service, and the duties on the competing goods are lowered so as to not fully cover the difference of money cost of production or manufacture and distribution here and abroad, then one of two things must take place here; either such industries must stop here or wages must be reduced to offset the new competition caused by a reduction of duties. As a matter of fact, both of these results are taking place all around us in anticipation of the reduction of duties. Labor organizations are valuable in maintaining uniform wages in the same industries within our own borders; but when competition comes in in the shape of the products of cheaper labor abroad, admitted free of duty or at a lower rate than the difference of wages here and abroad, such organizations are powerless for the reason that they can not control foreign wages.

And it is not simply the laborers and owners of so-called protected industries that are feeling the evil results of this threatened change, but every class of our people. All of our industries are interlinked; and under our economic policy, as it existed for more than thirty years, all were under our protective system—some protected by natural conditions, some by protective duties. And when it became evident that this policy was to be overthrown, and business and industries began to prepare for the revolutionary change, then all classes felt the blow.

Our sad experience the past six months contrasted with our prosperity for thirty years previous demonstrates that the policy of maintaining protective duties is not "robbery," nor a tax which increases the burdens of the people, as the Democratic majority of the committee reporting this bill affirm, but just, wise, statesmanlike, and promotive of the welfare of all our people, in that it tends to diversify our industries, develop our natural resources, gives wider employment suited to the differing aptitudes of our people, develops healthy competition on the basis of our high wages, stimulates our inventive genius, encourages agriculture by opening up large near-by home markets to the products of the farm, increases the production of wealth, and greatly contributes to the prosperity of the nation. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine be allowed a few minutes. I understand that he can conclude in a very few minutes.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Regular order.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think, on reflection, I will stop right here.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have often thought during the progress of this debate that if we on the Republican side were charged with the responsibility of defending a bill open to as many objections as my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has just pointed out, we would not begin the argument by a reference to the present condition of the country. Everybody knows what the state of our financial and industrial affairs was a year ago. The last report of Dun's Commercial Agency for last year showed the

highest level of business activity ever known in the history of our people, an activity in which all occupations of the people shared. Agriculture had its part in that prosperity.

In my own State which I love to think of as the great agricultural area of the earth, the people in every department of business enjoyed a full measure of the general prosperity. In his message of 1892 the chief executive of Iowa, the first Democratic governor in a generation and probably the last we shall ever have, began his address to the Legislature with a general congratulation to our people that never before since the State was organized had everybody enjoyed so universal and widespread prosperity. From the pinnacle of the temple of national fortune the American people deliberately cast themselves down, trusting that Divine Providence would in some peculiar way give His angels charge concerning them to keep them. [Laughter.]

Within one year we find the country in a situation as has baffled the eloquence of my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] and my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] to describe it. The Democratic party came forward at once with a remedy for the panic which followed the accession of Mr. Cleveland. After having attributed all of our misfortunes for thirty years to the protective tariff, after having gone through the campaign of 1892 without mentioning any other subject, they discovered about the first month of last summer that it was the silver policy of 1890 that had wrecked the industries of the United States; and though pledged to the American people to make a speedy and fatal attack upon the protective tariff, nearly a year elapsed before that subject was mentioned at all.

I have never heard anything more perfectly illustrative of the reluctance of the Democratic party to begin their assault on the tariff than the case of a gentleman who was riding in a sleeping car from Chicago to Rockford. He gave the porter a dollar, charging him under no circumstances to fail to put him off, saying that even if he resisted the porter must at all hazards put him off the car. He woke up at Galena without the assistance of the porter and went into the smoking room where that functionary was asleep. He found the porter's clothes torn, his face scratched, and his entire make-up in a state of dilapidation. "Didn't I pay you a dollar," said the indignant traveler, "to wake me up at Rockford?" "Fo de Lawd, Massa," said the mystified darkey, "who on earth do you suppose that man was I I done put off?" [Laughter.] So now we find the Democratic party here, dilapidated, torn with dissensions, wounded in the house of its friends, having disposed of the comparatively harmless question of silver, now at last reluctantly falling into conversation with the main question that has occupied their attention for so many years.

I like to talk about the tariff as well as anybody, but I confess that I sometimes get confused in the mists and fog banks of theory through which we are called to pass in conducting such a discussion. To my mind the tariff question is a question of fact. So that when we find a man in the clouds, in the upper air of speculation, the first thing I try to do is to bring him down to the earth where people live and labor and do business. That I propose to do to-day with the kind attention of the House. The act of 1892, tried by the evidence accessible to everybody, thoroughly justified itself even in the brief time before it was overturned. It had specific objects; and it is historically certain that even in the brief space of two years before the election of 1892 it accomplished these objects in a measure hardly expected even by its friends.

There is no slavery in the world which deludes a man's judgment and binds his faculties like a long devotion to the theory of free trade. It seems to destroy the most useful faculties men have. Common sense is the most splendid possession of the human mind. It is the only absolutely reliable human faculty. If this world were full of philosophers, of statesmen, of orators, of political economists, it would hardly be possible for a plain man to live in it at all. They would talk him to death; or if he escaped that, they would argue him, after the manner of Edward Atkinson's recent address to the workingmen of Boston, into the belief that by some new principle of cookery the shin bone of a beef can be so prepared as not to be distinguished from a sirloin steak. [Laughter.] Fortunately we have had in the history of the country at least four resplendent types of American common sense—Benjamin Franklin, Andrew Jackson, Horace Greeley, and Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

If the young men of the United States can find a doctrine of practical politics upon which that little group of statesmen are agreed, it is a waste of time to hang around the lecture rooms of a free-trade university in the hope of getting a patentable improvement on their wisdom. [Applause.] The doctrine of the protective tariff, vindicated by the united judgment of these men, may be attacked, may even be for a time discredited, but can not be permanently dislodged from the sober judgment of the people. The storm of clamor and hearsay and interest may threaten it, but in the end it will find an anchorage in the public judgment that is sure and steadfast. Can any sane man believe that God gave to our fathers the far-sighted prudence of Benjamin Franklin if he had intended this country to be guided by the advice of John Randolph, who used to say that he would go a mile out of his way to kick a sheep? [Laughter and applause.]

Can it be believed that Andrew Jackson made the 8th day of January notable and famous only to give the Democratic orators of our own times an opportunity to exploit the free-trade notions upon which the ordinance of nullification in South Carolina was predicated in 1832? [Applause.] Is it credible that Horace Greeley, faithful journalist that he was, made a daily record of the free-trade famine, in the midst of which the people celebrated the Christmas of 1854, if the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is now to persuade us that the starving multitudes of that afflicted winter were really enjoying the blessings of a "symmetrical industrial development"? [Laughter.]

Can any man in his senses suppose that Abraham Lincoln was called to think, to labor, to suffer, and at last to die, that through his martyrdom the struggling millions of the earth might be free, if, after all, his countrymen are to cast away his counsel and reorganize their affairs on the lines laid down in the Confederate constitution? [Loud applause.] So that I for one am not discouraged, even if this Congress should enact the proposed bill into law without substantial modification, because I know that the people of the United States, having learned their lesson in the midst of broken fortunes and impoverished industries, will come back speedily to the historic standards of American common sense. [Applause.]

But I started to say that the web of the free-trade theory once wound about a man's judgment absolutely deludes his faculties and leaves him helpless and worthless in the arena of practical affairs; and I want to comment upon that by a few illustrations. None of us wish to disparage any member of Congress; in fact, we would not dare to do it. Between ourselves it will never do for us to assume that anybody could get into this body without having shown symptoms of being a great man. [Laughter.] So I do not wish to disparage the membership of the House. But in East Liverpool, Ohio, last fall they elected a Democrat to represent their interests in Congress [Mr. IKIRT]. I have not the pleasure of his personal acquaintance, but I am told that he is an excellent man. He ran for Congress on the theory that the protective tariff is a fraud, a violation of law, and ought to be immediately displaced by a tariff for revenue only.

Now, you would suppose that a man like that would have been sitting up in the night after his arrival here trying to kill off the protection idea. Yet early in the contest we find our friend before the Ways and Means Committee pleading like a condemned anarchist for the life of the industries that have been built up on the ruins of the Constitution in the neighborhood where he resides. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I will read from his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee to illustrate what I mean. Let us first read the questions propounded to him by that serene philosopher from Maine [Mr. REED]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. REED. How much does that duty—

That is, the 68 per cent on the crockery schedule—

increase the price to the consumer?

Mr. IKIRT. That is a question I can not answer.

Mr. REED. It does increase the price to the consumer, does it not?

Mr. IKIRT. I can not answer the question.

Mr. REED. You think the tariff is a tax added to the price of the article?

Mr. IKIRT. Yes, sir; undoubtedly it is.

Here we have a man wedded to Democratic phrases in the act of receiving his sight, but unable as yet to see men even as trees walking. And so our friend, enslaved by the language of Democratic politics, was absolutely unable to apply it to the practical phases even of the industry he represented. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Let us take another illustration, selected by chance from some of the proceedings in which my amiable friend from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] participated. Now, our friend is a man solid and fixed in the conviction that the tariff is a tax. He may lose his grip on every other question, but that cherished conviction of his soul can not be shaken. It would appear that such is his fanaticism that if he went into a store and bought an article for less than the tariff amounts to, he would still be able to, by a perfect process of reasoning, to convince himself and possibly to convince the people of his district, that in some mysterious way, visible to the mind's eye, though to flesh and sense unknown, he had been compelled to work one day to pay for the article and another to pay the tariff on it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The only man that I have ever heard of who was able to make any impression on the mind of my friend was a witness who came here by authority of Queen Victoria to plead the cause of Bermuda potatoes and to bring tears to the eyes of the Ways and Means Committee by reciting the sad experience of Bermuda onnies. [Laughter.] Now, my friend, full of his theory, was amazed at this witness. The man actually said that the tax was

very burdensome to Bermuda. He went so far as to observe that the farmers of Bermuda paid that tax. This aroused the interest of the gentleman from Nebraska, and he began to suspect that the witness had come to Washington by way of Columbus, and had stopped off between trains for a little talk with McKinley. [Laughter on the Republican side.] So he roused himself and demanded to know what the price of Bermuda vegetables was prior to the McKinley bill. The witness was unable to say. He then asked what the price of those vegetables was after the McKinley bill. The witness could not tell, since the price varied from time to time. And now comes my friend from Nebraska, armed with his theory, and undertakes to make war against the facts in the case.

Mr. BRYAN. How can you tell without knowing the price before the McKinley bill was enacted whether the consumer pays the tariff?

Mr. MASTERS. Well, I was treasurer of the Farmers' Alliance and I know that during the latter part of the present season the shipment of some 10,000 boxes or cases to New York paid 38 cents a box and the freight was 16 cents. They sold for about 60 cents. There was clearly a loss and they brought us in debt. If we did not pay the duty, who did?

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have no doubt that my friend from Nebraska is figuring on that yet. He has not so far appeared in this debate, though we trust he may. I have sometimes thought, however, that he would not, for the reason that last summer he found occasion in this House to account for all the calamities that surround us and all the misfortunes we are heir to by charging them to the demonetization of silver; and it is possible that after having put the workingmen of the country and the farmers of the country at the head of the free-coinage parade he might feel a certain hesitation in overworking them by placing them in a prominent position in the free-trade procession. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

But we will not rest on particular instances. We will enlarge the field of observation a little. I was very much interested the other day when my friend from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], a few years ago president of my old college in West Virginia—I loved him as Tam O'Shanter loved the landlord, like a very brother, though for an entirely different reason [laughter]—opened this debate. I was interested in what he said. I admired his eloquence and wondered how a man could conjure up a scheme of argument like that to contradict the experience of mankind. I was especially interested in his discussion about woolen cloth, how the tariff had been raised to 300 per cent, and how the poor working girl of the United States looked longingly across the sea upon her sister on the other side who was wearing a cloak she could not have without working one day for the garment and four days more to pay the duty on it; and I asked myself whether it would not have been a substantial improvement on the intellectual equipment of my old college president if there had been left in his head room for a few practical ideas. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

My friend talked as if his countrymen were beggars waiting for the cast-off clothing of Europe, and as if the more cow's hair it contained the more ardent ought our expressions of gratitude to be. He dwelt with a solicitude, evidently sincere, upon what happens in the custom-house; but that is not the question. The question is what happens in the homes of the American people. The question is, How are the American people dressed? how have thirty years of protection left the great masses of the people of our country in the matter of clothes? And every man whose mouth is on speaking terms with his mental faculties knows perfectly well that this is the only well-dressed country in the world. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

You may be able to deceive yourselves in this matter, but you can not deceive even a casual traveler from abroad. Here is a little volume just printed by Daniel Owen & Co. (limited), Cardiff, Wales. It contains the letters written from the United States last summer by Lascelles Carr and printed in the Western Mail, the most influential Tory newspaper of Wales, of which he is the editor. The book is entitled "Yankee Land and the Yankees." On page 23 he says:

The more I see of this wonderful country and the further my inquiries reach, the more satisfied I am that it is the paradise of the workingman and especially of the working women. Wages are high and for the workman the cost of living is comparatively low. Except in the matter of house accommodation their circumstances are in every respect better than those of their English brethren. They eat better and more varied food, they dress better, they have at least as good means of education and other sources of intellectual and social recreation. Yesterday evening I stood at a ferry in Jersey City and saw the work girls trooping over in the boat from New York.

The crowd was composed of much the same social elements as those of which the crowd passing over Black Mars bridge consists. But, ah, what a difference in the appearance of these two sets of girls. These New Jersey girls were neatly and appropriately dressed, and not one of them but wore decent, well-fitting, and in some cases, quite elegant boots and shoes. They walked and spoke, and in every way behaved themselves as ladies. Mind you, this is no reflection on our English girls; it is only a reflection on the system under which the working classes are fain to accept such a rate of wages as puts neat clothes and good boots, and the elegance and propriety of behavior which accompany well-paid labor beyond their reach.

The workingwomen of the United States, for whose safety our friend awakened our interest, are not looking in anxious enthusiasm at the cloaks that are on the backs of their sisters in Europe; the workingwomen of America are sending their money to Europe to enable their sisters to get out of the countries where cloaks are so very cheap. [Applause on the Republican side.] Neither are the men, for on page 36 of the same volume Mr. Carr says:

I have several times alluded—once more I change the subject—to the condition of the workingman in this country. The further my inquiries extend the more convinced I become that the real truth of the matter is that in this country a workman earns nearly twice as much as he would in England, and the cost of his living, except in the matter of rent and clothing, is about the same. Even in the matter of clothing the difference is not great, except in so far as it is brought about by the general use of much better clothing by the artisan in this country than in England.

Now, if my friend from West Virginia by some miracle of Divine grace could enlarge his vision to take in that fact, the speech which he delivered here the other day, and which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] was so desirous of seeing in print, would never appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at all. [Laughter.] I wish to say another thing. I have remarked that common sense is the only reliable guide in men's affairs; and the chief guardian and enlightener of common sense is experience. We have had in the United States a good deal of experience with this matter of the tariff; and if I thought you gentlemen would listen to me I would read from the New York Tribune of January 6, 1855, from the pen of grand old Horace Greeley, a few lines which condense the tariff history of the United States into a single paragraph. They are full of truth and wisdom.

A MEMBER. Let us have them:

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will read them:

Protection died in 1818, bequeathing to British free trade a trade that gave us an excess import of specie, a people among whom there existed great prosperity, a large public revenue, and a rapidly diminishing public debt.

British free trade died in 1824, bequeathing to protection a trade that gave an excess export of specie, an impoverished people, a declining public revenue, and a stationary public debt.

Protection died in 1834–'35, bequeathing to British free trade a trade that gave an excess import of specie, a people more prosperous than any that had ever been known, a revenue so that it had been rendered necessary to emancipate from duty tea, coffee, and many other articles which we did not produce, and a treasury free from all charge on account of public debt.

British free trade died in 1842 bequeathing to protection a trade that gave an excess export of specie, a people ruined, and their government in a state of repudiation, a public treasury bankrupt and begging everywhere for loans at the highest rate of interest, a revenue collected and disbursed in irredeemable paper money, and a very large foreign debt.

Protection died in 1847 bequeathing to British free trade a trade that gave an excess import of specie, a highly prosperous people, their government restored to credit, a rapidly growing commerce, a large public revenue, and a declining foreign debt.

British free trade has next to make its will, having nothing to bequeathe but a trade that drains us of our specie, a people rapidly passing toward ruin, a declining commerce, and a foreign debt requiring for the payment of its mere interest at least twenty millions of dollars a year.

Now, my friend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, both in his speech and in the report which was submitted to this House, tells us that the period of the Walker tariff, 1847 to 1857, was the golden age of our industrial prosperity; and there are in existence some statistics, always open to suspicion, that would lead even a careful student to that opinion. I have made it my business during this debate to go down into the daily record of events preserved in the newspaper files in the Library of Congress in order to find out how the people lived in those days, what they did, and what they thought; and I stand here to say that, notwithstanding the discovery of gold in California, notwithstanding that magnificent stream of wealth poured into the channels of American trade, the Walker tariff, going into effect in 1847, had impoverished and bankrupted this people long before the middle of 1854; and I intend to prove that statement to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced man.

I had occasion in the last Congress in a speech made here to cite the daily record made by the New York Tribune; and somebody who was evidently unable to appreciate a man like Horace Greeley, said that he was a protectionist, and therefore, like the wage-earners in their protests against this bill, entirely unreliable and probably intimidated. [Laughter.] I go now into the columns of the free-trade press, and will read a few lines from the New York Herald editorial of January 1, 1855, a free-trade editor's farewell address to one of those years of "symmetrical" prosperity, about which the gentleman from West Virginia told us:

Seldom indeed within our recollection has there been a year so darkly overshadowed by general calamities, national misfortune and local disasters and suffering as the eventful and gloomy year which has just expired. The great financial and commercial panic of 1837 did not bring to us, with all its train of bankruptcies, explosion, and general ruin, so much of positive suffering to the working classes of our great cities, the combined causes which have brought about the existing lamentable financial and commercial depression.

I present here also the memorial of the unemployed working men of the city of New York to the mayor and common council at that time, a memorial which, taken in connection with the speech of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is to me very interesting. We had the pleasure yesterday of

hearing the eloquent observations made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], who seemed to think that he had discovered a remedy for the evils of our times, or that if he had not, the apostle whose follower he is had discovered it; but I call his attention to the fact that the humble working people of New York in 1854, in the midst of the poverty which surrounded them in that city, made a logical, square, and persuasive presentation of the theory which proposes to relieve the people of their distress, by putting the burdens of the Government upon the landed property of the country.

I will print a portion of this memorial, which appears in full in the New York Herald of January 4, 1855:

To the mayor and common council of the city of New York:

The memorial of the undersigned respectfully shows that at a meeting of more than 2,000 unemployed laborers and mechanics of the city of New York commenced in the Park on Tuesday afternoon of the 26th day of December and adjourned from there to Hope Chapel, in Broadway, on the evening of Friday, the 29th of December, for the purpose of providing not merely temporary but permanent relief to the unemployed poor of the city who are now, in addition to their inability to obtain work, threatened with famine, your memorialists were appointed a committee in behalf of the meeting to draw up and cause to be presented to you for your immediate action this memorial.

In an editorial in the New York Herald of January 4, 1855, you will find these words:

The past four months have witnessed a series of disasters affecting most gravely corporation and individual credit, and tending to take away from moneyed institutions and merchants the means on which they have traded for the last year or two. Stocks of various kinds have ceased to exist altogether. Railroad shares have fallen to the verge of bankruptcy, and individual paper has ceased to be negotiable.

That seems to be a fac simile of the condition that has prevailed this year. Here is another editorial from the New York Herald of January 6, 1855, showing that the depression to which the newspaper referred was not confined to the city of New York:

Elsewhere will be found some mention of large failures at Boston and New Orleans. The epidemic is traveling over the whole country. No city of any note can expect to escape. All followed the example of New York when flush times began. All must now follow her as closely in adversity.

You will find in the Herald of January 6, 1855, an address of the unemployed workingmen's committee to the mayor of the city of New York. It was read by Mr. West. He said:

We do not come before the committee as beggars, but we ask what we deem right. We ask not alms, but work. We don't want a little soup now and some cast-off clothing to-morrow. But we do want work and the means of making an honest livelihood. The condition of the working classes is most piteous. They want bread. Is there not enough in the city? They want clothes. Is there none made nowadays?

In the same column appears an appeal of the Five Points Mission House for the multitudes, victims of starvation in that portion of the city. It exhibits a picture that even now would touch the heart with pity if it were not in the midst of surroundings substantially the same, and surroundings, in my judgment, depending in main part upon the same causes.

It is well known—

Says the appeal—

to those who are acquainted with that locality, that hundreds of families have sold or pawned the last article of furniture or apparel to procure food, and are now left on the bare floor without bedding or fuel, and not knowing where they may get the next mouthful to eat. Persons in these circumstances (many of them sober, industrious people) are thronging the Mission House daily.

Mr. TERRY. What year do those quotations refer to?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The close of 1854 and January, 1855.

Mr. TERRY. How long did that depressed condition continue?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The next thing we hear of it is the message of James Buchanan of December 8, 1857, stating that it had become epidemic, universal, and chronic in the United States.

Mr. TERRY. I will ask the gentleman whether the condition of the country did not improve afterwards——

Mr. DOLLIVER. There is little evidence of it. So far as I can find the condition of the country during that period was such that few of us would have been able to live in it.

Mr. TERRY. In that statement the gentleman differs from a very distinguished member of his party (Mr. Blaine), who shows that after that there was a revival of business.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have gone to the sources of information; I do not care with whom I may differ, even if he be our most distinguished leader.

I will read also an editorial article from Hunt's Merchants' Magazine, a free-trade journal of trade, and the only one that is preserved from that period:

The commercial embarrassments noticed in our last have been continued, and in many sections of the country the pressure has increased, while confidence is shaken everywhere and all classes are made to realize the insecurity of worldly possessions. The causes which led to this have been a long time at work. The prosperity which prevailed almost universally up to the middle of last year had made our business men so confident in their own strength that all classes had expanded their engagements far beyond the protection of their own resources, and were exposed to the storm which began to gather on every side. Goods which had accumulated abroad when the demand had almost ceased were crowded upon our shores at whatever advance could be obtained, thus aggravating the evil.—*Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, volume 31, page 716, December, 1854.

This article shows that the depression to which I have been referring visibly began in the middle of the year 1853, a thing which it will be important to students of this situation to bear in mind. It may be worth while, also, to call the attention of the committee to the fact that during all this depression the antics of the Democratic party were very similar to their behavior in the present Congress. I read from a Washington letter to the New York Herald of January 6, 1855. It is a ray of calcium light thrown on the background of the situation:

Next Tuesday is the day fixed upon by the Committee on Ways and Means to call up the bill for the reduction of the tariff.

And here is a letter from Washington to the North American, quoted in the New York Herald of 1855:

The conspiracy of the Democratic members to break down the tariff of 1846, and to deprive the country of the little protection which it affords was considerably advanced last evening by a secret meeting or caucus held at the Capitol sometime between dark and midnight.

It was supposed that the present Congress had furnished us with the first example in our history of a secret caucus without deliberation, publicity, or discussion, agreeing upon an industrial programme for the American people. We are glad to relieve the members of the Ways and Means Committee of to-day by citing the example of their predecessors. Then, as now, the secret Democratic caucus and the public soup house went together.

Our city reporters—

Says the New York Herald editorial of January 14, 1855—

note that Mr. A. T. Stewart supplies from nine to twelve hundred people daily with soup. Mr. Lindenmüller does the same in Chatham street, and charitable committees discharge a like duty in each of the populous wards of the city.

If this had been read without giving the date of the paper everybody would have said that it was from the New York Herald of to-day. Here is a workingman's procession described in the New York Herald of January 11, 1855. To-day is the thirty-ninth anniversary of that great demonstration of unemployed workmen. Its banners will serve to illustrate the situation that now prevails:

We want work and must have it.
Hunger is a sharp thorn.
This is our last resource.
Live and let live.

I call the attention of the Democratic managers to the fact that these starving multitudes were not asking for a reduction of the tariff, they were not even asking for cheap clothes and cheap food. They were asking for the privilege of being employed. The country can gain no advantage through cheap goods that can at all compare in its ministration of good to the community which comes from the universal employment of the people. There is no burden levied at the custom-house, whether it is 100 per cent or 500 per cent, that can compare at all with the incalculable burden of three millions of willing workers without anything for their hands to do. [Applause.]

A MEMBER. Did you say three millions of unemployed persons?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I saw that number stated in a great newspaper. I have no doubt there are more of them. This matter long since ceased to be a mere question of politics with me. The saddest sight I ever witnessed in this Capitol was that delegation from Philadelphia, intelligent, well-dressed, manly young workingmen, standing before the Ways and Means Committee pleading, as they said, not for their employers, but for their employment, for their wives and their children. These men stated that the working people of Philadelphia are without occupation, and in many cases without food. They said that they represented 200,000 people, one-fifth of the population of the greatest industrial city on this continent.

Now it is a libel upon our common manhood and a slander against human nature itself, to say that these men were intimidated except as their actions were influenced by the facts and circumstances that surround them. And so when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means stood here and undertook to tell us the other day that the hundreds of thousands of workingmen of the United States who have protested by petition and in great public meetings against this bill have done so under duress from their employers and had been bullied and driven here by brutal threats, I could not keep out of my heart a sense of indignation at the disparagement of the workingmen of the United States implied by that reproach against their manhood. [Applause.]

The chairman went further, and in the same breath illustrated the attitude of our greatest and most thoughtful trades unions and the mass of our laboring people in looking with a protest of alarm upon this bill by the bogus petitions of John Quincy Adams's time, in which slaves were brought into this House by petition asking that their slavery might be made perpetual. Horace Greeley once said that the man who pretends to be in favor of high wages and a low tariff is either a knave or a fool.

Has it come to this that the doctrine of free trade, the favorite article in the creed of slavery, can not be resisted by the working people of the United States, enlightened as they are both by experience and by the wisdom of faithful and approved statesmen, without inviting from a leader of the Democratic party an odious and infamous comparison with slaves. [Applause on Republican side.]

A great deal has been said in the course of this tariff controversy from time to time about the working people of the United States and about the farmers. If there is anything that stirs up pathetic sentiment in the heart of the Democratic politician more than the distress of the workingman it is the distress of the farmer. As I said, I live in the greatest agricultural community in the world. It is true, as the gentleman from Illinois observed, that we have some mortgage indebtedness, because wherever you find wealth and prosperity accompanied by a business integrity that never repudiated a debt or dodged the fulfillment of a contract, you will find the credit which lies at the basis of investment and enterprise.

The States that are freest of individual debts in the United States are shown by the census to be the poorest and by the record to be given over to questionable business methods and in many cases to the open repudiation of their obligations. These States are comparatively free from mortgages, not on account of the thrift of their people, but by reason of the well-grounded caution of people who have money to loan. I know something personally of mortgages, having contributed at least one to the census of 1890. It represented the amount I paid for my homestead when I was without a dollar in the world and had to convert credit into a mortgage. I do not believe that it increased my poverty; on the contrary I have always suspected that it increased my wealth. And it does not take a very high order of intelligence to discern that that simple case represents the situation of nine-tenths of those who are in debt in the State of Iowa.

That is not a matter of speculation. It was made a matter of investigation and record in the county of Crawford, in my own Congressional district, where the census showed that 90 per cent of the indebtedness of the people represented the purchase price of land and only an insignificant fraction of the people's debts represented either their misfortune or their poverty. It is true that our people have suffered from time to time through the depression of business and the decline of market values; but we have been bombarded for a generation with humbug arguments for free trade; and the grand Commonwealth stands to-day first in the column of Republican States with the doctrine of protection made secure by the intelligence of the farmers of Iowa. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My friend [Mr. WILSON] in closing his address to the House took occasion to set up the standard of free trade; that is to say, the standard of plantation politics before the war in the United States; and as he called the Democratic party to rally around it in the name of the workingman and of the farmer, I made up my mind at the first opportunity to tell him that the farmers of the State of Iowa want none of the theories any less of the sympathy of the Democratic managers in this House. [Applause on the Republican side.] They talk about their affection for the farmer! Yet even the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] who has just taken his seat has just stated that if wisdom such as his could have left its impress on the proposed legislation he would have framed the bill in respect to the schedule of agricultural products exactly as the McKinley bill was framed.

What have these demonstrative friends of the farmers done? I recall very well the day when somebody introduced me to our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. STEVENS]. I took up the Congressional Directory and found that he was the largest individual woolen mill proprietor in the United States. When I saw him go over to the Democratic side and sit down my heart came into my mouth and I said, "Those fellows will murder that man." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I was young in this business then. I had at that time a tendency to believe everything I heard in speeches, and used to sit here listening as the precious truths fell from the lips of the orators. I heard these woolen manufacturers denounced as thieves, as burglars, as cutthroats, as pirates, and as pickpockets, fastening their smooth fingers upon the pockets of the American farmer, and I said, "If that woolen manufacturer goes over there, BRYAN and SPRINGER or some of those brethren will get around him, draw him into ambush, and murder him in cold blood." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But the next thing I heard of it was that the Democratic managers had placed him on the Ways and Means Committee of the House to help lift the burdens from American agriculture; and how did they lift them? Exactly as this House is about to do. They take the seventh agricultural industry of the American people, wool-growing, and put it into helpless and hopeless competition with those latitudes of the world where the business can be conducted almost without cost, all in order that the "thieves and burglars" of New England may have cheaper material out of which to manufacture cloth. Now, we do not take the view that the managers of industrial enterprise in New England or elsewhere are thieves and burglars. We have sense enough to know that these great centers of production are managed by men of affairs with economy and integrity, and if the people of New England prosper the people of our country have never had any quarrel with them on that account, because we have things to sell and we wish our customers to have money with which to buy them.

So the Republican party has never encouraged a quarrel with New England on that account; but when I find this masquerade of reform sacrificing the seventh agricultural industry of the country in order to increase the advantages of the woolen manufacturers of New England, I say to myself that nothing can compare to the thrift of New England, except the stupidity and the hypocrisy of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Republican side.] What else have they done? They have taken every article that the farmers of the United States produce and either put it on the free list or so greatly reduced the duty as to invite an immediate increase of importation; and in order that I may not be suspected of partisan bias in that judgment, I want to read what the greatest Democratic newspaper in the United States has to say this morning of their treatment of the American farmer. I quote from the New York Sun of to-day:

Prof. WILSON'S service to the great silent masses, the farmers, is the putting of a lot of agricultural products on the free list for the benefit of their Canadian competitors, and the increasing of the farmers' taxes for the benefit of manufacturers. The great silent masses must bear additional burdens in order that the manufacturers, protected and favored by the remission of duties on raw materials and by the continuation of protective duties on the manufactured products, may wax fat while the silent masses are plodding their way with WILSON taxation weighing them down.

I wish also to say a word about the wages of the working people of the United States. This country will find out within the next five years that Mr. Blaine was right in stating that the tariff question is essentially a question of wages. The lesson will come through experience; and for one I am not sorry for it, because the Ruler of the Universe has only one way in which to teach men and nations, and that is to send them along the pathway of experience.

The trouble with this country to-day is that a whole generation has grown up in the United States since we have had any practical experience on the other side of the tariff question; and so dreams and visions and mysteries and speculations, drawn mostly from the text-books of foreign political economists, have taken the place of the knowledge which would have saved the American people from the folly of 1892. And even now we are regaled in this debate with long extracts from Adam Smith, brought into this House as novelties, as if the American people had never heard of Mr. Smith. Adam Smith printed his book the same year that our fathers declared their independence; and if the people of the United States had desired to govern themselves by the wisdom of the father of English political economy they have had more than a century to read his book and apply his philosophy to their affairs.

It is an interesting fact that while our Ways and Means Committee is enlightening this debate by bringing into it the precepts of English political economists, old and new, great English statesmen like Lord Salisbury, speaking to the English silk-weavers and observing the almost total destruction of that great English industry, looked upon the maxims of his own school and mournfully declared that their application might be sound philosophy, but it was poor business. Nor is it remarkable that the editor of the Cardiff Mail, recently returned from an extended tour with a party of friends through the United States, takes the trouble to print the little book, of which I have already quoted freely, in which the sturdy Welsh good sense candidly admits that the situation and experience of the United States have contradicted the economical speculations in which his judgment had always yielded a ready acquiescence. He says:

I am, as you know, a convinced free trader. Protection is to mean economical heresy, the fraud and folly of which are capable of mathematical demonstration—demonstration as absolutely convincing as that by which the solution of a problem in Euclid is arrived at. And yet throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent one is almost daily brought face to face with solid, indisputable facts that seem to give the lie to the soundest and most universally accepted axioms of political economy. Let me give you just one example: Under the shadow of a stringent protective tariff the manufacture of paper was commenced in the United States. Paper is still subject to a heavy import duty. According to our theories that ought to enhance its price to the consumer in this country.

As a matter of fact, the New York newspaper proprietors buy their "news" at a less price than that at which it could be supplied to them in London, and some of the paper mills in New Jersey are actually exporting paper to the old country. Unless it can be shown that this paper industry would have grown up without the aid of a protective tariff, it is futile—nay, it is an impertinence—for an outsider to say that the Americans have acted unwisely in taxing themselves for a few years in order to establish in their midst a great industry, giving occupation to a great quantity of highly paid labor. And it seems to me that this set of facts and the arguments based on

it apply to many other industries which are assuming such colossal proportions throughout the length and breadth of the land.—*Yanks Land and the Yankees*, page 53.

Now, I like the English. They have never in any emergency failed to take care of themselves. I hope we have not lost our inheritance in that serviceable turn of mind. I can easily see how the problem of cheap production has driven English statesmanship to ignore every other element that enters into the life of man, resisting even that reduction in the hours of labor which is the hope of the working people of the world. So that I never tried to convince an Englishman that his countrymen have not had sagacity enough to look after their own interests. All I object to is that the leaders of English opinion should feel called upon, having taken care of their own people, to propose a plan for taking care of us.

I have an old friend at home, a farmer, who comes in occasionally to see me, a great talker, especially on the tariff. He likes to argue with the Democrats. Every time they make an argument in favor of the free-trade theory the old man always begins his reply with these words, "I recollect." If the Republican party in 1892 had had to do with men and women able to recollect what had happened in the experience of the United States we would have avoided the folly of that election.

Now, what of the labor condition in the United States? I believe that if our civilization is ever destroyed it will be by the degradation of American wages. This Government has no facility, for any length of time, to take care of universal popular discontent. In other countries it may be done with armies. In this country it may be done for months with soup-houses and with the bread of charity; but in the long run the idleness will destroy the fabric of our institutions and produce the irresponsible and uncontrollable forces that may shake the structure of modern society to its foundation.

I heard my friend from Illinois [Gen. BLACK] the other day, and who of us could express the amazement with which we heard him, deliberately advising the degradation of American labor in order to discourage immigration? Why, gentlemen, it is a great thing for a nation to be able to take care of itself. It is more than any nation in Europe has been able to do; but the glory of the Republican party is that for thirty years we have not only taken care of our own, but we have opened the doors of hospitality to the struggling people of the world, and they have come, ten millions of them, and instead of bearing down the level of our civilization they have helped us to lift it up, until to-day the American workingman has within his reach a larger share of the comforts of life than could have been secured by a day's work in any nation of the world or in any age in the history of the human race. [Applause.] That statement does not depend upon my testimony alone, for we recall that in the midst of the eloquent remarks of my friend from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], last summer in the silver debate, he made that notable admission in the cause of truth and political integrity, that a day's work in the United States goes further to provide a family with the necessaries of life than ever before since society was organized. [Applause.]

Where did the idea come from that the American workingman ought to take his place on the level of the civilization of the Old World? My countrymen, it came from the plantations of the slave power, where labor received no wages, and where the leaders of politics openly maintained that proposition in express words. Gen. McDuffie, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in 1832, without quibble or equivocation, admitted on this floor that the wages of American labor under free trade would fall to the level of the wages paid in other countries, and boldly declared that it ought to be so. That idea lies historically at the bottom of the free-trade agitation in the United States, and I denounce it here in the name of every American family that buys the comforts of life with the wages of daily labor. [Applause].

The Republican party, whatever may be the discipline of its defeat, will never consent to take away from the firesides of American labor the shield of American law. My friend from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] speaks of the lordly and almost kingly tone in which the employers of labor describe the unfortunate strikes which prevailed in some of the departments of industry in 1892. He emphasizes what the organ of the iron and steel industry describes as "the rebellion of labor." I do not undertake to apologize for the phrase; but I stand here to say that if there was a rebellion of labor it was a rebellion against organized capital and not an active hostility against the protective tariff, and if any proof was necessary I need only call the attention of this House to the fact that the "rebellious" Association of Iron and Steel Workers came before the Ways and Means Committee at this session pleading for the maintenance of the tariff of 1890 while Andrew Carnegie, departing for the Valley of the Nile for a winter's vacation, made a farewell address to his fellow-citizens by advising them to support the Wilson tariff bill.

There is one case in which the protests of labor were not the result of intimidation for it would almost seem that the arguments which have brought American labor to this Capitol with its protests have secured for the Wilson bill from the most repulsive syndicate of capital the benediction of approval. I am content if the indorsement of Andrew Carnegie costs the Democratic party as many votes in times to come as it has caused us in times past. We gladly exchange the support of the syndicate of iron and steel employers for the good will of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.

A great many people talk as if in the general decline of values the American farmer had been left behind. I intend to put into the body of my remarks a few observations made by my friend, once a member of this House, Senator MILLS, of Texas, a man whose tariff bill in the light of the present seems like the work of a statesman. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It is a profound study of the relation of American agriculture to the decline of values in recent times, a study which enabled the Senator to prove upon the floor of the Senate that while the products of the American farmer have declined in value in thirty years their fall has come far short in the fall of the value of every article that is essential to the comfort of farm life of the United States.

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891.

Years.	Silver, per fine ounce.	Gold value of silver dollar.	Articles that farmers sell.									
			Cotton, per pound.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Bacon and hams, per pound.	Lard, per pound.	Pork, per pound.	Beef, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.	Tobacco, per pound.
			Cents.	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1873	$1.32	$1.004	18.8	61	$1.31	8.8	9.2	7.8	7.7	21.1	13.1	10.7
1874	1.30	.988	15.4	71	1.43	9.6	9.4	8.2	8.2	25.0	13.1	9.6
1875	1.23	.964	15.0	54	1.12	11.4	13.8	10.1	8.7	23.7	13.5	11.3
1876	1.17	.894	12.9	67	1.24	12.1	13.3	10.6	8.7	23.9	12.6	10.4
1877	1.18	.929	11.8	58	1.17	10.8	10.9	9.0	7.5	20.6	11.8	10.2
1878	1.16	.891	11.1	56	1.34	8.7	8.8	6.8	7.7	18.0	11.4	8.7
1879	1.12	.868	9.9	47	1.07	6.9	7.0	5.7	6.3	14.2	8.4	7.8
1880	1.13	.886	11.5	54	1.25	6.7	7.4	6.1	6.4	17.1	9.5	7.7
1881	1.12	.881	11.4	55	1.11	8.2	9.3	7.7	6.5	19.8	11.1	8.3
1882	1.13	.878	11.4	66	1.19	9.9	11.6	9.0	8.5	19.3	11.0	8.5
1883	1.10	.858	10.8	68	1.13	11.2	11.9	9.9	8.9	18.6	11.2	8.3
1884	1.10	.861	10.5	61	1.07	10.2	9.5	7.9	7.6	18.2	10.3	9.1
1885	1.06	.823	10.6	54	.86	9.3	7.9	7.2	7.5	16.8	9.3	9.9
1886	.99	.769	9.9	49	.87	7.5	6.9	5.9	6.0	15.6	8.3	9.6
1887	.97	.758	9.5	47	.89	7.9	7.1	6.6	5.4	15.8	9.3	8.7
1888	.97	.727	9.8	55	.85	8.6	7.7	7.4	5.3	18.3	9.9	8.3
1889	.98	.724	9.9	47	.80	8.6	8.6	7.4	5.5	16.5	9.3	8.6
1890	1.06	.809	10.1	41	.82	7.7	7.1	6.0	5.4	14.4	9.0	8.7
1891	.98	.764	10.0	57	.93	7.6	6.9	5.9	5.6	14.5	9.0	
Average decrease	20	20	53	0	30	14	25	34	27	22	31	19

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891—Continued.

Years.	Articles that farmers buy.																			Freight rate, per ton per mile.
	Refined sugar, per pound.	Cut nails, per pound.	Bar iron, per ton.	Steel rails, per ton.	Rio coffee, per pound.	Tea, per pound.	Sheeting, per yard.	Drilling, per yard.	Shirting, per yard.	Standard prints, per yard.	Print cloth, per yard.	Quinine, per ounce.	Goblets, per dozen.	10 by 14 window glass.	Undershirts.	Ginghams, per yard.	Carpets, 3-ply ingrain, per yard.	Black pepper, per pound.	Molasses, per gallon.	
	Cts.	Cts.			Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.		Cts.			Cts.		Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
1873	11.6	4.90	$86.00	$120.50	18	95	13.31	14.13	19.41	11.37	6.69	$2.65	85	$3.40	$1.41	13	$1.14	19	39	2.00
1874	10.5	3.99	67.00	94.25	20	100	11.42	11.75	18.04	9.75	5.57	2.50	80	2.97	1.25	11	1.02	20	71	.....
1875	10.8	3.42	60.00	68.75	18	60	10.41	11.12	15.12	8.71	5.33	2.25	70	3.18	1.12	10	.92	17	70	.....
1876	10.7	2.98	52.00	59.25	17	55	8.85	8.71	13.58	7.06	4.10	2.00	65	3.08	1.00	10	.82	14	55	.....
1877	11.6	2.57	45.00	45.50	20	55	8.46	8.46	12.46	6.77	4.38	3.00	50	2.97	.91	8	.81	14	54	.....
1878	10.2	2.31	44.00	42.25	17	45	7.80	7.65	11.00	6.09	3.44	3.50	45	2.42	.87	8	.75	12	40	.....
1879	8.5	2.69	51.00	48.25	14	40	7.97	7.57	11.62	6.25	3.93	3.60	40	2.42	.83	8	.67	12	36	.....
1880	9.0	3.68	60.00	67.50	15	40	8.51	8.51	12.74	7.41	4.51	3.00	40	2.42	.83	9	.85	14	53	1.36
1881	9.2	3.09	58.00	61.13	13	35	8.51	8.06	12.74	7.00	3.75	2.60	35	2.12	.83	8	.75	14	43	1.25
1882	9.7	3.47	61.00	48.50	10	35	8.45	8.25	12.95	6.50	3.76	2.45	35	2.12	.79	9	.78	17	50	1.28
1883	9.2	3.06	50.00	37.75	8	33	8.32	7.11	12.93	6.00	3.60	1.80	35	2.22	.79	8	.74	16	52	1.23
1884	7.1	2.39	44.00	30.75	11	33	7.28	6.86	10.40	6.00	3.36	1.43	33	2.16	.75	7	.66	15	50	1.13
1885	6.4	2.33	40.00	28.50	9	33	6.75	6.36	10.37	6.00	3.12	.83	30	1.91	.70	6	.58	14	45	1.04
1886	6.7	2.27	43.00	34.50	9	33	6.78	6.25	10.66	6.00	3.31	.70	28	2.04	.70	6	.58	14	44	1.04
1887	6.0	2.30	49.00	37.08	15	28	7.15	6.58	10.58	6.00	3.33	.53	28	1.70	.66	7	.60	15	40	1.03
1888	6.3	2.03	44.00	29.83	15	23	7.25	6.75	10.94	6.50	3.81	.49	27	1.75	.66	6	.53	15	38	0.97
1889	7.6	2.00	43.00	29.25	16	23	7.00	6.75	10.50	6.50	3.81	.38	26	1.70	.66	6	.52	13	39	0.97
1890	7.0	2.00	45.00	31.75	19	25	7.00	6.75	10.20	6.00	3.34	.35	26	1.70	.64	6	.48	10	40	0.93
1891	5.7	1.86	42.00	29.92	18	25	6.83	6.41	10.64	6.00	2.95	.30	25	1.70	.62	6	.50	9	32	0.92
Average decrease	50	62	51	75	11	73	48	55	45	47	56	89	70	50	56	54	56	52	53	54

Average reduction in ten farm products, 26.1.

Average reduction in nineteen other products, 55.4.

This table shows that from 1873 to 1891 silver fell 26 per cent, cotton 53, corn 6, wheat 30, bacon and hams 14, lard 25, pork 24, beef 27, butter 32, cheese 31, and tobacco 19. These are the articles which farmers sell. The average decline of the ten articles is 26.1 per cent between 1873 and 1891. During the same time refined sugar declined 50 per cent, nails 62, bar iron 51, steel rails 75, Rio coffee 11, tea 73, sheeting 48, drilling 55, shirting 45, standard prints 47, print cloth 56, quinine 89, glass goblets 70, 10 by 14 window glass 50, undershirts 56, ginghams 54, carpets 56, pepper 52, molasses 53.

These are the articles the farmer buys. Now, if what he buys declines at an equal ratio with what he sells he is just as well off at one time as another. But if what he buys falls more in price than what he sells he is benefited. When we average the articles he buys we find that the decline is 55.4 per cent.

What is our situation to-day? I do not intend to say even a word about the industrial depression that surrounds us. God knows that it is bad enough, and God knows that it is plain enough, without the necessity of a description and without the need of an argument. Mr. Blaine very truly says, in his discussion of the tariff in Twenty Years in Congress, that in all the industrial depressions of the past the American people have never failed to turn from low duties to the standard of protection. He says that never once was a financial or industrial panic in the United States relieved by turning from protection toward free trade. In the disturbance of 1857, while possibly the panic was mixed with financial complications, the remedy proposed by the Democratic President was an adjustment of our affairs along the lines of a protective tariff.

I used to think that Mr. Buchanan was a weak and practically useless public man, and that he failed in yielding to the events which surrounded him at the outbreak of the rebellion. I have lived long enough to revise that impression. He was a man of culture, of large faculties, and of approved statesmanship, and if he fell short in the crisis of the civil war it was because he was dealing with a situation in which the Supreme Governor of the Universe had put his hand upon American society to revolutionize and reform it; and I believe the human race never produced a man strong enough to stand erect in that storm and come between Providence and the Divine purpose to create a nation strong enough to resist disintegration, and grand enough to cast off the barbarism of slavery. [Applause.]

And so I have quite revised my idea of James Buchanan. The remedy which he proposed was not a new one. It had already been suggested in his annual message of January 2, 1855, by Myron H. Clarke, governor of the State of New York, before the Republican party was born, in these words:

> Many branches of domestic industry are languishing for lack of that protection which proper tariff regulations would have afforded, which, had they been seasonably adopted, would have averted much of the distress consequent upon the paralysis of business which now pervades the country.

The remedy was to return to the protective tariff, and when my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, described the tariff then enacted as a war tariff, I answer him that it was a tariff enacted for economical and commercial purposes before the war began and signed by the last Democratic President save one.

Mr. Chairman, what is the remedy for the evils that now surround us? Our people are without work. Is it possible that the human mind is capable of the folly of seeking to correct that situation by sending the people's work to be done in other countries? The remedy for the evils that surround us is the employment of our people. That makes for the general prosperity. In the year that followed the enactment of the tariff law of 1890, no willing hand from one end of the country to the other was without occupation.

Every woolen mill and factory was in motion. More than a hundred new industries had been established and the American people, as President Harrison showed in his last message, had touched the highest level of prosperity. That seems now as if it were a generation away. Yet it was a condition to which we may go back if we do not blindly despise the wisdom of our fathers. The opportunity to work measures the ability to buy. The ability to buy creates the American market place. Destroy that or discourage it and the American farm goes back to the open prairie from which it came. Out West we long ago went through the experience of having nobody in the United States to buy what we had to sell.

In 1892 we thought we were beyond that experience. We had found the bread-producing power of the world at last overtaken by the bread-consuming power of the world and we believed that the permanent prosperity of American agriculture had at last come. To-day we are confronted with the spectacle of two or three millions of our customers deprived of their ability to buy, whereby the American market place is degraded and the welfare of the American farm threatened. I beg of you, gentlemen, by the counsel of every great statesman this country has produced, from Washington to Lincoln, to save the American people from re-enacting the folly which has already four times in our history destroyed our industrial and commercial prosperity. [Prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that possibly the discussion of the theory upon which this whole question rests may be supposed to have been exhausted, and yet perhaps a small portion of my time applied to that branch of the subject may not be wholly wasted.

In the first place the justice of a system which professedly, as protection does, aims to benefit one class of the community at the expense of another is certainly open to question on its very face. For instance, it would be manifestly unjust if this Congress were to pass laws reducing the selling value of manufactured articles in order that the consumer might be benefited.

I say it would be unjust to me as a manufacturer if this Congress by legislation should arbitrarily put down the price of the goods that I put upon the market; yet that would be a proposition (comparatively) easy to defend. Why? Because I am but a single individual and have hundreds, or possibly thousands, of customers, and it might be contended with some plausibility that the good done to the greater number was a justification for

the injury done to me. I am sure, however, that as an ethical proposition, it would be difficult to maintain.

But when you turn to the opposite side of this proposition and contend that it is the duty of this body to make laws to put up the price of my goods, then the wrong is manifest to all creation, because then the injury which in the other case fell upon one in order that good might come to many, now falls upon many in order that good may come to one. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Then examine briefly the economic principle which is involved, *i. e.*, the idea that protective tariffs increase national wealth. Let us, if you please, go the whole length with gentlemen on the other side, and admit, as was contended by my eloquent and learned friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] yesterday, that it is within the constitutional power of Congress to impose taxes upon one class of the people in order that the proceeds of such taxes may be poured into the pockets of another class; let us, I say, admit for an instant that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right, and that the principle he endeavored to establish is correct. I do not admit it in fact, but for the purpose of this argument I do admit for the moment what most men here believe to be untrue, that Congress has a constitutional right to put burdens upon a portion of the people in order to enrich another; and then, I ask, can you justify the act?

Let us see whether your plan would produce a large increase of national wealth, whether it would increase the fund out of which wages are paid; and if it would not, then it would be unwise, even if you had the Constitution upon your side, as you have not. On what grounds can a man appear before an intelligent committee of this body and ask protection on his line of manufacture? What are his claims for protection? His first claim is that he can not pay as large wages as his neighbor; his next plea must be that capital is too high in this country for him to employ it in his line of industry. These two claims are the sole grounds upon which he can ask for protection.

Now, what does it mean? We are a practical kind of people, and we ought to be able to get to the bottom of a question no more intricate than this. What does this mean, I say? It simply means that capital and labor employed in the ordinary industries of the United States are more profitably employed than they would be in the industry in which he proposes to use them. Now follow me if you please. When does a man grow rich fastest? When he employs all his capital and talents in the form of business or the calling which is profitable. All will admit this. It is not when he employs a portion of his time and a part of his capital in a profitable industry, and the balance in a business which loses him money every day. No sensible man continues long to carry on business in that way. Sooner or later he discovers that he can make no money in the unprofitable enterprise. What does he do? He takes the capital and labor which he employed in the unprofitable line of business and carries them over into the one that is profitable.

This ought to be the policy of a great country, for what is a nation but an aggregation of individuals? But, on the contrary, what do we find? We find gentlemen claiming that it is unprofitable to put capital into certain manufactures. They come before the Ways and Means Committee (and I have wondered why that committee did not always put these men who appear before them under oath. The habit of allowing Tom, Dick, and Harry to come before a great committee and tell that committee any fairy tale they choose should be terminated)——

Mr. REED. I think that has been reduced to a minimum before the present committee.

Mr. HARTER. The House is always glad to hear from the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]; and I confess I am never sorry.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Mr. HARTER. If the gentleman desires to ask me a question——

Mr. REED. I merely remarked that the thing you are complaining of—the committee listening to Thomas, Richard, and Henry—has been reduced to a minimum by the present Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HARTER. I give the committee credit for the possession of good sense; but if I were chairman of that committee, or had any influence in the committee, any manufacturer, or anybody else coming before it and proposing to give testimony upon which he hoped to obtain legislation in this House, taking away from the earnings of his fellow-citizens for his private gain, if he refused to give his testimony under oath so that he might be indictable for perjury if he lied, I would ask the doorkeeper of the committee, if I were not able to do it myself, to kick him away from the door of the committee room. The failure to require such statements to be made under oath in all cases is, in my view, one of the prime causes of the mistakes which have been made in our tariff system from 1792 down to the present hour.

But allow me to follow up the argument I was making. A man comes saying, "Because the employment of capital in my business is unprofitable, because I can not afford to pay for labor what my neighbors can, therefore the balance of the country should be taxed in order that I may withdraw labor and capital from where they are properly and profitably employed and put them into a sink-hole which you are to fill up afterward with taxes wrung from the people." Why, gentlemen, any man who would pursue such a system as that in his private business would become a bankrupt. The mystery to me is that the able, intelligent, accomplished, oratorical men upon my right, when they discover a great industry built up in this way by taxing profitable enterprise, say that all the people of the country ought to fall down and worship this ruinous policy, bless the industry itself, and thank God that they have had a body of legislators so wise as to build it up.

Any man looking at this matter as he looks at the things of everyday life, as the merchant and the manufacturer regard their business affairs, as our wives in the kitchen or in the parlor look at questions of domestic ecomomy, must say at once that this is the worst kind of economic waste; for so long as it is conceded that protection is necessary for any industry, just so long it is admitted that that industry is unprofitable; and the higher you build it, the more men you employ in carrying it on, the more injury it is to the country.

You can not create capital; you can not manufacture labor by act of Congress. Hence the capital and the labor which go into these protected, unprofitable industries must come from where? From the profitable industries of the country which require no protection. Is it not easy, then, to see that by such a policy not only do you not help the industries of the country, not only do you not build up the wealth of the country, but you injure the nation in two ways; you strike it two blows. By your laws you build up unprofitable enterprises, and at the same time in doing so you tear down the profitable industries of the country by compelling the withdrawal of a portion of the labor and capital employed in them. Therefore, I say, from any point of view it is a mistake, an economic blunder.

But the next proposition, Mr. Chairman, ordinarily brought in by these gentlemen is that labor has been benefited by this system. The positive, natural, logical answer to this, an answer so plain that in my judgment a blind man could read it, is that after you have adopted a system and carried it on thus constantly, which retards the growth and increase of the capital of the country, you simply reduce the fund out of which the wages of labor are paid, and as a consequence wages are reduced.

It is not necessary, Mr. Chairman, to go further than this plain and indeed self-evident proposition to answer the unfounded claim that high taxes make high wages. You injure the workman in two different ways, however. Under your plan, which increases the cost of the goods, or rather the selling value of the goods made by the protected manufacturer, you diminish the purchasing power of the wages of the laborer, while by reducing the fund out of which the wages of the laborer are to be paid you have already reduced the compensation he receives for his labor. A protective tariff is simply a plan for taking money out of the workingman's pocket; and to suggest that it would have the effect of enriching him is about as sensible as to propose to make him a millionaire by taking gold out of his pockets and filling them up again with lead, ashes, gravel, or sand. [Laughter.]

But speaking of the labor proposition. There are many things about it which are worthy of consideration. Before we had tariff taxes at all in this country, the difference in wages between the United States and Europe was much greater than it is now. It seems to me that there has been too much silence even on our side on this branch of the subject, and it is a suggestive omission, it strikes me, in the speech of my good friend from Iowa who has just taken his seat, that he did not mention the fact that under our low tariffs wages were higher as compared with the wages of European mechanics and laborers than they are now or ever have been under high-tariff taxation when gold is used to measure them. It is the fact, and you need not go any further than the argument I have made to show the cause of it. How could in any way a protective tariff benefit the workingman? Is there any method by which you can pour prosperity into his pocket, except by freeing him from the clutches of the high-tariff taxers? When you increase the cost of the clothing of himself and his family and of those things that he consumes you must necessarily injure him.

Now, these gentlemen who argue on the high-tax side of this question ought to be able to give us an object lesson on this point. They ought to show us, as water runs over a mill wheel, how protection runs into the home and blesses the habitation of the workman. But they can not, unfortunately for these eloquent people. The less "protection" he has the higher are his

wages. This is not only true of the United States, but it is equally so of every other country in the world.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when long before the time of the Revolution our manufactures were being established, not only under freedom of trade, but under restrictive legislation by Great Britain directed against our prosperity, what were the wages of the working people as compared to the present time? Again, early in this century Mr. William Cobbett, who spent a very large part of his time in this country in Philadelphia, and who then returned to Great Britain and afterwards to Parliament, speaking of wages in the United States, as compared with those of the English market, particularly of wages in Pennsylvania, as compared with the English wages, said that they were three times as great, and that was, as you all know, when you had a low tariff.

Mr. BOWERS of California. What time was that?

Mr. HARTER. Early in the century. You will, however, find the exact date in any life of Mr. Cobbett.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Can the gentleman give us a statement as to its condition in 1879 and 1880, and back of that?

Mr. HARTER. I should be infinitely pleased to go into the discussion of that question with my friend from California or anybody else if I had the time. If the opportunity occurs before I conclude my remarks I shall be very glad to do so. I only speak of one thing, and that is the hallucination which has led our high-taxing Republican friends on this floor to imagine that wages depend on the amount of the tariff, that is, that the higher the tariff is the higher are the wages.

If it was not for a want of respect to the Chair, I would turn my back and ask him to select any country in Europe, and I would tell him, without knowing the name of the country, whether the wages are high there or not. I am not a mind reader, either; but the Chairman of this body can take any country in Europe, keeping it in his mind, and if he will ask me whether the wages in that country are high or not (or he may take half a dozen countries and do the same thing), I will simply ask one question, "Is the tariff high in that country?" If he answer that the tariff is high, I will reply, "Mr. Chairman, the wages are low," and without any exception you will find I am right.

If a nation has a high tariff, even if it produces two or possibly three crops to the acre annually, as do some portions of Italy, even then, with a high tariff, all the advantages of God and nature will fritter away under high taxes, the steady belief in which makes the American Republic, economically speaking, the laughingstock of every intelligent country in the world. I repeat so-called protection wastes the advantages of any nation.

Let me illustrate. These gentlemen here have been talking about high tariffs and low tariffs, and the blessings of high taxation for the workingman. Let us take two conspicuous examples. Our good friends, the amiable and able gentlemen on the other side of the House, are talking to us about England and America; and they say, "Why, gentlemen, the wages in England are much lower than they are in America." After awhile, if I have the time, I will show you the fact as discovered by the Harrison Administration, that labor cost (not wages) is lower in the United States than in England. But they say that the wages are much higher in this country than they are in Great Britain. Well, to start with, we have about twenty times as much land and about a hundred times as many advantages for each inhabitant, as they have over there. Now, it is pleading the baby act for the American people in a manner that the Democratic party never will have occasion to do, when you say that the nominal rate of wages is higher in this country than it is in Great Britain. It ought to be.

Why, bless your soul, if I lived upon a farm of 200 acres of fertile land, which would produce more to the acre than my neighbor's land, with mines under it, when my neighbor had not any mines under his land; if under my 200 acres I had a gold mine in one corner, a silver mine in another, iron ore in another corner, and coal in another, with stone in the center, and timber all around, if the land was so fertile that when I tickled it with a hoe it would laugh with a harvest, and if my poor neighbor instead of having 200 acres of land had but 20 acres of land, if I could not prosper under such circumstances in a greater degree than he whom Providence had placed so unfortunately, indeed, gentlemen, I would ask to have the probate judge appoint a receiver for my estate and a guardian for my person. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. HARTER. I am one of the most obliging men in the world, but let me say that I am unexpectedly on my feet, and with no set speech prepared, and my remarks of necessity must be rather disconnected and if you put questions to me they will be still more so. At the close of what I have to say I will be glad to try to answer any question that any gentleman desires to ask me.

Mr. BOWERS of California. It would not have taken you half so long to have answered my question.

Mr. HARTER. So far so good. With what nation should we compare Great Britain. You are intelligent men, and some might call you ingenious in your arguments, but I prefer to say that you are ingenuous. You are simple minded on this question. You do not conceal your views at all. You want to be as open as the day, do you not? Therefore, I suggest, gentlemen, that you need not travel 3,000 miles across the Atlantic for an illustration and a comparison between low-tax countries and high-tariff countries. You need not launch your frail bark on the Atlantic and travel over the stormy and tempest-tossed ocean for 3,000 miles for an unfair comparison, because you can have a fair one within 25 miles.

Come with me and you shall have a free pass and, if you are seasick, a physician. We will go across from England to France, about 22 miles. Here you may find in all its beauty a comparison that is fair and just. You have two countries within twenty-odd miles of each other. Both of them are old civilizations, not new ones. In both countries you have to a great extent a homogeneous population, instead of the magnificent and varied population we have in this country, made up of the best, not the worst, as many men would say, of the whole earth. There you have homogeneous populations. Both England and France are densely populous They both have large standing armies, both have large expenses, and, ordinarily speaking, the rates of wages should be the same in these two countries. Here, then, you may find a perfectly fair comparison to start with.

Now, bring the tariff question in. What effect does the tariff have? England has what we call freedom of trade, and France has the blessing of a high protective tariff. Now, gentlemen, if there is any virtue in your medicine; if there is any truth in your argument, starting out with an equality, with a parity of population and advantages, if there is anything in your argument France should pay the highest wages. Should it not? If there is any flaw in my proposition I will yield to any man in the House to state where the flaw exists.

Mr. BLAIR. I will make the suggestion to the gentleman, then.

Mr. HARTER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BLAIR. If it would interrupt the gentleman I will take occasion at a subsequent period to offer my criticism.

Mr. HARTER. I yield now.

Mr. BLAIR. I would say this to the gentleman, that I do not understand it to be the contention of the Republican theory or the Republican party that necessarily the highest wages in all cases must give the greatest return to the individual. That depends upon the civilization or the grade of civilization of which he happens to be part. But this is the point, that when you allow the producer of France and the producer of Great Britain, or the producer of any country where the cost of the article is much less than the same article in the United States and give freedom of access to our markets, then, of course, you deprive us of our work, and the more dangerously so just in proportion to the lesser cost of the article produced.

Mr. HARTER. I will answer the gentleman. Our object in demanding lower taxes is not to deprive a workman of labor, but to reduce his occasion for it. I would be very glad indeed if the gentleman could arrange to keep my income in 1894 up by giving me only one-half the labor to do. It may be easily done, but not by doubling the cost of what I consume, by cutting off my salary and telling me I am "protected."

The facts are that the difference between English wages and the wages of France is greater than the difference between the wages of America and the wages of Great Britain; and yet Great Britain, within about 22 miles of her high taxed (protected?) competitor and paying very much higher wages, does not ask for a protective tariff. Yet, gentlemen speaking for American manhood, ask for protection from competition 3,000 miles distant, begging for a dishonest system which taxes all their neighbors for the benefit of industries which ought to grow as the acorns grow into oak trees, out in the open, and not because they are kept in hothouses or coddled like orchids, but because the winds of heaven, the blasts of winter, and the storms of the summer sweep through them and strengthen them.

Mr. BLAIR. But is not English agriculture dying, and do not the agriculturists of England cry for protection against the competition of American agricultural products?

Mr. HARTER. I would be very glad to yield to questions, but I have not the time. A fair question and an honest answer often throw a flood of light upon a subject.

Mr. BLAIR. The gentleman seems to be asking questions, and yet declining to have them answered.

Mr. HARTER. I said before that I would be glad to answer all questions at the conclusion of my remarks. The gentleman from New Hampshire suggests the idea that there is another condition. Here it is. When the free-trade mechanic in Great Britain, after earning higher wages than his French neighbor, goes to the market and the storehouse he finds he can supply his wants and needs better and cheaper than in any nation in the world. How is it with the protected and therefore underpaid mechanic in France? When he goes to spend his wages he finds he must pay far more for what he buys than his untaxed English cousin. You see so far as the workingman is concerned, the application of the principle of so-called protection simply cuts down his wages and increases his living expenses at the same time.

You may as well say you help a man support his family by first cutting off his right arm, then give him another boost toward fortune by cutting off his left arm, leaving him armless, but protected. [Laughter.] Where men disagree it is well to arbitrate. I am one of those people who like arbitration in all its forms. While sometimes compelled to go to the lawyer, still I prefer the arbitrator. There is one infallible arbitrator for all questions like this, and one that can always be appealed to, and that arbitrator is history.

My eloquent and intellectual friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] said that he was fond of facts. I think he intimated that a quart of facts were better than a bushel of theory. Now, I am going to pour in the quart of facts and wash away, drown out, and smother a bushel of my friend's theory, for perhaps gentlemen will have noticed that on this subject I am a practical sort of a fellow and not much of a theorizer. [Laughter.] Let us have a little history. Would you like to go back as far as the experience of the children of Israel? [Laughter.] If the House will give me time enough it will be easy to take them almost back to Adam.

Mr. LOUD. You might get lost on the way. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Well, the men who support this bill, and by its early passage hasten the time when the working people of this country can get employment, even if they do lose their way on earth, will never miss the path to Heaven [laughter]; for it has been most truly said: "Inasmuch as ye do it to the least of these little ones, ye do it unto me." But, Mr. Chairman, as my time is so limited, and as many of the gentlemen on the Republican side are unfamiliar with sacred history, it will be better to confine myself to history which they know something about. Take Great Britain. Great Britain which is held up to gentlemen on the other side like a jumping jack, and painted in every color that the average Republican statesman or orator fancies. They tell us that formerly Great Britain had protection.

Yes, Great Britain had protection down to about 1842, but what was the condition of England's trade under it? How did her commerce flourish? Did her manufactures prosper? What were the wages in Great Britain under protection? These, and questions like these, will throw much needed light upon this subject, which so utterly befogs the average Republican intellect. I beg, therefore, to say to the House that at the time tariff-reform measures were first introduced in Great Britain the chronic condition of her working people was one of hunger. One of hunger, I repeat. Her manufactures were languishing. At the end of a period of many hundreds of years of protection her trade was dormant, her shipping was small in extent, wages on land and sea were low, and occupation was about as uncertain as it has been in the United States of America, especially in Pennsylvania, during the past few years, a period in which we have suffered most from a so-called protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It was proposed to throw down the barriers, and even such a man as Mr. Gladstone, who was then a member of the Government, opposed the proposition. Some of the ablest, most conservative, and most conscientious men in Great Britain—men who, I am proud to say have their equals on the Republican side of this House, for no man is more willing than I am to accord intelligence, to account fairness, to acknowledge honesty of purpose to most of those who are opposed to us on this question—some of the ablest, and most conservative and most conscientious men in Great Britain, I say, opposed it, among them Mr. Gladstone. They said: "As surely as you reduce the tariff, so surely will ruinous competition come upon us from France and from Germany."

But what was the result? All the dismal predictions that were made, predictions like those which have been made here so eloquently by my able friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], made still more dexterously by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], made more specifically in the speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], and finally reëchoed and added to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], came to naught. You say that if we reduce the taxes of this country we will thereby bring paralysis upon our manufactures, destroy our commerce, reduce the wages of our working people, and supply no compensating advantage for this great blight which the Democratic party would put upon the country. Gentlemen, there is nothing new in this world, as you have probably discovered; and if you will go back to the records of Parliament from 1838 to 1842 I will show you that the speech which the senior Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee will make to-morrow or the day after on the floor of this House was made there long ago.

Mr. REED. Do not be too prophetic. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Well, I venture to make the prediction with absolute certainty that it will be fulfilled. [Laughter.] I have read the speech. [Laughter.] It will be the same speech, only that the gentleman from Maine will make it better. He will add to and improve it, but that is all. All your speeches have been made in England. You are only thrashing over old straw. You are making the predictions here that were made just as earnestly, just as honestly, in 1838 and in 1842 in Great Britain, and facts in the United States as in Great Britain will prove you wholly and fortunately wrong in them all.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. HARTER. My friend can ask me a question at the close of my remarks and I shall be very glad to answer it. Not being a Rollin, a Gibbon, or even an Heroditus, I fear I may not get through with this bit of history within my time——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was not going to ask the gentleman a question. I was merely going to suggest——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, as the House has so frequently refused to yield to the gentleman from Maine in the Hawaiian matter, I will show him the courtesy, on behalf of the House generally, of yielding to him on this occasion. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was simply going to suggest that the gentleman seemed to be making a confession that he was himself engaged in thrashing over Mr. Frank Hurd's old straw.

Mr. HARTER. Well, if Mr. Hurd ever used these arguments the better for Mr. Hurd. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. But you never "hurd" of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Wit will never die out in this House as long as the gentleman from Illinois remains in it.

The people of England did not listen to the croakers. The calamity howlers were disregarded and she passed the reform measure. What happened? I think even my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who is always so particular about authorities, will admit that Mr. Robert Giffen, president of the British Statistical Society, is probably the best authority on this subject in the known world, and if he had made any misstatements about it they would certainly have been called in question before this.

I am about to show to you the wretched, the miserable, the heartrending results of tariff reform in Great Britain, so that you may be prepared for the calamity which is to come upon the United States after the Wilson bill becomes a law. [Laughter.]

Forty years after the reform came, nearly a half century after they had deprived themselves of the blessings of protection, leaving nothing that could interfere with the horrible havoc of free trade in that little insular kingdom which was to drive the inhabitants into the sea and consign their industries to Hades, what do we find happened to them? Of course mourning and lamentation must have been heard in the land.

The heavens must have been draped in crape, in order to fulfill the predictions of the protectionists of that day, as will be necessary here in order to carry out the programme which gentlemen have presented so eloquently and picturesquely from time to time. I am sorry to shatter this dream of gentlemen on the other side; but here is the exhibit. Here is a statement of the wages of carpenters, bricklayers, masons, miners, cotton and woolen workers. We would have supposed that they would not get any wages after that bill had passed; that every industry of Great Britain would have been stricken to the ground. But, on the contrary, wages increased 73 per cent.

Mr. SPRINGER. Good.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman may well say "good;" but it is not equal to what we can do with our unrivaled advantages in the United States under low-tariff taxes.

English seamen's wages in competition with all parts of the earth increased from 25 to 70 per cent. But here is another object lesson: The net earnings of the people also increased—how much? Eighty-six dollars and fifty cents a year. Why, sir, many a poor fellow in my Congressional district does not make under this protective tariff $135 a year, with all the advantages of a free government and the great opportunities of American life and citizenship. Yet the average increase of wages among the workingmen of Great Britain, over and above what they got under a high tariff, was $86.50 a year.

Pauperism: This is another index, and I think a fair one, of

the condition of a country. Did pauperism increase? Why, if you had heard Mr. Gladstone and his coadjutors in that Parliament you would have supposed that it would become necessary to build almshouses to take the place of all the factories and public buildings of the country. But what was the fact? Although the population increased enormously in Great Britain, yet after forty-odd years of "free trade" there were but two paupers where, under a protective tariff and with a very much smaller population, there had been three.

Savings deposits: The number of depositors increased ten times over, and the sum of the savings deposits increased fivefold.

Another thing. Under a protective tariff in our country, unless a workingman is tolerably fortunate, he never leaves any estate whatever behind him. In Pennsylvania, in the ore mines (a protected industry), and at some of her "protected" coal mines, when a protected Pennsylvanian is carried to his burial place he is taken to the potter's field at the expense of the public. But what was the effect in England upon estates—the final test of prosperity in any man's life? Did estates in Great Britain go down to zero under free trade? On the contrary, they rose on an average $1,700. Why, gentlemen, it will take seventeen hundred years of protective tariff taxation in this great country of ours before the average workingman will have even a $1,700 estate to leave behind him.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the showing as to the cost of living?

Mr. HARTER. Oh, necessarily, the showing is in the same line. That accounts for the increase in the net profits. Not only did wages go up, but living expenses went down.

Mr. SIMPSON. It practically doubled the pay of the workingman.

Mr. HARTER. Exactly, but here is another exhibit. There were 106,000 taxable incomes in Great Britain at the end of fourteen hundred years of a protective tariff. After forty years of free trade the number of taxable incomes had increased to 320,000. This tells a significant story.

I look forward to seeing in the future my friend from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and these other eloquent gentlemen who have spoken for high taxes as being better for the people than low taxes—I expect to see them flocking to our side of the House in a few years—why? Because I find that the statesmen of Great Britain, men who were your peers, but not your superiors—the men who had opposed this measure were within two years after the statute reducing taxes had passed Parliament the advocates of still larger reductions. Mr. Gladstone, from having been an opponent of free trade and low taxes, grew up to the point where he was the champion who a few years ago unhorsed and threw into the dust the premier of your last Republican Administration on this question.

One thing further. The manufacturers of England were opposed to this measure; many of them said "under free trade we can not compete with the manufacturers of other countries;" but the very men who made that opposition and who sent to Parliament petition after petition, even larger, broader, thicker, heavier, and more numerously signed perhaps than the one that came in here from the overprotected manufacturers of Troy—even that class of people within two years confessed their mistake in the most practical manner by asking that the taxes which they had objected to having lowered should be taken off altogether.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Our manufacturers do not ask any such thing.

Mr. HARTER. They will within two years after the Wilson bill becomes law.

Having referred to the experience of England, let me follow history back to our own shores. And here I hope to show, especially from the experience of the State of Pennsylvania, one of the most impressive object-lessons that has ever been exhibited in this House.

Mr. PAYNE. Will you not please tell us——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. I can not yield. I have only about ten minutes of my time remaining, and I am under the impression that I might ask in vain for an extension of it.

Mr. PAYNE. I wanted you to tell us why these working people from England came over here?

Mr. HARTER. Let me say to you, gentlemen, that in 1846 we proposed to revise the tariff by a reduction, and the same hue and cry which you make now was made then. What was the result? I said I would use Pennsylvania as an object-lesson in this connection. Listen, you sons of the great Keystone State. In 1846 you only had two Representatives at Washington who were intelligent enough to vote for a reduction of tariff taxation. One was David Wilmot, who then sat in this very Chamber, and the other was the Pennsylvanian who was Vice-President of the United States at that time, George M. Dallas.

Mr. Dallas gave the casting vote for the reduction of the tariff in the Senate. What happened? The skies of Pennsylvania were lurid with the fires with which you burned Mr. Wilmot and the Vice-President of the United States in effigy because they voted, forsooth, to reduce the tariff and thus lightened the burdens of the poor. But mark the result.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. HARTER. I can not yield the few moments I have. My obliging friend from New Hampshire intimates that I can not have an extension of time.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I will not be put in that attitude——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. I can not yield for any more interruptions.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I give notice to the gentleman now that I will object to an extension.

Mr. HARTER. Two years after that reduction of the tariff what occurred? The results were so magnificently beneficial to the Keystone State that the low-tax people of Pennsylvania nominated Mr. Shunk for governor and actually carried Pennsylvania for the Democratic party and what is here called "free trade" by a majority of 15,000.

I am sorry the time is so short, for I would like to go a little further into similar historical facts.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman will now allow me a moment.

Mr. HARTER. Very well.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. You spoke of the prosperity of the country under the tariff of 1846.

Mr. HARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. I want to say right here that right in my district, including that of my colleague, Mr. KRIBBS, from Western Pennsylvania, thirty-three furnaces were closed in two years, and every one of them went into bankruptcy, with one or two exceptions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARTER. Yes; and each of those little two-penny, seven-by-nine protection furnaces were replaced by the magnificent Democratic furnaces erected under the low-tariff period between 1846 and 1860.

Mr. KRIBBS. Will my colleague allow me to ask him one question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KRIBBS. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. HARTER. Oh, yes; I will yield to all the Pennsylvanians.

Mr. KRIBBS. I wish to ask my colleague how many of these furnaces started up again under the high protective tariff?

Mr. HARTER. The final effect of this was that after the lapse of a few years the manufacturers of the United States came here to Washington and made a tariff for themselves; and I may say in reference to the "manufacturers' tariff" of 1857, that it was a great reduction even on the so-called "free-trade" tariff act of 1846. Pennsylvania and Massachusetts voted for that reduction.

I wish I had time to take you through the "manufacturers' tariff" bill of 1857, schedule after schedule, and compare it with this Wilson bill that you object to, and show you that the bill which we are offering to the House and to the country is to-day putting a higher tariff tax on the great mass of these schedules than did even the manufacturers of the country who sat on the floor of this House and voted for the tariff act of 1857. And since that time we have had a constantly mounting stream of protection and spoliation, tax after tax. When, therefore, you say that the tariff tax, which is higher yet, even under this bill, than it was in 1857, must be made higher after thirty years of tariff protection, it is a confession on your part that the result of protection has been damaging to the interests of the manufacturers, and that after all of these years they are less able to compete with foreign manufacturers than they were in 1857.

I had a number of these schedules that I had intended to have the Clerk read for the benefit of the House, but will, because of lack of time, have to confine myself to a very few.

Will the Clerk be kind enough to read from the bill the tax on chemicals—the average tax upon chemicals, paints, and oils?

The Clerk read as follows:

Average tax, 20 to 30 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. It will be found to be about 30 per cent. In 1846 this tax was 20 per cent, and the tax on these articles was still further reduced by the manufacturers themselves in 1857.

I ask the Clerk to read from the bill the tax on varnishes—the average tax under the Wilson bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Average rate, 25 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. Varnishes were free under the tariff act of 1846. I will not ask about earthenware and china, for my time is too short to treat the subject properly; however, let it now suffice to say that we made earthenware and china under a lower tax in those days than the Ways and Means Committee bill proposes now, after we have burdened the people for thirty years to build up that industry. What is the tax upon cutlery?

The Clerk read as follows:

Cutlery, 35 to 45 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. In 1846, as I recollect the figures, the tariff was about 30 per cent, and it was still further reduced by the manufacturers themselves in 1847. Now I will ask the Clerk to give the tariff on cotton manufactures.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cotton manufactures, 40 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. Listen! The cry has gone over the country that 40 per cent is not enough. Let me go back to the childhood of your cotton manufactures. Samuel Slater established cotton-manufacturing in Rhode Island in 1790, under a tariff tax of about 5 per cent, and he imported most of his cotton, paying, I think, 3 cents a pound tariff tax on his raw material, and then he competed successfully with Great Britain, and you, sons of New England, you degenerate descendants of Samuel Slater, a century later come before this House and say you have fallen so contemptibly low that you can not protect yourselves with practically eight times the protection your great grandfathers had in 1790.

I have in my possession a letter I received to-day from one of the great cotton-manufacturers of New England, in which he condemns our bill because, as he knows from long experience, the tariff on cotton goods is made too high, not too low; and thus practical manufacturers put to shame their hobbyhorse representatives on the floor of this House, members who prate about manufacturing as if they knew all about it and who nevertheless, in the simplicity of their souls, think the mule they use in factories walks on two legs, is kept in a barn, and has ears as long as their own.

Why, my good friends here from Maine, I would like to know when your cotton industries were established? Of course the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is excusably ignorant, because he comes from the boundless and trackless prairie where they do not know anything about cotton mills or cotton-mill machinery [laughter]; but you gentlemen from Maine are not excusable on that ground. When did you establish your cotton industries? When were those magnificent industries, the pride of New England and the glory of the United States, established? They were established under what was called the free-trade tariff of 1846. If you look over the census reports you will find that nearly every blessing that has fallen upon this country came down upon it in richest profusion immediately after the introduction in 1846 by the Democratic party of this miserable, horrible, damnable system of free trade that we want again to fasten upon the country.

By the way, I will say to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] that cotton manufacturing was established on the American continent before Columbus discovered it. I do not think they had a high-taxing protective tariff at that time, because the leaf of history from which I quote does not refer to any such blessing.

Mr. REED. If America was not discovered, it was very well protected from Europe up to that time. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. The industries did not flourish very much under that protection, though.

Mr. HARTER. My good friend [Mr. SPRINGER] reminds me that the industries did not flourish much up to that time; and I would like to remark that this industry did not fairly begin to flourish until Samuel Slater, in spite of the laws passed by England at that time against the exportation of skilled labor in cotton manufacturing, came across here and established cotton mills in Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] is satisfied with offering a second-hand answer from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], I am satisfied.

Mr. HARTER. I have known the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] for a long time, and I have rarely heard him make an answer that was not well worth attention, and also of quotation, either in this House or elsewhere.

Now as to the woolen manufacture, gentlemen, perhaps you think that must have been established under the McKinley bill. On the contrary the woolen-manufacturing industry of the United States was established in 1643 or thereabouts. Let me see, when did the Mayflower land?

Several MEMBERS. In 1620.

Mr. HARTER. Well, we were not on the Mayflower, and I am excusable for not remembering the exact date. My ancestors were able to remain in Europe a little longer than yours were. [Laughter.] But I want to speak a little while about the iron trade, for it is at the bottom of all our industries, at the very foundation, indeed, of our civilization. We give iron, I think, 22½ per cent under the Wilson bill, and steel 25 per cent.

I took pains last week, when over in Philadelphia, to get a copy of the London Iron and Steel Traders' Journal, and also a copy of the (American) Iron Age. I took the English paper of December 16 and the American paper of December 14. In looking over the English paper I found that in Staffordshire, England, certain grades of bar iron were selling for $37.56 a ton; and I found I could buy the same grade of bar iron in the United States of America for $26 a ton, leaving the difference between the English price and the American price $11.56 a ton, the price in England being that much higher than it is in the United States. The average freights are $1.25 to $2 a ton for crossing the ocean.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Are you complaining of that?

Mr. HARTER. I say that there is no need of 22½ per cent or any tariff tax whatever to "protect" iron manufacturers, yet with the 22½ per cent given them by the Wilson bill you are still a "calamity howler," and if you had 2,200 per cent I think your cry would be the same.

Steel billets are the foundation of the whole steel trade of the United States. I discover that steel billets were worth, on the 16th of December, in Great Britain, $23.42, while I could buy them at Pittsburg for $16.75.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then, where is the tax?

Mr. HARTER. There is no need of any tax, and yet you shriek and cry as if you were crippled for life while our bill feeds you with 22½ to 25 per cent of tax. I am just showing you that we are able to compete not only under the Wilson bill, but that with absolute free trade we could have all Europe within five years kneeling at our feet and the world buying and consuming American goods, made by untaxed Americans.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. What is the tariff on steel billets?

Mr. HARTER. I regret that the expiration of my time prevents me giving to the gentleman the attention he would otherwise have at my hands.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, I am very sensible indeed that this is not the hour for a serious discussion of this measure, and remembering the generous indulgence of the House to me on other and indeed on every occasion heretofore, I am reluctant to detain you to a later hour for the purpose of hearing anything I may say.

If the reapers in the field of Boaz had been as diligent and thorough in their work as have been the gentlemen who have preceded me in this discussion, it is not possible that the fair Maobitess gleaner could have gathered enough grain to reward her labor. In this debate, at this time, the gleaner is absolutely without hope. Still I must ask the indulgence of the House while I go over portions of the field of discussion, if only to emphasize some arguments already many times made.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], and I hope he has tarried, that there is a great diversion of opinion among us upon the tariff question, a great confusion of tongues. I do not see him in his seat.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. He has just gone out.

Mr. BROSIUS. Well, he is not here. Those who are here can tell him what I say about Pennsylvania and the tariff.

As a prologue to what I shall say I desire to submit a sentiment from a departed statesman, whose memory the people of Pennsylvania will not willingly let die:

Every highly cultivated nation has made the protection of domestic industry the special care of government. It has been found by the experience of more than twenty centuries that the protection of domestic manufactures by prohibitions, discriminating duties, and commercial regulations has been and is the true, natural, and wise policy of nations, or all history lies.

These are the words of the "Old Commoner" of Pennsylvania, who a generation ago sat in this Chamber, and with his imperial intellect and superb statesmanship guided the deliberations and determinations of this body in the stormiest seasons of its history. I can not withhold the homage due to greatness by omitting to say that I reproduce the words of Mr. Stevens to-day with undisguised satisfaction. They accentuate the statement made by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DALZELL] in his exhaustive argument yesterday, that Pennsylvania has never wavered in her loyalty to protection.

Horace White, in the preface to his translation of Frederick

Bastiat's Sophisms of Protection, says that the national Republican convention of 1860 offered a bribe to the State of Pennsylvania for its vote in the Presidential election, which bribe was set forth in the following resolution of the platform adopted by that memorable convention:

Resolved, That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingman liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufactories an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

I do not bring this antique and somewhat unique observation of Horace White into public notice for the purpose of resenting the apparent insult to Pennsylvania, for he distinctly disclaimed any intention to charge unworthy motives for the political action of that State in giving her support to the nominee of the Republican party. I use the incident as a pleader would use the name of John Doe or Richard Roe, to bring the cause into court; the cause of The People *vs.* the Wilson Tariff Bill on an indictment for assault with intent to kill the industries of the United States [laughter and applause], the intent, as in similar cases in our criminal jurisprudence, being presumed from the nature of the weapons used. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have never known the distinct ends had in view by those who have cherished the protective system in vogue in the United States in almost unbroken continuity for a hundred years to be more clearly and strongly stated than in the resolution to which Pennsylvania gave the honor of her support a third of a century ago. Nor were these sentiments the exclusive possession of the Republicans of Pennsylvania—they were shared by the Democrats as well.

In the very year that the representatives of the Republican party in the Republican national convention at Chicago were giving their adhesion to the principles of the resolution I have just read, a Pennsylvania Democrat, the late lamented Hon. John Cessna, a delegate to the Democratic national convention at Charleston, introduced on the floor of that convention the following resolution:

Resolved, That the convictions of the Democratic party of the country remain unshaken in the wisdom and justice of the adequate protection of iron, coal, wool, and the other great staples of our country, based upon the necessities of a reasonable revenue system of the General Government; and approving the views of President Buchanan upon the subject of specific duties, we earnestly desire our representatives in Congress to produce such modifications of existing laws as the unwise legislation of the Republican party in 1857 renders absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the great interests of the country.

When the principles of these two declarations of Pennsylvania sentiment on the tariff question were embodied in the tariff act of 1861 and passed by both Houses of Congress, it was promptly approved by another great Pennsylvania Democrat, President Buchanan.

To-day that great State waits in the attitude of expectancy to see her Democratic representatives in this Congress align themselves on these long-established Pennsylvania principles and take the touch of elbow with their distinguished predecessors, who in earlier days shed luster upon the Keystone Democracy. [Applause.]

These events, however, marked no departure, denoted no epoch in Pennsylvania sentiment on the tariff question. They were in consonance with the views held by the people and the statesmen of that State of both parties for more than a century. In her infancy she lisped the same accents; in her vigorous youth she shouted the same notes, in her mature manhood she utters the same glorious voice in favor of such defensive duties as will promote the remuneration and elevation of labor, adequate rewards for enterprise and capital, and the prosperity and happiness of all our people. [Applause on the Republican side.] In 1860 her convictions were uttered in the perfectly articulate and distinctly audible tone of 60,000 majority. In 1893, after an experience of a third of a century, she reaffirmed them in the detonating and reverberant thunder of 135,000 majority. [Applause on the Republican side.] My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is right. She has never wavered in her loyalty to protection.

I hazard nothing in saying that the best developed and most scientific conception of defensive duties existing when the foundations of our Government were laid was a Pennsylvania notion. One hundred and eight years ago on the 20th of last September the Assembly of that State passed a tariff act, the preamble of which stated the grounds upon which it proceeded. It declared that—

Whereas divers useful and beneficial arts and manufactures have been gradually introduced into Pennsylvania, and the same have at length risen to a very considerable extent and perfection, insomuch that during the late war between the United States and Great Britain, when the importation of European goods was much interrupted, and often very difficult and uncertain, the artisans and mechanics of this State were able to supply in the hours of need not only large quantities of weapons and other implements, but also ammunition and clothing, without which the war would not have been carried on, whereby their oppressed country was greatly assisted and relieved; and

Whereas, although the fabrics and manufactures of Europe and other foreign parts imported into this country in times of peace may be afforded at cheaper rates than they can be made here, yet good policy and a regard to the well-being of divers useful and industrious citizens who are employed in the making of like goods in this State demand of us that moderate duties be laid on certain fabrics and manufactures imported which do most interfere with, and which, if no relief be given, will undermine and destroy, the useful manufactures of the like kind in this country.

That was the germ of our protective system. It contained the power and potency of all that has been evolved out of it, or developed from it. It was the infant, grown now to a giant, which like a faithful sentinel stands guard over factory, forge, field, and every fold of American labor and industry.

Hamilton, with his prescient intellect and mighty reach of statesmanship, scarcely saw beyond the lines marked out by the Pennsylvania Assembly. Clay elaborated the scheme, broadened the field of vision, and furnished some arguments in support of the system. He gave its data classification, polished it and labeled it for popular study, and did more perhaps than any other American statesman to relieve the subject of its abstruseness and bring it within easy range of popular comprehension. In later years the contributions of economists and statesmen, the lessons of experience, and the more scientific study of its principles have demonstrated more clearly its superior utility and deepened the American conviction of its necessity to the welfare and prosperity of our industries, and established its title to the veneration and affection of every patriotic American citizen, until the feeling widely prevalent among all ranks of our people may be tersely and truthfully expressed in the words of Grattan, speaking of the Irish Parliament: "It is our very existence; nay, more, it is our life to come."

It has been through the century a leading agency in nourishing infant industries and in maintaining mature ones, in diversifying employments, and promoting the conditions of mutually advantageous intercourse between them; in utilizing all our powers and capabilities by employing them upon the totality of our native resources, giving employment to our labor and applying our own capital to our own industrial pursuits, thus meeting our own wants with our own supplies, our satisfactions with our sacrifices, and mutually serving each other to the greatest extent compatible with the conditions under which we are working out the problem of our industrial development, and in opening the way to results of such unrivaled splendor in the production and acquisition of wealth and the growth of trade and commerce as to extort from the greatest living Englishman the handsome tribute—and now where is the gentleman from Ohio [laughter]—that splendid tribute, "That so rapid has been our growth, and so swiftly are we forging ahead that our commercial supremacy is only a question of time." [Applause on the Republican side.]

So much for our past. What is our present situation in the shadow of an impending peril? It beggars description. In our factories you can hear a pin drop. In our forges a whisper reverberates. In our furnaces a friction match illumines the darkness, and in many American homes a piece of corn bread would be a feast. A few rough-hewn lines of some doggerel rhymes feebly portray the clouds and darkness round about us:

From forges where no fires burn,
From mills where wheels no longer turn,
From looms o'er which no shuttles leap,
From merchants' shops—which sheriffs keep,
From banks gone up, from stocks gone down,
From God-made country, man-made town,
From Wall street men, from sons of toil,
From the bronzed tillers of the soil,
From North, from South, from East, from West,
Business is crying with a zest—
"Don't monkey with the tariff."

[Laughter.]

THE WILSON BILL.

And yet we have before us a bill which proposes, in relation to a number of our leading and most necessary industries, to strike down those defensive duties in some instances and reduce them in others, and thereby diminish that protection under which they have prospered in the past, and without which they will not only be unable to prosper in the future, but must languish, and if not succored at an early day by wiser legislation, must perish by starvation or strangulation, unless they continue a precarious existence by reducing the wages of American labor to the foreign level. It is the fourth bill that has been written over the name of a Democratic statesman in thirty years. We have seen a Wood bill, a Morrison bill, a Mills bill, and now we have a Wilson bill. Which is the worst bill I am not able to say. When all are so bad it would be invidious to discriminate.

It is not a free-trade bill, for it admits protection to a limited extent. It is not a protective bill, for it contains too little protection to be of any use. It is like a dike too low to keep the water out. It is not a revenue bill, for it fails to produce reve-

nue. It embodies all the vices and none of the virtues of commercial restriction. It entails all the cost and vexation of maintaining custom-houses, while it brings none of the benefits the system was designed to secure.

THE BASIS OF SOUND LEGISLATION.

All sound and beneficial legislation on lines of commercial regulation must proceed upon these fundamental postulates:

First. Our own laboring people must be employed at remunerative wages.

Second. We have no advantageous industries which can employ all our labor in the production of commodities whose excess over and above our own consumption can find a market elsewhere at prices commensurate with such a ratio of result to exertion or of satisfaction to sacrifice as would justify the cumulation of our labor in them.

Third. That under these conditions the best results are attainable by the employment of our labor and all our productive forces on our own raw materials to meet our own consumption as far as is compatible with the nature and extent of our resources. In other words, under existing conditions of production, distribution, and consumption the world over, the American market is the best one, not only for the products of American soil, but as well those of American mines, factories, forges, furnaces, and the whole round of American production.

These propositions derive support not only from the deductions of reason applied to the facts of our situation, but from the lessons of our actual experience as well. If a shoemaker has a market for all the shoes he can make at a price which pays him more for a day's work than he can make at any other employment, he puts in all his time at making shoes; but if his market fails him, if he can not sell all his shoes at a price that constitutes that his advantageous industry he must either be idle a portion of his time or accumulate a surplus of shoes without exchangeable value. He is driven, therefore, to give a portion of his time to some other employment to eke out a living. Or, if he finds a market for all his shoes, but can not find a supply of some necessary article of consumption, say stockings, at such price as would pay him better to buy than to make, then he must employ a part of his time in making his own stockings. This would be an economic necessity.

Similarly, the people of the United States, having no single industry or limited number of industries in which their labor and exertion would be more efficient than in others, because there is no market to take all they could produce in them at a price that would give their labor superior efficiency, must do other things to make a living. And moreover, if they had a superiority in one or more industries they could not find an adequate supply of their remaining wants at a price which would pay them better to buy than to make. So that the economic limitations of the situation in which we find ourselves, and from which we have no means of escape, compel us to the course we have chosen to pursue, that of producing to a large extent our own consumption.

But if the necessities of our situation compel us, as the solicitation of our manifest interest moves us, to employ ourselves in the miscellaneous and manifold industries, with the resources and aptitudes for which our country and our people have been so richly endowed, and we are already established in these industries with fabulous amounts of capital invested in numerous plants equipped for business, under a scale of defensive duties, which secures to us so generous a share of our own markets as to give employment to our own labor in production at remunerative wages commensurate with the high general level of character and intelligence which distinguishes American labor, should we by withdrawing that protection, by the reduction or total removal of those duties, relinquish a portion of our own markets to foreign producers, displace our own labor for foreign, impair our own fixed capital, and voluntarily abdicate our sovereignty over our industrial realm.

The answer of the advocates of this measure doubtless is that the bill has no tendency to the production of the results named, but on the contrary it will tend to lighten the burdens of taxation, promote the activity of our industries, better the conditions of labor, and secure a progressively increasing efficiency in all our productive agencies.

But for the indisputable presumption of your sincerity in this contention I would say it is in vain you protest that you are practical economists working out the problem of your country's interests, while the agencies you propose are calculated to paralyze the industries they are meant to help, unless indeed it be economists of the class of whom Napoleon said: "If the empire were made of adamant they would grind it to powder;" in vain that you declare your solicitude for workingmen while you are legislating bread out of their mouths; in vain that you insist that their condition will be bettered while you are closing the mills in which they earned the highest wages ever paid to labor; in vain that you pretend to be seeking access to the markets of the world for American manufactures when England's factories are crowded with an accumulation of products for which the double advantage of free raw material and low wages does not enable her to find a market, but subjects her to the mortification of witnessing her foreign commerce in a progressive decline; in vain that you insist that you are cheapening commodities for the people's consumption while you are curtailing their means of buying the satisfactions of life at any price. But for the constraint I am under to believe you serious, the irony of your declarations and protestations is so apparent that I would be reminded of the hypocrite who protested his love for his Savior, his veneration for his Bible, and his devotion to his religion, while he daily broke every commandment in the decalogue.

THE REPUBLICAN DOCTRINE OF PROTECTION.

Conformably to the principles I have indicated, the Republican doctrine of protection is that imposts are to be levied for two purposes, both distinctly declared by the founders of the Republic, and to secure which was one of the chief reasons for the adoption of the Constitution of 1787, namely, to raise revenue for the support of the Government and to encourage our domestic industries; and a constitutional duty is one that has for its object this twofold purpose: A duty which yields sufficient revenue and at the same time guarantees our own producers the first chance in our own markets is a protective and constitutional duty; while a duty which aims to raise revenue while it injures home enterprise and discourages domestic industries by inviting importations is a destructive duty, and, if not an unconstitutional one, is maintained by an abuse of constitutional power.

Duties in the two instances are imposed on totally different principles. A duty regulated by the revenue principle alone proceeds upon the assumption that the point on the scale of rates at which a duty should be fixed is the lowest figure that will yield the requisite amount of revenue without regard to protection, on the theory that the less the duties the lighter the burdens. It is easily seen that this results in largely increasing importations, for as the duty falls the imports swell—to the injury of our home producers.

The principle of the maximum revenue from the maximum importations is the one stab the industries of this country can not survive, for it means the minimum of home productions. It substitutes foreign for home products and foreign for home industries, and is to that extent unpatriotic and un-American, if not treason to the welfare of the country.

On the contrary, a duty regulated upon the twofold principle of revenue and protection proceeds upon the assumption that the true point on the scale of rates at which a duty should be fixed is the highest figure consistent with sufficient revenue and adequate protection.

By the Democratic method the revenue is to be collected with as much incidental injury to the people as possible. By the Republican method the revenue is collected with as much incidental benefit to the people as possible.

We believe that if the collector of customs can dispense benefits while he is gathering revenue it is a relief and not a distress to the people. A revenue that carries a double blessing upon its wings is none the worse on that account.

Daniel Webster, the great expounder of the Constitution, said on this very point:

> Can it be that we have only a revenue power in this matter? That is, we have the clear and undoubted power to take so much money out of your pockets and apply it to our public purposes; but God forbid that in doing so we should do you any good at the same time.

Now, let us give some attention to the contentions in support of the bill. The proponents of the measure rely upon a course of deductive reasoning totally invalid when tested by the economic facts of our history. The only verification by actual experience which they have ever thought worth while to attempt is found in the period between 1846 and 1860. As the devout Mussulmen in prayer turn their faces toward the Caaba as their point of adoration, so do our devout tariff reformers when they bend their exertions to the rescue of their country from the robber barons of protection turn their faces to the Mecca of 1846 to 1860 as their point of adoration.

FREE-TRADE PERIOD.

A characteristic mode of depicting the unspeakable charms of that idyllic season after the winter of their discontent had been made glad summer by the glorious sun of free trade in the tariff of 1846 may be found in an address of the present Vice-President at Bloomington, Ill., just before his election. These are his words:

> The decade and a half extending from the passage of the low-tariff law of 1846 to the beginning of our civil war has been truly called the golden period of our history. The cost of the necessaries of life had reached the minimum, and at no time in our history was it easier for the wage-earner to support his family. The farmer, the mechanic, the day laborer alike realized the benefit of low taxation. A benefit, why? Simply for the reason that it lessened the cost of food, of clothing, of every article that conduced to his comfort. Our manufactories did not languish. The fires did not go

out in our furnaces. The wheels and spindles were not idle in our great hives of industry. The demand for labor was not lessened, nor was its value depreciated.

Mr. Chairman, an effective answer to the Vice-President, as well as to the fairy tales given us yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] concerning this long-to-be-remembered period when the industries of Pennsylvania languished, and languishing, died by the scores, with none to succor, may be found in the work of Robert Ellis Thompson on Social Science and National Economy. Mr. Thompson says:

Thus during the years 1846-'49 English iron was cheap, selling in New York at $40 a ton, and largely driving the home producer out of the market. One-third of the furnaces and iron mills ceased operations soon after the tariff was enacted, many being sold out by the sheriff, the rest were sorely crippled, and the amount of their production greatly diminished. In 1851-'51, when home competition was virtually out of the way, iron sold for $80 a ton, whereas native iron had been sold for $60.

A CONTRAST AND CONTRADICTION.

But further, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the contrast, and in the interest of truth, I submit without note or comment the dispassionate statement of President Fillmore in his annual message to Congress in December, 1851. This is what he said:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,701,621 in 1847, to $26,051,373 in 1850, and to $21,848,653 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year.

The aggregate value of rice exported during the last fiscal year as compared with the previous year also exhibits a decrease amounting to $460,917, which with a decline in the value of the exports of tobacco for the same period make an aggregate decrease in these two articles of $1,156,751.

The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise it was thought by those who promoted and established it would tend to benefit the farming population of the country by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestibly that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

BUCHANAN'S TESTIMONY.

To make confirmation strong as proof of Holy Writ I will place on the record of this discussion the statement of President Buchanan at a later period, when the evils of a revenue tariff had culminated in the overthrow of our industries and the impoverishment of our people. President Buchanan, in his annual message to Congress December 8, 1857, said:

We have possessed all of the elements of national wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

In the same message, after describing the distress and want to which the people had been reduced, President Buchanan enlarged upon the inability of the people to purchase manufactured articles for lack of means, and that goods therefore ceased to be produced. The decay of our own industries so lessened the people's means of purchasing imported goods that imports fell off to such an extent that the revenue declined so that it was inadequate to meet the necessary expenses of the Government. To supply this deficiency Congress, by act of December 23, 1857, authorized the issue of $20,000,000 of Treasury notes. This proving inadequate, in June, 1858, a loan of $20,000,000 was authorized to meet the expenditures of the Government.

The conditions progressed from bad to worse until March 3, 1859, when the situation was so appalling that the President issued a special message to Congress, appealing in tones of touching pathos to preserve the credit of the country.

The Treasury was bankrupt, the credit of the nation was reduced to its lowest terms, and no provision was made for the necessary expenses of the Government.

Thus—

Says the message—

the country, which is full of resources, will be dishonored before the world, and the American people, who are a debt-paying people, will be disgraced by the omission on our part to do our duty.

And these calamitous results ensued, it must not be forgotten, coincidently with an unparalleled succession of fortuitous circumstances, calculated in the highest degree to countervail the depressing influences exerted by the mistaken tariff policy of that unhappy period. These circumstances, as all will remember, were a succession of famines in Ireland, a crop shortage in Germany and other European countries, European wars, and the discovery of gold in California. But all these aids to prosperity could not overcome the noxious effects of the Walker tariff, and the country sank deeper and deeper in the slough of despond until the Morrill tariff brought succor to a demoralized and distressed country.

TARIFF FOR REVENUE.

One of the numerous contentions upon which the advocates of a tariff for revenue rely is the assumption that free raw material cheapens production, enlarges consumption, multiplies markets, promotes manufactures, and secures remunerative employment to labor. Precisely what mode of imposing duties is required by a tariff for revenue only may be a question not free from difficulty.

There is credible Democratic authority for holding that such a tariff excludes entirely the idea of free imports of any kind, that the Democratic doctrine of the unconstitutionality of a protective duty carries the necessary implication that revenue being the supreme and only purpose of the impost, it must be exacted from the whole field of importations without omission and without favor. In every quarter in which this view meets with acceptance, free raw materials must be condemned as repugnant to the principle of a revenue tariff and in derogation of the latest distinct tenet of the Democratic party. For a fuller exposition of this incongruity in the bill I refer to the following observations from the New York Sun:

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

We have had the honor to receive from the attorney-general of Mississippi, the Hon. Frank Johnston, a communication containing the following request:

"I have written to ask the Sun to give its readers elaborately its views on the subject of free raw material, with a protective duty on the manufactured product."

As any and all discussion upon this subject can be theoretical and academic only, and of no possible application to the practical transactions of the Democratic Congress, we must respectfully call Mr. Johnston's attention to the fact. Debate on free raw material is closed. Such a feature of the tariff was presented for approval to the last great court of the Democratic party, the National Democratic Convention of 1892, and it was repudiated, not merely by the negative of deliberate and categorical rejection, but by the added declaration of a principle that made the notion of free raw materials a constitutional impossibility.

The Chicago convention, which put forward Mr. Cleveland for the Presidency, decided that there should be a "tariff for revenue only," and in so saying it double locked the door on further argument as to the expediency of other policies, or as to national prosperity by other methods, or the inevitable changes in manufacture and commerce, or sectional advantages, or individual interests, or personal opinions, or discrimination of any sort or shade in customs duties. Each became thereafter an absolutely forbidden factor in the tariff, as prescribed by the Constitution. Each and all must be eliminated from the Federal system and barred out.

Free raw material, or free anything, is out of the question in a constitutional revenue tariff. A free list is as impossible under the Democratic platform as a prohibitory tax. Revenue is the supreme principle, and revenue only, to be exacted from the whole field of importation, without omission and without favor. The reformers have been proclaiming earnestly for years past that any other than a revenue tariff robs some one, and now the Democratic platform says the same thing. What any Democratic journal or Democratic statesman, therefore, thinks individually of the free-raw-material principle can have no more standing before a Democratic Congress or a Democratic Administration than advocacy of highway robbery, direct and simple. The Sun would have to attach as much importance to elaborating an essay on the multiplication table as to a renewed discussion on the merits of a free list.

In assuring Mr. Johnston of our most distinguished consideration, we must justify this somewhat blunt response to his courteous note by the fact that the Democratic pledge, solemnly offered and publicly accepted, tolerates no other. The tariff must be for revenue only, without humbug, backsliding, or delusion. Otherwise people will say the Democracy is a fraud.

Mr. Chairman, I indulge the hope that the humbug, backsliding, and delusion of "free raw material," so pungently referred to by Mr. Dana, may be eliminated from the bill before it reaches its passage.

HENRY WATTERSON.

Another father in Israel of the Democratic faith, from the opposite section of our country, Henry Watterson, says this bill is an attempt to steer between wind and water, to serve two masters. A tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection are the opposites of each other, and the conflict between them is irrepressible. If the party did not mean this in 1876, then the platform lied. If Mr. Cleveland did not mean it by his message of 1887, then he misled the people and is at this moment the custodian of stolen goods. At least the convention of 1892 meant it, because the issue was therein made so decisive and incisive that nobody could mistake it. The people voted distinctly to displace the protective system with a revenue system.

The safe course to pursue was to make a tariff for revenue only in consonance with the pledges of the party. The imperfection of the bill is its complications. It admits the smug face of protection in some parts and half its body in other parts. So says Henry Watterson in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

So firm is Mr. Watterson's conviction that the Democratic party has been guilty of a base betrayal of the people's trust in undertaking to foist upon the country the Wilson bill for a tariff-for-revenue measure that he has deliberately declared that "his party is marching through a slaughterhouse to an open grave." I do not quarrel with him on that point, but am happy to be in unity with him. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Andrew Jackson Steinman, as broad-gauged, clear-headed, and conservative a Democratic journalist as can be found in Eastern Pennsylvania, in the Lancaster Intelligencer says:

Mr. OATES furthermore believes that the free list in the Wilson bill is too large in view of the need of revenue. We are entirely in sympathy with this opinion. We are unable to understand how a Democratic committee, instructed by a Democratic convention in favor of a tariff for revenue, has been able to formulate a tariff bill which is not expected to raise anything like the revenue needed by the Treasury; which makes a large free list that yields no revenue at all, and continues a Republican bounty on sugar which not only fails to produce, but actually dissipates revenue.

It seems to us to be really silly to establish a free list, when we need the revenue it can be readily made to yield without complaint and without particular burden upon anyone. A tariff for revenue really prohibits a free list; though it would be a good policy, as to articles of prime necessity, provided the revenue was superabundant. It is a good way to release revenue, to establish a free list; but when we do not want to release revenue, it is a foolish establishment.

There should be a light duty levied upon all articles on the free list in the Democratic bill; a duty so light as not to hinder their importation, but enough to raise the revenue they can be made to yield without checking their importation. And certainly there should be no bounty on sugar. That is a question too clear for long discussion. No such proposition could have appeared in a Democratic tariff bill, if a proper hand had been kept upon the Democratic pulse of the country, which thoroughly and undoubtedly repudiates the idea of a bounty; and especially when the revenues are short, will it forbid the passage of such a measure.

The honest truth is that the Wilson tariff bill needs to be promptly recommitted to the committee with instruction to cause it to provide sufficient revenue; and the sooner this is understood and done, the better it will be for the party and the country.

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

I beg now to observe that if the theory of Mr. Dana and Mr. Watterson is not sound, and protective duties are after all compatible with the principle of a tariff for revenue only, then the "free raw material" clauses of the bill come under equal condemnation on another ground. If protection is admitted into the bill to any extent, however limited, as a direct object, it is a distinct concession to the principle of protection, and we may well insist that its application shall not be arbitrary but conformable to the reason of the case and the requirements of our industrial situation.

We do not want a tariff bill like that of 1846, which a distinguished economic writer characterized as "neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good salt herring." We ought to have a bill consistent with itself—without repugnancy—that stands by the logic of its principle and does not quail before its sequences.

The President says in his recent annual message that restrictions must be removed from the importation of the raw materials of our manufactures to enable the latter to compete on equal terms for the markets.

Of course a full and complete answer to that contention is that under existing law there is practically no duty on raw material manufactured for export. Ninety per cent of the duty is refunded. But supposing it was not. What is the philosophy of this proposition? It must be clear that if our manufacturers are barred from the world's markets it is because of some obstacles that are not in the way of other competing nations. In an economic sense what are the obstacles to free commerce on equal terms? Anything which prevents equality of facilities is an obstacle. Higher wages is an obstacle. Greater cost of material is an obstacle. There may be others, but these are all that concern us in this discussion. An equalization of facilities can be secured by the removal of one or both of these obstacles.

I do not believe the people of the United States can afford to secure a foreign market at the cost of foregoing any part of our wages or of any part of our protection to raw material. The President, however, thinks we can, and advises us to forego the defensive duty on raw material. On what principle is this selection made? In either case an injury is done to labor. Those employed in the collection and preparation and transportation of raw material can no more compete with the cheap labor abroad employed in similar work than can American manufacturers, and the result must be a cut in wages or a cessation of business.

The protective principle being admitted, then every industry in which American labor comes in competition with cheaper foreign labor ought to have its share of protection if it needs it. The production of raw material is as much an industry as its elaboration into manufactured articles. Those employed in it are as much workmen as any other laborers. They have the same wants, the same aspirations, the same need for protection against the corresponding labor abroad at lower wages. It is labor that is the object of protection, and any commodity representing labor is within the principle. If there is a raw material that is untouched by labor let that go on the free list.

Even Bastiat, who was a free trader *par excellence*, made that concession to the protective theory. He held that if protection is admissible at all, all labor should be protected: "No labor, no protection."

If it is the wish of the House, Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain it further this evening if I can have about twenty minutes in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied forty minutes of his time. He will be entitled to twenty minutes again when this matter is resumed.

Mr. BROSIUS. Then I will yield the floor, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

PRINTING COAST AND GEODETIC REPORT.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House agreed to a Senate resolution to print the annual report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for 1892. There was an error in the resolution. It should have been 1893. I move to reconsider, or ask unanimous consent to reconsider, the action of the House in order to ask its return from the Senate and correction. I submit a resolution, on which I ask immediate action.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to return to the House the Senate concurrent resolution to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. What is the suggestion? Should it be 1893?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is the correction which should be made in the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The SPEAKER. As it wants now only three minutes of the time for taking the recess, if there be no objection the Chair will declare the House in recess until 8 o'clock. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will preside and perform the duties of the Chair at the evening session, which will be devoted to debate only upon the pending bill.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by Mr. BROOKSHIRE as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is now in session for debate only on the tariff bill, and will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole under the special order.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

[Mr. MAGUIRE withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. COCKRELL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. KILGORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no conclusion thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. KILGORE (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 12, 1894, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 6 of Rule XIII, Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, reported the bill (H. R. 3195) granting a pension to Lovica Hall, a widow of a soldier of the war of 1812; which, with the accompanying report (No. 257), was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5142) to increase the pension of H. S. Mayhill, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a resolution of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5166) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 5167) to grant the right of way to the Indian Pacific Coal and Railway Company through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 108) authorizing Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 5168) for the relief of the estate of Alfred W. Green, late of Carroll Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) for the relief of Washington West, Madison Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 5170) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUNDY: A bill (H. R. 5171) for the relief of John McNaughton, second lieutenant Company G, First Regiment West Virginia Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the heirs of Dudley D. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 5173) granting a pension to Sarah L. Maxwell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 5174) for the relief of the heirs of John Innerarity—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5175) for the relief of Mrs. Ann M. Brown, Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Milton Iseman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Arra Van der Sinden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5178) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5180) to remove the charge of desertion against the record of William J. McFalls—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5181) to correct the military record of John Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 5182) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 5183) for the relief of Joseph W. Parish—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FIELDER: A bill (H. R. 5184) for the relief of Maria T. Kargo—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of George E. Andronette & Co. and 6 other firms of glass-manufacturers of Chicago, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry W. King & Co. and 41 other manufacturers of clothing of the city of Chicago, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. Johansen and 14 other cigar-manufacturers of Chicago, for a uniform duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Board of Trade, favoring the adoption of House bill 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Memorial of the Board of Trade of the city of Nashua, N. H., in favor of the early completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the farmers engaged in the tobacco culture and cigar manufacturers of Hinsdale, N. H., protesting against the tobacco schedules of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Petition of 280 miners of Brookside, Ala., protesting against placing coal and iron on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRANCH: Petition of citizens of Carteret County, N. C., to open Darien Inlet between Portsmouth and Cape Lookout—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of W. F. Willis, of Plymouth, N. C., for relief for property destroyed by United States Government in the town of Plymouth, N. C., during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Greenville Tobacco Board of Trade, protesting against the increased duty on cigarettes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Resolutions of Cigar-makers' Union, No. 126, Ephratah, Pa., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Memorial from the Legislature of Idaho, praying that certain waters in that State be drained—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of McKeesport, Pa., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE FOREST: Petition of sundry citizens of Danbury, Conn., against proposed change of duty on manufactured hats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of sundry citizens of Connecticut, against reduction of duty on imported leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of James Fanning for his relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George Glenn, of Madison County, Ark., for his relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of 31 citizens of Hardman, Oregon, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Protests of 240 citizens of Hadley; 153 of Amherst; 123 of Agawam; 97 of Northfield, and 63 more of Westfield, all in the State of Massachusetts, interested in the cultivation of tobacco, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 777 employés of the Otis Mills, Ware, Mass., irrespective of party affiliations, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 83 citizens of Winchendon, Mass., against the Wilson bill, especially as it affects manufacturing of toys—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 44 employés of the Swift River Company, Enfield, Mass., irrespective of party affiliations, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 21 employés of the Excelsior Woolen Company, Wales, Mass., irrespective of party affiliations, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Protest of the lithographers of the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the All Tobacco Cigarettes Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of H. C. Battey, Proctorsville, Vt., and 194 other farmers, laborers, and employés of the Taft, Burbank & Murdock Woolen Mills, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of James A. Hover and other citizens of Columbiaville, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Doty & Scrimgeour, of New York (manufacturers of surface-coated paper), against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance against the passage of the Wilson bill from employés of the Valatie (N. Y.) Cotton Mills—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. B. Knowlson and other citizens of Sand Lake, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employés of the Valatie Cotton Mills, the Wild Manufacturing Company, and the Valatie Paper Mill Company, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Gilbert Sherwood and other persons of Valatie, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of West Superior, Wis., against placing iron ore on the free list as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. Mathilda S. Lawler, widow of Nicholas Lawler, late a soldier in the Fourth United States Artillery, praying for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Petition of J. E. B. Hudson and 402 other citizens and old soldiers of Iowa, praying for legislation to prevent suspension of pensions until after due notice of proof of fraud, and for restoration of suspended pensions until such proofs are secured—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 35 farmers of Cattaraugus County, N. Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of citizens of O'Neill, Nebr., asking for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition and resolutions passed and signed by the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by W. A. Williams and 135 others, citizens of Clayton, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by Abram Simmerman and 20 others, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by John Campbell and 179 others of Glassboro, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MALLORY: Petition of levee men to dredge Charlotte Harbor, Fla., asking an appropriation of $150,000—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Crystal River, Fla., praying retention of existing tariff on lead pencils—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARVIN of New York: Remonstrance of Howard Greenleaf and 37 other citizens of Hampton, Orange County, N. Y., against reduction of tariff rates on tissue papers of all kinds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: Petition of sundry citizens of Peru, Ind., for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union, No. 73, American Flint Glass Workers' Union, of Marion, Ind., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maj. H. B. Sayler and 64 other ex-Union soldiers, for the passage of the bill (H. R. 1109) to correct the military record of Charles A. Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDEARMON: Petition of Mrs. Melissa Gill, for passage of a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to place the name of George W. Gill on the rolls and records of Company I, Seventh Tennessee Cavalry, to accompany House bill 5149—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEIKELJOHN: Protest of miners of lead ores in Missouri and other Western States, against the provisions in the tariff bill which prescribes 15 per cent ad valorem on lead ores and admits duty free all ores in which the value in silver is greater than that of lead—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEIL: Petition of Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange for completion of Harbor of Refuge at Cape Ann, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the employés of Irvington Woolen Mills, Delaware County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of Wolfender, Shaw & Co., Limited, of Cardington, Delaware County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the cigarette manufacturers, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of the manufacturers and employés in the manufacture of gold, silver, aluminum, and metal leaf, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employers of labor, workingmen, citizens, and others of Parkersburg, Chester County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of thread workers and spinners of fine cotton of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lead miners of Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill as now framed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of I. & I. Eastwood, Lyndell, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest of farmers of Westchester, town of Colchester, Conn., against the tobacco schedule of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, and their employés, protesting against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial of workingmen, employers of labor, and others, citizens of Gogebic County, Mich., protesting against the proposed free admission of iron ore and declaring that such action by Congress would bring suffering and distress to all those engaged in the iron industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of Martin Hazzard and 37 other members of Lodge No. 41 of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Findlay, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: Protest by 531 employés of the Bausch & Dombe Optical Company, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Papers in the claim of John D. Tanner, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of Martin Good and 20 employés engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods, of Highspire, Pa., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Petition of Adam Smith and other farmers of Bradford County, Pa., against the reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 12, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHIPMAN.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Friday at 3 o'clock I shall call up the resolutions of the House of Representatives in reference to the death of Hon. John Logan Chipman, a member of that body from the State of Michigan.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution of the House providing for the appointment of a special joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate and consider the rank, pay, and other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy.

The message also communicated a request to return to the House the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year 1892.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the memorial of John S. Krier and other citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Daniel Scotten & Co., of Detroit, Mich., praying for an amendment of the present tariff law so as to permit the sale of leaf tobacco in its natural state free of tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition of the Central Labor Union of Worcester, Mass., indorsing the Wilson bill in its own behalf and that of twenty-four labor organizations which it represents. I suppose these gentlemen are very much interested in the reduction of the hours of labor, as the passage of the Wilson bill, in accordance with the view of the petitioners, carried to an extreme, would prevent there being any hours of labor at all to a very large number of workingmen. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Rubber Garment Workers' Local Union, No. 51, of Boston, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Local Assembly, No. 7954, Knights of Labor, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Wilson tariff bill and for the imposition of an income tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Hayes Young and 24 other citizens of Champaign County, Ohio, remonstrating against the

passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of manufacturers of woolen and worsted goods of Cincinnati and Hamilton, Ohio, praying that the duty on wool and woolen goods be left undisturbed by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HILL presented a petition of members of the Medical Society of Oneida County, N. Y., praying for the establishment of a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented a memorial of growers of tobacco in New York County, N. Y., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers to $1 per pound for unstemmed and $1.25 for stemmed; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the employés of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Company, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against any change in the present duty on optical goods; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of cabinet-makers, wood-carvers, carpenters, upholsterers, trimmers, and others, manufacturers of New York City, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY. I present the memorial of K. H. Leavin and 81 others, operatives in the Kirk Mills, of Central Village, Conn., which are practically idle now, remonstrating against the common enemy—the Wilson tariff bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY. I also present the memorial of Edward Conant and 49 other citizens of Bozrahville, Conn., workers in the mills there, which is significant because of the following introduction:

We, the undersigned, overseers and operatives in the Bozrahville mills, irrespective of political party, men and women, acting as free agents and independent of the suggestions or the request of our employers, etc.

The memorialists then proceed to protest against the proposed Wilson tariff bill. I see in the public press utterances in various places which I can not properly mention implying that the people who sign these memorials by myriads are ordered to do so. Any man familiar with New England society at least (the rest of the country can speak for itself) knows that no greater insult could be given to the operatives in any mill than to have anything in the nature of an order, or a request which could be distorted into practically an order, to them. It would create an instant rebellion, even if it were one in which they themselves would starve.

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of W. P. Cotton and other cigar manufacturers of Macon and Clinton, Mich., and a petition of Brown Brothers and 21 other cigar manufacturers of Detroit, Mich., praying for the imposition of a duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of J. H. Krier and 107 other citizens of Michigamme, Mich., and the memorial of H. E. Hosking and 80 other business men, workingmen, and employers of labor, of Forsyth, Mich., remonstrating against any change in the duty on iron ore; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PASCO presented a memorial of C. E. Herrick and 79 other citizens of Crystal River, Fla., remonstrating against the reduction of duty on lead pencils, as proposed in the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the City Council of Palatka, Fla., praying that a liberal appropriation be made for the improvement of the St. Johns River at Orange Mills Flats by deepening the channel at that point; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of R. McConathy and 45 other business men of Florida, praying that a term of the United States circuit and district court be held at Ocala, Marion County, Fla.; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of J. B. Wall and 22 other members of the bar at Tampa, Fla., praying for the holding of a regular term of the United States courts at Ocala, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, covering the operations of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, be printed; and that there be printed 8,000 extra copies, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 for the use of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries; the illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office 8,000 copies of the thirteenth annual report of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology, with accompanying papers and illustrations, and uniform with the preceding volumes of the series, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Bureau of Ethnology; the illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1425) for the relief of Mrs. Maria McMurdie; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives requesting the Senate to return to that body the Senate concurrent resolution to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the request of the House of Representatives to return the concurrent resolution be complied with.

The motion was agreed to.

AMOUNT OF GOLD COIN.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to call up the resolution heretofore submitted by me in reference to the amount of gold coin in the country.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN on the 9th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate from what source or sources the gold coin in this country outside of the Treasury of the United States was increased to the amount of $83,839,482 during the fiscal year 1893, as expressed in his recent report for that year, and if derived from different sources, give the sources respectively from which derived and the amount thereof.

Mr. ALLEN. My object in introducing this resolution, and asking its adoption is to correct what appears to be an evident mistake in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1893. On page 10 of his report the Secretary of the Treasury gives as the total gold coinage for the fiscal year 1893, $30,038,140. On page 11 of the same report he says:

The movement of gold for the fiscal year shows an excess of exports over imports of $86,897,275.

On page 13 of his report the Secretary of the Treasury informs us that the increase of gold in this country outside of the banks for the same year was $86,869,482. The difference between the sum which the Secretary of the Treasury says was against us in the balance of trade for the fiscal year 1893 and the amount of our coinage was $56,859,135.

We can only obtain gold coin from two sources, the mines and by importation. It is quite apparent to me that this is a mistake which in its very nature is calculated to mislead the people of the country and deceive them with reference to the increase of the gold coin in this country for the year 1893.

I believe it to be due to the Secretary of the Treasury and to Congress and to the country at large that if this is a mistake it shall be promptly corrected, or if it is not a mistake that we shall have the data upon which the Secretary of the Treasury bases his conclusion. For that purpose, and not for the purpose of burdening the Secretary of the Treasury at all, I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I wish the Senator from Nebraska would amend the resolution by saying "increased to the amount stated in his report," without stating the sum, because the resolution in its present form commits the Senate to an interpretation of the report.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well.

Mr. HOAR. I for one have not had an opportunity to investigate the matter. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator's desire for the information, but on the other hand, I do not think the Senate should affirm a fact unless it has been inquired into to see that there is no mistake about it.

Mr. ALLEN. I am perfectly willing to have the resolution amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will adopt the phrase "increased to the amount stated in the Secretary's report," without putting in any particular sum, I shall then make no objection to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts move the amendment?

Mr. HOAR. I move to strike out of the resolution all after the word "amount" down to the words "in his," and insert "stated," and to strike out "that year" and insert "the year 1893."

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have the resolution read as modified.

Mr. HOAR. I will read it myself, if the Senator please.

Mr. ALLISON. That is better.

Mr. HOAR. It will then read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate from what source or sources the gold coin in this country outside of the Treasury of the United States was increased to the amount stated in his recent report for the year 1893, etc.

I move that amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be glad if the Senator from Nebraska would have read that portion of the Secretary's report on which he bases the resolution. He may have read it in the beginning of his observations, but I was unable to hear what he said.

Mr. HOAR. Let the amendment be made first.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly; I have no objection to the amendment

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will be considered as agreed to. It is agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. For the information of the Senator from Iowa I will read a portion of the report. On page 10 of the report the following language is used:

The coinage during the year consisted of 97,280,875 pieces, valued as follows:

Gold	$30,038,140.00
Silver dollars	5,343,715.00
Subsidiary silver	7,217,220.90
Minor coins	1,085,102.90
Total	43,085,178.80

On page 11 of the report, under the title of imports and exports, the Secretary says:

The movement of gold for the fiscal year shows an excess of exports over imports of $86,897,275, while the excess for the fiscal year 1892 was only $142,654.

The exports of silver exceeded the imports by $7,653,813, being an increase over the fiscal year 1892 in the net exports of $2,617,985.

Passing over page 13 of the report, the Secretary of the Treasury gives a table of money outside of the Treasury, the first item of which is as follows:

Gold coin, November 1, 1892, $411,252,197; November 1, 1893, $498,121,679; increase, $86,869,482.

There is evidently a mistake in the report in this respect. The Secretary of the Treasury gives us to distinctly understand that the balance of gold coin against us for the year 1893 was $86,897,275, while almost in the same breath we are told that there was an increase of more than that amount outside of the Treasury Department. This increase could only come from two sources, from our mines and mintage or from importations. We are distinctly told that it did not come by importation, because the balance of trade was against us.

Mr. STEWART. How much was the increase by coinage?

Mr. ALLEN. The increase by coinage was $30,038,140.

Mr. STEWART. Then there would be an increase by the amount paid out of the Treasury during that period, which, if I recollect aright, was a little over $20,000,000. That would leave in round numbers about $50,000,000, when subtracted from the $86,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN. Subtracting that, it leaves $56,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. About $56,000,000. I was unable to account for that sum. I have not the figures before me, but I found over $50,000,000 that I myself was unable to account for in the report. I looked at that point carefully.

Mr. ALLEN. The sole purpose I have in introducing the resolution is to correct what appears to me to be a mistake in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. I think it is due to the Secretary, it is certainly due to Congress and the country, if this was a mistake, that we shall be officially informed of that fact, and that it may be placed upon record concurrently with the report. If it be correct, then I think the Congress and the country are entitled to the data in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury from which he reaches this conclusion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

On motion of Mr. GORMAN, it was

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GRAY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two hours and twenty-seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 12, 1894.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

John M. B. Sill, of Michigan, to be minister resident and consul-general of the United States to Korea.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

To be post chaplain.

The Rev. James Wilson Hillman, of New York.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery arm.

First Lieut. Henry J. Reilly, Fifth Artillery, to be captain.

Second Lieut. Oscar I. Straub, First Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John B. Malony, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan.

DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

Robert E. Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Mint.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Shaw F. Neely, of Kansas, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Kansas.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Simon C. Karrer, of Michigan, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Sylvester Hull, of Redding, Cal., to be register of the land office at Redding, Cal.

John I. Lee, of Ashland, Kans., to be register of the land office at Dodge City, Kans.

James N. Fike, of Colby, Kans., to be register of the land office at Colby, Kans.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

W. B. Humphrey, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Sioux City, in the State of Iowa.

James R. Johnston, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Rock Island, in the State of Illinois.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Grant Herring, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of internal revenue for the twelfth district of Pennsylvania.

Raymond E. Shearer, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of internal revenue for the ninth district of Pennsylvania.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Marvin E. Mathews, of Marshall, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at Marshall, Minn.

Colin F. Macdonald, of St. Cloud, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at St. Cloud, Minn.

James F. Thompson, of Eureka, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Humboldt, Cal.

Lafayette S. Barnes, of Redding, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Redding, Cal.

Thomas J. McCue, of Norton, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Colby, Kans.

George T. Crist, of Santa Fe, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, Kans.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Charles E. Davis, of Mount Auburn, Ill., to be agent for the Indians of the Colorado River Agency in Arizona.

George W. Harper, of Carrollton, Ga., to be agent for the Indians of the Umatilla Agency in Oregon.

Isaac J. Wootten, of Laurel, Del., to be agent for the Indians of the Nevada Agency in Nevada.

POSTMASTERS.

James A. McDonald, to be postmaster at Mamaroneck, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

John J. Kane, to be postmaster at Sing Sing, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

John C. Edwards, to be postmaster at Yazoo City, in the county of Yazoo and State of Mississippi.

Thomas R. Wilcockson, to be postmaster at Paragould, in the county of Greene and State of Arkansas.
Samuel B. Holmes, to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Franklin and State of Kentucky.
Charles P. Weaver, to be postmaster at Louisville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Kentucky.
Jonas Rosenthal, to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Rapides and State of Louisiana.
Yoel G. Rust, to be postmaster at Albany, in the county of Dougherty and State of Georgia.
Hettie J. Foose, to be postmaster at Kosciusko, in the county of Attala and State of Mississippi.
Abner K. Northrop, to be postmaster at Pass Christian, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi.
Ella Harris, to be postmaster at Hazlehurst, in the county of Copiah and State of Mississippi.
Charles F. Rankin, to be postmaster at Brewton, in the county of Escambia and State of Alabama.
W. I. Branagan, to be postmaster at Emmettsburg, in the county of Palo Alto and State of Iowa.
John S. Sidey, to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Adair and State of Iowa.
Abram J. Howe, to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of Mills and State of Iowa.
W. C. Scrimgeour, to be postmaster at Belle Plaine, in the county of Benton and State of Iowa.
John F. Kent, to be postmaster at Dows, in the county of Wright and State of Iowa.
Joseph M. Bishop, to be postmaster at State Center, in the county of Marshall and State of Iowa.
Jonas F. Moyer, to be postmaster at Catasauqua, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania.
Arnold Smouse, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa.
Martin G. Stiger, to be postmaster at Toledo, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa.
John A. Flannery, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Prince George's and State of Maryland.
John Wolf, to be postmaster at Bangor, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.
Frank P. Sharkey, to be postmaster at Mauch Chunk, in the county of Carbon and State of Pennsylvania.
W. P. Walsh, to be postmaster at Smethport, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania.
George B. Nye, to be postmaster at Ellwood City, in the county of Lawrence and State of Pennsylvania.
John E. Malone, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.
Charles N. Berner, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Washington and State of Kansas.
John G. White, to be postmaster at Abingdon, in the county of Washington and State of Virginia.
Emmett M. Morrison, to be postmaster at Smithfield, in the county of Isle of Wight and State of Virginia.
William Lee, to be postmaster at Casey, in the county of Clark and State of Illinois.
William H. Harry, to be postmaster at Watseka, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois.
Abbie E. Libby, to be postmaster at Marysville, in the county of Marshall and State of Kansas.
Allen G. Clampitt, to be postmaster at Highwood, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.
Leonard W. Chambers, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Morgan and State of Illinois.
John W. Rout, to be postmaster at Stanford, in the county of Lincoln and State of Kentucky.
Samuel W. Taliaferro, to be postmaster at Roseville, in the county of Warren and State of Illinois.
James F. Robertson, to be postmaster at Camp Point, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois.
Ephriam A. Ray, to be postmaster at Oregon, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois.
Emanuel B. Thumma, to be postmaster at Garrett, in the county of Dekalb and State of Indiana.
Oliver P. Basford, to be postmaster at Flatonia, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas.
Carroll M. Lovell, to be postmaster at Dickson, in the county of Dickson and State of Tennessee.
James C. Brophy, to be postmaster at Shortsville, in the county of Ontario and State of New York.
Frederick L. Churchill, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.
Thomas K. Fleming, to be postmaster at Petersburg, in county of Pike and State of Indiana.
John Julian, to be postmaster at El Paso, in the county of El Paso and State of Texas.
David H. Mock, to be postmaster at Webb City, in the county of Jasper and State of Missouri.
John W. Mason, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Audrain and State of Missouri.
Thomas B. Gillouly, to be postmaster at Ridgway, in the county of Elk and State of Pennsylvania.
Thomas A. Butkiewicz, to be postmaster at Nanticoke, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania.
Ed. E. King, to be postmaster at Brownwood, in the county of Brown and State of Texas.
Frank Bucholtz, to be postmaster at Fort Bragg, in the county of Mendocino and State of California.
Leslie M. Dennis, to be postmaster at Redding, in the county of Shasta and State of California.
Elijah W. Rawls, to be postmaster at Tarboro, in the county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina.
George E. Sawyers, to be postmaster at Santa Barbara, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California.
S. J. Mayock, to be postmaster at Gilroy, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California.
Fannie Ingram, to be postmaster at Monterey, in the county of Monterey and State of California.
John A. Monaghan, to be postmaster at Nokomis, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois.
Albert F. Nash, to be postmaster at Sioux City, in the county of Woodbury and State of Iowa.
Alfred E. Haven, to be postmaster at Faribault, in the county of Rice and State of Minnesota.
Jacob Marx, to be postmaster at Aurora in the county of Kane and State of Illinois.
Samuel W. Chapman, to be postmaster at Elgin, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois.
John C. McGrath, to be postmaster at Jerseyville, in the county of Jersey and State of Illinois.
John Topp, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin.
Fred A. Lischer, to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Scott and State of Iowa.
George E. Young, to be postmaster at Amboy, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois.
Fergus F. Green, to be postmaster at Shawano, in the county of Shawano and State of Wisconsin.
Robert M. Crawford, to be postmaster at Mineral Point, in the county of Iowa and State of Wisconsin.
Samuel M. Sinead, to be postmaster at Fond du Lac, in the county of Fond du Lac and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 12, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. HAGBY.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to lay before the House executive communications.

LAWS OF OKLAHOMA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies of the Laws of Oklahoma for the use of the House.

The SPEAKER. These copies of the laws furnished the House the Chair has directed to be placed in the House library. The communication will lie on the table.

INSPECTION OF IRON AND STEEL BOILER-PLATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with a Senate amendment.

Mr. DALZELL. I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read, as follows:

Amend the title by adding: "relative to inspection of iron or steel boiler-plates."

The amendment was agreed to.

WILLIAM E. WOODBRIDGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 418) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852.

Mr. KRIBBS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. BELTZHOOVER] is absent, and I ask that the bill be laid on the table temporarily.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

EL CALLAO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a concurrent resolution relative to appointment of committees of the House and Senate to consider the personnel of the Navy, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read, as follows:

On page 1, line 2, strike out all after "concurred" down to and including "Senate," in line 8, and insert: "that subcommittees of the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, to be selected by each of said committees, are hereby directed to act jointly.

Page 2, line 6, after "convenient," insert: "to said committees." On page 2, line 8, strike out all after "premises" down to and including "possible," in line 12.

Strike out the preamble.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments to the House resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I demand the regular order.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], requesting the President to send to the House of Representatives further information on Hawaiian affairs, and I ask immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. That requires unanimous consent. The gentleman has the right to present the report and have it printed; and it will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the proposition?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the public interests, all information received since his message of December 18, 1893, or not transmitted therewith and now in his possession, touching recent reported events in the Hawaiian Islands, any attempt to overturn the republican government thereof and erect a monarchy in its stead, and especially whether any representative, officer, vessel, or armed forces of the United States took part in such recent attempts to subvert a friendly government; and if so, by whose orders they acted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky reports this resolution back within the week, the Chair understands, and asks unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, does not the right to report, and has it not often been decided by the Chair that the right to report a privileged resolution carries with it the right of consideration?

The SPEAKER. It would.

Mr. HITT. Has not that often been held by the Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Often. But this order under which we are acting especially dictates what we shall consider, and that the Chair shall not entertain any intervening motion, and the Chair held the other day, on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], that it might be reported and printed, and would not lose any of its privileged character, and that it could be called up as soon as the order under which we are acting is disposed of.

Mr. HITT. Then consideration could be reached now by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It could be reached by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent, as the Chair understands.

Mr. McCREARY. I had asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. HITT. I hope that will be granted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was simply going to say that if unanimous consent is given for the consideration of this resolution I must insist that it include the resolution reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, which has hitherto been denied consideration. It seems that the House is now ruled by three members, and I do not think we should reduce the number to one.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. As the gentleman from Tennessee objects, I ask that the resolution lie upon the table for the present without losing its privilege.

The SPEAKER. It will not lose its privilege. It will be printed and will retain its place, subject to be called up after the special order has been exhausted.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the Senate concurrent resolution to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. MARSHALL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1266) to extend and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, A. D. 1891: in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolutions:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office 8,000 copies of the thirteenth annual report of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology, with accompanying papers and illustrations, and uniform with the preceding volumes of the series, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Bureau of Ethnology; the illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Also:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, covering the operations of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, be printed, and that there be printed 8,000 extra copies, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 for the use of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries; the illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 4114) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bœuf River, in Louisiana; when the Speaker signed the same.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called; when the following report was presented:

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5077) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass, reported in favor of its passage; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House, and ordered to be printed.

The House then, pursuant to the special order, resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

THE TARIFF.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. EVERETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROSIUS] has still twenty minutes of his time remaining, which he desires to occupy.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, at the adjournment of the House yesterday afternoon, I was reviewing some of the contentions by which the measure before the House is sought to be supported by its advocates, and I had come, in the progress of my observations, to wool.

WOOL.

Now you put wool on the free list, because you put it in the category of raw material. Why call wool raw material? The farmer bestows upon it his labor, his skill, his intelligence, and his watchful care. It is touched by labor before it has value. Cloth you designate as a manufactured article and put it on the dutiable list.

But what do the economists say about that? The coat you wear has a history. Before the intervention of human labor the raw materials of that coat are air, water, heat, gas, light, and the various salts which enter into its composition. These are untouched by labor, have no value, and do not need protection. Now comes labor and converts these elements into sustenance for sheep; more labor and wool is produced, still more labor and yarn is the result, and still another acquisition of labor and cloth is produced, and yet another addition of labor and a coat rewards that accumulation of labor.

Now, I insist that upon any consistent, logical, and defensible theory of protection every one of these consecutive contributions

of labor from the first furrow of the plough to the last stitch of the needle is entitled to protection if the corresponding foreign labor commands a lower scale of wages. Iron and coal and lumber are amenable to the same reasoning. Where was the value of the ore and the coal for the millions of years it lay buried in the earth? Labor touched it and it had value. Labor dug it out of the mine, reduced it to convenient forms for use, transported it and made it available as the raw material for higher forms of elaboration. It is the finished product of the laborers employed in its preparation for higher uses in as true a sense as wool and wheat are the finished product of the farmer who produces them or the web of cloth of the man who weaves it, and has equal claim to protection to the extent of the labor it represents.

DUTIES AND COST OF CONSUMPTION.

Another contention, which reminds one of the observation of one of our humorists, that it is better not to know so much than to know so many things that ain't so, is that the present high tariff adds largely to the cost of articles necessary to the comfort of the wage-earner. Such a claim must be due either to insincerity or to mental limitations.

It is known to everybody that the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States recently concluded the most searching investigation ever made into the effect of the present tariff upon cost of living and wages, and the conclusions, acquiesced in by the entire committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, show that under our present tariff law the prices of commodities consumed by the masses of our people have steadily fallen, that the cost of living has steadily diminished, and the wages of labor as certainly increased.

This information is as accessible to Democrats as Republicans, and if they do not find it it is because they will not look for it. You know it takes a mind of some elevation to admit to its consideration facts which show it to have been in error, and our Democratic friends are much like the persecutors of Galileo, who refused to look through the telescope at the stars which they alleged did not exist.

WHO PAYS THE DUTY.

It is contended that the higher the duties the greater the burdens upon the people. It is amazing how much loose thinking and reckless talking there are on the vexed question of the incidence of defensive duties.

I am aware of no rule by which we can determine what proportion of the duty is paid respectively by the importer and the consumer. To say that the consumer pays the duty is as false as a general proposition as to say the producer pays it. In most cases neither one pays it all, but it is apportioned between them by a sliding scale governed by circumstances. When we produce an excess over consumption and there is a residue for export, the home price is fixed by the price of the exported portion, and any duty imposed upon that commodity is paid entirely by the foreign producer, as in the case of wheat from Canada.

In cases where foreign producers have the control of our markets and charge their own prices, we in most cases have much more to pay than we would if the industry was established here, and when we impose a duty to enable us to produce the commodity here that duty is paid by the foreign producers just to the extent that they are willing to lower their former price in order to hold our markets. If they have made great gains by their sales here before the duty was imposed they will be quite willing to lower their profits to continue their sales. They will fix their price at a point which will produce the largest aggregate profit. That this is so as a general rule is shown by the uniform lowering of prices of foreign goods when a duty is imposed on the imported commodity.

The extent to which they sometimes go to hold their grip on foreign markets, by the destruction of competition, is shown by the immense losses they are willing to undergo temporarily to accomplish their purpose. The report of the royal commissioner of England in 1854 contained this statement:

I believe that the laboring classes generally, in the manufacturing districts of this country, and especially in the iron and coal districts, are very little aware of the extent to which they are often indebted for being employed at all to the immense losses which their employers voluntarily incur in bad times in order to destroy foreign competition and to gain and keep possession of foreign markets. Authentic instances are well known of employers having at such times carried on their works at a loss amounting in the aggregate to three or four hundred thousand pounds in the course of as many years.

The amount of money foreigners have made by extortionate prices when they controlled our markets is beyond the power of calculation, and we have lost fabulous sums by allowing foreign producers to monopolize our markets when we could by imposing a duty manufacture for ourselves at greatly reduced prices.

The instance cited by Edward Everett is but one of many which illustrate how we have been robbed by failing to protect ourselves by import duties. Everett said, in 1831—

that the extra amount paid for woolen blankets and clothing for the soldiers in the war of 1812 largely exceeded the amount of revenue derived from all tariffs from the foundation of the Government to that time, and that it would have been a saving to the Government if Congress had expended many millions in building up our manufactures.

The frequency with which foreign manufacturing establishments are removed to this country to escape the burdens of our defensive duties can have no rational explanation but that they believe the foreign producers pay the duties.

The English view of this subject finds a graphic illustration in the observations of an English free-trade paper. The London Fair Trade says:

If we are to retain our hold on foreign markets, wages must be kept down that the foreign tariffs may be overcome. When a foreign nation increases the tariff on a British product the cost of the establishment as well as the wages on this side the water are lowered to meet the change. Our manufacturers and working people make sacrifices to meet the extra duty, and we accordingly hear grumbling from both.

An American economic writer quotes from a British trade circular this statement of a Sheffield steel firm:

We have a very large steel trade in America amounting to a large proportion of our whole business, and in that market there is from various causes much competition; and these two causes, large trade and competition combined, have induced us to be satisfied with a smaller average of profit there than we have realized on the average in our other markets.

The same writer quotes these words from the statement of a London firm to its customers:

The very threat of an American protective duty has often had the effect to lower the price of the foreign article.

A further illustration is found in the fact that the English press is swift to unite with American free traders in condemning protective duties.

The Manchester (Eng.) Courier of November 28 says:

As they now stand, the proposals of the bill almost seem too good to be true. There will be rejoicing in more English towns than Bradford and Sheffield over this news.

The London Times, the great watchdog of English interests, is baying a deep-mouthed welcome to the Wilson bill. Tray, Blanche, and Sweetheart, little dogs and all, are yelping a chorus of glee, while in every industrial center of England rejoicing jubilees are shouting pæans of praise and making the welkin ring with an enthusiastic acclaim of welcome to the New American tariff reform bill.

MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS.

Another contention is that under the present law the duties imposed exclude foreign goods from our markets, and thus by cutting off competition enable the home producers to fix the price of their wares, putting a tax upon consumers to the extent of the duty and breeding monopolies and trusts.

Well, are trusts the peculiar and characteristic sins of protective countries? Those who have given any attention to the subject are aware that England is the home of the trust. That commercial device is indigenous to free-trade countries. It has been for many years a part of the economic development of Great Britain. English commercial history teems with instances.

There are freight trusts, shipping trusts, steel-rail trusts, galvanized-iron trusts, wagon-axle trusts, cattle-shipping trusts, salt trusts, plate-glass trusts, and trusts in nearly all the trades in England. They sit at the commercial avenues of their export and lay their extortions upon the people of all nations. Here under our protective system, the conditions under which production is carried on for the most part are antagonistic to the creation of trusts, and they can only exist to a very limited extent, and can be made amenable to law and so restrained as to be comparatively harmless.

When gentlemen use the existence of an occasional "trust" in this country as an argument against protection, they certainly do not realize what concessions they make.

It means, Mr. Chairman, if it means anything, that we should surrender a portion of our markets to foreign producers in order to prevent one portion of our people from cheating the remainder; or, stating it another way, 65,000,000 of as highly civilized, moral, and upright people as live on the earth, with 3,000,000 square miles of the most bountifully endowed territory on the globe at their disposal; the biggest, healthiest, richest, and happiest country on earth; a country that grows one-sixth of the world's wheat, two-thirds of its corn, three-fourths of its cotton, a sixth of its wool, mines a third of its iron, a half of its copper, a third of its silver, a third of its gold, one-third of its coal, owns half the world's railroads, telegraphs, and telephones—in short a country that possesses half the world's instruments of civilization and produces from a third to half its crops and mineral products, and according to Mulhall, the greatest statistician in the world, adds two and a half millions of dollars to its accumulated wealth every time the earth turns upon its axis, that such a country and such a people actually require the intervention of a little island containing one-fortieth of the population and one four-hundredth of the territory of the globe to keep them from robbing each other; or to state it still differently, the industrial honor, com-

mercial integrity, and the effective operation of the law of competition in trade among 65,000,000 of the noblest people upon whom the sun shines can only be maintained by the supervising control of foreign producers—such a proposition it seems to me discredits the human mind.

The American who proclaims such a sentiment must be either densely ignorant or insensible to shame; and the American who believes it must carry in his breast the corpse of his respect for his country. As well say that the people of this planet should have commercial intercourse with Venus or Mars to keep the former from robbing the other. The United States, with almost every climate, with all soils, and with boundless resources of materials for all the uses of civilization, would live, prosper, and grow richer and better in unceasing progress if every foot of earth beside was at the bottom of the sea.

REDUCTION OF WAGES.

The President in his recent message to Congress intimated that even if wages were reduced by the operation of this bill labor would have steady employment by reason of free raw material. I know the labor of the United States will reject with the scorn it deserves the compromising and degrading alternative of low wages or diminished employment. What they want and have a right to have under a sound American industrial régime is both constant employment and remunerative wages. Every man who reflects must know that a cut in wages means diminished consumption, and that means curtailed production and consequent material and social deterioration.

The efficiency of an industrial policy is in proportion to its capacity to employ our people at high wages and cheapen wealth. Civilization means a progressively increasing amount of wealth obtainable for a day's labor. Human welfare is realized in consumption; that depends on the means of buying, and that in its turn on wages. This is the chain of beneficence which connects human development and social progress with human exertion and sacrifice, and—

> Like nature's chain it matters not what link you strike,
> Tenth or ten thousandth breaks the chain alike.

THE CURSE OF LOW WAGES.

With all the wealth of blessings we have enjoyed in this favored country we are not so happy as to be without instances of the demoralizing and degrading influence of low wages. Man's inhumanity to man scarcely finds a more graphic illustration than in the sweating system in vogue in portions of our country, in which the profits of middlemen are sweated out of the poor who toil under them. It is a deep reproach to a Christian nation and can not be set too often before the American people in the scarlet livery of its real turpitude.

No man can explore the slums of our great cities, the tenement houses where this iniquity is fostered; where widows and orphans ply the needle for life; where mothers have nothing but a sewing machine between them and starvation; where daughters dangle over the vortex of moral death by the thread of a needle red with the ruddy drops of their crushed lives; where amid squalor, noxious odors, and deadly filth, despair, and degradation, twin children of human greed and neglect hold high carnival in abodes where humanity can not live, but only foster and gender disease and death to body and soul, without feeling profoundly sensible of the unspeakable curse of low wages.

Mr. Chairman, we can not afford to cheapen commodities at the cost of the workingman's wages. Franklin said, "A cup of tea, the cost of which helped to pay the salaries of tyrants, would choke any decent American." Similarly I would say that the cheapness of goods which is secured by cutting down American wages would be spurned by any honorable American.

FARM PRODUCTS.

The next vice of the bill which I desire to notice is placing the products of the farm on the free list or at a reduced rate. This, it seems to me, is the culminating grotesqueness of the bill. A recent writer in a magazine for November remarked that had the McKinley bill been constructed for the purpose of striking the greatest number of the largest class of industrial interests in Canada it could not have been more skillfully framed. It seems like a hard thing to say, yet I hazard nothing in the statement, that had the Wilson bill been constructed for the purpose of striking the greatest number of the largest class of industrial interests in the United States it could not have been more skillfully framed.

It was not the least of the excellencies of the McKinley bill that it called to mind the forgotten farmer. In enacting the existing law we had in view the interest of the farmers of the United States and not of Canada. Are we now to do penance for that act of patriotism by employing ourselves in legislation for the protection of Canadian farmers against the injustice of the United States in invading and occupying her own markets?

I have a statement compiled by a friend of Canada to show how the agricultural schedule of the present law affects the vital interests of Canada, and it is well for those who propose to legislate in the interest of Canadian farmers to understand it. I will incorporate the statement in my remarks at this point.

CANADA AND OUR NEW TARIFF.

[Erastus Wiman, in the Engineering Magazine for November.]

Now that it is contemplated by the recent mandate of the American people to revise the mode and extent of taxation, and obliterate the exaction of unnecessary burdens, especially upon the poorer classes, the question of the relation of the tariff to Canada forms a far more vital part of the programme than is generally supposed. If the expressed wish for change in the policy of the American people means anything, it means that there shall be no tax upon raw material, and that burdens on food supplies shall be obliterated. This affects a vast class of the people, and to a degree that nothing else affects them.

Inasmuch as Canada can supply the two elements of raw material and food products to an extent greater than any other country, the consideration of the Canada question in regard to the tariff is of prime importance. Had the McKinley bill been constructed for the purpose of striking the greatest number of the largest class of industrial interests in Canada, it could not have been more skillfully framed. The classes and interests most adversely affected are widespread, and are resident in all regions, not only comprising the majority of the populace, but affecting practically the financial stability and the debt-paying power of the entire community. To illustrate just how far the agricultural schedule of the McKinley tariff has affected the most vital interests, the following table shows the agricultural exports to the United States from Canada in the two years 1890 and 1892:

Articles.	1890.	1892.	Decrease.
Horses	$1,887,895	$1,094,461	$793,434
Horned cattle	104,623	21,327	83,296
Poultry	105,612	44,537	61,075
Eggs	1,793,104	494,409	1,298,695
Wool	235,436	200,125	35,311
Flax	175,563	112,360	63,203
Apples	149,479	27,661	121,818
Barley	4,582,561	1,354,485	3,228,076
Split pease	74,215	20,460	53,755
Hay	922,797	598,567	324,230
Malt	149,310	20	149,290
Potatoes	308,915	41,886	267,029
Vegetables	80,976	68,948	12,028
Totals	10,570,486	4,079,246	6,491,240

It shows that of certain products of the farm named, the exports to the United States from Canada in the year 1890 amounted to $10,500,000, in round numbers, while in 1892, under the present law, the exports were only $4,000,000, a decrease of $6,500,000, or about 75 per cent, in two years. Now, it is quite true that a market for $6,500,000 worth of farm products a year to the farmers on our northern border is but a bagatelle, and will neither make nor break them, yet in the apportionment of the rewards of industry between our own and a foreign country we may as well possess and enjoy our own.

THE TOBACCO SCHEDULE.

When you reach the tobacco schedule in this bill——

Mr. HALL of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROSIUS. I can not yield, Mr. Chairman. My friend from Missouri will understand that a limited schedule will not admit of local accommodation. [Laughter.] I mean no discourtesy at all.

The tobacco schedule of this bill affords further illustration of the ineradicable disposition of Democrats to legislate for foreigners instead of Americans.

The antagonism of importers of the Asiatic weed and of some manufacturers of cigars to the present duty is based upon a number of somewhat inharmonious allegations:

First. That cigars can not be manufactured successfully for American consumption without using the Sumatra wrapper.

Second. That they have been compelled to discontinue the use of Sumatra wrappers on low-grade goods—that is, the 5-cent cigar, which supplies the larger part of American consumption.

Third. They are compelled to use inferior filler or reduce the wages of labor to meet the additional cost of the Sumatra wrappers.

Fourth. If the duty was reduced there would be more of the foreign wrapper used, and more American goods would be consumed as fillers and binders.

Fifth. The consumers will not stand the advance of Sumatra-covered cigars and cigarettes, and pipes would largely take the place of cigars. These objections to the present duty on Sumatra leaf, as stated by different witnesses before the Committee on Ways and Means, can not be easily reconciled, yet a fair understanding of the real situation can be extracted from them.

The fifth objection is not creditable to the human intellect, and I dismiss it with the observation that smokers who can not afford a high-priced cigar will smoke one they can afford. The

truth is that with the present duty Sumatra wrappers have given way to domestic wrappers on a portion of American consumption. The reduction of the duty means the relegation of the American wrapper to use as fillers and binders only—that is the milk in the cocoanut.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania has devoted to the production of leaf tobacco for the last fifteen years on an average about 28,000 acres of the best land in the State.

The product has averaged in those years at least 30,000,000 pounds a year.

In Lancaster County alone we have produced in thirty-two years about 400,000,000 pounds. We now produce about 15,000,000 pounds a year. According to the census of 1890 this is the greatest leaf tobacco producing county in the United States.

For many years the price all round averaged in the neighborhood of 14 cents per pound; but with the increase of Sumatran importations the price declined until, in 1890, just before the passage of the present tariff act, it reached the lowest figure known in the history of tobacco culture in Pennsylvania, as low as 5½ and 6 cents per pound. After the passage of the present act, and indeed before its final passage, in anticipation of its passage, the price began to rise, and the first crop sold after the present duty was imposed realized from 25 to 40 per cent more per pound than was obtained the previous year.

It has been estimated that the increased duty netted the tobacco farmers of Lancaster County alone in the neighborhood of a half million dollars the first year. But this was not the only benefit. In the ninth internal revenue district, consisting of several counties, in Pennsylvania, there are 2,453 cigar factories, whose output is about 627,321,550 cigars a year.

In Lancaster County alone there are from 750 to 800 cigar manufactories, large and small, in full operation. They furnish employment to about 8,000 persons.

Prior to the passage of the present law as many as 25 per cent of these factories used Sumatran wrappers. They were put on cigars sold at wholesale as low as $15 and $16 per thousand. The increased duty of $1.25 enhanced the price of the Sumatran goods so much that they could not be profitably used on cigars that sold for less than $28 or $30. Now, of the 627,321,550 cigars manufactured in the ninth internal revenue district three-fourths are the cheaper grades, and not more than 8 per cent of the factories use imported wrappers. So that the domestic wrappers has displaced the imported article on many millions of cigars, and to that extent increased the demand for home product.

In still another way domestic growers have been benefited by the increased duty. The high price of the Sumatran leaf has led manufacturers to economize in the manufacture of high-grade cigars by the use of a combination filler of domestic and Havana goods, thus increasing the demand for the inferior grades of our domestic product.

It costs to produce a pound of seedleaf tobacco about 8 or 9 cents, Havana about 10 cents per pound. In bad seasons not more than 25 per cent is fit for wrappers. If the product is of superior quality it may yield 60 or 70 per cent of wrappers. Good wrappers will at this time bring from 25 to 35 cents, and fillers from 1 to 5 cents a pound. In Lancaster County we are now producing seedleaf and Havana in the ratio of about 1 to 2.

The following tabulated statement further emphasizes the points made in the foregoing statement:

Imports of leaf tobacco for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1890, 1891, 1892, and 1893.

	Pounds.	Value.
1890.		
Netherlands	9,734,999	$9,037,388
Cuba	16,916,605	7,106,233
All other countries	2,068,930	1,461,571
Total	28,720,674	17,605,192
1891.		
Netherlands	4,908,545	4,682,493
Cuba	16,092,108	7,141,465
All other countries	2,060,355	1,460,204
Total	23,061,008	13,284,162
1892.		
Netherlands	2,661,932	1,899,721
Cuba	18,432,323	7,997,015
All other countries	894,280	435,687
Total	21,988,535	10,332,423
1893.		
Netherlands	5,374,765	5,078,315
Cuba	21,694,891	8,940,058
All other countries	1,040,914	684,756
Total	28,110,570	14,703,129

Estimated duty paid on Sumatra tobacco in the years named:

1890	$4,062,199.48
1891	9,817,050.00
1892	5,323,864.00
1893	10,749,530.00

These figures show that the present duty on Sumatran leaf tobacco yields abundant revenue to the Government as well as protection to home producers, thus carrying on its wings a double blessing.

The cigar manufacturers, too, have enjoyed their full quota of benefits from the existing duty Their protection even exceeds that of the leaf producers. When we look at the real protective feature of the duty, the farmer has decidedly the small end of it. In a paper submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means it is put in this way: The average value, the leaf imported at 35 cents duty, is 55 cents per pound. This duty is equivalent to 69 per cent ad valorem. Under the $2 rate, if the invoice value is $1 per pound the duty is equivalent to 200 per cent ad valorem. But one pound of Sumatra leaf will cover as many cigars as four pounds of fine domestic wrappers. Hence, so far as the American grower's crop is concerned, his protection is an ad valorem duty of 50 per cent.

Now, contrast this with the protection of the manufacturers, who have practically a monopoly of the domestic market. For distinctness of view let us put it in this way. If 1,000 Havana cigars weigh 14 pounds and cost $50, the present duty will be as follows:

Specific duty of $4.50 on 14 pounds	$63.00
25 per cent ad valorem	12.50
Total duty on 1,000 cigars	$75.50

It is thus seen that the manufacturers have the lion's share of the protection. They have been guarded with a solicitude that ought to convince anyone that faith with the cigar-maker has not been broken in the effort to save the producer.

The following statement shows the advantageous results to the manufacturers:

Statement showing the total importation of cigars into the United States for the years named.

	Pounds.	Value.
1890	1,250,217	$4,026,828
1891	885,139	3,386,899
1892	658,469	2,832,047
1893	654,095	2,831,171

This shows that importations of cigars have diminished since 1890 almost 50 per cent. When it is considered that Pennsylvania makes about one-fourth of all the cigars manufactured in the United States, it will easily be seen how a Pennsylvania industry has been benefited by the present duty on cigars.

The number of cigars taxed in the United States were:

Year ending June 30, 1890	4,087,889,983
Year ending June 30, 1891	4,474,832,767
Year ending June 30, 1892	4,548,799,417
Year ending June 30, 1893	4,814,302,117

This statement represents also approximately the number of cigars manufactured in the United States.

The following table shows the number of cigars manufactured in Pennsylvania in the years named:

1890	1,007,819,252
1891	1,169,699,963
1892	1,232,890,889

The following table shows the number of pounds of leaf tobacco manufactured into cigars in Pennsylvania in the years named:

1890	19,422,303
1891	22,056,396
1892	22,306,001

These figures show a progressively increasing business in Pennsylvania in the manufacture of cigars since the present tariff act went into operation, and verify the statement of Mr. Van Duzer, of New York, before the Committee on Ways and Means, that under the beneficent provisions of the present law the American wrapper had been restored and an industry re-established.

But it is said that the Sumatra leaf is demanded, and will come whatever the duty may be. If so, then let us derive revenue from it. It may be well to look into this and see what is the secret of this demand for the Asiatic weed. Whether a cigar is a luxury or a necessity, a comfort or a solace to the smoker, I will not decide. I know that everybody got along without it up to the time of Raleigh. The Romans conquered the world without it.

Neither Homer, nor Dante, nor Shakespeare ever enjoyed the solace of a fragrant Havana. Cæsar, Alexander, Demosthenes, and Cicero achieved their world-wide fame in total ignorance of the ravishing beauty of the Sumatra leaf; still, for the purpose of the argument, I will concede it to be necessary to human happiness, if not to human greatness.

The Sumatra leaf is not a superior smoking tobacco, but of most inferior quality. I have heard habitual smokers say they would not smoke a cigar made entirely of Sumatra leaf. It possesses no constituent of value to the smoker affecting either the palate or the nerves. It has been said that the street gamin who gets his smoking from the gutter would turn away with loathing from a cigar made solely of Sumatra. Mr. Morse, of New York, said before the committee in 1890 that the refuse or cuttings are so bitter that they can only be utilized by putting them in as fillers in such infinitesimal portions as to elude detection; and mostly it is put in the tip that is cut off before smoking. You must have the superior aroma of American or Cuban leaf or your cigar is worthless.

The fact is that the only characteristic of this singular leaf that creates a demand for it is its color. It appeals to the eye, and to that alone. It gratifies a mere fancy of the eye, as sublimated a taste as could enter into the æsthetic constitution of a human creature. To a blind smoker a Sumatra-covered cigar is not distinguishable from a fine American product. Mr. Morse, before the committee, aptly characterized it as a "dude" cigar, with nothing to commend it but its appearance; as unsafe to judge from its covering what is within as to guess the character of a man from the clothes that cover him, which every gentleman knows is very often suggestive of a fifty-dollar saddle on a twenty-dollar horse.

But the taste and the demand exist, and the inquiry I now put is, ought they to be gratified at the cost of this American industry? But for the fact, not creditable to us, that in the gratification of our appetites the sentiment of patriotism seems to have little part, a patriotic American smoker would spurn the "delight of the eye" that he can only enjoy upon the condition of supplanting the labor of Americans by that of half-civilized Asiatics. I am not, however, arguing for its entire exclusion. I am willing that those who have a fad or a fancy that they are willing to pay to have gratified should have an opportunity.

I only desire to curtail the importation so that the domestic market will not be relinquished entirely to the foreign product. I want the American industry to live and prosper, and to that end I would discourage the color fancy of fastidious Americans by making it costly to gratify. Cigar manufacturers say it took years to destroy the prejudice, nurtured by long habit, in favor of the imported Havana cigar. I do not want the prejudice in favor of a Sumatra wrapper to become inveterate. I want to nip it in the bud, so that we will not have to spend years hereafter in destroying it.

EFFECT OF THE DUTY.

What harm can come to any class from the proposed duty? It is a total misconception that supposes the manufacturing industry will be impaired. People will not stop smoking because Sumatra covered cigars are less abundant and cost more. The habit of smoking is not one that yields readily to difficulties. It has more courage and perseverance than many better habits. And it is growing more tenacious and aggressive every day.

At the World's Fair, in a great dining hall where ladies and gentlemen dined in company, I observed a poster on the wall containing this printed "solace to gentlemen" and insult to ladies: "Smoking permitted at these tables." In the United States House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative assembly, the most elevated theater of statesmanship on earth, a member can smoke with impunity. It is the only national legislative assembly in the world in which it is permitted. We have a rule against it, but it is not more observed than the unlucky law of Governor Kieft against smoking in New Amsterdam.

We seem to have imbibed the hazy notion of the renowned Wouter Van Twiller, that smoking induces thought, thought philosophy, and philosophy statesmanship. I may perhaps be excused for entertaining an old-fashioned notion that blowing clouds of tobacco smoke into the air of a legislative chamber like this, where statesmen are compelled to breathe and speak, will never make a nation great, if indeed it escapes consequences as lamentable as those which overtook our Dutch ancestors, as described with so much felicity by Irving, "transforming them from a goodly, burly race of folk to a lantern-jawed, smoke-dried, leathern-hide race of men."

At all events, it may convince us that the habit has become so inveterate that there is no danger of its being broken up by the duty on cigars, and that the consumption will continue whatever the imposts may be, and the only difference between a low and a high duty will be that in the latter case multitudes who now conceal the weeds they smoke under a foreign wrapper will turn to honest American cigars and consume the products of our own toil and our own labor and feel the better for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, seeing, as every member of the House must see, that the result of the reduction of the duty as provided in the bill and the very result desired by the merchants of Amsterdam and the importers of this product of a Dutch monopoly will be, not at once but gradually, the displacement of American wrappers to whatever extent they are now used by the foreign product, will we not pause before declaring to American farmers that they must employ their soil in growing fillers and binders at from 1 to 5 cents per pound or quit the business?

Mr. Chairman, one hundred thousand men in the sixty-four counties of Pennsylvania and from the numerous counties in the tobacco-growing States are pleading with us to-day to save their industry from the ravages of this Asiatic invasion of our domestic markets. They are holding up to us the picture of a balance swinging between the nations, in one scale a Chinese cooly living on 10 cents a day, in the other an American farmer, and they wait with awed and wondering look to see in which scale the Congress of the United States will place the weight of its legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is a cosmopolitan benevolence with which these views do not harmonize, I have little sympathy with it. I differ from the honorable member from Illinois, Gen. BLACK, who said the other day that he wanted to be "a citizen of the world." I can wait for that day until the time by poets foretold—

> When the war drums beat no longer, and the battle flags are furled
> In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

But for the present I am content to be a citizen of the United States. [Applause.] I am an American. I honor the sentiment of patriotism, and it seems to me that a man who loves another's country as well as his own is as unnatural, if not as immoral, as the man who loves his neighbor's wife equally with his own. [Laughter and applause.]

Our attachments are wisely circumscribed, that they may be intense. I would bestow the benefits of protection with equal prodigality upon all industries in all sections of the Union where needed.

I would send out copious streams from this reservoir of beneficence to fertilize the exertions of labor everywhere. I should have them flow like the four rivers from Eden's garden. Pison should flow west to the land of gold as well as grain. Gihon should flow south to enrich the whole land of Ethiopia. Hiddekel should go toward the east to nourish the mighty industries that grow there, while the Euphrates should carry gladness to the toilers and fatness to the land toward the north.

I would especially stimulate with its invigorating touch the mighty resources of the South which have yet to be awakened from the sleep of ages. I would make that fair land, described by one of her own sons as the fairest and richest domain of earth, where is centered all that can please and prosper human kind, where a perfect climate above a perfect soil yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone, where by night the cotton whitens beneath the stars and by day the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf, where in the same field the clover steals the fragrance of the wind and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains, where are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures, forests vast and primeval, and rivers that run wanton to the sea—I would make that great country grow and bloom and fruit for mankind under the magic touch of a wise protection. I would not suffer to be longer possible in any State in the Union the incident Henry W. Grady once told of happening in the State of Georgia. He may tell it in his own words. It illustrates what the condition of the entire country would now be if we had had a free-trade régime for a hundred years. Gentlemen of the South, I commend the wholesome chalice to your reluctant lips:

> I attended a funeral in Pickens County, Ga., of a poor man. They buried him in the midst of a marble quarry; they cut through solid marble to make his grave, and yet the little tombstone they put above him was from Vermont. They buried him in the heart of a pine forest, and yet the pine coffin was imported from Cincinnati. They buried him within touch of an iron mine, and yet the nails in his coffin, and the iron in the shovel that dug his grave were imported from Pittsburg. They buried him by the side of the best sheep-grazing country on the earth, and yet the wool in the coffin bands and the coffin bands themselves were brought from the North. The South did not furnish a thing on earth for that funeral but the corpse and the hole in the ground.
>
> [Great laughter.]
>
> There they put him away and the clods rattled down on his coffin; and they buried him in a New York coat and a Boston pair of shoes, and a pair of breeches from Chicago, and a shirt from Cincinnati, leaving him nothing to carry into the next world with him to remind him of the country in which he lived and for which he fought for four years but the chill of blood in his veins and the marrow in his bones.
>
> [Applause.]

Having thus depicted the situation of the South, he was can-

did enough to say that he believed the protective tariff had helped to remedy the difficulty.

But Mr. Grady was a capable man. The amplitude of his understanding enabled him to recognize a good thing when he saw it. Now, gentlemen, let me say good naturedly, why can not we have a few such Democrats in this House? Henry Watterson says, "This is a day of small men." The hour calls for great men, wise enough to perceive and virtuous enough to pursue their country's weal. Napoleon said he had 200,000,000 in his coffers and he would give them all for a Ney. We could afford to give all the contents of the Treasury of the United States at this hour, doubled and trebled, for one Democratic statesman who could lead his party out of the morass of imbecility and indecision in which it is sinking deeper and deeper every moment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The opportunity is around them for greatness, for the fame and favor they are ambitious to achieve, and which only waits on some act of broad-gauged, capable, and patriotic statesmanship commensurate with the exigency that is upon us. But the opportunity seems to elude them. They can not embrace it. The water is at their lips but they can not drink. They stand in the midst of it like Tantalus in the flood, as expressed in lines which are an academic recollection:

> Who from circling floods in vain refreshment craves,
> And pines with thirst amid a sea of waves,
> When to his lip the water he applies,
> Back from his lip the treacherous water flies.

THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES.

If we are to be unmindful of our own, and to cherish the interests of other countries, there are manifold ways in which it can be done.

It may be that we might help the nations of Europe if we would receive and make our country an asylum for their defective population, their paupers and criminals and debased classes; but we could not do so without great injury to our own country, and no one would advocate such an immigration policy. Similarly we might confer a benefit on foreign countries by surrendering our markets to their goods produced by underpaid labor, but to do so would inflict immeasurable injury upon our own people.

This Republic has a part to play in the world's history, an exalted mission to fill. We are to be a nation of men-builders. The political economy we must practice is that which promotes the care, comfort, and culture of men. We are to be a conspicuous agency in the development of civilization and the enlargement of human liberty.

To make our work beneficent and fruitful in the highest degree, we must protect our people and secure the conditions most conducive to the kind of development we are seeking. We must allow our institutions to grow naturally from within, without impeding competition from alien influences. As far as our protective system is effective in guarding us against the incursion of influences that retard our progress on lines leading to the highest growth, whether it prevents the deterioration of our population by the admission of inferior peoples from abroad, or saves our industrial system and our high-grade remuneration for labor from the interference of inferior systems of industry and lower-grade wages, it must be admitted by everyone to be a good and wholesome system.

It has had a conspicuous agency in making this Republic what she is to-day, and a wise administration of the same system in the future will enable her to maintain her supremacy, and our children's children, lifting their vision above the shadow of a passing cloud, will see her as we now see her, in the vanguard of the world, at the head of the procession of the nations. They will see a land without a slave and a church without a scourge, the home of freedom, where intelligence is without price and conscience without a master; where every poor man's child sits down with the rich man's at the royal feast of knowledge and every man is a brother; where government is the image of the people's will, in whose expression the lowliest is the peer of the proudest and every man is a king; where the rich regard the poor and the poor respect the rich; where toil is honorable and labor fairly rewarded; where poverty is the exception and plenty the rule; where the exactions of government are least and justice lightens every burden; where labor is protected in honest thrift at home against the competition of pauper wages abroad, and every home is a temple where honor reigns, comfort smiles, and hope and love cheer; where the laws, customs, and principles of the people find a common object in the care, comfort, and culture of the human family, all tending to make the Republic what she is destined to be, the home of the noblest race, the largest liberty, the highest civilization, and the purest Christianity attainable by man. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Imports of leaf tobacco from the Netherlands into the United States during each fiscal year from 1881 to 1893.

Years ending June 30.	Pounds.	Values.	Average rate of duty per pound.		Estimated duty.	Ad valorem per cent.
			A	B		
1881	200,602	$140,665	$0.35	.35	$70,210.70	49.9
1882	782,763	487,127	.35	.35	273,967.05	56.2
1883	3,818,931	2,942,148	.40	.52	1,985,844.12	67.5
1884	603,536	480,702	.45	.52	313,838.72	65.2
1885	2,217,919	1,881,494	.50	.52	1,153,317.88	61.3
1886	4,000,519	3,394,156	.55	.52	2,080,269.88	61.2
1887	4,213,336	3,651,349	.55	.52	2,190,934.72	60
1888	5,801,472	5,634,765	.55	.52	3,047,965.44	54
1889	5,024,455	4,333,463	.55	.52	2,612,716.60	60.2
1890	9,734,999	9,037,388	.55	.52	4,062,199.48	44.9
1891	4,908,545	4,682,493	2.00	2.00	9,817,090.00	209.6
1892	2,661,932	1,809,721	2.00	2.00	5,323,864.00	280.2
1893	5,374,765	5,078,315	2.00	2.00	10,749,530.00	211.6

NOTE.—The two columns of average rate of duty are taken from the books of two of the large importing firms of Netherlands tobacco in New York. They are, therefore, based upon actual transactions; and I think it will be safe to assume that they are representative figures. I have taken the figures in the second column for multiplication, but the averages in the first column from 1883 to 1890 will be a fraction less than 52 cents a pound. The column headed "Duty" is based upon the supposition that all the tobacco represented in the first column went into consumption in the year of importation. This supposition is, of course, not scientifically true, as tobacco imported in one year may remain for a long time in warehouse before passing into consumption.

Statement showing by countries the quantities and values of cigars imported into the United States each year, ending June 30, from 1890 to 1893.

Countries.	1890.		1891.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
Austria	43	$130	81	$220
France	87	307	1,328	1,169
Germany	4,979	6,849	6,042	8,266
United Kingdom	6,173	20,621	8,432	24,887
Dominion of Canada	475	765	28	92
Mexico	7,184	12,981	7,961	12,639
Spain	500	303		
British West Indies	827	1,451	735	1,610
Cuba	1,216,722	3,907,955	850,658	3,323,978
Netherlands (Sumata)	283	333	455	719
Turkey in Europe	11	28	55	69
Turkey in Africa	1,192	3,469	2,167	5,939
Phillippine Islands	7,034	8,218	4,813	4,569
Hongkong				
China	1,220	1,382	1,612	1,814
All other countries	1,488	1,976	772	1,071
Total	1,250,217	4,020,828	885,139	3,396,804

Countries.	1892.		1893.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
Austria	56	$147		
France	726	2,864		
Germany	4,005	4,672		
United Kingdom	6,593	25,881		
Dominion of Canada	231	215		
Mexico	10,187	13,314		
Spain	15	16		
British West Indies	495	1,231		
Cuba	632,504	2,775,849	616,080	$2,706,502
Netherlands (Sumatra)	200	276		
Turkey in Europe	40	53		
Turkey in Africa				
Phillippine Islands	292	407		
Hongkong	7	52		
China	110	131		
All other countries	2,858	6,877	38,015	64,669
Total	658,169	2,832,047	654,095	2,831,171

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, it is my present intention to support this bill. I believe that it would be improved by some amendments. There are some amendments which I hope to have the privilege of bringing forward and supporting myself. I will say at the same time that if this bill should receive certain supplements which have been proposed, it might be my duty to withhold my support from it; for I should consider it as weighed down and vitiated by means of raising revenue which I should regard as unjust and unkind. And having said, sir, that I mean to support the bill, perhaps the best thing for me now to do would be to take my seat, for all of the arguments for and against this measure have been already presented, I believe, on the floor of the House and in accredited treatises on the subject with an energy of diction and a wealth of learning to which I can lay no possible claim. And moreover, Mr. Chairman, I

believe there is a call from the whole country at this time for prompt action and not for talk.

But, sir, if I rise to add a few words to all the energetic and learned statements that have already been made upon the subject, it is because I do not wish to have it supposed that a member from the State of Massachusetts, brought up as I was in the old theories of protection, still clings to them and is prepared to acquiesce in the traditional views which so many of my colleagues now entertain. It is not, sir, because I sit on this side of the House and because I am ranked in the Democratic column that I am going to vote for this measure as a mere party measure. It is exactly the reverse. It is because I have believed for years that some such measure as this is demanded by broad patriotism and generous humanity that I am glad to be ranked with the Democratic party column and to be counted on their side. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If I had any wish, sir, to retain such connections as I once possessed with the Republican party, I should now wish them severed, because I believe the Republican party has been deaf to the call made on it by men all over the country who care very little for party and a great deal for what concerns the interest of every citizen.

In the tariff discussions of six or eight years ago the Republican leaders frankly acknowledged that a revision of the tariff was advisable, but said that such revision ought to be in the hands of its friends, and not of its enemies. In the confident expectation and belief that the friends of the tariff would revise it, many who had left the Republican ranks in 1884 and voted for Mr. Cleveland returned to the Republican party in 1888 and voted for Gen. Harrison.

I did not share in that expectation. I did not believe that those whose private and whose political interests had been so long connected with a system of protection, rising higher and yet higher, could be persuaded to make the needed reductions and to return to that low scale of duties which is favored by the great leaders who are confidently quoted by them, men like Hamilton and Clay. Well, sir, my apprehensions were justified. The Republican party came into power in 1888, and they did revise the tariff, and revised it with a vengeance, in 1890. And then, before the ink with which that bill was signed was fairly dry, the popular vote in 1890 declared against it. It was in operation for two years, and we received all those blessings which we have been informed on the other side of the House flowed so abundantly from the McKinley act. In 1892 the people who had been experiencing those blessings for two years called with a yet louder shout for the revision of the tariff, not by its friends, but by the Democratic party.

Now, our friends on the other side congratulate themselves on the vote of last autumn, which they think was a reversal of the popular decision. Let me say in reply to that, Mr. Chairman, that it is my conviction that the loss to the Democratic party in those States where it might have looked for a gain, is largely owing to the fact that when this Congress met in August, 1893, it did not avail itself of the opportunity put into its hands to revise the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If, immediately after passing the repeal of the silver bill, we had addressed ourselves to the formation of a tariff bill, and as soon as another body condescended to confirm our action, they had had in their hands a revision of the tariff to act upon as soon as they saw fit, I believe that the popular voice as to the Democratic party would have been different.

Now, sir, as I look to the Democratic party for the only hope to change the protective system, I am glad to vote with its leaders, even if I dissent with them on some important doctrines. I know very well that my support of this bill is going to forfeit me votes, if I seek them, that I might have kept by conciliating the protective sentiment, and that will make no difference in the speech or the vote that I shall give. [Applause.] I agree with my animated and eloquent friend from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], who spoke the other day, that this bill does not go far enough. [Applause.]

I wish that it contained many more reductions of the tariff. I wish that its free list was larger than it is, but I accept it as the best I can get now. If I thought this bill was offered as a finality; if, as some people say, our action now was to settle the tariff for ten or twenty years, I could hardly support it, but it is in the confident expectation that the reductions we make now are only the forerunners of greater reduction, and greater simplification in the future, that I am glad to take such measure of justice as we may receive now.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid of the charge of tariff tinkering and the suggestion that we must not alter the tariff as we need to from year to year. It seems to me the objection of tariff tinkering comes with poor grace from those who have altered the tariff some eight or ten times since they passed the Morrill tariff bill in the Congress of 1860-'61. No, sir; I quite grant that a system which has grown up like the protective system, by successive steps to its present height, can not be immediately destroyed by a single stroke, but I hail any attempt to reverse the process, and I make no doubt that the benefits resulting from even this imperfect measure will so commend it to the people of the United States that it will encourage them to ask still greater reductions, until we set the United States in the line of those countries which reduce their system of customs duties to the greatest simplicity and freedom consistent with the revenue needs of an economically administered government.

And I rejoice, sir, that the bill has been brought forward at this identical time. I know it is said this is a time of distress. I know it is said that in a time of business prostration we ought not to make great changes. It seems to me that a cry like that is always raised in the way of every reform, by those who believe in keeping things as they are. If a reform is proposed in a time of prosperity and content, it is said, "Oh, people are prosperous and contented and do not want any change." If a reform is proposed in a time of distress and discontent the cry always is, "Oh, surely this is no time to make organic changes when people are discontented and wretched."

The time to do a right thing, Mr. Chairman, is whenever those who believe it is right have the power to carry out what they think is right. [Applause.] The whole business and mercantile community have expected the Democratic party to make changes in the tariff since 1892, aye, since 1890. They expected us to do that if we did nothing else; and if we should turn aside now from their expectations and in answer to sudden protests stop in the work that we were sent here to effect, we should prove ourselves the knaves and fools that our enemies would like to have us prove ourselves.

The fundamental defense of protection in this country, ever since Mr. Clay took hold of it in the early twenties, is that it is the American system. That is the name that Clay gave to his protectionist ideas, and that has been repeated again and again in this House, that it is the American system.

Now, in my way of thinking, Mr. Chairman, there can be nothing more un-American, there can be nothing more utterly belonging to the Old World, more borrowed from the Old World, than the system of protection and restriction.

It is the old traditional policy of Europe, of Asia, and of Africa. At the time our Constitution was framed, practically every nation had a protective system; and it was supposed, of course, that each nation would try to encourage its own manufactures and to keep foreign manufactures out. If that idea is disputed, I would appeal to the authority of the great author of protective duties in this country. I would appeal to that celebrated report of Hamilton from which so many protectionists have drawn their armor and used the weapons for very different ends from what the great Secretary of the Treasury supposed. I will take his argument for extending the home market. He says:

> The embarrassments which have obscured our external trade have led to serious reflections on the necessity of enlarging the sphere of our domestic commerce. The restrictive regulations which in foreign markets have abridged the vent of the increasing surplus of our agricultural produce served to beget an earnest desire that a more extensive demand for that surplus may be created at home.—*Hamilton's Works*, III, 193.

Again, after stating very fairly the theory on which the Democratic party has always insisted, of the inexpediency of forcing manufactures into unnatural channels, he says:

> This mode of reasoning is founded upon facts and principles which have certainly respectable pretensions. If it had governed the conduct of nations more generally than it has done there is room to suppose that it might have carried them faster to prosperity and greatness than they have attained by the pursuit of maxims widely opposite.—*Ibid.*, III, 194, 195.

Again:

> The manufacturing nations abridge the natural advantages of their situation through an unwillingness to permit the agricultural countries to enjoy the benefits of theirs, and sacrifice the interests of a mutually beneficial intercourse to the vain project of buying everything and selling nothing.—*Ibid.*, III, 211.

[Applause.]

That was Alexander Hamilton

No, sir; it was because the old nations were still struggling in the bonds of the protective system that we were forced to adopt a policy which our great financier saw was inimical to the true laws of trade when flowing in its natural channels. It is strange to me to think the United States should imitate the old restrictive, paternal, timid policy of the feudal and arbitrary monarchies. I am amazed to see America say to her laborers, enjoying the advantages of our bounteous soil, her free institutions, her public education, her untrammelled thought, her peaceful life, that they must cower and crouch and bend and pray a paternal Government to protect them against what they call the pauper labor of Europe, underfed, underclothed, overworked, overtaxed to support standing armies and state churches under

the fostering wings of the Black Eagles of Central Europe. [Applause.]

Is it for this, Mr. Chairman, that we have invited Italians and Germans to come to this country, that they might find here a paternal protection which they ran away from at home in the search of American liberty? [Applause.]

There rises instinctively to my lips, Mr. Chairman, when I hear these doctrines, the words which Edmund Burke spoke on the eve of the battle of Lexington, on the 26th of March, 1775, to the House of Commons, begging them in the name of ancestral freedom to abandon their absurd policy of restriction to America. I can make it applicable to you here, changing a very few words and not changing the sense at all, after this interval of one hundred and nineteen years.

As long as you have the wisdom to keep the sovereign authority of this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever the chosen race and sons of America worship freedom they will turn their faces towards you. The more they multiply the more friends you will have; the more ardently they love liberty the more perfect will be their obedience. Restriction they can have anywhere; it is a weed that grows in every soil; they may have it from Spain; they may have it from Prussia; but until you become lost to all feeling of your true interest and your natural dignity, freedom they can have from none but you. This is the commodity of price, of which you have the monopoly. Deny them this participation of freedom and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the Empire.

Yes, sir; everything that looks to freedom, to greater freedom, to perfect freedom, is American. It is indigenous. It belongs to our race. It is the growth of our soil. Whatever is restrictive, paternal, protective, is European, is Asiatic, is African, is borrowed. We have no art or part in it at all. [Applause.] Ah! sir, think of those words of Burke, "They may have it from Spain, they may have it from Prussia." What are the most highly-protected countries in the world? Italy, Spain, Russia. Yes, Russia; that truly protective government where the Czar is habitually known as the Little Father of his people. Do you want your agricultural laborers, whose product competes with the wheat of Russia, to be brought to the level of the peasant of the Ukraine by a system of protection such as is adopted in that country? Nay, that is not the perfection of it.

We can take a finer instance yet. Let us take the example of China. China has always protected her manufactures and her people more than any other country. China has always refused to sell her precious tea and silks, her ivory carvings, her lacquer boxes to the "foreign devils," except for good hard silver dollars, and she would not voluntarily take a pound of their manufactures. It was only at the mouth of the cannon that the European nations forced their way into the heart of China.

Now, look at her laborers, look at their morals, look at their food, look at their manners, look at their character; and then, when you have contemplated the very perfection of a protected race, build up higher and higher your wall of restrictive duties and shut out all the products of "foreign devils" until you have got your population after the regular pattern of American Celestials, fit to be photographed in order to tell them apart. [Great laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the idea which underlies that Chinese expression, "foreign devils," is the proper explanation of the whole theory of protection. [Laughter.] It proceeds on the notion that every foreigner is a kind of fiend, that good moral folks stay at home, work at home, buy at home, sell at home, and that, somehow, it is a crime and an offense to bring foreign goods into this country. It proceeds upon the idea that whatever is one nation's gain is another nation's loss, instead of on the truth that what benefits one nation in trade benefits all, and that the constant increase in the wealth of mankind which strong arms and strong brains all over the world bring out of the elements may be divided among all the nations so that all shall profit and none shall lose. And, if this theory is disputed by my protectionist friends again, let me read once more from Hamilton's report:

If one nation were in a condition to supply manufactured articles on better terms than another, that other might find an abundant indemnification in a superior capacity to furnish the produce of the soil, and a free exchange, mutually beneficial, of the commodities which each was able to supply on the best terms, might be carried on between them, supporting in full vigor the industry of each. (Volume 3, 214.)

No, the idea of protection that one nation's gain is another nation's loss is not American. It is not even Christian; it is heathen. [Laughter.] The ancient writers are full of it. Virgil looks forward to the golden age when every land shall bear everything; when navigation shall stop, and when the sheep shall run about the fields with their wool ready died red and yellow. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, that would be hard on the chemical schedule. [Renewed laughter.]

Horace tells us that it is all in vain that the providence of God has parted the land by the severing ocean if after all impious ships rush across the seas that never ought to have been touched. [Laughter.] There lingers in all the protective policy this idea, that it is something wicked to bring foreign goods into our country, and that that man ought to be cursed as wanting in patriotism who first freighted and launched his fatal and perfidious bark. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] This theory of protection, sir, excluding foreign products, has been carried to its highest perfection, perhaps, in the communities in the center of Darkest Africa. If you will read the tale of those matchless explorers that have laid bare the dark continent—American, English, German, Portuguese: Stanley, Livingstone, Cameron, Grant, Speke, Schweinfurth, Serpa—you will find in all the same story.

Those negro monarchies are in a high state, one might say, of culture. Their agricultures, their manufactures, their armies, their diplomacy, their court arrangements, are all conducted on an artful and artistic system which make the fictions of Rider Haggard seem tame and weak. They do not want any foreign products brought into their country. The only article they sell to the foreigner is their own captives in war, whom they readily dispose of to the Arab slave-dealers. [Laughter.] And if any traveler comes to them he not only has to buy his way heavily at every step of his journey, but when he is hours from the frontier he has to pay a fine for the privilege of entering into the country. Yet there are commodities that they like; there are things that they can not do without, and for the sake of which they are willing to admit the "foreign devils."

In 1859 two adventurous Englishmen determined to make their way to the sources of the Nile through all the obstacles put against them. What was the commodity with which they bought their way? What was the one thing which could carry them in? They were Englishmen; but they have to record with considerable pique that the one thing that the Africans would take when they took nothing else was what they called Merikani—American cotton cloth—particularly valuing the corner piece with the blue stamp of the Pacific Mills upon it. [Laughter and applause.] It was with the help of American cotton cloth that those Englishmen entered the southern tropics, that they made their way to the source of the Nile, that they emerged at Alexandria, and solved the problem of ages.

Now, sir, in what year did this happen? At what time did the produce of American mills force its way into the secret crevices of the most protected nation? It was 1859. It was when the country was under the influence of the Walker tariff. It was when a Republican Congress had just consented to the further reductions of 1857. That was the time when the manufacturers of America—aye, of Massachusetts—in those days of low tariffs and little protection—penetrated where no other commodities would go, even in the hands of unfriendly Englishmen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it has always been maintained that Massachusetts derived special advantages from high tariff; and on this floor we have heard Representatives from other districts condemn us for our exclusively protective policy. I desire to remind them that the protective tariff was no invention of Massachusetts; that her manufactures were flourishing away back to the earliest colonial times. I would remind them that on more than one occasion she protested against the tariffs which her sister States wished to force upon her. But her enterprise, her energy, her invention have enabled her to bring good out of any and all tariffs.

The invention of Francis C. Lowell, who reinvented the power loom, having never seen one in operation; the invention of Paul Moody, who could look at a machine and see before he left the room where it could be improved; the invention of Erastus B. Bigelow, who, in the low-tariff times, invented and perfected the carpet loom—those are the things that made Massachusetts what she is.

We know that our soil is stony and our climate is severe. We know that you have natural advantages we can not boast of. We know that the coal and the iron, the wheat, and the cotton of Pennsylvania and Alabama, of Nebraska and Texas, are not for us. We freely grant that God has been good to you. We are glad of it. We rejoice in the blessings of our sister States.

But do not take from us our birthright, which is the sea. God has put the sea all along our coasts; and our seamen have tamed the ocean to their will, till it knows them as the horse knows his rider. We could get from other nations the natural products which we have not on our own soil; but your restrictive laws, your navigation laws, your bill forbidding the purchase of ships, your duties on iron and coal, prevent our bringing to our shores by the enterprise and skill of our mariners the things that we need, that we could use, and redeem our soil from the blight of barrenness.

In those days of the Walker tariff, when timid protectionists thought that the prosperity of Massachusetts was gone, the clink of the shipman's hammer sounded all along our coast. That most beautiful spectacle of human art, the launching of

the ship—made doubly beautiful by our own poet—was a daily exhibition all along New England. Those were the days of our clippers and liners—the Great Republic, and the Defender, and the Sovereign of the Seas. And we brought to our shores the wealth of every land; we made poor old rocky, sandy, cold Massachusetts like Tyre and Venice and Holland for creating wealth where no wealth was.

Then in 1855 steam navigation began to come up in foreign lands. For the moment we could not compete in building steamships with England and Scotland. Our commerce began to decline. And then you would not let us buy what we could not make; you shut us out from the industry which God and nature had designed for us. And when we learned enough to perfect the steam marine, when we might have again commanded the sea, you put your protective duties on in the time of the war and the time following. You put out our forges, and you prevented us from buying the materials which should have built them up again. Give us back our birthright; restore to us the dominion of the seas; give us free ships; give us free coal; give us free iron; and we will not grudge you all the natural advantages which your States have. [Applause.]

But do not taunt us with the blessings of a tariff which we did not seek at the outset, which we have forced by our own native powers to turn its curses into a blessing, and which has gone on piling up its oppressive favors upon us till all but a few petted industries are crying out for release, and industries like leather which rejoice in free raw material, and those that have yet escaped are dreading that you shall lay upon them its terrible beneficence—free raw material. That I know is a favorite jest of protectionists who affect to say there is no such thing; the gentleman from Pennsylvania has called it a myth.

Will they again listen to Hamilton:

All the duties imposed on imported articles, though with an exclusive view to revenue, have the effect in contemplation and, except when they fall as raw materials, wear a beneficent aspect toward the manufacturers of the country. (Hamilton's Works, volume 3, 245.)

And again:

The policy of the exemption of the materials of the manufacturers from duty as a general rule, particularly in reference to new establishments, is obvious. It can hardly ever be advisable to add the obstruction of fiscal burdens to the difficulties which naturally embarrass a new manufacture, and where it is matured, and in condition to become an object of revenue, better that the fabric rather than the material should be the object of taxation. (Volume 3, 251.)

I have said that I strongly favor the many additions to the free list that are made in this bill. My friend, the member from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who opened the debate on the other side, deplored that the free list was so large. I wish it were a great deal larger. I wish to comment on one item particularly which I am delighted to see have the shackles taken off it. I refer to the clause which makes works of art free; I refer to the clause which declares that whatever contributes to popular education should not be the subject of taxation.

It is an entire mistake, Mr. Chairman, to suppose that works of art are luxuries peculiar to the rich, and therefore proper objects of taxation. If that theory was ever accepted as true, the exhibition at the great White City has disproved it forever. The exhibition at Chicago showed that everything of beauty, everything which delights the eye and the heart, is enjoyed far more by the poor, by the masses, by the millions, than by the rich, the classes, the "four hundred." Give us free art. Let the principle of artistic design come into our industries.

Let our potters, our carpenters, our ironworkers, our stoneworkers learn from every land on earth, and then you will find every building in the country, every public hall, every home that shelters the sanctity of domestic life will not only be adorned, but will be elevated by works of beauty, which have no country and which rise everywhere where God puts genius in the eye, in the hand, and in the soul of man. [Applause.] And this addition of works of art to the free list is worthy of the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who proves in his own person that the culture of the scholar is not inconsistent with the practical knowledge of the statesman.

I wish the committee had gone a step farther. I wish that they had put books on the free list also. A book is not a manufacture. A book derives its force and meaning from the thought, the genius and invention, the poetry, the enthusiasm, the study that goes into it and that converts the black marks into a living soul. Books are the seed grain of learning, of manhood, of art, of religion. Whatever real value they have comes from the brains and not the hands which have labored to produce them. Homer was the same Homer before he was printed, aye, before he was written.

Shakespeare is the same Shakespeare in the costly but faulty edition of 1623, in the edition *de luxe* of the most enterprising publisher, as well as in the most wretched text of the smallest type and cheapest paper which is published. It is the soul, the genius, the inspiration, the study, the facts of the author that give life and reality to the page. And you have no right to shut out a single reader from the facts of a single book, under the idea that you advance the interests of the mechanical laborer who puts those thoughts and emotions into shape.

But, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the idea of putting books on the free list is opposed by the printers throughout the country. In their own interests they are mistaken. It will not diminish their work. There is not a more honorable, more glorious occupation than that of the printer. Our printers are worthy successors of Franklin. But the books I want to see free are not those that the international copyright will touch, but the publications that do not come within its provisions, the books that are needed in small quantities by the scholar, the teacher, the physician, the student, the inventor, a silent class who are living a laborious life, many on very slender means, and to whom books are the indispensable tools of trade, and who need them in the cheapest possible form, not for the purpose of superseding any American publication, or depriving a single printer or binder of his legitimate employment.

Take off the shackles that bind them; let the poor, hard-working, underpaid man and woman have their tools of trade, and they will write and offer for printing and publication tenfold the literature you would have in this country if this system of taxation is still preserved. Reading makes reading, books make books, writing makes writing, literature makes literature, and I honestly believe, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the printers themselves, that their labor will be doubled and wages increased if our action is governed in this matter by what I believe to be that principle which will most conduce to their welfare. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Bayard attempted to make books free in 1883. Can Democrats have a better example?

There is another item on the reduced list which I wish was on the free list. I believe that the committee have done a great work in reducing the duty on earthenware many per cent. I wish, in the interests of the great masses of the people, they would make sanitary earthenware and sanitary plumbing free. Every one who is a householder knows what an enormous expense attends sanitary improvements in the household. Sanitary ware comes through the hands of a combination. It can not be bought except on restrictive terms. I would enable every owner of a tenement house to employ laborers to put in sanitary provisions as required by the laws of health at the lowest cost.

Supposing sometime you have an epidemic of typhoid fever. Suppose the landlords of the tenement houses come under the ban of your boards of health. What excuse will it be, when your laborers are dying by thousands with some pestilential disease, because you have put this tax on decency, that you strengthen the profits of the pottery manufacturers of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, I wish not only for a greater reduction of duty, but I wish for greater simplicity in the tariff. I believe the more complicated the tariff is, the greater number of articles that are put on the schedule, the worse for the country. It is hampering and annoying to the manufacturer. It is hampering and annoying to the importers and it is corrupting to the country to have a complicated tariff that increases the staffs of our custom-houses and makes a greater number of offices to enter into spoils and corrupt party politics. The simpler the tariff is, the fewer articles there are on the list, the easier they are to appraise, the simpler the revenue is to collect, the greater relief it will be, not only to consumer and purchaser, but to the citizen, who knows the baleful effect of the custom-house in all political transactions.

How much more time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, in the year 1842 Sir Robert Peel entered on his great work of tariff reform. He was bound by the shackles of party. He knew that free trade would prevail ultimately, but he did not dare yet to introduce it into England for fear of losing control of his party. At that time the conditions were the opposite of what they are here. The manufacturers were seeking for relief and the agriculturists were the monopolists; but it was the same thing. The monopolists, whether agriculturists or manufacturers, were eager to keep in subjection the masses, whether engaged in manufactures or in agriculture. It was known that Sir Robert Peel meant to introduce great changes, and the debate was one of consummate interest. It called to their feet many men who did not ordinarily address the House. It called to his feet one member of great personal dignity, of great influence in the House, and yet a man who rarely spoke with any eloquence or force. Rising to the occasion, he addressed this appeal to Sir Robert Peel; and I would address it not to any individual, not to any man in the room or out of the room, but I would address it now to everyone who having power here, who having in-

fluence and being able to control men, thinks more of party advantages than of doing a great work to his country and to mankind.

Mr. Raikes Currie addressed these words to Sir Robert Peel:

You have the power to do justice to all classes. What a fearful responsibility that fact announces! Will you not, by timely concessions to the claims of justice and humanity, avert that fearful union of the starving workmen and their ruined masters, when they shall merge their mutual animosities in one fell cry for vengeance, and bury you and your monopolies under the ruins of the constitution? * * *

Elevate your vision! Look forth beyond a few feverish evanescent years, beyond the tiny segment of time with which we are personally conversant, when all the familiar faces which haunt these precincts have departed, when every pulse which beats within these walls shall have ceased forever, when my name and the names of nine-tenths of those who hear me shall be utterly forgotten, or remembered only as household words, cherished by children and descendants, you will then be spoken of.

For you there is no oblivion. You belong to history. You will be spoken of as an astute and able minister, as a statesman fertile in expedients, as a debater perhaps unrivaled, as one who achieved preëminence in a field of the intensest competition. All this your enemies and detractors must admit. Will you not claim a higher and more enduring eulogy? Will you not enter among a far scantier and more glorious band; among those master spirits who have achieved supreme power and used it like gods to do justice to mankind; who have stamped their impress on the age in which they lived, and given an impulse, large, continuous, and abiding to human happiness and human virtue?

[Applause.]

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, like other gentlemen who have addressed the committee upon the pending measure, I am constrained to say that there are some provisions in the bill as proposed that do not meet my approbation. As the best that is offered, I shall vote for it, but under protest as to some of its provisions. If it were in my power I would wipe out that provision of the bill which perpetuates a bounty on sugar.

I have misconceived one of the great doctrines of the Democratic party, and I have all my life been taught in a wrong school, if there is any correct principle that will justify us in retaining for a day, for an hour, for a moment, a law that takes money directly out of the public Treasury and puts it into the pockets of private individuals. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would repeal the bounty on sugar at once and to the last cent. To that, for any period and to any extent, I am unalterably and uncompromisingly opposed, now and forever, world without end. If it were in my power and practicable I would go further than that. I would strike out every vestige of protection, and I would make the commerce of the world free as the winds of heaven and the waves of the sea that bear it from shore to shore.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, before I address myself briefly to the measure that is now submitted, to speak somewhat of a measure that is not formally before us, but which we are advised officially will be submitted, either as an amendment to the pending bill or as a supplemental bill.

I refer to the proposition to supply the deficit which we all admit will be made by the enactment of the law as it is now submitted by a tax on incomes.

I am aware that in certain quarters this is a subject hardly less sacred than the subject of pensions, which becomes, in the eyes of many, more sacred the larger it grows, and before which we are all expected to bow down and worship. Rather would I lay a firm and vigorous hand upon both and reduce the pension list and set up an income tax. Such a tax is certainly sustained by some of the highest authorities that treat on these subjects. It is undeniable that it has been tried in other countries, and successfully tried.

There is no doubt that it will raise a revenue. There is no doubt that we will need the revenue. I shall address myself briefly to some of the objections that are urged against this tax. I do not find it argued, seriously argued, that it is unjust. Nobody disputes the fact that the public Treasury will need the money. Nobody disputes the fact that the revenue may be supplied by this law. But there are objections, common to all those who oppose this measure; and I beg the indulgence of the committee while I briefly address myself to those objections.

I find them stated in a resolution adopted by the New York Chamber of Commerce, as reported in the Washington Post of this morning. They are: that it is inquisitorial; that it is odious; that it was only tolerated as a war measure, and was abrogated by universal consent as soon as the condition of the country permitted it. I think these gentlemen so highly respectable, and intelligent, perhaps, on most subjects, have detracted from the strength of their protest by the statement that this tax was abolished by almost unanimous consent, in the face of the truth of the record that it was abolished by only one majority in the Senate and one in the House.

They say it is "odious." It is odious! Well, it is odious to the fellow who has to pay it, and nobody else. What tax is not odious? I think I have heard, if I did not misunderstand the suggestion, from some gentlemen on the other side, rather complainingly, that we on this side thought that taxation was an evil.

Well, I never looked upon taxes as a blessing. I never welcomed the taxgatherer as a friend who was coming with benediction in his hands to leave around me and my family. Odious! Yes, it is odious; as every tax is odious. But I submit this is not a sufficient objection to a system that is practically confessed to be just in principle, that can be enforced by practice; that has been tried, successfully tried, in other countries, and will supply relief which the empty Treasury needs to-day. The other source suggested from which to supply this deficit is a tax on sugar.

I will have to relearn my lessons of Democracy before I would raise my voice or cast my vote in favor of putting a tax upon the sugar that enters into the consumption, the daily necessary consumption, of every man, woman, and child, white and black, all over the country and by preference leave the unburdened capital of the country to go untaxed. [Applause.] Between a tax on sugar and income I would tax income.

We are told that it is "inquisitorial." I am not familiar with the laws of other States than my own; but I have made some inquiries from Representatives since I have been here, and I take it that in all other States the tax collector, or the tax assessor, or the proper officer goes to every citizen and inquires how much property he has. Of course, where it is open and visible the necessity for this is relieved, if not altogether taken away; but we, everywhere, as I understand, levy a tax upon property that is not visible.

We go to a man and inquire how much household furniture he has, how much jewelry he or his family have, how much money he has on deposit in bank, how much of everything he has, until we come to this question of income, and then we are told that the officer of the law must stop, because when he goes beyond that line it is "inquisitorial," and the taxgatherer who goes around with the insignia of his office and the authority of law, as soon as he begins to inquire of a man what is the amount of his income, is converted into a modern Torquemada, and at the suggestion of this tax, gentlemen are seized with all the horrors of the Spanish inquisition.

Now, it is an admitted fact, and if I thought it worth while to stop, I would read from the report of the present Secretary of the Treasury, who treats it as an admitted fact that there are large sums of capital in this country which do not bear their just share of the public burdens. Sir, I have not a word here or elsewhere against capital. I despise with my very soul, as I abhor any other iniquity, the demagogism that would set up one class against another in this country.

I would no more inflict injustice upon a rich man than I would upon a poor man. But I would follow capital into its secret hiding places by every just and proper process of law; and, if I found it necessary, I would take it by the throat and drag it forth, not to do it an injustice, but in order to compel it to do justice to the masses of the people who are bearing the burdens of taxation in this country. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

I would treat it like I would treat any other fugitive from justice. But we are told that this law would promote perjury. I am not the champion of those who oppose this measure, but I respectfully submit they have great reason to devoutly and fervently pray to be delivered from their friends. Gentlemen upon the floor of this House, and gentlemen who control a portion of the press of the country do, I insist, cast an unjust imputation upon a large majority of the people upon whom this tax would fall.

I do not question that some frauds would be perpetrated under this law, as are perpetrated under every other law, but I say it is an unjust imputation to put upon the people who have the ability to pay this tax to say that we ought not to enact the law because if we do they will swear to lies.

Sir, the suggestion is unworthy of those who make it, and it is insulting to this body.

What would you think of a judge who, in a case where it became necessary in the ordinary course of justice to put an unwilling witness on the stand for purposes of discovery—and we oftentimes have to resort to that where there are no other means of ascertaining the truth; it is a common practice in our equity system all over the country to put the defendant on the stand and make him swear, to purge his conscience, to put him on his oath—what would you think, I ask, of a judge who, in such a case, would excuse an unwilling litigant from testifying and discovering the truth because he was notified beforehand that if the man was put upon the stand and made to swear, he would swear to a lie?

I say it is an insult to the American Congress to suggest such a reason why we ought not to pass a law, provided that law is just and proper and wise, and if we were deterred from the discharge of a duty by such a suggestion, we would put ourselves in the unworthy, if not the shameful and disgraceful attitude of, through fear of inviting or promoting perjury, giving a reward to perjury. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

They say it is a war tax. There is a sense in which the war is over, and every patriot rejoices in the fact. Now and then there is some big-mouthed, little-brained fellow who would revive its issues, but he attracts no attention from any except those who are as little as himself, and these do not really respect him. There is another sense, however, a very important one, in which the war is not over. Some days ago in the discussion of the pension question, it was said on this floor, referring to the administration of the present Secretary of the Interior, "In 1863 the boys were marching through Georgia; in 1893 Georgia is marching through the boys."

Mr. Chairman, it might be said in 1863 the boys were marching through Georgia, in 1893 the boys are marching through the United States Treasury. Yes, they are marching nine hundred thousand strong. There was an end to the invasion of Georgia. There is no end to this invasion of the public Treasury. It is annual. They march and countermarch. The rear of the column has scarcely passed through before its head enters again, and every sweep of this great army achieves new conquests and marks its track with wider destruction. It appears from an official statement I hold in my hand that in 1863 the people paid for pensions $1,078,991.59; in the year 1873, $29,359,426.86; in the year 1883, $66,012,573.64; in the year 1893, $159,357,557.87.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, without detaining the House by any elaboration of what I have but briefly and imperfectly suggested, I say I would make up this deficit by putting a tax upon the wealth of the country; not by way of punishment, not by way of rebuke, not as an expression of hostility or unfriendliness, but because the wealth of the country is most able to bear it, and because the great trend of our legislation for years past has been against the masses and in favor of the few. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, I beg the indulgence of the committee while I speak briefly upon the pending measure. I shall not weary you gentlemen or myself with any figures from the census. I have never heard any side of any question discussed in this House or before the people that could not be sustained by a resort to the census [laughter], and the devil himself could justify his reign on the earth by the census of the world, because it would show that the march of humanity has been to higher and better things. [Laughter.]

I recall the historic fact that when our Revolutionary forefathers were struggling to throw off British domination they were pointed to the growth of the colonies. I recall the further historic fact, with patriotic pride, that their reply was, "The colonies have grown, not because of but in spite of British rule." [Applause.] That is my answer in brief to any suggestion of gentlemen on the other side who point us to the census of 1860 and the census of 1890, and ask us whether the country has not prospered in the interval. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I think, Mr. Chairman, it may be well for us to recall some primal truths, and among these I would reannounce, not of course because it is new, for I believe that after all the oldest truths are the best and truth should never lose its force or vigor because it is old—I would recall the primal truth that no taxation in any form or to any extent can find any justification or excuse except in the needs of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not a student of economics. I profess no technical knowledge on that subject. I do not like figures; largely perhaps because, for the most part, I do not understand them. [Laughter.]

But I want no political economy to teach me, I want no statistics to sustain the idea that government which derives its power from the consent of the governed has no right to come and lay its hand upon my earnings, or upon the earnings of any other citizen, and extract more than is required by its own necessities. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This, as I understand it, is the gospel of our political salvation, and the further we depart from it the further we shall go on the road to ruin.

We have heard a great deal here about the American laborer. Some of the gentlemen on the other side, whose pious souls have been so disturbed and whose serene spirits have been so moved by sympathy for the laborer, tell us that the adoption of our policy would degrade American labor. They claim that the perpetuation of their policy would increase the wages of American labor. That claim I do not believe is sustained by facts. But if it were sustained they might well afford to pay the laborer a higher price under a system that compels the laborer to buy from them at a higher price. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They are as audacious as they are greedy. They claim credit for what they do not, and that which would be no credit to them if they did. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I say, sir, that every American laborer has the right not only to earn all he may by honest labor, but the right to control the product of that labor as he chooses. If you strike down this right, which lies at the very basis of this controversy, if you strike down this right of the American laborer, you strike down every right that secures to him the free and uninterrupted enjoyment of his own labor. In the name of the American laborer I protest against this doctrine. I protest against it in the name of every American freeman who is entitled to enjoy his honest acquisitions, however he may acquire them. I oppose this system of protection because it promotes monopoly and paternalism.

I will not stop and undertake to restate the argument. I believe that to-day one of the greatest perils that threatens this country is the disposition among our people to welcome that which in other days they would have spurned—the disposition to call upon the Government to do for them what they ought to do for themselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For myself and my children after me I ask no protection except the protection of life, liberty, property, and reputation, and, with these secured, the man who can not conquer his own destiny and build his own fortunes without governmental aid is an unworthy American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Undoubtedly the Government owes the citizen protection, but protection against what? Not protection against competition in trade or business. We have heard in this discussion about surrendering seventy or seventy-five millions of dollars. If we surrender it, to whom do we surrender it but to the people to whom it belongs. The idea seems to be by not exacting this sum it is surrendered. The Government did not make the people; exactly the reverse is true; the people made the Government. The Government does not own the people; exactly the reverse is true; the people own the Government. Why should the Government complain that what does not belong to it is withheld? As well might the highwayman, whose robbery is stayed by an officer of the law, complain that he can not enjoy that which is saved from his despoiling hand.

The spirit of this system is bold and aggressive and rapacious. The more it gets the more it wants. Its appetite is whetted by that on which it feeds, and like death and the grave, its insatiable greed never cries "it is enough." This fact is shown by the legislation enacted here for its benefit and dictated by its cupidity, it appearing that sometimes, at least, it names the very terms of the law.

It is shown by the history of such legislation in England, especially that relating to the woolen industry, about which so much has been said here. The export of sheep was prohibited that wool might be plentiful in England. More protection was demanded, and an act was passed requiring that every dead body should be buried in a woolen shroud, and this not being enough, as a writer on the subject has suggested, because the people would not die fast enough, it was enacted that a fine of £5 should be imposed for wearing and £25 for selling calico.

We had a most touching picture drawn for us yesterday by the master hand of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who brought to our notice the men or the women who crowded here from Philadelphia to the room of the Ways and Means Committee, begging that we do not reduce the tariff. But the gentleman had nothing to say about those other men who from Congress to Congress fill the corridors of this Capitol and throng the room of the committee, asking for Government aid, having plodded their weary way by Pullman cars, taken their breakfast at 10 in the morning at the Arlington or the Shoreham or Chamberlin's, where they would dine at 6 in the afternoon, and in the meantime refreshed themselves with oysters on the half-shell and champagne in the restaurant of the House. [Laughter and applause.]

We have heard in this discussion allusions to the "soup houses" opened all over the country by private charity to feed the poor. If I may be pardoned for the assumption, I would modestly suggest that the best way to destroy these "soup houses" is to upturn this national pot of soup that has been erected here at public expense to feed those who have already been fattened by partial legislation and turn its contents back into the homes of the people where they belong. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I find that I have only a few minutes left. Permit me to add a few words more. Before I came here, when I contemplated my duty and responsibility as a Representative of the American people, I was overwhelmed with the reflection that to my hands were committed, even in some small degree and to some small extent, the vast interests of this great and growing country and these 70,000,000 of people. The sense of that responsibility has been deepened ever since I have been here.

But it has found this relief—that whether my political career here be long or short (a matter of no anxious concern to me and no importance to the country) I shall feel that the burdens and annoyances and disappointments it has brought have been lessened by the reflection that I believe I am to-day a better citizen, a better American, a better patriot than when I crossed the

threshold of this House. When I walk over the splendid avenues of this city; as I stand in the halls and corridors of this Capitol, and see how the figures of the men who have illustrated our civic and military history have been gathered here in busts and statues until we have a Congress of the dead to instruct and guide and inspire the Congress of the living, I feel devoutly thankful to the Providence which overrules our lives that my lot has been cast under the shadow of our free American institutions.

As I look upon the flag that waves over this Capitol, I feel like saying in my heart, if not with my lips, Flag of the Union, wave on, wave ever! Wave over the great and growing North, wave over the thrifty and historic East, wave over the young and expanding West, wave over our own Southland, until the hearts of this people shall be bound together in the indissoluble bonds of a broad and lasting American patriotism. [Applause.] Flag of the Union, wave on, wave ever! Wave on until the nations shall catch the spirit of freedom, until the fetters are stricken from every limb, until every conscience is free, until the light of knowledge illumines every mind, until the fires of liberty are kindled in every breast, until every angel in Heaven and every son of earth rejoices in the universal emancipation of the race. [Applause.] This I believe can be soonest accomplished by just and impartial laws in our own Government, and free commerce with the world.

May God speed the day that shall bring us to the full fruition of this inspiring hope and the high attainment of this glorious destiny, and to this end consecrate the heart and the brain of American statesmanship. [Long-continued applause.]

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia obtained the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the gentleman from West Virginia begins his remarks, the Chair desires to say that he would have recognized at this time a gentleman in opposition to the bill, but for an arrangement made by gentlemen who are to speak on that side, to whom it is more convenient that the Chair should now recognize a gentleman in favor of the measure. Hence the Chair has recognized the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia rose.

Mr. LOUD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order to recognize somebody in favor of this bill. I have not heard anybody yet who is in favor of it?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

[Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I will extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask that the time of my colleague on the committee be extended so that he may have an hour and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended so as to cover an hour and a half. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. I am much obliged for the courtesy of the committee at this late hour of the debate.

The gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in opening the debate upon this bill, said that he had brought it in here in response to a popular demand. We have had five days of debate. Gentlemen have spoken who say they will vote for the bill, and gentlemen have spoken who say that they will vote for it with some amendments applying to their several localities, but not a single man has spoken for it who indorses the bill. [Laughter.]

I trust that if there is a member on the Democratic side who fully indorses this bill, he will be heard before the debate shall conclude. The "popular demand" to which the chairman referred was doubtless the election of 1892, when a minority of the people declared in favor of the Chicago platform, which was a direct declaration in favor of a tariff for revenue only, a plank inserted in that platform by a bare majority of the Democratic convention. At first blush this would seem to be an indorsement of "tariff reform," if not of this bill, but in my own State national leaders of the Democratic party explained the Democratic platform of 1892, and satisfied the Democratic workingmen by telling them that we needed $175,000,000 of revenue to be raised by tariff duties; that no such amount of revenue could be raised unless by a tariff with incidental protection; that the Democratic party would take care of the wage-earners of the country, and that no tariff bill should pass which did not incidentally protect them in their wages.

This bill does not seem to have any petitioners crowding their prayers into the petition box for its passage. We have seen remonstrance after remonstrance brought in here, some even brought in on stretchers [laughter] in opposition to the Wilson bill. We have seen the corridors leading to the room of the Committee on Ways and Means blocked by crowds of people, manufacturers, laborers, producers, consumers, opposed to the Wilson bill; but we have not seen many people coming here who are in favor of the Wilson bill. I should think that, even in the secret recesses of the crypt of the Capitol [laughter], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means might have heard from the elections of last November in which the people said that they wanted no revenue tariff for them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I should think that he might have heard the voice of the American workingmen saying that they did not want anything that would jeopardize their interests; that they did not want anything that would still keep their dinner pails empty, even though they might get a cheaper pail. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have studied this bill to see if I could find any theory upon which it was constructed. It is not a protective bill, although the committee have left some protective features in it. They have even seen fit to adopt a number of the rates contained in the McKinley bill. The title of the bill says that it is "to raise revenue," yet it proves to be a bill to reduce revenue by $76,000,000 a year.

As I have gone through its provisions, and examined its paragraphs, and studied its relations to the different industries of the country, I have come to the conclusion that the committee have gone back to the year 1880, and with their candidate for the Presidency in that year, have agreed that "the tariff is a local issue." [Laughter.] And, as I have heard the debate progress and have seen my colleague from the Troy district [Mr. HAINES] with his big petition asking for more protection on collars and cuffs, and have heard him say if the bill were amended to suit him in respect to collars and cuffs he would support it, I have concluded that the members of the House propose to make the tariff question in this bill a local issue, and had said to each other: "If we can fix it up to suit matters 'in our town' it will be all right and we will vote for it." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the bill itself is curious from another standpoint. The committee have put a duty on rice of 1¼ cents per pound—equivalent to an ad valorem of 83.39 per cent. There are few articles in the bill that carry a larger ad valorem duty than rice. Plate glass, 24 to 60 inches wide or above, has a little higher duty than rice. Chemicals, and beverages of which alcohol is a large component, have a somewhat higher duty than rice. Tobacco has a somewhat higher duty. On alcohol and tobacco there is a very heavy internal-revenue tax, and of course there must be compensation for this tax, and this internal-revenue tax upon spirits is away up above the ad valorem duty that the committee put upon rice.

Playing cards have a little higher percentage of duty than rice. I suppose we shall know when we get the next message from the Executive Mansion giving us another chapter in the infamy at Hawaii, what the conclusions of the committee are on the subject of playing cards—whether they will put an internal-revenue tax of 2 cents a pack on those. And after that has been sanctioned or originated at the White House, perhaps some day the majority will invite the minority of the committee to come in and graciously inform us whether this is true or not.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not want to answer a great many questions; my time is limited.

Mr. BRYAN. Was the gentleman on the Ways and Means Committeee when the McKinley bill was reported?

Mr. PAYNE. I was.

Mr. BRYAN. Was that bill reported to the full committee before it had been completed by the Republican members?

Mr. PAYNE. No; it was not. And it did not come to the Democratic members through any message of President Harrison either. [Applause on the Republican side.] And it did not come to the Democratic members at first sight through the daily newspapers.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman allow me to state that the daily newspapers did not give out the tariff schedules of the Wilson bill until they had been presented to the Republican members.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I want to say to the gentleman that I came here to Washington at the request of the chairman of the committee; and on my way down here, I read the New York papers and the Washington papers, and I saw that their prognostications as to the provisions of the bill corresponded very accurately with the bill itself when it was presented to the committee. Of course it was not given out; it leaked out.

Aside from that, no information came to the minority members of this committee on these internal-revenue questions until it came through the President's message and through the newspapers; and no communication has yet been made to them of the committee. I suppose we may take it for granted that

they are going to put a tax of 2 cents on playing cards, and therefore they have raised the ad valorem a little above that of rice.

The only other item that has a higher ad valorem than rice is firecrackers. They do not want the boys to celebrate the Fourth of July, I suppose; so they put a higher duty on firecrackers than they do on rice. Why this great duty on rice—a duty of 83.39 per cent—when they reduce the ad valorem upon Northern products to less than 20 per cent? Can anybody guess? The first draft of the bill presented to the minority of the committee put all lumber on the free list. According to the newspapers, there was a universal protest against this from the Southern States, because they said they were developing a great industry in Georgia pine.

The protest was loud for a week, and then we had another meeting of the committee; another bill was presented, and lo and behold, lumber dressed on one side was dutiable at 50 cents a thousand; dressed on both sides, at $1 a thousand; dressed on both sides and tongued and grooved, at $1.50. And I have not heard a single protest from the South about Georgia pine from the time that was reported until now.

Now, I understand that Georgia pine always come to the market dressed on both sides, and generally tongued and grooved; it is used for ceiling and inside work. It will not do for siding, as the pitch will fry out with the sun and discolor the paint. For fear that there should be any mistake about the discrimination the committee took the Northern pine in the shape of clapboards, and put clapboards, dressed and planed on four sides, upon the free list. [Laughter.]

An ad valorem duty was put upon lead for paints in the first draft of the bill, a large reduction; and we waited a week for the outcome. The papers said—I do not know how true it was—that the president of the lead trust was in Washington for a week, and the president of the lead trust, formerly from the State of West Virginia, now of the city of New York, is a man supposed to be prominent in the Democratic councils. Of course he was not here to see the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. WALKER. God forbid. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. No; he was simply here for pleasure for a week, and to see the city. Somehow or other, though, when the week ended and an amended bill was reported, it contained a change in the lead schedule for paints, and they put on a specific duty, largely increasing the ad valorem, and we have not heard a word about the lead trust being dissatisfied with that bill yet.

The miners out West wanted some protection on silver-bearing lead ores; not only the mine owners, but the miners themselves. Why, a distinguished Democrat came here from the West advocating a duty on silver-bearing lead ores, but he was supposed to be a little unsound on the tariff question, and the committee do not seem to have heeded his suggestion. Others were interested in the smelting business up in Kansas City, Mo., and to-day silver-bearing lead ores are by this bill to be placed upon the free list.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. PAYNE. I shall have to decline to be interrupted, as I will not be able to conclude my remarks.

Mr. MORGAN. I only wanted to correct the gentleman. The establishment he refers to is not in Missouri, but in Kansas. The gentleman is right except as to the location of the establishment.

Mr. PAYNE. I thought the gentleman would correct his correction. There is nothing like a study of this question for members of the Democratic party.

In 1846 Mr. Walker put a tariff of 10 per cent ad valorem on lime, and that continued to be the rate of duty until 1890. The manufacture of lime proved to be a prosperous and growing business in the State of Maine and of New York. In 1884 or 1885 a prominent gentleman in Portsmouth, N. H., Hon. Frank Jones, late a prominent and very liberal member of the National Democratic committee, with a few patriotic American citizens, went over the line and founded the town of St. John, in New Brunswick, and opened up some lime kilns and began the manufacture of lime.

It was found that because of the cheaper wages in Canada he was able to manufacture lime and bring it into the States of Maine and New York, driving out the people who had formerly supplied that market, because they could not compete with the cheaper labor; and in 1890 some of the gentlemen who were interested in this industry—some of the "robber barons," I suppose—who owned lime kilns and were manufacturers, came before the Ways and Means Committee and demonstrated the fact that it cost 23 cents a barrel more because of increased wages in the town of Rockland, Me., to manufacture lime, than it did in the town of St. John, New Brunswick.

They frankly conceded to the committee that there was a difference of 8 cents a barrel in freight in favor of the Rockland district, making a difference of 15 cents a barrel more to manufacture in Rockland than it did in St John; and the committee in 1890 put a duty of 6 cents per hundred pounds on lime, making 13 cents a barrel. They put a duty of 8 cents per hundred on cement; and the lime industry and the cement industry have flourished since 1890. And when I say any industries have flourished since 1890, I mean from the passage of the McKinley bill down to the time it was known that the Democracy had charge not only of the executive branch of the Government and the House of Representatives, but down to the time that it was known they had a majority in the United States Senate—and I want to make this explanation at the outset. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Jones said that this duty on lime was ruining his town of St. John, New Brunswick; that they could not get into the American market and compete very well with the Rockland people. He freely acknowledged that the price of lime had gone down since 1890, and was selling much cheaper now than before the McKinley bill was passed. But he wanted to build up his town of St. John, in New Brunswick, at the expense of the towns in Maine and New York, and he seems to have struck a responsive chord in the bosoms of a majority of the Ways and Means Committee, for they have taken off the duty on lime, at 6 cents a hundred pounds, and put an ad valorem duty of 10 per cent upon it; and for some reason or other, I would not dare to say why—I would not insinuate that it was because they had not discovered that any prominent Democrat had started to manufacture cement in New Brunswick or in Nova Scotia—they did not touch the cement schedule at all, but left the duty of 8 cents a hundred on cement although it was in the same paragraph. [Laughter.]

Oh, we are getting at the principles on which this bill was formulated in the committee! After putting a duty of 10 per cent on lime, they put a duty of 20 per cent on limestone. [Laughter.] Oh, this is a good bill!

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Did Mr. Jones say to the Committee on Ways and Means that he wanted to build up the industries of New Brunswick?

Mr. PAYNE. The funny thing about it is, that although we had hearings for two weeks, no one of the minority knew that Mr. Jones came near the committee; but when we got the published report of the hearings, at page 146 we find a statement of Mr. Jones, in which he sets forth the facts which I have stated. He did not appear for cross-examination by the minority of the committee, but this paper found its way into the hearings in some way, and I think it was by mistake and not by design. That is the only way we knew how Mr. Jones had anything to do with this. I quote from Mr. Jones, at bottom of page 147:

> Your petitioners, therefore, respectfully pray your honorable committee to recommend the complete remission of this duty, so that they may light up their kilns, and set to work their capital now locked up, etc.

Mr. DALZELL. That is not the only case, though, of evidence published in that book that was not presented to the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course not; but I do not think they put that letter in knowingly. I think it was put in by mistake.

The hay crop of the country amounted in 1890 to $400,000,000. The cotton crop amounted to $305,000,000. The hay business seems to have been the biggest industry, according to the returns. Hay is baled, but no one ever heard of any Democratic committee or any Democrat advocating the making free of duty the ties with which the farmer bales his hay; yet cotton ties are on the free list.

A finished product! Does that throw any light upon this bill? They use bagging for cotton, and they make a provision in this bill different from any other provision ever put in a tariff bill. They say that the finished article of a cotton bag used in baling cotton, when it is exported, shall receive a rebate of 99 per cent of the duty paid. When materials are brought in here and manufactured into a finished product, we gave them a rebate of 99 per cent; but here they take the finished product, cotton bagging, and put a special clause in the bill giving them a rebate of 99 per cent on those cotton bags.

Mr. WALKER. Wherever manufactured?

Mr. PAYNE. When they are imported and pay the duty, of course, wherever manufactured. But the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia] says that the great features of the bill are free wool, free coal, free iron ore, and free lumber; and the chairman claims that wool can be produced cheaper in Texas than it can be produced in New Zealand. He said that some gentleman from Texas on the Democratic side rented agricultural lands in Texas at 3 cents an acre, and pastured his flocks upon them; and then he compared the wages of the Texas agriculturist with the wages of some New Zealander a number of years ago, and arrived at the conclusion from those

two isolated facts that wool could be produced cheaper in this country than it could in New Zealand.

I do not propose to go into an argument with him on that question. There is not a farmer who ever saw a sheep—why, there is hardly a sheep in the country—that does not know that wool can be produced cheaper in Australia and New Zealand and South Africa than it can in the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Why, I find a statement here in regard to wool dropped from a New Zealand wool-grower, and that is the country my friend from West Virginia referred to in his argument. Mr. D. E. Meikle, of Chatham Islands, New Zealand, said "that he had resided there thirty years as a sheep-grower; that ocean freights are three-eighths of a cent per pound to London; that it costs him 4 cents a head to shear his sheep, and 7 cents a pound to produce the wool and sell it in the London market." And here is one from an Idaho wool-grower:

Frank J. Hegart, of the firm of J. D. Wood & Co., Challis, Idaho, is ready to make affidavit "that Mr. Wood has resided in Idaho twenty-seven years; that he is a sheep-grower and ranged about thirty thousand sheep in Idaho last year; that railroad freights are 2½ cents per pound to Philadelphia; that it costs him 10 cents per head to shear sheep; that it costs him over 20 cents per pound to produce his wool and sell it on the Philadelphia market."

Now, I put in these two fair statements of farmers right on this very subject against the consular reports of years ago, referred to by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the statement of the member from Texas in regard to his 3-cents-an-acre land.

But suppose we admit his conclusion that wool can be produced cheaper in this country than it can across the water. He says iron ore is shoveled up out of the mines and can be produced cheaper here than anywhere else in the world, and that coal can be mined cheaper than anywhere else in the world, and that lumber can be produced cheaper than anywhere else in the world; and then he says, when we have got these four materials cheaper than anywhere else in the world, he is going to take the tax off them and give the mechanics untaxed raw materials, and by some process, which he does not explain, he is going to expand their wages by reason of that. Why, if they are getting these things cheaper now than anywhere else, how is it going to benefit them to have untaxed raw materials—wool and coal and iron?

Then he says that with these things upon the free list, with wool on the free list, it is going to advance the price of wool in this country; and after it has advanced in price and the woolen manufacturer gets the benefit of dearer raw material to him, then he says the wool industry and the woolen industry and the manufacturing industry are going to thrive in this country and the wages of employés are going to be on a higher plane. That is the logic on which this bill is presented to this House, and you are asked to vote for it!

In the agricultural schedule the committee have reduced the ad valorem duty from about 33 to 22 per cent. In my own State agriculture is a great interest. In the early days we raised breadstuffs for the market, and our farmers had some degree of prosperity even when subduing the wilderness. At an early period the Erie Canal was built; built with the consent of the farmers of the State of New York. With wise foresight and statesmanship they laid the foundation broad and deep for the future. They provided a water way that carried your product from the Northwest to our principal market and laid it down there at almost as cheap freight rates as we could get from the center of our own State. That produced a new condition of things.

Our farmers could no longer compete in cereals with your deep rich soil of the West, but they were looking for something else. They saw in the future, cities and towns springing up. They saw and heard in the future the busy hum of industry. They saw prosperous mechanics. They pictured a home market, and they changed the conditions of their agriculture. They dropped largely the growing of breadstuffs and prepared themselves for the market at their doors. Vegetables, butter, cheese, eggs, poultry, meat, tobacco, hops, barley, small fruits, became their staples, and these again brought prosperity to the farmers of the Empire State.

We have eighteen cities of over 20,000 population each, with an aggregate population of 3,240,000 busy, prosperous people receiving good wages, getting a large share of the daily distribution of the wealth, and they furnish a market to our farmers. Now, the committee propose to open the door to the agricultural products of Canada, placing many of them on the free list. The cities of New York and Philadelphia are 300 miles from the district I have the honor to represent. From this district two milk trains start every evening, delivering milk in the cities the next day.

The valleys through which these trains run are lined with farms, in the best of condition, good fences, well-painted houses and barns, and an air of prosperity greater even than that of the surrounding farms. From other parts of this district the railroads are blocked with train loads of grapes during the season. These farmers know that high wages give the mechanics of our cities the ability to purchase these commodities at fair prices; the district, especially among the farmers, is intensely for protection and the Republican party.

Out of fifty millions that the committee transferred to the free list they took thirty-five millions from agricultural products. And then they have reduced the schedule by imposing an ad valorem duty. They have not only cut down the duty, but they put it in the power of the importer to cut it down still further; and we have now the prospect that our markets in the State of New York, embracing three million and a quarter of consumers, are to be turned over to the Canadians across the border.

With their farms worth 36 per cent less than ours, with their wages an average of 32 per cent lower than ours, and with a difference in insurance and interest of 12 per cent more, they can produce 44 per cent cheaper than we can. Yet this committee think that 20 per cent is a fair rate of duty to be placed upon the articles that they have raised upon the dutiable list.

Our State (New York) produces a great deal of hay. Out of the $400,000,000 produced in 1890, we raised $65,000,000. We are the first State in the Union on our hay crop. The Canadian farmer right over the border has equal facilities and lower wages and cheaper farms. The McKinley bill put $4 a ton on hay.

The man who went from Canada to sell his 100 tons of hay in Buffalo would get his $1,200 and deposit $400 of it in the custom-house, and take $800 home with him, while the American farmer who sold his 100 tons would take the whole $1,200. The $400 was what the Canadian paid for the privilege of our market, and that went right in our Treasury, and helped to pay our expenses of government. They cut this in two and make a duty of $2 a a ton on hay, which is something less than 20 per cent, and puts us at a disadvantage with Canada.

The McKinley bill put a duty of 30 cents a bushel on barley, which I always thought was too high. I thought 20 cents a bushel was enough, but I wanted it to be specific. Why, we can raise all the barley that all the beer manufacturers in the country can use. My own State can raise it. They use about 44,000,000 bushels a year, and with a duty of 10 cents a bushel on barley they imported 12,000,000 bushels from Canada prior to 1890 in a single year, and our people had the other 32,000,000 bushels of the barley market to themselves. Even at 15 cents a bushel, prior to 1883, the Canadians sold over 10,000,000 bushels per annum. They raised a good deal more that they did not sell for malt. They fed it to hogs.

It was not good feed, and it was a losing business. Last year only 2,000,000 bushels of Canadian barley came into this country and the other 10,000,000 bushels was supplied from our farms. Our farmers liked it, too. It was better to sell it for that purpose than to feed it to hogs; but this committee not only reduced the duty but put an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent upon it, averaging about 9 cents a bushel for the benefit of those importing barley. We will have 15,000,000 bushels coming in next year, and the other 30,000,000 our people will struggle to supply a market for. Oh, you might go all through the bill.

"Hops." They reduced the duty on hops from 15 to 8 cents. Who wanted it? The brewers. Why? Because if they paid the whole duty it would cost them from 2 to 3 cents a barrel of beer to provide foreign hops. The committee thought the brewers ought to be relieved, and so they reduced this duty on hops. We had before the committee Mr. Fox, a hop importer, and he told very glibly how the price of hops had gone down since they had to pay a duty of 30 cents; and I asked him and compelled him to testify before the committee that the price averaged 6½ cents more a pound after the McKinley bill passed than it did before it passed.

Mr. BRYAN. Do you mean to say that the tariff on hops raised the price?

Mr. PAYNE. You will have your chance, you will have your time to develop your peculiar theories here.

Now, the farmers like that. In my State we raise a great many hops. Now we shall be compelled to enter into competition with Canada, Germany, and England, and with any other country that raises hops; and why? To save 2 cents a barrel, they say, to the brewers of the country. It is time that the farmers of this country had a little consideration from the Democratic party as well as the brewers of the United States. [Applause.] They are all citizens of this great Republic.

Our farmers raise tobacco, and in 1883 we came in competition

with Sumatra leaf, raised by the cheapest labor in the world, with their wages from 10 to 15 cents per day. The Sumatra made rapid strides and destroyed their market up to 1890. The present tariff, while affording a large revenue to the Government, has at the same time made this business profitable to our farmer, increasing his acreage and increasing his profits. This committee not only cuts the duty in half, but they destroy even the effect of that by introducing the old fraud which was originally in the law of 1882, describing tobacco leaf "such as is commercially known as wrappers, etc." The universal testimony of producer and importer was that these words furnished a wide loophole for fraud up to 1890, and yet this committee seems to have adopted them.

The committee have put binding-twine and some agricultural machinery on the free list, as a "sop" to the farmer. I shall not add anything to what I have said on other occasions on the subject of binding-twine.

Under protection agricultural machinery has been reduced in price to a point never before dreamed of. Binders that formerly sold for $300 have been sold for $125, and other machinery in the same proportion. It may be useful to try and build up this business in Canada, but it will never aid the American farmer. Why, Mr. Chairman, the more we examine this bill the more we are convinced of the astuteness of that Canadian member of Parliament who stated that Canada got more out of the Wilson bill, without giving anything up in return, than she could have hoped to obtain by the most favorable reciprocity treaty.

The bill should read, for the encouragement of the Canadian farmer and the Canadian mechanic, the Algerian grape-grower, the Bermuda onion-grower, and the foreign mechanics the world over. That would be its most appropriate title.

I might speak of flax and hemp. I might speak of the peculiar consideration and the love that this committee have for the rags that fall from the paupers of foreign countries, that they should put rags and shoddy, unmanufactured, on the free list in this bill. We put a duty on them that kept their dirty rags out of the country. But they seem to want them. It is in keeping with the stuff that the chairman of the committee brought in here and wanted to put on our servant girls, made of cotton and shoddy, rags worked up with cow hair! We do not propose to clothe our people with any such stuff as that. We propose to give them wool; and then we propose to give them wages to enable them to buy their wool. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My colleague from Troy [Mr. HAINES] did not entirely exhaust the collar and cuff industry in Troy. It is a big industry, employing between 15,000 and 16,000 people. It pays a wage of $4,240,000 a year; not that these people are employed all the time, for they take the work to their homes and do it at odd times. Women chink it in with their housekeeping, and it brings in money and helps to clothe and feed them. Last year there was a falling off in this industry at Troy; the payment of wages was less by $2,000,000. In Troy they pay the girls $8 a week for making collars and cuffs, against $2.40 paid in Berlin. There was a duty of 40 per cent on collars and cuffs under "articles not otherwise provided for" up to 1890. In 1886 they had strikes in Troy which stopped the business.

There was a fight between the employers and the employés, and the employers went over to Germany and got Germans to make collars and cuffs, and the Germans learned the business. Then when the strikes were over and these Troy people had returned to work they found that the Germans wanted a share in our trade; and an American manufacturer went over there to start the business, and the Troy people were being driven out by cheaper labor that was being employed. In 1890 they came before our committee and presented their facts, and we put a duty of 30 cents a dozen on collars and 40 per cent ad valorem.

In the hearings before the present committee a Mr. Rosenfeld, from New York, appeared and stated that he was an importer of collars and cuffs. He said that since the McKinley act had gone into effect, instead of costing him $1.95 a dozen, his imported collars and cuffs cost him $2, just 5 cents more. The other 5 cents came out of whom? Why, of course, out of the foreign manufacturer. Mr. Rosenfeld wanted the duty reduced, and he told the committee how it ought to be arranged. Said he, "Put a duty of 25 to 35 per cent upon linen and about 35 per cent on collars and cuffs;" and the committee did put 30 per cent on linen and 35 per cent on collars and cuffs, to suit Mr. Rosenfeld. Then, in order that the committee might understand the question we asked him some questions about it, and he said that with a duty of 35 per cent on collars and cuffs he could make 37½ per cent profit on all his importations. A modest fellow, was he not? [Laughter.]

Then he told the committee some astounding stories about the immense profits that the manufacturers of Troy were making; somewhere about 75 per cent. We asked him to tell us what he knew about it, and it turned out that he did not know anything. Then the Troy manufacturers came down here with affidavits and showed the committee that the story told by this man Rosenfeld was absolutely false from beginning to end; that they were hardly making a living under the rate of duty contained in the McKinley bill, and that they were paying $8 a week wages, as against $2.40 paid in Germany. Then came the question "But is there not greater efficiency in the American labor?" The answer was, no; that the German girls were as skillful at the sewing machine as any girls in the world, and could produce as many collars and cuffs in the same time.

Now, collars and cuffs are coming in from Japan made at an expense of 15 cents a day for labor, and, in order to encourage Japanese industries and get that "great" market of Japan for some of our goods, the committee have put the duty down to 35 per cent ad valorem on collars and cuffs. My friend from the Troy district [Mr. HAINES] comes in here with a petition signed by 69,000 people, the majority of them Democrats, including the mayor of the city, the common council, the supervisors of the county, and all the prominent men of Troy and all the laboring men without distinction of political party, and he is told by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that those people in Troy are so slavish that they would not dare to refuse to sign a petition at the bidding of their masters.

Well, the gentleman from Troy knows better than that. He knows better than that; but still he says that if they will only fix up this little feature of the bill for him he will vote to rob every other constituency in the United States by the passage of this Wilson bill; that he will vote for the bill. The committee are very tender of the importer. Do they know that in New York and Brooklyn manufacturers pay annually in wages $290,512,997? That in the same cities importers pay annually only $2,700,000 in wages?

The committee put salt on the free list. Why? I have lived to see salt go down from $4 a barrel to 40 cents a barrel at the factory. We paid $4 a barrel when we did not make enough salt to meet the demand in this country; but now it has gone down under a high rate of duty to 40 cents a barrel at the factory.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The people are heavily taxed by that.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, very heavily taxed! [Laughter.] Only think of 40 cents a barrel. I do not know how long into eternity a barrel of salt would serve an ordinary family. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That includes the barrel, does it not?

Mr. PAYNE. That includes the barrel, which is worth 28 cents. If a man buys the salt loose, without the barrel, he gets it at about 22 cents, while the duty is 32 cents per barrel.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not care to yield for questions just now.

Mr. SIMPSON. It will be a very short one. I will just touch the button and you can do the rest. I was going to ask you, if salt has gone down from $4 a barrel to 40 cents a barrel, where are the manufacturers of salt going to get the money to pay the high wages which they promise?

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to the gentleman that by improvements in processes of manufacture they do get the money to pay high wages, and they do pay them to the laborers every day at this time.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. They have control of the entire market. That explains it.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the freight on salt from Liverpool to New York varies from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 4*s.* a long ton of 2,240 pounds. The frieght from Warsaw in my State to the city of New York, three or four hundred miles, is $2.24 a long ton, or more than double the highest rate from Liverpool to New York. Now, the production of salt is a question of labor, for the expense of making salt is merely the expense of the labor employed.

These facts being so, how can we compete with such freight rates in favor of the foreign salt. Some foreign salt comes in even at the present rate of duty. How? I have in my desk a printed circular from the agents of the Liverpool salt merchants offering to sell for shipment to New York for two shillings a ton less than they sell for shipment to Australia, a difference of 20 per cent in favor of New York as against Australia, the object being to get into our market.

Every pound of salt shipped from Liverpool to the United States and to Canada pays a profit to a single agent at New York City to-day. Give them free salt—what then? Why, they would cut down just enough below our prices to get into New England, to get into New York, to get along the canal and up the lakes, to get in from Canada; the wholesale price would be no lower than would be necessary to accomplish this. But what gentleman is so credulous as to believe that a single individual consumer of the United States would get his salt a hun-

dredth part of a cent lower than he gets it to-day. Then when they have got into our trade, when they have closed our factories (and when a salt factory is closed it deteriorates very fast and soon loses its usefulness) we shall have to pay tribute to this English subject in the city of New York for every pound of salt that comes into the United States from across the water. Oh, it is a fine thing to put salt on the free list.

I have in my district a factory that makes wire cloth, a new business—not a great many years old. This industry was brought out to meet a necessity and a want. It has become an immense business, so that to-day hundreds of thousands of dollars—yes, millions of dollars—are invested in this business, the principal works being located in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois.

Four-fifths of the cost of the wire from which this cloth is made is labor. Four-fifths of the cost of the wire cloth is labor. But it is skilled labor. It is labor that brings four and five dollars a day in the village of Cortland, in my district. And, by the way, some gentleman gets up here and makes known his discovery that in the same town a boot and shoe maker gets bigger wages than a worker in a cotton mill or a woolen mill. Gentlemen on the other side do not seem to have the capacity to understand that it requires a skilled workman to make boots and shoes, and does not require the same degree of skill to run a machine in a woolen mill or a cotton factory. Hence higher skill gets higher wages.

Why, sir, I know laboring men in my town who work for $1.50 a day; I know those that get $2 a day for every day in the year; and I know one who gets $2.50—why? Because he has brains, a skillful hand and vigorous health, and is worth more money than other men. But take the general average of wages for a particular class of work, and you will find that the average as between this country and Great Britain holds good all along the line; that wages are twice as high here as they are there. This fact was abundantly attested by the hearings, while the old fake about the large difference in efficiency was thoroughly exploded.

The committee has put the same ad valorem on wire rods, wire, and wire cloth. If the manufacturers continue to make wire cloth in this country under this bill they must cut wages right in two in the middle. You may say these men are Republicans. Yes, they are; but not all the intelligence is in the Republican party. Once in a while there is a Democrat engaged in the manufacturing business and carrying it on successfully. I received in my mail this morning a statement from the Martin Kalbfleisch's Sons Company in reference to sulphuric acid and alum. They state that every member of the concern is a Democrat.

They comment on the fact that the committee has put sulphuric acid on the free list. They say they believe they can stand sulphuric acid on the free list if they can get a sufficient market for an increased output without reduction of wages, if the committee will discriminate against Canada, which has a tariff of half a cent a pound on sulphuric acid. But they say that if we are going to allow Canada to exact that duty they can not get the market which they should have under this free-list provision without a reduction of wages.

They say further that the committee have reduced the duty on alum two-thirds; that they might stand a reduction of one-third. They are very particular to say that they supported Mr. Cleveland for the Presidency; that they are in sympathy with this enigma of tariff reform, and all that sort of business; but they say that if the duty on alum be reduced more than one-third they must reduce the wages of their workmen, and that if the duty be left as it is in the Wilson bill they must cut the wages of their men right in two in the middle. They send me their answers to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, wherein they say:

> There would be no possibility of reducing cost except by reducing wages. Our raw material now comes in substantially free, and we should gain nothing in the way of raw material by the proposed Wilson bill.
>
> If insufficient protection were accorded us the effect on raw material would be to shut up the bauxite mines in the South, from which at present we buy most of our bauxite for alum-making in preference to the foreign article.
>
> Q. If your raw materials be free, would there be any necessity for a customs duty on the manufactured product?
>
> A. Our raw materials are now substantially free, and we can gain no benefit from a new tariff bill in that regard, beyond a possible few hundred dollars a year to be saved on salt and coal.

I have brought in only half a dozen samples of the hundreds of letters I am getting every day on this Wilson bill. It would vary the monotony if I could only find somebody somewhere who is in favor of the thing. Why, sir, I longed for the day to come when we should have this debate, for I thought that someone would be able to get up here and say that this was a good bill and that he was going to support it because it was a good bill. Alas, alas! Five days have passed and there does not seem to be a man, woman, or child in the whole United States who believes in the Wilson bill, although many are going to support it because they think it is a party measure.

I will refer to surface-coated papers. The duty on some of the raw material entering into this manufacture is in the Wilson bill at 75 per cent ad valorem, while the duty on the paper is 25 per cent ad valorem. This is a fine thing in the way of free raw material, is it not? Raw material "free" at 75 per cent ad valorem and the finished product at 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. In the interest of labor.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, in the interest of labor. There are some things about this bill that I can not understand at all, unless the rates were put into one basket and the subjects into another, and one man drew out the rates and another the subjects, and the clerk wrote them down as they thus came out. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOOKER of New York. You did not have any in hand in the drawing?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, nobody ever suspected me of having any hand in the drawing.

There is a two-ply carpet manufactory in my town. The president of the corporation is a Democrat. He is a very good fellow, an intelligent man. He told me in 1892 he was in favor of free wool. Said I, "What do you want with free wool? Are you going to extend your carpet market?" "Yes, if we had free wool we could sell carpets all over the world." I replied, "Why do you not sell your carpets all over the world now? On every yard of carpet you export you can get back a rebate of 99 per cent of the duty paid on the wool." [Laughter.]

But he said he did not know that. Said I, that is not the trouble with you, my friend. You know very well that you can not compete in the markets of the world unless you cut down your wages. That is the reason you don't export. He says the committee made a mistake about his business. He said if they had put the two-ply into the three-ply paragraph and given him the higher rate of duty he could live with free wool. If he could get 30 instead of 20 per cent on the product, with free wool he thinks he could compete in the markets of America. [Laughter.]

And this is the same man who was ready two years ago to compete against the world if only he had free wool under our laws! So you see when you bring a man face to face with a practical fact, and he has to meet the particular case that is presented, without theory or humbug, he yields to the inevitable facts of the situation. At the same time he says the manufacturers of the finer grades can not continue business, if the duty that these gentlemen have put upon the finer grades is to be maintained.

No wonder, gentlemen, no wonder that at the last election in the State of New York, in a town where there is a large carpet factory which has continued to pile up carpets until every nook and every corner of their factory is filled with finished goods and no sale for them, and during the last six months have shut down their wheels and stopped business, and are helping to take care of some of the unfortunate men who, when wages were high, did not look ahead and lay up something for the future—no wonder, I say, that on the last election day hundreds of these men formed themselves in a line and marched through the streets to the polls, for the first time in their lives voting the full Republican ticket. [Applause on the Republican side.] Ah, they were "bulldozed," some Democrat says. But the man who says that does not know the laboring man of this country.

But, Mr. Chairman, they had a struggle on the sugar question it seems. I think they announced that in their report; but if they did not, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means did in his interview. They "labored" with the sugar question. Why? Why, because sugar was on the free list. In accordance with their platform they should have put a duty on it, for this is a tariff bill for revenue only; but they did not have the courage to do it. Three years ago we struggled with the sugar question. We found that there was a duty of 2 cents a pound on it; and because we did not produce 10 per cent in this country that we needed for consumption, that 2 cents came out of the pockets of the people and they did not like it. It produced sixty millions of dollars of revenue a year, or an average of a dollar a head all over the United States. We thought it proper to take that duty off.

Experiments had been made in beet-sugar raising in the West. The commencement of it was discouraging, as it was in France and Germany; but the French and German Governments encouraged it by a bounty until now they supply their own people and help to supply the markets of the world. We thought it worthy of experiment, and we did take the $60,000,000 of tax off the people while at the same time we encouraged this industry.

We gave them a bounty of 2 cents a pound on the sugars they produced, and the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means and the views of intelligent, candid men show that they are now succeeding in the beet-sugar industry, and with proper encouragement would soon supply all the wants of our own people, at the same time adding a new industry to our farmers that

the Democrats love so well. Well, they have had three years of untaxed sugar, and the consumption has increased from 52 pounds per capita to 66 pounds per capita of our population.

The laboring people can afford to buy all they want, and it is a good article of food.

This committee were confronted with that condition and they had a theory in their mind. They were down on bounties. Bounties were "bad." They were so "very bad that they were unconstitutional" in the Democratic mind. What did they do? Why, Louisiana wanted protection on sugar. They were willing to sacrifice all the industries of the country if they could only have protection on sugar. They were like my collar-and-cuff colleague from the city of Troy. [Laughter.] Well, the committee finally resolved that they would reduce this sugar bounty an eighth of a cent a year until it was wiped out. Well, that process would cost the Treasury anywhere from $35,000,000 to $40,000,000.

For what purpose? We put a bounty on sugar to build up the industry. They put a bounty on sugar as a gratuity to their friends in Florida, Louisiana, and Texas. There is no other reason under heaven. You can not explain it on any other ground. They know it will not build up the industry. The industry will starve and die with a bounty running through a series of years, with an eighth of a cent reduction each year. It is simply a bold, bald taking of the people's money out of the people's pocket, and putting it into the pocket of the individual, without a cent of compensating equivalent to the people of the United Sates.

Why, that is what our Democratic friends call highway robbery, and worse than highway robbery, as I have heard hundreds of them say. Still, I suppose you will vote for it because it is in the bill. This is a Democratic bill, and though you are opposed to it, every man of you is expected to walk right up and vote for it.

I was going to say something about ad valorems, but that subject is pretty well exhausted. I have not received a communication from anybody who had an ad valorem duty on his product who was not opposed to it, be he Democrat or Republican.

Every honest importer is opposed to it. Every honest importer has been opposed to it from the beginning down to now. Every official who ever wrote on the subject, save Robert J. Walker, has been opposed to it. The people are opposed to it. I have not heard of a man that was in favor of it, except the members of this Committee on Ways and Means, with the indorsement they receive in the President's message in its favor.

A MEMBER. Why are importers opposed to it?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, it drives the honest man out of business. That is the universal testimony. The merchants and importers of the best character in this country uniformly oppose it. They say that they are compelled to go into the streets and buy of the brokers of foreign manufacturers, because they can buy of them a good deal cheaper than they can go and buy the same articles abroad and pay the honest duty on them, and hence they are opposed to an ad valorem system. Why, an ad valorem duty always lowers the amount of the duty received, in the long run.

The lowering of the duty is only measured by the conscience of the man who swears to the value of the goods. The value of goods is a matter of opinion about which honest men may differ. Oh, what a chance this gives for the rogue and the rascal.

And then the committee, as if to encourage dishonesty and fraud, have made another change. In the administrative customs bill of 1890 we provided that where there was an undervaluation of goods, and the appraiser valued them 10 per cent higher, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties imposed by law on such merchandise, a further sum equal to 2 per cent of the total appraised value for each 1 per cent that such appraised value exceeds the declared value in the entry; and if the undervaluation exceeded 40 per cent in difference, there should be a confiscation of the goods.

But this committee simply provides that where there is an undervaluation equal to 10 per cent there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties imposed by law on such merchandise at its appraised value, an additional duty equal to the amount of the lawful rate of duty upon the sum which the appraising officer, in order to make market value, adds to the value declared in the entry; that is to say, the lawful rate of duty upon the merchandise in question shall be doubled upon the amount added by the appraising officer to make market value, and if the undervalution exceeds 40 per cent they retain our old measure of confiscation of the goods. This will be equivalent to a reduction of almost 40 per cent of duties all along the line.

But the bill is going to be fixed all right according to the rumors we hear in the streets. We are going to supply this deficiency of $75,000,000 in some way. Why, I understand the Democratic members are struggling with the question yet, although it was announced in the daily papers that they had voted upon it days ago.

They are going to have an income tax, on incomes of over $4,000, and then they are going to have an income tax on the surplus earnings of corporations; and this last feature is surely going into the bill, because the President says he approves of it and he wants it there. Well, they thought when they put a tax upon the people to meet this $75,000,000, they would put it upon them in such a way that they should not know that they were being taxed. They thought they would put it on the surplus earnings of corporations.

They consulted the Comptroller of the Currency, and he told them that there were over three hundred thousand stockholders owning stock in national banks, and they found they were going to affect three hundred thousand people owning those stocks. They inquired further, and they found that there were a million of people owning stocks in national banks and in various corporations of this country, and that a great deal of this stock was owned by individuals having small holdings, and they saw that it was going to affect a great many people, and that when they got their reduction of dividends they would remember the Democratic party. So they thought they would not put 5 per cent on the incomes of corporations, but 2 per cent, and also put 2 per cent on the surplus incomes of individuals over $4,000. I do not wonder that they hesitated about that.

Now, it is said the committee hesitate to offer the internal-revenue feature as an amendment to this bill, for fear it will not pass this House with such a load. They will offer it as a separate measure. They put a high estimate upon you Democrats who are opposed to an income tax, and your intelligence. They propose to get you to pass a tariff bill creating a deficiency of $75,000,000, and when that is done to call upon you to sustain a bankrupt Treasury with an odious tax. How long, oh, how long, will you let yourselves be deceived?

Are you not going somewhere for your revenue? Must you not put it on sugar or on beer?

Mr. WALKER. On whisky.

Mr. PAYNE. No, they can not get it on whisky soon enough to help them out.

A MEMBER. Issue bonds.

Mr. PAYNE. Issue bonds in time of peace! A great economic party issuing bonds in time of peace!

They say we have used up the surplus. So we have. We used $259,000,000 in paying the debts of the United States. They say we reduced the revenues; so we did. But we reduced it to a point where during every year of our administration we had more than enough to pay the expenses of the Government; and it is only when you come in that the revenue falls off.

Well, but they say that this is a temporary tax. How are you going to get the revenue? "Oh, we are going to have an increase of imported goods." An increase of imported goods to make up the deficiency! It would take $250,000,000 annually to make up the deficiency in revenue. Do you expect to have that? If so, where are your high wages coming from? Where is the work for the laboring man coming from if there is to be an increase of $250,000,000 worth of imported goods, paying out this money to the producers of Europe?

Why, our Democratic friends are becoming educated to our theory. Mr. A. C. Raymond, of Detroit, a prominent Democratic tariff reformer, whom we have seen about the Capitol for the last five years, appeared before the committee and said that he was converted on pearl buttons. How were his eyes opened? He had studied the question. He had found that the wages paid here were three times more than the average wages paid in England and Bohemia; and he said that he wanted that protection in order to keep this business going on, because the cost of the labor was 61 per cent in making pearl buttons; and because under the duty given under the McKinley bill the whole pearl-button business had been transferred to this country, giving employment to more than 5,000 people. The prices had slightly advanced; advanced why? Because of the greed of the retail dealers. He had even been to the store of a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and there they charged him a profit of 152 per cent on pearl buttons.

Mr. Raymond wanted the duty left at 1½ cents a line, instead of 2½ cents, and the same ad valorem rate, but the committee cut him down from that to 1 cent per line and 15 per cent ad valorem; and Mr. Raymond has been at work ever since trying to get it back where he knows it ought to be, for he is an intelligent man, and has studied the subject. I do not care how much a man may be steeped in the follies of Democratic theories, if he is sufficiently intelligent, and will study up the question and get at the foundation facts, he will come out for protection on that subject every time. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Well, we had the gentleman who sits in the seat once filled by the present governor of Ohio [Mr. IKIRT]. He appeared on the consideration of the crockery schedule. He had made a study of the subject, and he talked for an hour and a half. He had

convinced himself, but I am sorry he did not convince the intelligent gentlemen of the majority of the committee, that they should continue the same protective duty on crockery as was put in the McKinley bill. He had studied the subject, and he was converted on that.

And then we had Governor McCorkle, of West Virginia, and Senator Davis, and they told us about free coal. The chairman says that the duty on coal is simply a gratuity to a railroad trust. Why, how does the railroad combination pay their employés except by carrying freight? Does not the gentleman know that if you reduce that freight and cut off that revenue they can not pay the laboring man?

So, in the last analysis it comes to the laboring man. And when you come to divide up this duty you will find that it will come to the poor miner in the mines and the poor employé who transports the coal on the railroad. And whom do you benefit save the Whitney syndicate, who now control the coal mines of Nova Scotia?

Then the editor of the Cleveland Plaindealer appeared before us in favor of free silver-bearing ores; and he became a convert to the doctrine of protection on that, because he knew about it. Then the Democratic wage-earners that came before the committee by the hundred—it is not theory with these men. They are brought face to face with the facts every day. They know what high wages are; they know what they get in the old country; they know what the conditions are there and what they are here.

I was amused the other day at my friend from Ohio, Mr. HARTER, trying to prove that workmen in England left estates, on an average of $1,700 to each man, and then depicting the prosperity and happy condition of the laboring man there. There was one fact which the gentleman left out of his calculation, a fact which knocks his statistics higher than Beecher's famous work ever soared [laughter], and that was the fact that these same laboring men, whenever they can get enough money from this side, come over here to better their condition and were never known to go back until the Democratic panic of 1892 struck this country.

The tide of immigration has been this way until last August, but now the Democratic Commissioner of Immigration, in an interview in the public press, tells us that more people are going back to the old countries than are coming here from the old countries. Mr. Chairman, that shows the change in conditions which has come about because of your threat to ruin the industries of this country.

Last of all, my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is partially converted. The last time before yesterday that I heard him make a tariff speech he strenuously insisted that the "tariff is a tax" and the amount of the duty was added to the price of goods every time. Now, he tells us that the Canadian farmer has to pay the whole duty on his products and that on a great many articles the foreigner has to pay the duty. Oh, that light should come into the mind of so eminent a tariff reformer as the last chairman of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee! Why, it is almost a miracle to behold! The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] says that not more than 5 per cent of our industries are protected.

I am amazed when I hear a man make that statement. Are the carpenter and the mason protected? Yes, by the laws of nature; because people can not build houses on the other side of the ocean and transport them to this country. The work has got to be done here. Every branch of our industries is protected; not all the farming industry, yet that is the largest beneficiary of protection. Our farmers could not live against the competition of the lands beyond the sea but for the magnificent home market that is created for them by our industrial growth and progress.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means wants to go out after the markets of the twelve hundred millions of people who buy only 10 per cent of the consumption of the world. Better keep the market of those who, though they be but seventy millions of people, buy more than 30 per cent of the consumption of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] Buy it how? Buy it because they earn more than 30 per cent of the wage of the world, while the other twelve hundred millions earn but 10 per cent.

With what would the South Sea Islander, what would the native of Africa, whose sole possession is the necklace around his neck, what would such a savage pay for the railroad iron which the chairman is going to send to that market? [Laughter.] Oh, this *ignis fatuus* of a foreign market! Let us keep our own market, pay our own wages, keep our own consumers what they are, the best consumers in the world. Do not cut off the very life-blood of the prosperity of this great nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, speaking of the industries of England, I have a statement here which I will print as an appendix, showing the condition of the cotton industry in Great Britain, losing money year after year and making up the loss out of capital. And yet, sir, they have all the markets of the world except ours. [Applause on the Republican side.] The London gold-beaters have reduced their production under free trade from 4,000,000,000 to less than 80,000,000 leaves a year, and their laborers from 2,000 men to 400 men, with wages going down, down every year, till they can hardly continue in the industry.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] says he is the part owner of a steel-rail mill. I was amused to see him standing behind his intrenchment of 202 patents, which by the use of machinery have reduced the cost of his labor to the cheap labor of Europe, boldly proclaiming that he was ready for free trade. Free trade that would close the other mills of the country would only give him the monopoly by means of his patents. They constitute a very Chinese wall of protection, higher than any tariff, and it is no wonder that he is defiant.

Only a year ago and our people were in the enjoyment of a prosperity never before equaled. Now men are looking for a job; then the work was looking for workmen. Almost in a night the change came over the condition of things. Factories began to close; hours of labor were cut down, wages were reduced, and men began to cast about for the cause. Some believed it was because of the provision in the silver law by which silver was purchased month after month, and they clamored for the repeal of the Sherman act.

The President waited for an object lesson until the coming of the calamity which threatened, and then he called Congress together and recommended the repeal of the purchasing clause as the panacea for the trouble. Wise men saw that it might help the banks, but it would not help business. They said it might relieve the minds of those who had a panicky feeling that this was the real cause, but would have no other effect. Because they did not believe in the policy of the purchase they voted for the repeal. More than two months ago this clause was repealed; it relieved the banks; hundreds of millions of dollars of currency that was in hiding came to the surface ready to be used in business enterprises.

Still the factories were shut down; still the distress increased; manufacturers said they could not get orders and therefore they did not dare manufacture goods, because of this threatened tariff reduction. Merchants would not order goods because they expected more goods and less prices with the influx of foreign goods already piled up for the market. The money stringency has passed, and yet business grows worse. More than one million, perhaps two millions of men who were employed at good wages a little more than a year ago, to-day are tramping up and down our streets. Go where you will in any manufacturing city of our great land, distress, hunger, cold, and want are seen on every side.

Only a few days ago a respectable-looking workman walked into a market and stealthily wrapped up a piece of steak in a paper and carried it away. The proprietor called a policeman, who followed him to his home; upon rapping at the door the workman appeared and the policeman told him he "wanted him." The man said "Well, I suppose it is all right, I will go; but first I want you to step in here." The officer walked in and saw the man's four half-starved children around the table eagerly devouring like wild beasts the raw meat. The officer said, "I can't arrest you," and reported the matter to the marketman, and he, having a heart, sent up clothing and coal and provisions, and the man became an object of charity. Yet a little over a year ago the man was earning good wages, his children were attending school, and his home was a happy one.

That man, the gentleman from Illinois would say, has been improvident. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois never tried to rear four children on the wages of a workingman. Our workmen as a class are not improvident. If they were their savings would not be called from the banks, as they are, to keep them from starvation. With over 2,000,000 of idle men the charity of the people would be taxed beyond endurance to support hungry men in our Northern cities clamoring for work but for their savings. It is a great thing that with so many of these men idle there are so few demanding charity.

Why, it is estimated that in 1893 the wages paid in Troy were reduced from $4,240,000 to $2,240,000 in a single industry, and this is but a sample the country over. Think of the want, the suffering, the cold and hunger this winter has brought upon these poor people, reduced for the first time in their lives to eat the bread of charity; how it has sapped the manhood of the American workmen. Does any one doubt that if this House should by a decisive vote strike out the enacting clause of this bill, these men would all be at work within the next sixty days? [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, this question is something higher than merely

the question of high wages, and yet the chairman says that if that was the question, and he were convinced that protection would bring higher wages, he would be a protectionist. He tells us of the immense consumption of coal, iron, and wool, and he might have said of every product there was in this country, and he wants to give up this great market—consuming one-third nearly of the world's supply of each commodity—and let in the competition of the cheapest labor on God's green earth in order to get the markets of the twelve hundred millions, whom, he says, do not consume 10 per cent of the commodities of the world. Why? Because they earn only 10 per cent of the wage.

What use has railroad iron to the naked savage of South Africa? With what shall the native of South America, whose only clothing and possession is a string of beads—with what shall he pay for the manufactured products of the United States? We have one-third of the markets of the world, and if we would only take care of them right here among ourselves it would relieve all our wants. The chairman spoke deprecatingly of the fact that the laborers of the world were coming to America to compete with our labor, and he spoke of them as "foreign labor." Well, he may rest content. The threat of free trade has turned the tide of emigration, and for months more people are leaving our shores than the number of those coming.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to hold out the hand of welcome to every self-respecting, honest workman, from whatever quarter of the world he may come. Some of us may trace our ancestry back a few generations and we will find that our ancestors were immigrants, and yet to-day we sit in this House side by side with those born in foreign countries, and with whom we know no difference, for this is their country as well as ours. If we can give them the benefits of our wages as well as our own people, so much the better. It is not the nation that has the greatest amount of acquired wealth, but it is the nation that has the best daily distribution of that wealth gained each day, that is best and strongest.

Shrewd men will accumulate a fortune if conditions favor it, either under tariff or free trade; but this country is the only land where the workman—the average workman—can acquire a home. A home and good wages means what? It means education for his children; it means the refinements of life; it means a carpet on the floor; and, as my friend from Missouri would say, "a napkin on the table." It means intelligence, good citizenship. Intelligence, good citizenship, in a land like ours, means strength and stability, and these latter elements are more than the wealth of the aristocracy of the Old World can buy.

Mr. Chairman, does it occur to you that when a laborer loses a day it is lost forever? He can not store it up like capital; he must use it day by day. Who shall repay the laborers of this country for the days and weeks and months of their idle hours that have passed away, forever lost, and for which they can never get compensation? Pass this bill—I do not say the industries of this country will stop; immense sums are invested in immense plants with which something must be done—but you introduce an element of competition which is based upon the cheapest labor in the world. The factories may run when the strikes are over and the workman is starved out; when his manhood is crushed out of him, instead of the old wages he has accepted three-fourths or one-half, he must come down to wages that barely give him bread and butter for his existence. He must come to this from the high standard of wages which has made him the greatest consumer in the world, and which has helped to make America the greatest market in the world.

There are many gentlemen who sit on the other side who represent constituencies that believe in protection. You know that the remonstrances sent in by Democratic workmen the country over were not inspired through slavish fear of masters. These men never knew a master. They are intelligent—educated in the hard school of experience. They study this bill from a knowledge of facts of daily experience, not from mere theories. You may in mock heroism brave their anger and vote for this bill, bidding adieu to public life. But you can not in after years escape the contemplation of your work. The matter of a seat here is of little consequence compared with daily life among those who have honored and trusted you, the knowledge of their pinched wages, improvident homes, desolate hearthstones, uneducated children, and above all a loss of that independence and manhood which characterizes and ennobles your constituents and mine to-day.

I want you gentlemen to amend this bill only as suits your own sweet wills. Put all the direct and war taxes upon it you choose; fix it even to suit the Ohio free trader, who was so vociferously applauded by you, then when you have perfected it I shall stand ready to vote to strike out its enacting clause that it may remain as a monument to your folly.

I shall do this to save the present law, which gave us the three most prosperous years of our national life. I shall do this because this bill will encourage fraud and perjury; will drive the honest importer from the business; will put a direct, offensive, and inquisitorial tax upon our people; will give a gratuity to the sugar-producer, without a farthing of benefit to the country; will foster the interests of sections at the expense of others; will impoverish our farmer, destroy his wool industry, leave him defenseless against the tobacco of Sumatra, give his market for barley to Canada, for hops to Germany; cripple by a reduction of their purchasing power the consumer of his vegetables, his poultry, his dairy products, his small fruits, ruin his home market, and because it will tend to reduce labor to the level of its foreign impoverished rival; will stop many a wheel, put out many a forge, bring poverty and want to American homes, sap the manhood of American citizens, and continue the blight of poverty and want, and hunger and cold, which has so recently overtaken the people of a country one year ago the busiest, the most prosperous, the most progressive, the happiest, and the most independent the world ever saw. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

66 STATE STREET, *Boston, January 6, 1894.*

CONDITION OF THE COTTON-SPINNING INDUSTRY IN ENGLAND.

The balance sheets of 93 corporations in Oldham, England, for the year 1893 show that 31 companies made profits aggregating £31,870 16*s.* 5½*d.*, and 62 corporations showed losses of £104,644 12*s.*

So that the final results show a net loss for the year of the 93 companies amounting to £72,767 15*s.* 6½*d.*

The paid-up share capital of these companies is £3,751,030 11*s.* 10½*d.*, upon which there was a net loss as above, equal to £1 18*s.* 9*d.* per cent.

Besides the above paid-up share capital, these corporations have a loan capital of £3,293,639, 0*s.* 8*d.*, so that after making allowance for interest on this borrowed money they would show a net profit, were they free from debt, of about £1 1*s.* 5*d.* per cent. Or, in other words, if a spinner employed only his own capital in manufacturing, the business would have given him a return of a little over 1 per cent on his investment.

In the year 1892 the returns of 90 companies show as follows:

56 lost	£160,666	16*s.*	6*d.*
34 made	59,233	6	8
Net loss of 90 companies	101,434	8	10½

This is equal to only about three-fourth of 1 per cent on the total investment of paid-up share capital and loan capital.

The bad condition in which the business has been getting may be judged from an examination of the balance sheets for the past four years.

At the end of 1890 only eight of the companies had adverse balances amounting to £8,412.

At the end of 1891 forty-nine companies showed adverse balances of £142,767 4*s.* 5*d.*

The adverse balances of fifty-seven corporations at the end of 1892 amounted to £269,252 12*s.* 4*d.*

At the end of 1893 the adverse balances of sixty-three companies were £366,800 14*s.* 6½*d.*

FRANCIS E. BACON & CO.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the members of this House are perhaps fortunate to-day that I am compelled to condense into an hour a three hours' speech.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me a moment to make a request of the House?

Mr. SIMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I would ask in behalf of the gentleman from Kansas, in view of the position he occupies upon this question, that an arrangement be made, if possible, by which he shall have an extension of his time indefinitely or for another hour at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from West Virginia that this would disarrange the order of debate, and deprive some other gentleman of the time. The Chair, however, will submit the request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is to speak to-day, I think, and in his absence I must object to the extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that while I am compelled to condense a three hours' speech into one hour's time, this will probably prove to be a fortunate circumstance for the members of the House who may have to listen to me.

I wish to address myself to this question to-day as the representative in part of the People's party, to set forth the position of that party that I have the honor in part to represent upon this question of the tariff bill.

I am gratified, Mr. Chairman, that throughout all this discussion there have been but two sides to this question, that of the Democratic side, who have argued the question from the standpoint of free traders, and the Republican side, who argue it from the standpoint of protectionists. There has been nothing said about a tariff for revenue, and therefore I am gratified to know that we have made that much progress toward the liberation of trade which must result from the fact that there are but two sides to the question, and that is that either protection is right or free trade is right, and there is no middle ground between them for any honest man to stand upon. [Applause.]

I am a free trader in all that the word implies. I believe the right to trade is one of those inalienable rights that Thomas Jefferson spoke of; one of the rights that is born with a man, goes with him throughout his life, and is only laid down at last with him in the grave. The right to trade the products of my labor with the man that will give me the greatest return from the products of his labor is one of the rights of the human family, and any law that restricts or abridges that right is an interference with the liberty of the human race.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this question is a broad one, one that I believe in which is bound up the prosperity of the American people, and sooner or later we must settle it definitely. Either we must become a wholly protective tariff country, building up and shielding ourselves behind a Chinese wall of exclusion, or we must tear down all the barriers and challenge the world for the trade of the world.

I believe that in the discussion of this question one very important factor has been excluded. I believe, inasmuch as this is an agricultural country, and that with more than one-half of, or nearly one-half at least of, the population depending on agriculture for a livelihood, that any law or system of laws that results in injury to agriculture must finally endanger every other branch of business, for all depend upon it.

I have not heard an argument from the Republican side on this question that has to me given proof that agricultural interests are benefited one particle by this system of protection.

The history of the last twenty years proves that the interest of agriculture has been constantly declining, until to-day the farmers of this country are producing nearly everything that the soil yields, that they cultivate, at a very low profit, and a great many at an actual loss. This can be demonstrated by the facts, figures, and statistics gathered from the Eleventh Census; and for Republican protection-tariff advocates to stand here and say this difficulty, this disaster to the laboring classes that now confronts us, and to the business interests of the country generally, has come upon us suddenly within the year, is to ignore all the facts of the case.

For more than fifteen years, Mr. Chairman, the interests of agriculture have been declining. Twenty years ago the income which each cultivated acre of land in this country yielded to the farmer was $14.75. To-day the same quantity of land yields him an income of $8.15. The decline has been steadily downward for twenty years. Eight dollars and fifteen cents for a cultivated acre means the very lowest wages possible. It means but a bare subsistence with the barest necessaries of life for the agriculturist. It leaves him without any surplus whatever to buy the products of other labor; and that is the reason to-day of the lack of labor for the employés of the various factories; that is the reason that the factories are shutting down to-day, because this large class of our people is unable to purchase the products of the factories.

I have here some figures clipped from an able article taken from the New York Sun of September 10:

For more than fifteen years—from 1878 to 1893—all the great primary agricultural staples have been declining in price, although there have been periods when the price of some one was high for a limited time. This is more notably true as regards secondary products, especially meats and lard, but the trend of the whole scale has been constantly downward, and the general price level at the close of each year was lower than at its beginning.

In the meantime there has been no material reduction in the cost of production, for nearly all if not quite all of the improved machines for increasing the force or increasing the product of the farmer were invented prior to this date, and it would be safe to say that the power for increasing products on the farm by improved machinery since 1878 has not been more than 5 per cent, while the decline in the value of farm products has gained in fifteen years more than 50 per cent. The average value of the crops per acre for 1893 only amounts to $8.15 per acre, which brings it down, if not below, at least to the very verge of the cost of production, which only leaves to the farmer very low wages at least for his toil and leaves him without any surplus whatever to purchase anything beyond the bare necessaries of life, and often he must content himself with a half supply of those.

As 203,000,000 acres are now employed in the growing staple crops, it follows that the power of the farmer to purchase is this year one billionfive hundred and sixty-three million less than it would be if he was receiving the prices of 1866 or 1870 for his staples. If the price now realized is in the foreign markets equal to those received from 1871 to 1875, the farmer would be able to spend one billion four hundred and fifty millions more for manufactures and other commodities than he will be able to spend with prices at their present level. Were the prices now equal to the average of those obtained from 1876 to 1880, the purchasing power of the farmers would this year be augmented by seven hundred and sixty-eight millions. Should the crops of 1893 give average yields and the price equal those current from 1881 to 1885, the farmer's spending power would be six hundred and forty-five millions greater than with present prices—even with prices as low as those prevailing from 1886 to 1890.

The farmers of the United States would have three hundred and fifty-eight millions added to their debt-paying and purchasing power in 1893, and like advances on the other products of the farm would create an ample fund for building and general improvement, thus employing more labor. The least of these sums, added to the sums yearly distributed among the producers of metals and textiles, would afford employment for greater numbers, keep the mills in motion, and make money abundant and bring good times.

Much stress is laid upon the necessity of cheap food for the wage-worker, but what possible benefit can be derived from a cheapness that deprives the thirty millions who produce food and fiber of the ability to keep the wage-worker employed by buying the product of artisan and operative? Doubling the present price of wheat would probably add the price of six days' labor to the cost of the year's supply of bread for the average family; but with wheat at an average of $1 a bushel at the farm markets, and other farm products at proportionate price, there would be no idle mills, and the earner of wages would have that easily procured and constant work which would insure him the continuous ability to buy bread. Would not that be far better than existing conditions and bread unattainable so low in price?

We recently published a statement to the effect that the 1,600 young women employed in Warner's corset factory in Bridgeport, Conn., had been reduced to one-half time, and that 600 of them were unable to buy food, and were fed by charity of their employers. Such conditions exist because the women on the farms are unable to renew their corsets with wheat selling west of the Mississippi at from 30 to 40 cents a bushel. The relations between the price of wheat and the lack of power to buy corsets and the idleness and inability of the women of Bridgeport to buy bread is as obvious as that between the earth's movement and the day and night.

However people may have disagreed about the late Zach. Chandler's statesmanship, no one questions his success as a merchant and this was due as much to his power of discerning economic conditions affecting his customers as to the honorary judgment with which he provided salable goods. Soon after the close of the civil war, being asked if he could find sale in the farming districts for a lot of rich dress goods which he was shipping to small inland towns, his reply was characteristic: "Sell them, sell them; why the women on the farms of Michigan have discarded homespun and calico for silk and merino, and no farmer's son now thinks of going out to plow unless dressed in doeskin trousers and calfskin boots. Don't you know that wheat is selling for $2 per bushel?"

Such was the late Zach. Chandler's way of stating the operation of that economic law which enables people to buy liberally of the products of others. Mills and furnaces are idle and operatives unable to buy bread because a large part of that thirty million inhabiting the farms have lost their purchasing power. The purchasing power has been lost because the products of the soil have, over wide areas, sold at or below the cost of production. Farm products bring inadequate prices because primarily of the existence during recent years of a cultivated acreage in excess of the world's requirement, and there are those who believe that the depressing influences of this excessive acreage upon prices has been intensified and augmented by methods employed upon produce exchanges.

When we reflect that had the 460,000,000 bushels of wheat exported since July 1, 1891, brought but 15 cents more a bushel, the corn exported 10 cents more, and the cotton exported only 4 mills more on the pound, fully one hundred millions less in gold would have gone abroad and many millions less in American securities have been sent back, we can understand that the purchasing power of the farmer would have been enhanced by several hundred millions, and like advances would have been secured on all similar products sold at home. Such an addition to the farmer's power to purchase would have kept the mills and furnaces employed; the operatives having constant work at high wages, would be able to buy bread, and their power to purchase of the products of their own labor, as well as of the products of the labor of others would be vastly increased; gold would be abundant, confidence unimpaired, and prosperity still be the rule.

With prices of farm products against such as afford their fair remuneration for the labor and capital employed in production, as they presently must be by reason of the elimination of the world's acreage success, the purchase of the thirty millions upon our farms will help to keep every spindle busy, labor in the towns will at least for a time be well employed, hoarding will cease, confidence will be restored, money become abundant, and an era of prosperity will result from the operation of that natural law which is the ultimate armature in determining the price in nearly every product of labor.

The growth and wealth of this entire country in the past has depended on the growth and prosperity of agriculture.

To show you that the wealth created by these farmers has steadily passed into the hands of the money-lenders, you have but to study the facts and figures in connection with the increase of mortgage indebtedness upon the farms of this country. The farmers of the country in 1850 owned 60 per cent of the wealth; 53 per cent in 1860; 40 per cent in 1890.

Why is this? Has the wealth of the entire country diminished in the same ratio? The total valuation of the property in the United States was $8,000,000,000 in 1850. In 1860 it was $16,000,000,000, or a gain of 100 per cent. In ten years, in 1870, it was $30,000,000,000, a gain of 87½ per cent. In ten years, in 1880, it was $45,000,000,000, or a gain of 50 per cent. In 1850 farm mortgages were almost unknown. A mortgaged farm was an exception, and not the rule. To-day it is the rule, and a farm without a mortgage is the exception.

Agriculture yields a lower rate of interest than any other pursuit. Why is this? Politicians tell us we are shiftless, idle, extravagant, all of which we know to be absolutely false as a general statement, though it may be true in individual cases. In 1880 agriculture employed 44 per cent of our industrial population, had an invested capital of twelve billions, and yielded products valued at two billions; those engaged in mining, manufacturing, mechanics, and the production of petroleum, with a capital of two billion seven hundred millions, threw on the market a product valued at five billion six hundred millions.

While the gross income of the farmer was 6 per cent of the invested capital, the gross income of these other pursuits was over 200 per cent. Farming is the national occupation. Our country is peculiarly an agricultural country. Farmers are the chief wealth-producers of our country; nine-tenths of our exports are agricultural products. Is it right for the wealth-producers, toilers, to be robbed of the fruits of their labors? The census of 1880 fixes the male population engaged in all occupations at 14,744,842, out of a total working population, male and female, of 17,392,690, of whom 7,670,493 were classed as agriculturists.

I quote these figures to show you that when any law or any system of government does not bring prosperity to the agriculturists of this country, it must follow as the night the day that no prosperity can come to any business in this country. Let us see a little further where the losses were.

In 1873 corn was worth to the farmer 40 cents a bushel and yielded a return of $11.41 an acre.

In 1889 corn was worth 28 cents a bushel, and yielded a return to the farmer of $7.63 an acre.

In 1873 the home value of wheat was $1.15; average yield 12.7 bushels, and worth $14.59 per acre.

In 1889 the home value was $0.698; yield per acre, 12.9 bushels; value per acre $8.98. The quantity per capita was about the same in 1873 as in 1889.

In 1872, 10,303,000 milch cows were worth $339,000,000, or nearly $33 each. In 1890, 15,952,000 were worth $352,000,000, or $22 each. The number of cows in 1872 was one to a little less than four of the population. In 1890, the number was one to a little more than four of the population; so that relatively to population, the number of cows had decreased and their value at the same time had fallen over 30 per cent.

Great as has been the fall of agricultural products, the fall in the price of farm lands has been greatest of all, notwithstanding the fact that the area of arable lands, relatively to population, is rapidly decreasing; and nowhere has the value of land fallen more than in the old settled parts of the country.

At the price of wheat in 1873 the value to the farmer of the crop of 1889 would have been $563,000,000 instead of $342,000,000, a difference of $221,000,000. This would have gone a long way toward paying off mortgages.

The corn crop of 1889, at the price of 1873, would have yielded $1,008,000,000 instead of $597,000,000.

At the value of milch cows in 1873, the number in 1890 would have been worth $510,000,000 instead of $352,000,000.

The cotton crop of 1888, at the price of cotton in 1873, would have been worth to those South $515,000,000, instead of $292,000,000, its actual value in 1888.

The difference in the value of farm products in 1873 and 1888–'89, correctly marks the difference between prices which the farmers should have received and what they receive now, because in part of protective tariffs, as I propose to show you before I finish my remarks.

There has been a good deal said about trusts in this discussion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] the other day, through some false information, I presume, denied even that there was a steel-rail trust. The Republican party have always based their argument principally upon this fact, that they want a protective tariff, first, because they say it builds up competition among manufactories in their own country; and, secondly, because it yields a higher rate of wages to the American laborer, increasing his capacity to buy of the products of the farm, which will result in creating a home market to consume the products of agriculture. Let us see about that. Let us see what the effect of a protective tariff is. It was very cogently stated by Mr. Henry George, who says that out of a protective tariff, as naturally as grow toadstools out of a rotten log, grow the trusts and combines of your country.

These facts were taken from the New York World of September, 1892. Let us see. The 14,500 employers of the 905,000 paupers in our pauper houses, called protected industries, collected in 1880 over $300,000,000 under pretense that it was to pay the difference in wages; and the total amount received by their workers was under $300,000,000. The employers had absolute pauper labor, and robbed the paupers of over half of the public money contributed for their support.

Here are a few specific instances: The forty-nine refineries—the protected sugar trust—sold to the people in 1890 3,156,996,000 pounds. They collected 1½ cents per pound "protection" to pay the difference in wages, or $47,354,940. The total wages paid for refining this sugar were $4,419,094, leaving to the sugar trust the sum of $42,935,846 profit in addition to its pauper labor.

This enormous profit from employing pauper labor was in addition to the ordinary and usual profits in the refining business, and between 1880 and 1891 it amounted to $546,931,358, every cent of which was taken from the people by forty-nine refineries under the false pretense that it was to pay the difference in wages between this country and abroad. When, in 1888, an enormous campaign contribution was levied upon the sugar trust it refused to pay it. Senator Plumb advised Chairman Foster to "put it over the fire and fry some of the fat out of it." This was done, and the McKinley bill reduced its protection from 1½ cents to one-half cent a pound. But plenty of fat was left. The protected sugar trust did collect from the people in the year 1892 its protection of half a cent per pound on 3,600,000,000 pounds of sugar, or $18,000,000 to "pay the difference in wages." The total wages it pays is 14 cents per 100 pounds, or $5,040,000, leaving $12,960,000 which it pockets from the money collected to pay its workmen the "difference in wages" after getting its labor practically free of cost.

The forty-nine refineries reported to the Census Office in 1880 that the total wages paid for refining was 14 cents per 100 pounds. This included all wages paid. The Bureau of Statistics reports that 1880 to 1891 there were refined 16,277,719 tons, and wages paid $51,046,926, if the labor cost of refining remained the same as in 1880. It has been greatly reduced. To pay the difference in wages these forty-nine refiners have received protection of 1½ cents per pound in addition to the compensatory protection of 2 to 3½ cents to recoup the duties on raw material. This protection for wages was $546,931,358, every cent of which the trust promised to collect and pay the workmen in addition to foreign wages. The refiners collected it, but the total the workman got was $51,046,926, and the trust had $495,884,432 to divide up as boodle, and then had pauper labor that cost it not a cent.

The Tweed ring took about $32,000,000 of the public money for the improvement of the city of New York, paid about $26,000,000 in wages for honest work, and stole $6,198,950. The sugar trust in 1890 took $47,350,940 of the public money, paid $4,419,094 in wages, and "lifted" $42,935,846.

In the year 1892, the sugar trust took from the people $18,000,000, paid $5,040,000 in wages, and "lifted" $12,960,000. No one defended the thefts of the Tweed ring on the ground that 80 per cent was to pay wages, but every Republican in the land defends both the old and the new "conversions" of the sugar trust as proper and moral because a small percentage goes to the workman—and to the Republican campaign fund.

So much for the sugar trust.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I understand from the drift of your argument that the continual decrease in the price of agricultural products is owing to the policy of Republican protection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir; you are entirely right.

Mr. BOWERS of California. One other question, if you will allow me, a question which my friend did not have time to answer yesterday; and I would like to ask you, if you will tell us, why this protection, that is so hurtful to the whole agricultural interests, and which, as the eloquent gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EVERETT] this morning stated, was "heathenish," if I understood him aright, is all right and necessary for the big mill owners in the rich State where he lives, to which this bill gives a protection of 40 per cent, or $4 on every $10, I would like to ask the gentleman to come down to that, as I know he can do it.

Mr. SIMPSON. I understand your question. The gentleman surely knows that the agricultural classes, whose interests, according to the Republican members, are left out of this bill, because they have nothing protected, are ignored because they are scattered over so wide a territory, because they represent unorganized labor, and because these other parties can combine and concentrate their forces and send a lobby here to Washington to lobby in their interests, and because farmers do not know how to protect their interests as do the protected interests; and also because Democratic politicians are no better than Republican politicians. When this force is brought here they always surrender, not alone to get the "fat" for the campaign but of getting voters to keep them in power.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Your answer is very satisfactory.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, about the carpet trust. Mills in 1890 required 116,000,000 pounds of carpet wool, which is not raised in this country. They imported 30 per cent and added 7 per cent of the domestic shoddy on which they had to pay from 3 to 6 cents revenue duty on the wool they used, and they were given a "compensatory duty" of 12 to 70 cents per square yard. Then to unite their interests with the others, they were given a "protective duty" for themselves of 35 to 50 per cent to pay the difference in wages. To collect both duties or either duty they had to form a trust and agree on a selling price. Without this trust they could not collect even 1 per cent of the tax they paid on their imported wool.

Our carpet mills produced in 1880 product valued without wages at $24,957,524. To pay the "difference in wages" they were authorized to collect from the people, through a tariff trust controlling prices, not less than $8,735,154. They actually paid a total of $6,835,218, getting their labor for nothing and defaulting on the trust funds, $1,889,936. This was only their protection to pay the difference in wages, the ad valorem duty given them for this purpose. They had a "compensatory duty" besides.

But the protection of the carpet trusts was not confined to a tax for the difference in wages. It paid a duty on its raw material, and this duty it had a right to collect again from the people.

For every pound of imported wool used it should have the power to charge up the duty of 3 to 6 cents. But the Congress instead of authorizing it to collect the 3 to 6 cents paid, authorized it to

collect 18 cents. The value of only a small part of this compensatory duty to the trust, 4,077,190 yards at 44 cents, 21,986,434 yards at 12 cents, 862,394 yards at 17 cents, 1,984,401 yards at 12 cents, 9,441,205 yards at 40 cents, 60,000 yards at 70 cents, 157,620 yards at 70 cents, 40,000 yards at 25 cents, was $8,755,863. The total duties paid were $2,077,959, leaving fat from shoddy for contributions worth at least $6,667,904.

I have here a list of the window-glass trust, worked under the same conditions. The fifty-eight members of the American window-glass trust were protected in 1860 by a duty of 15 per cent; in 1861 it was raised to 80 per cent; in 1884 to 120 per cent; and in 1890 to 132 per cent.

The price per half box of 18 by 24 in this country was in 1860 $3.60; in 1890, $3.13. The price abroad per 100 pounds of 16 by 24 to 24 by 30 was in 1867, $4.50; in 1890, $1.80.

We imported in 1890 of this size 19,097,057 pounds, for which we paid in our labor products the foreign cost $343,540, and McKinley fine (duty) $452,605, so that while the cost abroad per 100 pounds was $1.80 it should be here $4.18. In 1880 the total wages paid here for making $1.80 worth was 75 cents, and the manufacturer received to pay the difference in wages $2.38, leaving him $1.53 net "profit" for using pauper labor supported by a tax on the public.

The window-glass trust is protected by a duty of 132 per cent on the common size, 16 by 24, to "pay the difference in wages" between this country and Belgium. That "difference" is not equal to a duty of 10 per cent. Here is the proof. Take cost of melting in the United States from Republican reports, Geological Survey: Raw material, $47.53; labor costs $19.96; total, $67.49.

Take cost of melting in Belgium from Republican consular reports: Raw material, $48.44; labor costs, $11.53; add 10 per cent duty, $6.29; total, $69.26. A tariff duty of 10 per cent more than compensates for this difference in wages of 40 per cent. The additional 122 per cent duty, equal to $76.82, is "fat" levied solely for the benefit of the window-glass trust that its members may contribute liberally to the Republican campaign fund. They do. It is not necessary to "fry the fat" out of them.

The window-glass trust was protected in 1891 by a duty of $2.37½ on $2.20 worth of foreign glass 16 by 24. The cost of raw material for a melting was, in 1884, in the United States, $47.53; in Belgium, $48.44. Wages paid, ten-pot furnace, per month was, in United States, $2,241, and in Belgium, $1,584. The duty levied on a month's product of a Belgium furnace was $2,937, or $796 more than the total wages paid in this country, collecting this money from the people. They never paid it to their laborers, but have put it into their own pockets, as proved by the facts and figures that I have collected here.

The enormous amount collected from the people for this extraordinary privilege for the products they produce fell heavily upon the agricultural classes. They are the consumers of sugar and window glass and all of those things that the four hundred and fifty trusts that have been formed under your protective system produce, and that is what has brought the agricultural interests of this country to poverty and bankruptcy to-day, and it must follow that the other interests, as I stated before, must fall into it, and if they do not look to the upbuilding of those interests the whole fabric of your institutions must bring us to bankruptcy as sure as the sun will rise in the morning.

To show that protection has not built up the home market, has not increased the demands for the products of the farm, I want to read a few more statistics:

The total area devoted to the cultivation of cereals in the six New England States in 1889 was 580,297 acres, as compared with 746,128 acres in 1879, a decrease of 165,831 acres, or 22.23 per cent.

In Massachusetts the total area in cereals in 1889 was 63,376 acres, as compared with 104,631 acres in 1879, a decrease of 41,255 acres, or 39.43 per cent.

Twenty-two per cent decrease in the cultivated acres in the New England States! There, where, if anywhere, agriculture should have been benefited by this home market that we hear so much about, there is a falling off of the cultivated acres of over 22 per cent. Now, I ask my Republican friends, where is that home market of which they tell us, that was to take the products of the farm? Where has it gone?

And in the State of New York, a great manufacturing State, where they have this boasted home market, the total area devoted to the cultivation of cereals in 1889 was 3,239,466 acres, as compared with 3,669,834 acres in 1870, a falling off of 11.75 per cent. Pennsylvania shows a decrease of about 6 per cent in the cultivated acres devoted to cereals, and she is one of the great manufacturing States. So Illinois, the best agricultural State in the Union, one that is building up her manufacturing interests to establish the home market for her farm products, shows a decrease of about 20 per cent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. Those statistics do not take into account the amount of land that is occupied by the opening of new roads and the encroaching of the municipalities of the State upon the farm lands.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, there used to be considerable controversy between Kansas City and Denver. The Denver people claimed that their city limits extended to the Missouri River, while the Kansas City people claimed that *their* city limits extended to the Rocky Mountains. [Laughter.] On that line of argument the reasoning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be correct, but this decrease has not been in the West.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. How about the roads?

Mr. SIMPSON. I believe that in Kansas we have about the widest roads in the country, because the people of Kansas are a broad-gauge people and they need wide roads [laughter], but the width of our roads is only 60 feet. In your New England States your roads have been opened up for hundreds of years, and so with New York State. So that suggestion about the roads falls to the ground.

What has taken the place of those cultivated acres? The cultivation of them has been abandoned because there was found to be no profit in agriculture.

Now, as to the arguments of the protectionists, let us see what there is in them. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], who through a long experience here has learned all the details of everything connected with this question of protection and tariff taxation, stated yesterday on this floor that we were manufacturing cotton goods in this country as cheaply as they could be made abroad and that they could be bought as cheap in the city of Washington at this time, at retail, as they could be bought in the city of London.

If that is the case, if we are doing that in this country, then I want to ask you gentlemen fairly—let us be honest with one another—where are the manufacturers going to get the money to pay the increased prices of labor or the increased prices which you say they will pay for farm products?

Again, if they are making these goods here and selling them as cheaply as they are sold in England, what need have they of protection? Certainly it can not be of any advantage to them. According to your own statement, gentlemen, your own manufacturers are capable of making these goods so as to compete with all the world. What need, then, of protection?

Now, as to wages, what country of all the countries in the world do you want protection against? Do you want it against China, which pays the lowest wages of any country in the world? Is the cheap labor of China flooding this country with its products? Do you want it against Italy, which has the highest protective tariff in Europe and pays the lowest wages? Do you want it against Germany? Do you want it against France? No, sir; you want it against Great Britain, a free-trade country that pays the highest wages in Europe. If your argument is correct that high wages necessitate protection, why does not Great Britain want protection against Italy or against France or against Russia?

It has been demonstrated over and over again, and if I had time I could demonstrate it here, that the laborer in the American manufactory produces double as much per capita as any other workman in the world. The laborers in the United States factories produce on an average $1,600 worth of wealth per annum per capita, the laborer in Great Britain $800, in Germany $500, in Italy about $400. Go all through the countries that have the highest protective tariff and that pay the lowest wages, and you will find in those countries the lowest average production of wealth. Now, every man that has reasoned this question out knows that wages are regulated by the opportunities that labor has to employ itself.

In all new countries these opportunities abound. The great and boundless West opened a new country where the surplus labor of our land could find an outlet, where men could go and take up the vacant land, and labor could thus find employment. This, in connection with organized labor in the large cities, has helped to keep up wages. But now that land has rapidly concentrated into the hands of monopolists, who hold it out of use, there is no more new country to be thus opened, and the great tide of population is turned back again upon the East. Competition among laboring men has set in, and as there are no new outlets they must compete against one another for a job. As monopoly rapidly takes land out of use and deprives labor of access to it, jobs rapidly decrease, the number of people seeking employment also grows, competition becomes sharper, and wages, by a natural law of supply and demand, must gradually go down.

My friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said to-day in the course of this debate that protection on wool and woolen goods had enabled the wool-grower of this country to get better prices, and that in this way shoddy, which would otherwise come from Europe, has been shut out. There are no facts or figures to prove this assertion. The fact is that the price of wool has been and is steadily going down under a high protective tariff. Why? Mainly because of the land monopoly. Every man who knows anything about sheep-raising knows that sheep need a

large territory to roam over when they are kept in large bodies; that they eat down to the root of the grass and soon destroy it; that where they must be penned in they can only be kept in limited numbers. Hence, as the value of land goes up, it is not profitable to keep sheep. In evidence of this we have the fact that sheep-raising in this country has steadily moved westward as land became more and more occupied, and consequently rose in value.

Another thing, your protective tariff in this country has had the effect of narrowing the profits of the agricultural classes, cutting off the consumption of woolen goods, creating a demand for a cheaper article, woolen goods being placed beyond the reach of a large mass of the consumers of this country. When any man says there is no shoddy used now in manufacturing goods of this country, he states what is not true. Shoddy is more largely manufactured in this country than it ever was before in our history.

My friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] the other day, in his elegant way, flourished here some samples of shoddy, remarking that by the McKinley bill these shoddy goods were shut out; that no self-respecting American lady would wear goods of that kind. I want to show you a sample of the shoddy goods that the American people are wearing. I want to show you a sample of the goods that the American farmer and laborer are wearing to-day under your grand system of protective tariff. I want to give you protectionists, in the language of Mr. Cleveland, an "object lesson." Yesterday I went along the market on the south side by the park, where the farmers come in from the country to sell their "protected products" in the "home market." I went along, viewing the mass of people collected there. I wanted to get an average suit of clothes, such as the American farmer and laborer are wearing to-day under your beautiful protective tariff. I made a bargain with one man by which I bought his overcoat; and I have brought it here to give you gentlemen an object lesson. There it is [untying a package and exhibiting an overcoat]. There it is, gentlemen. [Great laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole will be in order.

Mr. SIMPSON. The man from whom I bought this overcoat told me that he got up at 12 o'clock at night and drove 25 miles with the products of his farm in order to sell them in this great capital city of the nation. My friends, that is the garment which he wore; that is the result of the profits which the farmers of this country are enjoying under your beautiful system of protection—an old shoddy rag with which this man has shivered through the winter blasts! [Applause on the Democratic side.] Talk about prosperity to the farmer! I can duplicate that coat by the million in the United States to-day on the backs of American farmers and American laboring men.

Mr. LOUD (to Mr. SIMPSON). I wish you would take it off of my seat. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir; as you are a protectionist, you do not want to come in contact with the result of your system any more than the saloon-keeper wants to come in contact with the products of his factory. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will you not vote, all the same, for the 40 per cent protection in this bill for the manufacturers?

Mr. BRYAN. That is better than 300 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] vote to make the protection any lower?

Mr. LOUD (to Mr. SIMPSON). I would not object to the coat if it were clean.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me say to the gentleman from California that I am not pleased with this bill. I like much better the bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON]. But, inasmuch as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] says in his speech that this bill carries large reductions as compared with the McKinley system of robbery, and inasmuch as it puts one hundred and thirty-one more articles on the free list, therefore every man who has his article on the free list will be an enemy to the protection the other fellow gets, and must eventually come in the direction of free trade. I support and welcome the bill as a step in the direction of what may eventually follow. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Kansas allow me a moment?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In what mill, in what town, was the goods made that the gentleman has exhibited?

Mr. SIMPSON. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I can not tell in what mill it was made, or in what town, any more than can the man who bought and paid for it. He bought it a year ago, he tells me, in the capital city of the United States, here at Washington, and paid $8.50 for it. I bought him another shoddy coat to take its place for $10.80 that will probably wear him about as long. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Was it made of imported goods or of American goods; does the gentleman know?

Mr. SIMPSON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Can the gentleman say of his own knowledge whether the goods he has exhibited here in that coat was of American manufacture or foreign goods?

Mr. SIMPSON. Whatever it is, it is the product of protection. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Where was it made?

Mr. SIMPSON. Whether it was made in England or France or Germany or the United States, it does not detract from the force of my argument, under the conditions of the farmer and the laboring classes to-day, owing to the system of protection that has forced him to wear such a rag. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, I do not believe—and I regret to see that my time is nearly exhausted; I would like to have longer time to talk about this system of protection—but I do not believe that this great nation to-day needs protection against any person on earth. With our steam power, with our electric power, with our water power, with the immense machinery that this country possesses, doing the work of millions of men, with our boundless resources, with our means of transportation, with our vast tracts of magnificent arable and grazing land, I believe we can safely tear down the custom-houses and challenge the world for competition in its markets. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe, gentlemen, that the time has come for the United States as a great nation to take its place as one of the great commercial nations of the earth.

I want to read you here a short extract from a speech made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], the brilliant leader of the Republican party, a sentiment that I indorse heartily and entirely, and if it had been uttered in connection and in support of the free-trade measure, it would have had a meaning that it has not in connection with the mere extension of the use of gold as a measure of value in commercial transactions. He says:

In former times they used to be more especially confined to each particular country and were not simultaneous—

He is speaking of the periodical depressions—

but modern times have bound the earth together, so that it is impossible for even the greatest nation to disregard the other nations of the earth. The railroad has diminished distance, and the telegraph has obliterated time. The ocean steamers plying between the different hemispheres, the trains of cars which sweep across the continents, have made business a far different thing from what it was in the earlier ages. Without undertaking to give the particulars of the change, it is enough to say that the world, which in the days of Magellan it required three years to circumnavigate, can be circumnavigated to-day in a period of two months. This binding together of the whole world by obliteration of time and distance has bound together the business of the world, and hence these periodic changes occur in greater or less measure throughout the world, not always exactly simultaneous, but always more or less sympathetic.

That is it, my friends, the commercial nations, the civilized nations of the world are bound together by these natural ties, that endless chain with its unbroken links, so that when you destroy one of the links you disarrange the entire system, and it is felt like an electric shock throughout the whole earth. This panic, the failures, and bankruptcies all over the world to-day, I believe, is largely due to the vicious financial system that has disturbed the course of business, and is largely due, also, to the vicious system of protection that prevents the human race from exchanging the products of their toil and labor without restriction.

I believe in this universal union for the interests of the human race. Why, you protectionists acknowledge it yourselves when you pass your laws. Whom are you passing that law against? Is it against the citizens of a foreign country who want to come here, fill your country with good things that everybody needs and wants? No; you are passing it against the citizens of your own country, because you acknowledge that if you would remove these restrictions your own people would be quick to take advantage of the fact and better their condition by exchanging the products of their toil for the products of the toil of the other peoples of the earth. This law is passed against your own citizens.

Do the American people need protection? Does the Yankee need protection for fear he will make a bad trade? The Yankee people have been the greatest and most successful swappers the world ever saw, and your protective tariff is passed to prevent these people from making trades, on the assumption that they will make bad trades against their own interests.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion allow me to say that as has been stated upon this floor before, even if you adopt the principle of free trade in your laws to-day, your hard times will continue, because the principles of free trade as generally understood, are not as I understand them, and will not be carried out to their logical conclusion as I understand they should be.

Trade only follows when you have something to trade. If you have a thing to trade, you must have the proper tools and ma-

chinery for carrying on the trade, which will necessitate a reform in your financial system to provide the means with which to trade without putting burdens upon the people by the monopoly which at present exists through our national banking system. But after you have your transportation system to carry the goods from State to State, to bring about exchanges, after you have gotten your financial system and your transportation system, after you have removed the restrictions from trade, then you must destroy the monopoly of land, wherein lies the store of wealth that labor must have access to in order to get something to trade.

Labor must have access to this great store of wealth, the earth, in order to have something to trade. If I had time to-night, I would read you some facts and figures that will illustrate this principle in connection with the great iron ore products of this country, showing that the Mesaba ore district, up in the State of Minnesota, a deposit of ore 120 miles long, 30 miles wide, 300 feet deep, covered with a layer of gravel and earth, in some places not more than 4 to 30 feet deep, which can be mined at a cost of from 4 to 40 cents a ton—that that great iron ore deposit is under the control and ownership of a trust at whose head stands the great head of the Standard oil trust, Mr. Rockefeller. Instead of reading this article, I will insert it in the RECORD. It is as follows:

THE GREAT MESABA IRON ORE RANGE.

The history of the development of the big Mesaba iron ore mines furnishes an excellent text for a single-tax sermon. These vast deposits of iron ore in Northeastern Minnesota cover an area of about 120 by 30 miles. The deposits vary in thickness from 50 to 200 feet, and the ore beds are covered with a layer of gravel and earth from 4 to 30 feet thick. More than two billion tons of ore are known to exist in the Mesaba range. The common method of mining this ore is by means of steam shovels both to remove the gravel and earth and to dig the soft ore and load it directly from the open cuts into cars. The cost of mining the past season varied from 4 to 40 cents a ton—the average being much nearer 4 than 40 cents.

As often happens with unusually valuable land, a large portion of the Mesaba range was a gift from the General Government to the State, under the provisions of the swamp act, by which the States acquired the title to the swamp land lying within their boundaries. Such land as was not owned by the State of Minnesota was generally owned by men who had bought it for pine land. When the mineral deposit was discovered, speculators immediately leased the more valuable tracts from the State or owners. These men agreed to pay about 25 cents per ton royalty, and in addition to mine ore amounting in the aggregate to over 16,000,000 tons a year. The royalty on this amount must be paid whether the ore is mined or not. The New York Times of December 26 says:

"The lands secured by the speculators they in turn leased to mining companies at a sharp advance, rigidly binding the mining companies to all the conditions relative to amount of ore to be annually mined that were stated in the first lease. The speculators secured an advance in royalty of from 15 to 30 cents per ton as their profit on the transaction. If it is paid as agreed upon, scores of men who never struck a blow in any creative industry or performed any useful work will draw royal revenues from the iron-ore deposits of the Mesaba range.

"Last spring the Mesaba region swarmed with eager miners and speculators. * * * The greatest iron-ore deposit found by men was being developed. Towns rose out of the ground as if by magic. * * * It was boom times in Northern Minnesota, and the operators in the Mesaba range had all the other miners of iron ore in regions that are adjacent to Lake Superior by the throat, and were rapidly choking the life out of them."

Alleged mining kings in other ore-producing regions found their wealth rapidly slipping out from underneath them, and many such millionaires and important financiers became bankrupt in a few weeks. A money stringency began which soon extended to the Mesaba, "where mining companies, the face value of whose stock amounted to $189,000,000, had been incorporated to extract ore from the iron deposit and money from the pockets of the investing public. Directly times grew hard on the Mesaba. It was evident that the American market could not consume sufficient iron ore to enable the speculators to pay the royalty they had contracted to pay." Fear and panic seized the speculators and the bottom seemed to fall out of the financial slough.

"Forth from this financial storm," says the New York Times, "strode John D. Rockefeller, of Standard Oil Company fame, serene, keen-eyed, alert-brained, and armed with effective knowledge of precisely what he wanted and how to get it, and with sufficient means to buy it, and resolute in the intention to secure sufficient area of the iron-ore laden lands of the Mesaba range to control the output of the range and to set the price. Promptly after the appearance of Mr. Rockefeller a consolidation of the Mesaba iron-ore mines was effected, and included in the consolidation was the Duluth and Mesaba Northern Railroad Company."

Other mines being without outlet, the Rockefeller syndicate now has a monopoly of the richest iron-ore deposit in the world, and within limits fixed by the import duty on ores and the cost of production in other mines, can "fix" prices. This is the syndicate that says free iron ore will ruin mining industries, and that has recently closed its mines at Virginia City, Mesaba range, to secure the retention of the uncalled-for protection. That the syndicate expects to sell ore at prices which will leave a wide margin for profits is evident from the fact that it, together with other mining companies, is under contract to pay royalties on millions of tons of ore in excess of what is needed to supply the American market.

If the single tax were in operation, and the natural rent of these mines—their full royalty value—were taken by the State of Minnesota, not only would the Mesaba range supply a sufficient revenue for the State, but the monopolistic railroad syndicate would be impossible. More ore would be mined, and more miners find employment at better wages than at present. There being no monopoly, the product would be sold cheaper, to the benefit of all iron-consuming industries. Not only this, but the panics, bankruptcies, etc., in this and other iron-ore regions would not have occurred.

BYRON W. HOLT.

To-day the laborers in the mines up in the iron-ore district are on the verge of starvation and out of employment because of this iron-ore trust. While the consumers of iron all over the United States are paying tribute to this iron-ore trust, the people are paying these tributes to the sugar trust, the window-glass trust, the carpet trust, and all the four hundred and fifty trusts of the country. These are the things which have robbed labor.

The eloquent gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] told you the other day of the enormous increase in wealth in the last thirty years, from 1860 to 1890. He told you we had increased the wealth of this country more than thirty billions of dollars; and he closed his speech by saying that nearly three millions of men were out of employment and upon the verge of starvation. I have the New York World of to-day, which gives an account of ten thousand loaves of bread being distributed amongst the poor of New York, where every loaf of bread meant a meal for a family, and probably saved the life of a human being.

Labor, after having created this enormous pyramid of wealth, stands starving to-day amidst plenty. Who has gotten that wealth? Has not the labor that created it been deprived of its share? Under any just system of laws to secure the distribution of wealth these laboring men should have been benefited by this large increase of wealth. What are the facts? Through your system of finance, transportation, and protection thirty thousand men control one-half of this wealth which they gather into their coffers, and they are now called upon to support, through charity, the men who have created it.

Mr. Chairman, just a word more. Let me say to the laboring men that this is not the fault of the monopolists, of the plutocracy, as you call them. It is the fault of the laboring men themselves. They have voted to put into office the men who made these laws, and they are responsible for it; and until they have intelligence and manhood enough to vote for their own interests and to send their own representatives here to secure legislation that shall give to them a share of the wealth that they create they can expect no lasting benefits through any party. [Applause.]

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before the House for its consideration as a sequel to a period of prosperity that has exceeded all that this country in its previous history has ever known. This condition has been fostered by the economic laws of the country as they now exist; but it is proposed to change those laws radically and essentially in nearly every respect by the bill which is now before this House.

It is not a system of to-day, but it has grown up as a result of judicious legislation during a period of a hundred years. At the close of the Revolutionary war, as is well known and understood by the members of this House, one of the serious embarrassments which the Government then labored under was the inability by legislation to regulate or control the foreign commerce of the country.

The Congress of the Confederation appealed again and again to the States to accord to it the authority of imposing duties upon imports into the country for the purpose of sustaining and supporting the frail government which then existed; but inasmuch as the consent of each one of the thirteen States was requisite to granting this authority, unanimity upon the subject could not be secured, and the Congress of the Confederation was left in its crippled condition without this authority. The result of it was, according to the prominent historian of the country, and a foremost Democrat in that respect, that England imported into the country manufactures to such an extent as to crush out even the infant industries of the land. Upon this subject he says:

An excess of imports at low prices crushed domestic manufactures.

This is the tribute, and this is the authority of Mr. Bancroft, in writing the history of those times; and it became apparent that no government could be maintained in the country that would secure the prosperity of the people and the States alike unless it was one that should be formed for general purposes, having this power to impose duties upon the imports into the country, and, incidentally, for the benefit and improvement of the manufacturing interests.

It may be observed, as we pass, that it has never been asserted upon the part of any person that Congress had the authority solely and exclusively, and without reference to ulterior purposes, to impose duties upon imports for the sole benefit of manufacturers, for the mere purpose of building up the manufacturing industries of the country; but the position has been taken, and maintained with a singular degree of uniformity throughout all our entire history, that when Congress imposes duties on foreign imports, it can incidentally arrange those impositions of duty so that they would afford incidental protection and prosperity to the American people so far as they may be devoted to the development of manufacturing interests.

That has been the principle that has underlain this system of protection from that time down to the present; that it is the duty of Government, of Congress, to initiate measures by which the expenses of the Government may be met by means of imposts and duties upon foreign imports. It is a fact established by the

history of the country; and it has been the theory upon which these laws have been passed and have been carried into execution under the authority of the General Government. It has been primarily to collect duties upon imports for the support and maintenance of the Government, for the purpose of meeting its obligations, and its exigencies, and at the same time spreading those duties over imports in such a manner as incidentally to maintain and build up the industrial interests of the whole country.

No more significant evidence of this purpose has been exhibited anywhere than in the act which was first enacted upon this subject after the formation of the Government, and which received the sanction not only of the Congress, but of Gen. Washington as the first President of the United States. The title of that act is in these words:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported, etc.

A clear and unequivocal expression of the conviction in the title of the act that this power of imposing duties for the purpose of meeting the debts and discharging the obligations of the Government and incidentally for the protection of manufactures was then constitutional authority that was vested in the Government of the United States. It was a contemporaneous construction of the authority which had been conceded directly to the United States by means of the constitutional provisions relating to the imposition of taxes and duties and the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and between the several States, and such a contemporaneous construction of the power and authority of the Constitution has been regarded and properly regarded historically as a part of the Constitution itself.

Upon this subject, in the celebrated case of Prigg *vs.* The State of Pennsylvania, which, it will be remembered, was one which related to the authority of Congress to enact the fugitive slave law, it was said in the opinion of the court, in referring to the contemporaneous construction in this manner given to the Constitution by the Legislature in the enactment of laws:

Under such circumstances, if the case was one of doubtful construction, such long acquiescence in it, such contemporaneous exposition of it, and such extensive and uniform recognition of its validity would, in our judgment, entitle the question to be considered at rest.

This is the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States in expounding constitutional power regarding legislation that was contemporaneous with the growth and establishment of the Constitution, and furnishes an ample answer to any objection that can be made relative to such a construction of the Constitution as might exclude the exercise of such authority. It is true that we have been met here repeatedly in the discussion of this bill that notwithstanding this great authority in favor of the exercise of this power, with the objection that the Constitution of the United States confers no such power and no such authority upon the legislative department of the Government; and reference has been made during the discussion, and also in the report which has been made, to the decision in the case of the Loan Association against Topeka, which was claimed to have been an authority that deprived the legislative department of the Government of the exercise of this power.

But that authority involved no such question. It involved no examination whatever of this principle of raising money to sustain the Government by means of taxes upon imports, and at the same time extending incidental protection to the growth and development of the manufacturing interests of the country. That case was this. Under a law of the State of Kansas authority had been given to concede, by a vote of the population of the locality, loans of money to institutions of an industrial character that might be located there, the people believing, as the people of the Western country generally will undoubtedly soon realize, that the establishment of industrial enterprises is a benefit to the progress, the wealth, the activity of the place in which they may be located.

A vote was taken, under those circumstances, to pay to a certain establishment, in case it would locate in the city of Topeka, a certain sum of money, and after it had been located there it was proposed to raise by taxation the amount of money that had been agreed to be paid. A suit was brought to restrain the imposition of those taxes, and that suit was maintained for the reason that if the understanding or agreement were allowed to be consummated it would be simply taking the property of one person and giving it to another.

That is all that was decided in that case, and all that is sanctioned by that decision, leaving a wide and extensive margin between the conclusion which was there maintained and that which is necessary for the argument against the system of legislation that has prevailed during almost the entire history of this country. In reference to the duties that are imposed upon imports, incidentally affording protection to American manufactures, there is no such attribute, there is no such distinguishing circumstance. That is not the taking of a cent of the money or any part of the property of one person and giving it to another. On the contrary, it is simply the means by which money is raised from imports brought into the country for the maintenance and support of the Government itself.

Every cent that is raised in this manner beyond the mere necessary expenses of collection finds its way into the Treasury of the United States, and is disbursed for the purpose of paying the debts and meeting the obligations of the Government. Not a cent of it goes into the possession or under the control of any private interest or any single individual. On the contrary, it is wholly and exclusively devoted to the development and the maintenance of our system of Government.

Under these circumstances the citizen receives a fair equivalent for the contribution that he makes. Whether it be made directly or indirectly is a matter of not the slightest significance, because every person is bound, theoretically at least, to contribute something to the support and maintenance of the Government from which he receives and his property receives protection and support, and it is that protection and support which is the equivalent for what he pays in the form of duties, and, under the theory of our Government, it is a fair equivalent for whatever amount he may pay.

Now, as to these matters of tariff duties, it is for the Congress of the United States to determine how they shall be spread over the imports that are brought into this country so as incidentally to aid the manufacturing interests of the country; deeming that to be a fit and important step in the promotion of the general welfare of the people of the United States by promoting all classes of industrial pursuits and enterprises within their own limits, instead of leaving them dependent for the products of manufacture upon the importations that might be brought here from the Old World for the purpose of supplying their wants.

Briefly and incidentally, it may be well to refer for a moment to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States upon this subject, although they have been brought to the attention of the House so fully that any detailed discussion of them has, of course, been rendered unnecessary. Upon this subject the Constitution provides that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

The exercise of the authority is subject to but one qualification. That qualification is this:

But all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

That is the only limitation upon this general grant of authority, intended, with another provision to which I propose to call the attention of the House, to cover the entire subject of legislation over these matters of foreign commerce and the incidental protection that may be extended to domestic manufactures by means of the exercise of this power. The other power is the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." This is considered a grant of authority so broad, this power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, that even an entire suspension of commerce may be made under the direction of Congress by authority of this provision.

Such a suspension took place during the Administration of Thomas Jefferson. It was resisted as unconstitutional at the time by many people in different localities, but it was finally settled that the power to regulate, when it came to be understood and applied in its broad sense, as the language was used in this clause of the Constitution, included not only ordinary matters of regulation, but also actual prohibition; so that the construction which was then given to the constitutional provision upon this subject was of the very broadest character, and that, too, under the Administration of Mr. Jefferson, who is pointed out to us now, and justly so, as one of the exemplars to whom we are to look for a fair construction and administration of the Constitution of the United States.

But it is still urged that by means of these general provisions the power was not given to the Federal Government to impose these duties in such a manner as to incidentally build up and promote the manufacturing interests of the country. Gentlemen, let us look for a moment at the history of the times when this Constitution originated and the defects of which it was intended to be the remedy. It is a matter of history that before the present Constitution was adopted every State imposed such duties as seemed to it to be just and right for the purpose of promoting the success of its industrial institutions. The result was that the duties imposed by one State were entirely incompatible with those imposed by another; so that by reason of the duties imposed by the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New York and collected upon articles brought in from Connecticut and New

Jersey, New Jersey it was said was like a barrel tapped at both ends, and it was because of this oppressive system of regulating commerce that the action of New Jersey upon the adoption of the Constitution was accelerated so that she was one of the first States to accede to that instrument.

When this Constitution was framed and adopted it was intended to vest the General Government with all the power that the States had over this subject. It was not intended to leave with the States any vestige of authority by which they could interfere in any manner whatever with the exercise of this authority by the Federal Government.

If this was not the case, if full power was not vested in the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States, then it is certain that the power still remains with the States, because by the tenth amendment of the Constitution it was declared that—

The powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

It being conceded as a historical fact that these powers existed before the Federal Constitution was framed, and were vested in the several States, then if it is true that they were not by our present Constitution transferred to the General Government, they remain under this declaratory amendment of the Constitution in the States themselves. So that if it be the true construction of the Constitution that the General Government can not incidentally impose duties in such a manner as to foster and build up the industries of the country, what is there to prevent the separate States from legislating on this subject? And if this power were conceded to the States it would be found that the legislation of the several States would be dictated by the interests of one State as against another, and we should have a system which would be entirely destructive of everything like the order and harmony which prevail through the exercise of this power under the auspices of the General Government.

But it was not designed, when our Constitution was adopted, that the States should retain any such authority. On the contrary, it was the intention of the Constitution that this entire power should be vested in the Federal Government. Accordingly when the State of Maryland, in a case which members of the House will recollect, undertook to impose a license fee upon importers, requiring them to pay a license fee before being allowed to sell their imported articles, the Supeme Court of the United States decided that this could not be done; that the States had parted entirely with their authority over the subject of foreign commerce; that this power is vested wholly and exclusively in the Federal Government, and that a State law which undertakes to interfere with the freedom of importation and the rights of the importer to dispose of the imported article must be held unconstitutional, inoperative, and void, as in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

There seems, therefore, upon a fair consideration of the provisions of the Constitution, no difficulty in the way of concluding that Congress possesses this power, which, prior to the adoption of the Constitution, the States exercised, of imposing duties upon foreign importations in such a manner as incidentally to benefit and build up the industrial institutions of the country. As has been remarked, this was the doctrine of the fathers of the Constitution—the men who concurred in framing that instrument and secured its adoption; and with very little interruption the practice of the Government has been in accord with this doctrine from the time of the passage of the very first tariff act, which was expressly designed for this purpose. There have been since the passage of that act repeated measures having in view the building up and sustaining of the industrial interests of the country. And we know, as a matter of history, what has been the result of thus fostering manufacturing enterprises.

Of course, under the vacillating legislation that occurred prior to the late war, manufacturing interests drooped, enterprises of this description did not prosper, were not increased and extended as they have been in more recent years. But when the war came a different state of things was brought into existence by the necessities of the times. Duties were imposed in such a manner as incidentally to encourage and build up the industrial interests and institutions of the country; and this policy has resulted, during a period of thirty-three years, in doing more in this direction than was ever done during the whole preceding history of our Government. Hence we find that the United States to-day, by means of legislation of this character, by means of legislative encouragement to our domestic industries, has become the largest manufacturing country upon the face of the earth.

In support of the bill now before the House it has been said that a part of its design was to make the people of the United States such a manufacturing people that they would be able to send their products into all quarters of the globe, and thereby secure a degree of prosperity that has never before characterized our history or the history of any other country. But such have not been the means by which our industrial institutions have been maintained; they can not be maintained without the assistance of protective legislation; and the impracticability of a free-trade policy is substantially conceded by the provisions of the bill now before the House, because it seeks to raise from importations into this country, under the low scale of duties provided in the bill, an amount of money that will exceed the sum of $100,000,000, to be appropriated for the benefit and maintenance of this Government.

It is idle to say the people in the Old World are receiving, as has been asserted here during the course of this debate, equal measures of compensation for their industry with the people of the United States. This fact of itself, as well as the preceding history of the country in its commercial dealings, is a direct contradiction of all that has been said on that subject. We have had figures produced and submitted to our consideration indicating, as it has been said, that the American laborer and the American artisan, skilled and unskilled, receives only as much for his services in the way of compensation as persons employed in similar occupations in the Old World.

If this is true, without stopping to consider the figures at all, then where would be the possibility of this Government receiving one single cent from imports from the other side of the Atlantic, if the people who produce them were better paid than the people engaged in similar industries in the United States? It would be impossible to bring imports from the other side here and pay a duty toward the support and maintenance of the Government of the United States, toward the expenses of this Government, if it were not for the fact that these articles are produced upon a cheaper scale in the Old World, so much so that the importers can pay the additional duty on them and still bring them here and undersell those of our people who are engaged in the manufacture of similar products.

There can be no question of that fact; and that circumstance of itself is a clear and explicit contradiction of the theory advanced here, and that is endeavored to be sustained by figures, which go to show that the American artisan, skilled and unskilled receives a rate of wages not greater, perhaps not equal to the wages paid to persons engaged in similar pursuits on the other side. It would be an impossibility if this was the fact, I repeat, to bring foreign imports into our country and sell them in competion with the people of this land, and in addition to pay the duty intended to be levied on them for the support of the Government of the United States.

But that, Mr. Chairman, is not the case. Historically, our industrial interests have been built up by legislation of a protective character, and have reached a point of production that not only equals, but absolutely exceeds the manufactured products of any other country on the face of the earth. I call your attention now to what is said in the World Almanac for 1893, which certainly will be accepted as good Democratic authority on this question. I find it stated here that the amount of manufactured goods produced in the United States in the year 1888, which is said to be the last year in which accurate returns had been made, amounted to the immense sum of $7,204,000,000 a year—a sum that is beyond the human comprehension, and makes the United States, according to this statement, the largest manufacturing country on the face of the globe.

The products of Great Britain are given by the same authority, and in the same year, at $4,100,000,000, or vastly below, as you will see, the productive condition existing in the United States at that time. And this is the tribute of Democratic authority, which, of course, would not be willing to concede anything more to the success of measures of this character than was absolutely required under the circumstances that tended to the development of these industries.

Now, since that time it is a notorious fact that the industrial interests of this country have progressed more rapidly than prior to 1888; and there is probably now engaged in the production of manufactured articles so many more persons and so much more capital than there was then that the manufactured products aggregate an annual amount of more than $10,000,000,000, an amount of products that has never been exceeded, of manufactured goods, by any other country on the face of the earth.

The last gentleman who addressed the House referred to the fact that this had not aided the farmers of the country in any degree. But that is an erroneous view of the question, manifestly, because consideration must be given to the effect of the development of these industries, since they necessarily employ a vast number of people. Millions upon millions of people engaged in domestic manufactures are supported and fed by the products of the American farmer; and certainly if it were not for the vast number of persons thus employed and maintained the market of the American farmer would be very greatly abridged.

It is by supplying the wants of this vast number of persons that a large part of the agricultural products are paid for and consumed.

If the persons who are engaged in these pursuits, or a large portion of them, should be added to the agricultural population of the country you will see at once that it would necessarily increase agricultural productions, glut the markets, and bring down the prices to a lower level than they have ever descended. And it is the fact that these persons are engaged in other pursuits than agriculture that affords an immense market for a large portion of the agricultural products of the country at higher prices than could possibly otherwise prevail.

It is idle for us to suppose, if we allow the imports from the other side to be brought into this country under the ægis of a bill of this character, that the farmer is going to receive any more for his products than he does now. Europe already takes from this country everything that it requires, and it takes no more than it requires, and as a matter of generosity or sentiment, the people of Europe never buy a dollar's worth from the people of the United States.

Mr. NORTHWAY. They would not buy an hundred bushels of wheat unless they needed it.

Mr. DANIELS. On the contrary, their course of business has been such as under all circumstances to discriminate against the people and the prosperity of the United States, wherever they have been able to do that, either politically or in the matter of trade. And it has been one purpose and object of protective legislation to build up the American people as an independent people, as they were designed and intended to be, as the result of the first war, manufacturing and producing their own products, free from obligations to the Old World, either politically or materially.

The system and theory of our law is adapted to this end, and for the purpose of permitting this result to the utmost it has been provided by the Constitution that taxes or duties shall not be imposed upon articles exported from any State; whereby the inhabitant of every State in this Union has the free and unlimited authority to take its exports into foreign countries, and to sell them there, or to take them into other States and sell them where best it may be done, without any restriction, without any duties or any taxes being imposed upon their production.

This has been added as a matter of encouragement to the development of the interests and the pursuits of the people of the United States, to build the people up as one people, not dependent upon the other side of the Atlantic for any element of their prosperity any more than they are dependent upon the other side of the Atlantic for the very principles that lie at the foundation of their Government.

Now, another thing is to be observed right here: that in all that has taken place in our foreign commerce in the exports of our foreign products the Old World has taken just as much as it actually needed and could buy from the United States cheaper than it could buy from any other place; and if this bill that is now before the House should become a law, it will not have the effect of adding to these purchases or adding to the prosperity or success of the agricultural portion of the people of the United States—not one single dollar. You may buy from the other side all that your wants may require, and the other side will buy from you just exactly what they can buy cheaper than they can buy anywhere else, and they will buy not one single cent beyond that.

Now, as another circumstance in favor of this bill, it has been stated upon the floor of this House that it will encourage the exportation of domestic manufactures, instead of prejudicing and restricting and crippling those manufactures. The people who are engaged in these manufactures throughout the country know better than this. They will believe in and adopt no such sophism, for they know as a matter of fact that with the prices paid for labor in this prosperous and intelligent country of ours, this land of freedom, they can not come into successful competition with the underpaid people of the Old World.

Go to England, to France, to Switzerland, or to Germany, and, as a matter of fact, it will be demonstrated by researches that admit of no possible doubt, those countries are able to produce manufactured articles at least for one-half the cost that the same business is subjected to in the manufacturing interests of the United States. It is because labor there has come down to so low a grade of compensation as to enable those countries, except for legislation of the character which now exists, to bring their products here and undersell our people and destroy our industrial occupations.

But, aside from these considerations, is it true that legislation of the description now proposed will aid the prosperity of the manufacturing interests of the United States? Will it add to the ability of the people of the United States to send abroad their products and sell them there, if this bill should pass with its increased free list, and with the diminution of duties prescribed in it, increasing largely the imports that shall be brought into this country in competition with the products of our own established industries?

I read, gentlemen, from the present law of 1890, which contains this provision:

That where imported articles on which duties have been paid are used in the manufacture of articles manufactured or produced in the United States there shall be allowed on the exportation of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the materials used, less 1 per cent of such duties.

That, you will see, leaves to the importations which are brought into this country and manufactured into articles here the unrestricted right to a return of the duties paid upon them, less only 1 per cent upon their exportation to any foreign country. So you have the utmost freedom of trade by the system of drawbacks already provided for in the act of 1890. Whatever may be brought into the country that may be used in the manufacture of American products that are afterwards taken abroad, the importer who has paid the duties upon those materials has the right to have 99 per cent of these duties refunded to him as a matter of course by the custom-house. So that if there was this ability, if the power existed on the part of the people of the United States to compete with the products of the manufacturers of Europe upon the other side of the Atlantic, here is ample authority for it.

The door is widely opened under this provision of the law for the purpose of securing that end and that result; and yet nothing has been accomplished; literally nothing has been accomplished by means of this liberty to the manufacturing interests of the people of the United States. It is true that we do export articles to the other side and sell them there; but it is not owing to the fact of the existence of such a provision as this. It is owing to the circumstance that we are able to manufacture articles requiring a large proportion of wood or other materials which we can supply cheaper than they can do it upon the other side, and it is because we have engaged successfully in those manufactures that we are able to export anything and make a show of foreign trade in this respect with the people on the other side of the Atlantic.

Do not, therefore, be deceived, gentlemen. The people of the United States will not be deceived by the assurance that in this bill which is now before this House there will be any possible condition secured for manufacturing exports of the United States for sale and disposition in foreign countries. It can not be done. If it can be done at all, it could have been done already under the provision of the law securing this result to the persons who are engaged in the manufactures of the United States; but nothing has been accomplished, and we can expect nothing to be accomplished, for the reason that the manufactures of the Old World can be produced at so much lower a figure than by the people of the United States as to render this practically impossible.

If, therefore, this bill becomes a law we substantially give away our market to the people of the Old World without any equivalent. They will increase their imports here to the extent of at least one-half more than they are able to do under the present law, and will import largely into this country their manufactured articles and sell them on the market, and undersell our people. It is a matter of fact that under the present law, and in the last year prior to the present disturbance in the business of the country, we imported from the other side about $450,000,000 worth of their products—their manufactured articles. They pay the duties upon those articles at an average rate of 45 per cent, and still they come into the markets of the United States and undersell our people, who could produce most of the same things, and do it just as well, were it not for the increased amount that is paid to American labor.

There is nothing, therefore, that we reasonably can hope to expect from this source; but we must, if we build up our interests in this respect, build them up for the benefit of our people, for the security and the prosperity of the individuals who are engaged in these industrial enterprises. If you bring them down to the level of the Old World, then one of two things must necessarily follow the enactment of the bill under discussion: Either our industrial institutions must be closed up, as they are substantially now under the cloud and disturbance produced by the fear that this bill will go into effect as a law; or else conflict must take place with the persons who are engaged in the industrial pursuits of the country, and as a result of that conflict our laboring people must be brought down substantially to the same grade as the laboring people of the Old World.

There is no person who can look upon this result without disquietude. Where will be our industrial population? How will they be sustained? How can they be supported? How can these millions live who will be discharged from pursuits that have heretofore been so entirely satisfactory to them? The situation of the industrial pursuits as we have built them up to such an

extent by means of legislation of this character is such that they have become essentially an important attribute of the institutions of our country. They are part and parcel of America and of the American people, and the millions who are engaged in these pursuits can find employment nowhere else, and in no other course of industrial pursuit.

Hence, if Europe is to bring in manufactured articles in this manner our people who have their large capital invested in these industrial pursuits must either give up the contest or they must enter into a contest with the laboring population, by which they will bring labor down to the same grade of wages that the European countries give. Will our Government, will our people, who are interested from nearly one end of the country to the other in these industrial pursuits, yield the market; will they abandon the protection of their own property and the maintenance of their own interests, or enter into a struggle and competition with the producers of the Old World and say to the people who are in their employment, You must come down to this measure of compensation, or otherwise you must be discharged and find some other means of livelihood.

We know that it would be an utter impossibility for so large a population to be discharged upon the various communities of this country and be able to maintain themselves. They are dependent upon the existence of these manufacturing institutions. They are dependent upon the progress and success of the industrial market. Deprive them of that and you make out of those who are now intelligent, industrious, prosperous people, a class of beggars, many of them criminals. No person can look without apprehension at the possibility of that state of affairs. The prosperity of the country is opposed to this bill.

The interests of the people in all respects and all classes, except importers, are opposed to it. Their interests have become interwoven together, for, though engaged in different pursuits, they constitute one vast nation that has secured its success and its prosperity under the operation of protective legislation. Yet we are asked to-day by those who present and advocate this bill to destroy this system by voluntarily throwing open our markets to the Old World and bringing this vast army of our own laboring population into competition with the underpaid labor of Europe. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to occupy the time of this House in the delivery of an address for home consumption. And I have no hope that what I may say or leave unsaid could affect the majority of this body. They seem, like Ephraim of old, "joined to their idols." But I desire at least, to put myself on record, as I shall later by my vote, against the passage of the pending bill.

A theory is only valuable until it comes in contact with a fact, and this bill is builded upon the theory of free trade, while the opposition has for its foundation the accomplished facts of the protective system. As a theory, free trade will cause our land to blossom like the rose; as a fact it will cause it to blossom with the thistle and the weed. As a theory, it will give renewed life and vigor to our industries; as a fact, the very shadows of its coming has paralyzed them. As a theory, it will enable the consumer to buy at the lowest possible price; as a fact, it will deprive the consumer of the means to buy at any price. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] As a theory, it will cause prosperity and consequent happiness to reign throughout our entire country; as a fact, it will lead to bankruptcy in business, and even greater suffering and want than now exist.

These are not mere assertions, having their source in selfish interest or partisan bias. They are but the self-evident conclusions of all past experience as recited on the pages of our country's history. With that experience not yet faded from the memory of the older generation who passed through some of its phases, and impressed upon the minds of the younger generation, who look to the past for guidance in the present and for the future, it is not to be wondered that from every branch of our diversified industries, from every section of our country, and all classes of our people there arises a protest against the passage of this bill. Its shadow alone has aroused them to a dread of its substance. In exercise of their constitutional rights they are petitioning this Congress against the passage of this measure, and their earnestness is only equaled by the indifference of the majority to their protests and appeals. [Applause.]

But it was stated by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia that these protests and petitions were dictated and their signing compelled by the overseers of the laboring men. I would say to that gentleman that overseers were abolished with slavery about 1865. The workingmen who signed those petitions are the peers in point of manhood and independence of any member of this House. They do not take their orders, either for the signing of petitions or on election day, from any man or set of men. They are leaders and not followers. They are readers and students, and can give a reason for the hope that is within them. There are men employed in the mills and factories and mines of this country who need sit at the feet of no man in this House to gain instruction on the questions of protection or of free trade. With them these questions are not theories.

Until seven months ago these men who are now protesting against this bill were happy and prosperous. To-day many of them are idle, depending in whole or in part on public charity for their support, and all this through no fault of their own. What has caused this stagnation of business, this distress, this almost starvation, throughout this country? There is but one answer that can be made, and that is, the fear that the Wilson bill will become a law. It is worse than folly to ascribe any other cause, or to attempt to ascribe any other. That fear, and that fear alone, has banked the furnace fires and stopped the wheels of our manufacturing establishments, has made willing hands idle, and honest men the recipients of public charity. That fear has caused the child of hunger to suckle the breast of want. It has caused the father to hear his child cry for bread, without being able to still that cry.

With all this upon us at the present, and the absolute certainty of still greater distress and troubles before us, should this bill become a law, why does the majority in this House insist upon the commission of what can only be regarded as a legislative crime? Have the present misery and woe no power to restrain it from completing the ruin of the people? Will nothing but the annihilation of the nation's industrial system satisfy those to whom theory is everything and experience nothing?

The great argument against the McKinley law, as it has been against all our tariff laws, is its alleged unconstitutionality. If the men who framed the Constitution are to be credited with any knowledge whatever of what their work meant, then this argument must fall to the ground. For when enacting laws to give life and potency to that instrument, they embodied the protective policy in the very first. Is it possible that this great truth, if truth it be, was overlooked by Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison, and the Adamses, or was it withheld from these wise founders of the nation and only declared to the babes and sucklings of the Democracy of to-day? It can not be that this is true. The argument is contrary to history and contrary to the expressed judgment of the greatest minds the country has ever produced.

If it be patriotic to declare that unconstitutional which the framers of the Constitution inaugurated, then this bill should become a law. If it be wise to legislate upon the unsubstantial grounds of theory, rather than upon the sure basis of indisputable facts, then this bill should be put upon the statute books. If it be prudent to refuse to permit our path to be lighted by the lamp of experience, and, like blind men following the lead of the blind, turn from certainty to uncertainty, and from what has been proved to that which is but an experiment, then this bill should have our votes. If it be wise financial policy to pass a bill to raise revenue which confessedly will create an enormous deficiency in the revenues; if largely increased importation of foreign-made goods, to further which increase this bill is avowedly framed, will give work to men who are idle now; if the less work there is to be done here and the more men there are to do it the higher will be the rate of wages; if the farmer is to be benefited by opening to his products a foreign market 3,000 miles away, at the cost of destroying the home market now at his door—if all these assumptions be true, then this bill should pass.

But against their truth the whole people voice their indignant protest. They understand this bill, and no oratory however fervent can blind them to what it means. They know that the promises upon which it is framed are false, their deductions illogical, their theories vain, and the results disastrous to the interests and industries of the whole people. And they are protesting against it, protesting to unheeding ears. But in next November they will have the hearing denied them now, and their ballots then will be as effectual as their petitions now are unavailing. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. Mr. Chairman, the nation to-day is in an anomalous condition. Blessed with bounteous crops, with universal peace at home and abroad, with an incomparable development in manufactures, we are in the midst of an industrial paralysis and financial depression unparalleled in our nation's history.

Less than eighteen months ago a new propaganda was issued to the American people by a national party in convention assembled in the Columbian city. The manifesto opened with the usual and customary prologue:

> That we, the Democratic party of the United States in convention assembled, do reaffirm our allegiance to the principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson and exemplified by a long and illustrious line of successors in Democratic leadership from Madison to Cleveland.

After this pledge of fealty and rebaptism of faith in the teachings of the prototype of Democracy, you said:

> We believe that the public welfare demands that these principles be applied

to the conduct of the Federal Government through the accession to power of the party that advocates them.

The climax of the introduction is the grave announcement of impending national danger when you said:

And we solemnly declare that the need of a return to these fundamental principles of free and popular government based on home rule and individual liberty was never more urgent than now.

The epilogue of this pronunciamento is no less presumptuous than the prologue. It is a prayer for the salvation of the country through "a change of party, a change of administration, a change of system, and a change of method."

One year ago the prayer for "a change of party" was, through the voice of a plurality but not a majority of the electors of this nation, answered, and for the first time for more than a third of a century the executive and both branches of the legislative departments of the Government were placed in the absolute control of the Democratic party. The American people prior to this "change of party" were enjoying the blessings guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Industry, the great heart of the arterial system of trade, was beating normally and regularly; her pulsations filled the conduits of commerce with the products of American labor, American capital, and American genius. She blessed with wealth and prosperity the most remote part of the nation; she fed the bread-winners of the land with the produce of American soil and made a home market for the American farmer; capital had a field for investment; labor, employment; transportation, trade and commerce; manufactures, a demand for their products.

The nation was blessed with universal prosperity, and happiness and contentment beamed from the home. The maxim of Daniel Webster, that "Where there is work for the hands there is work for the teeth," was never more fully verified. This was the condition of our Republic before the transformation scene of a year ago.

"A CHANGE OF PARTY"

was the verdict of the ballots; the "change of administration" had not yet come. Its realization was four months in the future. The prospect of Democratic experimentation and platform translation began its work of industrial prostration and commercial depression. Capital took fright; industry moved sluggishly; products of manufactures decreased to the current demand; labor saw her wages decline and the doors of employment slowly close.

Doubt and uncertainty drove our medium of exchange into hiding; banks were forced to realize on securities to keep up reserves; exports decreased and contents of bonded warehouses increased. The nation for the first time since 1857 began to taste the unripened fruit of free trade and that sweet morsel of Anglomaniacs, the markets of the world. Who could predict what was in store when "a change of administration" should come?

The Democratic party to whom the control of the Government has been intrusted had in their indictment against the Republican party denounced as a fraud that protection which had reared industries, increased the national wealth, ennobled labor, and crowned us with industrial independence. That this policy was a felony, "the robbery of the great majority of American people for the benefit of a few." It said:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only.

It charged the policy of protection as a violation of the fundamental law of the land, our Constitution, for the past thirty years, and yet it never invoked the judicial power of that same instrument to declare that policy unconstitutional. It charged the arch crime of Republicanism in these words:

We denounce the McKinley law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation.

And said:

We promise its repeal as one of the beneficial results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party.

You crowned this catalogue of reformations with a declaration to repeal the 10 per cent tax on State banks.

Those who study the logic and rhetoric of Democratic platforms and promises know that like the hieroglyphics on the monoliths and cenotaphs of Egypt, they require the application of a Rosetta stone for their interpretation and translation. [Applause on Republican side.] We understood perfectly well that you did not intend to repeal the "culminating atrocity of class legislation" and enact a policy of "tariff for revenue only," or the 10 per cent tax on State banks. These threats, however, against the policy of a third of a century have only been less damaging and pernicious to the nation than their enactment and consummation.

A CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION

came and ushered in a panic transcending in severity the panics of 1837 and 1857, as the business of the country had grown and its interests multiplied.

The priestess of an Adelphian oracle could not predict the future. The place of the manufacture became the home of the bat. Fixed prices were unknown quantities. The confidence and faith that prevailed throughout the land was shaken to its foundation. The success of Democracy depressed trade and commerce, but its Administration paralyzed American industries and electrified British manufacturers. The fires which Republican protection had lighted were extinguished by Democratic tariff for revenue only.

There was a prostration of American interests and a lockout of American labor. The bears of trade performed fantastic gyrations on stock exchange; solvent banks closed their doors; foreign holders of American securities demanded liquidation; the gold reserve in the national Treasury registered its lowest point. The decline in prices of farm products was simultaneous with the decrease in home consumption. The Democratic party had denounced the Republican party as one "which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff." The industry of the sheriff, however, has never been so active, so abundantly protected and nourished and universally patronized since the Democratic days of 1857 as it has during the past nine months under this change of Administration. [Applause.]

The allegation needs no proof; we see the evidence on every hand. A million of the sons of toil are barred from employment, and their cries come to these halls daily from every quarter of the nation for relief from their condition of want and starvation The avenues of business and trade are strewn with lost fortunes and financial wrecks, while the people patiently plead for relief. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CLEVELAND SAW THE HANDWRITING.

It would be difficult indeed for one to picture the want, woe, and distrust which prevailed throughout the land under this "change of Administration," in any stronger language than did the President in the call for the special session of Congress. He said:

Whereas the distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation which pervade all business circles have already caused great loss and damage to our people and threaten to cripple our merchants, stop the wheels of manufacture, bring distress and privation to our farmers and withhold from our workingmen the wage of labor.

Again, in the same message to Congress of August 7, 1893, he said:

The existence of an alarming and extraordinay business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives in Congress, to the end that through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty with which they solely are charged, present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.

Our unfortunate financial plight is not the result of untoward events, nor of conditions related to our natural resources; nor is it traceable to any of the afflictions which frequently check national growth and prosperity. With plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distrust and fear have sprung up on every side. Numerous moneyed institutions have suspended because abundant assets were not immediately available to meet the demands of frightened depositors. Surviving corporations and individuals are content to keep in hand the money they usually are anxious to loan, and those engaged in legitimate business are surprised to find that the securities they offer for loans, though heretofore satisfactory, are no longer accepted. Values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural, and loss and failures have invaded every branch of business.

The Democratic party saw this ominous handwriting on the wall through the nation, and called on its political astrologers, sooth sayers, and necromancers for an interpretation, but all failed to make known the cause of our national calamity. As Belshazzar called the prophet Daniel to translate the fateful writing on the wall, so the Democratic party called its great prophet, not a Daniel, but one of the stuffed variety, to interpret the meaning of the words in its platform.

We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with the possibilities of danger in the future.

Had the divination been delayed until after the election of 1893 even an average free trader, and he is nothing if not a prophet, could have read it easily and correctly, though in agony: mene, mene, tekel, upharsin—"God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it. Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting." Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Republicans and protectionists. [Laughter.]

In less than eight months after this change of party and less than four months after the change of Administration the condition of the country had become so threatening and appalling that the President was forced to call the National Congress in extra session. In the same message the President said:

It may be true that the embarrassment from which business of the country is suffering arises as much from evils apprehended as those actually existing.

This tersely and succinctly describes the condition of the coun-

try which has existed since the nation declared for Democratic control of the Federal Government. The evils apprehended were those arising from threats in your platform to abolish protection, repeal the tax on State banks, and destroy reciprocity. We have experienced a change of party and a change of Administration for the short period of nine months and the nation is now awaiting the offspring of a "change of system" and a "change of methods." [Applause.]

UNCONDITIONAL REPEAL.

The extraordinary session of Congress called by the President convened on August 7, and eighty days were consumed by the Democratic party in the translation of the words, "We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and the coinage of both gold and silver without the discrimination of either." The Democratic party were not agreed as to the correct interpretation of this passage in the platform, and again deferred to the prophet. He declared it meant unconditional repeal of the Sherman law and gold monometallism for the future coinage of the nation.

The "cowardly makeshift" was repealed, and with repeal the wiseacres prophesied the reëstablishment of confidence, the revival of industries, the employment of labor, the rise of prices, and a return of the era of prosperity which prevailed throughout the nation a year ago under Republican administration. Has the prophecy been fulfilled? Has there been any transformation of the condition of the country since the day of the unconditional repeal of the "Republican cowardly makeshift"? Has unconditional repeal started idle factories and employed starving labor? Has unconditional repeal given bread to the workingmen? Do labor and capital walk hand in hand along the avenues of investment? Has it inspired credit and confidence? Has it given stability to markets and caused a rise in the price of farm produce? Newman Hall said "clamorous labor knocks with its hundred hands at the golden gate of the morning." Labor with its hundred hands is still knocking at the gates of industry, but they are not opened.

The financial and industrial condition is to-day as you found it with the passage of the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law. On what could you anchor hope for any change when you cried unconditional repeal of the Sherman law and with the same voice threatened "State bank tax repeal," "tariff for revenue only," an "income tax," and the annihilation of reciprocity?

Physical prostration is not relieved by aggravating its inducing cause.

It is folly to prescribe revolutionary legislation as a remedy for our industrial and financial depression caused by fear of such action.

Only a legislative quack in such case insists *similia similibus curantur*. There has never been a day since the change of administration to the 1st of October but that the total of the imports has exceeded the exports. There never was a day in 1892 during the same period but what the total exports exceeded the imports, as the following table shows:

Month.	Excess of exports from January 1 to end of each month.		Excess of imports from January 1 to end of each month.	
	1892.	1893.	1892.	1893.
March	$53,932,822			$40,411,805
April	53,546,335			57,552,160
May	54,553,643			64,552,046
June	47,425,412			68,800,021
July	40,157,149			62,872,231
August	33,761,669			47,833,307
September	29,294,090			22,154,098

The excess of exports for 1891 was $142,000,000, and for 1892 $97,000,000.

The decrease of exports over imports in 1892 was $45,000,000, and $43,000,000 of that reduction was in the months of November and December, 1892, under prospective Democratic rule.

The exports of gold and silver bullion for April, May, and June, 1893, exceeded those for the same period in 1892 by $13,000,000. I append a table giving the exact figures:

Exports and imports of gold and silver coin and bullion from and into the United States for three months ending June 30, 1892 and 1893.

Months.	Exports.		Imports.	
	1892.	1893.	1892.	1893.
April	$9,971,225	$20,535,501	$1,669,382	$1,710,092
May	5,202,088	19,141,690	2,054,033	3,480,789
June	18,238,904	5,753,291	2,651,426	2,595,792
Total	32,412,227	45,430,482	6,374,901	7,786,673

The unconditional repeal of the Sherman law has caused no rise in the price of cereals. The market values of wheat and corn have declined nearly 12 per cent.

I append a table from the weekly market letter of Clapp & Co., New York:

Months.	Wheat.				Corn.			
	Chicago.		New York.		Chicago.		New York.	
	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.
September	$0.73⅜	$0.67⅜	$0.78⅛	$0.74½	$0.43½	$0.37½	$0.51½	$0.46⅜
October	.69½	.62⅝	.75 7/16	.68	.41½	.36½	.49½	.46½
November	.64⅝	.59⅜	.69 7/16	.65½	.39½	.35 1/16	.47½	.44½

The condition of business is shown by commercial reporters to remain comparatively unchanged.

Dun's Review of November 18, 1893, says:

Business is gaining, but it is a constant complaint that the improvement is slow.

State factory inspectors report that out of 90,000 persons employed in mills in Philadelphia only 11,500 are at work.

Review of November 25, 1893, says:

Consumption increases slowly, and all branches of business are waiting for its growth.

Trade waits for the revival of industries, and the week's returns respecting industrial progress are rather conflicting.

Failures, compiled from Dun's Review, show no decrease since the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law:

Date.	1893.	1892.	Date.	1893.	1892.
	Number.	*Number.*		*Number.*	*Number.*
August 12	394	160	October 7	330	181
August 19	455	172	October 14	303	215
August 26	410	180	October 21	346	225
September 2	356	148	October 28	368	197
September 9	323	179	November 4	358	228
September 16	314	182	November 11	364	210
September 23	319	183	November 18	324	235
September 30	329	177	November 25	287	189

I quote from the Chicago Times, November 7, 1893:

Everybody is waiting for somebody else to move. The purchasing clause of the Sherman silver law has been repealed, and what was generally expected has not happened.

Also from the Chicago Times, November 13, 1893:

Too great hopes had been entertained by many people regarding the repeal of the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman law. It was too much to expect that the repeal would be immediately followed by a complete restoration of confidence and a return to the condition of things existing prior to the recent panic.

The following extract shows the commercial situation on June 1:

Bradstreet's, a great commercial authority, has received reports from 800 manufacturing establishments, at 210 different points, that have closed their doors since June 1, and says:

A summary of the results of the investigation shows that no fewer than 483,000 industrial, building trades, and mining employés have been thrown out of work within the period specified, due to the absolute closing of the establishments at which they were engaged or the shutting down of work at the mines.

The conclusions arrived at by Bradstreet's are given as follows:

When it is realized that this report, complete as it may be, is quite incomplete so far as the country at large is concerned, even with respect to manufacturing establishments which have wholly closed down for one reason or another, and that it takes no account of the thousands of reductions of working forces in other manufacturing establishments, in commercial houses, or by transportation organizations, large and small, it becomes plain to the casual observer that there are in all probability no fewer than 800,000 to 900,000 idle employés of manufacturing, commercial, and other enterprises at this time, who were nearly, if not all, actively employed three or four months ago, and that not more than one-sixth to one-fifth of this aggregate may fairly be said to have been out of work during the past two months owing to the customary midsummer shut down or the necessity for repairs, or to the taking of inventories, even though the not infrequent midsummer-wages dispute in the iron and steel industries be taken into account.

THE REMEDY.

Counterirritants in physical diseases are used to produce irritation at one point to relieve an affection at another. This principle in bodily infirmaties can not be applied to national maladies. You can not inspire faith and hope with suspense and doubt. You can not create confidence and trust with uncertainty and expectancy. You can not remove fear and distrust with objects of terror and fright. If you would raise the siege against American labor, cease firing free-trade shells at the bulwarks of American industries. If you would have confidence

and reliance in financial circles and harmony in monetary affairs, tell the nation you did not intend to repeal the tax on State banks; that it was a mere exhibition of legerdemain to secure the support of the Southern Democracy. As the President has failed to refer in his message to Congress to this plank in the Democratic platform it is reasonable to presume he considered it innocuous desuetude. If you would answer the prayer that comes daily from the millions of American toilers for an opportunity to work for bread, declare that articles for American consumption shall be made by American labor on American soil and in American manufactures. [Applause on Republican side.]

PROTECTION.

The policy of protection for American industries inaugurated by the colonies, sacredly guarded and preserved by them in the Constitution, engrafted in the laws by the founders of the Government and indorsed by the American people for more than a century, has been the foundation of our great industrial system and the corner stone of American prosperity and American wealth. It was used by the Colonies as a weapon of defense against tyranny. It has produced a century of development and advancement without parallel in all the world's history. It has caused genius and capital to turn nature's resources to the wants of man and civilization. The Revolution gave us national independence. Protection has given us industrial independence. Ireland once bloomed with industrial prosperity.

England prevailed upon her to produce the raw material for English manufactures. She consented, and the Emerald Isle became a garden for England. When she parted with manufactures she parted with her liberty and independence. When England extended this same invitation to America, Protection replied that she would take the bounteous resources from the hand of God, combine them with American capital and American energy, and manufacture for American consumption. Protection was the key to the storehouse of American resources. These resources opened the doors to American industry. Industry invited American labor. Labor invited consumption. Consumption made a home market for the products of our soil. This combination of natural resources, industry, labor, and home market, has crowned the Union with national wealth and independence.

My colleague, Mr. BRYAN, in the Fifty-second Congress, said that protection has crushed the people like the Australasian cannibal tree.

You pass this bill and you will not only crush, but you will draw the lifeblood of the nation and her people.

I would advise my friend that if he has any of these cannibal trees in stock he should dispose of them under a sale extraordinary at reduced prices before the passage of this measure, as they will then only thrive in English soil. [Applause on Republican side.]

CONSTITUTIONALITY.

You declared that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for revenue only. You argue that the Constitution being one of limited and enumerated powers the power to regulate commerce does not include protection to home industries. You have admitted in the past under this power that to levy a duty is a proper method to regulate commerce. That duties may be levied under the Constitution, not for revenue only, but to counteract foreign restrictions and prohibitions. That when revenue is the design of the law that incidental protection may be given to manufactures. You said in your platform in 1884:

That revenue for customs duties should be levied for the support of the Government economically administered, and when so levied the fostering of American labor, manufactures, and industries should constantly be held in view.

In your platform in 1888 you said:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations.

In the minority report of your committee on platforms in your last national convention you said:

That when custom-house taxation is levied upon articles of any kind produced in this country the difference between the cost of labor here and abroad, when such a difference exists, fully measures any possible benefits to labor and the enormous additional impositions of the existing tariff fall with crushing force upon our farmers and workingmen.

Delegates representing three-eighths of the Democracy of the country here admit that a duty equal to the difference between home and foreign wages was necessary.

Every Republican in the land insists that in any correct system of customs this allowance should be made.

As the parties are equally balanced numerically we have practically three-fourths of the American people united on the proposition that a tariff duty equal to the difference between American and foreign wages is constitutional and demanded for the protection of labor. You said in that minority report:

But in making reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. * * * Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and the capital thus involved.

Three-eighths of the delegates to that convention by their votes subscribed to the doctrine that our industries are dependent upon protection for their successful continuance and that any change in the laws should be made "regardful of labor and capital."

The minority report from which I have quoted had received the indorsement of the Democratic convention of 1884 and 1888 which had twice nominated Grover Cleveland for the Presidency, but in 1892 the substitute was adopted declaring protection of every kind and variety unconstitutional.

To catch the voters both "a-comin' and a-goin'," as the slang phrase goes, Mr. Cleveland allowed himself to be understood as adhering to the tariff planks indorsed by the Democratic conventions of 1884 and 1888, notwithstanding their rejection in 1892, and it is a fact which no candid person can deny that the people believed in the obstinate honesty of the President, but few gave any real weight to the platform of his party. I may concede they had reason for faith in the man but none in his party. [Applause.]

Even in his message of December, 1893, he said:

We can not close our eyes to the fact that conditions have grown up among us which in justice and fairness call for discriminating care in the distribution of such duties and taxation as the emergencies of our Government actually demand.

You have in times past, through your leaders to whom to-day you gave the mocking service of lip praise, admitted that the power in the Constitution on regulating commerce is not wholly confined to revenue or wholly confined to commerce. If the objects of this provision in our Constitution are for levying incidental protection and *lex talionis*, why should it not include the object involved by every nation on the earth and the American policy of protection to the American manufactures and American industries.

Madison, in a letter of Joseph C. Cabell of September, 1828, said:

If revenue be the sole object of a legitimate impost, and the encouragement of domestic articles be not within the power of regulating trade, it would follow that no monopolizing or unequal regulations of foreign nations could be counteracted.

Under the Confederation the power to levy duties on imports and the protection of manufactures and agriculture was reserved to and exercised by the several States. When the Federal Constitution was adopted this power was taken from the States. It follows that if the power was not given to the Federal Government it is annihilated. Is it reasonable that the States which had protected manufactures and encouraged agriculture would have ratified our Constitution if it did not contain the power which was their weapon of defense against foreign tyranny and the foundation of their welfare and prosperity.

On this Madison, in his letter to Joseph C. Cabell, said:

It is a simple question under the Constitution of the United States whether the "power to regulate trade with foreign nations" as a distinct and substantive item in the enumerated powers embraces the object of encouraging by duties, restrictions, and prohibitions the manufactures and products of the country, and the affirmative must be inferred from the following considerations:

1. The meaning of the phrase "to regulate trade" must be sought in the general use of it; in other words, in the objects to which the power was generally understood to be applicable when the phrase was inserted in the Constitution.

2. The power has been understood and used by all commercial and manufacturing nations as embracing the object of encouraging manufactures. It is believed that not a single exception can be named.

3. This has been particularly the case with Great Britain, whose commercial vocabulary is the parent of ours. A primary object of her commercial regulations is well known to have been the protection and encouragement of her manufactures.

4. Such was understood to be a proper use of the power by the States most prepared for manufacturing industry whilst retaining the power over their foreign trade.

5. Such a use of the power by Congress accords with the intention and expectation of the States in transferring the power over trade from themselves to the Government of the United States.

If Congress have not the power, it is annihilated for the nation; a policy without example in any other nation and within the reason of the solitary one in our own.

In October, 1828, he wrote Mr. Cabell:

I stated briefly the grounds on which I rested my opinion, that a power to impose duties and restriction on imports, with a view to encourage domestic productions, was constitutionally lodged in Congress.

The theory of "let us alone" supposes that all nations concur in a perfect freedom of commercial intercourse; were this the case they would in a commercial sense be but one nation, as much as the several districts composing a particular nation, and the theory would be as applicable to the former as the latter. But this golden age of free trade has not yet arrived, nor is there a single nation that has set the example.

Another one of that "long and illustrious line of successors from Madison to Cleveland" has added his indorsement to protection of American industries. Jackson, in his message to Congress in 1830, said:

The object of the tariff is objected to by some as unconstitutional, and it is considered by almost all as defective in many of its parts. The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other.

The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection, does not exist in them, and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct.

Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case.

This indispensable power thus surrendered by the States must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

That part of his message on manufactures was referred to the Committee on Manufactures in Congress, and both the majority and minority report of that committee indorsed his utterances relating to the constitutionality of protection of the American industries.

Mr. Mallory, who presented the report for the majority of the committee, said:

The committee are gratified to have the opinion of the President, clearly and fully expressed, that the tariff for protecting domestic industries is constitutional.

Our Government has adopted and endeavored to sustain by repeated legislative enactments a policy which has had the sanction of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. It has been sanctioned by the continued acquiescence of the States and the general understanding of the people.

Mr. Menell, in presenting the views of the minority of the committee, said:

With the President we also concur in the constitutionality of an adjustment of import duties with a view to the protection of our own agriculture and manufactures.

It would be difficult to frame a more direct, convincing, and conclusive argument on that point than is presented in the message.

ATROPHY OF DEMOCRACY.

The Democratic party, in speaking of the principles of Thomas Jefferson, in their platform said:

We believe that the public welfare demands that these principles be applied to the conduct of the Federal Government through the accession to power of the party that advocates them.

I would that you indorse the policy of protection as did Thomas Jefferson, the prototype of a genuine Democracy. He dimly saw in 1800 what he openly advocated in 1816, the protection of American industries and agriculture, and that the combination of manufactures and agriculture was the foundation of American independence. He said in his message to Congress in December, 1802:

To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation in all their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries and nurseries of navigation, and for the nurture of man and protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances * * * are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings.

He became more courageous during his second term, and in speaking of the suspension of commerce by belligerent powers, in his message to Congress in November, 1808, he says:

The situation into which we have been thus forced has impelled us to apply a portion of our industry and capital to internal manufacturing improvements. The extent of this conversion is daily increasing, and little doubt remains that the establishments formed and forming will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and subsistence, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent.

I would like to ask my Democratic friends if these sentiments coming from their great leader, Jefferson, do not have a tendency to stay their hunger for tariff for revenue only? He left another message from which modern Democracy should profit. In a letter to his friend Benjamin Austin in January, 1816, he says:

You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependence on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with candor, but within thirty years which have since elapsed how are circumstances changed. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist.

In speaking of American independence from the protection of American industries, in the same communication he says:

Shall we make our comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort, and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign when an equivalent of domestic fabrication can be obtained, without regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not soon have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has wielded it.

That these were the words of Jefferson on protection can not be gainsaid, and that they were written by him with care and deliberation is evidenced by his communication to Mr. Austin in February, 1816. He says:

Your favor of January 25 is just now received. I am in general extremely unwilling to be carried into the newspapers, no matter what the subject. With respect, however, to so much of my letter of January 9 as relates to manufactures, I have less repugnance because there is perhaps a degree of duty to avow a change of opinion called for by a change of circumstances, and especially on a point now become peculiarly interesting.

I fear if Jefferson were in these halls to-day he would fail to recognize modern Democracy as the legitimate offspring of those principles which he taught. You say in your platform that these principles of Jefferson were "exemplified by a long and illustrious line of successors in Democratic leadership from Madison to Cleveland." These principles were certainly exemplified by Madison, Monroe, and Jackson. Madison, in his message to Congress in December, 1815, says:

Under circumstances giving a powerful impulse to manufacturing industry it has made among us a progress and exhibited an efficiency which justify the belief that with a protection not more than is due to the enterprising citizens whose interests are now at stake it will become at an early day not only safe against occasional competitions from abroad, but a source of domestic wealth and even of external commerce. It will be an additional recommendation of particular manufactures when the material for them are extensively drawn from our agriculture.

Monroe in his message to Congress in December, 1822, says:

Satisfied I am, whatever may be the abstract doctrine in favor of unrestricted commerce, provided all nations would concur in it, and it was not liable to be interrupted by war, which has never occurred and can not be expected, that there are strong reasons applicable to our situation and relations with other countries which impose on us the obligation to cherish and sustain manufactures.

In his message of December, 1823, he recommends additional protection. He says:

Having communicated my views to Congress at the commencement of last session respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures and the principle on which it should be founded, I have only to add that those views remain unchanged and that the present state of those countries with which we have the most immediate political relation, the greatest commercial intercourse tends to confirm them. Under this impression I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of our country.

We have heard the voice of the people against this infamous measure through petitions and at the polls. My colleague [Mr. BRYAN] will remember, in the Fifty-second Congress, in speaking of the election of 1890, he said that he would not find fault with Mr. REED if he consumed his time in recalling those words of Thomas Moore, "The last rose of summer."

You will remember that you predicted that the "revolution" might reach the shores of Maine. Little you then thought that it would reach the prairies of Nebraska before the shores of Maine. With the victory of the Administration in the last Democratic convention in Nebraska and the Republican victory in the nation I know my colleague will find no fault with me if I consume sufficient time to recall the words in the last stanza of that beautiful anapest:

So, soon may I follow,
When friendships decay,
And from love's shining circle
The gems drop away.
When true hearts lie withered,
And fond ones are flown,
Oh, who would inhabit
This cold world alone.

[Laughter and applause.]

The pending bill lays a mailed hand upon every American industry. To some it extends the doubtful clemency of a lingering death.

Let us examine it with respect to two which have obtained a footing in my own as well as some other States. This will serve to illustrate its general plan and purpose.

SUGAR.

It provides that bounty on sugar under the act of 1890 shall be reduced one-eighth each year, beginning with July 1, 1895, extending to July 1, 1902, inclusive, and shall thereafter cease and determine.

Year.	Present law.	Present bill.	Year.	Present law.	Present bill.
	Cts. per lb.	*Cts. per lb.*		*Cts. per lb.*	*Cts. per lb.*
1894	2	2	1900	2	¾
1895	2	1⅞	1901	2	½
1896	2	1¾	1902	2	0
1897	2	1⅝	1903	2	0
1898	2	1	1904	2	0
1899	2	⅞			

Under present law the benefit in eleven years would be 22 cents, or an average of 2 cents per pound per annum.

Under this bill the benefit is 9 cents in eleven years, or an average of nine-elevenths of a cent per pound per annum.

This is a reduction of 59$\frac{1}{11}$ per cent on this industry, while the reduction on sugar in which the sugar trust is interested is but 50 per cent.

Why this discrimination in favor of the sugar octopus?

Sugar is an American agricultural industry which is yet in its infancy. It is an exception to the rule, insisted upon by those on the other side of this House, that a tariff for revenue only is the true policy, and that established industries are only incidentally protected under that policy. You invoke the most severe construction of the tariff policy in the Democratic platform, and it ought not to be applied to this important and growing agricultural product. Wherever in the past a distinction has been made between agricultural industries and manufactures it has always been in favor of agriculture. The evidence of this is not only shown in the first tariff law of 1789, but the efforts which were then made to protect it are shown by public writings, debates in Congress, and subsequent tariff acts.

In the first tariff law of 1789 cotton was protected 3 cents per pound, tobacco 6 cents, indigo 16 cents, and hemp 60 cents.

Mr. Burke, in speaking on the cotton industry in the House, said:

The ordinary crops of the South no longer pay, and that the cultivation of cotton was in contemplation there, and if good seed could be procured he hoped it might succeed.

It did succeed, and cotton became king.

Mr. Sinnickson, of New Jersey, spoke for the manufacture of beer. He said:

As the raw material (barley and hops) were produced in this country, it would tend to advance the agricultural interests.

Mr. Madison thereupon moved to lay 8 cents duty per gallon on beer, and hoped that such encouragement would induce its manufacture to take deep root, in which case it would produce the collateral good hinted at by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Bland, of Virginia, spoke for a prohibitory duty on beef.

Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, was in favor of a like duty on tobacco in aid of agriculture.

In 1812, Mr. Jefferson, in writing to an English traveler, said:

I have not formerly been an advocate for great manufactures. I doubt whether our labor employed in agriculture, and aided by the spontaneous energies of the earth, would not produce us more (abroad) than we could make ourselves of other necessaries. But other considerations entering into the question have settled my doubts.

We find in 1816 Mr. Dallas, when Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Madison and subsequently Vice-President, and giving the casting (Democratic) vote on the tariff of 1846, divided our industries into three classes. His second class embraces—

Manufactures which being recently or partially established, do not at present supply the demand for domestic use and consumption, but which with proper cultivation are capable of being matured to the whole extent of the demand.

In this class falls the sugar industry of this country. He further said:

It is respectfully thought to be in the power of Congress by a well-timed and well-directed patronage to place them, within a very limited period, upon a footing on which the manufactures included in the first class (*i. e.*, permanent or established) have been so happily placed by the lapse of a few years and the perseverance of a comparatively few individuals.

In 1816 Mr. Jefferson, in referring to the powers of other nations, said:

To be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them for ourselves. The great question is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation. He therefore who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence on a foreign nation or to be clothed in skins.

To-day we consume 2,000,000 tons, or 4,000,000,000 pounds, of sugar, and for nine-tenths of this article, which has become a household necessity, we are dependent upon foreign nations. Mr. Monroe, in his message to Congress in 1817, said:

Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government.

Mr. Monroe, in his message to Congress in 1819, said:

Foreign manufactures, for the want of a ready or profitable market at home, have been shipped by the manufacturers to the United States, and in many instances sold at a price below their current value at the place of manufacture. Although this practice may from its nature be considered temporary or contingent, it is not an that account less injurious in its effects. It is deemed of great importance to give encouragement to our domestic manufactures.

EXCEPTIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.

Sugar, whether manufactured from beets, cane, or sorghum, is an exceptional agricultural product. It has so been regarded the world over because its production is confined to certain climatic conditions and particular soils. It has become an expensive household necessity and requires a large investment to produce the first pound. European legislation in the interest of sugar embracing early exemptions of the raw material from taxation. The payment of bounties and premiums, the establishment of educational schools, the erection of experimental stations followed by liberal encouragement through bounties on exported sugar, and high tariff on foreign sugar all prove that sugar has been considered by France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and other nations as a most important agricultural product.

Even if it be not exceptional in its character the mere fact that it is an agricultural product of which we produce one-tenth of what we consume; that it drains from our aggregate wealth annually over $100,000,000 is enough of itself to bring it within the policy adopted by the fathers of the Republic and within a policy that should appeal to wisdom rather than partisanship or idle theory.

The fact that we have the necessary area, the soil, and the proper climatic conditions, the energy and capital to manufacture the sugar for our own consumption are elements that should appeal to our impartial and unbiased consideration and judgment. That we have the soil and climate is vouched for by Prof. Wiley, chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture. He says:

California is the most promising State for the manufacture of sugar beets.
Colorado shows a great interest among the farmers in the culture of the sugar beet; the experience which has been gained in Colorado and other Central Western States is such as to lead to the greatest encouragement; in—
Kansas sugar beets, of high sugar content, can be produced; that—
Michigan is a State peculiarly well suited to the production of rich sugar beets; in—
Missouri, the northern part of the State is especially well suited to the growth of sugar beets of high grade.
Nevada shows beets with a phenominally large sugar content, while in—
New Mexico the sugar beet, under proper agricultural conditions, can be made to produce a phenominally rich beet, and that beets in—
New York show a very high content of sugar; the beets in—
Ohio and North Dakota show a very fair sugar content, more interest having been shown in Ohio during the past season in regard to the sugar beet than ever before, and attention is called to the fact that especially in the northern part of that State there are vast areas suitable to the culture of, the climate there being favorable to, a high-grade beet; that—
Oregon shares with the rest of the Pacific Slope special advantages for beet culture; and he classes—
South Dakota with Nebraska; the latter State ranking second to California.
Virginia shows a fair content of sugar; the State of—
Washington showing a very high content of sugar.
Wisconsin shows great capabilities for beet-sugar production, while beets in—
Wyoming are extremely rich in sugar; and—
Utah being well suited to beet culture.

It is also known that in South Carolina the sugar beet will yield a very high per cent of saccharine matter, and now that cotton has become so depressed the farmers have begun to turn their attention to beet sugar as they did from indigo a few years ago to cotton.

CONSUMERS.

We have the interest of the people, the consumers, as individuals, to consider. Down to July 1, 1891, sugar had always paid liberal tribute, for revenue only, to the Treasury. I say this because the 3 cents duty imposed to encourage and foster it was before Louisiana was a part of this Union of States. In fact all through the debates, it will be discovered, even after Louisiana was purchased, that the policy of the duty on sugar was not so much for protection as for revenue.

Including 1888 to 1890, sugar paid $317,000,000 in duty, which in turn was exacted from the people. They have borne the sugar-duty burden uncomplainingly for over a century—ever since the enactment of the first tariff law in 1789—just as they bore the duty on cotton for the same time down to 1867. They are now entitled to the relief which the bounty policy affords and which it promises for all time. There is no sound reason not allied to half-baked theory or partisanship why this relief should not continue without a sacrifice of the sugar industry. There is no more reason for bankrupting Louisiana, sacrificing hundreds of millions of capital there and many millions more in California, Utah, and Nebraska, destroying the value of agricultural lands given over to cane and beet culture and dealing a death blow to planters and farmers, than there is in flooding the coal mines of West Virginia, the lead mines of Missouri, or firing the millions of capital invested in lumber in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Georgia. To destroy the coal and lumber interests would be no worse than is the sugar provision of this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

INDEPENDENCE.

We ought not be dependent on any nation for sugar. No one will seriously dispute this. We imported in 1891 over 3,480,000,000 pounds of sugar, and we paid a trifle over 3 cents a pound for it. The Statistical Abstract places the cost at $105,729,210.

In 1892 we imported 3,556,000,000 pounds, for which we paid 2.93 cents per pound, or as stated by the aforesaid authority, $104,400,000.

The exports and imports to and from sugar-producing countries do not show the amount of gold that must have been sent abroad for sugar. For instance, our imports of sugar from Cuba in 1892 amounted to $60,838,765 and in 1893 to $60,637,670, while our imports from exceeded our exports to Cuba in 1892 by $50,000,000, and in 1893 $54,550,000; and yet we seem to have sent in gold to Cuba in either year only $6,200,000 in 1892 and $6,400,000 in 1893. We paid in exchange through London:

Imports from and exports to sugar-producing countries for fiscal year ending June 30, 1892.

Countries.	Imports.	Exports.	Sugar imports.	Excess of imports.
Cuba	$77,931,671	$17,953,570	$60,838,552	$59,978,101
Hawaii	8,075,882	3,662,018	7,442,047	4,413,864
Santo Domingo	2,293,748	1,019,450	2,017,739	1,274,298
British Guianas	4,363,204	1,933,299	4,468,145	2,429,905
Austria-Hungary	7,718,565	1,527,980	1,818,915	6,190,585
Philippine Islands	6,308,653	70,914	2,417,109	6,247,739

There are various important considerations of a purely national character involved in this sugar question. First. The Treasury, since the formation of the Government and down to 1890, had been in receipt of custom duties on sugar. Second. The future national benefit likely to accrue under the "bounty" policy, and the interests of our capitalists, farmers, and planters who have invested in this industry several hundred millions of dollars, jointly engaged in an agricultural enterprise that promises us our sugar and at a cheaper price than our people have ever paid.

Now, let us look at the economic feature a moment. And first, under the tariff policy our importers had paid for sugar from foreign countries from 1851 to 1891 over $2,000,000,000; and they had paid in duty $1,100,000,000; a total in less than forty years of $3,100,000,000.

This, however, does not show what our people paid for sugar. It only shows what we paid in tariff duty to our own Government. If the probable average retail cost to consumers was 8 cents per pound, the foreign sugar consumed from 1851 to 1890, 53,732,000,000 pounds, would cost them $4,298,560,000
They probably consumed about 5,500,000,000 pounds of domestic sugar at 8 cents 440,000,000

Total 4,738,560,000

This surely looks as if the sugar industry was of great national economic importance to the people of this country and to the Government as well. And it becomes more and more important as each decade follows the other. We imported sugar and values as follows:

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1851	380,400,000	$13,800,000
1861	809,750,000	30,000,000
1871	1,270,470,000	64,600,000
1881	1,946,745,000	88,670,000
1891	3,483,477,000	105,700,000

Our per capita consumption has increased as follows: From 44.2 pounds in 1881 to 62.1 in 1892.

This shows an increase in total consumption of nearly 79 per cent in ten years, with an increase in total cost of 21 per cent. Increase on consumption per capita was 40½ per cent. If our population increases as in the last decade, we will have, say, 75,000,000 people in 1900, and if we increase our consumption per capita as in the last decade (*i. e.* 40½ per cent), we will consume 6,000,000,000 pounds of sugar, which will deplete our aggregate wealth annually by $180,000,000, if we are dependent on foreign nations for our sugar. [Applause on the Republican side.]

EXPORTS COMPARED WITH SUGAR IMPORTS.

In 1891, we exported in value of wheat and wheat flour $106,181,000.

It took nearly all to pay for our foreign sugar. Foreign sugar rivals, backed up with bounties and tariffs, balanced our wheat and flour exports with a necessary which we can produce here.

We exported of corn only $17,600,000 and paid over six times that sum to foreigners for sugar.

The total value of our domestic exports was $872,270,000, and it cost us nearly one-eighth of the whole for sugar from abroad.

Our exports of beef, hog, and dairy products were only $139,000,000. It took nearly 80 per cent of it for foreign sugar.

It took 36 per cent of our raw cotton exports ($290,000,000) to liquidate out debt for foreign sugar.

Our foreign sugar cost us nearly eight times as much as our tea ($13,600,000), and ten millions more than our coffee ($94,000,000).

This exhaustive drain will go on *pari passu* with a constantly increasing population, because without adequate protection or stimulant to develop this industry and to encourage capital to embark in it, there is no hope of escape from foreign control and necessity for foreign supply.

DROUGHT AND SCOURGE.

There is still another consideration why we should not be dependent on a foreign nation for sugar.

For several months—in August, September, October, 1893—there was a sugar famine at various points in our country and prices went up, and why? The drought in Europe caused the Cuban sugar-producers to hold their sugar for higher prices.

Dependent on foreign governments for sugar, we are at their mercy. As well be dependent on them for our supply of iron, clothing, shoes, and flour. I read from the Louisiana Planter of October:

Messrs. Willett & Gray's telegram to the Picayune indicates that the New York sugar refineries were stopped last Sunday because of the lack of supplies, but started up Monday with fresh supply of raw sugars received on Sunday. Was there ever before this such a hand-to-mouth supply of sugar in the Union?

September 30, 1893, the Cuban stocks indicate an excess of near 50,000 tons over the same date last year, reflecting the stubbornness with which the Cubans have held on to their sugar, they believing that the shortage of over 150,000 tons of their own crop and the short crop in Europe justified a far higher range of sugar values than those current.

Another enemy is always likely to stalk across the path of our foreign sugar supply. An outbreak of yellow fever in Cuba or cholera in Europe is by no means a remote or improbable contingency. In such case the people must pay dearly for their sugar. Recently during the visitation of cholera in the lower bay at New York, closing the avenue for the importation of sugar from Hamburg, the price of sugar suddenly increased nearly three-fourths of a cent a pound, and continued six weeks. The Cuban producers, seeing the plight we were in, put an extra price on their sugar to us, which the refiners paid and in turn collected from our people. Here was the sum of $4,000,000 transferred from the pockets of the American consumers to the pockets of the Cuban producers in a short space of fifty days, and this simply because we were at the mercy of a foreign country for an article of daily necessity.

ENCOURAGEMENT.

If we are to look across the waters for precedents for a new revenue policy, let us not confine our attention to England, but let the eye rest as well on Germany, France, Austria, and Russia. What have they done for sugar? Instead of casting it down and out, they have by every means in their power lifted the industry, and to-day more than one-half of the world's product of sugar is made from beets. The history of the European sugar policy shows that no reasonable stimulant was considered too great, no tariff too high in its behalf. The result must astonish the world. Another important consideration is that our efforts to supply our wants are combated on all sides by powerful rivals, who possess as to cane advantages in matters of climate, cheap labor, and decennial instead of biennial planting; and as to beet sugar, cheap labor, while liberal bounty encouragement and high tariffs in foreign nations operate against both industries here.

These nations by the exercise of a liberal and an enlightened policy have become independent of the world and of each other for sugar. They have more than doubled the world's product, and by scientific, though tedious and costly research, have raised the percentage of sugar in a given weight of raw material from 50 to 80 per cent. Is it possible and shall it be said that these things can result in empires and monarchies and are denied us in the foremost Republic on the face of the globe? Shall we assume the monopoly of adverse legislation? In a country where we have comparatively no debt and a small standing army, where the Federal burden is light, shall we alone among all the enlightened nations pursue an illiberal policy? When the people understand this question they will not "mouth" the words of the political spigot savers concerning "bounties."

The people do not ask and have not asked for a repeal of the bounty on sugar. Why should they? They have contributed liberally to the upbuilding of our manufacturing industries, and now, when agriculture has found a new field, we are gravely informed that a nation which had, down to 1890, paid a tax or duty on foreign sugar for a century amounting to billions of dollars should not now pay $10,000,000 per annum bounty, laid for the purpose not only of relieving the people of four-fifths of this sugar-duty burden, but for the greater national object of so stimulating home production as to render us independent of the world for sugar.

We paid $27,000,000 in 1866, increasing yearly to $55,000,000 in 1889, a sum equal in 1871 to nearly 90 cents per capita, or $4.50 to a family; 1881, to nearly 92 cents per capita, or $4.60 to a family; 1887, to nearly 100 cents per capita, or $5 to a family.

A little calculation will readily disclose the difference between the old "duty" and the present bounty policy.

The following table shows the consumption of sugar in the United States in 1892:

Willett & Gray's circular for January 5, 1893, makes the total consumption 1,837,626 tons of 2,240 pounds each.

The Statistical Abstract for 1892, page 221, makes the consumption 1,813,594.

The mean average between these two authorities would be		1825594
		2240
		73023760
		3651188
		3651188
1892, consumption in pounds		4089330560
		8½
		$327,146,444
		13,631,101
		340,777,546
The average retail price to the consumers before the bounty law was enacted was 8½ cents, or 3 pounds for 25 cents.		
Since the enactment of that law the average price has been, say, 5½ cents	4,089,330,560	
	5½	
	204,466,528	
	20,446,652	
		224,913,180
Difference		115,864,366
Sugar, and sugar from imported molasses (Statistical Abstract, page 221) was, tons	1623126	
	2240	
	64925040	
	3246252	
	3246252	
	3,635,802,240	
Duty on it at 2 cents	2c.	
	$72,716,044	
Add bounty, say	10,000,000	
		$82,716,044
Balance in favor of bounty law		33,148,322

Does any sane man suppose that if the masses of the people fully understood this they would favor a repeal of the bounty law on sugar? Why should they? They have simply kept the duty in their pockets and $33,000,000 besides. They have seen beet-sugar factories built that turn out from 50,000 to 75,000 pounds of sugar a day. They have seen employment given to an army of agriculturists, land values in the vicinity of these factories increase four-hundred fold, cities and towns spring forward into activity undreamed of, railway freights increased, and millions of additional capital invested in Louisiana, Texas, California, Nebraska, with millions more standing ready to erect factories at Anaheim, San Diego, and Westminister, Cal.; at Muscatine and Sioux City, Iowa; at Omaha and Lincoln, Nebr.; at Spokane, Wash., and Syracuse, N. Y. This was the real object of the bounty law. The capitalist and the planter and farmer have fulfilled their part of the contract. Is the $150,000,000 of capital in Louisiana, the $5,000,000 in Florida, the $10,000,000 in California, the great factories in Nebraska and in Utah, to say nothing of Mr. Lapham's adventure at Staunton, Va., to be stricken down?

Give the sugar industry in America the protection and encouragement it has had in Europe and you will have 1,000 sugar factories producing 5,000,000,000 pounds of sugar, employing 1,200 laborers in each factory or an average of 1,200,000 employés from whom 6,000,000 of our population would draw their maintenance and sustenance. We would have invested in this enterprise $500,000,000, and would add annually to our aggregate national wealth $100,000,000.

The raw material used in the operation of 1,000 sugar factories would be 30,000 tons in each factory or 30,000,000 tons of beets, of the valuation of $150,000,000, which would be paid to the agriculturists annually.

RESULTS.

Wherever a beet-sugar factory is located and within a radius of many miles the agricultural country seems touched as with a new life. There is a rise in the value of land and labor is in demand, towns and villages take on vigor and growth, and every man, laborer, banker, merchant, and farmer, feels the touch of a new industry. Thousands of dollars are annually expended by the factory in every direction, giving business a steady impetus and a demand for the products of other industries.

No man, of whatever political faith, who is not a demagogue can go through a beet field and visit a sugar factory without feeling that God's sunshine is indeed a partner with labor and capital in one of the great agricultural industries.

Are the energy and capital invested in this enterprise the hopes of the farmers and planter in this great sugar industry to be paralyzed? At whose behest? Is it possible that Claus Spreckels has found favor in the eyes of a Democracy which only fourteen months ago was yelling itself hoarse in denunciation of trusts?

Mr. Bringham, in 1890, Master of the National Grange, composed of one and one-quarter millions of farmers, said:

I think our people would not favor a bounty on any commodity that we now produce in sufficient quantities to supply our people. There are many of them in favor of bounties. Take, for instance, sugar.

At the transmississippi convention, held at Ogden last spring, a convention composed of over 600 delegates from 22 States, a resolution passed without opposition against a repeal of the bounty from or protection for sugar.

Let no one suppose for a moment that but two or three States growing sugar are the only ones interested in this industry. On the contrary, the mechanic, the laborer, the merchant, and the farmer in many States, aside from the cane, beet, and sorghum belt are deeply interested in this struggle. Prior to 1857 Louisiana had paid to Eastern foundries and machine shops over $10,000,000 for engines, sugar mills, kettles, furnaces, doors, grates, bars, vacuum pans, pumps, water pipes, wagons, and harness. She had paid to Tennessee, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, and Indiana over $7,500,000 for mules and horses for her plantations. She had purchased every year over $1,500,000 of pork, $65,000 of flour, $275,000 of shoes, $1,250,000 of clothing, half a million dollars of blankets, and $1,250,000 of horses and mules, or a total of nearly $4,700,000 annually. When she had with a capital in this industry increased fourfold and now reaching $150,000,000, her calls on the North and border States for machinery, animals, wagons, harness, provisions, and clothing makes an interstate commerce of $50,000,000 annually.

Is such an industry in such a State to be stricken down or crippled?

Her product in 1870–'71 was, pounds	168,878,592
In 1890–'91 it was	483,489,856
A gain of nearly 200 per cent, or pounds	314,611,264

The planters have invested at least ten millions new or additional capital, and increased their planted area 100,000 acres since the bounty law was enacted, and on the faith of its continuance as promised and provided. Against many disadvantages Louisiana has done well. In the ante-rebellion days the conditions were not conducive to the greater enterprise and advancement which has since marked the progress of the sugar industry. The tariff act of 1833 worked disastrous results to domestic sugar production from which the industry had not recovered at the breaking out of the civil war.

Not unlike those embarked in the venture of the beet-sugar industry, Louisiana is now availing herself of modern and costly appliances, and of scientific effort, and the sugar industry in this country may be said to be for the first time successfully launched and on the road to complete success.

Beet sugar at Watsonville, Alvarado, and at Chino, in California, at Lehi, in Utah, at Norfolk and Grand Island, in Nebraska, and at Staunton, in Virginia, under the stimulation of the bounty offered is an assured success, as the following increase of production will indicate:

Beet-sugar production:	Tons.
1880	357
1890	2,800
1891	5,400
1892	12,355
1893 (estimated)	25,000

The struggle has been tedious and expensive. Its production requires chemical knowledge of soil, skill in manufacture, practical knowledge of seed, planting, cultivation, and harvesting, heavy expenditure for land, plant material to run it, and for skilled labor.

Add to this is the material item of cost of disseminating education among farmers, who must in this country be gradually brought to see the profit in a beet crop. This has been and continues to be expensive.

While I may not hope that any sentiment uttered by Hamilton, upon whose profound learning, practice, judgment, and sterling loyalty Washington leaned, will convince the gentlemen of the majority, I venture to appeal from them to the people for whom that statesman gave a noble life, and reproduce here his words:

Bounties are especially essential in regard to articles upon which those foreigners who have been accustomed to supply a country are in the practice of granting them.

The continuance of bounties on manufactures long established must always be of questionable policy, because a presumption would arise in every such case that there were natural and inherent impediments to success, but in new undertakings they are as justifiable as they are oftentimes necessary.

There is a degree of prejudice against bounties from an appearance of giving away the public money without an immediate consideration and from

a suppostion that they serve to enrich a particular class at the expense of the community.

But neither of these sources of dislike will bear a serious examination. There is no purpose to which public money can be more beneficially applied than to the acquisition of a new and useful branch of industry—no consideration more valuable than a permanent addition to the general stock of productive labor.

As to the second source of objection, it equally lies against other modes of encouragement which are admitted to be eligible.

As often as a duty upon a foreign article makes an addition to its price it causes an extra expense to the community for the benefit of the domestic manufacture.

A bounty does no more. But it is in the interest of society in each case to submit to the temporary expense, which is more than compensated by an increase of industry and wealth, by an augmentation of resources and independence, and by the circumstance of eventual cheapness, which has been noticed in another place.

BINDER TWINE.

This bill strikes down the manufacture of binder twine in this country. Under the present law there is laid a duty of seven-tenths of a cent per pound. The istle or Tampico fiber, manila, sisal grass, and sunn used in its manufacture and which are not grown to any extent in this country were by the act of 1890 put on the free list, while hemp, a product of the American farm, was made dutiable at $25 per ton.

Hemp and binder twine under the provisions of this bill are placed on the free list.

The Nebraska Binder Twine Company was organized in 1890 for manufacturing binder twine from hemp. This new and growing industry has opened a market for another agricultural product in Nebraska. The hemp from 1,700 acres of land was consumed last season by this company. The amount of binder twine manufactured was: 1891, 476,000 pounds; 1892, 626,000 pounds; 1893, 558,000 pounds.

Mr. B. W. Reynolds, president of the Nebraska Binder Twine Company, says:

In the manufacture of any commodity there is a fixed limit of price below which manufacture must either cease or be carried on at a loss. The price of binder twine during the last season has been too low to make the business either remunerative or profitable. Should the present price be reduced to correspond with the proposed schedule the industry of binder twine manufacture in this country must nearly or altogether be wiped out of existence. The only salvation would be the reduction in the price for labor to correspond with that of our European competitors, which we deem, at least in Nebraska, utterly impossible. Another consideration which is not generally given the weight it deserves is that the use of money in this country is worth fully twice as much as in Europe, and that works correspondingly against the American manufacturer as compared with his European competitor. It is also a fact that when money is invested in machinery constructed specially for the manufacture of any article, unless there is some profit in the business, that capital is practically an expense and the taxes and interest eat it up.

And I will say right here that under the present prospects or until the matter of the tariff on our product is settled the Nebraska Binder Twine Company will not manufacture another pound of twine. We can produce the raw material and manufacture the article as cheaply right here at Fremont as it can be done in any part of the United States, and we therefore have no fear of American competition, but we can not compete with European pauper labor and their low rates of interest on capital invested.

What effect has the proposed tariff change had on the wages of your employés?

We started up our two mills the middle of September on a 30 per cent reduction from former prices for the manufacture of the raw material, but even that reduction would not be adequate to make the manufacture of twine profitable with the tariff reduced as proposed.

I will state that as far as my observation extends there has been no complaint among the farmers as to the price at which we have held our twine under the McKinley tariff. They seem to be willing to pay prices that will sustain the home manufacturer in his enterprise. The kick has come from the professional politician, and for what purpose you know as well as I. The farmer reasons that the production of hemp lessens the acreage of other crops and that it has thus far proved one of our most profitable crops, when the twine could be sold at fair figures.

The policy of the present Administration seems to be to strike down any industry that promises anything for the people, and twine as well as sugar may all have to be imported until the American people are again permitted to speak at the ballot box.

The plain, simple statements of this man of business contain so much of common sense, I can not but indulge the hope that even the free traders in this House will feel their force. I know the people of my State who are sick of senile Democracy and its twin brother Calamity will consider them and next November voice their judgment by sending to this House a solid Republican representation who by their acts will give proof of loyalty first to the industries of their own State and also to all that is American.

What humiliating contrast, gentlemen of the majority, does your plan and purpose to wreck the industries of this country present to that patriotic utterance of Thoreau which made him immortal—

There is no hope for him who does not think that the bit of mold under his feet is the sweetest spot on earth.

You propose to sacrifice this industry, destroy this new field for agriculture, and place this necessity of the American farmer under the control of foreign manufacturers.

You propose to give preference and priority to foreign lands and foreign productions. In this you have succeeded in securing the support and indorsement of the Canadian and English press.

Sirs, pass this bill and you will lock the vaults of American resources.

Pass this bill and you sign the death-warrant for American industries.

Pass this bill and you issue a proclamation for the ensalvement of American labor. [Applause.]

Pass this bill and you will declare for the destruction of our home market; the depletion of the national Treasury; the placing of labor on a plane with ryots, coolies, and kanakas, and the transfer of American manufactures to foreign shores. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The hour of 5 o'clock and 30 minutes having arrived, under the order of the House the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ARANSAS PASS.

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present a report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. For reference to the Calendar?

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5077) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass

The SPEAKER. This bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, will be ordered to be printed.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will discharge the duties of the Chair at the evening session. In accordance with the order of the House, a recess will now be taken until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to debate only on the pending bill.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by Mr. BROOKSHIRE as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is now in session for debate only on the tariff bill, and will, according to the special order, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

TARIFF.

[Mr. McKAIG withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. HERMANN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I observe in the report of the minority upon this bill a complaint that a tariff for revenue only has been made to embrace the principle of protection. I wish to say something on that point and to speak of the only kinds of tariff duties on imports that can be arranged. There are two, virtually three, for one of them can be divided. There is the tariff for protection only, which has protection for its object and revenue for its incident. That tariff favors the few at the expense of the many, and in my judgment is properly called a tariff of robbers.

Then you have a tariff for revenue only. That may be divided into two kinds; one the tariff which has revenue for its object, and for its incident a depreciation of that revenue and its ultimate absence. That I call the tariff of idiots. It taxes raw materials and, in the end, by crushing industry, gives us no imported raw materials to tax. The other tariff for revenue only is one whose object is revenue but whose incident is protection, and that is the tariff for revenue only which has been advocated for over half a century by the Democratic party and on which the lines of the present bill are founded. That I call the tariff of statesmen.

If you go back as far as 1844 you will find in the canvass between Mr. Polk and Mr. Clay that both those gentlemen wrote letters upon the subject of the tariff. I have here an extract from the letter of Mr. Polk, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

I am in favor of a tariff for revenue, such an one as would yield a sufficient amount to the Treasury to defray the expenses of the Government, economically administered. In adjusting the details of a revenue tariff, I have hitherto sanctioned such moderate, discriminating duties as would produce the amount of revenue needed, and at the same time afford reasonable incidental protection to our home industry. I am opposed to a tariff for protection merely, and not for revenue.

Mr. ENGLISH. Now, that was the keynote of all Democratic action on this question. It is true that fads of various kinds have prevailed in the Democratic party, for it is a party which allows a certain liberty of action in its members. But the real doctrines of the party, as I shall proceed to show, were precisely those laid down by Mr. Polk and carried out by Mr. Walker in the tariff of 1846, which, in my judgment, was the best tariff ever made in this country. I ask the Clerk to read the extracts which I send to the desk, from some Democratic platforms from 1840 down to the present time, in order to sustain my point.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Democratic platform of 1840:

"*Resolved*, That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country."

The Democratic platform of 1844 reaffirmed this section of the platform of 1840.

The Democratic platform of 1848 reaffirmed this section of the platform of 1840.

The Democratic platform of 1852 reaffirmed this section of the platform of 1840.

The Democratic platform of 1856 reaffirmed this section of the platform of 1840.

The Democratic platform of 1868:

"And a tariff upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the internal-revenue, laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country."

The Democratic platform of 1876:

"We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue."

The Democratic platform of 1884:

"It proffers a pledge to correct he irregularities of the tariff; it created and has continued them. Its own tariff commission confess the need of more than 20 per cent reduction; its Congress gave a reduction of less than 4 per cent. It professes the protection of American manufactures; it has subjected them to an increasing flood of manufactured goods and a hopeless competition with manufacturing nations, not one of which taxes raw materials. It professes to protect all American industries; it has impoverished many to subsidize a few."

The Democratic platform of 1888:

"All unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation."

The Democratic platform of 1892:

"*Protection.*—We denounce Republican protection as a fraud; a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered."

You will see, Mr. Chairman, how closely, with the exception of those forms of language used frequently to conceal thought, all these utterances follow the lines laid down by Mr. Polk and carried out by Mr. Walker. You will see how in one or two of those platforms they recognize very positively the fact that raw materials should be free to our manufacturers, and that the true doctrine of imposing duties on imports and arranging a tariff of those duties is, first, to find revenue, and then to give us free the raw materials for our industries which we do not make here, which we make here at a disadvantage, or which we make here in insufficient quantity.

That is the line upon which this bill is framed. It does not have protection as an object, but as an incident. The ingenuity of man can not frame a tariff that will not have as an incident a certain amount of protection. Every cent that you place for revenue upon the foreign article handicaps to that extent the foreign manufacturer, and incidentally protects our own. But there is a vast difference between protection as an object and as an incident. Protection as an object is simply a robbery of the masses; protection as an incident is the inevitable result of a proper attempt to collect revenue. I am astonished at the ground which has been taken by these gentlemen of the opposition. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG] read to-night a letter from Mr. Clay, written during the Polk-Clay campaign. I have here an extract from that letter, which, though it was read to-night, I wish to emphasize.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum and substance of what I have conceived to be a true policy of the United States in respect to a tariff may be briefly stated. In conformity with the principle announced in the compromise act, I think that whatever revenue is necessary to an economical and honest administration of the General Government ought to be derived from duties derived from foreign imports. And I believe that in establishing tariff on those duties such a discrimination ought to be made as will incidentally afford reasonable protection to our natural interests.

Mr. ENGLISH. It will thus be seen what Mr. Clay says on this subject. He was the father of the American system—the idol and the ideal of the Whig party; and we all know that the Republican party is an offshoot and descendant of the Whig party. No doubt Mr. Clay is as much admired by the Republicans of to-day as he was by the Whigs of the past. Is the opposition about to "go back" on its own position? The Republican party, which was the son of the Know-nothing party, which was the son of the Whig party, which was the son of the National Republican party, which was the son of the Blue-light party of 1812, which was the son of the Federal party, which was the son—well, I will go no further, Mr. Chairman, with this genealogy for fear I shall run presently against the impenitent thief on the cross. [Laughter.]

Will they repudiate that? They are not satisfied with assailing this tariff as a mask of protection, but they make other statements, which I propose briefly to consider. I ask the Clerk to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The price of lead in New York has steadily declined for the last thirty years from 6 cents per pound to 3¼ cents per pound, and the prices to-day are a little above those in London.

Mr. ENGLISH. That is all true; and it is partly due, mainly due, to the present tariff act. Prior to that act there were silver-bearing lead ores introduced in this country and used partly for the extraction of their silver and partly as a flux to the harder and more refractory ores of the West. The present tariff shut them out. What has been the result? Capital went over the line into Mexico and established smelting furnaces there. Those silver-bearing ores were reduced there, the silver paid all the cost and made a profit, leaving the lead free; and that was sent to New York, paying duties there, and it undersold our lead and brought down the price. That is the fact.

I ask the Clerk to read another extract.

The Clerk read as follows:

The pottery industry can not be accused of being fostered by a prohibitory tariff. The amount imported exceeds the amount manufactured here, and notwithstanding the act of 1890, the importations have increased. Under such circumstances, to lessen the duty would seem most unjust to the potters so long as protection is sanctioned by the bill.

Mr. ENGLISH. Is not that admirable? Claiming merit for a bill that has protection for its object, because it has fostered importations! Is not that remarkably cool, even for this weather? Do you know why the importations have increased? It is the result of those high duties.

The potteries of Trenton, in my State, are the leading potteries of the country in the coarser ware. While some of the superior classes of ware produced there are unequalled or at least unsurpassed in the world, the ordinary pottery of Trenton under this hothouse system of high duties has gone down to such a condition that we are obliged to import increased quantities of a better foreign ware. That is the fact in regard to the pottery in Trenton. But there is another fact which is very significant. Immediately after the enactment of the McKinley bill, the present law, which raised the duties, the master potters of Trenton cut down the wages of their men 20 per cent as a tribute to protection. The men resisted; a strike followed; labor won; and to-day it dictates prices and wages to the masters. I ask the Clerk to read again.

The Clerk read as follows:

The bill proposes to put into competition with American ores foreign ores, some of which are produced at a labor cost one-tenth, and none of them at a labor cost greater than one-fourth of ours. It proposes to bring our laborers who get from $1.60 to $2 per day, and who work from fifty-five to sixty hours a week, into competition with laborers who work seventy-two hours a week and get 36 to 60 cents per day; our miners who get from $2.25 to $2.75 per day into competition with those who get from 60 to 72 cents per day. Ocean rates are so low as to afford no protection. Ore is frequently carried across the ocean as ballast, and when freight is paid at all it averages not to exceed 5s. per ton on iron ore from Bilboa and other points in Spain.

Mr. ENGLISH. Here is the most extraordinary tissue that I ever saw put upon paper. I know something about the iron in my State. The iron industry of New Jersey has declined one-half within the last few years. We have in that State magnetite, one of the richest ores of iron to be found anywhere, with the possible exception of franklinite, which is alloyed with manganese, also found in my State, and from which the splendid spiedeleisen is produced.

We made in that State some years ago two classes of iron—one from the magnetite, what is known as mill or wrought iron; the other from the limonite brought from Northampton and Lehigh, what are called the lean ores, making foundry iron or cast iron, pots, pans, stoves, and other articles of that kind. We wanted, and need to-day, the foreign ores for the admixture with some of our Eastern ores. We need the ores of Spain and Cuba; and when they say, as they do in that extract, that the labor abroad is so much cheaper than our labor; then they forget the strikes of the iron miners again and again, and that they are complaining of starvation wages, they will tell you that in Cuba they have cheaper labor than here and talk about the $2.25 and $2.75 wages of our miners.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact we do not mine iron; we dig it out. There are no tunnels and no drifts. It is brought from the surface or found in dikes and easily removed. I have seen it carted, masses of it, hematite ore, in the Pennsylvania region, almost from the surface. It is the most inexpensive kind of labor naturally. But the miners of Pennsylvania have complained again and again that their wages were reduced to 70 cents a day. Now, in Cuba you can not get any labor of any kind at less than 80 cents a day. I know that to be the fact, and I defy

contradiction. They talk of it coming here into this country as ballast, or freight-free; that vessels bearing wheat bring back iron ore sometimes as ballast.

This is absolutely absurd as well as untrue. We export our wheat mainly to England, not to Bilboa, in Spain, and but 5 per cent of the ore of this character that we get and import into this country comes from England, and that is the only way it could possibly come, though even the English ships that come here for wheat do not come empty. But from Bilboa, in Spain, when the ore is brought from there, it is brought by vessels specially chartered for that purpose. The freight is more than the amount named there—5*s.*; it runs up sometimes as high as $3 a ton; for to that barren region they carry nothing from this side.

That is the kind of statement, Mr. Chairman, to be sent broadcast over the country. Let iron pass, and I will ask the Clerk to read the next extract.

The Clerk read, as follows:

TIN PLATE.

It will be observed that the proposed duty is 1 cent per pound less than that of the present law. This means a severe blow to an enterprise, which, under existing conditions, under proper protection, promises to be one of the great industries of the country.

Mr. ENGLISH. There is another thing that I am astonished should come up in a report of that character. Cicero once said that he wondered how two Augurs—who I presume were Republican politicians of that time in Rome—could look each other in the face without laughing. [Laughter.] The statement that the tin-plate industry is successful in this country is an absurdity. When that duty of $2\frac{2}{10}$ cents was added, the tin-plate manufacturers at Swansea, many of them, were on the verge of bankruptcy.

But what did they do? Why, they moved their plant and their material and the men over here. The output of America is but about 11,000,000 pounds of native American material thus made up; the rest of our consumption is made entirely of foreign material by foreign workmen and mainly foreign owners. So that we have been legislating in this country absolutely to put this profit of $2\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound on tin plate in the pockets of foreigners. And furthermore, our tin is of an inferior character; and we are fast depreciating the value of the tin plate in the same way, and I will tell you why. They will say to you, these same gentlemen who ought to know better, that the tin plate that is made here is a finer article, that we use steel instead of iron.

Well, steel is cheaper than iron for that purpose; but it is compact, and it does not admit of any depressions or projections to which the tin can cling. And I tell you if you expose the tin plate to the heat or the weather you will soon see the difference between the steel tin plate and iron tin plate. So much for the tin-plate industry.

I ask the Clerk to read the next extract I have given him.

The Clerk read as follows:

The law of 1883 provided a duty on cutlery, including razors, of 50 per cent ad valorem. This duty was grossly inadequate, as the labor cost in making cutlery is highly skilled, and is nearly all done by hand; it equals 80 per cent in knives, and 90 per cent in razors.

Mr. ENGLISH. Now, during the recess I have been inundated by the master cutlers of my city, and they came singing the same song as that. They told me that but 10 per cent was expended for raw material, and that all the rest was for labor, and that it was all hand labor. I sat in my modest parlor and listened to what they had to say and I never smiled, nor did I order them out of my house, but I knew at the same time something of their industry, in fact I know a great deal about it, and I knew that it was not hand labor, except in some minor points, that it was the creation of machinery; and I took the trouble to write to a leading manufacturer of my town, and here is his answer; and I commend it to the attention of this committee. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

I find that hand labor has been reduced to a minimum in this country in the production of pocket and table cutlery. In the making of solid bolster table knives a bar of steel of suitable size and cut to proper length is taken, heated to redness, and put under a heavy drop of three or four hundred pounds weight containing forming dies, and with two or three rapid blows is forced into shape. This is a rapid operation, and many dozen bolsters can be formed in a day. The piece of steel in them is worked under quick blows given by a power hammer run at considerable speed, thus forging out the blade and tang. The blades are then trimmed into required shapes by dies in power presses, worked generally by boys. They are then put on plates, one, two, or more dozen at a time, heated to redness in a closed furnace and tumbled into a vat of oil, which harders them. They are again put on plates in the same quantities and put into another furnace, where they are heated to a degree determined by experience to be right and under pressure. The heat tempers them and the pressure straightens them, although they have to be looked over and a few need to be touched up by a hammer. They are then ground.

The cutlers are now introducing grinding machines, where one man can do the work previously done by three men. The blades are then glazed, polished, and handled. The manipulation of these portions of the work is accomplished on suitable wheels run by power, the handles being finished on such after they have been riveted or cemented on the tangs, subsequently to the polishing of the blades. These operations are the only portions of the work that can properly be termed hand labor. There are so many different sizes, styles, and qualities of cutlery that to go into the question of cost would take up considerable time and space. What I have said shows you that the statement made to you that cutlery is produced in this country mainly by hand labor is not true, while it is true in regard to that made on the other side of the ocean.

I know that Richardson Bros., when they had charge of the saw factory in this city, sent many cases of saws each year directly to Sheffield, the saw manufacturing center of England. Carnegie has virtually said that we can manufacture steel in this country against the world. The industries are now very few indeed that need any sort of protection, and while there may be an item or two in the Wilson bill that may need modification, in the main it is in the right direction. The utter absurdity of the assertions made by protectionist journals and manufacturers that manufactories, especially anything in the line of hardware, will be ruined by the enactment of the Wilson tariff is shown by the fact that in the old so-called free-trade period, prior to 1860, the proportion of foreign hardware sold by jobbing houses was only 15 per cent to 85 per cent of domestics, and under the tariff prior to the McKinley bill the proportion was not over 4½ per cent foreign to 95½ per cent domestic, and very probably would have been still less if natural laws of trade had continued.

A hardware merchant of New York, of forty years' experience in dealing in foreign and domestic hardware, and who for over thirty years past has been an exporter of American hardware, writes: "I have carefully gone over the hardware items affected by the Wilson bill, and outside of affecting combinations and trusts to some extent, by which enormous profits are made, I challenge anyone to make any satisfactory exhibit of any class of goods now made in this country and sold by hardware merchants, the manufacture of which can not be prosecuted with a fair, legitimate profit."

Mr. ENGLISH. So much for that. Let that pass. I ask the Clerk to read the next extract which I have handed him.

The Clerk read as follows:

Silk-workers in America are paid at least twice as much as those in England, three times as much as in France and Germany, and nearly five times as much as in Italy. We are now manufacturing and producing in this country fully two-thirds of all the silk goods consumed here; and not only that, but the same grade and quality of goods are sold here cheaper than when we depended upon the foreign manufacturer.

Mr. ENGLISH. Precisely so. The American silks can not be surpassed. What woman will take a foreign silk when she can get one of Cheney's manufacture? The Jacquard looms of Paterson produce fabrics equal to anything produced abroad. They can sell cheaper. They do. What is the need, then, for protection to the extravagant amount that has been imposed by former tariffs and by the present tariff?

The statement there that we pay twice as much wages as they do in England, three times as much as they do in France and Germany, five times as much as they do in Italy, and somewhere else, as it is stated in the report, ten times as much as they do in Japan, must make us pause and reflect when we consider that the silk-weaver of Spitalfield pays his men one and a half times as much as they do in France and Germany, two and a half times as much as they do in Italy, and five times as much as they do in Japan, and yet goes on and has no protective tariff, no high duty, but the whole of England is open to us and to Japan, and to everyone else. But you take a Japan handkerchief, which costs 75 cents, and compare it with one of the Paterson handkerchiefs. I intended to have brought a Paterson handkerchief here to-night to compare with a Japanese handkerchief.

I have a Japanese handkerchief here. You can get one for 70 or 75 cents, and the Patterson handkerchief will cost you a dollar and a quarter or more, but the Paterson handkerchief will outlast three of the Japanese. The Paterson handkerchief weighs twice as much and it is better in every way. It would be cheaper than the Japanese if it cost $2. The silk industry of Paterson can by this time stand alone; and so throughout the United States. Yet this bill gives a duty which will afford us a moderate amount of revenue and sufficient incidental protection. I ask the Clerk to read a further extract.

The Clerk read as follows:

The working of these immense coal fields gives employment directly to nearly a quarter of a million of men at American wage rates, and furnishes opportunities for labor to another army of men in addition at like wage rates.

Mr. ENGLISH. Now, just fancy for a moment the coolness of that statement! Does not everyone know the history of the coal strike in Pennsylvania? Does not everyone know that the miners there have worked at starvation wages, down to 60 cents a day, and that they struck in utter despair? You gentlemen remember the wage riots there. Yet they talk about the superior wages of these men. This talk about coal is simply rot. I can use no other word than that to characterize it. We hear every day how we will have free coal, and how we will have Nova Scotia coal poured upon us in immense quantities, and how all the manufactories on the Atlantic coast will use it; because no one has the face to say that it will interfere with the coal on the other side of the Alleghanies.

Does any man who knows anything about manufacturing—and I live in a manufacturing district, and claim to know something about it—does any one suppose that our manufacturers will introduce that smoky coal instead of the anthracite which is a free article and which is kept up in its price by a trust? It is cheaper at its present price than foreign coal with the duty taken off twice, that is, with a reduction in price the same as

the duty. They do not want that foreign article. Coke is frequently used elsewhere, but you can go to the gas companies in my city and you will find that they have difficulty in selling their coke at any price, and it will not be used by a single manufacturer. The talk about inundating us with coal is like the talk about iron ore coming to this country. Fancy the iron ore and the coal going out West. Fancy the lean ore coming in from abroad and destroying the market for the Bessemer ore of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, the finest hematite ore in the world, the red hematite. Fancy this coal coming in! It is the most absurd statement in the world. There is no basis for it.

How any man could have the face to put that thing before the public, and then talk about the wages, the American rate of wages, paid to the miserable miners in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. May I make a statement to my friend? The Republicans tell us that the coal that will come into this country will probably come from Canada. I want to say that according to the last statistics we have for the year 1892 there were 179,000,000 short tons of coal dug in the United States, and 3,000,000 tons in Canada. So that the coal dug in Canada amounted to one-sixteenth part of that dug in the United States.

Mr. ENGLISH. That is precisely like the cry of some years ago when they wanted a duty put on the anthracite that we use here, the smokeless coal, because, they said, there was such an enormous deposit of anthracite in Canada that if there were not a duty put upon it, it would drive our miners out of the field. Well, the character of that anthracite coal was well described by a savant who was asked to give his opinion upon it. They sent him a specimen, and he wrote back, "My opinion, after a careful examination of this coal, is that the man who sits upon it in the day of judgment will be the last to be burned." [Great laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Who wrote that opinion?

Mr. ENGLISH. I think it was Prof. Silliman; but he was not a silly man by any means.

Mr. HAINES. Was he a Democrat.

Mr. ENGLISH. No; I do not think he was a Democrat.

Now, before I close, I wish to say something about the clamor which has been raised in the country in order to induce the workingman to hound us into violating our pledges to the people of the country, pledges which we made in two hotly contested elections. There has been an organized attempt, I say an organized attempt, among leading manufacturers of this country to induce the mass of the working people to believe that if this bill were passed their wages would inevitably be cut down; and some of them have begun now, while the new tariff is in an inchoate condition. They have three objects in this. One is to intimidate us from passing the bill, which is an idle piece of folly; and another is revenge. For years past the laborers of this country, by combination, have organized toil, so that it has forced from ruthless employers fair rates of wages. They had the sense to combine and the manliness to maintain their combination; and they obtained an increase in their creature comforts.

The manufacturers have determined for some time to cut wages down. The attempt that was made by the potters of Trenton shows how ready they are to spring into it, without or with a pretext; and here we have a pretext. The other is avarice. Now, look to a man who employs a thousand men, and we have manufacturers, I am glad to say, in the city of Newark who employ as many, and I think very few of them engage in the combination and conspiracy; but there are manufacturers who employ a thousand and even two thousand men. But, take the case of one with a thousand, and allowing that they give the magnificent sum of $15 a week as the average, which is a heavy sum for an average, you take 10 per cent off that, and the manufacturer pockets in one week $1,500. In fifty working weeks, $75,000.

There is something for his coffers, and his greedy fingers go out for it. I tell you that this attempt to rouse the workingmen presupposes that they are dupes and fools; but they are neither dupes nor fools. Most of the workingmen of this country have intelligence, many of them have education, and all of them that grand quality which men of genius seldom have—common sense. [Applause.] They are looking into this matter closer than ever. I have been talking with many of these workingmen during the recess, and I know how well they are forming their opinions upon this attempt to dupe them. These men who are engaged in it, or who are back of all these attempts at high protective tariff are doing so for their benefit and not for the benefit of the workingman. These men who are cutting down the wages now are men who are looking to the future. This very saw company, which was spoken of in that letter read here, that is one of the two great trusts through which they control almost every saw manufactured in the country. It is running the Richardson saw works.

There is not a hardware store in this country that does not keep the Richardson saw, because it is the highest-priced saw and is the cheapest for its price, and it is the best article made or ever made. It goes to Canada, where a duty of 35 per cent has to be paid on it, just the same as the British manufacturer pays there, and the Richardson saw commands the market. No Sheffield saw can compare to it. It goes to the West Indies and South America and undersells or rather drives out all competitors, although it is frequently a higher-priced saw than the English article. Disston, another of these saw-makers, sends saws to Australia and drives the British manufacturers out there; and, furthermore, the Richardsons, when the Richardson Brothers were running that mill, sent case after case of saws to Sheffield, the center of the saw manufacture in England, and sold them there.

Now, that company, needing no protection, under the pretext that their duty is a little reduced in this bill, have cut down the wages of their men 10 per cent. Mr. Chairman, I have a certain amount of respect for the burglar and for the highway robber, but I have none for the sneak-thief who enters your hall and carries off your overcoat, yet I think him preferable to the company or the men who, under such a pretext, would rob their laborers of their honest earnings. [Applause.] I tell you, sir, that these men are going too far. They are raising the proletariat of this country, and woe be to them if these once spring to their feet. These men are themselves the fathers of the incendiary torch and the dynamite bomb. They are the breeders of anarchists. They would crucify the Christ of the poor, but on the day of his crucifixion the skies will darken and the graves open and the ghosts of dead wrongs stalk forth to plague the wrongers. [Applause.] I have no patience when I look upon these efforts to warp legislation, to intimidate Congress, to plunder the workingmen, and to deceive the country.

I have no patience with it; and although I do not like all the details of this bill, although I think it imperfect in some of its parts, imperfections which I believe will be removed in the Senate and their removal concurred in by this House, yet take it as it is to-day, so far as the schedules are concerned, although some of them strike hardly at the industries in my district, and I think unjustly, still I take it as a choice of evils in preference to the present infamous act, and would support it were there not one bar in the way. I may, after all, much as I admire the bill, withhold my vote from it, not because of the nature of the bill as a tariff measure, but because it contains one thing that I can never sanction or approve. There is a bounty in this bill which is a subsidy. I am a Democrat after the strictest sect of Jefferson. For fifty years I have fought in the Democratic party, and always against subsidies, and I am not disposed to take the legacy of the Republican party in the shape of a bounty.

The gentleman who made the minority report stated that the Supreme Court has validated bounties by its decision. That is a most extraordinary statement. Let me say something about courts. Let me cite two decisions, one of a State court and one of the Federal court of highest jurisdiction. In the State of Maine, some years ago, the Legislature was called upon to pass a bill affording a bounty to a certain industry on condition that it would establish itself in a certain town. The Legislature had some doubts as to their power, so they sought for legal advice. The attorney-general of the State at that time was named Thomas B. Reed [laughter], a name quite familiar to me, although not as that of a lawyer. I presume, however, that he must have been a distinguished advocate, this Mr. Reed, or he would not have been selected for that high position. [Laughter.]

But, singular to say, the Legislature, with reprehensible negligence, overlooked their natural adviser, the attorney-general, and asked the judges of the highest court in the State for their opinion on the subject, and the judges gave it. It was adverse to the power of the Legislature. The court held that to give a bounty to individuals from funds raised for the public use was a perversion of taxation, a doctrine as old as Bourlemaqui and all the old English law writers, and that it was nothing more nor less than robbery under color of law; and one judge, Dickerson, gave the quaint illustration that it was like setting down a few to a banquet in order that the many might possibly have the crumbs that fell from the table. [Laughter.]

If any gentleman wants to look at these opinions he will find them in 58 Maine, pages 597 *et supra*. Some years later the same question was raised in Kansas. A certain manufacture proposed to establish itself in Topeka, and it was agreed either to give a certain bounty or to subscribe for stock. I am not sure which, but I think the agreement was to give $100,000 on condition that the industry was established there in order to boom or benefit the town. The contract was made. Bonds were issued and the interest for the first year was paid, but the second year a clamor arose and the people elected officers who refused to pay the interest on the ground that the contract was illegal and therefore void.

It went from one court to another, and finally came to the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice Miller gave the opinion of the court, one justice alone, Clifford, dissenting on the ground that the expenditure was possibly good for the public. Judge Miller, delivering the opinion of the court, laid down the doctrine that while it was within the power of a legislative body to raise money for public use, it must be for public use simply—nothing more: that to divert money thus raised to private uses was a perversion of taxation, and "plunder in the guise of legislation." Now, if that is validating bounties, I must confess that I have no knowledge of the force and effect of the English language. It strikes me that it goes very far to invalidate bounties, for the court held that the contract was illegal and therefore void.

You will now see why I hesitate to vote for the bounty. I hope it will yet be stricken out so that I may give to this bill by my vote the support that I have in my mind for schedules, and that I have given this night with my voice.

I know that in taking this ground I stand apart from many of my colleagues in action, possibly, but not from so many in thought, for I have heard a great many words on this subject uttered in conversation in this House, in the cloak room, and on the floor. I know that I do not stand alone. But that is of no consequence to me, for stand alone or with many, I stand as I think right; I do what I think right, and I let consequences take care of themselves. But with or without my vote this bill will pass, and its passage will bring about a revival of business and an increase of the prosperity of the country. [Loud applause.]

[Mr. WAUGH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to; and, Mr. BROOKSHIRE having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. MCKAIG reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. MCKAIG (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4968) for the relief of the heirs at law of William H. Muse, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a resolution of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEEN: A bill (H. R. 5185) providing for the erection of a public building at Cheyenne, Wyo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STRAIT: A bill (H. R. 5186) providing for the erection of a monument to designate the battle ground of Buford, in the county of Lancaster, S. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BLANCHARD: A bill (H. R. 5187) granting to the Fort Jesup Masonic College, Louisiana, for school purposes, the lands remaining unsold in the abandoned military reservation at Fort Jesup, Sabine Parish, La.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAIR: A bill (H. R. 5188) to fix the rate of postage on periodical publications containing the print or reprint of books—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5189) to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A bill (H. R. 5190) to amend sections 4818, 4821, 4822, and 4823 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 4 of an act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5191) to provide for the enlargement and improvement of the United States Naval Hospital, Brooklyn, N.Y.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHELL: A resolution assigning a clerk to the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUNDY: A bill (H. R. 5192) for the relief of William H. Sprinkle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 5193) to remove the charge of desertion from Henry Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 5194) to pension G. O. Greiner, of Texas—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 5195) granting a pension to Fanny E. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 5196) for the relief John C. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5197) for the relief of Michael Kries—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) for the relief of Benjamin F. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) for the relief of William Ellis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5200) for the relief of Thomas McGrath—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5201) for the relief of Thomas Fletcher Foley, alias Thomas Fletcher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 5202) granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEIL: A bill (H. R. 5203) for the relief of John R. Farrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 5204) for the relief of William and John Beattie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 5205) for the relief of Louisa S. Guthrie, widow and executrix of John J. Guthrie, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEADOCK: A bill (H. R. 5206) for the relief of Robert B. Tubbs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. APSLEY: Petition of Charles E. Dresser and 53 other manufacturers of toys, of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of R. M. Sharp and 10 others, pensioners, of Pemiscot County, Mo., praying Congress to adjust and settle all pension claims by law by December 31 next—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of I. M. Johnson and 23 others, of Sparta, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAIR: Remonstrance of the legal voters, belonging about equally to the Republican and Democratic parties, employed in the hosiery mills of Laconia, N. H., 240 men, and representing more than 1,000 employés in all those mills and other industrial occupations, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the employés of the Manchester Locomotive Works, Manchester, N. H., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill or any legislation aimed against the policy of protection to American industries and American workmen—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the employés of Gonic Manufacturing Company, of New Hampshire, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, because it will impoverish the country, reduce wages, and greatly injure the manufacturing and other interests of the State—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the employés of the Cocheco Woolen Manufacturing Company, of East Rochester, N. H., irrespective of party, against the Wilson tariff bill, declaring that they believe that if it passes it will impoverish the country, reduce wages, and greatly injure the lumbering, farming, and manufacturing interests of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of citizens, employés, and operatives of the town of Tilton, N. H., protesting against the Wilson tariff bill as exceedingly disastrous to the business of that town—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the Hodgdan & Holt Manufacturing Company, of Laconia, N. H., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill (the remonstrants are all voters)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Protest of 50 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against the reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 48 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 48 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 60 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 25 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 25 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against the reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 41 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 97 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 44 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 32 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 25 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against the reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 29 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 23 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 23 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 16 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 30 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 24 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 48 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 69 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 50 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 25 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 56 farmers of Lancaster County, Pa., against reduction of the duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 110 manufacturers of cigars in Lancaster City, Pa., in favor of a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNDY: Petition of Joseph W. Warner and 16 others, of Pike, Pike County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CADMUS: Petition signed by 3,000 employés in the city of Passaic, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Resolutions of the Oswego Board of Trade, in favor of the proposed tariff on barley and malt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of N. D. Anthony and 36 other farmers and dealers in barley, protesting against any reduction in the import duty on barley and its product—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURBOROW: Petition of employés of the Chicago Hardware Manufacturing Company, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the thread-workers and spinners of fine cotton yarns of Newark and Kearny, N. J., against a reduction of the tariff on spool cotton and fine cotton yarn—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. O. Frye and 293 other miners of lead ore in Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, against the proposed 15 per cent ad valorem duty on lead ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of the miners of lead ore west of the Mississippi River, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 66 of the employés of J. C. Parker & Co., Quechee, Vt., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George W. Wing and 93 others, in behalf of Fannie E. Alexander, of Montpelier, Vt., widow of Elhanan W. Ormsbee, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers, to be restored to her pension by a special act of Congress—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Memorial of the Packers and Nailers' Protective Union, No. 6152, of Superior, Wis., in favor of the establishment of a Government telegraph system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of H. W. Scott, of Seward, Ill., in favor of 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 100 employés of the Hanover Woolen Manufacturing Company, of Hanover, Jo Daviess County, Ill., praying the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of importers and merchants of the city of New York, asking that a specific duty be put upon sardines in lieu of the ad valorem duty provided for in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL: Petition of I. H. Mues and others, of Frontenac, Minn., for a retention of tariff taxes on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar-makers of Chaska, Minn., for a reduction of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar-makers of Faribault, Minn., for a reduction of duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar-makers of New Prague, Minn., for reduction of tariff taxes on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar-makers of Faribault, Minn., for reduction of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. O. Richel and others, of Faribault, Minn., for reduction of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco to 35 cents ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Two petitions of citizens of the Territory of New Mexico, praying Congress not to place wool on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of Joseph Kindley and 7 others, cigar-makers, of Delphos, Ohio, praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of the silk throwsters of Matteawan, N. Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the operatives in the factory of Wm. Carroll & Co. at Matteawan, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means,

Also, petition of the tobacco manufacturers of Kingston, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition signed by 9 firms of umbrella manufacturers, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James G. Shaw and 110 others, employés of the East Lake Woolen Mill, of Bridgeton, N. J.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted at a mass meeting held in the courthouse in Camden, N. J., March 30, 1893, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stephen Robinson and 60 others, employés of Camden Woolen Mills, Camden, N. J.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of the Boston Society of Water-Color Painters, in favor of the free-art clause of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee Ways and Means.

By Mr. McETTRICK: Protest of the Merchant Tailors' National Exchange of the United States, against any reduction in the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition of Robert B. Tubbs, to accompany House bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Petition of 54 citizens of Columbus,

Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARSON: Petition of George E. Hiller and 23 other citizens of Warren Township, Belmont County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Remonstrance of 29 men, employés in the Bentley & Gerwig twine mills, in the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, representing also 200 women employed in the same works, against a reduction of the tariff on hemp and flax products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Lodge No. 38, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, New Castle, Pa., representing 500 members, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance signed by committee of 5 of the local union No. 38, situated at Beaver Falls, Pa., of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, against a reduction of the tariff on flint glass ware—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of glass stainers of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIGOTT: Petition of Sons of Temperance of Connecticut, for an investigation of the liquor traffic in its relation to crime, etc.—to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, remonstrance of George W. Stevens and others, of Cromwell, Conn., against the reduction of duty on toys—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of King Phillip Globe and Yarn Mills, Fall River, Mass., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 4,000 operatives of the King Phillip Globe Yarn, Sanford Spinning, Kerr Thread Company, and other mills of Fall River, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the machinists, molders, and other operatives of the Fall River Machine Company, in opposition to the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED: Protest of Cornelius Weeks and 56 others, employés of the Robinson Mills, South Windham, Me., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of S. E. Lee and 59 others, employés of Pondicherry Company, Bridgeton, Me., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest by the Trades League of Philadelphia, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Robert Halford and 240 others, employés of Goodall Worsted Company, of Sanford, Me., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Geo. E. Moulton and 396 others, overseers and operatives of the Lewiston Mill Company's mills, irrespective of political party, etc., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Geo. L. Hanson and 52 others, employés of Portsmouth Company, South Berwick, Me., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employés of different shops in the State of Maryland, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition and statements favoring House bill 4645, for the relief of C. C. Miner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial of John H. Crier and 101 others, citizens of Michigamme, Mich., representing without regard to party relations the great anxiety respecting the tariff legislation now pending, and praying that the duty on iron ore be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of fishermen of Grand Marias, Mich., praying that the tariff on twine and netting be removed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Protest of Local Union, No. 48, American Flint Glass Works, Tarentum, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of green and flint glass workers of Pittsburg, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRAIT: Petition and papers to accompany the bill (H. R. 5186) for the erection of a monument to designate the battle ground of Buford, in the county of Lancaster, S. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of Jeff McClarney and 5 other citizens of Wabasha, Minn., praying for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Selleig and 10 others, of Albert Lea, Minn., for the same purpose—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. J. Simmons and others, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, thirty-three protests of 1,311 citizens of Minnesota, against changes in the barley schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of George H. Hale and others, citizens of Pleasant Grove, Olmstead County, Minn., against the barley schedule, being 34 protests, signed by 1,329 citizens of Minnesota—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolutions of the citizens of Warsaw, N. Y., irrespective of party, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of importers and merchants of the city of New York, and asking that a specific duty be placed upon sardines, in lieu of the ad valorem duty proposed in the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Papers to accompany House bill 3919—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition of D. M. Pierce and others, to retain iron ore on dutiable list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of Charles Parsons and 79 other citizens of Conway, Mass., against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers for cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Philip Hyde and 46 other employés of the Holyoke Paper Company, of Holyoke, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 13, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of yesterdays's proceedings was read and approved.

FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement showing the principal imports and exports in the foreign commerce of the United States for a series of years; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

HAWAII.

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the message just received from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress:

I transmit herewith copies of all dispatches from our minister at Hawaii relating in any way to political affairs in that country, except such as have been heretofore laid before the Congress.

I also transmit a copy of the last instructions sent to our minister, dated January 12, 1894, being the only instructions to him not already sent to the Congress.

In transmitting certain correspondence with my message dated December 18, 1893, I withheld a dispatch from our present minister, numbered 3 and dated November 16, 1893, and also a dispatch from our former minister, numbered 70 and dated October 8, 1892. Inasmuch as the contents of the dispatch of November 16, 1893, are referred to in the dispatches of a more recent date now sent to Congress, and inasmuch as there seems no longer to be sufficient reason for withholding said dispatch, a copy of the same is herewith submitted. The dispatch numbered 70 and dated October 8, 1892, above referred to, is still withheld for the reason that such a course still appears to be justifiable and proper.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
January 13, 1894.

The SPEAKER. This message, with the accompanying documents, will be ordered to be printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MAJ. GEN. OLIVER OTIS HOWARD.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 108) authorizing Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor.

The joint resolutions was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, of the United States Army, is hereby authorized to ac-

cept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring upon him the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If there is to be any discussion on it I must object.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. There will be none.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to consider the joint resolution; which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

RECIPROCITY.

Mr. TAWNEY. I rise to a question of privilege. On the 15th of December last I submitted a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information concerning the operation of the reciprocity clause of the tariff act of 1890. Upon a suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] that resolution was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, he promising that it should be promptly considered and reported back. It has not yet been acted upon by the committee, or at any rate not reported; and I now move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be read and considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. That can only be done by unanimous consent, under the order of the House which is now being executed. The question which the gentleman presents is a privileged matter; but the order adopted by the House suspends for the time being the ordinary rule on that subject.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I call for the regular order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the call of committees be dispensed with so that we may proceed with the debate on the tariff bill, and that gentlemen having reports to make be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection that order will be made.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

The following report from a committee was handed in at the Clerk's desk, referred to its appropriate calendar, and otherwise disposed of as indicated below:

JURISDICTION OF POLICE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5013) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia;" which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to inspection of iron or steel boiler plates; when the Speaker signed the same.

THE TARIFF.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the tariff bill.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the McKinley law in 1890 as a member of this House, and against a good many protests from some parties in my part of the country. I believed that it was wisdom then to so vote, and time, since the passage of that act, has demonstrated the wisdom of that law; so that to-day, although my State is largely agricultural, I do not know a farmer within its bounds, whatever may be his party affiliations, who does not believe that it is to his interest that this law shall stand, rather than to concede the adoption of the measure now before the House, the Wilson bill, and its provisions in so far as they relate to the interests of the farmer.

WILSON LAW ROBS THE FARMER.

And while I occupy the time of the House, I simply desire to call your attention to a single proposition, or two propositions rather, as to what this Wilson bill takes away from the farmer, and where it is inimical to his interest, as I believe; and, secondly, what it promises him in return.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill is aimed at the agricultural classes of the country. It seems to me that the free-trade force of the Democracy is seeking to wreak all of its vengeance against protection, pent up for years past, and has selected the farmer to receive the blow. The Wilson bill—and I say it after a careful consideration—the Wilson bill smites the farmer hip and thigh. It is against him on every article he produces. I believe the McKinley law—and I believe it because I know it from many sources in the country, having been amongst the farmers in many parts of it—that the McKinley law offers more protection to the farmer than any other class of men in this country. I believe the farmer is reaping more advantages from the protection features of the McKinley bill than any manufacturer in the United States.

In that bill the agriculturalist had ample and most liberal consideration, whereas under the provisions of the Wilson bill we find it attacks the farmer on every hand, and I simply refer to the bill in support of that statement. Let us note a few of the reductions and confiscations to which the agricultural community is treated in this bill, and I defy any gentleman to select or name any specific advantage this bill confers on the farmers as a class, more than is conferred generally on all classes by the provisions of that bill. You may claim that he has a little of the advantage from your standpoint, that you propose every one else is to have who is interested in the bill, but even from your standpoint it is only an advantage which all enjoy in common with the farmer. But my proposition is that there is no specific advantage conferred upon him at all or in any respect. You confer no favor whatever upon the farmer, while you protect all other interests and confer privileges and protection to the manufacturers of the country. And the farmer is the only class in the country against whom wholesale attack and onslaught is made.

ITEMS UPON WHICH THE BILL ROBS THE FARMER.

Now, let us see how the professions of this party that we have heard so earnestly and often on this floor in their advocacy of the farmers and their rights is borne out by their acts; let us see, I say, what they are doing in this act and under the provisions of this bill for the farmer's benefit. Here they had an opportunity to care for the farmer's interest. What have they done?

Under this bill they reduce wool from 11 cents per pound under the McKinley law and place it on the free list. They reduce horses from $30 a head under the McKinley law to 20 per cent ad valorem under this. They reduce the tariff on mules from $30 per head under the McKinley law to 20 per cent ad valorem. They reduce cattle from $10 a head under that law to 20 per cent ad valorem under this. They reduce sheep from $1.50 a head to 20 per cent ad valorem. Hogs from $1.50 a head to 20 per cent ad valorem.

Barley, that great crop which, before the McKinley law went into effect, the former law permitted the importation of over $11,000,000 worth in one year, and since that law, less than half a million dollars' worth—what have they done with reference to barley; and what does my distinguished friend from Nebraska do for the barley-raisers of his State, which adjoins mine and has the same conditions, and, as he knows, they have few if any better crops in their State than barley. They reduced it from 30 cents a bushel to 20 per cent ad valorem; buckwheat, from 1 cent per pound to 20 per cent ad valorem. You see that these are all farm products I name. Every farm product of any considerable importance is reduced under this bill, I think, without a single exception.

But I go on with this table. Corn is reduced from 15 cents per bushel under the McKinley law to 20 per cent ad valorem; oats from 15 cents a bushel to 20 per cent ad valorem; cornmeal from 20 cents per bushel to 20 per cent ad valorem; rye from 10 cents a bushel to 20 per cent ad valorem; wheat from 25 cents a bushel to 20 per cent ad valorem; beans from 40 cents a bushel to 20 per cent ad valorem; potatoes from 25 cents a bushel to 10 cents a bushel; onions from 40 cents to 20 cents a bushel; peas, dried, from 30 to 20 cents a bushel; vegetables in their natural state from 25 per cent ad valorem to 10 per cent ad valorem; hay—and in the great Northwest we have enough hay to supply the world; they give the Canadians across the line from our States the opportunity to come and drive out our haymakers and allow millions of tons of our hay to rot on the ground. What do they do for hay?

Hay is reduced from $4 per ton to $2 per ton; hops from 15 cents a pound to 8 cents a pound; butter and substitutes therefor from 6 cents to 4 cents; poultry from 3 cents to 2 cents; poultry, dressed, from 5 cents to 3 cents; apples, green or ripe, from 25 cents per bushel to the free list; bacon and hams from 5 cents to the free list; beef, mutton, and pork from 2 cents to the free list; eggs from 5 cents a dozen to the free list; lard from 2 cents a pound to the free list; milk from 5 cents per gallon to the free list; broom corn from $8 per ton to the free list; straw from 30 per cent ad valorem to the free list; cider from 5 cents per gallon to the free list.

This is the record of the Wilson bill for the farmer. This is what it offers to the farmer, and I say that it smites the farmer hip and thigh upon every article that he produces.

INCONSISTENCIES OF THE BILL.

I desire for a moment to call attention to the argument offered to the wool-growers of the country. The committee say in their majority report that they are to furnish manufacturers with free wool, in order, as they say, that the general public may have cheaper clothing. And then, as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] very emphatically announced the other day in his argument, they turn around immediately in the next breath and tell us, the wool-raisers of the United States, that we are to have a better price for our wool than we have under the present law.

Now, how is that? How can you tell the people of the United States that you are putting wool upon the free list in order to give them cheaper clothing, and then turn around in the next breath, as you do in this majority report, and tell us, the wool-raisers of the country, that we will have a better price for our wool than we have at present?

These two propositions are utterly inconsistent. If clothing is to be cheaper, as is promised by the committee, as the result of the passage of this bill, which is made the excuse for putting wool on the free list, then it follows as a matter of course that the wool-raisers must take a smaller price for their wool. Certainly there can be no denying this proposition.

It means this, you can not escape it; and it means to rob us of a fair price for our wool and mutton, and in this bill they do so rob us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have in my State, and in the country north and south and west of there, one of the greatest sheep-raising sections of the Union. We have a particularly well-suited climate for wool growing.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

We have particularly nutritious grasses that cure upon the ground, and when they are not covered by snow furnish good pasturage for horses, sheep, and cattle the year round. We have artesian wells, the greatest in the world, supplying water, flowing from one to four thousand gallons per minute, throwing the water 50, 75, and 100 feet into the air, affording the cheapest and greatest power there is in the country. We desire to raise wool there. We, the people of South Dakota, and the farmers whom I represent, desire to furnish our portion of the sixty millions of sheep that are yet lacking in the United States to supply the people with what they consume of wool and mutton. We want to raise our portion of these sixty millions sheep. We want to produce our part of that wool and mutton, and we want to manufacture it in our midst, because we have the power so to do.

WILSON BILL DESTROYS NATURAL ADVANTAGES.

But the Wilson bill destroys every natural advantage that that country affords us. We know that we are to be driven out of the wool industry. We know that we can not compete with the wool-raisers of these other countries, as has been well said here; our people can not compete with Australians, South Americans, and South Africans; they are a much cheaper people than our free Americans; and, whereas, Mr. Chairman, since the passage of the McKinley bill in my State our sheep have trebled in number, yet since this question became agitated, and the passage of this bill was promised, the sheep-raisers have become despondent and are going out of business, and are despairing of any hope from this source of income.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PICKLER. Under the five-minute rule I will be glad to answer the gentleman, but I can not now, as my time is too limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. PICKLER. I will be glad to talk to the gentleman under the five-minute rule. I would not be surprised if gentlemen coming from Texas should find their consciences hurting them a little when they think about this wool schedule.

Mr. CRAIN. In view of that remark the gentleman ought to allow me to ask him a simple question.

Mr. PICKLER. I will later. I want to ask you gentlemen on the other side of this House, if this proposition is true that by putting wool on the free list, or giving manufacturers free raw materials, if that is to cheapen clothing and other articles of consumption, I want to know why it is that you select the farmer to bear all the burdens?

Why do not you distribute them? How is it that you say to the farmer and to the millions of farm laborers throughout this country: "We will protect the Eastern manufacturers; we give the wool manufacturers," as the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia] puts it "forty dollars on the hundred yet;" and if that be so, why is it that you protect these industries while you make the farmers bear all the burdens by putting his products on the free list and protecting all others? Why do not you equalize this matter in some respect? Why do not you give to the farmer some reduction and some reduction to the manufacturer, instead of giving it all to the manufacturer and nothing to the farmer?

The farm laborers in this country number 9,000,000 of people, and including those who are dependent upon them number 35,000,000 of our population; and you strike every interest possible in this bill. In the year 1889, before the McKinley law and with an insufficient tariff, there was imported into this country of farm products over $125,000,000, every item of which should have been produced by our own farmers. I submit the items.

More than one-sixth of the $745,131,652 worth of imports during the fiscal year 1889 was made up from commodities coming in immediate competition with the products of American farms, viz:

Animals and meats	$14,010,498
Cotton	1,194,505
Dairy products	1,250,922
Fruits, other than tropical	8,794,272
Flax seed	3,851,685
Grains, hay, hops, etc.	9,252,912
Rice	3,499,437
Skins, other than furs	25,127,750
Tobacco	10,868,526
Wool	17,974,512
Vegetable fibers	20,468,475
Vegetables	3,637,301
Miscellaneous	5,151,650
	125,082,148

This excludes sugar, spices, raw silk, dyes, wines, and numerous other articles, of which many are grown in the United States.

KICK THE FARMER DOWNSTAIRS.

This majority of the Ways and Means Committee, it seems to me, have called in the several classes before them. They have called the importers in before them, the manufacturers of woolen goods, and perhaps the glove manufacturers and shoe manufacturers; and this committee had before them also the farmer. They have called them in and said, "Just stand up, gentlemen, and we will dispose of you." The importer says, "I want a lesser duty so that I may sell more goods." They say to him, "Come up higher. You advance three steps to the front." Then they say to the woolen manufacturer, "Stand back a little," and they jostle him a very little, and they do the same with the glove manufacturer and other manufacturers.

Then it comes to the farmer's turn. They take him by the throat and back to the back door and kick him downstairs and into the alley. I defy anyone to say that this is not the treatment this bill affords the farmer. That is what they have done to the farmer. Then comes to the bruised farmer the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], with a ball of binding-twine under his arm and rolling a barrel of salt and saying to the farmer, "We will give you free twine and salt." That is the promise they give to the farmer. It seems to me, gentlemen, unfair, unjust, and not right that you should, in carrying out what you say is this great reform, to the Northern and Western farmers especially, to make him bear all the burdens which you do in this bill. Should he, in order to have cheaper clothing, bear the brunt for all the 70,000,000 of these people? Should not the burden be distributed? Why have you made him bear it alone?

CANADIAN PRODUCTS.

I am speaking of what I know, as I live only 200 or 300 miles from the British Possessions; and I say that in this bill you are inviting the horse-raisers of those provinces, the wool-raisers of that country, the poultry-raisers, their butter-makers, and the producers of all articles of farm products they there produce, the vegetable-raisers of Bermuda, the onion-raisers of Spain and Egypt, and all of those foreign countries, and especially those producing wool, to pour their agricultural products into this country and into my State, and drive us out of the business. You have put in a few ad valorem duties here upon a few farm products, but there is not an iota of protection in any of them. It is virtually free trade for every one of the products of the farmers of America.

Oh, you select some articles, talk of the tariff on same, and say protection does not help the farmer any. Then, if it does not help or hurt him, why make any reduction in the duties that are given for the benefit of the farmer? Why put him on the down grade? Why did you not give him the protection he has in the McKinley bill? He asks it, even under your own theory, if it is of no value. This theory of free trade does as a theory, but the farmers in my State, living at no great distance from the British Possessions, know that it is disastrous.

PROTECTION GIVES THE FARMER BETTER PRICES.

It is not guesswork with the farmers of my State. They know that since the McKinley bill was passed they have received better prices for their barley, for their flax, for their horses, for their wool, for their potatoes, for their eggs, their butter, and other articles, than their neighbors across the Canadian line have received. That they know, and no theory can displace the knowledge of this fact in their minds.

We know these things to be facts, and this theory that protection does not help the farmer is regarded a fallacy beyond all doubt in our State. We know that it does; and then, beyond that even, from your own standpoint, if protection to farm products does not give a cent better prices, which it does, there is this point to it: Every horse that a Canadian sells in this country prevents the sale of a horse by an American farmer, and I desire to call attention to the admirable list the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] furnished in his able speech the other day, as to some articles. He shows that the number of horses imported were 62,411, on an average a year for five or six years before the passage of the McKinley law. I see it in evidence before the Committee on Ways and Means that one man states that from Mexico alone there were driven across 250,000 Mexican horses annually. Undoubtedly the large share of these horses came into this country without paying any duty, thus defrauding the horse-raisers in this country as well as the Government of the revenue.

We ought to supply the horses that are used in this country. Our farmers ought to raise these horses, and if we get no more out of protection, it is a great advantage to us to furnish this sixty thousand to one hundred thousand horses annually, and it would give us the market of this country for our horses. Every Mexican or Canadian who sells a horse to our people deprives the farmers of this country of the sale of that animal. So every steer, sheep, hog, bushel of barley, flax, or potatoes furnished by a foreigner prevents our farmers from furnishing these articles. What do you put in this bill on horses? Twenty per cent ad valorem. It is in evidence before the Committee on Ways and Means that that duty, 20 per cent ad valorem, was enforced before the McKinley law and that it amounted to $2 on the horse. The duty of $2 on a horse, as you fix it in this bill, is an insult to every horse-raiser of the United States. Two dollars a head protection; what a humbug!

Of cattle there were imported 88,000 head annually on an average before the passage of the McKinley law. We have the territory, we have the grass, we have the facilities for raising these cattle; and our farmers are anxious to produce these horses and sheep and cattle, and all these other products, and sell them as a livelihood, but by the passage of this act, you nullify every advantage we have to so do. It is a great injustice, great hardship, and a great detriment to my constituents, and I protest against it.

Your pretense for this onslaught upon the farmer is that you want the manufacturer to have free raw material. You destroy our wool industry, you declare, to get cheaper clothing, and yet clothing is cheaper than it has ever been known in the history of the country. A man's all-wool, first-rate suit for less than $11. And while it is an admitted fact that the class of clothing worn by the farmer is not protected and is cheaper than in England, after thirty years of protection in this country the farmer's dollar buys more than ever before, while all of his products bring him a much better price than during any free-trade period.

FOREIGN COMPETITION.

You open our markets to people with whom they can not compete and you drive them out of the business. What are they going to do? What business do you propose that the wool-growers and the cattle-raisers and the horse-raisers of that country shall undertake after you have driven them out of the business in which they are engaged?

SIXTY MILLION SHEEP.

Take sheep. As I said before, statistics show that we need 60,000,000 more head of sheep in this country for our own consumption. We ought to raise them. We have the facilities for doing it, and does any gentleman here doubt that it would give a great impetus to trade in every line if we were producing those additional 60,000,000 of sheep in this country, with the enormous amount of money they would yield?

TWO TAILORS.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] argued very eloquently the other day as to what a great advantage it would be for the farmer in this country to have a tailor making a suit of clothes on this side of the water and another one making another suit of clothes in England in opposition to the American, so that the farmer might have two bidders for his wheat instead of one. Now, the farmers in my part of the country would rather have both those tailors near them. [Laughter.] We would rather have them both at our own doors and furnish us a market at home for our products. We want them for their society; we want them to help to pay the taxes in this country while they are making the clothes; to help to build our schoolhouses and our churches, and to develop our great country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There would be just as much competition between them, so far as the consumption of wheat is concerned, if both the tailors lived in this country. [Laughter and applause.] And if we had them with us we would save the transportation on our wheat to England and on the tailor's goods to this country.

My distinguished friend from Nebraska, my neighbor [Mr. BRYAN], is willing, as I understand, to destroy the sugar factories in his State. He is willing to destroy our sheep-raising and horse-raising out in that country by the passage of this bill. I do not know what the will of his constituents in Nebraska is, but I do know that just across the line in my State the farmers are solidly opposed to this bill. I had a letter a few days ago from the president of the agricultural college of my State, Dr. Lewis McLouth, saying that before the fear about this bill came up they had had men from the East looking to that country for places to locate beet-sugar factories, but that since the agitation of this Wilson bill those parties had declined to consider any proposition whatever.

Mr. BRYAN. Just before the elections of 1880 and 1890 nearly every town in Nebraska had similar propositions.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, my friend, is it not your duty to encourage such propositions and such enterprises?

Mr. BRYAN. But after the election they all disappeared.

Mr. PICKLER. Ah, they did not. Has the one at Norfolk disappeared?

Mr. BRYAN. No.

Mr. PICKLER. Are you not, as a Nebraskan, proud of that enterprise?

Mr. BRYAN. I am proud of anything that stands on its own feet, but——

Mr. PICKLER. Then why do you undertake to cut it down? I tell you, my good friend, you absorbed too much free-trade doctrine when you lived farther East. [Laughter.] You know that you propose to destroy that beet-sugar manufacture. You know that those people fear that.

And you know further, if the bounty of the present law were continued, these factories would spring up all over our countries specially adapted to the business, giving employment to tens of thousands of farm laborers, and saving scores of millions of dollars to this country that now goes abroad for sugar.

PROTECT NORTH AND WEST.

You know that you are going to destroy our wool industry out there. I tell you I think that it is most emphatically the duty of men in that portion of the country to protect the interests of the people there, and I submit to the gentleman from Nebraska that while the South was getting free cotton ties, and while he was consenting to the retention of the bounty on sugar, and while the Southern farmers were getting a high tariff on rice the farmers of the North and the West ought to have had some consideration. I want it understood that I do not envy the Southern farmers a particle; on the contrary, I am glad that the farmers in some part of the country are getting something out of this bill; but I repeat, I think that while the gentleman was agreeing to those things it was his duty to have stood, at least to some extent, for the interests of the farmers of his own section.

BINDING TWINE.

Mr. BRYAN. Will you help us to put binding twine on the free list?

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, I voted for free binding twine long ago in the McKinley bill, and I voted for it at that time, believing then, as I believe now, that it did not amount to a row of pins as far as saving the farmer anything was concerned. What is the history of binding twine? Its price was 14 cents in 1890, and in the McKinley law we put a duty of seven-tenths of a cent a pound upon it, and the result was that it sold for 11 cents the next year, 3 cents lower than before the McKinley law. I was coming to that subject. I know that is the bait that you throw out to the farmers. The majority say in their report to the farmers of the country, "We have given untaxed agricultural implements, binding twine, free salt, and untaxed cotton ties"—the latter with an explanation. That is, after all this tearing down of the interests of the farmers that I have been detailing, you promise to give them this. What does it amount to?

FREE AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Free agricultural implements; what does that amount to? It amounts to nothing. The price of agricultural implements is only about one-third of what it was ten years ago. A binding machine that cost $330 ten years ago costs now only $115. The

patents on those inventions have expired and our home competition puts the price as low as the manufacturers can afford. Therefore there is nothing whatever in that. Even if the tariff upon agricultural implements, reapers, binders, mowers, and other machinery was all a tax it would not amount to $2 a year to the average farmer. A binder, reaper, and mower will last ten years with ordinary care and two or three farmers will use it.

There is nothing whatever in this free agricultural implement proposition. It is a shadow without a reality. And while history shows that binding twine was lower after the McKinley tariff than before, even if the seven-tenths of a cent per pound under that bill had been so much tax added to the price, what would it cost the ordinary farmer farming 80 acres?

I want to say to my good friend from Nebraska that any ordinary farmer would lose more under your bill on a dozen chickens he may raise than you can possibly save him on free binding twine. [Applause.] He will lose more under your bill upon one good sheep annually than you will save him annually by making binding twine free. This is a fact; the figures will demonstrate it. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the farmers in my State are now largely using headers, and thus dispensing with binders and binding twine.

This talk about lightening the tax on binding twine and agricultural implements does not amount to anything substantial to the farmer; it is mere claptrap.

SALT.

Then the gentleman from Nebraska comes rolling his barrel of salt, and says, "We put salt on the free list for the benefit of the farmer." Now, salt costs 40 cents a barrel with the barrel thrown in, and our farmers do not care to have salt cheaper than that—it will be no cheaper than that. No ordinary farmer uses more than a barrel of salt a year. If he uses more than that he has a large amount of stock for which he requires salt; and on every head of stock he loses more by your reduction of tariff in this bill on stock than he would lose by the duty on salt in ten years.

NOTHING FOR THE FARMER.

There is nothing in what you offer to the farmer. Everyone of your changes in the farm schedule helps to ruin us. You put upon the free list or reduce the tariff so low that it is no benefit upon everything in which the farmer is interested in having a market.

UNFAIR TO THE WEST.

Gentlemen, it is not fair to the great West to treat us in this way. In that region are the homes of your sons and daughters who are coming among us to build up that great country. We do not deny that you ought to have equitable protection in the East: but we say that you ought to treat us fairly. The pioneers in the Western country have great hardships to endure. We are battling there for the development of that country so as to make it an honored part of this great American Union. The farmers, because they are weak, ought not to be trodden upon.

I call upon Democratic members from the North to beware of what they are doing. We can not always stand the treatment we have been receiving. Within the last few years we have been deprived of millions and millions of dollars by the putting of hides on the free list while protecting your leather and shoe manufacturers in the East. In this way the interest of the East has been cared for at the expense of the West. Now, you propose to drive us out of the wool business, because such a measure will conduce to the interest of the manufacturers of the East directly, and, as you claim, indirectly to the people. This is unjust to the people of the great West. It is unjust to the young men and young women who are developing that country.

YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN.

Mr. Speaker, my State is a State of young men and young women. The old men are few. We have young men and young women who left their Eastern homes to acquire homes in the great Northwest, brave, energetic, and determined. They are true pioneers, and the true pioneer is always courageous, hopeful, and persevering. They are building a State. They have many hardships, they undergo many privations, but this young population will develop a State and shape its destiny, an honor to themselves and an honor to the nation. They are entitled to fair treatment as an agricultural and mining community.

They are virtuous, deserving, and brave. We have room for hundreds of thousands more. With a soil unsurpassed in fertility, within twenty-four hours of Chicago, twelve hours of St. Paul and Minneapolis, fifteen hours of Duluth, all things considered we offer the cheapest lands and best facilities for raising stock and all cereals in the West.

They ought to have a fair chance; you owe that much to them. You do not give it to them in this bill. I defy my honored friend from Nebraska or any other gentleman to show a single article produced by the farmer, in reference to which he is not left in worse condition by this bill than he was before. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. TURNER of Georgia withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. GROSVENOR withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. COCKRAN withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Will there be a session of the House this evening for debate on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There will be—at 8 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will ask whether the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] will be recognized to address the House at the evening session?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] is on the list to speak to-night at 8 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to consume a single moment of my time in discussing the constitutionality of a protective tariff. I beg to notify my distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], whose able argument this morning was based mainly on the ground that there is no warrant in the Constitution for levying duties on imports with a view to the protection of American industries—that that question is closed, and that that proposition is not entitled to the serious consideration of any enlightened deliberative body in this country.

I beg also to remind the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], who has just addressed the House, and whose genius and oratory I always admire, that notwithstanding the assertions he has made, which his friends seem to accept as convincing arguments against the American protective tariff system, the fact, attested by thirty years' experience, is plainly seen looming up above the din and confusion of his fierce assault, that under the operation of that system we as a people have become a prodigy of growth, development, and prosperity in all the elements of national greatness and individual happiness, and a living wonder among the nations of the earth. [Applause.] Yet, in the face of this solemn, burning truth, these gentlemen and their Populist allies are asking us to support a measure now before us for our serious consideration and determination, formulated by the greatest committee of this House, proposing the ultimate if not the immediate overthrow of that beneficent system.

Mr. Chairman, if I could have my way I would change the title of the bill. Instead of "a bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—as the committee has designated it—I would characterize it as a bill to create a deficiency in the Treasury of the United States; to deprive thousands of American workingmen of the opportunity for employment; to reduce the wages of those who are already employed; to ruin the American farmer by the destruction of his home market; to wreck American industries for the benefit of foreigners, and for other kindred purposes. [Applause.]

If the Committee on Ways and Means had contented itself with the articles it had succeeded in retaining on the free list—such as acorns, fish bait, and balm of Gilead; such as guano, bologna sausage, and sauerkraut; as yams, mud turtles, and tobacco stems, and such other articles of prime necessity, in the estimation of the committee, as worm guts, or whip guts, cat guts, salted guts, and snails, the country might have survived the passage of this bill [laughter]; but unfortunately the committee's free list does not end with these items. As a strict partisan, I would rejoice to see this bill pass Congress as it has come from the committee and become a law without amendment, for following such passage, and at the expiration of its present lease of power, I can see the Democratic party step down and out of this Capitol into its open grave! [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, sir, as it is a question of meat and bread for the millions, viewing it from the standpoint of a citizen of the United States deeply interested in his country's welfare, and who would not seek party advantage at the price of his country's peril, I would kill this bill on the spot, as I would kill a deadly reptile. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I doubt if in all our legislative history a measure more unjust and productive of more harm to the country at large was ever presented for the consideration of Congress. I can not see how it could have been possible for the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means to have concocted a scheme of class legislation more complete and more effective.

If they had set to work, purposely, to make a sectional bill, they could not possibly have framed one more sectional in its operation and effects. Let me show you how it will work. It undertakes to raise revenue to meet the expenses of the Govern-

ment, and falls short of the accomplishment of that purpose by $75,000,000.

The distinguished speaker who just closed on the other side [Mr. COCKRAN] does not believe this statement, and argues that the revenues will be increased by it rather than diminished. If his position is correct, why is it that the Ways and Means Committee, to which he belongs, has decided to bring in a separate bill here taxing incomes, and is preparing bills looking to the levying of additional internal-revenue taxes upon our people, with a view to raising an amount sufficient to meet this enormous deficit?

Under the Republican plan duties levied on importations from abroad produced the larger part of our needed revenues. This bill shifts the burden of taxation from the shoulders of foreigners and places it upon the shoulders of our own people. As has been suggested by the minority report, under the pretense of affording encouragement to the manufacturer by giving him his raw materials free, it puts no tax at all on what goes into the mill or into the factory, but what goes out of the mill, out of the factory into consumption, is to be made pay all the taxes. Under the operation of this scheme of "free raw materials" the manufacturer is to be allowed to go scot free, while the consumer, who is also the producer, furnishing the "free raw materials," must pay all the taxes.

The manufacturer pays no taxes on what he buys, getting all of his materials free, but the people must pay all the taxes, or the equivalent of taxes, on all they purchase.

This is exactly the way this proposed law will operate. Now, I say that is not fair. The men who furnish the bulk of the raw material, as you Democrats call it in this country, are the men who furnish the wool, the wheat, the cotton, the lumber, the iron ore, and the coal. Who are they? They are the cotton-producers, sheep-raisers, farmers, lumbermen, iron-ore men, and coal men of the United States, more than one-half of our population.

The great bulk of these people and their interests are located in the South and West. Now, this bill legalizes all their products—their cotton, after it has been picked and put through the process of ginning; their wool, after it has been clipped from the sheep and washed; their wheat, after it has been harvested, thrashed, and garnered; their lumber, after it has been cut down in the forest and manufactured into the log; their iron ore, after it has been dug out of the hill and washed; their coal, after it has been taken out of the bed; their coke, after it comes from the oven—as raw materials, when in reality they are as much the finished product of the farmer, the mine owner, and lumberman as is the pick and the shovel and the hoe, the wool clippers and the cotton gin the finished product of the men who manufacture them.

Yet it is proposed to compel these farmers, lumbermen, iron miners, and coal dealers, to turn over to the manufacturer all these products as raw materials, free of duty, while, at the same time, a duty of 40 per cent is imposed on every product of the manufacturer into which these materials enter, thereby forcing—even according to Democratic theory—the producers of the raw materials, so called, to pay to the manufacturer 40 cents on every dollar's worth of goods they buy in order that he may have the benefit of protection.

But this is not all. The work of the men who manipulate the saws in our lumber mills is unprotected, while the work of the men who operate the machinery to plane and tongue and groove the boards as they are transferred from the saws to the planers under the same roof, is protected by protective tariff duties. Labor in the mills and factories of New England is not neglected by this bill—its interests are looked after by shrewd, alert, and watchful representatives. I congratulate the Democratic representatives of New England on their success in procuring what they regard as ample protection for their manufacturers and laborers. But what shall I say of Democratic Western and Southern representation here?

The fact is labor in the shops and factories of New England is protected by this bill, while the labor in the iron mines, coal fields, and other fields of the South and West is unprotected and left to the mercy of charity. I make no comment.

But my greatest objection to this bill is the fact that it is a sectional and not a national measure. It affords 40 per cent of protection for New England, and authorizes absolute free trade for the South so far as her chief staples are concerned.

The South must pay 40 per cent protection to New England on every article of woolen and cotton goods and other goods she buys, while she herself is left to revel in the anticipated glories of free trade in iron ore, free trade in coal, free trade in lumber, with "tariff for revenue only" on marble, "tariff for revenue only" on mica, free trade in wheat, free trade in wool, and free trade in cotton. The South must pay 40 cents on every dollar's worth of goods she buys as a tribute to the New England manufacturer, "protectionist," "monopolist," and Yankee, and that, too, without the slightest reciprocity.

But I do not desire to be understood in this connection as complaining of New England. Would to God this was a patriotic measure and treated all sections alike. [Applause.] I have no fault to find with New England. She deserves to be favored. I congratulate her. As a citizen of the Republic I am proud of New England, for she is the glory of a great nation. Who that loves man in his proudest type, in his grandest development of mind in science and in art, in the useful and in the beautiful; who that loves man in his sublimest appreciation of liberty and noblest manifestation of liberality, does not love New England! [Applause.]

And, sir, the great heart of New England throbs with sympathy, I know, and she is touched to tears, I am sure, as she beholds the ruined West and the stricken South—for patriotic as she is in her participation in all our national legislation, she has always "kept steadily in view the prosperity and honor of the whole country and the preservation of the Federal Union." [Applause on the Republican side.]

In addition to the serious injuries inflicted by this bill to many Western interests, by another bill which passed this Congress in its extra session, and for which the Democratic party will never be able to escape responsibility before the country, the greatest industry of six of the Western States was stricken down at a single blow, and now the Democratic party again steps to the front and proposes through this bill to lay its blighting hand on the chief industries of eight, if not all, of the Southern States.

Crushed down under a heavy burden of debt, individual, municipal, county, and State, the South was fast recuperating, and was on the high road to financial independence until the anticipated change in our industrial system caused a halt in her career of progress and locked fast her growing prosperity "in the paralysis of hard times." The announcement of the Democratic policy has been to the South as a cyclone, unroofing cities and laying low the forests, or as a blighting frost in June, nipping Southern flowers and withering Southern cotton. It has reduced all values within her borders 30 if not 40 per cent. Every interest has been touched by the blighting hand.

It has cut the price of her horses, mules, wheat, corn, cotton, mica, marble, copper, lead, zinc, iron, coal, lumber; it has cut her credit and the price of her real estate and driven into receiverships her principal industries, and her magnificent system of railroads into bankruptcy by the enormous cut in freights. Her working people who were making a decent living in the sweat of their face, and who were able to educate their children, are begging now in vain for work, and trembling lest they shall have to call on the county courts for help or hide themselves in the poorhouses. Thus bleeds the South at every pore. Gentlemen of the Democratic side of the House, what is the measure of relief you offer, what is the remedy you propose?

You say it is the Wilson bill. God help the South! In this hour of her greatest tribulation you propose to withdraw the helping hand of protection from her every industry, at a time she most needs help, and leave her to her fate—a fate which makes her people still the "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to New England and the great manufacturers of the North—whom you have always denounced as "protection sharks and monopolists"—monopolists and sharks grown up under the protective system, as you allege, and yet they are the only people on God's earth now you offer to protect at the rate of 40 per cent, and do protect at that rate by this bill, in the face of your stereotyped declaration that protection is unconstitutional, a fraud, and a robbery. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It has always seemed to me as it seems to me now, that the only hope of the South for present relief and for future prosperity is through the instrumentality of the pick and the shovel and the hoe—of the drive wheel and the spindle, the coke oven and the blast furnace—as well as the plow and the cotton gin! [Applause on the Republican side.] The Southern people must become manufacturing communities. The superior advantages nature has afforded in climate, soil, water power, forests, and minerals, and their necessities have so decreed.

Beginning in West Virginia and running southward far into Northern Alabama there is a body of coal 1,000 miles in length, including the Pocahontas lead, which as yet the hand of enterprise has scarcely touched. Lying on the south side of these immense coal fields and paralleling them all the way there are a succession of deposits and veins of iron ore, covering every variety, inexhaustable in supply and unexcelled in quality, and which only in recent years have begun to attract the attention of capital and enterprise.

In the section where I live these long parallel lines of hidden wealth are only separated by the valley of Eastern Tennessee, from 60 to 75 miles in width. Iron is king, coal is queen. Our

great hope has been that these two would meet and become joined together in our magnificent valley—

> Where healthful breezes ever blow,
> And coolest springs and rivers flow;
> Where yellow wheat and waving corn
> Are liberal poured from plenty's horn,

and thus together joined, fill it with boundless wealth and a million industrious, thriving, independent, and happy people. In addition to our iron and coal we expected to derive much benefit financially from our lumber and marble resources. We ship many millions of feet of lumber from my immediate section in almost all directions, but this bill ruins this industry, and the committee justifies its action in placing lumber on the free list on the ground that it "will delay the rapid destruction of American forests." I fail to see the wisdom of a policy which proposes to surrender our markets to foreigners in order that we may preserve our forests until the crack of doom; it may do future generations some good, but I can not see where the present generation is benefited.

The marble industry is a very large industry with us. The marble which decorates this Capitol comes from my Congressional district, but the cut in the rate of duty on foreign marble is so far below the point of protection in the pending bill that our marble men can not stand the foreign competition, and must suspend. Realizing this, I have been informed that some of the great derricks used to lift the immense blocks from the quarry to load them on the car have been actually draped in mourning by the proprietors and their quarrymen—signalizing, of course, the death of the marble industry.

The whole South is in possession of natural advantages of which no other country on the habitable globe can boast. She is blessed with every natural element above all peoples of the earth that enters into the growth, prosperity, and happiness of a country. And yet, industrially speaking, she is distressed, depressed, discontented, unhappy, wretched, prostrate!

Therefore, I say, the only possible hope for the Southern people is through the development of their natural resources—they must become a manufacturing people as well as an agricultural people. They must build up manufactures—and in building up manufactures, build up home markets for their agriculture—furnish opportunities for the employment of their idle labor—supplying their own market with the products of their fields, their mills and their factories, and sending those products to other markets in exchange for other commodities, and bringing back the golden eagles.

When the South reaches this point in her development—as she surely will some day, when tariff tinkering is abandoned—then will the day of her permanent prosperity dawn, then will she flourish as she has never flourished before; then will she become the garden and glory of America; the pride of the nation and the envy and admiration of all the world. [Applause.]

But pass this bill and you palsy the South.

In this great crisis, for one I stand here to-day and plead the cause of that generous, brave, magnanimous, and chivalrous people.

Gentlemen of the South, let me plead with you. It is your peculiar province just now to wield the scepter of power in these Halls and in this Government. You have hitherto taken pride in your devotion to Southern interests. Many of you wear honorable scars to-day in proof of your devotion to what you once believed was the true Southern cause. I appeal to you on this occasion to uphold and defend the true Southern cause of to-day.

Pass this bill, and you paralyze your country. Pass it with the duty reduced on pig iron from $6.72 per ton to $1.90 per ton, the lowest rate ever known in all our tariff legislation, and you endanger, if you do not destroy every Southern furnace. Pass this bill with lumber and coal on the free list, and you substitute the foreign for the native product—largely at least—close up many establishments to the injury of many laboring men, and surrender a part of our market—if not all of it—to Canada and Nova Scotia and other foreign lands.

Pass the bill with iron-ore on the free list and you at once substitute the foreign for the native ores, and enable Cuba, Spain, British Columbia, England, and even far-away Africa, through their cheap water transportation and low-grade labor, to capture the American market to the exclusion of Americans who ought to hold it and use it.

Pass this bill, and in the iron-ore industry alone you render unproductive if you do not destroy $110,000,000 of capital invested and drive out of employment 38,000 men.

Do this and you not only destroy the $110,000,000 of capital engaged in the iron-ore industry, but you turn out the 38,000 men who are engaged in this industry. You also render unproductive, if you do not destroy, the tens of millions of capital invested in every enterprise directly dependent upon the iron-ore industry of this country. Pass the bill and you do this——

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I do not like to be interrupted.

Mr. COX. I will not take your time, if it is a question of time. I desire to ask you this question: If you do not know it to be a fact that Tennessee and North Alabama are now producing iron at such a cost as to control the Eastern market upon pig metal?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. They may be at the present time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] allow me to make him a suggestion at that point?

Mr. COX. I am talking to my colleague; I do not want to interrupt him if it will consume his time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The freight on a ton of iron from Tennessee to the iron manufactories of New York is $4.40; the freight on a ton of pig iron from Glasgow is how much? It is less than half a dollar a ton.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I accept the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, and that is a complete answer to my colleague.

Mr. COX. I want to submit a word further, and that is if the gentleman does not recognize the fact that there is not a ton of pig metal sold in Pittsburg, the price of which is not regulated by Southern iron?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. But when you put——

Mr. COX. Now, then, one word more. If we can make iron and send it to New York, with nearly $5 a ton of railroad transportation on it, what is the trouble with our country down there, when, without any tariff, we can compete with anybody.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The $4 a ton duty.

Mr. COX. We are sending it there for a little over $4 a ton, and selling it in Pittsburg for less than they can make it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I can not yield any further.

It is a question of freight rates, but if you go ahead and put iron ore on the free list how long will the furnaces of Tennessee and Alabama be furnishing raw materials? You will be able to revive the 75 or 100 furnaces along the New England seaboard and the coast of New Jersey, where they can get free raw material and the cheap ore from foreign countries, dug by pauper labor and shipped as ballast, but when you do that you strike a death blow to the mines and the furnaces of our State and of Alabama. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, after all is said and done, the decree has gone forth that you must pass this bill. You will pass it under the whip and spur of party leadership. You will pass it under the influence of the party lash in the hands of your imperial master. [Laughter.] But the people of the United States will "repent in sackcloth and ashes" of having given you the power to do it. Four times have they repented as they passed through "the valley of the shadow of death," for four times have they passed through as many different periods of Democratic "tariff for revenue only" and free trade.

When you pass this bill the people of the United States will enter for the fifth time the dreaded valley, if, indeed, they have not already entered it; but they will profit by the "object lesson;" they will again repent. Through that repentance Republican "hope sees a star"—even in Tennessee! [Applause on the Republican side.] When we go down in the struggle here, as we doubtless must, by force of overpowering numbers, we will rise again and confront you in another field of conflict. [Applause on the Republican side.] It will be the open field, the field of our triumphant victory—our Austerlitz—and whoever our chosen leader is he will be our Napoleon!

We will then reëstablish on the ruins you have wrought the most beneficent, the most magnificent industrial system of all the ages—the American protective system. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] A system approved by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Webster, and Clay; upheld by Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, Arthur, and Blaine, and every truly great statesman and patriot of our country—living or dead. [Long and loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DRAPER. Mr. Chairman, I approach this tariff question from the standpoint of a business man, the nature of whose business has made it as necessary that he should make the tariff a study as that he should know the cost of the material he uses, or the prices at which he can afford to sell goods.

My living has come from a protected industry, in which my father and grandfather preceded me, and for nearly or quite seventy years the firm of which I am now a member has been in existence, paying 100 cents on the dollar to all creditors, through all the panics and under all the different tariff laws that have been in force in this country since 1820.

During the most of this time we have been in constant competition with manufacturers of similar goods across the water who have been and are able to compete, in all lines not patented, with American manufacturers, in spite of the amount of protection we have received.

I will say, further, that my business is building machinery for spinning and weaving cotton, and that the amount of protection on such machinery (45 per cent) has not been increased, the makers having neither asked nor received any increase of protective duties under the McKinley bill. Under the proposed bill the duty is reduced to 35 per cent.

Besides my immediate business, I have also been interested in the manufacture of cotton goods, and with others suffered serious loss from the lowering of duties on the finer grades of yarns, made on the recommendation of the Tariff Commission in 1883.

This practical knowledge and experience makes or ought to make me a fair judge of the effect of lowering tariff duties on industries with which I am acquainted; and, reasoning by analogy, on all protected industries where our manufacturers and their employés are now competing in our home market with foreign manufacturers and their employés.

Further than this, the prosperity or otherwise of the manufacturing classes affects in an equal degree the prosperity of the communities or States where manufacturing is the leading industry; and the number and importance of the manufacturing States, and of manufacturing interests in the other States, is so great that the whole country must prosper or suffer with them.

Now, a little more than a year since this country as a whole was prosperous as never before. Our manufactures, under sufficient protection, were not only flourishing, but increasing by leaps and bounds. Labor was in great demand and paid, not only in money but in what money would buy, more than ever before in this country, and double what similar labor commanded in any country whose goods competed in our markets.

Here let me put in a little personal knowledge bearing on the question of wages. I manufacture certain articles, duplicates or substantial duplicates of which are made in certain English shops.

They were invented in this country and introduced abroad, but not made here to be sold there, because that was impossible with our greater labor cost.

The proprietor of one of these English shops told me that his pay roll averaged a pound ($4.86) per employé per week. The average pay roll of the works in which I am interested was last year $2 per day or $12 per week; and these two shops are probably fair averages of those on corresponding work in the two countries. I will not dwell on this point, as this difference in wages is not now disputed by intelligent and candid free traders.

As before stated, the season of our greatest prosperity has substantially corresponded with the time of what is called the war tariff.

Rev. Edward Everett Hale, a man well known the country—nay, the world—over, made the following statement during the 1892 campaign:

If you make an estimate of the wealth of this country for the last two hundred and fifty years, and put it on one side, and then on the other the wealth that the country has gained since 1861, you will find that the increase of these last years is fivefold over the two hundred preceding. In other words, everything has been multiplied fivefold, and this during the rule of the Republican party. Physical wealth is not everything, however, but when, as in the present case, to physical wealth is joined a higher manhood, a higher morality, a broader system of education, and a higher average intelligence; when you can say this of a nation, you can say the greatest things that can be said of any nation. This is the result of this country's taking into her own hands her own interests and making the best out of them.

Dun's Review of Trade in December, 1892, said:

The most prosperous year ever known in business closes to-morrow with strongly favorable indications for the future. * * * For this year the volume of settlements through the clearing houses is the largest ever known. * * * The largest total of exports and imports ever known in any year. * * * Unprecedented purchases for consumption. * * * Manufacturers have made extraordinary progress. * * * The year closes with all woolen, cotton, and silk machinery fully employed and unsold stocks much lighter than usual, while the demand for the coming season already exceeds the capacity of many mills. Shipments of boots and shoes from the East have been 5 per cent larger than any previous year.

But perhaps neither Republican nor business authority will have much weight with our friends, so I quote from one of the best free-trade authorities, Mr. Edward Atkinson. In an article in the Forum for May, 1892, he says:

There has never been a period in the history of this or any other country when the general rate of wages was as high as it is now, or the price of goods relatively to the wages as low as they are to-day; nor a period when the workman, in the strict sense of the word, has so fully secured to his own use and enjoyment such a steadily and progressively increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product.

Perhaps even free trade American authority is insufficient, so I will add an excellent English authority.

Mr. Bryce, in his American Commonwealth, says:

With one interval of trade depression, it (the United States) has for twenty years been developing its amazing natural resources so fast as to produce an amount of wealth which is not only greater but more widely diffused through the populations than in any other part of the world, and the people allow themselves luxuries such as the masses enjoy in no other country.

I am perfectly aware that in spite of all this prosperity a party pledged to make a complete change in fiscal legislation has come into power.

I am also aware that in my section, at least, Democratic speakers and newspapers in the last Presidential campaign insisted that their party platform did not fairly represent the party view; that it was like the platform on a railway car—made to get in on, but not to stand on.

We were referred to the plank voted for by a large minority at Chicago as evidence that the party was divided on this issue, and it was also said that the rejected plank embodied Mr. Cleveland's ideas. The plank, you will remember, was in part as follows:

But in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government, taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice.

These arguments made some votes, or kept some in the party lines who would never have voted the ticket had they believed the platform promises were to be kept.

The most effective argument for Democratic success, however, in my section was the demagogic appeal to class prejudice.

It was said that protection was of benefit only to the very small class of manufacturers, those who owned or carried on establishments devoted to the production of articles upon which duties were levied in the tariff schedules.

On the one side, it was claimed, was the personal interest of these few men, and on the other side the interest of the great mass of the people of the country, including even the employés in the protected industries.

It was asserted that no matter how much protection was reduced, the reduction would simply be taken from the alleged immense profits of these manufacturers, and that they would continue to run their establishments and pay as high wages as before, because the labor unions would prevent reduction of wages.

Under these circumstances even the laboring men in the manufacturing States were to improve in condition, because they would get the same wages as before, if not more, while they would be enabled to buy articles of their own production, and of the production of other laborers, for less money, because of the reduction in prices which would come from lower duties.

The only difficulty with these statements was that they were not true, although perhaps the majority of the laborers in protected industries were misled by them.

The influence of partisanship on all these questions is unfortunate, and I suppose will not be avoided in this day and generation. We are too much inclined, as St. Augustine said, to "seek contention rather than truth." It should be our aim, as reasonable men, to discuss these public questions in a fair and candid spirit and after considering the arguments on both sides to make up our minds as to the proper policy to favor.

There is more unfairness of discussion on the tariff question than on almost any other, and I am thankful that, so far as I can see, much the greater part of it comes from the free-trade side. The profits of manufacturers are immensely overstated; wages double those paid in England are denominated as starvation wages; known and admitted differences between the condition of the mass of the people here and abroad are ignored; and all the arts of the demagogue are resorted to to stir up jealousy between employer and employed.

There is no difference of interest between classes on this question. It is either better or worse for all classes that factories should run here and that their number should increase; and it is a necessity of the case, if they do run, that there shall be a profit in running them, equal at least to the average profit of other business in the country.

A question for fair consideration is, Do manufacturers in protected industries make a larger percentage on their money than men who have invested in other lines of business—a percentage that can be substantially reduced and insure the carrying on of these industries in this country?

I have made some investigations on this point that I will come to soon, but I will first refer to matters of general knowledge.

Few if any of the great fortunes in this country have been made from the profits of ordinary manufacture.

They have been acquired in real-estate operations, in railroad building and management, in banking, in stock speculations, in trade, in the control of patents, and in various other directions in far greater number and amount.

Such as have come from manufacture are generally due to the control of some specialty, by patent or otherwise, and lowering the tariff would not necessarily affect them injuriously. It might even increase them by enabling their owners to manufac-

ture cheaper in England while retaining their selling prices in this country.

As corroboration of the above statements (if they need corroboration), I will read a quotation from authority that ought to have weight with at least one party in this House—Mr. Edward Bellamy, the author of Looking Backward. In a recent article in the New Nation he says:

Mr. John E. Russell, Democratic candidate for governor in this State, in his speech at Springfield, October 25, declared that the vast individual fortunes which of late have been piled up in these United States, are chiefly the results of the protective tariff, and were made by the manufacture of protected goods. It is lamentable that a public speaker should indulge himself in such a loose manner of talk. Of course Mr. Russell, as a man of at least average intelligence, must be aware that the accumulations he refers to have mostly been made by operations which depended in no way on the tariff. Their sources have been chiefly real estate, telegraphs, telephones, mining and petroleum, stock-watering and speculation.

You can analyze the origin of all, or nearly if not quite all, of the first grade of great American fortunes, including the Astor, Gould, Standard Oil and Bonanza mining groups, without coming upon a single one which was to any considerable extent, if indeed in any part, derived from a tariff-protected industry. There are a few considerable fortunes, such as Carnegie's, which have been drawn from protected manufacturing, but their list is very brief. Manufacturing is at worst a fairly honest business as compared with railroad, real estate, and mining speculation, and stock-watering, and does not offer the shortest cuts to wealth. A large number of fortunes have been doubtless made by manufacturers, but they are as a rule moderate in bulk and come nearer than most fortunes nowadays to representing real services to the community.

We care not a pin for the tariff; but the pretense that the tariff reform or free-trade party is in any way or sense devoted to the popular interest or opposed to plutocracy is a transparent lie, which ought to be nailed on every occasion. There are to-day more money and bigger fortunes arrayed for free trade than for protection, and the only reason that the money bags have not already carried the day and overthrown protection is that protection has had hitherto great strength with the wage-earning class, who, rightly or wrongly, have believed it for their interest.

New York City, the center of the moneyed interest of the country, is the center of the free-trade agitation. Among the newspapers of the great moneyed centers of the East, journals that chiefly represent capitalistic interests, for one that stands for protection you will find two that cry for free trade, or at least radical tariff reduction. And those of them, as a rule, which are most bigoted in their defense of every form of corporation abuse and capitalistic aggression are most passionate in their demands for free trade. How, for instance, do papers like the New York Times and Post strike you as champions of the people against the money power?

Brethren, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of hypocrisy."

Again, it is a matter of common knowledge that in all ordinary times a reasonably sure return of 6 per cent interest, yes 5 per cent, with the principal secure, will command all the money that is required for almost any legitimate purpose. If manufacturing stocks paid more than that, and were considered secure, even our free-trade friends would be building woolen mills and iron works, instead of trying to shut them up.

Still again, if there were a large margin of profit in manufacturing, coöperative production would be generally successful when undertaken, instead of being almost universally a failure.

All this is generally known to business men, but perhaps it is not fully realized by other classes in the community.

In that view, a few facts that I have gathered together may be of interest.

It is known that my State of Massachusetts is a manufacturing State. Over 300,000 people are employed in her shops and mills (when they run), and, in connection with the capital invested, they substantially support the rest of the inhabitants.

Now, anyone would naturally suppose that most of the millionaires in Massachusetts would be manufacturers, even if there was no protective tariff, and certainly if that tariff was of benefit to manufacturers only.

Such, however, is not the case. There are 46 individuals or firms in business in Massachusetts that were estimated a year ago by the commercial agencies to be worth a million dollars. Of that 46, 19, or less than half, are manufacturers proper; 20 are merchants; 4 distillers and brewers, and 3 bankers.

The manufacturing firms are divided in business as follows: Paper, 4; leather, 3; cotton goods, 2; woolen goods, 1; shoes, 1; machinery, 1; pistols, 1; jewelry, 1; chairs, 1; sugar refining, 1; chocolate, 1; pork-packers, 1; fertilizers, 1. Several of these lines of business are not generally supposed to be materially affected by the tariff, and the entire list shows very much less concentrated wealth derived from the profits of manufacturing firms than is commonly supposed. The wealth of men not in active business is not so easily estimated, but no one conversant with the facts can doubt that the general capitalists and owners of real estate in Massachusetts who possess more than a million dollars greatly outnumber the millionaires of both manufacturing and mercantile business combined.

I confess that I was astonished at the result of this investigation. I have carried it a little farther (as Massachusetts is a manufacturing State), and have made similar investigations regarding New York City, which is more particularly a banking and trading center, although there is much manufacturing there. There I find 181 individuals and firms in business that are said to possess over a million of dollars. Of these only 35 are manufacturers proper, 102 merchants, 25 bankers, and the rest are in sundry lines of business. These figures do not indicate that manufacturing yields larger profits than other lines of business, but, on the contrary, quite the reverse.

It may be said, however, that corporations are not included in this statement, which is correct. The profits of corporations, however, can be gauged by the amounts of dividends they pay during a term of years. More than a year ago, while no political campaign was pending, I made certain investigations on this point, which were printed in two or three magazines, and commented upon somewhat by the press, and no one has questioned the correctness of my calculations.

I took all the manufacturing companies in Massachusetts, whose dividends were payable in Boston or in Fall River, that were in operation the 1st day of January, 1882, and ascertained the market value of their stocks at that date.

I then found the entire amount of dividends that they paid in the ten years from January 1, 1882, to January 1, 1892, and also the amount of additional capital that had been put into those companies during the same time.

I then learned the selling value of the stock of all these companies on January 1, 1892.

By combining these figures, it is easy to ascertain what amount of interest on investment a man would have made who had bought the stock of all these companies January 1, 1882, and sold them on January 1, 1892, meantime paying in all the money that was paid in and receiving all the dividends that were declared.

The companies were 65 in number. I can give the detailed statement to any party who is interested to examine or criticise the figures; and, in fact, I think I will attach it as an appendix to these remarks, as it may be more interesting to read than to listen to.

These companies had an average capital for the ten years of $50,415,500; the selling price of the stocks January 1, 1882, was $70,324,725; the selling price January 1, 1892, was $58,601,883; the total dividends paid amounted to $31,140,163; and the amount of cash paid in was $6,135,000. Deducting the cash paid in from the dividends, leaves $2,500,516 per annum. This is equal to 4.86 per cent on the capital stock. The average selling price, ascertained as before, was $64,463,304. On this sum the average dividend was 3.87 per cent. The loss in value of all the stocks for ten years was $11,722,842. Deducting this from the dividend leaves $13,282,321, or 2.06 per cent per annum on the average value of the capital invested.

My list of 65 companies included 41 that had gone through the ten years with unchanged capitals, and 24 that had been unfortunate or put in additional capital during the same time.

Omitting the 24, the figures are somewhat better, and show what has been done by the average of the manufacturing companies that may be called successful.

The entire par value of their stocks is $37,078,000; the selling value of all their stocks January 1, 1882, was $55,496,350; the selling value of all their stocks January 1, 1892, was $44,490,883; the total dividends of all these companies for the ten years amounted $24,420,913.

This amount of dividend for ten years is equal to an average dividend of $2,442,091 per annum, or substantially 6.58 per cent per annum on the par value of the stocks of the above-named companies. I also find the above annual dividend to be only 4.88 per cent of the average selling price for 1882 and 1892, which is $49,993,616.

The change in value of manufacturing or other stocks may, of course, be said to depend in part upon the years selected for the comparison. If the selection of one year was during a particularly prosperous time, and the selection of the other year was during a panic, differences would appear which would not be normal.

If the valuation of to-day instead of January 1, 1892, had been taken, it is possible that all this business as a whole would have shown an absolute loss. I do not, however, consider the prices of to-day as normal, because they are unusually depressed from the uncertainty of the pending tariff legislation.

So far as general business is concerned, however, the year 1892 is reckoned as good as the year 1882, and the comparison of those two years would, in that view, appear to be a fair one.

Assuming this to be the case it is evident, from the figures of selling price at the two different periods, that these corporations, as a whole, have been paying out in dividends more money than they have earned during the past ten years, proper depreciation being taken into account.

But waiving this, as the average dividend paid, saying nothing about loss of value, was 3.87 per cent on the value of the stocks, it looks as though either these great corporations have been particularly unfortunate during the last ten years or that the profits of manufacturing are not so enormous that any substantial reduction in prices can be taken from them. The latter statement is undoubtedly the true one.

I have taken the average of industries, successful and otherwise, because with material at standard prices and labor at standard rates average results should be considered as a basis for argument rather than those exceptionally favorable or unfavorable.

Taking these averages as a basis, and taking into account also the facts that loans can be made on real estate even in New England at 4 to 5 per cent and that savings banks pay 4 per cent interest, it would seem that if manufacturing profit is to be reduced below present figures a large part, at least, of that business would go out of existence here.

But let us compare the manufacturing dividends of the last ten years with other dividends. I have taken for this purpose the dividends of sixty Massachusetts banks having an average capital of $52,755,000. The average dividend paid by these banks for the last ten years was 5.56 per cent on par or substantially 4.63 per cent on the average market value. This should be diminished by assessments paid to make up losses of $600,000 during the ten years, which is an average of $60,000 a year, or about one-tenth of 1 per cent. Deducting this would bring the average income of all this property for the ten years to 4.53 per cent.

Let us now take the railroads operating in New England, since in New England roads as a whole the stock represents money paid in, while in Western roads that is not always the case.

These roads (29 in number in 1882 and 36 in number in 1891) have an average capital of $126,530,600. The average dividends paid by them for the ten years was 4.88 per cent on par, or about 4.15 per cent on the selling price. Besides this, there have been extra dividends amounting to $2,079,020. Averaging this for ten years it comes to $207,902 a year, or about fourteen-hundredths of 1 per cent. Adding this to the amount divided would bring the average income of this railroad property for the ten years to 4.29 per cent.

The result of this comparison shows that the average investor in Massachusetts manufacturing stocks for the past ten years received 3.87 per cent per annum.

The average investor in Boston bank stocks has received an average of 4.53 per cent.

The average investor in New England railroad stocks has received an average of 4.29 per cent per annum.

It thus appears that for the last ten years either banking or railroading has been a better business for the investor than manufacturing; and that even under the circumstances existing before the present depression capital would not seek manufacturing, with all the advantage it might derive from the tariff, as readily as the other lines mentioned.

Now, following out my former argument, the average duties on goods similar to those manufactured by these companies are undoubtedly as high as the average of tariff duties on protected goods, which I understand to be about 50 per cent.

The annual production of these establishments, which embrace the cotton and woolen manufacture, bleacheries, belting, and machinery, is substantially the same as the amount of capital invested in these lines of business.

In the cotton manufacture, according to the last census, the entire annual product is only 76 per cent of the capital invested, but in the other lines the annual production would exceed it. The annual production, therefore, being substantially the same as the amount invested, any percentage taken from the selling price of goods must result in the same percentage of reduced profit or of actual loss on the invested capital unless the cost of production is also reduced.

Under these conditions, which indicate that a reduction of 5 per cent in competing lines would more than sweep away the entire profit of these establishments if no change were made in wages, it surely does not appear that the average manufacturer is a substantial beneficiary from the tariff, except so far as it is a benefit for him to invest his money at the ordinary rate of interest.

The benefit comes, first, to the country, from the diversification of industry, which everybody agrees is essential to a strong and prosperous people.

Daniel Webster put this great truth more forcibly than I can in his last protection speech, July 25, 1846:

> The interest of every laboring community requires diversity of occupations, pursuits, and objects of industry. The more that diversity is multiplied or extended the better. To diversify employment is to increase employment and to enhance wages. And, sir, take this great truth; place it on the title-page of every book of political economy intended for the use of the Government; put it in every farmer's almanac; let it be the heading of the column in every mechanic's magazine; proclaim it everywhere and make it a proverb, that where there is work for the hands of men there will be work for their teeth. Where there is employment there will be bread. It is a great blessing to the poor to have cheap food, but greater than that, prior to that, and of still higher value, is the blessing of being able to buy food by honest and respectable employment. Employment feeds and clothes and instructs. Employment gives health, sobriety, and morals. Constant employment and well-paid labor produce, in a country like ours, general prosperity, content, and cheerfulness. Thus happy have we seen the country. Thus happy may we long continue to see it.

In the second place the benefit comes to the mechanic and laborer, who have been enabled to receive wages far above those received by men engaged in similar occupations in other countries. If manufacturers are to receive interest at all—and there is no inducement for them to do business without it—any reduction of the tariff that renders necessary a reduction of prices of manufactured goods in this country must be met by reductions of wages to substantially the same amount.

The present disturbances in the manufacturing industries are a sufficient corroboration of my statements. Mills are stopped because a large part of the goods ordinarily produced are made in advance of orders for sale at certain seasons of the year. Now, no one but an idiot, or a wild enthusiast, would think of piling up goods, at present cost, when the selling price is to be reduced by act of Congress, and when it is still uncertain what selling price is to be fixed. Those receiving absolute orders can, and will undoubtedly fill them; but even such concerns must run from hand to mouth if they wish to avoid loss and failure.

The reductions of wages that have already commenced, and that are generally accepted by the laborers as a necessity, are simply a preparation for the coming change; and the amount of reduction necessary can only be fixed when the amount of tariff reduction to which the dominant party is pledged is definitely crystallized in the form of law.

Of course the changes proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of this House are embodied in the bill under consideration; and, although they are bad enough, it is evident that the proposed legislation is not the purely revenue tariff called for by the Chicago platform. For purposes of raising revenue, in fact, it is admittedly less valuable than the present McKinley bill.

For the measure of protection left the country should be thankful, and far be it from me to attempt to remove or lessen this protection by any accusation of inconsistency. It is better for you gentlemen on the other side of the House to be somewhat inconsistent than to pass legislation that would destroy instead of injure a large part of our industries, or reduce our wage level to that of England, instead of an average reduction of perhaps 25 per cent.

One thing, however, the country has a right to demand of you and the party that you represent, namely, that you shall yourselves respect the scale of duties you now propose for ten years, at least, if they are embodied in law.

Without this assurance business will be uncertain, new enterprises will be checked, and our prosperity will be retarded more than it would be under a worse tariff, that could be considered secure against further reduction.

There would be this advantage in absolute free trade, that after conditions were adjusted to it there could be no further depth to be sounded.

I shall be glad to hear all the assurances possible on this point, and feel sure that the entire business interests of the country, including importers and traders as well as manufacturers, will agree with me.

The change of duties proposed by the committee from specific to ad valorem means simply opening the door to fraud, and making the collection of all duties, either from a protective or revenue standpoint, uncertain.

Statesmen of both political parties have pointed out the evils and dangers of the ad valorem system in the past, but I will take time to quote only two.

In 1842 James Buchanan, on the floor of the Senate, said:

> I am not only opposed to any uniform scale of ad valorem duties, but to any and all ad valorem duties whatever, except where, from the nature of the article imported, it is not possible to subject it to a specific duty.

In 1846 Daniel Webster, presenting also an argument before the Senate, said:

> It has been the experience of this Government always that the ad valorem system is open to innumerable frauds. What is the case with England? In her notions favorable to free trade has she rushed madly into a scheme of ad valorem duties? Sir, the system of ad valorem duties is not free trade, but fraudulent trade.

On the authority of the financial column of the New York Mail and Express it appears that the experience of all other nations has induced them to levy specific rather than ad valorem duties.

According to this authority, "England has 38 duty items, all specific; France, 619, all specific; Austria-Hungary, 357, all specific; Russia, 440, all specific; Sweden, above 300, all specific; Norway, about 500, all but six specific; Spain, 369, all but one specific."

It thus appears that the Ways and Means Committee propose a plan of collecting revenue which is discredited by our former experience and by the practice of all other nations.

It would seem that neither a protective nor revenue tariff is aimed at, but a tariff for the benefit of the fraudulent importer.

Considering the bill as it is, I will not attempt to go through

the schedules now, but hope to refer to several of them when they are considered later.

I will now simply say that the bill makes heavy reductions in the cotton, wool, iron, stone, jewelry, and other schedules in which my district, in common with many others, is greatly interested.

The manufacture of these articles in fact supports the larger part of the people I represent, directly or indirectly, as before said. The duties on all have been reduced, and on some, like cotton yarns and fine cotton and woolen goods, disproportionately reduced.

All these reductions of tariff mean reduction of wages and probable decrease in the development of industry.

In lines where the duties are to-day needed for protection, where foreign producers compete to-day under present duties, a lessening of duty will lower the wholesale price of foreign goods. This done, American prices must be lowered to correspond, or American producers go out of business.

I believe the former will be the alternative in most cases, though some weak concerns may fail or retire, and some industries may be destroyed by disproportionate reductions. The great mass of our industries are too firmly established, however, and on too large a scale, to be crushed out by the reductions proposed, or even by absolute free trade.

If the prices of our home products are lowered by act of Congress they must be produced cheaper if they are to be made here at all; and they are pretty certain to be cheapened in the way foreign goods are made cheap—by low wages.

Give the American manufacturer foreign wages, and he will fear no foreign competition.

It may be said that our workmen will not accept lower wages; that their unions will keep them up. To this I say that trade unions may keep up or raise wages when there is a profit made from hiring the labor they control; but there is no union—no government even—that can force men for any great length of time to carry on a losing business.

The inevitable will be recognized, and perhaps, after some friction, be submitted to; and business will go on, with the laborers permanently degraded, unless by the exercise of their right of suffrage they change the party in power and undo what is now being done.

Let it not be supposed either that the wages in these special trades will be lowered and other wages remain the same, or keep up the advance of recent years. To quote a motto of one of the labor organizations, "The injury of one is the injury of all;" and they will all be likely to learn the practical truth of this statement if free-trade legislation prevails.

All movements for shorter hours, or other ameliorations of the laborer's condition, would be stopped temporarily or permanently, and the hand of human progress be turned back on the dial.

Farmers and other alleged unprotected producers would lose by the lessened consumption of the wage-earners, and the consequent loss of market, quite as much as they would save in the lessened price of manufactured products, which after all might not be so much lessened at the retail store.

I have noticed that retail prices for such manufactured goods as are consumed by the masses are substantially as high in England as in this country, in spite of the present tariff. Witness cotton cloth, ready-made clothing, boots and shoes, and railway fares and freights, which is where the duty on steel rails and other articles entering into the construction or operations of railroads hits the people.

It may be said that even if the wages of our mechanics and operatives are reduced, or if, taking the other horn of the dilemma, many of them are thrown out of employment by the stoppage of factories, they ought not to find fault, since this present so-called tariff reform Administration was elected by their votes, or at least that it could not have been elected without them. It may be noticed, however, that they seem to have changed their minds quite largely at the recent election.

Well, gentlemen, if these men trusted you, do not betray them. You can better afford to disappoint the doctrinaires than the laboring men. If you could waive all legislation on this subject your lease of power might be a long one, while if these reductions are persisted in, and the result of lessened employment and lower wages continues and follows, as seems to me inevitable, your control of the Government will be short, and deservedly so.

My argument so far may seem to be made almost exclusively from the manufacturing or Eastern standpoint. This is natural, as I am a Representative of an Eastern district largely engaged in manufacturing. I wish, however, to call attention to the importance of New England as a customer for all the other sections of the country, and I can not do it better than by reading a quotation from a recent statement of Hon. William C. Lovering, of my State, before the Ways and Means Committee:

> It is not frequently considered how important to the country as a whole is the prosperity of New England and the full employment of its vast army of people engaged in manufactures.
>
> While there is no other section of the country so densely populated as New England, there is also no section which produces so small a proportion of the articles needed to support life and to carry on manufacture. With three-fourths of the spindles of the country, it produces not a pound of cotton, but consumes one-fifth of the cotton crop of the United States, and was thus a consumer of the South for this one article alone, in 1890, to the value of nearly $77,000,000. It grows less than 4 per cent of the wool grown in the country, but uses one-half of the total clip. It mines not a pound of coal, but uses not less than 10,000,000 tons yearly in its homes and factories.
>
> Of all articles of food for man and beast, it produces a sufficiency of hay and potatoes only, and is an annual customer of the West for not less than 3,000,000 barrels of flour. Manufacturing fully three-fourths of all the boots and shoes worn in the country, it is of necessity the purchaser of a very great proportion of the hides which are to be tanned into leather. Its beef and pork are not raised at home, but are imported from the West. It is dependent upon the Northwest and South for its supplies of lumber to build its houses and factories.
>
> In short, there is no other section of the country which is required by its lack of natural resources to draw upon other parts of the country for anything like so large a proportion of all that it must eat and wear and manufacture. In this respect it is even more startlingly dependent upon communities without itself than is Old England, which contains vast stores of iron and coal, and produces a very material part of its food, while New England is almost totally lacking in all these resources.
>
> The question is, whether it is desirable at this time to hazard the welfare of a community which, man for man, and family for family, consumes a larger part of all the products of the country than any other section.

As compared with Old England, New England is a far greater customer of the rest of this country per capita (the ratio being about 6 to 1), and figures that have been carefully prepared by Mr. Edward Stanwood indicate that her people, in spite of their smaller number, are larger buyers from the South and West than the people of England as a whole. Besides this, the injury or destruction of the New England market will not be compensated for to other Americans by a like increase of the foreign market, because most of the articles bought in New England principally from Americans are, and will continue to be, bought in Old England principally elsewhere. I refer particularly to iron, coal, wool, hides, salt, lumber, crockery and glassware, spirits, beer, and perishable food products.

Even for cotton and grain the New England market is secure for our countrymen, while England has other sources of supply, which she uses largely.

Further, as a New England Representative, I wish to say that I am not one of those protectionists that believes in protection for what he sells and free trade in what he buys. As a builder of machinery I believe that the producer of iron is as much entitled to protection as I am—in proportion to the disabilities under which he labors as compared to the foreign producer.

The same argument that sustains protection to woolens would give it to wool also, and the men who favor the one and not the other are, I fear, largely misled by selfishness, consciously or otherwise, and unenlightened selfishness at that.

Protectionists must stand together or fall separately.

I suppose this bill will pass as it is or amended in certain details.

There seems to be no way to settle this question for this generation, except by a trial of an alleged revenue tariff; and while I will not be responsible by my vote for bringing it about, I have no doubt of the result. The more of the free-trade principle there is in your bill, the more reason it will give when carried into effect for repudiating it and the party responsible for it.

As a partisan, therefore, I would say to my Democratic friends, pass your bill and take the consequences; but as a citizen, interested in the immediate prosperity of the country, as well as its future, I hope that wisdom will finally prevail in your councils, and the tariff be permitted to stand substantially as McKinley left it.

In closing, I desire to present the memorial of the Home Market Club, which represents the great mass of New England's industries, against the pending bill.

THE HOME MARKET CLUB'S MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The undersigned, members of the Home Market Club, a national association organized under the general laws of Massachusetts, with office at Boston, for the promotion of American industries, the investigation of political science and the dissemination of correct ideas concerning the same, respectfully represent that as individuals we are largely engaged in the manufacture and distribution of merchandise, and it is roughly estimated that our business in the aggregate employs, in prosperous times, not less than 2,000,000 of people directly, and about as many more indirectly. Having this large stake in the economic policy of the country, we believe that our opinions should have some weight with Congress in its work of revising the tariff, though it is impossible to state all the reasons for them within the proper limits of a petition.

First. Let us say that we believe protection should be the settled policy of this country.

Second. That it should be national in scope and impartial in application, the true rule being to protect every important domestic industry that is subject to foreign competition.

Third. That while duties should be reasonable and occasionally readjusted to correct errors and meet economic changes, they should be sufficient for both revenue and protection.

Fourth. That the doctrine of Jefferson, which was indorsed by Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, that industrial independence is as necessary to our happiness as political independence, and that it can be secured and maintained only by a protective tariff, is as true to-day as it was in the time of those great founders and leaders of the Democratic party.

Fifth. That the experience of our own and all other enlightened countries proves that whether a tariff be partly for protection or for revenue only, duties should be, so far as possible, specific instead of ad valorem, and that the laws for their collection, while avoiding unnecessary inconvenience to honest importers, should be framed for the rigorous discouragement of frauds upon the revenue and domestic industry.

Sixth. That we see neither justice nor expediency in depriving the finished products of the farmer and the miner of protection and leaving a measure of protection, however inadequate, upon the finished products of the manufacturer.

Seventh. That even if it were in the power of Congress to obtain for American producers free access to all the markets of the world, in exchange for a freer admission of foreign goods to the home market, the gain would be small in comparison with the loss.

Eighth. That nearly all foreign markets are barred against us by protective tariffs, and Congress has no power to open them except by reciprocity, and every concession of duties without consideration throws away the bargaining power of the nation.

Ninth. That in fixing duties reference should be had to present conditions rather than to the rates in former tariffs, for it is well known that modern improvements have largely overcome the natural barriers that afforded protection in the earlier years of our history, so that in many cases a duty of 50 or even 100 per cent is less protective to-day than one of 30 per cent in the time of Washington, or even as late as the day of Polk.

Tenth. That duties should be sufficient to offset the higher cost of labor, plant, interest, and incidentals in this country over the cost of those items in competing countries.

Eleventh. That the danger of high duties is more fanciful than real, because competition is sure in a short time to bring the price of the protected commodity into a fair relation with the prices of all other articles. The duty is not added to the price except when we are dependent upon foreign supply, and in such cases it is a fundamental principle of the protective policy to abolish the duty unless its continuance affords reasonable assurance of the timely development of an adequate domestic supply.

Twelfth. That the benefits of protection are not limited to the employments to which they are applied, but when conferred upon all that are exposed to foreign competition they diffuse themselves by the sure working of economic laws equitably to all classes.

Thirteenth. That the profits of domestic manufacturers are not excessive. Statistics prove that in Massachusetts, where manufactures form the leading industry, their average profits are smaller than those of banking and transportation, though the risks are greater.

Fourteenth. That the United States set out to promote the happiness of the common people and declared this purpose in its fundamental law. It is beyond dispute that after a century of protection, prosperity is more universal here than in any other country. We believe this is chiefly due to the diversification of industries and the general employment of the people at high wages, which could not have occurred and can not be maintained without protection. Hence the tariff question has become almost wholly one of employment and wages, for under the free-trade system of Great Britain the customs revenue is as large per capita as that of the United States under the present tariff, and it would be easy to raise in this country as much by duties on imports as we raise now, without protecting a single domestic industry.

Fifteenth. That while in adjusting wages with our employés we are obliged to consider the rates of competitors whose goods are sold in the common market, we desire to pay all that the market will afford. Without claiming extraordinary consideration for humanity, we present the important business fact that the profit and stability of business depends upon the high purchasing power of the people. The more there is paid for labor, the more the wage-earners can buy, and the more efficient, as a rule, is their service. We shrink from the necessity of discharging old and trusted coworkers from employment or reducing their wages.

Sixteenth. That whatever change may be made, Congress ought to postpone the day of effect at least six months and in some cases at least one year from the date of passage, so that the ordinary courses of business may be as little interrupted as possible and opportunity may be afforded to conform to the new conditions of production and sale.

Seventeenth. That a bill, though professedly protective, which is accompanied by the declaration of its framers that it tends toward free trade and is designed to reach that goal, can not, in our judgment, restore confidence to business and revive industry beyond the small demand of immediate necessity. This tendency and purpose, therefore, are even worse than the pending bill, and as for the bill itself, we fully indorse the facts and arguments presented against it by the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means.

For these and many reasons pertaining to the intricacies of business, which can not be set forth here, but which we should be glad of an opportunity to explain to the appropriate committees of the Houses of Congress, we pray you to defeat the bill known as the Wilson tariff bill and to take more time for preparing a careful and scientific measure, by means of which the Treasury may be replenished and the depressed industries of the people may be revived.

Signed by the subcommittee appointed by the executive committee to prepare this memorial, at Boston, this 28th day of December, 1893.

WM. H. BENT,
O. H. SAMPSON,
ALBERT CLARKE,
Committee.

[Mr. WEADOCK addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, for the past thirty years the policy of the Government of this country has been American, and at no time until the advent of the present Administration has there been an opportunity for the party now in power to make the attempt to carry out its own peculiar doctrines in the establishment of policies or the management of the affairs of this country. During the past thirty years a broad, liberal spirit of patriotism has at all times pervaded governmental legislation, and the same spirit and disposition displayed by the hundreds of thousands of brave men who fought in the defense of the integrity of this nation during the war, and the same spirit of lofty self-abnegation which animated the families of those brave men has, ever since 1865, been manifest in the laws of this country in the protection they afford primarily to American labor and to the industries and development they have encouraged.

Under this wise system the inventive genius of the American people, always remarkable in fertility, has been stimulated and encouraged to a greater extent than has ever been the ingenuity of man before, and while labor-saving machinery has been invented, perfected, and adopted in all lines of manufacture during the past thirty years, so that one man, with the machinery he operates, performs the work that many men were required before to do, nevertheless such has been the increased demand for products that labor has not gone seeking employment, and under the stimulus of protection wages have constantly climbed the scale until never in the history of the world have laborers been housed, clothed, fed, and their children educated as have those who have been the wage-earners of the United States during the past three decades. Under this system wages have been increased wonderfully, and the burdens as well as the hours of actual labor have decreased correspondingly.

Since the beginning of this debate I have heard from out of the stores of wisdom from which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is in our midst, seems to draw as his occasion demands an attempted statement in effect that our great national growth, wealth, and increase in wages paid to the laborer had all resulted from the fact that the United States was a new country of unparalleled resources, and that the natural development of these resources had brought about the condition of great prosperity the people have enjoyed. While possibly no other one country in the world contains so great a variety of climate and production from field, forest, mine, and waters as does the United States.

Yet probably nearly all of these conditions exist in European countries separated only from each other by political boundaries, where problems of overcoming long distances in no way interferes with exchange of commodities, and where no protective tariffs impose serious barriers to interchange; and if the theories of free trade in all their perfection as theories were truthful in application, the conditions surrounding labor and the masses of the people in European countries would have certainly shown some of the beneficial effects claimed for it in this country in wages, development, and surroundings.

Russia, within the boundaries of the home country and her possessions, contains inexhaustible natural wealth in the fertility of her soil, her mines, forests, and the waters that surround the empire of the Czars, yet the people of that great country have never been visited by the affliction of high wages, which the eloquent gentleman from Illinois, who addressed the House during the afternoon of the second day of this debate, so eloquently and feelingly pictured the laboring man of this country to be suffering from, and even in that country where harvests repay the husbandman for his efforts so abundantly, the most wasting famines that the children of men have ever suffered from are frequent, and want, squalor, and misery always abound even in agricultural districts. No one can truthfully say to-day that Russia is, in the development of her resources, an older country than the United States. Since the days of Peter the Great there has not been the advancement we have seen within our own borders in the past twenty years.

Can any sane man doubt that had the populations and governments of the two countries been exchanged twenty-five years ago that Russia to-day would not have been far in advance of her present position in wealth and advantages for her people? In other words, can any one doubt that if the policy which has prevailed in this country during these years, protecting the people in their industries and labor and encouraging them in the development of the natural wealth of the country, had been adopted by the Russian Government instead of its arbitrary and selfish sway, that Russia and her people would have been infinitely further along in the way of progress than that country is at the present time? And so, we might proceed by way of comparison through all the list of countries outside of our own and be forced to the conclusion in the end that the Government which has best protected its people and best encouraged progress along all desirable lines has been the Government of our own land during all the days since the rebellion.

It is not true that the great prosperity we have enjoyed has resulted to this country on account of the rapid development of extraordinary resources unaided by the policy of protection, nor would such unexampled prosperity have ever been known in this country but for the laws that have been so wisely enacted within the past thirty years. There have been but few demands suggested by our civilization which could not have been supplied out of the products of the United States easily and well during the past quarter of a century.

But now an evil day has befallen us. An Administration and a Congress unfriendly and hostile to the prosperity which has

been the fruitage of successive Administrations of an opposing party is in power, and like a country occupied by an invading foe, and threatened with every evil incident to such occupation, our country is at a standstill. No one knows what acts of vandalism or injustice may be visited upon us. Business is everywhere paralyzed, even the hopes that prior to this change of Administration animated the hearts and faces of our citizens everywhere, has died out. To-day the American people are an apprehensive, disturbed, and well-nigh a hopeless people. All this change from a great and advancing prosperity to present adversity has come about since the country realized that the elements that attempted to destroy once before were in full power and again busy in the destruction of its industries.

I will not accuse you men of the South, who are in truth the Democratic party of this country—those claiming that name in the North being simply your allies—of an entirely deliberate intention to bring ruin to the very dregs, and a blight to the length of extinction upon all of the industries and opportunities for wage-earners that have been builded up almost entirely under the influence and by the hands that in the days of the sixties carried the muskets of the North in support of the old flag; but I do charge that you in the intoxication of power and the determination to perpetuate yourselves in office are now prepared and willing to lend yourselves to this process of destruction.

You have never been the brothers of toilers. You yourselves have never worked under the fierce sunlight with blistering backs and aching hands in a close communion with nature in the fields. Your hands were never taught to grasp the woodman's ax or send its shining blade to the heart of the trees of the forest; your arms have never wielded the hammers that beat into useful forms the iron and steel of this age; your backs have never borne the burdens of the physical and material progress of mankind.

Neither have your sympathies gone out to those who have toiled and labored, because you have not been of them. Men with darkened skins or occupation alien to your own in all ways have performed the labor of the States from whence you come.

All of your history and traditions exhibit you to the world as men having no contact whatever with the labor of the busy world or the laborer. And now, for the purpose of weakening and injuring the strength of the sections of the Union from which you can expect no permanent aid to the perpetuation of party rule, you would wreck the values of great accumulations, the result of the intelligent toil of the lives of countless thousands of American freemen in the North and West, heedless (if no harsher term is used) as to the suffering already preceding the act and the disgrace and infamy of the act itself; but in this you are no more than consistent with the character you bear in history.

It is said that exceptions prove the rule, and I would be unjust to myself if I should not willingly and cheerfully record my admiration for the character, liberality, and broad patriotism displayed by some of the noble men whose homes are in the South and who represent Democratic constituencies in this Congress, in both its branches. It is true that, like angel's visits, they may be few and far between, but notwithstanding that fact, they are a delight and the soul of a hope for better things in the hearts of their countrymen.

Of the great benefits that have resulted to this country from the policy of legislating in behalf of our own people and labor, instead of legislating in behalf of the subjects of foreign countries and governments not friendly to ours, one need but look upon a few of the demands that have grown up in the United States during the last thirty years and the industries here builded which have supplied those demands. In 1860 all the country west of the Mississippi River contained 4,236,746 inhabitants. The country lying east of the Mississippi River contained at the same time about 27,206,575 inhabitants. Cities containing 8,000 people or more in the region lying to the east of the great river contained at that time 4,783,090 inhabitants, and the cities of the same class to the west of that line about 289,166 inhabitants.

West of the Mississippi, in 1865, there were only 6,858.21 miles of railway and east thereof 26,137.45 miles of railway, and in this brief period of time, and all of that time under Republican rule, let me again remind you, the country has grown until in 1890 there were of American people residing on the prairies, along the streams and in the valleys, and everywhere between the surges of the Pacific and the Mississippi River, 15,774,557 inhabitants. Of this number about 2,800,462 people reside in cities of the class before mentioned.

For the purposes of transportation there has been builded over those prairies, along the rivers, and over the mountain ranges to the western ocean, 88,620.12 miles of railway, as against 6,858.21 miles in 1865. And now the country lying east of the river I have spoken of by way of division, is peopled by 46,847,693 American citizens. The population of the cities in the East containing 8,000 and over has increased since 1860 from 4,783,090 to 15,483,923 inhabitants in 1890, and 48,739.48 miles of railway transportation lines have been added to the 26,137.45 miles you possessed a quarter of a century ago. Twenty-five years ago there were very great supplies of timber within the eastern area.

The forests of Michigan, Wisconsin, and other States were no more than being fairly developed, and lumbering in Minnesota was only well under way. When you recall the enormous demand that our increase of population and building and improvements of all kinds has created during the period mentioned and that the United States possessed within her limits and is yet in possession of supplies sufficient to last many generations to come, all of the materials, including lumber and timber, out of which structures of all kinds have been completed both east and west of the Father of Waters, it will be readily admitted by every candid, unbiased judgment that the United States during the three decades past has been the greatest lumber and building material market the world has ever known or probably ever will know.

Under the protective policy adopted at about the inception of this marvelous increase of wealth and population, a policy was inaugurated for the purpose of putting into the pockets of our own people the money which should be expended for all of the materials out of which all the cities have been builded, as well as the homes and improvements upon the farms, along the railways and everywhere over this land. So it was that acts of our National Legislature said to the Canadas and other countries where great and cheaper forests have remained to this day comparatively untouched, we will first use the resources we have at home, and employ in the manufacture from these trees which have grown upon American soil, the labor of our own people in preference to employing the labor of your people upon your soil, and we will in this way encourage the ingenuity and industry of our own inventors and skilled mechanics in constructing constantly improving machinery to be used in the manufacture of this supply, thus keeping all the beneficial fruits of labor and development under the Stars and Stripes.

It is estimated conservatively that during these years the enormous sum of twenty-six to thirty billion dollars has been paid for the building material that has been put into construction. Will anyone tell me that this country would have been better off or its labor more justly treated or that her values would have been as great as they now are had this sum of twenty-five to thirty billion dollars been paid out for building material to the citizenship of Canada or other countries? The effect of our policy has been to retain this enormous sum within the United States, and it has been used by those who have earned it for the building of homes, the clothing of men, women, and children, the education of the young, the building of churches and the establishment of industries, and the bringing of intelligence, happiness, and appreciative contentment all over this land, until the United States has become the wonder and envy of the nations of the earth.

Other countries have been and are blessed with great natural resources of kinds largely similar to our own, as I have shown; but the policies of other governments has been different and their opportunities for prosperity have not been embraced as have ours, and it would seem that opportunities for comparison are abundant enough everywhere, and that the whole subject is not one difficult to be understood.

In my own State, of which I now speak by way of illustration, which contains about 69,994 square miles, lying between the forty-fifth and forty-ninth parallels of latitude, and the one hundred and seventeenth to the one hundred and twenty-fifth degrees of longitude, bounded on the north by the Straits of Fuca and British Columbia, and on the west by the Pacific Ocean, we possess almost every natural resource that all of the other States of the American Union possess combined; and it has been said with much truth that "you could build a Chinese wall around Washington, and the State will yield all that her inhabitants need, without contributions from the outer world." Nearly all of the area lying between the mountains of the Cascade Range and the ocean is naturally timbered land, and six and eight millions of feet of lumber are frequently cut from a quarter section of forest land in the Puget Sound Basin, instead of the one hundred and sixty to two hundred thousand feet that were often furnished by the same acreage of timber land in Wisconsin or Michigan.

Besides this great timber wealth, the first crop of nature upon a soil prolific in its fruit, vegetable, and cereal producing ability when cleared, the mineral wealth, consisting of gold, silver, copper, coal, iron, zinc, lime, and other minerals exist to such an extent as to make that section of our State richer by nature than any other area of the same extent that can be found in the world. Besides timber and the deposits of minerals, the most

productive agricultural lands in certain lines known are found in the valleys and along the tide waters of Puget Sound, while perfect fruits of every kind save those of the citrous species are everywhere produced in every clearing with no care save the planting, and as if by nature. The hops raised in this section are noted the world over for their excellence.

In the waters of Puget Sound (where fifty to a hundred fathoms of water are under every ship's keel visiting us and the whole Sound is a harbor) and its tributaries, and the Straits of Fuca, in the Gulf of Georgia, and in the waters of the ocean off our coast we have a greater variety of food fishes than the waters of the Atlantic have at any time supplied. This supply and resource is inexhaustible, and no inclement weather makes the taking of this food supply either disagreeable or dangerous, as it ever has been in Atlantic winters.

The climate of the section of our State I have already spoken of is exceedingly equable, it scarcely ever in summer being warmer than 75 degrees, with the nights cooler, and the winters are practically snowless, never bringing zero weather. East of the Cascade Mountains and west of the Columbia River are valleys and table-lands with rolling prairies of most wonderful fertility. In many places these lands are being, and will eventually all be, irrigated—where irrigation is required—and most localities are now producing great yields of grasses, grains, vegetables, and fruits without the smallest possible interruption from dry weather or blight or injury from storm, so even and favorable is the climate of that section.

In the counties of Walla-Walla, Columbia, Garfield, Asotin, Whitman, Adams, Franklin, Lincoln, Spokane, and the Big Bend of the Columbia, and in many other portions of the State, is produced the finest wheat that is known to commerce as well as the best barley for malting and other purposes harvested from any land on the American continent. Besides grain growing in the section last mentioned, nutritious grasses and fruits are grown with great success. And no such thing as failure of crops has ever been known in the portion of the State naturally grain-growing, and no storms of violence have ever visited that country. And no country has ever been fuller of promise to home-seekers or of plenty to its inhabitants than has been the State of Washington. The sun has never shone upon a fairer land than that lying east and west of the Cascade Mountains in that State. Lying along the entire northern boundary of the State is the English province of British Columbia. In that province are forests equally great and heavily timbered, with as valuable timber as we possess in the State of Washington, and that province possesses in fact every resource we have in the States of Washington and Oregon, with the exception of the vast areas of our agricultural and fruit lands. Every mineral resource we possess is paralleled by another in British Columbia.

In that province timber lands can be purchased for from 40 to 60 per cent of the money charged for timber lands in Washington or Oregon, and coal and other mineral lands with the same proportionate difference, attributable entirely to the protective duties of the United States. Labor in British Columbia is paid much lower wages for from twelve to fourteen hours work than within any of the States on the Pacific coast for ten hours work. For instance, the scale of wages paid in sawmills at and about Vancouver, where the largest mills of British Columbia are located, are as follows: For head sawyers, $2.75 per day, while in the States on the Pacific coast sawyers are paid $4 per day; setters at Vancouver are paid $2.25 per day, while in the States adjoining they are paid $3.50 per day; edger men at Vancouver are paid $2.25 per day and in the States $3 per day; engineers at Vancouver are paid $2.50 per day, while in the States the same character of labor when employed is paid $3.50 per day; common laborers about the mills in Vancouver are paid $1.37½ per day, while on the other side of the line the same labor is paid $2 per day; and the same difference in wages is paid for coal production and in all labor-employing lines, and yet gentlemen have undertaken to say during this debate, in the light of all the facts before them, that wages in the British provinces are as high as they are in the United States. Every barrel of flour these men in British Columbia consume, every pound of meat they use, and nearly everything in fact they live upon, is shipped to them across the line from our Western States, after first paying a high protective duty to the Canadian government, so that living to-day in British Columbia is more expensive than in the United States, if they live as well as we do, and wages that are paid are much less.

Some one may ask why it is that the labor of British Columbia endures this condition when it might better itself by coming across the line. The facts are these: The white labor comes to British Columbia direct from the old countries, where even less wages are paid than the figures they are offered in British Columbia, and men coming from Great Britain to the province locate themselves among those with a history more in sympathy with their own than is the history of the people across the line, and there is that in the make-up of many of the laborers of Great Britain which kindles a respect and renewed attachment for the flag of that country when oceans separate them from the islands of their birth, and an English or Scotch laborer or mechanic when first coming to this continent almost without exception prefers life in a British province with smaller wages than he would receive if he labored on this side of the line.

Besides this fact is another one of still greater significance to our people, Chinese and Japanese cheap labor is employed in all of the mills, logging camps, mines, fisheries, and in every industry in British Columbia without stint, while in the State I represent in part such labor is not employed save to a slight extent as cooks and laundrymen, and somewhat in the canneries at the mouth of the Columbia River, and never will the intelligent white labor of my State submit to being placed in rank with this debasing and degenerating heathen labor of Asia, either by association in labor or wages.

The resources of British Columbia have been but little developed owing to the fact that they have not had access to the world's greatest market for the products of their forests or their mines, or the demand which as existed in the United States, as the figures I have heretofore given show beyond controversy. So that this province has done but very little in the way of supplying even the foreign demand upon our coast for lumber, and the same conditions exist as to all the other resources of our northern neighbor.

Now, then, the bill pending places logs, lumber, shingles, piling timber, hoop poles, and nearly every form of wood finished for some purpose as well as iron ore, copper, and in fact nearly everything of value we possess in nature on the free list. The annual cut of our sawmills is 3,000,000,000 of feet for foreign and coastwise shipment, and our shingle mills 4,000,000,000.

The States of Washington and Oregon, besides being near the injuring competition of British Columbia of which I have spoken, and that will surely follow the passage of this bill, are situated upon the Pacific Ocean and sailing vessels coming from all ports of the world are only too anxious on a voyage to our ports for the products of our country, to bring ballast of some value instead of earth or stone. By ballast of some value I mean something the result of cheaper labor and cheaper materials than we employ in this country, where such ballast will pay for the taking of it from the holds of ships.

The yield of wheat in the State of Washington for the year 1892 is placed conservatively at from twenty-five to thirty million bushels. The surplus, after our own demands have been supplied, finds its way over the various railway lines in the State to the seaboard, and is there shipped, as a rule, in English sailing vessels with registered tonnage varying all the way from 1,200 to 4,000 tons, and the finest vessels I have ever seen in American waters come into Puget Sound ports. Magnificent steel four-masted, square-rigged ships are the rule in the great wheat-carrying fleet visiting the Northern Pacific Ocean, and the English flag floats from nearly every masthead.

These foreign vessels on their voyage from foreign ports will bring to us as ballast Chinese, Japanese, Australian, and English coal, very much cheaper than coal can be taken from our own mines with the class of labor we there employ. And all these various coals are on the free list. They will also bring, as ballast, building brick, flooring and ornamental tiles, drainage pipe and all sorts of terra cotta, and all kinds of heavy and coarse articles manufactured from clay, under the diminished ad valorem duties proposed by this legislation, cheaper than our people can manufacture such products on account of the wages we are paying labor engaged in these occupations on the Pacific coast. Iron ore, copper, and several other minerals are free listed also by this bill and come to us in ballast in these ships, cheaper than our labor can produce them.

This bill strikes at the industries of the Pacific coast everywhere and directly. Our fruit-growers are hurt irreparably; our barley-raisers are left to the mercy of the cheaper farm labor and cheaper lands of Canada. Our lumbermen are driven out of the forests of Washington and Oregon; our miners of coal and iron must give up their occupation: our sawmills and shingle mills will be silent; our cities in the State of Washington, which have become so beautiful and prosperous and such scenes of bustling activity in manufacture of the materials we have, with the crowds of life and commerce upon street and wharf and at railway warehouse, must give up their hopes of growth, of commercial and manufacturing importance, and wait for the good day to come when Republican patriotism and the love of the United States and her people and industries shall again throw about the people of my State and the people of this Union the strength of protection, which has borne such glorious fruits to labor and the industries we have established. But while this waiting in patience is going on, industries will be established in

British Columbia, with its cheaper labor and cheaper materials, to plague and harass us in foreign markets for many a long year to come.

What do you think will become of the men who are driven out of the forests, mines, factories, and mills in the United States by the passage of this law? What do you think will become of the agricultural classes of this country who are dependent upon the soil for their gains, and of the other countless thousands who have been deprived of employment by this law? Do you not think this will make them know that they are brought into direct competition with the classes now engaged in agricultural pursuits, and that they will be driven to tilling the soil for a subsistence in one way or another?

What will be the effect on wages and the prices of farm products when our agricultural classes are subjected to this competition and when the farms of the United States are shorn of their home markets as they will be by the turning out of employment of all the hundreds of thousands of these men, then unable to buy farm products out of the earnings they have always enjoyed? All this you say is for the purpose of cheapening some fabrics, or rather the foreign materials out of which such fabrics and articles are made, so that, as you profess, certain lines of goods may be bought cheaper in the United States than they have been under the laws enacted by an opposing party.

I might have spoken of other industries and business crippled by this unjust and unwise bill in my own State, but Representatives from Idaho, Montana, and Oregon are interested in sheep-raising and silver-bearing lead ores as well as the State of Washington, and these subjects will be treated in this debate by Mr. SWEET of Idaho, Mr. HARTMAN of Montana, and Messrs. ELLIS and HERMANN of Oregon, the able and conscientious Republican Representatives from those States.

In my State there are about a half a million of people, American by birth and citizenship, and as industrious, frugal, and intelligent a people as are found anywhere within the limits of the Union, who are wide awake to the natural resources of their chosen home, and full of appreciation of the bounteous gifts nature has showered upon that State, and they are also alive to the dangers that are threatened them in this measure. They have petitioned this Congress, and protested against the passage of this bill with all their might. You must remember that our industries have been built up under the guaranty of this country for protection, and under the law that has protected.

These men of my State have broken the virgin soil of Eastern Washington and have cultivated its rolling prairie lands all these years, and made for themselves and their families homes in that land of bounteous harvests. They have builded towns and cities in Eastern Washington, some of them in the midst of undulating prairies, and others where beautiful streams, fed by the snows of the mountains, rush whitening by over basaltic rock and boulder, turning the whirling wheels of the mills and machinery; and one of them, bearing the name of the "Spokanes," the beauty and pride of that inland empire, has been builded where the great volume of the waters of that river makes the descent of more than 300 feet in traversing a distance of a little more than a mile, by broken leaps down the rocky bed of that stream, furnishing water power equal to any in the world.

The men of my State have gone into the Puget Sound Basin and have there builded large cities and flourishing towns. They have builded sawmills that have cut a million feet of fir lumber in less than twenty-four hours with machinery for this purpose, which, under protection, has become as perfect for these uses as any machinery the hand of man has ever rested upon. They have built mills for the manufacture of shingles, and are engaged in the manufacture of wood finishings of all descriptions for modern buildings, and they are making furniture of perfect kinds for dwellings and business buildings. They have constructed flouring mills to supply the demand of their section of the country and to export to China and Japan, with capacities of 1,000 barrels a day. They have erected wharves and warehouses for the export of the grain from the fields of Eastern Washington and great bunkers for loading our coal into ships. They have opened the mines of our State, both east and west of the Cascade Mountains, and in all things and all ways, under the protection that has been guarantied them by the laws of their country, they have with long strides proceeded in the development of the natural resources of our State.

If one hundred or even ten of the citizens of my State had gone with their means to a foreign country and had the government of that country confiscated their property and destroyed their values, as you will confiscate and destroy the values and business of the 500,000 people in my State by this iniquitous bill should it become a law, the citizenship, army, and navy of this country would be at the command of this government at once to right such wrongs. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

And no one gives an answer in any way worthy of the intelligence of the American people, why this thing should be done or this gigantic wrong perpetrated. It is without excuse, and in violation of all lessons taught by experience. It blights all hope, and disregards the free and manly protests of labor. It defies the warnings of humane and careful employers of men. It denies bread and shelter to the formerly prosperous but now idle and poverty-stricken artisan and mechanic. The cries and distress of mothers, wives, and children are scoffed at and derided. Its originators and promoters are not laborers, and their hands have never borne the stain of honest toil in the fields, forests, mines, or workshops, but they are Democratic politicians with a tariff bill on their hands.

This country by reason of the advancing shadows of this measure in the past year has lost more capital, many, many times over than would have builded the Nicaragua Canal, thus shortening the distance between Puget Sound and New York nearly 11,000 miles and uniting forever the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans for the great good of mankind all over the earth, and a work of inestimable value and overwhelming importance to the United States, permitting the people of the Pacific Slope to land their products from the farms, vineyards, orchards and forests, mines and waters, in Liverpool within twenty days from the time of sailing.

Why will you not in common fairness respect and regard to some extent the intelligent protests and wishes of the people of that section, united as it is with the cries and demands from every city, farm, forge, factory, and hamlet all over the North and West, as well as the indignant objections that reach your ears from many, many places in the Southland. Give to this country the Nicaragua Canal, or assurances of its speedy completion, as wise and patriotic men have planned it, and as skillful engineers have demonstrated its practicability, uniting the oceans and giving the people of the East and West a cheapened means for transportation for their products not profitable for railways to handle over the long distance, and leave us the protection as wise, strengthening, and beneficent as the greatest of all parties has made it, and an "American" financial policy, recognizing American silver as it should be recognized, and we shall have a country within whose limits the problems affecting the weal of mankind for the future will be speedily worked out and more beneficially than elsewhere in the world.

We shall have a country then whose limits from east to west and north to south will be filled with prosperity among the people, the like of which the world has never known, and this prosperity will become the servitor of education and justice among men, the promoter of the arts and sciences and the encourager of invention. A man will then have reason to be proud indeed of being an American citizen by birth or adoption.

Other gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate have so thoroughly exhausted the figures and statistical information, showing, as I believe beyond doubt, the unwise and pernicious character of this attempted legislation, that I have not felt that good ends would be subserved by attempting to repeat such useful and necessary data. It is before the country in these speeches, and has been presented with much more ability than I could hope to equal, and consequently I have endeavored to confine myself to matters that have come under my own observation and with which I am personally familiar, well knowing that the people are the higher court in this country, and that they will speedily know the merit of service rendered and be ready to condemn the shifty expedients of the insincere and incompetent. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

During the delivery of the above remarks the time of Mr. DOOLITTLE expired.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The committee must rise at half past 5 o'clock. The Chair has indulged the gentleman for forty-two minutes in order to take up the time, and the hour for taking the recess has now arrived.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I do not see how any great wrong will be done if the gentleman be permitted to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not object if the committee had power to do it.

Mr. MARSH. The gentleman could have leave to proceed by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has no power to give unanimous consent. The House could extend the time, but the committee can not do it. The Chair asks the indulgence of the committee to state that the general debate has now closed, by order of the House as to day debate. There have been thirty-one hours and twenty-two minutes of debate during the daytime. The friends of the bill have consumed, as shown by the statement of the time clerk, fifteen hours and forty minutes, and those who are opposed to the bill have consumed fifteen hours

and forty minutes—exactly the same time. The committee will now rise, under the order of the House.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will discharge the duties of the Chair at the evening session; and now the House will take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to debate only on the pending bill.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes) the House was declared in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m., by Mr. BROOKSHIRE, as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is in session for the purpose of general debate only on the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, pursuant to the special order.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the tariff bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chrirman, It is a fact generally admitted that the existing depression in the industrial and commercial affairs of the country is entirely due to want of confidence; it is equally true that this want of confidence is almost entirely caused by the proposed legislation embodied in this bill, which might more properly be entitled "A bill to reduce the wages of labor, to increase pauperism, and to disturb and harass the people."

It is said that this bill has been prepared in response to the voice of the people as indicated at the last Federal election, but now that it is ready and its effects are made apparent in advance, the people do not seem to be so anxious for a change. In this connection I am reminded of a letter which I received last summer from a merchant at Troy, Pa., in which he said:

A customer of mine brought his wool to town and sold it to-day. He came to my store and loitered about for a time, apparently much depressed; finally he said: "Well, I voted for free wool last fall, and I'll be d——d if I haven't just about got it."

So it is with many thousands; they voted for free wool and free trade, and now, when they are distressed and suffering, they find that they have "got it," but its reality is not what they anticipated in their desire for a change.

Theories are fine things and sophistry is often alluring, but hard facts and common sense often disprove them and are, to my mind, worth a thousand times more than both.

Until the election of 1892 prosperity was the rule, and labor was well paid, while capital well managed brought fair returns. We were, as a people, doing well and thriving under an industrial system of thirty years' trial which was constantly making us as a nation richer and stronger, while it brought increasing reward to the laborer. Not a man in the United States who could work and who would work need want for employment, but the party in power was displaced and a revolution in our laws under which we had developed a magnificent industrial system and prospered was decided upon. Even now we begin to see the preliminary results.

The entire industrial and commercial system of the country is demoralized; large numbers of operatives are out of employment and dependent on charity; the number of commercial failures is rapidly increasing; the building trades are at a standstill and the development of new enterprises has ceased. If the final outcome shall be the employment of more labor and better paid labor, I shall be happy to see it; but from my standpoint and in my opinion it seems that a very brief experience with "free trade revenue reform" will convince our people of the folly of taking the bread out of their own mouths to feed it to those on the other side of the ocean, that the foreigner may grow fat while our own citizens are starving.

The proposed bill does not make a new market for our manufactured goods or for our crude products to the extent of one dollar. Our manufactured goods must pay duty when they enter France or Germany, because this bill makes no provision for retaliation or reciprocity in any direction. It seems almost like the will of a man who bequeathed all his property and effects to clothe the poor heathen Hottentot and left his old invalid wife and helpless children destitute and starving.

A protective tariff serves a double purpose. It is the most effective agent for producing the necessary revenues for the support of the Government, while it furnishes the widest field of employment to our own labor at better wages than can be obtained under any other system; it promotes industrial activity, thereby increasing competition, which prevents monopolies and keeps fair prices for all.

As a nation we have absolute interstate free trade throughout the entire length and breadth of our national domain. As a nation we now under existing laws offer to trade on reciprocal terms with other nations who are in a position to meet us on a fair basis.

This is the best condition. If our manufacturers are producing in excess of domestic requirements they must adjust themselves to the inexorable law of supply and demand. It will not help them to open our domestic market to the world's factories, nor will it open the world's markets to them, and if it did they would prove a poor return for the loss of our own. Our manufacturers understand this very well and know that they can only meet the world's competition by scaling wages to what is paid by their foreign competitors. Of course free trade in merchandise would be illogical without free trade in men. If our gates are to swing open for the products of the foreign artisan's labor, it is but fair to presume that they will open as freely for the artisan himself.

It appears to me that the gentlemen on the other side of the House have decided to ignore the well-being of a majority of the people for the purpose of using a supposed party advantage to enable them to experiment with a political dogma. They have caused it to be stated on the floor of this House that this is a "political bill." They must be acting on the assumption that the people are very stupid and slow to anger. This is an error into which, as a partisan, I have no objection to see them fall, knowing that the consequences will in the end be fatal to their party, but I am alarmed at the suffering and general disaster that must inevitably occur before the evil results of the measure they now propose are cured and normal conditions restored.

The history of the protective policy in the United States comprises the essence of all that is peculiar and distinctive in the history of this country, from colonial to the present time.

The history of colonial times shows that the grand object, the impelling necessity, for the formation of the Federal Government in 1789 was to obtain a power for the protection of the commercial rights of the people; in accordance with this design, the earliest action of the new government was upon the question of forming and establishing a protective system. The bill, or act, which was the great object of the Federal Constitution, on motion of Mr. Madison, the father of that instrument, was presented promptly under the following preamble:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and procection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported, be it enacted, etc.

And after having been passed, was signed by President Washington, the 4th of July, 1789.

The same necessity which begat the Revolution was the parent of the Federal Constitution and of this law—this law, or its policy, established and secured, being the end of all.

The principles of protection to domestic industry were prominently and forcibly urged upon Congress by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and J. Q. Adams. Andrew Jackson, in his second annual message to Congress, December 7, 1830, confirms this action of his predecessors, and clearly explains the constitutional right to so adjust duties on imports as to afford protection to and promote development of the domestic industries. In that message President Jackson said:

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the Federal Government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable restriction relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case; this

indispensable power thus surrendered by the States must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

The advocates of the so-called Wilson bill make the following claims in behalf of the proposed measure:

First. It will so enlarge our markets that the manufacturer can do a larger and more profitable business.

Second. That it will give employment to more labor.

Third. That it will give higher wages to the individual operative.

How all these benefits can result from the passage of this bill is something no one has yet been able to explain to me, and until I receive some better explanation than has yet been advanced on the subject I shall look upon the above claim very much as I do upon that of the empiric who has a compound to cure every ill to which humanity is subject; and any person advocating such physical impossibilities is, in my judgment, a fit candidate and fully qualified for membership in the St. Ananias Club.

It is a well-known fact that nearly every town and city has a board of trade, organized for the open and avowed purpose of inducing manufacturing establishments to locate in their respective communities, and to secure this result offer not only free land, but free buildings, free rent, and generally a bonus in cash. The majority of these boards of trade are as often composed of Democrats as Republicans, and in their efforts to secure for their own localities the benefits accompanying the establishment of such industries in their midst are quite as zealous as Republicans; and in this line of effort I have never known politics to cut any figure. The reason openly assigned for all this effort and expenditure is not that the manufacturer himself may be enriched, but that more employment may be given to labor in their midst. And in fact, this employment of labor, and its resulting benefit to the community, is the only reason assigned and the only end in view. Not only is the town itself benefited, but every person engaged in agricultural pursuits within miles takes equal interest with those therein residing.

Now, if in a given locality, through this practical form of indirect protection, the erection of an industrial establishment, and the employment thereby given to labor is a benefit to that locality, why, on the same grounds, should not the country as a whole be entitled to receive the same benefits as against foreign countries that this local system would give to the individual town as against those surrounding it? If encouragement to local manufactories is advocated by Democratic boards of trade, why should the same Democrats oppose encouraging a system which indisputably does build up the material wealth of our whole country? This, Mr. Chairman, is Democratic consistency!

The chief disadvantages with which the American employer contends is the greater cost of money and labor—in other words, of labor itself—in this country as compared with its price in foreign parts. It is the difference between the freedom and the bondage price of labor. This difference affects capital, as well as labor, in the same manner and degree; for all capital is the product of labor, the cost of which must necessarily be graduated by the price of labor. By the rights or institution of property, as secured by every civilized society, capital or property, when acquired by industry and prudence, comes to occupy the position of the employer of labor, in order that labor in its turn, enjoying a freedom price under adequate protection, may rise to the same condition by the same means.

This is the American wheel of fortune, free to all. It is what we have fought for, and are bound to maintain.

It would be hard, indeed, that labor, which, when applied, produces all the means of enjoyment in civilized society, should never itself be able to come to such enjoyment. The very design of American society is to keep open these chances which European society, as a general rule, forever bars. Since capital is nothing more nor less than labor in another form or state, it follows that it must have cost in proportion to the price of labor that produced it, and that it can not be employed in the same ways as foreign capital which has cost only half as much without protection; it is also evident that the protection of this capital is the protection of labor itself, not only because it is labor in another form as being its product, but because it can not employ labor in these ways without protection so that the interests of the employer and the employé are strictly mutual in their necessity for adequate protection.

This tariff question is not merely a question of party politics with me, because it deeply affects the prosperity not only of my constituents, but of the great body of the people. I know that upon it depends the interests and the happiness of the bone and sinew of the country. While I do not pretend to an intimate acquaintance with its complexities, nor an ability to sound its uttermost depths, yet it is evident to me that the Democratic party is consistent with the entire recent history of its actions on this question in one thing, and that is to belittle the breadwinner and cheapen the price of his labor. It has by its actions confirmed the statements of a former Democratic leader (Gen. McDuffie, in 1832, Debates of Congress, page 3827), who said on the floor of this House that the natural price of the manufacturing labor of the United States is precisely the same as that of other countries, and not a cent more.

The effect of the proposed law will not directly reach a large part of the late Confederate States of America, for the reason that, with few manufactories there established, they expect to exchange their cotton for a little larger than usual return of manufactured goods from English and continental workshops; hence I can easily account for the free-trade proclivities of the cotton States.

The clause in the constitution of the late Confederate States of America, which provided for practical free trade as a constitutional right and fundamental law, was placed there by the same sentiment and belief in its righteousness that exists among those who to-day represent that same section of the country in Congress, and who constitute not only the majority of their party representatives on the most important committees, but who absolutely control the action of these committees and the legislation of the country and the policy of their party.

We are told by the advocates of free trade revenue tariff that the tariff is a tax, and therefore should be reduced and destroyed. I shall not now take time to argue whether the tariff is a tax paid by the consumer or by the foreign manufacturer; but even if I should admit, for the sake of argument, that tariff taxes are paid by the consumer, I would say that the Government requires a revenue from some source of several hundreds of millions per annum, and this revenue must either come from duties on imports or from an internal tax; it can be nothing more than a tax, be it paid in either way, and I believe the former way the best.

Then, as to the needs of the Government, what easier or more equitable mode of securing revenue than by a duty on foreign manufactures which compete with similar manufactures here, large enough to permit the operation of our own institutions by covering the full difference between the cost of labor in this and foreign countries.

NO NECESSITY FOR ANY CHANGE.

There is no necessity for a change. Such a change as this bill involves must upset all business for a long time, no matter what the final outcome. The drain of gold caused by increasing purchases from foreign countries will cause a worse financial effect than was last summer experienced and which this Democratic Administration claim was produced by the late Government purchases of silver bullion.

It will close our mills and workshops; it will throw out of employment our mechanics and operatives who have been earning good wages with which they have purchased freely the products of the soil; they have thus not only prospered themselves, but have brought prosperity to their localities and to those engaged in other pursuits. It will disturb existing industrial, commercial, and financial conditions and put us back half a century in material progress. It will close the iron mines, the coal mines, and remove the source of employment now afforded by their transportation.

It will *not* open to us any foreign markets for our goods or products, but will give to foreign manufacturers a monopoly of our trade. "Charity should begin at home"; yet our lawmakers propose to exercise that greatest of all virtues for the benefit of foreigners, and, meanwhile, to let our own citizens starve through lack of employment.

It will be the inauguration of a period when no laborer can provide education or any of life's comforts for his family, and when father and mother and children must drudge every day as their competitors in the labor market of the Old World are forced to do, or in lieu of such drudgery must starve or go to the poorhouse.

Advocates of this bill claim that it will reduce the tariff income of this country some $75,000,000 per annum on the basis of present importations, but that one-half of this falling off in revenue will be made up by the largely increased importations which will surely be made in consequence.

This claim is, no doubt, partially correct; but if so, and on an average duty of about 20 per cent ad valorem the sum of $35,000,000 is raised by increased importations of such goods, there must be an aggregate of $175,000,000 of said goods imported more than at present; and as this increased importation of foreign manufactures must and will displace an equal amount of the same goods now manufactured in this country, it is a self-evident fact that our factories and industrial establishments must curtail their product to the full extent of said increased importations,

and at least 100,000 operatives, laborers, and mechanics now engaged in manufacturing will be thrown out of employment.

If this will tend to make our country prosperous, then my ideas of political economy are based upon false premises. It has all ways been my belief that two bodies could not occupy the same space at the same time; that we could not eat our pie and keep it, too. To me it seems an axiom that we can not manufacture our goods and at the same time buy the same goods abroad. And if we manufacture them here we can not import them, while if we import them we can not and will not manufacture them here, and the result of the latter condition will be lack of employment for labor; the mechanic and laborer of to-day must either take up a tract of land and compete with the farmer or else emigrate to the Old World, there to perform the labor of manufacturing the same goods he formerly did here, but at a new and much lower scale of wages. There is only one way of escaping this result, and that is by accepting the same rate of wages here that are paid abroad and by beginning a new industrial era with cheap labor as its foundation.

If the laborers of the United States will be content with such an outcome I am greatly mistaken.

Why our lawmakers should devote themselves, their time, and ingenuity toward inventing some mode or scheme of building up factories and workshops in Great Britain and the Continent, and as an absolute necessity and inevitable result destroy a corresponding amount of our home industries, is beyond my power to comprehend.

It is argued by the friends of free trade that no tariff affects the wages of the bricklayer, the house carpenter, and those who work on our lines of railroads, etc.; but I would ask how long could the bricklayer, the carpenter, the railroad mechanic, or the laborer retain his present rate of wages should those now employed in other manufactures be permanently thrown out of employment?

In the first place, there would be less work for the house-builder, because no new homes would be needed; and less demand for employment of the railroad workmen because, the coal and ores now carried to the mills to make the finished product would be transported on English and continental lines, and the transportation lines of this country would simply get the distribution of the goods from the seaboard. Simultaneously with this decreased demand for labor would come a struggle by those thrown out of industrial pursuits, by reason of the ruin of the business they were engaged in, for any employment whatever that would keep them from starvation. The result will be that labor in this country will fall to the same commercial value as in foreign countries.

Take any possible view of the situation, and it is plain that on the laborer of this country will fall the chief loss which will result from the operations of this bill. It will be a serious and a disastrous experience for which this legislation will become responsible.

Last spring I had a conversation with a former member of Congress, now officially near to the head of one of the Departments of government, in which I said, "How is it that you, who at one time, and not long ago, believed and advocated on the floor of the House the same principles as did the late Samuel J. Randall, have become a blind follower of 'free trade revenue reform'?" He replied that he had studied the question, and his reason told him he was formerly wrong, but he now was sincere in his present belief. I asked him if he did not fear the terrible results of a trial of his theory in his own State, which is largely devoted to manufacturing. I spoke of the largest cities in the State and asked what would become of the thousands of factories and industrial enterprises in those cities if his present ideas of tariff were put in force, and if such action would not injure his own party. His reply was, "The manufacturer is the man the Democratic party has to fight in my State, and year by year these manufacturers, who are almost all Republicans, help to carry on a fight against my party, and from them we get no aid. If they were all legislated out of business, the loss would be to the Republican party, not to the Democratic, as but few of them are Democrats." "Very well," I replied. "Suppose you do ruin or drive these manufacturers, even if they be Republicans, out of business; will not the laborer in those factories ultimately be the greatest sufferer?" He replied that no doubt labor would suffer and that want of employment would result; but added, "It's a case where great suffering must come, but it's like a man with an immense carbuncle on the back of his neck, and, although the agony will be intense, yet the surgeon's knife must relentlessly cut out the carbuncle, roots and all, that the man may be free therefrom." I could only reply that his theory and his illustration were plain enough to understand, but that in every such case the man would not survive the operation, and a live man with a carbuncle was better than a dead man without. In the same interview I asked him if he did not think that the proposed pension policy would hurt his party, and he replied, "No; because practically all the pensioners are Republicans anyway, and the Democratic party has nothing to gain by liberality in that direction."

I only mention this matter to show the indifference to results displayed by Democratic leaders, providing its principal injury falls upon the man who votes the Republican ticket. But I prophesy that when this free trade revenue tariff scheme for political purposes has ruined the labor interests, Democrats and Republicans alike, the party which causes the ruin will learn by something more tangible than sophistry and theory that it was not good American policy to build up foreign manufactures at the ruin of our own.

We hear so much of the immense profits of the manufacturer. In exceptional cases I acknowledge that for a brief time certain factories have made large profits, but in every case competition has soon brought the profits down to so low a point that only those most advantageously situated and who have best managed their business have survived or continued the same.

Where is the woolen manufacturer who has made a fortune in many years? I think they will be few and far apart, and the same is the case in most all our industries. The laborer had employment at good wages until the elections of 1892 were understood to be a verdict for free trade. Then the manufacturer began curtailing production and working off his stock in preparation for the execution of the sentence, and to-day we see only the beginning of the result in the thousands of unemployed and the many more who will be unemployed until they will accept the wages current abroad, where the dominant party proposes that our goods shall be made.

It is argued by advocates of this bill that our present depression can not be ascribed to the results of the election of 1892 because we are yet governed by the McKinley protective tariff, and that the Democratic party has as yet not put in force any of its promised tariff reforms. They argue that having done nothing yet, why should manufacturers abandon or curtail their business while a protective tariff stands on our statute books and is the law of the land? They say, "We have done nothing yet, so why do manufacturers get scared before they are hurt," and they go to the laborer and tell him all this as proof that protection does not protect labor, and that labor meets all this suffering while a protective tariff is in full force.

Well, if any one of the gentlemen who talk this stuff was condemned to be executed on, or even about, a certain day, I suppose he would be cheerful and happy until the sentence had been carried out, on the ground and for the reason that "nothing had been done to him yet." It is my opinion that in such a predicament the person condemned would use every effort to escape the execution of the sentence, even if he did have to sacrifice much of his worldly possessions.

And so the manufacturer who knows that the party in control of making and executing laws has decided to destroy his business as soon as it could put the machinery of legislation into motion, like the man condemned to death tries to get out of his predicament just as fast and as far as is in his power, and he is a wise man who does thus prepare for the storm. A sailor at sea, when a storm is approaching, or even when the barometer indicates its approach, although he may be assured of a brief continuance of clear sailing, yet he would be criminally negligent should he not reef sail and prepare for the worst. Thus, if one of the gentlemen who are now crying, "Why, we have done nothing yet," was captain of that vessel and I should ask him why he took in sail and prepared for a storm because it "had done no damage yet," I am quite sure he would be justified in thinking of me as I do to-day of him when he tries to prove that "having done nothing yet," the manufacturer should not prepare for the ruin which is proposed to be dealt out to him. Yet if only the capitalist and the manufacturer were to suffer it would not be so bad, but this verdict of "death to American industries" means distress, want, and destitution to millions of laborers who will not be able to save anything from the general wreck.

THE BENEFITS OF TARIFF PROTECTION TO FARMERS.

By the operations of this bill the farmers are to be deprived of protection and the revenues of the Government will be reduced more than $15,000,000 annually of duties now collected on agricultural products, that being the difference between what is now collected and what will be paid should this bill become a law.

This loss of revenue is divided as follows:

Wool	$8,000,000
Tobacco	2,500,000
Other products	5,000,000
Total	15,500,000

The history of tariff debate shows that the advocates of free

trade and of its counterpart, "tariff for revenue only," have always admitted the great benefits resulting to the farmer from a protective system which has created industries supporting millions of persons who are consumers of farm products at the highest prices. This bill will take our home market from us and give it to the foreigner, and will throw into agricultural pursuits those who are now the best customers of the farmer. It will affect the farmers living in proximity to manufacturing towns, who have had a steady market for all their garden produce and vegetables, most of which will not bear transportation to Europe.

What will become of the truck-farming industry if it loses the trade of manufacturing cities and has to depend entirely on the patronage of New York and other distributing depots of imported goods?

Truck farming has attained great proportions and enables a diversification of product which is a necessity to profitable farming. It is distinct from market gardening; the former is carried on at a distance from market, water and rail transportation being necessary, while the latter is conducted near local markets, the grower of vegetables using his own team for transporting his products direct to either the retailer or consumer.

A summary of the number of acres under cultivation for truck-farming purposes and the value of products raised, given by districts, as shown by census reports, is herewith appended:

Districts.	Acres.	Value of products.	Districts.	Acres.	Value of products.
New England	6,838	$3,184,218	Southwest	36,889	$4,979,783
New York and Philadelphia	108,135	21,102,521	Central	107,414	15,432,223
Peninsular	25,714	2,413,648	Northwest	1,083	204,791
Norfolk	45,375	4,092,859	Mountain	3,833	531,976
Baltimore	37,181	3,784,696	Pacific coast	14,357	2,024,345
South Atlantic	111,441	13,183,516	Total	534,440	76,517,155
Mississippi Valley	36,180	4,982,579			

Upward of $100,000,000 are invested in this industry, the annual products reaching a value of $76,517,155 on the farms after paying freights and commissions, realized upon 534,440 acres of land. There are employed in this industry 216,765 men, 9,254 women, and 14,874 children, aided by 75,866 horses and mules, and $8,971,206.70 worth of implements.

SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTS.

The principal agricultural products of which we now produce a surplus are cotton, tobacco, and wheat.

In the old days the cotton-planters were the champions of free trade because they could produce the crop by slave labor and exchange it readily for foreign manufactures. But the new generation in the South is learning that it is better not to depend solely on the raising of cotton year after year, and that the development of manufactures in their midst will give them a home market for diversified crops and enable them to gain their freedom from the dictation of the cotton factor and his satellites, the local merchants.

We are now manufacturing about one-third of our production of cotton, there being 904 mills, of which 239 are located in the Southern States. The cotton manufacture is in a healthy condition, exporting its product to the value of about $3,000,000 annually, and the number of Southern mills will continue to increase if properly encouraged. Is the policy of this bill calculated to do this? I think not.

Our mills now consume $117,392,576 worth of cotton and turn out $267,981,724 worth of product. The difference of $150,000,000 between the two amounts is nearly all wages, which are expended in this country.

TOBACCO.

The Wilson bill plays havoc with our Northern tobacco-growers, reducing the duty on wrappers from $2 to $1 per pound, while on other leaf the tariff is untouched. Why this vicious stab is made at the people of my section I am at a loss to understand, since a large proportion of them are loyal adherents to the Democratic party, but I do know that it will kill the industry.

The result of the law of 1890 on the production of tobacco in the United States has been great prosperity to the tobacco farmers.

About 25 per cent of the crop is suitable for wrappers and now brings a fair price; prior to 1890 the farmer was obliged to sell it as fillers at a less price.

WHEAT.

Viewing the world's wheat-producing area and its markets, we find that India, Australia, Eastern Europe, and Canada, raise a surplus of wheat which they produce at a much lower labor cost than ours. The market for all this surplus wheat is comparatively limited averaging an annual demand of about 200,000,000 bushels. With such a competition for this limited foreign market it behooves our wheat producers to diversify their products and develop the home market which will enable this, because the farmer gets his share of every dollar of wages paid out by the manufacturer.

LOCAL MANUFACTURES MAKE GOOD PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS.

The average price of such staple products as corn, wheat, rye, oats, barley, potatoes, and hay is much higher in States largely engaged in manufactures than in those principally devoted to agriculture. The extension of manufactures has been of inestimable benefit to the farmer, and there can be no doubt that the decrease of manufactures will be of corresponding injury.

WHAT THE WILSON BILL DOES FOR THE FARMER.

Now, let us see how the direct action of the Wilson bill is to benefit the farmer.

In 1889 the duty on horses was 20 per cent ad valorem, and there were 48,784 horses imported as compared with 2,263 exported. Most of these horses came from Canada and paid a tax of about $9 on a value of about $45 per head. The McKinley bill made the duty a specific one of $30 per head on horses valued at less than $150, while those valued at $150 or more paid an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent.

The result was that in 1892 we imported only 10,762 horses and our own stock-raisers furnished the difference of 38,022 horses, valued at more than $1,000,000. Why need we go to Canada for horses? The last census shows that we have 15,000,000 in this country and that we are raising them at the rate of 2,000,000 annually, of which 60,000 are foaled in the State of Pennsylvania. The Wilson bill, however, restores the old duty and the American horse must give way to the Canadian stock.

Previous to the passage of the McKinley bill there were about 90,000 head of beef cattle imported annually which paid a duty of $2 per head. The present duty is $10 per head, and the average importations since 1890 have been about 2,000 head annually. The Wilson bill practically restores the old duty, since it puts all live animals in at a uniform ad valorem duty of 20 per cent; when these animals arrive at the international boundary under the operation of this ad valorem feature it is found that their cost is abnormally low, so low that what little duty is collected will necessarily have to be disbursed by the Government in the support of an army of customs officials to ferret out and prevent frauds.

Previous to 1890 we imported from Canada about 11,000,000 bushels of barley and malt annually, which paid a tax of 10 cents per bushel. The McKinley bill raised this to 30 cents per bushel, and the importation fell off from over 11,000,000 bushels in 1889 to about 3,000,000 bushels in 1891, a gain to our farmers of about $6,000,000, for, I take it, the brewers have used just as much barley all the time, and appear to be making money. Why is it necessary, in a bill to raise revenue for the Government, to make such radical reductions in the materials for malt liquors? The Wilson bill reduces the tariff on hops from 15 cents to 8 cents per pound, when this country can raise all the hops the world requires. In 1889 we imported 4,176,158 pounds of hops, but the McKinley bill reduced this to 2,506,224 pounds in 1892, and our hop-growers were correspondingly benefited.

In 1889 we imported about 900,000 bushels of potatoes, which paid a tax of 15 cents a bushel. The McKinley bill raised this tax to 25 cents, and the average annual imports since have been 175,000 bushels. The Wilson bill restores the old duty.

And so I might go on with every item of farm products, all receiving ample protection under the McKinley bill, but some of which are now to be put back to less than the rates which preceded the passage of that bill, while many are transferred to the free list.

It is absolutely impossible to show that the cost to the consumer of any of these products has been increased by the amount of the McKinley tax, but its effect has been to check importations and thereby enable our farmers to supply these products at such prices as their local competition and conditions enabled them to get.

Nor is the protection afforded by the existing law restricted to the products of the Eastern States, but its provisions have been made to cover the farm products peculiar to the South and to the Pacific Slope. Has anyone discovered that he is paying more for food since 1890 than he did before? Presumably it is with the expectation of making food cheaper that these reductions are made in this proposed reform tariff on farm products, but what is the use of placing cheap food before our mechanics if we take away from them the ability to earn the means to buy it?

HOW IT WILL HELP CANADA.

The Canadian government not only imposes duties on all agricultural products imported from the United States, such as 30

per cent on cattle, sheep, and other animals, 2 cents a pound on hogs, 75 cents a barrel on flour, 4 cents a pound on butter, 3 cents a pound on cheese, 5 cents a dozen on eggs, 15 cents a bushel on potatoes, 40 cents a bushel on apples, and so on, but it imposes heavy duties on all manufactured products and then pays a bounty on many things produced in Canada.

The Wilson bill not only admits the agricultural products of Canada into the United States free of duty, but it also reduces the duty on Canadian manufactures far below that imposed by Canada upon American goods. The Dominion government gives a bounty of $2 upon every ton of iron manufactured in Canada. Under the Wilson bill the duty on pig iron will be equal to about $1.60 a ton. With the Canadian government paying a bounty of $2, it will be seen that the Canadian producers can pay the tariff on this side and still have 40 cents left.

When their lower rate of wages is taken into consideration, it will be seen what a fine field the Wilson bill is opening in the United States to the Canadian iron manufacturers, as well as for the Canadian farmers.

The Wilson bill puts agricultural machinery on the free list, whereas the Canadian government imposes a heavy duty on it. This duty is so high as to be absolutely prohibitory, and no American agricultural implements are sent to Canada. Since 1890 the manufacture of reapers, mowers, etc., in Canada has been in the hands of the powerful and energetic combination which has pushed its business with much success in Europe and South America and which has undersold American manufacturers even in this country in spite of the present tariff.

This Canadian combination has certain decided advantages. Labor is from 20 to 33 per cent cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States for workers engaged in the production of this machinery.

The McKinley bill reduced the tariff on pine lumber from $2 to $1 per 1,000 feet, but left the duty on spruce lumber at $2 and the duty on hemlock at $1. All lumber is made free by the Wilson bill, and we thus propose to annually present the Canadians with over $1,000,000, the amount of duty which we are now collecting annually on importations of their lumber. No one acquainted with the subject can suppose for an instant that lumber will be cheaper by the smallest amount, but the remission of duty will at once accrue to the value of the stumpage, which is all owned and controlled by the Canadian Government.

It is indeed no wonder that Canadian statesmen are boasting that they get more by this bill than they could hope to get by the most favorable reciprocity treaty, and this without the surrender of a single advantage on their part. While the Democrats pretend to denounce trusts, agricultural machinery is to be put on the free list for the benefit of a Canadian combination which is to all intents and purposes a trust, but which can not be reached by American antitrust laws, even if we had a Democratic Attorney-General not disposed to nullify those laws.

The Wilson bill proposes to open the United States market free to the Canadian manufacturer, while the Canadian market will remain closed to the American. The only way that this competition can be met will be by scaling down wages.

EFFECT OF THE BILL ON A FEW MANUFACTURES OUT OF MANY—THE WOOL MANUFACTURE.

My knowledge of this industry has been obtained by practical experience as an operative in woolen mills, and I am also familiar with the causes which make the wool manufacture one of the most precarious and hazardous of all lines of manufacture for capital employed therein.

One of the principal reasons for this is its dependence on the changes of fashion, which fluctuate in this more than in any other of the textile industries.

In modern wool manufacture the requirements of fashion demand new patterns every season, thus adding greatly to the cost of manufacture.

The material requires great skill and experience in its purchase and manipulation. An error in the purchase of wool, in its preliminary preparation, its fabrication, or its dyeing and finishing, means the loss of a large amount of money.

Another feature in the industry, which breaks down many manufacturers, is the long period which elapses between the beginning of manufacture and the placing of the product on the market and obtaining its avails in cash.

There were 267 idle establishments reported at the census of 1890, having invested capital amounting to $6,107,360. The volume of capital which has been sunk in this industry is larger, in its proportion of the total capital invested, than in any other. Instances are frequent where the money expended in equipping a woolen plant has been entirely lost before that plant had been finally brought to the point of earning a return upon the capital required for its active operation. It is due to this cause that the Eastern States are full of woolen mills which have passed through many hands. At the census of 1890, the greatest number of idle woolen mills was found in the State of Pennsylvania, where 47 establishments represented inactive plants which cost $1,265,460.

This was the condition of the industry in 1890 under the operation of the tariff bill of 1883, but still the operatives who had employment were earning good wages. The census reports show that their average annual earnings were $350, as compared with $293 at the census of 1880.

The number of persons employed had increased from 161,557 in 1880 to 219,132 in 1890.

The total employés in 1890 were divided into 98,446 men, 105,993 women, and 14,693 children.

During the decade the number of men employed had increased 30 per cent, the number of women 59 per cent, while the number of children had decreased 24 per cent.

The great increase in the number of women employés shows the effect of improved machinery upon the present condition of mill operatives.

The tendency of these improvements is to lessen the physical exertion required, and thus to increase the efficiency and the employment of women.

The added protection given by the McKinley bill, which reduced importations of woolen goods from $56,582,432 in 1890 to $35,565,879 in 1892, has enabled some of the idle mills to start up, thus furnishing employment to many additional operatives and a market for our domestic wool, and all this without increasing the cost to the customer of a yard of woolen goods.

GLASSWARE.

The McKinley bill increase the duty on green and colored glassware from 1 cent per pound to 1¼ cents per pound; and on cut glass the duty was increased from 45 per cent to 60 per cent.

The Wilson bill changes the specific duty imposed on green and other colored glass to an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent, while on cut glass the present ad valorem duty of 60 per cent is reduced to 35 per cent. The collection of ad valorem duties in the past because of undervaluation has practically resulted in the payment by the foreigner of only about one-half of the tax contemplated by the law, so that for the same reason the actual tax in this case will be only 12 to 15 per cent on the cost of green glass and 15 to 20 per cent on the cost of cut glass in Europe. This action shuts up every factory engaged in the manufacture of these goods in this country at the present rate of wages.

The products of this branch of the glass industry reported at the last census comprise flint or lead and lime glassware, both cut, blown, or pressed, lamps and lamp chimneys, and flint druggists' ware.

But little cut glass was made in this country previous to 1890, but the degree of protection afforded by the McKinley bill has encouraged its manufacture, and nearly one thousand workmen are employed in my district in this industry.

Here is the scale of wages earned in one factory in my district:

	Per day each.		Per day each.
2 managers	$5.00	1 engraver	$3.05
4 pressers	5.00	4 mold-makers	4.00
8 finishers	4.50	1 machinist	4.00
15 gatherers	2.50	3 mixers	2.00
15 stickers-up	1.25	2 teazers	2.00
15 cleaning-off boys	.80	1 pot-filler	2.00
15 carrying-in boys	.90	5 packers	2.00
10 mold-holders, boys	.90	2 drivers	2.00
15 blowers	5.00	5 laborers	1.75
60 cutters	3.50	2 engineers	3.00

From the foregoing statement we find that, with 186 hands employed, the average daily earnings per hand are $2.75.

Carroll D. Wright in his published report of 1891, on Cost of Production, says:

One thousand two hundred and seventy-six families employed in the glass industry in the United States had an annual average income of $859.04, while 60 families employed in the same industry in England and Belgium had an average income of $362.16.

It is very evident from this showing that glassware costs more to manufacture by the wage-earners in American factories than that made by the foreign operative, and when my Democratic brother pats them on the back and tells them that they are so much smarter than their competitors across the water and have such superior facilities in mechanical appliances that they require no Federal protection, it sounds absurd, because mechanical appliances are but little used, the products of this industry being almost entirely the results of manual labor combined with the highest degree of artistic skill.

Taking the total cost of manufacturing glassware we find that the labor directly employed constitutes 65 per cent of it, and that this labor now receives 53 per cent more wages than is paid in Europe. What is to become of the industry under this bill we are now asked to railroad through Congress?

Nor will the annihilation of the industry in this country bring lower prices to the consumer. In 1890 the average factory prices of tumblers and goblets were $3.77 per gross for the Pennsylvania, and $1.22 for the Ohio product, while for lamps the average price was $1.65 per dozen in Ohio, and $2 in Pennsylvania. The average value of lamp chimneys per dozen, according to census statistics, is 13½ cents in Ohio and 35½ cents in Pennsylvania, and 41½ cents in New York—all these differences of price being due to the different classes of goods made.

The census returns of 1890 classify 125 establishments as engaged in the manufacture of glassware. They had $15,448,196 capital invested in plant and appliances: they paid $70,000 in local taxes; they employed 23,313 people, who received more than $10,000,000 dollars in wages during the census year 1890. They used the following materials:

	Cost.
115,746 tons mixing sand	$365,915
36,070 tons soda ash	1,274,382
250 tons salt cake	7,258
6,955 tons nitrate of soda	274,686
255,333 pounds English clay	2,699
1,417,644 pounds German clay	11,792
4,219 pots purchased	255,535
28,000,000 feet of lumber	353,518
10,000 kegs of nails	28,018
23,660 tons of straw and hay	177,426
1,650,000 casks and barrels	405,033
Miscellaneous materials	1,768,972
Total	$4,925,234

The total gross value of their products was $18,601,244.

The foregoing only refers to glassware, including cut-glass products, and out of the gross value stated has to be paid the expenses of selling, cost for the depreciation of plant, mercantile risks, etc.

The proposed reduction is particularly severe and unjust to the cut-glass branch of the industry, which will be entirely unable to compete with cheap foreign labor in the manufacture of goods which are essentially an article of luxury.

A plain article of glass, made ready for cutting, is worth about 30 cents per pound. An ordinary decanter, weighing about 3 pounds, is worth 90 cents as a plain decanter. The actual cost in wages to cut upon it any of the designs now running is from $3 to $6, so that the cost of cutting will average not less than 80 per cent of the entire cost of the output of this particular class of glassware.

In this connection I quote from petitions before me signed by all the glass-cutters in two of the largest cut-glass works in the country, the signers being mostly Democrats, who I know were not coerced:

It was generally expected that the result aimed at by the Wilson bill would be to reduce the tariff on raw materials and the necessaries of life, which was calculated to help manufacturers and also enable the American people to live a little cheaper, but in proposing to reduce the tariff on cut glass it would appear that the framers of that bill went out of their way to reduce the tariff on an article which, in a great measure, is a luxury, and one in which none but the wealthy can indulge.

We reasonably and urgently request that our petition be given a fair consideration, for if the proposed reduction in the tariff is carried into effect, it will be of no benefit to any but people of wealth and to importers of glass; but, on the other hand, it will be disastrous to all engaged in the manufacture of glass in this country.

We will now consider the manufacture of green and black glass, and we find that at the census of 1890 there were sixty-nine establishments engaged specifically in this branch of the glass manufacture. They had $7,165,078 capital invested in plant and appliances and paid $33,323 in local taxes.

They employed 10,400 people, who received $4,454,304 wages for the manipulation of materials costing $2,594,216, from which they evolved products having a gross value of $8,521,464.

These products consist of green and black bottles and vials, beer bottles, fruit jars, demijohns, carboys, telegraph insulators, and similar articles. The workmen employed in these industries may now take a cut of at least 30 per cent in their wages or the factories must be closed.

FREE RAW MATERIALS.

As a panacea for the distress which the authors of this bill plainly foresee, they propose to give the manufacturer free raw materials by admitting wool, coal, and iron ore free of all tariff charges. They say this will enable domestic manufacturers to enter the world's markets with the products which they can not sell at home.

But how can it be shown that these articles are "raw materials," since they all represent the product of labor? Why should the miner and the farmer be selected as a scapegoat for the manufacturer?

Moreover, under the McKinley law a manufacturer of any class of goods whatever may import any material he sees fit, raw or otherwise, and use the same in his factory, and when his goods are ready for market he can export them to any foreign country and have refunded all the duties he had paid on said materials which entered into said manufactures, less 1 per cent of the duties levied on said material imported. By reason of this law an iron manufacturer may have his ore, lime, and fuel brought to him practically free of duty, providing he can find a market abroad for the iron produced therefrom. As a matter of fact, the manufacturers of this country have not availed themselves of this opportunity to have free raw material with which to manufacture goods for export, for the very reason that combined with said material must be the high-priced labor of the American artisan. I think this clause was put in the McKinley bill more to prove absolutely the fallacy of the free-trade claim that with free raw material we could enlarge our market and furnish goods to the whole world, and still pay current rates for American labor.

When I hear my friends on the other side of the House clamoring for the wider markets of the whole world so that more labor at present rates can be employed, I wonder why they do not take advantage of this clause of the McKinley act, and prove by something besides theory and sophistry the possibility and practicability of our country furnishing manufactured goods to the rest of the world. If they can succeed in profitably manufacturing goods for the foreign markets from practically free raw material already provided for by existing law, I will be very willing to be convinced of the consistency of their arguments.

The current wages paid to mine employés in this country are twice those paid in England, and about four times higher than in the Spanish mines.

Every ton of imported coal takes the place of a ton of domestic product upon which the average labor cost of mining is 77 cents, to which must be added the labor cost of transportation to the seaboard points which are now to be supplied with the foreign product.

So with iron ore. Each ton imported deprives our miners of $1.06, the average labor cost per ton of mining.

WOOL.

Are American farmers doing well with their wool under the existing tariff? I think not, and what will their condition be when the last remnant of protection is swept away? We are now growing over 300,000,000 pounds of wool annually in this country, besides importing about 100,000,000 pounds, which pays a duty of 12 cents per pound, but is now to be admitted free.

Since there were in 1890 about 44,000,000 sheep in the United States growing a fleece which has an average weight of 6¾ pounds, and the average value of those sheep was $2.51 each, it follows that the abolition of the present duty means a reduction in their value of at least 79½ cents each, or $34,848,000.

THE CHANGE FROM SPECIFIC TO AD VALOREM DUTIES.

The reductions which this bill proposes in the duties on manufactures will really be much greater than appear in the estimates which have been published, because there are so many changes from specific to ad valorem duties.

This will invite persistent and systematic undervaluation, an unknown factor which will tend to wipe out any remnant of protection this measure might afford.

Our experience has demonstrated conclusively that it is only under the specific form of duty that the full measure of revenue intended by the law can be collected.

The late Secretary Manning, Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, in his report on the revision of the tariff, dated February 16, 1886, well stated the reason why this is so in the following words:

Perhaps the chief advantage of a specific over an ad valorem system is the fact that under the former duties are levied by a positive test, which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in possession of the Government, and according to a standard which is altogether national and domestic * * * Under an ad valorem system the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousands of miles away and under circumstances most unfavorable to justice.

Secretary Manning's reasoning is that duties, to be effective, must be specific in form.

THE BILL IS UNPRINCIPLED AND DISHONEST.

The majority of the committee in reporting this bill say that they are legislating for the benefit of the masses, so that there shall be a substantial and beneficial reduction in the cost of the laborer's living expenses, in order to compensate him for the loss of wages which this bill will inevitably cause.

Of the proposed reduction of $75,000,000 in the Government's revenue, I find that more than $10,000,000 will result from the

removal or the reduction of duties on such items as the following:

	Proposed reduction.
Perfumery	$74,177
Opium prepared for smoking	400,073
Decorated china	1,361,218
Cut glass	154,584
Cigars	921,029
Cigarettes	17,210
Laces and embroideries	3,085,277
Silks	3,196,612
Playing cards	1,189
Ostrich feathers	1,514
Jewelry	47,797
Kid gloves	1,008,428
Paintings and statuary	339,264
Total	10,611,372

Why have the committee scaled the tariff to such an extent on articles of luxury, such as are shown in the foregoing list?

Is this legislation for the masses?

How inconsistent is this with their statements, and how false to their promises. Are these so essential to the happiness of the miner or the farmer that their admission at a decreased duty will compensate for the free entrance of the products of foreign mines and farms to compete with him in a market already crowded?

To what extent will our mill operatives, working at European wages, or out of work entirely, be able to indulge in perfumery, kid gloves, jewelry, paintings, or statuary?

Why is the duty on a deadly drug, imported only for immoral purposes, cut down from $12 to $6 per pound?

This bill, which purports to be a revenue measure, should not be railroaded through this House, carrying such incongruous and inconsistent features, which are not only false to the principles of the party represented by a majority of the committee, but designed to disturb the business of the country at a time when the greatest amount of disaster will result.

And I appeal to you, my Democratic friends, to hesitate and consider well before you place upon the statute books of this country this unwise and unjust law, which will bring ruin and untold suffering to the American laborer. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the time of Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania expired.

Mr. BRYAN. How much longer does the gentleman desire?

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. About ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for fifteen minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Before the gentleman proceeds, I ask that ladies accompanying members and the friends of members may be admitted to the floor for this evening session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that members be permitted to bring their ladies and friends on the floor of the House this evening. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The time of Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania was further extended five minutes, on request of Mr. SAYERS.

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind our visiting friends that a very unusual privilege has been granted, that of admission to the floor, and the Chair feels that it is necessary to remind them of this fact and to ask them to observe the most proper decorum. If conversation must be indulged in by our friends, under the rule they must retire to the cloakroom. Conversation on the floor will not be permitted. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SAYERS. Before the gentleman from Nebraska begins, I understand that no other speaker is to follow him this evening. I therefore ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak without limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BELTZHOOVER] was to have followed the gentleman from Nebraska, but he is not here; and therefore there is no other speaker to follow. Without objection, then, the gentleman will be recognized without limit.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BRYAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. HAINES. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, a bill of the following title was introduced, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGANN: A bill (H. R. 5207) for the protection of honest industries from unjust and ruinous competition of convict-made goods transported from one State or Territory into another—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 5208) granting a pension to Jerusha Sturgis, widow of Brig. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRESHAM: A bill (H. R. 5209) for the relief of A. M. Shannon & Co., of Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 5210) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of James H. Deal, and to issue to said Deal an honorable discharge for service rendered—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5211) for the benefit of M. S. Elkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) for the benefit of Mrs. Elizabeth Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) for the relief of Mary Elkin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5214) for the relief of the heirs of William Wesley Turner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 5215) for the relief of the estate of Sylvanus Sandford, deceased, late of Cass County, Tex.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of William R. Harper, president, and 51 professors of the University of Chicago, for the removal of the duty on books printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the officers of the Arnold Toynbee Club, of Chicago, for the removal of the duty on books printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AVERY: Petition of Hon. Silas Moody, George L. Huffman, and others, citizens of Gratiot County, Mich., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARWIG: Petition of citizens of the town of Trenton, Dodge County, Wis., protesting against any change in the existing import duty on barley—to the Committee on ——.

By Mr. BLAIR: Papers to accompany House bill 5188—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUNDY: Petition of Elliott Pemberton and 51 other citizens of Lawrence County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. M. Dever and 87 others, citizens of Hamilton Township, Jackson County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. R. Rose and 100 other citizens of Union Township, Lawrence County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURROWS: Petition of the citizens of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABANISS: Petition of citizens of Culloden, Ga., in favor of House bill 3188—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the cigar-makers of Wheeling, W. Va., against increasing revenue duties on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of glass workers in W. H. Hamilton & Co.'s

works, Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of blast furnace employés of Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Two petitions of the citizens of Manilla, Crawford County, and of the citizens of Farnhamville, Calhoun County, Iowa, protesting against any change in the existing import duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Protest of employés of the Dudley Mills, of Newton Lower Falls, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Protest of H. B. Powell, of Putney, Vt., and 60 other farmers, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the employés of the Dyottville glass works, of Kensington, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the proposed reduction in the Wilson tariff bill of duties on green and flint bottles, or the change from specific rates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of the lithographers of the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, against the proposed reduction of the duty on lithographic products in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial and resolution of the directors of the Chicago Board of Trade, indorsing House bill 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection of animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Remonstrance of 136 citizens of Madison County, Ind., against the reduction of the duty on window glass, as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of citizens of Muncie, Delaware County, Ind., against the reduction of duty on glass bottles, as provided for in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of the Matteawan Manufacturing Company, of Matteawan, N. Y., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 250 of the operatives of the Rifton Manufacturing Company, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Papers to accompany House bill 5197—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Madison County, Ky., for appropriation to improve the Kentucky River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McLAURIN: Petition of citizens of Effingham, S. C., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Petition of District Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Rhode Island, for appointment of national commission of inquiry in regard to the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the American Curled Hair Company and 38 operatives, of Central Falls, R. I., against removing the duty on curled hair below 15 per cent—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 14 workingmen of Woonsocket, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 194 operatives of the Glenlyn Dye Works, of Saylesville, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 184 operatives of the William Clark Company Mills, of Westerly, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY: Two petitions of citizens of Binghampton and Ithaca, N. Y., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, their employés and others, interested in the cultivation of that product, of Suffield Township, Hardford County, Conn., protesting against the proposed reduction on foreign wrappers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of the American Hosiers' Company, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the defeat of that section of the Wilson bill that applies to knitted underwear, both cotton and woolen—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS: Petition of 160 employés of the Lowell Carpet Company, of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the carpet schedule as proposed in the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Petition of Franklin Carter and others of the faculty of Williams College, of Williamstown, Mass., for the removal of the duty on books printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 15, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

ALLOWANCES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of November 1, 1893, a report of the Third Auditor of the Treasury relative to the allowances made to the State of New York by the Third Auditor under the provisions of the act of July 27, 1861, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the memorial of William Trebilcock and 139 other citizens of Ironwood, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 46, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying that no change be made in the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Malt and Grain Company, remonstrating against any reduction of duty on barley; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of W. R. Sturtevant and 106 other citizens of Ironwood, Mich., remonstrating against the placing of iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Monmouth and Ottawa in the State of Illinois, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry manufacturers of clothing and cloaks in Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of S. N. Tarpley, of Kewanee, Ill., remonstrating against the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco, and praying that the tariff be raised so as to prevent the shipment into the country of every ounce of this grade of tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a resolution adopted recently by the Portland (Oregon) Chamber of Commerce. The paper is brief, and I ask that it be read, if there is no objection.

There being no objection, the Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolutions passed by the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oregon, January 6, 1894.

Whereas on Christmas Day Sylvester Pennoyer, governor of Oregon, addressed an open letter to the President of the United States, in which he said, "To-day is the first Christmas in the history of Oregon when more than two-thirds of its people are without employment, and more than one-third without sufficient means of support, and "the debtors are powerless to avoid the seizure of their property and their homes to satisfy, at a small percentage of their value, the claims of creditors;" and as the statements have been given wide-spread distribution by the Associated Press, and emanating from the governor, the highest official of the State, may be taken by those unacquainted with the conditions existing in Oregon as authentic and thus prejudice our State in the eyes of the world at large, and work great injury to its general interests; and

Whereas careful investigation throughout the State does not show any material percentage of unemployed or destitute outside of Portland, and fails to show in Portland, the largest center of population in the Pacific Northwest, any alarming or unusual number of unemployed, considering the present financial depression and condition of trade existing throughout the country at large; and

Whereas, using the census of 1890 and Bradstreet's published report of December 23, 1893, as a basis for calculation, investigation shows that Portland has the third lowest percentage of unemployed and dependent of fifty important cities selected from various sections of the United States; therefore be it

Resolved, By the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oregon, in special session assembled, that, in defense of the fair name of our State, we condemn the statements of the governor as erroneous, misleading, injurious, and not warranted nor substantiated in any manner by the facts or conditions existing in any section of the State or throughout the State as a whole.

H. M. CAKE,
THOS. N. STRONG,
E. D. McKEE,
H. E. BATTIN,
D. D. OLIPHANT,
J. LANG,
Committee.

Attest:
[L. S.]

FRANK METTER, *Secretary.*

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. I desire to state that I have received a duplicate of the resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oregon, presented by my colleague, which I shall not present to the Senate, inasmuch as it has already been submitted.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States, residents of the Pacific coast, praying for the enactment of legislation protecting the salmon in Alaskan waters; which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of 35 citizens of Libertyville, Iowa, honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation which will prevent the suspension of pensions until after alleged fraud in their procurement shall have been proved; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHOUP presented memorials of Thomas I. McMahon and 15 other wool-growers of Canyon County; of R. B. Campbell and 49 other wool-growers of Logan County; of Isaac I. Lewis and 18 other wool-growers of Alturas County; and of E. G. Burnett and 4 other wool-growers of Bellevue, all in the State of Idaho, remonstrating against any change in the present woolen schedule; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Hoisting and Portable Engineers' Association of Boston, Mass., and a petition of Boston (Mass.) Lodge No. 264, Independent Association of Mechanics, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of 175 citizens of Toledo, of 114 citizens of Braceville, of 127 citizens of Erie County, of 43 citizens of Sharon, of 22 citizens of Center, of 244 citizens of Cleveland, of 68 citizens of Marion, of 175 citizens of Cincinnati, of 47 citizens of Farmington, and of 78 citizens of Coal, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 37 citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction in the salaries of all Government officers; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of E. A. Gilbert and 173 other green and flint glass bottle-makers of Newark, Ohio, remonstrating against the reduction of duties on green and flint glass bottles to 30 per cent ad valorem, as proposed in the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST presented a memorial of the employés of the Broderick & Bascom Rope Company, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented the petition of A. M. Michelson and other citizens of Bismarck, S. Dak., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY. I present the memorial of A. J. Spencer and 490 other wage-earners of Massachusetts and Connecticut, remonstrating against the Wilson tariff bill in general as a measure which will deprive American labor of employment at remunerative wages. They are mostly out of employment, and they desire to be let alone, as the occupation in which they have been engaged is their only way of getting a living. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the memorial of A. E. Potwine and 24 other farmers and growers of leaf tobacco in East Windsor, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the duty on leaf tobacco and cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of John B. Talcott and 339 other employés of the American Hosiery Company of New Britain, Conn., remonstrating against any reduction of duty on cotton or woolen knit goods; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition of the South Dakota Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, assembled at Brookings, S. Dak., on the 11th of October, 1893, composed of 85 ministers, representing about 10,000 church members, praying for the repeal of the so-called Geary law, excluding Chinese; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the American Society of Naturalists, praying for the removal of all duties on scientific and philosophical apparatus whose chief use is for instruction or research; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Boston (Mass.) Lodge, No. 264, Independent Association of Mechanics; of the Hoisting and Portable Engineers' Association of Boston, Mass., and of the Rubber Garment Workers' Local Union, No. 51, of Boston, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WASHBURN presented memorials of citizens of Virginia, Tower, and Soudan, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of hat manufacturers of South Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against any reduction of the present duty on hats; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Sons of Temperance of Connecticut, praying for the appointment of an impartial national commission of inquiry to investigate and report upon the alcoholic liquor traffic; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Henry James, residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1280) for the promotion of anatomical science and to prevent the desecration of graves in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1260) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 655) to extend the jurisdiction of justices of the peace in the District of Columbia, and to regulate the proceedings before them, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 755) granting the right of way to the Albany and Astoria Railroad Company through the Grand Ronde Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, reported it with amendments.

Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 914) for the relief of the legal personal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

KANSAS RIVER DAMS.

Mr. VEST. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within Shawnee County, in the State of Kansas.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of the bill. It has been pending here quite a while, and is a matter of great importance to our people there. There can be no sort of opposition to the bill. The committee has reported in favor of it unanimously, and I should like very much to have it disposed of now. It is purely a local matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. HOAR. I am not quite sure that I heard the bill perfectly, but as I listened to it it seemed to me to provide that the dam should be torn down if anybody gave a notice to the Secretary of War that it was interfering with navigation.

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir; I think there is no such provision in the bill.

Mr. HOAR. I withhold objection to its consideration for the present that that may be ascertained.

Mr. MARTIN. I think there is no provision of that kind in the bill. It provides that if the Secretary of War shall deem the dam or dams material obstructions to navigation they shall be removed.

Mr. HOAR. To see whether I am right or not, let the first section be read again.

The Secretary read as follows:

That the Chicago-Topeka Light, Heat, and Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns,

be and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to construct and maintain a dam or dams across the Kansas River, at any suitable place or places within the county of Shawnee, in the State of Kansas: *Provided*, That on notice by the Secretary of War that said dam or dams are material obstructions to navigation, said dam or dams shall be at once removed, or suitable lock or locks provided by the owner or owners thereof at his or their expense so as not to interfere with navigation.

Mr. HOAR. I thought it was read, "*Provided*, That on notice to the Secretary of War."

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir; "on notice by the Secretary of War."

Mr. HOAR. Then I make no further objection to the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 105) granting to the Chicago-Topeka Light, Heat, and Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of Illinois, the right to erect and maintain a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within Shawnee County, in the State of Kansas, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HUNTON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1426) to provide an American register for the steamer Goldsworthy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen G. Heiner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1428) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. DANIEL. I introduce a bill for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell. I beg leave to state that I know nothing of the merits of the bill; I simply introduce it because I think the claimant is entitled to a hearing.

The bill (S. 1429) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell, and to pay just compensation for his invention of armament made for the Army and Navy service, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1430) for the protection of salmon, trout, and other fish in the streams and tide waters of the Territory of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print the annual report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for the year ending June 30, 1893.

The message also announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print the annual report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year 1892, with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 108) authorizing Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor; in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to inspection of iron or steel boiler plates; and

A bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Bœuf River, in Louisiana.

DES MOINES RAPIDS POWER COMPANY.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to call up the bill (S. 1126) granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill. It is the bill which was laid over the other day because it was not printed, with the amendments of the committee.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments reported from the Committee on Commerce have been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOG SIGNAL NEAR CAPE ARAGO, OREGON.

Mr. DOLPH. I expect to be absent for some days. The second bill on the Calendar under Rule VIII is a small bill to which no one has any objection. I should like to have it considered for fear that it might come up in my absence.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon for the present consideration of the bill (S. 757) to provide for the erection of a first-class fog signal at or near the present position of the Cape Arago light station?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate $5,000 for the erection of a first-class fog signal at or near the present position of Cape Arago light station.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD in connection with the bill a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury which is only ten lines long. There being no report on the bill, the letter will explain it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon ask to have the letter read?

Mr. DOLPH. No; not read, but inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *September 8, 1893.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from your committee of September 5, 1893, inclosing Senate bill No. 757 appropriating $5,000 for the erection of a first-class fog signal at or near Cape Arago (Oregon) light station.

This bill with your letter was referred to the Light-House Board, which returned them with the statement that commerce and navigation would be greatly benefited by the establishment of this fog signal, and that it can be done for the amount named in the bill.

Recommendation is therefore made that the bill be passed.

A copy of Senate bill No. 757 is inclosed.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES S. HAMLIN,
Acting Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN *of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*

CHOCTAW COAL AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PLATT. On Thursday last I reported favorably from the Committee on Indian Affairs the bill (H. R. 299) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company. I said then that I thought the bill ought to be immediately considered, but that I would wait until the report had been printed and call it up this morning. The report has been printed and laid on the tables of Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at the present time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. I shall not object to this bill, but give notice that I shall hereafter object to bills being called up out of order. I shall insist that we go to the Calendar in regular order after this bill is disposed of.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANT OF LANDS TO ARIZONA.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (H. R. 3627) granting certain lands to the Territory of Arizona.

Mr. TELLER. I gave notice a moment ago that I should object to any further taking up of bills out of their regular order on the Calendar. I do not like to do that, but it seems to me the better way would be to go to the Calendar regularly.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator will allow the bill to which I have referred to be considered.

Mr. TELLER. Unless there is some particular reason why the bill should be taken up out of its order, I think we ought to go to the Calendar.

Mr. BERRY. The bill has been on the Calendar for quite a while. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that the bill has been reported for some months, and the Delegate from the Territory from time to time has been urging me to call it up. There have been two bills passed this morning and I hope the Senator will not object to this bill.

Mr. TELLER. If we can go to the Calendar after the bill of the Senator is disposed of, I shall not object to its consideration, but I do not think this is a good way to do business.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from Colorado will allow the bill to be considered and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SHERMAN. I should first like to hear the report read.

Mr. BERRY. I will send the report to the desk to be read. It is very short. The Senate committee adopted the House report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. BERRY, October 30, 1893, as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3627) granting to the Territory of Arizona certain lands for the use of the Territorial prison, beg leave to report the same, adopting the report (No. 94) of the House of Representatives, and recommending that the bill pass.

[House Report No. 94, Fifty-third Congress, first session.]

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3627) granting to Arizona certain lands for the use of Territorial prison, beg leave to report that the said bill has received the careful consideration of the committee, and its passage is recommended.

At the junction of the Colorado and Gila Rivers in Arizona, and lying between said streams, are fractional sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, and 25 of unoccupied and unclaimed public lands. This land in its present condition is worthless for any purpose whatever on account of the frequent overflow of said rivers. The land can not be utilized without great expense in construction of levees to prevent the overflow of said streams.

The land lies directly adjoining the Territorial prison grounds in the village of Yuma, and can be reclaimed by prison labor and made valuable as a prison farm and thus relieve the people of the Territory of some of the burden of taxation under which they labor. Arizona has never received one acre of land or one dollar of aid from the Government in the construction of any public building. The land granted in the bill is now worthless, and will in all probability forever remain so. It can be made valuable and productive under the provisions of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892, which was, in line 4, to strike out "1892," and insert "1893."

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives. It is merely a change as to the date.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HILL. I was about to submit a motion for an executive session, but my attention has been called to the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] gave notice that to-day, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, he would like to address the Senate on the subject of the tariff. I ask the Senator whether he can just as well postpone his remarks until to-morrow at the same hour?

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that my matter is not of sufficient importance to stand in the way of an executive session. Furthermore, as I am suffering from a severe cold to-day, I should regard it as a courtesy if the Senate would change the date until to-morrow.

Mr. HILL. With that understanding, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six hours and eighteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1894.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles Parlange, of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana.

MARSHALS.

J. Shelby Williams, of Texas, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Texas.

O. J. Carroll, of North Carolina, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of North Carolina.

John W. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 15, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of an appropriation submitted by the Secretary of State to meet the share of the United States in the expenses of the special bureau created by article 82 of the general act concluded at Brussels July 2, 1890, for the suppression of the African slave trade and the restriction of the importation into and sale in a certain defined zone of the African continent of firearms, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings of the court in the cases of Alfred Blackman, deceased, and S. S. Eason against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The SPEAKER. The Senate, in compliance with the request of the House of Representatives, has returned the Senate concurrent resolution, with a House amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892, 1,500 copies of part 1 in quarto form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 900 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and 2,800 copies of part 2 in octavo form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,200 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the amendment was agreed to here a few days ago and sent to the Senate. The House later requested the Senate to return the resolution in order that we might correct an error. The resolution as passed provides for printing the report for the fiscal year 1892, whereas it should be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893. I therefore move to reconsider the vote by which the House concurred in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I move to amend the resolution by striking out "1892" and substituting "1893."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate resolution as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolutions:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries covering the operations of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, be printed, and that there be printed 8,000 extra copies, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 for the use of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries; the illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, that resolution is identical with one reported by the House Committee on

Printing for the same purpose, and I move that the Senate resolution be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a Senate concurrent resolution, providing for the printing of 8,000 copies of the thirteenth annual report of the Bureau of Ethnology, which was read.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a question in regard to that resolution. My recollection is that the printing of the Geological Survey, under which the Bureau of Ethnology operates at least in part, is provided for in the sundry civil bill. Now, I want to ask the gentleman whether this resolution proposes to make an additional appropriation for that printing?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No, sir. The appropriation of which the gentleman speaks as being carried in the sundry civil bill is for the current printing of the Bureau of Ethnology. There is no provision there for printing the extra copies which are provided for in this resolution, and which are intended for Congress and for distribution by the Bureau. This resolution is to provide for printing the same number of extra copies that is provided for in the printing bill which passed this House in the extraordinary session and is now pending in the Senate; but, lest that bill should not pass the Senate in time, the Bureau and its officers have thought it wise to ask us to provide for these extra copies by a special concurrent resolution in order that they may go on with the work and not be delayed while waiting for the passage of the printing bill. That is the reason this resolution is proposed.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman to let the resolution lie over until I can confer with him about it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker. Let it lie on the Speaker's table.

SENATE BILLS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House an act (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has reported without amendment a House bill which is identical with this Senate bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill and that the latter lie on the table.

Mr. SAYERS. Will my colleague permit a question?

Mr. CRAIN. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. I understand this bill simply extends the time for the completion of the work at Aransas Pass.

Mr. CRAIN. That is all.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Aransas Pass Harbor Company, which is engaged in the improvement of Aransas Pass under the provisions contained in an act of Congress entitled "An act for the improvement of Aransas Pass," approved May 12, 1890, is hereby relieved from the conditions of said act which require the construction of said work to be commenced within one year from the date of its approval and to be diligently prosecuted by the expenditure of at least $300,000 per annum thereafter, and to secure a navigable depth over the outer bar of 15 feet of water within three years after the date of approval of said act, and of 20 feet within five years from said date; and the said company is hereby authorized to continue and complete its work of improvement as set forth in said act: *Provided*, That work shall be resumed by the said Aransas Pass Harbor Company within six months from the date of approval of this act, and shall be diligently prosecuted to completion, and said company shall secure a navigable depth over the outer bar of at least 20 feet of water within two years from the date of approval of this act. And in the event of said company failing to resume said work within the said six months, or failing to diligently prosecute the same, or to secure a navigable depth of 20 feet of water over the outer bar within the time required by this act, then Congress may revoke the privileges herein granted in relation to said improvement.

SEC. 2. That the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN]?

Mr. DINGLEY. Before consent is given, I wish the gentleman from Texas would explain exactly what this bill does.

Mr. CRAIN. On the 12th of May, 1890, a bill was passed by both Houses of Congress, and became a law, authorizing the Aransas Pass Harbor Company to improve the outer bar at Aransas Pass. That act prescribed certain limitations, and amongst other things it was provided that within two years there should have been attained a depth of 15 feet of water over the outer bar, and at the expiration of five years (which would be May 12, 1895) a depth of 20 feet; and that there should be expended by the company $300,000 a year upon the work.

The company began its operations. A number of the stockholders were stockholders and bondholders in the Aransas Pass Railroad Company, a State institution, its line being the largest local railroad in the State of Texas, being upwards of 800 miles in length. That railroad company went into the hands of a receiver, and as a consequence the Aransas Pass Harbor Company was compelled to suspend operations. The people who owned property adjacent to Aransas Pass, and for many miles in the interior of the State tributary to the Pass, concluded that they would themselves raise the necessary funds to induce outside capital to take possession of the works and complete them within the time prescribed by the amendatory act which I now ask to have passed. They have raised in donations of land and money upwards of $600,000. They have an inchoate contract with Mr. Brewster Cameron, of Arizona, and his associates, capitalists in Chicago, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, who propose to take the franchise of the Aransas Pass Harbor Company and operating under it to do the work which was contemplated, and which if their operations be successful will give 20 feet of water in a less time than was prescribed by the maximum limitation of the original act, which I may say in passing, provides that there shall be no levying of tribute on commerce, but that every vessel, coastwise and foreign, shall be permitted to go through the Pass without charge.

The State of Texas in furtherance of this improvement passed an act granting certain privileges to such company as would within two years from some day in March or April (I forget which) accomplish this work. So that Mr. Cameron and his associates operating under this act will get this donation of $600,000 in value, in land and money, and will also be the beneficiaries of the act of the Legislature of Texas of which I have spoken.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is an extension of the time in which they are to complete the work?

Mr. CRAIN. It is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Did not the original act authorize the imposition of a charge or duty on tonnage going through the Pass?

Mr. CRAIN. No, sir; the gentleman is thinking of the act for the improvement of the mouth of the Brazos. That was subject to the control of the Secretary of the Treasury. The act now under consideration provides—I will read it——

Mr. DINGLEY. A brief statement will be sufficient.

Mr. CRAIN (reading):

Nothing in the provisions of this act shall be construed to authorize the said company to charge or collect tolls or tonnage upon boats or vessels navigating said channel; and the navigation of the same shall be free.

Mr. DINGLEY. As I understand, neither the original act nor this amendatory measure imposes any charge upon the Treasury. The proposition is merely that Congress shall give its consent to certain works of improvement to be carried on by private individuals at the expense of such individuals or of the State.

Mr. CRAIN. Neither directly nor by implication does the measure impose any charge upon the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. So I understand.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CRAIN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House bill No. 5077, similar in its provisions to the Senate bill just passed, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

LOVICA HALL.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill (H. R. 3195) granting increase of pension to Lovica Hall, a widow of a soldier of the war of 1812, was read, with the amendment proposed by the Committee on Pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WELLS. I object at this time.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. I ask consent to have the report read.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think as consent has been refused already we had better stop right here.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the Clerk will call the committees for reports.

STATE HOSPITAL, OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

Mr. MEYER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 3202) donating condemned

cannon to the St. Lawrence State Hospital, at Ogdensburg, N. Y.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The call of committees was concluded, there being no further reports.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 299) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company;

A bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within Shawnee County, in the State of Kansas; and

A bill (H. R. 3627) granting certain lands to the Territory of Arizona.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, under the special order, for the further consideration of a bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is entertained I desire to call up the question of privilege now pending.

The SPEAKER. There is no motion pending; this is the order of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about executing the order of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I submit that the question of privilege is a matter of higher preference than the present order of business in the House.

I desire to call the attention of the Chair to a ruling made by the Chair on the 3d day of January, which covers this subject. The Chair then held that no technical operation of the rules of the House could deprive the House of the right to consider a matter relating to its own privileges. The Chair held that the action of the Chair in referring a resolution of that character of high privilege to a committee, and the action of the committee in reporting it back to the House, under a certain order of business, could not possibly deprive the House of the right to act upon it when the matter was called up. Because the Chair held:

In the case of a resolution which is itself privileged without any regard to what committee it might be referred, a case where the privilege attached not to the committee, nor even to the committee and the resolution together, but to the resolution itself, the Chair does not think it loses its privilege because reported during the call; because if it did then a committee, by exercising its right to report a privileged resolution during the call of committees, could deprive the House of the right to consider it as a privileged matter.

I desire to submit to the Chair that the events which have transpired since the House assembled on Saturday have emphasized the situation I presented to the House last week in a very conspicuous and grave manner.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I suggested, if the Chair will remember, the hypothetical case that the President might send a message to Congress calling upon this body to exercise its privilege in the constitutional mode and manner.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Maine is not stating any question of privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, Mr. Speaker, I can not conceive that the gentleman from Tennessee desires to allow this Hawaiian infamy to rest upon the Democratic party and the whole Government of the United States——

Mr. MCMILLIN. We are trying to relieve the people from a burden of infamy in the shape of tariff taxation, and I demand the regular order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I say to the gentleman that if he and his associates persist in refusing to permit Congress to repudiate this infamous business he is making the whole Government of the United States rest under this odium and obloquy.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman is not stating a question of privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I demand recognition of the right of this House—of the Democratic majority of the House, unless it has lost its manhood—to exercise its privileges, and unload from the majority of this body and from the Government of the United States the burden of outrage and disgrace that has been unlawfully incurred in its name. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. There is no question before the House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will take the chair——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, it can not be possible that the Chair desires to keep this burden of obloquy resting upon the honor of this country and that the nation shall be made to bear the odium——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I enter my protest against this denial of privilege as an outrage upon the honor of the United States and the dignity and privileges of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will resume his seat. There is some limit even to the right of a gentleman to violate the order of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Ah, Mr. Speaker, you are violating the Constitution of this country.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will take his seat. There must be somewhere the power in the majority of the House to enforce its own rules, and when gentlemen persistently violate the rules day after day, there must be some remedy in the possession of the majority to protect itself from such violations of its own rules.

THE TARIFF.

And then, under the order heretofore adopted, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order adopted, the time for general debate has expired, and the bill will now be read.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, before the committee proceeds to the consideration of the bill under the order which provides for its consideration under the five-minute rule, I would suggest to the gentlemen upon the other side of the House, if they do not object to it, that we take up the schedules in the order in which they occur in the bill itself, and consider them in the usual manner, say for three days, by the end of which time we can form a judgment as to whether in the time limited for the consideration of the bill—twelve days—we can get through with all of the amendments in the usual way.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion just made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has been made to me in private, and consequently I am in a position to state to the committee the difficulties which surround the proposition mentioned by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]. I am very glad to see him recognize thus, at the outset, the utter impropriety of the method which he has seen fit to adopt for the consideration of this measure. It will be found to be fraught with great misfortune the further we go; but the gentleman does not propose to remedy it in the only way which is a suitable remedy, namely, to allow the question to be considered after the fashion which the wisdom and experience of the House have sanctioned for a great many years, namely, to remove the time limitation and allow the House freely and in untrammeled fashion to consider each proposition as it comes up.

This bill contains a great many propositions, many of which are vital to different sections of the country. Instead of having the free right which every member—as is evident from the proposition made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]—should have to offer amendments without let or hindrance on the part of the Chair, the whole bill is thrown upon the House, and we are dependent upon the action of a single man in the Chair. It depends upon his recognition; and one of the great reasons which exists for having rules at all has been absolutely ignored in the proposition.

The fact that it was done so at another time, as has already been stated to the House, does not in the least alter the case, for that experiment itself is only an evidence that this thing ought not to be done. But the proposition now made is not to return to the old and well-understood way of doing business, but to try it for three days; and if the gentlemen on the other side do not like it, then we are to have no more of it. Of course we can not accept a proposition like that. It is not reasonable. It is as unreasonable as the other is.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Maine is going to take up all the time with a speech, I shall object to this. We had better proceed with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. This is proceeding by common consent.

Mr. REED. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Indiana for not giving his side a chance. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

Mr. WISE. Will the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] allow me to make one remark? Mr. Chairman, I unite

with the request made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. There are Representatives upon this floor whose people are deeply interested in some of the provisions of this bill. They have not had an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] objected, and unless he withdraws the objection, the consideration of this proposition can not proceed.

Mr. WISE. Well, I have the permission of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means——

The CHAIRMAN. But the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has not the floor for that purpose. He only took the floor to ask unanimous consent for a modification of the order.

Mr. REED. I am glad to see the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE], even in this stifled manner, give utterance to his sense of outrage which this system produces.

Mr. WISE. I have not risen to debate this. I have risen with the permission of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to say that I think——

The CHAIRMAN. But the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has not the floor for any such purpose.

Mr. WISE. I ask unanimous consent that I may make my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman can proceed.

Mr. WISE. I have had no opportunity to be heard since this question was before the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state how much time he desires?

Mr. WISE. I did not want but a moment, and would have been through if the Chair had allowed me to finish. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want to say that there are members here whose people are deeply interested in this legislation; and I do think, as has been said by the honorable gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], that this bill ought to be thoroughly discussed, that every opportunity should be afforded to members who represent people upon this floor to present the views of their constituents, and I do hope that his suggestion will be respected and will be observed. That is all I want to say.

Mr. CRAIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAIN. How are we going to proceed to consider this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will proceed to consider any amendment that may be offered.

Mr. CRAIN. In what order?

The CHAIRMAN. In the order that they are recognized by the Chair, by the rules that always prevail in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REED. That is leaving the matter of recognition entirely to the Chair, and is a "one-man power" exalted to an unnecessary degree, and naturally repugnant in a Democratic House. If anything can be more autocratic than that I do not know of it.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state in connection with my parliamentary inquiry that I have some amendments to offer. I would like to know when to offer them.

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman gets the floor he can offer them.

Mr. REED. And unless the Chair gives it to you, you can not offer them.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will resume their seats and come to order. The gentleman from West Virginia offers the first amendment, which will be reported as soon as order is restored on the floor.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, amend section 183——

Mr. REED. The Chair says the gentleman "offers the first amendment."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states that the first amendment is offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. REED. That is better.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, amend section 183, lines 20 and 21, by striking out the words "commercially known as."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DINGLEY. We desire to know the object of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "commercially known," in section 183. On all leaf tobacco, on such part thereof as is commercially known as wrapper tobacco, and suitable for cigar wrappers if unstemmed, $1 per pound; if stemmed, $1.25 per pound.

Mr. REED. I think we ought to know why this proposition is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear any gentleman who desires to address the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to hear the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. REED. I would like to ask the gentleman if he proposes to have this amendment passed for the reason given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his speech?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I did not catch the question of the gentleman?

Mr. REED. I asked the gentleman from West Virginia if he proposes to have the section changed for the reason given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his speech.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I do not know the reasons given by the gentleman from New York. Unfortunately I did not hear his speech.

Mr. REED. Then I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will give us some reason of his own.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That amendment is offered, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that it might lead to some trouble in the custom-house. It is merely a verbal amendment. There may be some difficulty in interpreting these words by the officers of the custom-house; and in order to avoid that objection the amendment is offered. It does not affect the substance of the section at all.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. The bill as reported by the committee adopted the language used in the law of 1883. The amendment is conforming the language to the paragraph in the act of 1890. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That may be correct. I have not read the law, but probably that is substantially correct.

Mr. PAYNE. There is no doubt of the correctness of it. I supposed that the chairman of the committee would know that.

Mr. MALLORY. I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia whether or not this language, "commercially known as," proposed to be stricken out, is recommended by the Department?

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to ask the gentleman from West Virginia a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has recognized the gentleman from Florida to ask him a question.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The gentleman from Florida asks whether or not the proposition to strike these words out is recommended by the Department. It was not recommended by any Department. It may have been in the recommendations of one of the general appraisers, but I do not recall that fact. It is probable, however, that the language might lead to some trouble in interpretation and administration by the custom-house; and the committee, on further consideration, thought it better to strike it out.

Mr. MALLORY. I would like to state that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, instead of leading to any confusion and misapprehension, the language or the words undertaken to be stricken out will really lead to certainty, for the reason that there is in the tobacco business a species of tobacco which is known commercially as "wrapper tobacco," as distinguished from tobacco which may possibly be used as wrapper tobacco, but which may also, and which very often is, used as filler tobacco.

The information which I receive from the Havana tobacco cigar manufacturers, the largest manufacturers in my State, is that, as the matter stands now, the construction put by the appraisers upon the language "wrapper tobacco" is that anything which may possibly be used as a wrapper is to be classed as wrapper tobacco and is to pay the highest rate of import duty; whereas, in fact and in truth, a large part of that which is classed under this strict interpretation as "wrapper tobacco" is not wrapper tobacco and is not used as such, but can be used by the manufacturer only as filler tobacco. As an illustration, they cite the fact that they may make a wrapper of a piece of paper steeped in tobacco juice. It is possible to do that, and it has been done, but that is no reason why that material should be classed as wrapper tobacco.

From my investigation of this matter I am inclined to think that it will lead to much more certainty as to what is being imported, and enable the burden of taxation to be more evenly imposed to retain this language, and let it apply to what is commercially known as "wrapper tobacco" than it will to strike it out. The inspectors all know now what is commercially known as "wrapper tobacco," but if you strike this language out and leave it to them to say whether any given material is capable of being

used as a wrapper, they will necessarily conclude that all that can possibly be used as a wrapper will be so used, and that in many instances will lead to great injustice. Of course, it is not the purpose of Congress to impose an unjust burden upon these people, and I am inclined to think that the certainty which is sought will be best attained and the desire to get rid of ambiguity will be best served by letting those words stand.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Line 22, strike out "one" before "dollar" and insert "two."
Line 23, strike out "$1.25" and insert "$2.75."
Insert the following proviso:
"*Provided*, That if any portion of any tobacco imported in any bale, box, or package, or in bulk, shall be suitable for cigar wrappers, the entire quantity of tobacco contained in such bale, box, or package, or bulk, shall be dutiable; if not stemmed, at $2 per pound; if stemmed, at $2.75 perpound."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means have got some fresh light on this subject and are willing to make an amendment that is in the interest of the better protection and collection of the duties which they impose. I tried to get that amendment adopted in the committee, but gentlemen did not seem to understand it then. I hope they will continue their studies, not only of this paragraph but of every paragraph in the bill, and if they will do that carefully and prayerfully I think they will end by adopting not only the language of the tariff act of 1890 in this particular, but the whole act itself. [Laughter.]

The amendment that I have offered is still further in the direction of protecting the collection of the revenues which are to be imposed under this paragraph, and for the same reason I have offered the proviso. I have gone a little farther than that; I have offered an amendment which increases the duty, in order to protect not only the tobacco-growers of my own State, but also those of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and many other States. I do that in order that the farmers may be able to sell their leaf tobacco, suitable for wrappers, at a price that will pay them to raise it, that it may be put upon domestic cigars, so that when an American citizen who feels a pride in the land of his citizenship, who feels a pride in the American flag and in the Constitution—which gentlemen on the other side seem to think they have full charge of—in order, I say, that when such an American citizen wants to smoke, he will be able to go into a store and buy an American cigar—a cigar that is American all through, wrapper, binder, filler—from stem to gudgeon an American cigar. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I have but five minutes. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to inform the House and the country that under the tariff act of 1890 the price of American cigars, the price of the cigars that we common people use, has not increased in the market. In fact, they are selling cheaper to-day than they sold before the tariff of 1890 was enacted. Now, I know that this duty puts up the price of imported cigars, but I have always felt that any man who was able to smoke a Havana cigar was able to pay a portion of the revenues of this Government, and I have not felt any particular sympathy for that class of our people.

I think they ought to bear a share of our burdens. I think it is proper to put that obligation upon them; and to you, gentlemen, who are hunting for revenue in every nook and corner, trying to find how you can put an internal-revenue tax upon the people without their knowing it, or appreciating it, or charging it to the Democratic party, I commend the plan of putting more import duty upon imported tobacco and imported cigars, thus helping the farmers of the country and at the same time helping to make up the enormous deficit which you are providing for in this bill.

Mr. DE FOREST. Mr. Chairman, I desire most heartily to second the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and I want to say that it would be perfectly consistent with Democratic principles that this amendment should be adopted.

We in Connecticut are perhaps more deeply interested in this question of tobacco culture, or at any rate in the culture of that brand of tobacco which comes in competition with imported tobacco, than any other section of the Union; and we have felt that the farmers of Connecticut were benefited by this one particular feature of the present tariff almost alone; that it is the one particular section perhaps of the existing tariff which is beneficial to the farming interests of my State.

I have supposed it to be one of the cardinal doctrines of the Democratic faith that if there was anything which could be contrived in the way of tariff legislation which would relieve the farmer from the burden resting upon him and place him upon something like an equality with the other interests of the country, such a measure ought to be adopted. Beyond all that, I understand it to be a principle of the Democratic faith and of Democratic platforms that taxation should rest upon luxuries rather than upon the necessaries of life; and whatever might be said about the low-priced or cheaper grades of tobacco, it is perfectly obvious that this kind of tobacco which is imported with a duty of $2 a pound upon it and is used to a considerable extent is that kind which only the wealthier classes can use. Beyond that, there is a question of revenue here.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DE FOREST] yield?

Mr. DE FOREST. I will in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand the statistics, the retention of the present duty on this kind of tobacco is in the interest of increased revenue. If I understand the statistics, we have during the past year realized something like $9,000,000 of revenue from the duties on this kind of tobacco; and I do not believe that under the reductions proposed in the pending bill that amount of revenue will be realized. Therefore, in the interest of the farming classes and because this is a tax upon a luxury and because it is calculated to swell our revenues when we greatly need revenue, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

I will now yield for the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. MARSH. The question I desired to ask my friend is this, whether his constituents in the tobacco-producing region of Connecticut did not vote against all protection, and why should they not be allowed to take the medicine which they voted for? [Laughter and applause.] And why is the gentleman, who claims to be a Democrat and in favor of carrying out the principles of the Chicago platform, advocating here a high protective tariff upon tobacco productions for the benefit of Connecticut? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DE FOREST. I gave way for an inquiry and I have not heard it yet. I have already endeavored to explain the reasons upon which I think it is perfectly consistent with Democratic principles and with the Democratic platform and with Democratic promises and pledges that this duty should be retained as in the present law.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in the first place that I am a protectionist—in favor of protecting every industry in this country that by means of protection can be builded up and made prosperous. The only thing in which I am disappointed in regard to the bill now pending before the House is that the Democratic party have not the courage of their convictions and the honesty and manhood to incorporate into this bill the declarations and principles upon which they claim to have carried the elections in this country in 1892. My friend from the little "Nutmeg State" of Connecticut—and I do not mean to speak disrespectfully of Connecticut—wants protection to the extent of $2 a pound upon leaf tobacco for the benefit of the farmers in his district; yet he would vote to take off the duties upon barley and wheat and live stock that are produced by the farmers of the West. What sort of honesty and consistency is there in a position of that sort? [Applause on the Republican side.] If you want to protect the farmers of Connecticut, come out West and help me protect the farmers of Illinois and the great West. [Applause.]

You Democrats have declared in your platform in favor of a tariff for revenue, and revenue only; all over this country you have denounced protection as unconstitutional and as a fraud upon the people. Now, why in the name of Heaven have you not the honesty and courage to stand up to you profession? [Applause.] Why do you insist upon presenting to the American people the spectacle of compelling the farmer to compete in the markets of the world with the underpaid labor of other countries while you ask him to pay a duty of 40 per cent upon the woolen manufactures of Connecticut and other portions of the country?

Mr. Chairman, this is all that I have to say.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was a member of the Ways and Means Committee and helped to frame this bill, I am glad that we get one confession from him at the threshold of this discussion, which will serve to guide us all the way through. One of the reasons, he says, why this tax ought to be increased is that the man who smokes a foreign cigar can afford to pay something to the revenues when he uses that cigar. Then a tariff is a tax; and the man who consumes the article pays that tax! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York further says that one of the objects of the imposition he proposes is to increase the cost of the home product, to give protection to the maker of tobacco in Virginia, in Connecticut, in Pennsylvania,

in New York, and in other States in the Union. Now, it turns out that the tobacco which is to take the place of that embraced in this paragraph does not bear in the market, even under the present rate of duty, near the amount of the rate of import duty; and hence protection has failed to raise the price, and an increase of the amount of duty would not give the farmer here the price that it is claimed he should have.

Now, as for the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who has just taken his seat, who complains of the putting of American products of the farm on the reduced list, I wish to say that the McKinley bill did place an increase of duty on wheat. But it turned out that under the old duty, the year before the bill was enacted, there was imported into the United States less than 4,000 bushels of wheat, and I suspect that the members of the Ways and Means Committee of that Congress, when they increased that duty and pretended that it was for the purpose of protecting American wheat, must have snickered in each other's faces when they looked at one another and thought how "gullible" they were assuming the American people to be. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has seen fit to refer to me, I want to make a suggestion.

Mr. McMILLIN. Certainly.

Mr. MARSH. I want to know why the gentleman takes up a single article or a single feature of the bill and brings it to our attention? Why, if he wants us to understand the question at all, or the effect of the legislation he refers to, does he not take other features of the bill and let us know their effects? Why talk about wheat alone? Why not take up the other provisions of the McKinley bill and show their effects? It is unfair to take up a single item in that way. Let the gentleman take up other features of the bill and show their effects.

Mr. McMILLIN. With much pleasure, if the gentleman will just allow me. I will explain, for instance, the effect of that bill upon the importation of horses into this country. Now, a horse that is worth $1,000, imported by a wealthy man for driving purposes or for a saddle horse, will pay $30, whereas the cheap horse——

Mr. MARSH. No, sir; not $30. It pays 30 per cent, or $300. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] You are mistaken, sir——

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman is right; it would pay 30 per cent. If I said $30 I meant 30 per cent.

Mr. MARSH. And you made a mistake?

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes; I made a mistake by *lapsus linguæ*. I said $30 instead of 30 per cent.

Mr. MARSH. And a good many of them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Now, if the gentleman's fervor has worked off, I will state what I intended to state and what his interruption prevented me from making clear. I was going on to say that a horse worth a thousand dollars pays a duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. MARSH. That is it exactly. But you did not say so before.

Mr. McMILLIN. If the gentleman will let me proceed. The horse that is worth less than $150 pays $30, a specific rate. Hence horses worth $145 would pay only $30 a head, while one that is worth only $20 would have to pay $30. That is the point to which I wished to call the gentleman's attention; that is to say, the cheaper the horse the higher the rate of duty, just as in other features of the bill, the cheaper the goods the higher the rate of duty. It is so with most of the schedules.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, at the time the McKinley bill was pending in this House one of the hardest struggles the protectionists here had was to fix this duty on tobacco as it is now in the law of the land; and it was done very largely upon the faith of the members of this body that it would be a benefit to Connecticut and to the farmers of that district of country.

I, Mr. Chairman, for one, am in favor of any provision that is protective in its features; but I am at a loss to know whether the farmers of Connecticut favor this tax, for I would not like to press upon them a measure to which they are opposed.

It is a State which has a large share of the intelligence of this country, and I am satisfied that the farmers of Connecticut must have known how bitterly the Democratic side of this House opposed the levying of this high duty, and they must have known also how strenuously the Republican side battled for their interest. But yet, sir, when the test came, in the election of 1892, not only did Connecticut largely increase her Democratic majority on the issue directly assailing this tax, directly putting in issue the propriety of this identical provision of this law, directly putting in issue the constitutionality of the tax, denouncing it, as it was denounced, as a robbery, and proclaiming that it was an unconstitutional tax—I say not only did they understand that, in my judgment, absolutely, but understanding it they voted by a larger majority than they had ever done before in favor of the platform and the party which had undertaken to make that issue; and not only so, but in looking at the returns from Connecticut I am led to believe that the largest Democratic vote cast in the whole State was in those sections where the farmers raised the greatest quantity of tobacco; and at the same time, in doing all of that, they turned out of this body the men who had voted for their interests; and I can hardly believe that the Democratic farmers and the Republican farmers of Connecticut are in favor of this protective duty on tobacco in view of their own action.

I would be very glad to give it to them if I could; but if it be true that the tariff is a tax, and that the tax is a burden and robbery, why, the Connecticut farmers must cut down the price of their tobacco; and, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] said with much force and effect, let them take their share of the medicine which is to be administered to the men of America from one end of it to the other. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said in this debate about the petitions which have been presented here against the passage of this bill. I think the records of the Committee on Ways and Means will disclose the fact that more persons have signed petitions for the reduction of the rates of duty upon wrapper leaf tobacco—not to the rates fixed in the bill, but to a lower rate—than have signed petitions in favor of any other proposition in this bill. Every cigar-manufacturer in the country and every operative in cigar-manufacturing establishments, embracing 45,000 persons throughout the United States, have signed petitions in favor of this reduction. Under the act of 1883 the duty on Sumatra leaf tobacco was 75 cents and $1 a pound. By the McKinley bill the duty was increased to $2 and $2.75 a pound.

Sumatra tobacco does not come in competition with American tobacco. Why, the gentlemen who are here demanding that this rate be maintained are not selling tobacco of their own raising for anything like a dollar a pound. The highest price paid for American wrapper leaf tobacco does not exceed, I believe, 50 or 75 cents a pound, even at the very highest.

Mr. McMILLIN. Has not the price gone as low as 25 cents?

Mr. BYNUM. Twenty-five cents was the price before this duty was imposed, and since that it has run up probably to 60 or 70 cents a pound, but there is no competition between Sumatra leaf and American wrapper leaf tobacco, which is raised in Connecticut and in a small part of Pennsylvania, and probably to some extent in Florida and Georgia now. And besides this, the great bulk of the tobacco produced in the United States is not wrapper leaf tobacco at all, and sells for only about 10 cents a pound.

Now, the whole purpose of raising this duty to $2.75 a pound has been to discourage the importation of Sumatra leaf, to exclude Sumatra leaf from the market, and thereby compel the consumption of the American leaf. If that is Democratic, then, gentlemen, I am not a Democrat, and I want that understood. When it comes to the levying of a duty for the purpose of absolutely prohibiting the use of an article it is not Democratic, nor does it come anywhere near the Democratic platform.

Now, the whole question is simply this, are you going to burden 45,000 workingmen in this country with an exorbitant tax, and break down a great industry, for the sake of giving three or four counties in Connecticut which are engaged in the raising of tobacco a monopoly of the market?

Mr. SPERRY. Do I understand the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] to say that the tax now imposed under the McKinley bill was imposed in order to prevent the importation of Sumatra tobacco?

Mr. BYNUM. It has not prevented the importation altogether, but it has broken up a number of manufacturers in this country who have tried to carry on the business and are unable to do it. One of my own constituents told me that he had sunk $16,000 in that way, trying to carry on business under this higher rate of duty.

Mr. TUCKER. I have a similar case in my district.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. And I have one in mine.

Mr. BYNUM. There are numerous instances all over the Western country. Now, in the present bill we have not reduced the duty even to what it was under the act of 1883; and if I was making an objection to this bill it would be that the rate has not been reduced half low enough. It ought to be reduced to from 35 to 50 cents a pound, which would be ample protection for the American tobacco-growers; because as I have said there is no real competition. Manufacturers of tobacco are compelled to use Sumatra leaf. They can not make as merchantable cigars,

that will sell as well, from American wrappers. I trust the House will sustain the committee in this reduction, because I believe it is not only in the interest of a great industry in the United States, that it is not only in the interest of 45,000 workingmen in the United States, but it is in the interest of revenue also; because the duty of $2.75 a pound is entirely above the revenue point.

Mr. MARSH. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARSH. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already one amendment pending and an amendment to the amendment, and a third amendment would not be in order.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut——

Mr. MARSH. Can I offer a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY] is recognized.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself to this amendment from a revenue standpoint, pure and simple. Being on the Democratic side, I could not be expected of course to vote for anything that was at all protective in its nature. I therefore consider it from its standpoint as a question of revenue. Before speaking of the revenue that is derived from what is known as Sumatra tobacco, I will state what it is, where it is used, and to what extent it is used. Sumatra tobacco is a wrapper tobacco. It is not fit for filling or any other purpose except to wrap a cigar; but it is desirable to use as a wrapper; because of the color, the gloss, and the uniformity of the color the cigar-rollers like to use it.

At the present price of $4 or $5 a pound, which the cigar manufacturers pay for it, it is used upon cigars that sell for $30 a thousand and over, or at least that priced cigar permits it to be used. It will sell at the price of $4 or $5 a pound to be used upon cigars that sell for over $30 a thousand. So that the proposition comes down to this: In the first place it is a tax on a luxury. It is a tax upon a man, if we admit that the tariff is a tax upon the consumer; it is a tax upon the man who can afford to smoke an expensive cigar.

Now, then, in relation to its effect upon imports. I do not doubt that this clause in the McKinley bill was put in strictly as a protective measure, as a very highly protective measure. If I were to speak my convictions upon that point I should say that in my judgment when this clause was put into the McKinley bill it was expected to be prohibitive; but, upon the other hand, the imports increased under the duty; and it was testified to before the Committee on Ways and Means, in the presence of my friend from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], that it might be taxed still higher than now and bring in still more revenues than now.

If that is the case, in the condition of the revenues at this time, for myself I should favor a higher tax; and in reply to the suggestion that it would not bring in as much revenue, I would say that I have in my hand a statement of the Treasury Department showing the imports of Sumatra tobacco since it was first known in this country, which was in 1881, and the amount of the imports, and figuring it at $2 a pound for the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, indicates an income under this schedule of upward of $10,000,000. Ten million dollars! Now, that is evidence, I submit to the Committee on Ways and Means, that the tax might go still higher and provide still more revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I have other evidence, which I have not at hand with me now, and from that I understand—from the information I got from the Treasury Department in the statement of the amounts of Sumatra tobacco now in bond ready to be entered—according to that calculation there is in New York today, ready to be entered, in round numbers, 5,000,000 pounds of Sumatra tobacco, which will pay, under the present law, $5,000,000 more than we provide for by the bill as it has been submitted to this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it be the sense of this committee that this tax should be reduced, the effect, and the only effect, would be that $5,000,000 will be put into the pockets of five or six importers in New York instead of being put into the United States Treasury.

So that, Mr. Chairman, without regard to protection, without regard to what may be the effect of it from a protective or prohibitory standpoint, speaking in behalf of the Treasury, that is about to issue bonds if they can get the permission of this House to do so—speaking from the point of revenue, to pay our ordinary disbursements, I shall vote for the amendment that my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has proposed; and in so voting I do not vote any tax upon any necessity of life; I vote nothing upon any poor man, but I vote for it so as to put $5,000,000 into the Treasury this year and $5,000,000 each year hereafter. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I submit the following, to be printed in the RECORD:

Imports of leaf tobacco from the Netherlands into the United States during each fiscal year from 1881 to 1893.

Years.	Pounds.	Value.	Average rate of duty per pound. A.	Average rate of duty per pound. B.	Duty.	Ad valorem per cent.
1881	200,602	$140,665	$0.35	$0.35	$70,210.70	49.9
1882	782,763	487,127	.35	.35	273,967.05	56.2
1883	3,818,931	2,542,148	.40	.52	1,985,844.12	67.5
1884	603,536	480,702	.45	.52	313,838.72	65.2
1885	2,217,919	1,881,494	.50	.52	1,153,317.88	61.3
1886	4,000,519	3,394,156	.55	.52	2,080,269.88	61.2
1887	4,213,336	3,651,349	.55	.52	2,190,934.72	60.
1888	5,861,472	5,634,756	.55	.52	3,047,965.44	54.
1889	5,024,555	4,333,463	.55	.52	2,612,716.60	60.2
1890	9,734,999	9,037,388	.55	.52	4,062,199.48	44.9
1891	4,908,545	4,682,493	2.00	2.00	9,817,090.00	209.6
1892	2,661,932	1,899,721	2.00	2.00	5,323,864.00	280.2
1893	5,374,765	5,078,315	2.00	2.00	10,749,530.00	211.6

In the above table the duty from 1881 to 1890, inclusive, is estimated at what is supposed to be the actual duty paid; from 1891 to 1893 the duty is fixed at $2 per pound.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I give you herewith figures showing the quantity and value of leaf tobacco "suitable for cigar wrappers" in warehouse on the 30th of November. Fully 98 per cent of this tobacco is Sumatra tobacco.

The returns for December will not be received in this Bureau until the 20th of this month, so I send you these, which may answer your immediate purpose.

Leaf tobacco, suitable for cigar wrappers, 5,958,649 pounds = $5,665,427.

Yours, respectfully,

WORTHINGTON C. FORD,
Chief of Bureau.

Hon. LEWIS SPERRY, M. C., *House of Representatives.*

Mr. PAYNTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia and the amendment thereto of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 183. On all leaf tobacco and such parts thereof as suitable for colored wrappers, if unstemmed, 35 cents per pound, and if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

Mr. PAYNTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to say anything in this discussion except to indorse what has been said by the gentleman from Indiana, that the present law reduces the wages of the laboring men who are engaged in the manufacture of cigars. They were reduced in consequence of the McKinley bill in my section. The increase in the duty has resulted in a reduction of the wages paid to the laboring people in that industry. The adoption of this amendment will result in the increase of wages of laboring men engaged in that business.

Mr. REED. I am rather rejoiced to hear the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky. My purpose in rising was to reinforce, not the argument of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY], but his statement of facts. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] declares that this tax is not defensible on the ground of protection, for he is opposed to that, or upon the ground of revenue, which also he seems to be mainly opposed to. [Laughter.] Now I suppose the testimony of a witness on the other side, when it is clear and explicit, is worth something in considering this matter. Mr. Merfeld, an importer, was before the Ways and Means Committee for the purpose of getting this duty reduced, and he was asked, after he had finished his statement, this point-blank question, which will be found on page 554 of the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. REED. It produces about five or six times the revenue for the Government at $2 as it would at 35 cents, and a government in search of a revenue would naturally continue it.

Mr. MERFELD. I could not dispute that fact.

The gentleman from Indiana could. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the only doubt that the framers of this bill had upon this point was whether they had not fixed this tax higher than it ought to be as a revenue tax. They felt that tobacco, and especially tobacco of this kind, was a most proper subject of revenue, and they were anxious to place a duty upon tobacco wrappers at such a rate as would be most advantageous to the Treasury. But, in addition to taxing a proper subject of revenue taxation, in addition to getting revenue from what has been denominated a luxury, they felt that they ought also to consult the interests of the thousands upon thousands of workingmen in this country who are engaged and who make their living in the manufacture of cigars.

Now, the duties we have proposed in this bill, higher than those of the act of 1883, but lower than those of the act of 1890, will, in our judgment, produce more money to the Treasury, to help to bear the expenses of the Government, than the existing rates,

while, on the other hand, they are not so unmercifully oppressive to the workingmen and will not blot out, as the McKinley act did blot out, many small cigar manufacturers in the country villages. It has been said that the present rate of duty produces a larger revenue than the proposed rate will produce. If gentlemen will turn to the table of imports which we have prepared for the use of members in this debate, they will find that in the importations of 1891, between June 30, 1889, and the 6th day of October, 1890, when the McKinley act went into operation, there were imported into this country 7,233,000 pounds of wrapper tobacco, and that for the year 1893 less than 2,500,000 pounds were imported.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is not the gentleman aware that the large importation just previous to the act of 1890 going into effect was anticipatory of the increase of duty under that act, and not with reference to consumption?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Undoubtedly that large importation of 7,000,000 pounds was partly made in anticipation of the McKinley act. But the importations for the previous year were 3,756,033.95 pounds, a larger importation than there has been any year since the McKinley law went into operation.

Now, the only question in my mind is, whether the House ought to fix the rates proposed in this bill or adopt the rates proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER]. The rates proposed in this bill, while affording all the protection that could be reasonably asked by any interest in this country will, I believe, bring the largest return in the way of revenue, and therefore I hope the House will stand by this bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word in reply to the gentleman from West Virginia. He has cited statistics to show that more Sumatra tobacco was imported the year before the McKinley law was enacted than was imported the year after.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Not the year after, but the present year.

Mr. REED. Well, the present year. What was the gentleman's object in citing those figures? It was to show that the rate of duty in the act of 1890 had diminished the use of Sumatra tobacco in this country, but he was obliged, on the suggestion of my colleague [Mr. DINGLEY], to admit that the figures were of no value for that purpose. Now, let me give him some figures that are of value, but which he paid no attention to, as he did to nearly the whole of the contents of this book. [Laughter.]

In the hearings by the Ways and Means Committee is a statement upon this subject by Mr. Merfeld, not a gentleman who, trying to rob the country as Connecticut persons, whether Democratic or Republican, seem inclined to do [laughter], but a gentleman seeking to protect himself after the manner of the gentleman from West Virginia. What does he say on this subject? I read from page — of the hearings:

Mr. REED. Has the consumption of Sumatra tobacco been lessened in this country by this act?
Mr. MERFELD. No sir.

There is a gentleman who knows what he is talking about, who is thoroughly posted on the subject, and who does not have to make any deduction for his figures or any equivocation in his answer. He says plainly "No, sir."

This is testimony given by this gentleman before the committee, given against his interest, when he is trying to sustain the other side. That, it seems to me, is sufficient answer to the gentleman from West Virginia, figures or no figures.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. My only answer to the gentleman from Maine is that when in the hearings before the committee I find any statement inconsistent with the official report of the custom-house, I take the statement of the custom-house as correct, in preference to the statement of a witness. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. I do not object to the gentleman taking the statement of the custom-house, but that is not what is contradicted. The statements of the custom-house are true, but the inference that the gentleman is trying to get this committee to draw is shown to be untrue by the statement of a witness who, while he may be very much inferior to the gentleman from West Virginia in position and in intellect, is very much superior in his opportunity to know something about the subject. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MARSH. I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, in line 22, strike out the words "one dollar" and insert "35 cents;" and in line 28 strike out "$1.25" and insert "25 cents."

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, if the majority of this House mean what they said to the people in 1892, upon which representations they were enabled to get themselves into power—if they were honest at that time in their declaration that they intended to take off from the shoulders of the people the burdens which had been imposed upon them by the McKinley bill, here is an opportunity to do something in that direction.

The substitute which I propose is (if I recollect correctly) the law as it was in 1883 and up to the time of the enactment of the McKinley law. Your bill provides for a duty of $1 per pound upon this leaf tobacco. It is designed for protection, not for revenue. My only object in offering this substitute is to test the sincerity of gentlemen on the other side and to let them make their record before the people—to let the people know whether their representatives are willing to carry out the declarations that they made upon the stump.

It is one thing, my Democratic friends, to go before the people and by misrepresentation to capture their votes; and it is another thing to make your record in this Hall. Your votes here will be known to the people. Not less than 40,000 hard-working, industrious people in this country engaged in cigar-making have petitioned this Congress that this duty of $2 a pound shall be taken off of wrapper tobacco and the old duty of 35 cents a pound substituted. Why was that duty of 35 cents a pound changed by the McKinley bill to $2? It was done by a Republican Congress in order to protect tobacco-raisers; it was not for revenue, but in large part for protection. Then why are not you on the other side willing to assist me now in wiping out that protection and replacing this tobacco upon a revenue basis, or upon figures that will enable the Government to obtain greater revenue while at the same time extending a reasonable protection?

The proposition embraced in this bill is the sort of unconstitutional and fraudulent protection that you Democrats all over the country undertook to bamboozle the people with in 1892. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And under those false pretenses, under those fraudulent representations, you have brought yourselves into the seats which you occupy here to-day. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, if I can awaken the Democratic side of this House to a recollection of their declarations in 1892 I will have accomplished my purpose.

One gentleman asks me whether I would vote for a strictly revenue tariff bill. No, sir; I would no more vote for a strictly revenue tariff bill, and in doing so strike down protection, than I would take a torch and set fire to the great cities of this Union. I would do the one as readily as the other. If last January you had touched the torch to the city of New York and burned down every building upon Manhattan Island, you would not have injured the 65,000,000 people in this country as you have injured them by threatening economical legislation of the character now presented. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the principle embodied in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, by which filler and leaf tobacco are both put at the same rate of duty. I am brought to this conclusion by a pretty thorough examination of the subject among users and importers of tobacco. Every bale of filler tobacco contains more or less leaf tobacco; and we have a further proof of the difficulty of a proper collection of the revenue in the fact that so many cases involving these questions have of late been decided against the Government, which is now paying a number of millions of dollars on account of such decisions.

It would very much simplify the collection of the revenue and I believe would very much increase the amount collected, if some such provision as that of the gentleman from Kentucky were adopted. I am not, however, in favor of the figures which he proposes; I think that they are too low; but I am in favor of the principle of the amendment, as I am glad to observe the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] is.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let us have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and the amendment to the amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will be read.

The amendments were read.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed is exactly the present law; and I wish to say that this provision was adopted in 1890 not as a prohibitory measure, but as a measure of protection. Gentlemen do not seem to understand the facts in regard to Sumatra tobacco. It is a thin leaf, light, tough, and flexible, exactly suited in every particular for wrappers, but it is so bitter that any man who might attempt to smoke a cigar made entirely from this leaf would quit the business forever before trying another. And 1 pound of this tobacco will go as far as 4 pounds of the domestic leaf.

Prior to 1890 we had the law largely as now proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, in his substitute, and under it our people could not sell their tobacco for wrappers. It all went in as binders and fillers. Out of every 1,300 pounds

of tobacco raised in this country about 300 pounds are suitable for wrappers and the rest for binders and fillers. Of course this brings up the price somewhat for wrappers, and enables the farmers to obtain better results for their labor than would otherwise be the case. But we put this duty there so that the people could use American leaf tobacco on their cigars.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, as everybody knows, cigars are a matter largely of taste, though sometimes of the eye; and this Sumatra leaf tobacco has a wrapper that is better to the eye, but not good to the taste, while the American leaf tobacco, though not so desirable in appearance to the eye, is better for the taste. Under this law our people have been enabled to sell their leaf tobacco for wrappers, and have better prices for their crops than before the passage of that law; while at the same time people who consume tobacco have been able to purchase American cigars—and every man knows that American cigars have been as cheap or cheaper since the passage of the McKinley bill than they ever were before.

Now, I want to continue this law so that this use of tobacco for that purpose may be continued and extended, and for that reason I propose to continue the duty. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DE FOREST] says he wants to continue it as a matter of revenue. Well, that may be well enough from his standpoint, but the gentleman will not be inconsistent if he advocates it for protection.

I am informed by the New York Sun, a great Democratic paper, or by its correspondent, that, notwithstanding the provision in the national platform, the people in State convention in Connecticut passed a resolution unanimously in favor of maintaining the present duty on tobacco. Now, the gentleman from Connecticut can stand on his State platform on this particular paragraph, even if he shifts his position to the national platform on the next paragraph. It is only another illustration of what I said the other day. The Democratic party at Chicago when they presented their platform to the people of the Northern States did not rest on that, but went to the people and made up a false issue. They went to the people and said they would protect their industries if they got into power, that they must raise $175,000,000 of revenue from tariff and would so adjust it as to protect all American labor.

Another suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee a half hour ago. He intimated that I had a hand in the preparation or production of this bill. Why, that was the worst charge that was ever made against me. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I did not have a hand in it. If he means the bill of 1890, why, he is correct about that. I am proud of my connection with that bill, and I have never denied it; but I had nothing to do with this measure.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I make the point of order that debate is exhausted on this paragraph.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. But I have moved to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. It is not my intention now to enter upon a discussion of these matters of free raw material, that so materially affect the interests of the State I have the honor in part to represent. But in order to add something, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] said, "to the gayety" of the occasion, I desire to have a memorial read here, if in order, from the chamber of commerce——

Mr. MCMILLIN. I make the point of order—not for the purpose of taking the gentleman off the floor but simply to preserve the order of proceeding in the committee—that his amendment is not strictly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Washington that as many amendments are pending now as can be offered.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. This is not an amendment, but a petition or memorial I wish to have read——

Mr. MCMILLIN. I did not wish to take the gentleman off the floor.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I wish to ask if I will have the right to read this memorial in my own time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the right to proceed for five minutes. He has used one minute of his time now.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Then I will read this memorial in my own time. I take this opportunity to state that the only other chance to get these memorials before the House that come to me from my State is through the petition box. If they are presented in that way nobody ever sees them, and nobody knows what the views of the people of my State are. I desire to read this memorial now, in order to have it placed in the RECORD, and I will have plenty more of them as we go along in this discussion. The memorial which I wish to read is as follows:

Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Fairhaven, Wash.

Whereas many of the natural resources of the eastern and interior portions of the United States have been to a great extent developed and the business interests connected therewith brought to their present success and magnitude, and the manufacturing industries of such localities built up, with their immense capital and great diversity, largely by means of protective duties; and

Whereas the State of Washington, in her four years of Statehood which have been, in a large degree, years of depression in business on the Pacific coast and financial depression and disaster in many parts of the world, finds her vast natural resources yet largely undeveloped, with her manufacturing industries in their infancy and with but little diversity, and greatly in need of the protective duties which have in years gone by done so much in the development of other localities in the nation; and

Whereas her immense forests, her large coal area, her iron mines, galena ores, agricultural fields, and sheep husbandry yield products, nearly all of which are brought into aggressive competition with the same products of British Columbia, and to remove the protective duties on these products on the plea of free raw material for the benefit of the manufacturing plants of the East and interior portions of the country, built up under protection and yet to be fostered thereby, is virtually a decree that the people of Washington shall be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the localities that have their manufactories established and resources developed: Therefore,

Resolved, by the Chamber of Commerce of Fairhaven, State of Washington, That, in the interest of the business and development of the State of Washington, we respectfully urge that the tariff affecting the products of this State may not be removed or modified, and that the people of the new States may continue to have the same benefits for their products that those of the older States have already received; and we hereby protest against the application of the principle of protection on the unjust and sectional basis whereby the capital, skill, and labor employed in one kind of production shall have a benefit not conceded and accorded to the capital, skill, and labor employed in other productions which stand in the same general relations with reference to the products of foreign countries.

Approved by the board of trustees of the Chamber of Commerce of Fairhaven, Wash., December 28, 1893.

FRANK J. HAMILTON, *President.*
O. H. CULVER, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. PAYNE), there were—ayes 70, noes 110.

Mr. PAYNE. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. WILSON of West Virginia and Mr. PAYNE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 76, noes 110.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute is now pending.

Mr. REED. A substitute for the whole section?

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute for the whole section, offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER].

Mr. PAYNTER. I will ask that it be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER].

The substitute was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered to this substitute by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH].

The amendment of Mr. MARSH was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered to the substitute.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MARSH) there were—ayes 37, noes 114.

Mr. MARSH. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. On the demand for tellers, 33 gentlemen have arisen—not a sufficient number.

Mr. MARSH. The other side.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no other side on the demand for tellers. It takes one-fifth of a quorum. The amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] is rejected, and the question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER].

The question being taken on the substitute, it was rejected.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

Mr. BURROWS. I offer the following amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

West Virginia, representing the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BURROWS. How does he represent the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear one gentleman at a time.

Mr. BURROWS. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] was offered in his individual capacity. It is not an amendment proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. BURROWS. It is not an amendment offered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman as offering a committee amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. No amendments have been offered by the Committee on Ways and Means or agreed to by that committee, and I claim the right to be recognized to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of recognition is entirely in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand that is so——

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair recognized the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. BURROWS. I suppose the Chair will recognize both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to do so.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, in debate it has been customary to recognize the opposite sides alternately, and whatever may be fair we are willing to do; but as a matter of right it has never been the duty of the Chair, and it has never been recognized by any occupant of the chair as a duty, to alternate from side to side in recognizing members to offer amendments, and no parliamentarian will risk his reputation by saying so.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. McMILLIN. And further, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that while it is true that it has never been conceived to be the duty of the Chair, and has never been recognized as the right of the opposite side of the House to have alternations in the matter of recognition for the purpose of offering amendments, it is also the universal custom of whoever is in the chair, and has been under all administrations, to recognize the gentleman in charge of the bill while he was proposing amendments to it. I state a proposition as broad as the experience of any member of this House. The custom is to recognize the member having a bill in charge first, that he may present amendments looking to the perfecting of the text of the bill.

Mr. BURROWS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, that there is no rule, and there is no practice, upon which he can found his statement. I know, when a committee has proposed certain amendments, and the amendments are the result of committee action, sometimes the gentleman in charge of the bill has been permitted to perfect the text of the bill that he has introduced; but that is not this case. The gentleman from West Virginia offers this amendment in his individual capacity as a member of this House, and the fact that he is the chairman of the committee gives him no more right to recognition than any other member of this House in offering amendments. There is one place where the minority has the right to be heard.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURROWS. I decline to yield at this moment.

Mr. McMILLIN. Very well.

Mr. BURROWS. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman knows that I am always courteous, and would not interrupt him without his consent.

Mr. BURROWS. When the committee framed this bill they had it in their power to meet by themselves and to exclude the members of the minority of the committee from all participation in the proceedings. That was done until the measure was perfected by the committee. But the Committee of the Whole House meets in this Hall, in open daylight, when every member is the peer of every other member and has a constituency back of him, which he happens to represent; and that being the fact, I claim that it is the right of every member of this House to offer amendments such as he may have in mind.

Now, if the Chair is to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means because he is the chairman, to offer all the amendments he desires to offer, the result will be that gentlemen on that side of the House could pass their amendments to the chairman of the committee and could occupy the two weeks, if necessary, in offering amendments, and absolutely preclude the offering of all amendments on this side of the Chamber.

Now, I insist that every member has the right to be recognized in this committee, and this passing up of proposed amendments to the chairman and having the chairman determine who shall be recognized is based on no authority, no rule, and no practice of the House.

As I said, we are each the equal of every other member in this House in our representative capacity, and we of the minority insist that we have at this time a right to offer any amendments; and I propose this as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I think, Mr. Chairman, that all of the old members of this House will remember that in all the rulings that have been made by any presiding officer, the uniform ruling of the House heretofore has been that the committee reporting a bill have the right to perfect it by amendments offered, not by the chairman of the committee because he is the chairman, but offered by the chairman having control of the bill on the majority side of the House because he is the exponent of the majority of the committee, and the committee presenting the bill has the right, through him, to offer any amendments to perfect the bill, which not only excludes anybody on the minority side, until he gets through, but also members on the majority side.

Such has been, I think, the uniform ruling in regard to offering amendments to a bill which comes from a committee. They have the right to perfect the bill by the amendments which the committee has authorized to be offered, and when that is done amendments may be offered from other quarters, by the minority, or any person may offer an amendment. That, I think, has been the uniform ruling in this House to give the majority of the committee the right to offer amendments. No one else would have the right to come in advance of the committee having charge of the bill; and I think that to recognize the chairman to submit the amendments which he desires to do as from the committee is in conformity with the rulings and precedents, and that he has precedence. I think that is the true ruling.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi show very plainly that this case has been misunderstood by him. I hope it will turn out that it has been misunderstood by the Chairman. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has not presented to this House any amendment recommended by that committee. If he did, he would perhaps have the right of offering those first, under the rules and customs of this House; but there has been no amendment submitted even to the Committee on Ways and Means since this bill was presented to the House.

I want the committee to thoroughly understand that. Whatever is presented here is the individual action of the gentleman from West Virginia. Had he seen fit to call the committee together to present his amendments and to receive their approval, then, according to the customs of the House, the committee amendments would come first; but that is not this case. The case here is simply that an individual member offers amendments, with no rights beyond those which every other member has. He is not to be permitted to monopolize the time, although the committee might. He can not monopolize the time, because he is not the organ of the House; the committee would have been the organ of the House.

The ground on which committees are allowed to present their amendments first is because they have presumably acted under the order of the House. It is a testimonial of the superiority of the House over the individual. But no such superiority exists in this case. Each individual stands upon his own rights, and the injustice of such a proposition as is presented here must be obvious to every member. There can be no custom in such a matter as this, because this is a new question and should be decided upon the basis of general parliamentary law; nor does the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia is in charge of the bill give him the right to make all the amendments which he chooses to propose. Unquestionably he might have a right to offer the first amendment, for he would naturally be first recognized, being in control of the bill; but beyond that his right or power does not go.

If he desires that power as the organ of the House, let him act so that he will be the organ of the House, being the organ of the committee which has been commissioned by the House. It seems to me that all this is so plain that it serves only as a reënforcement of the argument of the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], because his argument is based upon this very idea of the superiority of the committee, not the superiority of the individual. I do not say that it has been the universal custom, without deviation, in receiving amendments to pass from one side to the other alternately, but I do say that it has been the custom, almost unbroken, to pass from one side to the other in amendments, in

speeches, and in everything under the five-minute rule. Let me say, further, that according to my recollection, the principles of general parliamentary law which must govern us about this matter, are that it is the duty of the Chairman to so alternate his recognitions that both sides may be fairly represented, and that can only be done by alternations to a reasonable and suitable extent, keeping in mind the fact that the gentlemen on the majority side are 50 or 60 superior in number to those on this side of the House. But, with that difference, which arises from the nature of the case, regular alternations would seem to be the fairest and most just practice.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no disposition existing, nor will there be any manifested, to do injustice to the gentlemen who are in the minority on this question. But when we come to settle what is the custom and what is right in the conduct of these parliamentary proceedings, it strikes me that on this side we have demanded and practiced nothing unreasonable. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] concedes too much in the beginning of his argument for the good of his cause. He concedes that the chairman of the committee was properly recognized first for amendments. Now, there is no rule that prescribes that; custom does, but not the rule.

Why is the chairman first recognized? Because he has charge of the bill and because it has been the universal practice of this House to accord to a gentleman in charge of a bill the right to have the floor for the purpose of perfecting its text before it is subjected to amendment by those who are in antagonism to the whole measure. The friends of the measure have that prior right and it has been exercised always, and whilst the question has never risen before in so sharp a form as it has now, it has been conceded always that those in charge of a measure had a right to perfect it by proposing whatever amendments they saw fit until it is perfected. Why, the very rules prescribe that the amendment which is offered by the party having control of a measure shall be acted upon and the bill perfected before a substitute can be voted on.

The substitute is held in abeyance. Now, let us see how the opposite course would operate. Suppose there should come here a bill into which fifty errors had crept at the Printing Office or in transcribing, and that every time one of those typographical or clerical errors was to be corrected a substantial amendment was permitted to be offered by the other side. Can you not see how the committee having charge of the bill might take up its whole time in perfecting the text of the bill, and might never reach a point where it could offer substantial amendments?

There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Michigan. When the McKinley bill was being considered there was a rule adopted limiting the time for the consideration of that measure to a shorter period than that provided in the order now operating. It is within the memory of every member of this House who was here during the consideration of the McKinley bill that four-fifths of this time was taken up by the chairman in charge of the bill, offering his amendments to it. That will not be denied.

Mr. REED. That he did as a member of the committee.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman from Ohio was in charge of the bill. But we never conceived that we had any right to the floor until he had been allowed the opportunity to perfect the text of the measure. And let me say there never was a single one of those amendments submitted to the full committee. We were then in the same condition that we are now. The committee had framed their bill; they had brought it in here, and after it was brought in, from hour to hour and from day to day, they conceived that it ought to be amended; and they took all the time necessary to do it; and properly so. We did not complain of it.

Now, I want to say, as I said in the beginning, that there is no purpose to cut off the right of any gentleman on this side of the House or the other to amend this bill; but we do insist that we have the right, which has always been exercised and always conceded, to perfect the text of the bill before the right of general amendment begins.

Mr. REED. Now, I want to make another suggestion to the Chair (for I have thought it best to argue the entire question), that in this particular case, while the question of recognition, owing to the custom in the House, and perhaps also in Committee of the Whole, rests with the Chair, it does not rest with the Chair arbitrarily. The gentleman from Michigan was alone standing in his place and asking for recognition at the time when recognition was given, and the gentleman from West Virginia had not risen from his seat.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what is before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. A question of order is pending.

Mr. SNODGRASS. What is the question of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, who is entitled to recognition by the Chair to offer an amendment.

Mr. SNODGRASS. It seems to me the Chair might settle that without all this discussion. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. The gentleman who has just spoken is perhaps more in favor of a settlement than he is of a just settlement.

Let me read the language of the rule:

When two or more members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the member who is first to speak.

It is only upon the condition of several members rising at the same time that the Chair acquires any right to discriminate.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I am quite certain that gentlemen on the other side will be willing to accord to the minority what in right and equity belongs to that minority. It has been said that the Chairman has the right to recognize anyone on this floor——

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SNODGRASS. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending; and there can be but one point of order pending at the same time.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Then I rise to a parliamentary inquiry: How many times has the same gentleman the right to address the Chair on the same point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. On a point of order as often as the Chair is willing to hear him. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has the floor.

Mr. BURROWS. I presume a gentleman has the right to address the Chair as often as the gentleman from Tennessee has the right to interrupt.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is said that the Chair, in Committee of the Whole, has the right to recognize whomsoever he may please. I concede that the Chair has the power; I deny that he has the right. I deny that the Chairman of this Committee of the Whole has the right to recognize the gentleman from West Virginia for all amendments that may be proposed this week or next in the consideration of this bill. Yet the position contended for would place the whole power of offering amendments with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In contending for the right of the minority, I am seeking to establish not only the right of members on this side of the Chamber, but of members on the other. If it is conceded that all amendments must pass through the hands of the gentleman from West Virginia, then you gentlemen on that side of the House who may have amendments to offer to this bill must first present them to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. If he desires to offer them he will do so; if not, he will decline; and if he shall have other amendments to offer which may take up the entire time of the Committee of the Whole, then every other member of this House outside of the chairman is absolutely denied any opportunity to offer any amendment, or to be heard upon any proposition in this bill except such propositions as the chairman of the committee may see fit to present.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says that it has been customary to allow the chairman of the committee to perfect his bill in the first instance. I concede that in the consideration of the tariff bill two years ago many amendments were offered by the chairman of the committee, Maj. McKinley, to the bill. But my friend will remember that that bill was considered by paragraphs. We commenced at the first paragraph of the bill and continued the consideration as long as we could. When a paragraph was read the chairman would rise in his place, if he had an amendment of the committee, or if he desired to offer an amendment himself, and he would be recognized by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to offer his amendment to perfect the text of the paragraph under consideration, but after that was done the paragraph was open to amendments by every member of the committee. No one thought——

Mr. MCMILLIN. If the gentleman will permit an interruption just there?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I know the gentleman would not willingly mislead the House.

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly not.

Mr. MCMILLIN. That bill was read through, and I have the rule before me, if the gentleman desires to hear it read. It provided that this bill was to be read through first, beginning with the one hundred and tenth paragraph, which had been reached. If I recollect aright, this was on page 16 of the bill, whereas there were 140 pages in the entire bill. But it provided—and I speak by the book—that when it should have been read through entirely, then it should be open to amendments in

any part of the bill; and, as a matter of fact, amendments were offered in all of its parts.

Mr. BURROWS. That was not my recollection.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the gentleman desire me to read it? I have it at hand.

Mr. BURROWS. Oh, no; I take the gentleman's statement.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is correct.

Mr. BURROWS. But it does not alter the fact that I am referring to here. That bill in the first place had been considered by paragraphs, several pages of it, and for a long time.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Only to a certain point. After that the bill was open to amendment anywhere to anyone who could happen to get recognition.

Mr. BURROWS. But at the same time it had been considered by paragraphs. The time being short, the entire bill was then open to amendment.

But I stand simply on this proposition, Mr. Chairman, that we of the minority and the members of the committee on the other side should have an opportunity to offer amendments. The gentleman from West Virginia has offered an amendment, and we had the right to offer amendments to that.

Now, if the whole matter of recognition is to be given to the gentleman from West Virginia, we are not only powerless to offer independent amendments—for none are in order as amendments to his amendment except they be germane to the subject-matter of it—we are not only powerless, then, to offer independent amendments, but the result is that those who desire to offer amendments on this side, or the other side for that matter, if this practice is to prevail, may as well leave the committee at once, for they have nothing to do with the formation of the bill.

All I ask for, then, is the right of the minority, and the right as well of every member of this House, to participate in the amendments, to enable him to reflect the judgment of his constituents. I therefore insist on the right of recognition at this time.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman from Michigan that there is no disposition on this side of the House, nor on the part of the majority of the members of this committee, to prevent him or any other member who has an amendment to propose to the bill from offering it and having it considered in the time allowed for the consideration of such amendments under this rule.

I did not suppose when we entered on the consideration of the bill this afternoon that the few amendments I had lying on my desk before me would consume more than an hour's time of the committee; and I supposed, in following the ordinary rule of recognition, that the member in charge of the bill, who was supposed to speak for those who supported it, should be first recognized to make any changes in the bill he desired before the bill passed to the consideration of the members of the House generally. I say that the reason of that rule, if not its strict language, would apply in a case like this as much as if I were speaking by a direct vote of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman must take into consideration another fact. I offered an amendment to the bill which was merely a formal one, simply to perfect the phraseology of the bill, a matter of no special moment, that did not go to the merits of a single schedule or rate in the bill, and there was recognized on the other side of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who tacked on to my formal amendment a very substantial one that did go to the merits of the bill and to the rates it proposed.

That amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], in a parliamentary sense perhaps, was in order, but was not really akin to the amendment that I offered in any other sense, and it has been followed up by a substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER], and an amendment to the substitute by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH]. While, therefore, there has been but one recognition to those who are supporting the bill, the Chair has given three recognitions to those who are opposing that part of the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to add that we are simply doing what was done, and what perhaps was necessarily done, in the consideration of the last tariff bill. I have here on the desk before me the official minutes of the Committee on Ways and Means for the Fifty-first Congress, and I find that between the 14th day of April, when the McKinley bill was ordered reported to the House of Representatives and the passage of that bill, there was no meeting of the committee at which amendments proposed to the bill were submitted to the members of the committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

All the amendments, then, that were offered to the McKinley bill from the middle of Schedule B, when you took it out of the Committee of the Whole and passed to its consideration under the special rule then adopted before you had gotten more than half-way through the second schedule of the bill—every amendment after that was offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, without any authority whatever from the committee itself and before others were recognized to offer amendments.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the merits of the question. I say again that I had not supposed that the few amendments which I have here upon the desk before me would have occupied the time of the committee half of the evening. We desire to clear them out of the way, so that members upon both sides of the House who desire to amend the bill in the final shape that those who prepared it will give to it may be recognized honestly and evenly by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule in the matter.

Mr. REED. I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] if he was on his feet at the time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] addressed the Chair?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I had asked for recognition from the Chair.

Mr. REED. Privately or publicly?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Privately, in the way that members get recognition—in the ordinary manner.

Mr. REED. Now, I ask the gentleman was he on his feet at the time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] addressed the Chair?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I am not able to answer that question as to whether I was on my feet or leaning on my desk.

Mr. REED. I saw the proceeding, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] was the only man on his feet asking recognition at the time.

Mr. ENLOE. I have seen it occur here in the Fifty-first Congress a hundred times that gentlemen were recognized who were sitting in their seats, when there were a dozen men asking for recognition from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule in this matter.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlemam from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] desire to be heard?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has gone into an examination of the record. I do not know whether he desires to address the Chair further on that point or not. It was with a view of fortifying himself in the position he has taken that he desires to examine the record. Now, with the indulgence of the Chair, I will occupy a minute until the gentleman from Michigan returns.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is in the Hall, standing within a few feet of the Chair.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. He is examining the record.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know that I care to be heard further on the point at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of recognition is one which the Chair understands to be largely, if not altogether, in the discretion of the Chair; and so long as the present occupant of the chair has the honor to fill that position he will endeavor to be fair in his recognition of gentlemen for and against the pending amendments or the proposed amendments to the pending bill.

Now, the Chair has understood that it has always been the custom, under the rules of the House and in committee, to permit the gentleman in charge of a bill to first offer amendments, that the text may be perfected. Of course if he offers them in behalf of the committee they are so much more strongly commended to the House.

But at any rate, the gentleman in charge of the measure has the floor to offer his amendments. The gentleman from West Virginia had informed the Chair that he had certain amendments which would occupy but a short time this afternoon; and as an evidence of the fact that the Chair intended to be fair to the minority, he had stated to a gentleman on that side, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], that it would be well for him to be ready with an amendment which he desired to offer, as he had informed the Chair, and that the Chair would recognize him during the afternoon as soon as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had offered certain amendments.

With a view of ascertaining the previous rulings and the precedents which should govern the Chair in this unusual position in which he finds himself, the Chair had examined, before this meeting of the House or committee, the practice pursued and adopted by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when it had under consideration the bill known as the McKinley bill. The Chair found by actual count, unless he is mistaken in that count, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKinley] in charge of that bill, after the House had passed the special rule, similar to the rule under which we are now proceeding, which took that bill out of the usual course of its con-

sideration in committee—that is, by items and paragraphs—and had determined to throw open the remainder of the bill for amendment at any point—the Chair finds by actual count that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McKinley) was recognized by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to offer eighty-eight amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. Before anyone else was recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. I think before anyone else was recognized. Gentlemen will find if they will read that debate that the gentleman from Ohio was interrogated by the minority while offering amendments as to how many amendments he had in his desk. He declined at first to state, and said that he would continue to offer amendments until he got through; and if the Chair is not mistaken he offered eighty-eight amendments.

The Chair wishes to say further that gentlemen representing the majority on that side of the House offered fourteen additional amendments to that bill and were recognized for that purpose. Gentlemen representing the minority on that bill were permitted to offer nine amendments, and that is all. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] That is all the amendments that were offered to the McKinley bill by the minority after the adoption of the special rule. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Chair wishes to be fair, and will endeavor to recognize gentlemen on both sides of this question during the two weeks that this bill is open for amendments. The only question now presented is the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia, and the Chair applies this ruling to only one amendment. The Chair does not intimate what his ruling will be on the next, but for the present there is but one amendment offered—the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia—and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] desires to offer one. The Chair decides, and he thinks that he has discretion to do so, that the gentleman from West Virginia is in order in offering his amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 45, paragraph 266, in line 3, after the words "or in part of," insert "New Zealand hemp;" and in line 4 strike out the words "and cables and cordage made of hemp."

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Is any explanation required in regard to that?

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to hear the gentleman explain the necessity for this amendment.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The reason for inserting the words "New Zealand" and striking out the words "cordage and cables" is to prevent any trouble at the custom-house in deciding as to what is cordage and cables and what is twine. Cordage and cables are made of New Zealand hemp, and in order to make it perfectly clear, and so that there may be no dispute as to twine, we insert the words "New Zealand" and strike the words "cordage and cables made of hemp" from the paragraph.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Was not this amendment offered in the committee and voted down?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. No, sir; not that I remember.

Mr. DALZELL. Was not this identical amendment offered in the committee and voted down by the majority?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I do not remember.

Mr. DALZELL. I say it was.

Mr. DOCKERY. I submit that it is not in order to refer to proceedings in committee.

Mr. REED. This evidently is not a committee amendment. I understood the chairman of the committee said he does not remember whether this amendment was offered in committee or not.

Mr. DALZELL. So far as I remember I offered the amendment and it was voted down by the majority of the committee.

Mr. REED. It is rather a queer practice that the chairman of the committee can not only do what the committee authorizes him to do, but he can also do what the committee has not authorized him to do.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means what new information he has in his possession that makes him think it necessary to offer this amendment——

Mr. BOUTELLE. He has changed his mind.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois (continuing). Since we voted upon it in committee?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I do not concede, Mr. Chairman, that it was voted down in committee. I do not remember all of the amendments offered by gentlemen on the other side in the committee. I do not for one moment concede that this was offered and voted down by the committee.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Has any information come to the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means upon this subject that was not furnished to the full committee at the time the bill was under consideration?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. If this is an amendment that you gentleman voted for in the committee why do you raise any objections to it now? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I am not raising any objection to it. I am simply asking for the information which has changed your minds.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose it was voted down in the committee because it was offered by a member of the minority and was therefore supposed to be bad. It is offered by them now because they have forgotten its origin. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The amendment of Mr. MORSE was read, as follows:

Page 45, schedule 1, paragraph 266, line 2, erase the words "except binding-twine." Also "binding-twine" on the free list on page 67. Erase paragraph 397.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I have in my district a very large cordage industry, one of the largest in this country. They manufacture, among other things, binding-twine to a large extent. This bill proposes to put binding-twine on the free list. At present, under the McKinley act, there is a very low duty of seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound upon binding-twine. In Hongkong, in China, there are cordage manufactories where binding-twine is made very extensively, and they have the most approved American machinery. The operators in those factories are paid 15 cents a day, and subsist on a little rice; and I am told when 500 men get up and go to work, another 500 other men get into the beds that they have left and the manufactories are run night and day.

Now, I stand here to say that the proposition of putting binding-twine on the free list is a great wrong to my constituents. There are in New England 12,000 men engaged in the cordage industry, or were so engaged before the present awful Democratic nightmare overtook the country. Governor McKinley told me with his own mouth that the only blot upon his bill was the very low duty which it placed upon binding-twine—seven-tenths of 1 cent a pound; and it is now proposed to wipe out this small protection and turn the workmen into the street to crowd other occupations or join the army of idle. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side]. I say, Mr. Chairman, that there are 12,000 men engaged in the cordage industry in New England, several hundred in my own district, and it is idle for any man to say that those industries can be run successfully with free binding-twine. The effect of this change will be to transfer that business which now gives employment to American workingmen to foreign workingmen, and largely to John Chinaman at that.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. If it is very brief.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman states that the men who are engaged in this business in China are paid 15 cents a day.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did not the gentleman vote to admit that kind of men free into this country and make a speech in favor of it?

Mr. MORSE. No, sir. I spoke in favor of restricting Chinese immigration. But I did speak in favor of kind, humane, Christian treatment of those already here. [Applause on the Republican side.] I believe in the restriction of Chinese immigration, but I would by no means stop there, because worse emigrants are coming here from other lands, endangering our institutions.

Mr. Chairman, it is needless to describe the effect of this bill upon the cordage industry, the effect of putting binding-twine on the free list, and I denounce the proposition, and I offer in good faith the amendment which has been read at the desk.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, in opposition to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], I wish to say to the House that the United States are to-day exporting binding-twine by tens of thousands of tons against the competition of China, England, and other countries. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, to put the tariff back on binding-twine would be an outrage on the masses of the people. Gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber have been pretending to have unbounded sympathy for the farmers of the United States. Now they have an opportunity to prove their faith by their works. Every time a measure affecting the farmers is up here, crocodile tears as big as walnuts roll down the cheeks of these tender-hearted philanthropists, who feel so deeply for the poor downtrodden farmer. Now, if they are honest, if they mean what they say, they will vote down the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] to put a tariff on binding-twine, because they have a chance in that way to help the farmers; but they will not do it, because they are

merely feigning a love which they do not feel. I know that this matter of binding-twine costs the farmers of this country only $3,000,000 a year, but three millions added to the other burdens put upon them helps to bring them to the condition where they raise their wheat at less than cost. But every little helps. We will cut off this small extortion now and the larger ones when we reach them. [Applause.] The gentleman says that 12,000 men in Massachusetts are making binding-twine and should be protected. This proves the selfishness of the whole iniquitous system. Thirty-five millions of people in this country are directly interested in agriculture and seventy millions eat wheat bread—when they can get it. [Laughter.] Under the blessings of the McKinley bill a great many of them are short on bread just now. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those 70,000,000 are of more account than the 12,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I stand for the 35,000,000 bread-makers and the 70,000,000 bread-eaters. I am opposed to fleecing them for the 12,000 binding-twine makers and the cordage trust. [Applause.] He says, by way of persuasion, that binding-twine is made in Hongkong. I do not care a straw whether it is made in China or Japan or elsewhere, let it come free. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The farmers will get the benefit, no difference where it comes from. And I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and all the rest of the gentlemen on that side, that wherever there is an item on the free list in this bill they are going to have a most difficult job putting it on the protected list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It will be up-hill work for them, sure as they live. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. Why can you not let the woolen manufactures come in free as you let wool come in free to compete with that produced by our farmers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am in favor of letting woolens come in free. [Applause.] And what is a good deal more, I am in favor of letting everything else come in free. [Applause.] That is my creed. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. But you will vote to put a duty on manufactured goods, while you let binding-twine in free?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You need not worry yourself about me. [Laughter.] I propose to support every amendment to this bill that puts anything on the free list or cuts the tariff lower. [Applause.] The more of them that are adopted the better the bill will be. [Applause.] You can not have too much of a good thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am a free trader from the sole of my foot to the crown of my head. [Renewed applause.] That is the doctrine of nature and of common sense. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. And I will vote to put everything under protection—every article of American production, and that is what the people of this country want. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me say that the good sense and the ability to comprehend economic questions and economic conditions exhibited by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] who has just spoken are about as great as the intelligence of a farmer who should kill his hens because they had stopped laying, and before they had a chance to begin laying again. [Laughter.] The farmers to-day are raising every dollar's worth of their farm products for one-half what it cost in hours' labor to raise a like quantity in 1860 by reason of the inventions that have been made by mechanics working in this country in the mechanical industries protected by the tariff.

Never since this country was settled was the farmer, as compared with every other class in the community relatively or absolutely, so well off as to-day. And if any of these inventions have been made in Europe, they have been brought to this country to be developed. The gentleman can not mention a solitary machine made in Europe, or used to-day in Europe that was not invented in this country or developed in this country. But for the mechanics who, under our protective laws, invented machines to use this binding-twine, you would to-day be binding your grain by hand, or binding by material taken from the sheaf. Never was there such utter nonsense, such short-sightedness——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. WALKER. You have had your time. Now let me have my five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you not know that the reaper was invented under the Walker tariff?

Mr. WALKER. Well, is not that rich! "Under the Walker tariff!" What do you know about it? [Loud laughter and applause.] I know when and where it was invented; and it was not invented in this country; it was invented——

Mr. TUCKER and Mr. WASHINGTON rose and endeavored in the confusion to make themselves heard.

Mr. WALKER. I ask the gentlemen to sit down.

Mr. TUCKER. It was invented in my district.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman [derisive cries on the Democratic side]; well, here is Democratic politeness; here is Democratic decency. You emptied your seats all the time we were talking on our side; and we stayed and heard you like gentlemen when you were talking on your side. Now let me say that this machine was invented in France; but it was never worth a dollar until it was brought to this country and perfected. That is the fact of the matter. I am talking by the book.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi obtained the floor.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts was deprived of a large part of his time by disorder on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will bear in mind that the Committee of the Whole is the representative of the House of Representatives, if not the House itself; and it is hoped that gentlemen may assist the Chair in preserving order.

Mr. WALKER. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has been recognized.

Mr. WALKER. I want to raise a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. It is within the knowledge of the Chair that disorder on the floor prevented me from occupying half of my time, so that I had, in fact, but two minutes and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair endeavored to protect the gentleman from Massachusetts from interruptions, but will, if there be no objection, recognize the gentleman again. In the absence of objection, the gentleman will be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hopes that order may be restored, so that the gentleman from Massachusetts may be permitted to proceed in order. Any member desiring to interrupt him or any other gentleman should rise and address the Chair and get permission. The Chair hopes that the gentleman from Massachusetts will be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. WALKER. Let me say that we have the evidence of half a dozen farmers whom I consulted on this floor in the Fifty-first Congress—free-trade farmers—that taking all the machinery the farmer uses together he can produce farm products to-day with just half the labor cost that they could be produced in 1860. I use that date as a basis, because while much of it was invented before then, by the war this machinery was all brought into operation; and we are obliged to go back to that date as a starting point for all our economic facts. The farmer to-day can sell his wheat at one-half what it sold for in 1860, and while doing so can pay off a mortgage or any other debt whatever; and this is because of the protection we have had on the agricultural machinery in this country. Yet, when these great machines were first invented they sold for $300 and $400 apiece—and plows sold for $25 apiece—when all our agricultural machinery was sold at four, five, or six times what it is sold for to-day——

Mr. WASHINGTON and Mr. HALL of Missouri rose.

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I wish to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom I have a very kind regard, whether he can state to members of this committee what it costs the average farmer of the United States to raise a bushel of wheat? Get down to business principles. Can you give that statement?

Mr. WALKER. I have not the statements now in my possession, but I have looked them up very carefully, and I know the facts that I have submitted to be true.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will give us his information; but if he has not got the information I will give it to him.

Mr. WALKER. I want to say that the price of wheat came up and was considered thoroughly during the Fifty-first Congress, when the question was raised, as the gentleman will probably remember if he was here, about burning grain. You remember that we burned grain because it was cheaper than fuel.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. They burned it in Kansas, I believe, was the statement.

Mr. WALKER. Yes; and it was proven that they could raise grain at that time and burn it cheaper at the price then prevailing than they could buy coal for that purpose.

Mr. SIMPSON. Protected coal, you mean. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. And if there had been any plan by which they could have raised coal on the stalks just as they raise corn, and could have got it at a cheaper price or as cheap, then they would not have been compelled to consume their corn in that way.

Mr. CRAIN. They ought to have their coal on the free list; it would help them.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. With the gentleman's consent, I will state that the price of raising No. 2 wheat is 51 cents and a fraction a bushel—I mean, of course, the average price throughout the country.

Mr. WALKER. Then, without machinery it would cost 102 cents; and that is what the gentleman from Iowa wants to destroy.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. And, further, a bushel of No. 2 wheat can not be sold now except at a loss to the man who raises it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Now, will the gentleman from Missouri give the authority for that statement?

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I will say this, that it is a statement of a good many of the agricultural papers in the United States as well as the statement of many wheat-raisers.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I would ask the gentleman if that statement is made from any authoritative source, or by anybody on whom any reliance can be placed as to its accuracy?

Mr. HALL of Missouri. Well, I thought so, or I would not have stated it to the House.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But you are not giving your authority.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I could simply add my own experience to the experience of other gentlemen who have made this statement.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But what agricultural paper, recognized as authority, indorses the statement of the gentleman from Missouri which he has just made?

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I do not know that I can state exactly the name of the paper, but I have in my mind Coleman's Rural World, a leading agricultural paper, the Journal of Agriculture—I have seen it in several papers, twelve or fifteen perhaps; but I do not know whether I state exactly the ones I have seen it in. I am not sure, for instance, whether the American Farmer contains the statement, and I would not like to undertake to specify the particular cases; but there were a number of them. I have given attention to these matters for a number of years, and have taken up each agricultural product and endeavored to ascertain the facts about it in the same way, so as to show the cost of each one of these products.

Mr. REED. The cost where? On the farm?

Mr. HALL of Missouri. The cost of raising it.

Mr. REED. On the farm?

Mr. HALL of Missouri. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized or not? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor just at present.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. In further answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I desire to state in response to his question that there are a great many people in the United States who are vastly mistaken as to the average number of bushels of wheat raised on an acre in this country. The average in the United States, according to my experience, is about 11 bushels or less, and when you put that at 50 cents a bushel there is not much profit in raising it, although improved machinery assists in doing so to a very marked degree.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. My only object was to get the source of the gentleman's information. He simply gives conclusions which are disputed by a great many people. I myself do not believe that the conclusion of the gentleman is correct, and I desired, therefore, the sources of his information for the purpose of investigating it.

Mr. COX. Where did you get your information from?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Well, when I take the floor on this question I will give the gentleman that information.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] reminds me a good deal of an utterance of a half-witted fellow down in my county, who, being personally acquainted with three men who were one-eyed and who were 6 feet high, attributed the fact that they were 6 feet high to the fact that they had but one eye apiece. [Laughter.] Nobody in this whole wide world disputes the fact that not alone in our land, but in England, in France, in Germany, in Australia, and in Canada, man can produce wheat to-day at half what they could produce it for forty years ago.

Nobody disputes that as civilization goes on, and the inventions of men come into play, that all things can be produced cheaper for the children of men. The point is not that. The point is whether the men who are following the natural occupations of life—not the hothouse industries into which they have been called by legislation—have procured, not a greater facility for production, but whether they have as great a facility as they ought to have procured, and whether they have been deprived of their share of the increased facility by being hampered and burdened, in the advance of civilization, by taxes that have been laid upon them for the benefit of other people and to their own detriment.

We produce wheat to-day cheaper than ever before. We get more out of it than we did before. We can buy more woolen cloth for it than we could before, and God knows they can buy still more in England, where the farmer, after he has raised his wheat and sold it, is not to be taxed when he goes to buy the cloth. They can get more there where the farmer is not taxed when he goes to harvest his wheat for the very binding-twine which he puts upon it. The question after all is a question of unearned increment. Here, as in land, there is an increment that comes with civilization from invention and improved machinery and new processes of production, and the question is not whether men are better off, but whether they are as much better off as they ought to be if the division was fairly made between them in the several industries.

Say whatever you please, this whole discussion is in this proposition: It is a question between the interests of the manufacturers of the United States and the interests of the farmers in the United States. You have carried things on in your way until you have over half the wealth of the United States concentrated within the nine manufacturing States of the Union. And now a gentleman of national reputation, of international reputation, stands here, and for the benefit of twelve thousand men, as his colleague from Massachusetts says, wants to tax every farmer in the United States upon binding-twine. And when he taxes him, whom else does he tax? Every man who buys the wheat from him which is harvested, every man who buys the flour which is made out of the wheat. And for what purpose? To diversify industries and to enable twelve thousand men in Massachusetts to make money out of you and me that God and nature did not give them the right to make, but which you choose to give them by legislation the opportunity to make.

The voice of the Cordage Trust is heard in the land. That is about what is the matter with a great deal of this sort of thing. What difference does it make to the farmer that Mr. Whitney invents a cotton gin, if they come to Washington and make me pay a hundred dollars more for the cotton gin than I could get it for if I had the markets of the world in which to buy? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. Chairman, that meets the approval of the Democratic party, and therefore seems to be worth noticing. I would like to ask a question of those gentlemen who applauded. They need not all answer at once. If this tax which is put on the farmer is immediately turned over to the bread-eater, what has the farmer to complain about?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will answer the question. I did not say that every bit of it went over to the consumer. I said that in taxing the farmer you taxed the consumer, too. Whenever you tax these things the burden is shifted to some extent, in a market where one man bargains with another, and part of it remains upon the farmer and part of it goes to the consumer. In a year when the conditions of farming as to prices are hard the farmer pays it all and the consumer has the benefit. It is like invention itself. A part of the invention goes to labor, a part of it is profit, and a part of it goes to the consumer, and all things are divided that way, whether it be an invention that is a benefit or a tax which is a burden.

Mr. REED. I wish simply to remark that when the gentleman has spread himself all over creation, he will find that the taxation that he spreads over is very thin on the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia and then the amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment to the amendment was read at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was read.

Mr. MORSE. But the amendment to the amendment was not read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was under the impression that the amendment to the amendment was read, but is informed by the Clerk it was not; therefore the Chair will direct the Clerk to read the amendment to the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment to the amendment was read.

The question was taken on the amendment to the amendment; and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of West Virginia was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 41, paragraph 252, line 12, after the words "warp and filling," insert "including all cotton duck;" and in line 15, after the word "bleached," insert "including all cotton duck."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Where does that amendment come in?

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, paragaph 252, line 12.

Mr. DALZELL. Let us have that reported again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the amendment, it is to include and increase the duty on cotton duck 5 per cent?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkans - This amendment makes certain where cotton duck would be classed.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman says it would make "certain;" but that is not an answer to my question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I have answered the gentleman. If we do not make certain what the amount is, no one can say what the present rate would be. It is a decrease by 10 per cent of the present ad valorem rate on part of the cotton duck, and it makes 25 per cent of what was 40 per cent in the Mills bill. In your own bill which was passed by the Fifty-first Congress this duty, I think, was reduced.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does it not increase the duty 5 per cent above what it was when the bill was reported?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. That can not be positively affirmed, for the gentleman himself does not know what the duty was. This makes certain what the duty is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does it not change it from a class of goods in reference to that particular kind of goods different from what it would pay duty on?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. That is exactly the question of fact in dispute.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there any question but that it does do that?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. That is the question that is in dispute. Perhaps the gentleman is right and perhaps the gentleman is wrong; I am not prepared to say.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is in the right direction, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. It is a material reduction, bringing the duty to nearly two-thirds, upon a part, of the existing rates that you have in the McKinley bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the gentleman if the manufacturers of Baltimore did not state that this would increase the duty 5 per cent, as reported originally by the committee?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Any fear that they entertained that it would be classed lower is removed by this action.

Mr. PAYNE. They understood that it would be an increase, as reported by the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Perhaps they did. They had good ground for that conclusion.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman concludes that as coarse cotton goods, as cotton ducks, have this increase, why not propose to offer an increase for the fine goods, which actually need it, and which we can not make without it?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will answer the gentleman that fine goods are provided for at a higher rate.

Mr. DINGLEY. But should they not pay a higher duty, as they involve a larger amount of labor?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Of course the ad valorem follows the value, and, as I said before, the ad valorem provided for is higher than this upon the fine goods.

Again, as to this being an article of coarse thread, that is true only in a limited sense. The gentleman from Maine knows that while this may not count more than fifteen threads to the square inch under a certain strict construction, yet each of these threads has a great many smaller threads within it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I know all about that.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I know the gentleman does. He is only asking questions in order to be entertaining, which I appreciate very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my inquiry was simply for this purpose, aside from any joking. I agree entirely with the increase which it is proposed to make in cotton goods, but I wish to say to the gentleman that the necessity for an increase on fine cotton goods in which there is larger proportionate amount of labor is still greater.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. They have a rate now; and I shall be glad to hear the gentleman upon that subject when we reach those articles in this bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. There is more protection proportionately where there is a comparatively small amount of labor than on the finer goods where there is a larger proportion of labor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The gentleman understands cotton duck, and he also knows that when you count the fine yarn in the square inch there is not an article in the cotton schedule that has as many fine threads as these large threads contain that compose cotton duck.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not object to this increase, Mr. Chairman. It is in the right direction; only there should be more of it where it is more needed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. But the gentleman's argument does not appear to be very sound.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I had a sort of idea that there would be an amendment offered to increase the duty on cotton duck ever since I read the protest from the city of Baltimore against the reduction proposed in this bill. I have not much doubt that the manufacturers of Baltimore think they can proceed to make cotton duck under what is granted them by the committee without a very large reduction in the wages of their employés. In other words, this seems to be another concession to "our people" in the interest of protection.

But the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] very well asks our friends on the other side: Why do you not go all along the whole line, and when you are dealing out protection in this industry give it not only in cotton duck, but in all the manufactured articles; give it not simply on coarse goods, but give an increased ad valorem duty on the finer goods, and thus enable the people who are engaged in this industry to get fair living wages for their work? Why discriminate against one American laborer while conceding protection to another? It seems to me only an additional step in the direction in which this committee have gone toward making a bill that is protective once in a while, sometimes by accident, though in this case it seems to be by design, while in other directions it is not protective; and that is never by accident, but always by design.

The amendment of Mr. WILSON of West Virginia was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 69, paragraph 415, line 21, at the end of line add, "and sweat-leathers, bindings, bands, and tips, when cut to length for trimming felt or wool hats;" so that the paragraph will read:

"Braids, plaits, laces, and similar manufactures composed of straw, chip, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, or rattan, suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, and sweat-leathers, bindings, bands, and tips, when cut to length for trimming felt or wool hats."

Mr. EVERETT. That is inconsistent.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Then that makes it in harmony with the rest of this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be again reported.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would state what was the duty on these articles in the bill as originally reported.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I have no data by which I could give the gentleman that information; these articles are nowhere specially named in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Then they were included among articles of this class not otherwise provided for at a duty of 30 per cent?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. They are included in several schedules.

Mr. PAYNE. This is a manufactured article, of course.

Mr. COOMBS. It is not made in this country.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, yes.

Mr. COOMBS. Not to any extent; it never has been.

Mr. PAYNE. We had this matter before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1890. This class of manufactured articles has been on the dutiable list, I believe, ever since the Walker tariff. It is a finished manufactured product.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that the explanation of this proposition is that it is a concession, a "sop," offered to the hat-makers of this country, who are very much agitated over the duties in this bill. I suppose this is a little sugar-coated pill offered to the laborers in that branch of industry. The committee promise to wipe out two or three other industries for the purpose of trying to get the hat-makers to submit to their bill. Of course they can not do it in any such way as this. Of course the amendment will be adopted. Of course any amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will be adopted; but in behalf of the men who manufacture these articles I simply wish to offer my protest and have the House understand it now.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed

to assist an industry which has never been assisted under Republican management. Wherever the tariff legislation of that party has benefited the hat industries 5 per cent by a tariff for protection, it has injured them 25 per cent by tariffs on their raw material. The object on this side of the House is to give the hat industries of this country a chance that they never have had before.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to ask my colleague [Mr. COOMBS] whether this amendment has been offered at his suggestion.

Mr. COOMBS. No, sir; not at all.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I would like to know where this industry is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] says the amendment is intended to benefit.

Mr. COOMBS. All through New Jersey; and Brooklyn has a part of it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. What industry is it?

Mr. COOMBS. The hat industry—the manufacture of felt and wool hats.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Are these establishments found in your district?

Mr. COOMBS. Some of them are—not in my present district, but in my former district. I know the industry thoroughly; and I know that it is an industry that should be encouraged.

Mr. PAYNE. Then this amendment is for the purpose of encouraging the hat-makers?

Mr. COOMBS. It is for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture of hats by taking off the burdens under which that industry has labored heretofore.

Mr. DE FOREST. Mr. Chairman, a gentleman on the other side of the House has asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] whether this amendment has been offered at his suggestion or whether he is interested as a representative in this kind of industry. I want to say that I am most emphatically interested. The town of Danbury, in which I suppose more of the fur-hatting business is carried on than in any other place in the United States, is in my district. Now, it has been stated by eminent authority that four thousand or more men who are now out of employment in Danbury, locked out of the shops there, owe their unfortunate condition to the proposed change in the tariff. Nothing could be farther from the truth; nothing could be more false than that assertion.

The fact is that the suspension of operations in the hatting factories of Danbury is due to a persistent effort on the part of manufacturers there to crush out the "trades unions." The fact is that this effort has been carried on almost from the time the McKinley bill went into operation. The manufacturers told their employés that if they would come down here to Washington and go before the Ways and Means Committee when the McKinley bill was under consideration, and advocate the duties proposed in that bill, it would inure to their benefit. Those employés came here, and the duties were secured.

But almost before those men had returned, the manufacturers began to talk about the necessity of reducing their force and of cutting down their expenses and of turning away certain of their employés. They began to talk about changing the arrangement which had been maintained there between the trades unions and the manufacturers' association for seven years, to the great benefit of all concerned. And because the men would not yield to the proposition which was made by these manufacturers, they shut the shops. The closing of those shops had no connection with this proposed change in the tariff law.

But I have been there myself and talked with these 4,000 men who have been locked out, or some of them, the men whose names have been used by gentlemen of high authority in the course of this controversy, in support of the proposition that the present depression in business is caused by the proposed change in the tariff. I say I have talked with the men representing these 4,000 operatives out of employment, and not one that I met or talked with desired to have the present duty retained on the manufactured hats, but they were unanimous in their desire to have the materials put on the free list and that as soon as possible.

Mr. PAYNE. Was this change made at your suggestion?

Mr. DE FOREST. It was, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. How long have these men been locked out?

Mr. DE FOREST. Since sometime in November.

Mr. PAYNE. Last November?

Mr. DE FOREST. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. About the time that men were becoming idle all over the country?

Mr. DE FOREST. I understand the suggestion of the gentleman, but if he will take the pains to look into the manifesto issued by the manufacturers of Danbury, Conn., he will see it contains the assertion that the suspension of operations in the hat industry is due to the pending tariff bill is utterly false and without any foundation in fact.

Mr. PAYNE. Did not the manufacturers claim that in view of the condition there and throughout the country they must reduce wages?

Mr. DE FOREST. No, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. Was it not because of the state of trade and the condition of finances generally?

Mr. DE FOREST. No, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. Why was it?

Mr. DE FOREST. It was on the grounds of their inability to come to any arrangement with the trades unions.

Mr. PAYNE. Exactly; the trades union wanted higher wages and the manufacturers lower wages. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, gentlemen, you need not laugh; I will give you the facts before I am through.

Mr. DE FOREST. The trades union simply desired to continue the arrangement under which the business was then being carried on throughout the country, I will say in answer to the question.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, please answer the question I have asked you. Was it not because the manufacturers claimed that they must pay lower wages because of the uncertainty of tariff legislation by this Congress?

Mr. DE FOREST. No, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. Was it not a fact that because of the uncertainties of the tariff the manufacturers could not carry on their business without a reduction of wages?

Mr. DE FOREST. They claim——

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). Did not they try to reduce wages on that ground?

Mr. DE FOREST. I will tell the gentleman. They said it was necessary to make different arrangements with the trades unions in favor of lower prices because of domestic competition.

Mr. PAYNE. Now there has been a good deal of amusement here, especially on the other side, in the last minute or two, because I asked the gentleman the question if the manufacturers did not want to reduce the wages. Why should they not want to reduce them? They are mere human beings like ourselves. I have never claimed otherwise. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] They do not go out into the streets like our friend from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] and hunt up men to pay higher wages to. What I want to do is to put the manufacturers of this country in condition such that they can pay higher wages; and one thing is certain, that the workingmen of this country, organized as they are, when the manufacturers shall have been enabled to pay higher wages, will compel them to do so. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. PAYNE. But, on the other hand, if you deprive the manufacturers of the power of paying high wages, if you take from them the sale of their commodities at a fair living rate, then you deprive them of the power of paying higher wages, and they can not do it whether the men they employ are organized or not. That is the difference, and I hope some of you will understand it now.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman, as I understand it——

Mr. COCKRAN. I simply wanted to ask my colleague one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether he considers that the rate of wages depends on the demands of the trades unions or on the law of supply and demand?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is the question I wanted to ask the gentleman myself.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. COCKRAN. Well, please let us have an answer to the question. I don't want miscellaneous information. I asked the gentleman a direct question on that subject, and hope he will give a direct answer.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, what I said was simply this, that you must give a man the ability first to pay the wages. If he can get enough for his commodities to enable him to pay the high wages, he will be able to do it.

Mr. COCKRAN. But will he do it?

Mr. WALKER. Yes; every time.

Mr. PAYNE. He will not do it of his own free will, unless he is compelled to do it by trades unions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The trades unions will compel him and can compel him to do it if he has the ability to do it.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman answer one more question? Did Mr. Carnegie and the proprietors of the Homestead works have abundant means to meet their laborers' demands when the strike occurred there?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know. I am not familiar with Mr. Carnegie's business. If he can make steel rails as cheaply as my friend from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] says he can under his two hundred and two patents, then he did have the ability. If he can not make them as cheaply, then he may not have had the ability. I have never seen any investigation of that strike that threw any light on the subject as to whether Mr. Carnegie had the ability or not.

Mr. COCKRAN. The last statement explains the gentleman's position. He has evidently spoken without information on the whole subject. [Laughter on the Democratic side and cries of derision on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Now, my friend is up to his old tricks. I want to say one thing——

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will suspend until order is restored on the floor. The committee must proceed in order.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say one thing more to my colleague.

Mr. COCKRAN. If my colleague from New York desires to ask me any further questions, I am willing to answer them.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to make one further observation in answer to the gentleman's last jocose remark, which seems to have been taken for an argument on the gentleman's side of the House.

Mr. COCKRAN. There is no demand for anything else.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say in reference to Mr. Carnegie, that if reports are true, a Democratic member of the committee which investigated that strike said, when he had found out what the wages paid to Mr. Carnegie's men were, that they were the highest wages that he ever heard of in this country or any other. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. And yet, Mr. Chairman, when the trades unions sought to maintain those wages, they were met by bullets. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.] They were met by bullets in the hands of the hired assassins of a protected industry. [Applause on the Democratic side and manifestations of derision on the Republican side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I thought the Democratic governor sent the militia down there.

Mr. COCKRAN. Yes, the Democratic governor sent the officers of the law to supplant the volunteers of anarchy and of assassination. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Did they not carry some bullets down there with them?

Mr. COCKRAN. They did, but they did not have occasion to use them, for those men, and I may say all the people of this country, have always shown their readiness to submit to law, just as they are ready to resist oppression, invasion, and armed aggression in the hands of any unauthorized power. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the whole question, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am glad I am going to have my friend's assistance in asserting the rights and dignities of this House, which have been trampled upon——

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman may always rely upon my assistance to maintain the dignity and the rights of this House when he first shows that he understands them himself. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will show you to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, my friend from New York, my colleague [Mr. PAYNE], has placed this question before the committee in a shape in which it can be disposed of in the briefest possible space. He tells us that the theory upon which this protective system is maintained is to stimulate the profits in the hands of the manufacturers, and then trust to the trades unions to get those profits out of the manufacturers. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] We believe in putting the profits in the first instance into the hands of the laborers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. How?

Mr. COCKRAN. By increasing the demand for their labor and increasing production in this country. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] says the object of this bill is to reduce wages and make this country less attractive to immigration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. I am not responsible for the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] or the statement of any other gentleman, as I imagine that the members of the Republican minority do not want to be responsible for all that is said by the gentleman from Maine. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. But you are standing on the same platform——

Mr. COCKRAN. I did not quite understand the gentleman's remark.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But you and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] pretend to be standing upon the same platform.

Mr. COCKRAN. We make no pretenses. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. You declare yourselves——

Mr. COCKRAN. We make statements in the English language, which this House is competent to understand. So far as I am concerned I know, and so far as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] is concerned I believe, that we both want to state the truth about every matter on which we address the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then you want to get within about 4 miles of each other if you are going to try to stand upon the same platform. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the platform of the Democratic party is not only 4 miles wide, but 3,000 miles wide. It is wide enough to cover all the people who dwell in this universe. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Is it wide enough to take in Hawaii? [Great laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Yes, that platform can take in the largest as well as the smallest, the United States as well as Hawaii, the gentleman from Maine as well as the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. God save the Queen! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Great confusion in the Hall.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has the floor. The committee will be in order. Gentlemen standing in front of the Chair will please resume their seats, and the committee will suspend business until order is restored. The Chair can not maintain order unless the committee will assist him.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire rather to state my own position than to have my friendly colleague from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] state it for me, because I have noticed that he is in the habit of stating part of the truth, half truths, and of forgetting to state the whole truth. What I said was this: That we proposed to furnish to the manufacturer a market for his commodities. I repeated it three or four times—a market for his commodities, so that he might be enabled to convert them into cash, that he might have the wherewithal to pay his laborers; and when you give him that, when you give him that market, you put him in a position——

A MEMBER on the Democratic side. "Louder."

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). Where, if his laborers come to him demanding pay for their work they might get it. What cuckoo was that cried "louder?" [Laughter on the Republican side.]

They might get pay for their work. My friend has seen fit to go to the Homestead strike, that unfortunate matter, unfortunate to the men engaged in it, unfortunate to the employers, unfortunate to the people connected with them. What does that illustrate? Simply that the passions of men became unbridled; and they quarreled over the subject of wages, it is true. It was unfortunate for the men, unfortunate for the proprietors; but it was something that might have occurred anywhere else in the world, and while these men were fighting for their rights more than 100,000 men in free-trade England, which you praise so much for her commercial system, were wandering up and down that isle seeking for work on a question of a reduction of their wages.

Such questions will arise wherever there are men with human nature; and it does not argue in favor of one system or another. What we contend is, that with this grand market, with consumers who are also producers; who are consumers because they are producers; who get the power to consume from the high wages they get from their employers—by this system employers can sell their products and sell them at a fairer price and pay a fair amount to every man who is willing to give his brain and muscle in producing in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman has done us the favor of stating that he would place his own position before us in such a way that we would not only have half the truth, but a larger proportion of it. But as he does not say that he gave us the whole of it, I leave it to him to say whether that is all the truth or whether he has an installment in reserve.

M. PAYNE. I would say to my friend——

Mr. COCKRAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. I can talk longer than five minutes on this subject.

Mr. COCKRAN. But the point of the gentleman's argument

that struck me with the greatest force was that admission of the breaking down of the machinery of distribution of profits on which he has based his reliance in the case. The trades union is the only method of distribution which he can name, and I challenge him to name another which will force the manufacturer to divide his profits with his laborers. I ask him how it worked in Homestead? Is there any union man employed there? Who is going to regulate the distribution of these profits now, in view of the fact that the very labor unions were wrecked in the contest for what they believed to be their share? I want the gentleman to answer that.

Mr. PAYNE. I have already stated the enormous price paid for wages at Homestead——

Mr. COCKRAN. That is too wide a distribution.

Mr. PAYNE. Whether that was all of the profits that that plant could pay or not I do not know, and my colleague does not know, but the results of that strike were these: Because the owners of those mills were willing to take a loss of hundreds of thousands rather than pay the higher wages, the inference is that these employers had given their employés the extreme limit of wages they could afford to pay.

Mr. COCKRAN. Why could they afford hundreds of thousands of dollars to fight them? Why would it not have been better to have made that a distribution and preserved the peace?

Mr. PAYNE. Because they thought it was better to lose perhaps two or three hundred thousand dollars for a few months than to increase wages for a lengthened period of time in a measure that would perhaps—I do not know—but that would perhaps ultimately destroy their business. [Derisive cheers on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have the statement in full at last. Now we can go to the country.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. COCKRAN. What does the gentleman from Maine desire?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's effort to exhaust all the information on every subject two days in succession.

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, I should never have attempted to talk to the gentleman from Maine if I wanted to exhaust information. [Laughter.] I do not wish that remark to be misunderstood, however. I do not mean to say that the gentleman from Maine is barren of information, but I mean to say that his information, such as it is, is exhaustless.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman has applied that same remark to nearly everybody; now, why not go on and apply it to everybody except himself, and then he will have it all his own way?

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, no; I have applied it to you alone.

Mr. BOUTELLE. You have applied it to at least three gentlemen already.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, if I stated that any gentleman was exhaustless except the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], I did violence to the facts of history. [Laughter.] I move to strike out the last word now, so that I may get down to that basis of reason which has been established by my colleague [Mr. PAYNE].

We have, then, this proposition, that it was better for these protected employers to have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to settle this question of wages, by reducing them, than to distribute that amount among their employés. But what was the method by which they accomplished the reduction? Why, by striking down the trades unions themselves, which my colleague [Mr. PAYNE] declares are the sole means of regulating wages by the distribution of profits. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if this method of distribution, which is the only one my colleague can suggest, may be broken down as a salutary exercise of the power of capital, what is left for the protection of the laboring man to enable him to get his share of this robbery which you have made universal under the pretense that he was to be the chief beneficiary of it? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to stating to the gentleman from New York precisely what my view of this economic question is, and of the reason why these hard times to which he has referred are upon us. It is because your method of distribution was unequal, was unjust, was in the nature of pillage rather than of division. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why are the laborers hungry and the manufacturers comfortable? What basis of division is that which enables these employers to look forward to this winter with composure, which forces the men over whose fate you gentlemen shed your tears, to wander in the streets hopeless, homeless, without food or shelter, while all around them the favored objects of your legislation are dwelling in comfort as a result of that legislation? [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, Jack Cade exhausted that style of argument more than five hundred years ago.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is faulty in his history. Jack Cade lived several hundred years ago.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly sorry that, with all the répertoire of eloquence which the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has at his command, he should resort so frequently to that portion of it which is merely physical. [Laughter.] I want to present this matter simply and in a few words. The gentleman from New York wants to know why it is that men are traveling about the streets without work, and he says that it is because of the McKinley law——

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman is mistaken. He certainly does not wish to misquote me.

Mr. REED. Not at all.

Mr. COCKRAN. I said——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN. I wish simply to make a statement of what I did say. I did not say that the suspension of industry now was due solely to the McKinley law. It is the result of long years of a false economic system. What I did say was that it was extraordinary that when the suspension came the workingmen should be plunged immediately into want, while the employers do not seem to have met with serious disaster.

Mr. REED. That is precisely what I am calling the attention of the committee to. The gentleman from New York, instead of giving reasons, which I think he knows, has seen fit to substitute attacks.

How easy it is to respond to that in a similar strain, and to say that the reason why the laborer is walking the streets to-day is the unfaithfulness of the Democratic party to their duty; because to-day all industry is arrested by reason of the mere threat of adopting another system.

The gentleman has indulged himself both to-day and on Saturday last in expressions of contempt for our industrial system, because under threat of changes business is paralyzed, and because the accumulated wealth of this country is too little to tide it over the difficulty. But unfortunately, throughout all the language which he has used on this subject, there went this continuous error; he made no distinction between wealth which is consumable and wealth which is intended to produce consumable wealth.

There is an immense amount of unconsumable wealth which is used in the production of other wealth existing in this country and in other countries; but from the very nature of the case, the amount of consumable wealth that there is in any country at any time is exceedingly limited. And I say to the gentleman that the strike of the British coal miners in free-trade England had the effect of putting a large portion of the population in that country in the condition of desolation in which ours is to-day. And in free-trade England and everywhere else in this world, when there is a suspension of business to the extent that there is now in this country, there will be a similar result.

Now, let me come for a moment to this question of wages. The gentleman says that it depends upon supply and demand. I say that is an utterly exploded doctrine. Wages depend upon the amount of the market, and also upon the nature of the workingman himself. I anticipate what the gentleman is going to say in response to the suggestions of other gentlemen on his side, that what they need is a more extensive market; that what they need is to go forth to the rest of the universe and obtain a market; and the method they propose is to obtain a market somewhere else by giving up the market that we have here. [Applause on the Republican side.] But we on our side believe in enlarging the market in a different fashion. We do not mean to go to the ends of the earth and struggle with the cheaper labor of the whole world. What we mean to do is to elevate the market of this country by giving higher wages to the laborers, and thereby constituting a market as broad as our production. [Applause.]

Now, let me say another thing. This is a selfish world; there is not a shadow of doubt about it. We are each of us seeking our own good, or our fancied good. We are each of us endeavoring to obtain the best we can out of life; free trade or protection makes no difference in human nature in that respect. Men in this country and men abroad are endeavoring to obtain what they can for wages and what they can for profit, and in this struggle there are certain underlying fundamental principles, among which is this: that when men reach a certain stage of civilization—supply or demand, or what not—they are going to have their wants supplied or they are going to make difficulty and trouble. And if you endeavor to crush down their wages so that their wants can not be supplied, you are going to create a condition of affairs which will reverse any action that this House may take which produces such a disaster. Wages can not be

raised by mere volition. Sir Thomas Brassey said years ago that when his father in India raised voluntarily the wages of his Indian laborers, the result was that they simply stopped working when they had all their simplest wants supplied. When that point was reached no more work was done, even for higher wages.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COCKRAN. I hope the gentleman's time will be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Maine will proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. So that it is not the arbitrary fixation of wages, but it is the growth in intelligence, the growth in desires and wants of the laborer that forces a rise of wages. What is the direct means by which the laboring men reach this result? By labor unions, by combining, by making manufacturers understand that they must give higher wages. How are the manufacturers enabled to give higher wages? By increasing their product, which increase can only take place by the larger market which comes of these larger wages.

That is the secret of this matter. But there are limitations in this case just as there are to all human tendencies. The laboring man is struggling to supply his wants. He makes his demand on the manufacturer. The manufacturer is set to work to devise new inventions, and by the assistance of these he is able to supply these wants. But there is a limitation to inventions; there is a limitation to the capacity of the employer to enlarge his market. And those two things struggle together. In this country, with the laborer seeking to obtain higher wages and fewer hours of work and the demand of the public for lower prices, there is going on a tremendous struggle; and that is all the struggle that the inventive power of this country can sustain.

Now you propose, by bringing us in contact with a lower civilization without protection, to make the success of that struggle an absolute impossibility. You are crushing down the laboring man by your efforts: and you are thereby intensifying this struggle between the employer and his employés, which is liable to be fought out as long as selfishness reigns in this world. But, thank Heaven, the success, the good fortune, and the prosperity of the laboring man does not depend on these men who rend the heavens with their shouts of praise, but upon the laws of the Lord God Omnipotent. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side]. And among the laws of Omnipotence is the use of human brains by aid of law to provide the laborer with opportunities for work. [Renewed applause on the Republican side and in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must remind visitors in the galleries that they are not permitted to make manifestations of approval or disapproval, and if there is a repetition the Chair will be compelled to cause the galleries to be cleared.

Mr. COCKRAN. The conclusion of my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. REED], and an opportunity to listen to him is always a liberal education; the conclusion, I say, of his remarks explains the beginning of them, and adds a significant light to the examination which we can bestow upon them. He began by stating that much of the discussion on this side was physical; let me compliment him by saying that the conclusion of the protection argument is purely spiritual. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

In this way you will observe that the distinguished warrior who had entered the ring when his partisans were sore beset proves that his final reliance is on the Lord of Hosts rather than upon the reasoning power of the American people. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

But I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that there ought to be any contest between the two. My judgment is that every conclusion which the American people have reached in their history upon any great question has sooner or later come into direct conjunction and harmony with the laws of God; and the American people are moving in that direction now by this bill which is before the House. [Great cheering on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the committee will indulge me for a moment, I would like to take up the Republican position as it has been explained by the giant of the Republican party. [Laughter.] We have hitherto had the lesser lights attempting to explain it, but now we have at last got the explanation of the creed of protection from its highest authority. It is this, if I understand it, that we enrich the manufacturer by giving him protection against a lower level of civilization; and then the manufacturer in turn will proceed to enrich the laborer under the pressure of the demands of the trades unions. I hope that I am stating this question fairly. It will profit us little to make a statement which is not an accurate statement of the position of the other side and then proceed to combat it. If the gentleman from Maine is not satisfied with my statement I hope he will correct me.

Mr. REED. I think that anybody who listened to me would be surprised if I assented to your statement of what I said.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, that is not an unusual condition for those who listen to the gentleman from Maine. [Laughter.] The way in which he wound up his address this afternoon, while violating what we believe to be economic truths based upon the wisdom of God, by appealing to that same God leaves little room for surprise at anything he may say. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But I will endeavor to state the proposition as the committee must have understood it, that the idea of protection is to so increase the profits of the manufacturer that he can afford to pay high wages to his men——

Mr. DINGLEY. No such proposition was ever made by any protectionist.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I trust that if any gentleman on the other side conceives that my statement is inaccurate or unfair he will correct me now

Mr. WALKER. We know it is, every one of us. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. I intended to exclude the gentleman from Massachusetts from the operation of my remark, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.] But let us see what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has said. I am perfectly willing that he shall state it over again if he desires to.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why should he?

Mr. COCKRAN. Well, I think he had better not, myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I think it is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. COCKRAN. I think that in the hereafter he will be better pleased for his own sake if he does not; but at the same time I think it would be better for the purposes of this discussion that he should.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Everybody understood it except the gentleman from New York, and I think he understood it also.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking now to the gentleman from Maine, to whom his party turns for enlightenment and leadership. And since there is more than one gentleman from Maine, I desire to state that I was appealing to the late Speaker of the House [Mr. REED].

Now, if I understood this statement, and I trust I will be corrected if I be wrong, the gentleman says that there is a large amount of consumable wealth in this country, and he attempts to make a distinction between wealth which is consumable and wealth which is not. Now, if I could make that distinction, I could understand his argument, but according to the interpretation of all the economic laws that I have ever seen, all wealth is consumable. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is no wealth that is not consumable.

Mr. WALKER. Land, houses, and such things.

Mr. COCKRAN. Why, land in itself is not capital. The right to use it may be capital. Land and labor in conjunction make capital. That which land produces is consumable, and that which is not consumable is not useful. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who stated last Saturday that a river was not an advantage in manufacturing, is of course, capable of any statement, and I trust that this committee will relieve me from the necessity of treating his remarks seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCKRAN. I trust that I may be allowed to continue.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, at the bottom of this whole protective system lies that fallacy which has been stated by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. All wealth is consumable. The capacity of a country to consume is not a factor in the creation of wealth, unless it is met by a greater capacity to produce. The capital of a country increases year by year by the amount of the annual production that can be saved from its revenue; but at the very basis of wealth lies the capacity to produce, for you can not save that which you do not have.

You can not divide what you have not got. You must have wealth produced before you have that wealth to divide. Now, the theory of the Democratic party on this economic question is that where by legislation you make production expensive you limit its amount, and I do not think any gentleman on this floor has disputed that if you limit the amount of production you limit the opportunity of labor to find employment.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has said with perfect truth that there is no such thing as charity in commerce. I agree with him. The contest of commerce is the contest for cheapness. In commerce the survival of the fittest is the domination of the cheapest, and that being so, we believe that because we can produce the chief staples and necessaries of life in this country cheaper than anywhere else, as the great republic of antiquity accomplished the military conquest of the world, the providence of God has ordered that this country shall complete the economical and industrial conquest of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But in making that conquest, the widest facilities must be given to production; and believing as we do, and as you concede, that to cheapen production is to enlarge it, we think an abundant production furnishes a better field for the trades unions to claim for labor a larger reward than a narrow production. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We believe that if we can increase the productive capacity of this country $500,000,000 a year, there is no law of God or man that will prevent the laborer getting his share of that increase. We believe, on the other hand, that if you restrict production, you may keep the profits of the manufacturer as large as they are now, but you must necessarily reduce the profits of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As my friend from Maine [Mr. REED] says, there is no charity in commerce. I may add to his statement that there is no room for charity in commerce.

That the wages of labor depend upon the law of supply and demand is a proposition so evident that I never expected to have heard it denied on this floor by a gentleman to whom a great part of the intelligent thought of this country looks up for guidance. I had never supposed that the value of any material or element of wealth depended upon any other law than that of supply and demand. But I regard the statement of the gentleman from Maine on this subject as the crowning admission of the correctness of the position occupied by the majority. I am willing to leave this dispute on the issue which he has framed. If the laws of supply and demand do not control the price of labor, then you gentlemen of the minority are right. If the laws of supply and demand do control the price of labor, then according to your own statement we are right, and on that issue we challenge the verdict of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I call for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment of Mr. WILSON of West Virginia was agreed to.

Mr. BURROWS. I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise to receive a message from the Senate.

The committee rose informally to receive a message from the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 757) to provide for the erection of a first-class fog signal at or near the present position of the Cape Arago light station; and

A bill (S. 1126) granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

The committee accordingly resumed its session.

Mr. BURROWS. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The hour has arrived for the committee to rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. SHERMAN, indefinitely, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, there are many members I know who have a large number of papers, and they desire to know whether we can safely leave them on the desks, or whether the Hall would be open for a mass meeting I desire a ruling of the Chair in regard to the rule which provides that the presiding officer shall not even entertain any motion or request to use the Hall for any other purpose than legislative business. That is the provision of Rule XXIV, and I desire to get a ruling of the Chair upon that rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that not only is it not in order to adopt a resolution permitting the occupancy of the floor by other than members; but the Speaker is denied the right even to submit a motion for unanimous consent that such an order be made.

Mr. BURROWS. And the rules of the House are and have been specific on that point. I understand a mass meeting was held here the other night. I wanted a ruling on the question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in justice to the action the other night, both sides of the House were represented; unanimous consent was asked, and no objection was made.

Mr. BURROWS. But the rule provides that the Chair shall not entertain a request for unanimous consent; and we think that the Hall ought to be saved for the use of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. At the inauguration consent was given, and also during the consideration of the Mills bill persons who were not members were frequently on the floor.

Mr. BURROWS. I asked for a ruling, and the Speaker has very properly decided that it was not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he is not aware of any instance when the House was in discharge of a legislative duty that the doors have been opened. The Chair has only known of one or two exceptions, that of the counting of a vote, or a funeral service, or something like that; but the Chair has never known it happen on a legislative day, and it will not do so again by the assent of the Chair.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BROOKSHIRE) will discharge the duties of the Chair this evening. The House will now take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to debate only on the pending bill.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House was declared in recess.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m. by Mr. BROOKSHIRE, as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is in session for the purpose of general debate only upon the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, pursuant to the special order.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for debate on the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The title was again read.

Mr. POWERS Mr. Chairman, It is greatly to be regretted, sir, that a system of taxation which concerns the people of the greatest and grandest nation on the footstool, is to be formulated at the behests of a party caucus. It would rather seem to be the part of wisdom—to be the part of patriotism, and more in the line of statesmanship, to employ in its structure all the features that experience has demonstrated to be wise and efficient, wheresoever they were cast, and by whomsoever they were fashioned.

It avails little to say that Washington and Hamilton were protectionists or free traders unless, under their administration of a tariff law, they discovered in its workings a superior advantage to the people in one or the other policy. It adds nothing to the sum of our wisdom to say that we are one in the family of nations and that it is a natural right that a free citizen has to buy where he can buy cheapest and sell where he can sell dearest.

We are considering a policy, a scheme, a plain business problem, how to provide revenues to meet the enormous and rapidly growing needs of a government of seventy millions of people, with interests as diversified and numberless as the leaves of the forest, a system of taxation that shall realize the needed revenue by imposing the lightest practicable pressure upon the people. In such a work, where is the possible chance for a patriotic man to display the virus of partisanship, or to contemplate possible political advantage? If we proposed a system of direct taxation upon the property of our citizens—property indifferently owned by all partisans—nobody would quote political platforms as the watchword of action. If we proposed to collect all needed revenues by a tax upon corporate and individual income, would there naturally be an alignment of parties, one for and another opposed to the details of the plan.

Now, to-day, we are all agreed on the plan. All parties, from the foundation of the Government to date, have, in accord with the policy of all civilized nations, finally, fully, and unreservedly declared that there is no method for raising funds to carry on the Government that works with so little friction and accomplishes the appointed end so imperceptibly as that of a tariff upon imports. But the moment we attempt to prescribe details the statesman is lost in the politician, and the question is not where the money will come from, but where the most votes will come from.

The existing law now on the statute book was framed along

the lines of protection to American industries. The proposed law will radically change or completely overthrow this policy, and the burden of proof is upon the proponents of the new law to show that evils exist under the present policy which will be cured by the new.

First, and in importance the most decisive objection urged against the protective policy is the startling declaration in the Chicago platform, which has been so often quoted on this floor as to show that it has been adopted as the Blarney stone of the Democratic party, that protection to domestic industries is unconstitutional; and echoing this charge, my colleague on the Judiciary Committee [Mr. LANE], a thoroughgoing lawyer, seeks to demonstrate it by citing numerous dicta from the text-books and from our courts declaring that taxation can be imposed for public purposes only, and if imposed for private ends it is invalid and *ultra vires*.

My learned friend put himself to great, unnecessary labor when he collated authorities to prove that proposition. No man outside a lunatic asylum ever disputed his proposition, and no lawyer inside a lunatic asylum was ever so unbalanced as to affirm the contrary. The difficulty with the gentleman's logic is in his definition of a public purpose. The very books he quoted and the countless decisions in our courts, both State and Federal, have uniformly held that if the primary object of a proposed tax is to subserve public ends, the appropriation of money from the public treasury to accomplish such ends is strictly within constitutional limitations, even though private interests are incidentally subserved. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that municipal aid to private railroad corporations, which implies the power of taxation, was a valid exercise of the taxing power, because the interests of the general public were promoted, although the same act advanced a private interest.

Courts all over the Union have held that towns and cities might expend public money in supplying themselves with water for fire and domestic uses, and this being the primary purpose a private end might be accomplished by renting the surplus water to private persons. The exact statement of the rule is this: If the proposed appropriation is designed to meet a public demand and subserve a public good, it is held to be valid, although in carrying it into effect it be made incidentally or intentionally to foster a private good. And conversely, if it is primarily designed to serve a private purpose, but incidentally promotes the public good, it is invalid.

It is needless to multiply cases holding this rule. Every lawyer knows they are so uniform that the doctrine has now become elementary. Now, the protective policy of a tariff law rests on this precise ground. Duties or taxes are laid upon imports for the primary purpose of raising public revenue. In laying such duties the classes of imports to be selected for duty, the classes to be admitted free, the amounts to be fixed on one and another, and all details of method are necessarily and properly and legitimately left to be determined by the legislative branch of the Government exercising the function of taxation. This is the rule under any form of taxation you may adopt. If you lay an income tax will you not say what incomes shall pay and what go free, and do you not thus protect the incomes you exempt?

Has not Congress always and State Legislatures always when exercising the power of taxation selected in their discretion the objects upon which the burden should rest, and excused such objects from the burden as they pleased? Why, then, in laying duties upon foreign goods, which is nothing more nor less than laying a tax, may not Congress admit to the free list such as it deems best? Why may it not lay the duty on one class of goods at one rate, and upon another at a different rate; and, in the name of law, in the name of patriotism, in the name of reason, in the name of justice, in the name of national pride, in the name of every consideration that makes for the honor, happiness, and prosperity of our people, may it not lay a duty on those imports which compete in American markets with American products?

We have had a tariff with protective features most of the time since the foundation of the Government. Is it not remarkable that with all its inherent wickedness nobody has had the courage to make a case for the courts and get it judicially declared to be robbery?

Again, it is a familiar rule in the construction of law, whether it be organic or statutory, that the construction given it at the time of its enactment by parties called to administer it shall have great weight. If our Constitution forbids the laying of duties in a way to foster domestic industries, we should expect to hear Washington and Madison and Jefferson and their contemporaries say so. It is a well-known fact that Madison and Jefferson were strict constructionists of the Constitution, and yet Mr. Madison in a message to Congress in December, 1815, recommended a tariff act that would both raise revenue and promote manufactures.

To Mr. Madison more than any other man is due the credit of formulating the letter of the Federal Constitution, and to him we can safely turn to learn its true spirit. Not only were Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton in accord with him on this question, but the doctrine itself became sound orthodoxy in the Democratic creed of that day and for many years after. Mr. Monroe, in his message to Congress in December, 1823, recommended a revision of the tariff for the purpose of affording additional protection to manufactures.

Gen. Jackson, the next old-fashioned Democrat in line, and I may add the best Democrat to be found either in the old-fashioned or new-fashioned ranks, in a letter to Dr. Coleman, of North Carolina, dated April 26, 1824, and published in the Raleigh (N. C.) Star, written when he was for the first time a candidate for the Presidency, in speaking of our natural advantages, says:

> Heaven smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. That same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us, we deserve not the continuation of His blessings. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals, with lead, iron, and copper, and given us climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the grand materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our own manufactories and laborers may be placed on a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential in war.

Further on in the same letter he says:

> In short, sir, we have been too long subject to the policy of the British merchants. It is time that we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England feed our own, or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall be rendered paupers ourselves.

How nicely, Mr. Chairman, old-fashioned and new-fashioned Democracy dovetails together. These words of Jackson sound like the words of McKinley, and it would not surprise me to learn that they were fresh in the ears of Ohio Democrats on the first Tuesday of last November.

It is safe, I apprehend, to assume that a tariff laid for revenue in a way to encourage or preserve domestic industries will stand the test of constitutional inquisition.

But if the protective policy is invalid on constitutional grounds, the Wilson bill if enacted will be an unconstitutional law. It is confessedly protective in some of its schedules and the only genuine Simon-pure Democrats of the new-fashioned school, having the courage of their convictions, to wit: Chales A. Dana, Henry Watterson, and TOM L. JOHNSON have the frankness to say that it is protective through and through, from end to beginning, and "when you see a thing in the Sun it is so." [Laughter.]

The excuse given for making the bill moderately protective is that it would disturb settled business and reduce values if all protection were withheld. But you say that protection is robbery, and the manufacturing classes are robbing labor of its just share of reward. If a robber has invaded your house and is engaged in lugging off your goods, do you refuse to arrest him on the plea that it will disturb his business and unsettle his values? The Simon-pures are exactly right according to the Chicago platform, and if you propose to be guided by that "bill of rights" you can do no otherwise than tax tea, coffee, sugar, and everything else that would yield revenue.

When you take counsel of your fears and decline to wholly lift the burdens of a robber tariff, you give away your case. That you really intend an ultimate policy of free trade is demonstrated in your purpose to create a deficit and then supply it by an income tax, thus changing the plan of taxation for the support of Government from that we have used for a hundred years, and that which every civilized nation under the sun has used and now uses except England, namely, a tax upon imports. You are following in the footsteps of England—a nation that embraced the protective policy for three centuries and never gave it up until she had made the island a workshop from one end to the other, and which to-day is the warmest friend that the Wilson bill has on the face of the earth.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are told that the people gave the Democratic party last year a commission to do the work contemplated by the Wilson bill, and however unpatriotic, un-American, and unwise it may be, the commands of this warrant must be obeyed. The party practically concedes that it feels much as the sheriff does who holds a writ of possession to oust a poor family from its homestead. What need, however, has the Democratic party for credentials when it enters upon the work of raising sheol with American industries and American homes? Is not the propensity a birthright? Was it not born in them?

In the light of recent events in Iowa, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, it turns out, however, that you have not correctly construed your warrant. You have gone beyond the command of the writ and are wrongdoers *ab initio*.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in his speech a few days since, declared that the purpose

of his bill was to alleviate the burdens that the consumers of the country were supporting under the workings of the present protective system, and, amid deafening Democratic cheers, declared that the producer was made for the consumer, not the consumer for the producer.

If it were possible to draw a line that would leave the producers on one side and consumers on the other, his argument would have great force. But he seems to forget that in fact no such division can be made, for the reason that everybody belongs to both classes. The farmer produces horses, beef, pork, corn, wheat, oats, hay, potatoes, cotton, rice, tobacco, etc., to be consumed by the doctor, lawyer, minister, mechanic, merchant, and every other class in the community, but at the same time, the farmer is the consumer of the mechanic's work, the doctor's pills, the minister's sermons, the lawyer's services, and the merchant's goods. Who, then, shall be called the consumer in this enumeration? The gentleman's logic is manifestly unsound, for every man in the nation produces something and consumes something, with the exception of the dude; and, indeed, he is no exception, for he produces a sensation. Laughter.]

The fact being patent that the interdependence of all classes of society upon each other makes any arbitrary division among them impossible, it follows logically that one is as much entitled to the fostering care of the Government as any other. As Burke said of liberty, if it is good for one, it is good for all.

Again, the gentleman with great satisfaction announces tha he has relieved the burdens of taxation, because he has placed certain articles, which he denominates raw materials, upon the free list. Coal, iron, lumber, and wool are to be admitted free of duty. This change of policy it is claimed will help the manufacturer, who employs labor; raise the wages of the workingman who is employed by the manufacturer, and reduce the price of the manufactured article to the consumer. This is a problem in the old rule of three, and is easily solved by the doctrinaires of the Ways and Means Committee.

If you take the tariff off raw materials you save the manufacturer so much in the cost of his manufactured product, but if you add the same amount to the wages of his workmen, I have not yet been able to see how the consumer is to get the product at any less price. But what about this figment of raw materials? Who asks that they should be admitted to the free list? Who is to be benefited by it? What practical good can come to the farmer, the mechanic, the professional man, or the workingman if you give them free bituminous coal and free iron ore? They can not gain it indirectly from the products of the manufacturer, because you keep the duty on the manufactured product. Nobody in the world could receive any benefit, except the manufacturer himself, and he is not asking it.

The fact is, that this cry for free raw materials originated in the fertile brain of a few amateur politicians in Massachusetts, who used it to hoodwink the people of that State with great success for a brief time, and it worked so well there, and not being patented, it was seized upon by the Democratic party as a slogan for the last campaign.

But what are raw materials? Take a concrete case. The Wilson bill admits all manufactured lumber free because it is a raw material. Now, the gentlemen composing the Committee on Ways and Means are all learned and scholarly men, and know a thing when they see it. If they would like accurately to define raw materials in the lumber trade, let them put on a sheep's gray suit of clothes made from American wool, a pair of boots made of American rubber, a cap made from the skin of the American bear, shoulder an ax made up in Maine, take a dinner pail made of American tin and filled with American pork, American beans, American doughnuts, and American cheese, and start out some morning with the thermometer at 10 below, up the slopes of the Green Mountains, carrying a banner inscribed, "Science communing with nature," and standing, ax in hand, before a spruce tree 100 feet high and 4 feet through at the butt, and they will find they are confronted with a condition.

When they strike the first blow at the tree they will for the first time in their lives strike an idea, and that will be that they have at last found out what raw materials are in the lumber trade. They will learn that cutting the tree into logs involves an expenditure of capital and labor, and is a step in a manufacturing process; that hauling the logs to the mill involves an expenditure of capital and labor, and is a step in a manufacturing process; that sawing the log into boards, planks, and dimension stuff involves an expenditure of capital and labor, and is a step in a manufacturing process; and when the product of the mill reaches our boundary line it comes, not a raw material, but a manufactured product. So that this bill, instead of supplying raw materials, steps in at the middle of the manufacturing process, and declares that we must give to Canada the benefit of all the capital and labor that has been employed down to this point of time. The labor employed in all these initial steps is the poorest paid and most deserving of consideration at the hands of the Government of any employed in the whole process, from the standing tree to the finished building.

Thus this sublime fallacy of free raw materials, when inspected, turns out to be not only a misnomer, but a very large-sized humbug. It is merely a device to give to Canada all the benefit of the labor that rightfully belongs to us, and to give all the profits to the manufacturers. Why this discrimination against American forests? Why did the God of Nature cover our mountain sides with the finest qualities of every name and kind of standing timber that ever waved in the breezes of heaven from Maine to California, from Oregon to Florida?

Why, Mr. Chairman, the value of the standing timber, hard and soft, in Vermont to-day, after a hundred years of harvest, probably exceeds the value of her open tillage land; exceeds the value of her marble quarries; exceeds the value of her granite quarries; is, in short, the most valuable natural asset she has. The same thing is true of Maine, of Michigan, of North Carolina, of Georgia, the Pacific Slope, and many other States. And not only this, these same mountains are pregnant with an untold wealth of lead, iron, granite, and marble, and we are told by this bill to let them alone—do not disturb their covering—you will make an ugly looking hole in the ground; with 2,000,000 starving laborers in the land to-day, buy your lumber in Canada and keep her laborers employed; buy your granite in Scotland and your marble in Italy, and keep their laborers employed; buy your iron in Norway and your coal in Nova Scotia, and keep their laborers from starving. All this in the name of tariff reform!

Let it rather be said, on the other hand, that the first duty of Congress is to make laws that will promote the happiness, well-being, and prosperity of America. All this natural wealth was deposited here for the use of Americans. If the Almighty had intended that we should use Italian marble He would have located Carrara in Vermont or Tennessee.

But they tell us that protection to American industries is selfishness. So is patriotism, and still we are taught from the cradle to the grave that one of the noblest traits of character is the love of one's own country. Love it better than any, than all others. Even die for it. Is this not selfishness? And what are we to love if it is not everything that makes our country lovable? Her manhood, her industries, her moral and material prosperity. Her boundless natural wealth of mine, mineral, and forest. All which is lovable because it can minister to our happiness if the Wilson bill does not compel us to seek happiness, like defaulting cashiers, in Canada. [Laughter.]

The reason assigned for the proposed onslaught upon American industries is that the people are excessively taxed by the McKinley act now in force, and the Committee of Ways and Means is the physician called to cure this ailment of the body politic. The first duty of an intelligent physician is to correctly diagnose the case he has in hand; the next to prescribe the proper remedy. Are the people excessively taxed by the McKinley bill? Are they suffering from Federal taxation? What Federal taxation affects them? The Chicago platform says that in one Western State the mortgage indebtedness is $165 per capita of its population. If that indebtedness was created by the McKinley act, it is worthy of consideration here. If not, the announcement is an attempted deception of the people.

The only Federal taxation that affects the people is that imposed by the tariff, and that imposed by the internal-revenue tax laid on whisky and manufactured tobacco. The tariff tax is laid on foreign goods only. American goods of course are free. If an American buys a foreign-made article which is on the dutiable list he may pay a tax. If he drinks whisky he is sure to. Under the McKinley bill all the necessaries of life, like tea, coffee, and sugar, are on the free list. The luxuries are taxed. Now, how many of the farmers of that Western State, while their mortgage indebtedness has been growing, have paid a copper for any article of foreign growth or manufacture, and thus been compelled to pay a tax? Not one in fifty. And so it is everywhere.

The people as a whole do not pay a copper toward the support of the General Government. The man of wealth and the man of fastidious taste will many times buy foreign dutiable goods, but the plain people of this country as a rule buy American goods on which there is no tax. It is not true that our own goods bear higher prices because of the tariff on the foreign article. Every intelligent man knows that the prices of home-made goods are lower to-day than they were in 1860, when the protective tariff came into being. The tendency year by year since that date has been downward. Abnormal conditions may have, in individual instances, marked an exception, but the exception only proves the rule. As a whole the necessaries of life are cheaper.

It follows, then, if the American people will board at home

and clothe themselves at home and let rum and tobacco alone, they are practically exempt from Federal taxation. That the people are heavily taxed is true. But it is municipal taxes that they suffer from. Town, city, and county taxation is excessive all over the land, and these are the taxes the people vote upon themselves, and for which neither Congress nor the tariff is responsible.

When this Democratic doctor, then, proposes by his dose of free trade to cure our political ills, he proves himself a quack as a physician and a worse one as a metaphysician.

In my own State, the effects of the Wilson bill will be disastrous. Everything the farmer produces is reduced in value. Horses, cattle, hay, oats, potatoes, eggs, corn, wheat, rye, barley, wool, pork, lumber—in short our entire agricultural industry is subjected to a ruinous competition with like products in Canada, where the women and cheap farm hands do the labor; where wages are lower and the scale of living vastly inferior. Not only this, our marble, granite, slate, and lime industries are disastrously affected if not absolutely ruined. Canada is doubly fortunate. She has a parliament at Ottawa honestly and patriotically striving to legislate for the good of her people and another at Washington legislating in the same direction.

But the farmer is not alone affected. Our manufacturers of woolen and knit goods must throw a large number of persons out of employment. I have received many letters and remonstrances from both employers and employés, protesting against this monstrous infamy, and can confidently assure the House that the workingmen of Vermont do not belong to the class of men who can be coerced by their employers into signing these remonstrances. They are reading, thinking, intelligent men, who carry their sovereignty under their own hats, and you might as well undertake to coerce Niagara to run the other way as to coerce a Vermont workingman to act against the dictates of his judgment. The Irishman, the Scotchman, the Welshman, and the Swede, who work in our mills and quarries, know that legislation which closes those mills and dismantles the derricks in those quarries is a blow at their wages, and have an altogether more intelligent apprehension of the effects of your legislation than the framers of the Chicago platform.

Labor is the source of all wealth, and the highest aim of legislation ought to be the continuous employment of all our labor in a way to swell the grand aggregate of our wealth. If this policy be preserved, labor will be well paid, the workingman's condition improved; he may enjoy the comforts and luxuries of a home and lift his children to a higher level and a broader plane in the race of life. Under our system of government we can not afford to depress labor. It should be and it is as honorable to produce wealth from the bowels of the earth as to produce it on the surface of the earth. No policy is safe that reduces our workingmen to the low wages and consequent low status in life that has overtaken the peasantry of the Old World.

The policy of protection to American industries means good wages to employés. It should be our policy to build up and maintain a home market, for it is more steady and certain than the foreign market. Our population doubles in twenty-five years; that of Europe in a hundred years. If our production and consumption is in the same ratio of increase, as they doubtless are, our production would increase in a ratio four times as great as the demands of the foreign market would call for. While we want both, it is evident that the home market is by far the most important.

This being so, it belongs to Americans in preference to foreigners. Our producers help pay our taxes, fight our battles, and uphold our flag. The foreign producer fires at, but never in defense of our flag. Who has the better right to the American markets? Our producers have all the competition at home that they can withstand, but if the foreign producer will pay a license fee large enough to meet the difference in wages and advantages he enjoys over our producers, he is welcome to compete in our markets. He will at least pay a large share of our Federal taxes, and thus the home producer is *pro tanto* benefited.

Hitherto in the warfare between the protective system and the free-trade policy, the South has generally been arrayed against the North. This in former years was largely due to the different labor conditions in the two sections, the South having the advantage of cheap labor. But the day for sectional advantage has happily passed. No adherence to old traditions should longer divide us. No conservatism, as Douglas Jerrold would say, should preclude our looking upon the new moon because we were brought up to love the old one.

Moreover, you of the South have the advantage of climate, have a wealth of coal and iron that will, if developed, as it surely will be, make some of your States another Pennsylvania, and within ten years you will be knocking at the doors of Congress for protection to your coal, iron, and lumber industries. You will demand it for your cotton against the competing crop of Mexico, fostered by American capital, and that of Egypt, fostered by English capital. Of all sections of our country, you are the last that should destroy the protective policy.

But it is said that this system builds along our boundary lines a Chinese wall that shuts out the sunlight of prosperity. Be it so. You will, however, confess this: If we build this wall you may rest assured we shall give the job to American labor and employ in the structure American stone. Chinese wall! Why France and Germany and nearly every other commercial nation, including all the colonies of Great Britain, have had up this wall from time immemorial. Has our nation had any difficulty in getting through the gates? Let the annual report of the Treasury Department, showing the fabulous figures of our exports to those countries, demonstrate the worth of your fears. Chinese wall! Have other nations had any difficulty in entering our gates on account of this wall? Let the fabulous figures of our imports for the past thirty years be your consolation and your hope.

Why, sir, in my State, where the wind sometimes drifts the snow to the depth of 5, 10, or 20 feet, railroad companies build high storm fences at exposed points along the track. They do not do this to stop the wind's blowing at all, but they say to old Boreas, "Blow all you please, but you must not stop the progress of our car." So we build our industrial barricade against the withering blasts of England's starvation-made competition, and say to her, "Blow about it all you please, but you must not stop the car of our progress."

Chinese wall! Do you not understand, Mr. Chairman, that the function of a wall is not only to keep things out, but to keep things in? Why, sir, our wall will be useful in a thousand ways. We need it to keep out that ceaseless tide of European paupers and criminals that is constantly flowing, without ebb, to our shores. We want it to keep that Queen of Hawaii, with her unpronounceable name, out, and we need it to keep Grover Cleveland in. [Laughter and applause.] If these lovers must coo and woo, let them do it as Pyramus and Thisbe did, through a hole in the wall. [Renewed laughter.]

We need it to break the force of that cyclone of British rapacity which, overriding every principle of commercial equity and every principle of everlasting justice, has reduced Ireland, an integral part of her own empire, to a state of beggary; has made English colonies on every parallel of latitude mere tributaries to her home wealth, and which compelled our own fathers, more than a century ago, to bleed at every pore in the battle for a system of American manufactures and for a home market that should not be controlled by the home government. Why, sir, so prominent a friend of the colonies as Lord Chatham declared in the British Parliament that in his judgment the American colonies ought not to be allowed to manufacture so much as a hobnail.

The Revolutionary war was waged to secure industrial independence of England, and the same battle is on to-day. We are fighting for the highest and noblest conception of free trade, the privilege of trading among ourselves. You are fighting to compel us to trade with England, who, as soon as she has crushed out our industries by her mercantile wealth, will subject us to the same grinding monopoly that she has subjected every other people who have been brought under her commercial sway.

We do not ask for prohibitive but for preservative duties upon imports. We build our wall no higher than we build the wages, the condition, and the happiness of American labor. It is for the workingmen that we build at all. Capital needs no armor of defense. But labor can tolerate no unfair competition. It should have continuous employment and advancing wages. As it is honorable, it should be honored. As it is faithful, it should be rewarded. As it is defenseless, it should be protected. To-day it is paralyzed. It cries out with the Psalmist:

> Establish thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish thou it.

Grant its prayer and every furnace fire will at once be lighted and every mill wheel begin to turn. Pass the appropriation bills and go home, and all the people will rise up and call you blessed.

But we are told that all men have the natural right to buy where they may and sell where they may, and the silver-tongued orator from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] fairly electrified the House in his beautiful apostrophe to that axiomatic proposition. Indeed, it may be said, generally, that this free-trade philosophy is made up of universally accepted truisms, perverted by sophistry to meaningless or illogical conclusions.

I agree that every man has the right to buy and sell where he pleases, but this being the right of all, each must exercise his right in a manner that will permit his neighbor to exercise his. All men have the right to travel upon the public highway, yet no two can exercise this right at the same instant over the same segment of roadway. There must be control and regulation of

this right over both in order that each may enjoy his right. Every man has the right to sell. Nevertheless, there must be regulation of this right so that the privilege of one to sell shall not be destructive of another's equal right to sell. The right to sell, like all other natural or legal rights, is absolute in form and substance, but relative in its application and exercise.

The right being common to all, it necessarily breeds competition, and in order that competition may not destroy the right to sell, it must be restrained; it must be compelled to be fair, otherwise it will destroy the other competitor's right. The foreigner may not set fire to and burn down his American competitor's store to destroy or defeat the American's right to sell. The foreigner has no right to steal his goods, and in that way defeat his right to sell. He has no right to steal the labor employed in making his goods, and in that way defeat our right to sell. He and we have a common right to sell in the American market, but as this is a common natural right, it must be exercised on common lines of natural justice.

It is exactly fair and just that the foreigner should enter our markets on the same equal footing with the American. Therefore, if the American pays a bonus for the privilege of selling, the foreigner must do the same. If it be necessary to employ a police force to guard the merchandise of all sellers in the market, the foreigner using the market ought in justice to bear his proportion of the expense. Now, your theory comes around to this: America has at great expense built up an American market. It has set up and is maintaining the vast machinery of a government to control and regulate it and keep it on foot for the public good of our people. It employs and pays a legislature to make suitable laws regulating the rights and duties of sellers and buyers; it employs and pays courts to settle and determine all violations of those laws; it builds and supports jails for criminals in the business, and poorhouses for the paupers of the business; it builds churches and school houses for the benefit of all engaged in the business; it goes to war to defend its rights; in short, government does everything and incurs every expense necessary to make the American market a success, and, indeed, to make it possible, and the American seller is heavily taxed to meet all this expense.

Now, when Mr. Bull knocks at our Chinese wall for admission, Jonathan says to him, "John, do you mind that notice over the gate? 'Equal rights for all. Special privileges for none?' That, John, came from Chicago, and just at this particular time the Democratic party is our purchasing agent, and we are going to exercise our God-given right to buy where we have a mind to. So, John, you can have no special privileges in this market, but we will give you equal rights with our peddlers, and inasmuch as they have to pay a good smart bonus for the chance to do business here, you will have to do the same thing. We are going to treat Americans just as well as we do strangers."

But the brilliant gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], who has the faculty beyond any other man on this floor to "make the worse appear the better reason," cries out in an apparent agony of despair, "Can not the superior civilization of America successfully contend against the effete and worn-out civilization of the Old World?"

Mr. Chairman, this is not a battle of civilizations. If the gentleman means by civilization commercial sagacity, the civilization of the Old World is not effete. On the contrary, it is vigorous, aggressive, and quite as advanced as our own. But it makes its advance by trampling down the rights of labor and denying to workingmen all opportunity to better their condition in the race of life. The system of labor in most European states is a slavery as bad as that we were once cursed with in America. It is inhuman, corrupt, and degrading, while in America our system gives workingmen a hope, an ambition, and an inspiration. The humblest son of toil may aspire to the Presidency and occasionally one reaches it. The field is clear for all. Our system not only recognizes the fact that every man has the right to buy and sell where he pleases; it goes further and declares that he has the right to grow, the right to prosper, the right to be educated, the right to have a home and all the comforts of home; has the right to participate in government, and the right to be a governor over his fellowmen.

Our system is the opposite of that of Europe. Ours is humane, honest, and elevating, and the battle is not between two equally developed civilizations, but between one recognizing the laws of humanity, and the other practicing the arts of inhumanity. If two merchants in Washington with equal capital and both paying the same rent are selling the same goods in this market, and one pays his clerks $5 a week and the other pays his $10 a week, the first will undersell the other and secure the trade. But the first set of clerks will starve, while those of the latter will prosper. The fate of these competing merchants is not the result of a war between civilizations, but is the result of the battle of humanity.

The gentleman from New York tells us that England levies duties on six articles, tea, coffee, sugar, cocoa, etc. All these, you will notice, affect the poor man's table, and frankly concedes that the Wilson bill is only a step toward free trade, which is to come in due time. If it comes it surely and logically means the condemnation of our working classes to the slavery of European labor.

The first step you are about to take, but the second will never follow. The American people are too intelligent, too honest, and too proud to turn the dial of progress back, and so soon as they can get hold of it, they will consign your free-trade scheme to the sleep that knows no waking.

> By foreign hands thy dying eyes were closed,
> By foreign hands thy decent limbs composed,
> By foreign hands thy humble grave adorned,
> By strangers honored, and by strangers mourned.

[Applause.]

Mr. BOEN Mr. Chairman, the greatest questions in the problem of government are those of money and taxation. The money question may be said to have been pretty thoroughly investigated and considered by the present Congress, but by no means settled, and the question of tariff, of taxation, is the next to demand our attention.

If duties on imports are at all justifiable, it is only on the grounds of revenue or protection. They should, therefore, be so arranged as to affect all classes alike, make all pay an equal share of the expenses of the Government, and give to all the same protection.

Society consists of two classes, producers and consumers. The producers can be divided into two main classes, namely, farmers and their employés, and manufacturers and their employés. The manufacturers demand a high protective tariff for the purpose of preventing competition by foreign manufacturers, and thus be enabled to dictate to the American farmer and laborer the price he shall pay for the machinery, implements, clothing, etc., that he must buy.

Now, I am not here to argue in favor of either free trade or protection, but I am here to ask that the farmer and manufacturer, as well as all other classes, be treated alike.

It is claimed that duties on imports under existing laws average about 50 per cent. Goods of American manufacture are, therefore, at a premium of about 50 per cent over goods of foreign make, and the American farmer and laborer has to pay that premium when he buys the goods. That premium is, therefore, a tribute paid by American soil and toil to the owners of the factories in this country who, in many cases, are foreign flunkies living in regal style in foreign lands, knowing nothing of and caring less about the privations of the people they plunder.

I believe in the perfect equality of man before the law as before God, and I believe that class legislation is the cause of our national ills. The most alarming symptom is that the real estate of the country is fast passing from the original owners into the hands of a few persons, many of them subjects and residents of foreign countries, and the descendants of the noble founders of the Republic are homeless tenants on their paternal estates. It is the result of class legislation.

The soil is the chief source of wealth, therefore one should think that its tillers were the most prosperous. But not so. The farmers are, and for centuries have been, society's beasts of burden. Laws inimical to the farmer have always disgraced the statute books.

The banker, the manufacturer, the common carrier, all regard the farmer as their legitimate prey, and he humbly submits. But whether he submits or not there is no redress. The whole machinery of legislation is against him; the courts are unfriendly, the Executive immovable. Whatever a man has to sell or dispose of is his money, his currency. The laborer sells his time, his energies, his skill; the farmer sells the products of his soil and toil; the manufacturer sells the products of his factory, and so on. My wheat is my currency. With that I buy money, and with the money I buy machinery, clothing, etc. But the price of my wheat is fixed in London. So also is the price of all wheat, no matter where it is grown. I get the London price, less the cost of transportation from my place to London. I am, therefore, competing with all other farmers in the world.

I sell my goods in a free-trade market and I buy in a protected market. The result is disastrous. Whatever premium or tariff I pay on the goods I buy as a farmer increases the cost of production of my crop. And, as in selling it, I must compete with men who buy their goods and machinery in a free-trade market, and who pay less than I do for labor, less for transportation, less for the use of money, it stands to reason that I can not pay expenses unless I am favored with an unusually large yield, or unless the work has been done by my own help. When the crop brings to the farmer less than it costs him to produce it, he soon

finds himself in debt and at the mercy of the money-loaners. When once in their power he is soon out of house and home.

Agriculture is the noblest occupation, and should be the most independent. It is as old as the human race. From the earliest times till now millions, nay billions, of men, women, and children have been engaged in farming, and among those countless numbers you can not find one millionaire, not one, while among those engaged in banking, manufacturing, mining, transporting, or as merchants, millionaires are numbered by the thousands.

In farming every member of the family works—man, woman, and child. All direct their time, strength, and skill to the process of production. Ceaseless, unremitting toil from early morn till late at night, from childhood to the grave. And when near the end of a busy life the weary worker views his or her possessions it is generally found that the chief item in the assets is the knowledge of dreary years spent in the production of wealth that has been enjoyed by others. Sobriety, industry, honesty, a fertile soil and good climate availeth not. Life began in poverty, was spent in toil, in privations, and still ends in poverty, because the burdens of government and the fuss and feathers of the butterflies of society, the support of the drones of the hive, all come from the farm.

In banking, manufacturing, mining, transporting, only the head of the family is actively engaged in the business while other members of the family, unlike that of the farmer, enjoy life in various ways, spending freely the wealth that they never earned but which by fair means or foul has been secured from its producers, the farmers.

It may be objected that as times are hard all along the line every other business has suffered fully as much as farming. For the sake of argument let that be admitted.

Agriculture is the basis of our national prosperity and the foundation of our industrial and commercial structure. Vast as our agriculture is there is still a limit to its carrying capacity. Our manufacturing and inland commerce at least rest upon it; the expenses of government, State, and national, all come from the same source. The demands made on agriculture were more than it could bear and the crash came.

I tell you, gentlemen, there can be no general, enduring prosperity in this or any other agricultural country until farming is properly shielded against encroachments by the other industries. Agriculture is the goose that lays the golden egg. Destroy it and you destroy the nation. Agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce are a mighty trinity. The last depends on the first two.

Let production, farming, and manufacturing cease, and distribution ceases. There can be no distribution where there is nothing to distribute. Let manufacturing cease, and both farming and commerce are crippled. But, if farming is seriously injured through adverse legislation or other causes, manufacturing and commerce are suspended; financial institutions that have withstood the storms of generations crumble; bread riots and social disturbances are the order of the day, and the safety of our institutions tremble in the balance.

When Congress assembled in extra session on the 7th of August last year, the country was in the midst of a financial panic which the President informed us was caused by the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman law. After one of the most severe legislative struggles on record that clause was repealed, the result being, as everyone knows, a further contraction of the currency, which means more poverty, more misery, more suffering every day. The Sherman law was used as a special bugaboo. As it did not frighten anyone but the goldbugs, recourse must be had to that favorite, convenient, old, reliable nightmare "the tariff." Therefore pretended fear of "tariff reform" is now agitating the huge frame of the G. P. O. elephant. No danger. The old Norse saying, "Ravens do not pick out each other's eyes," is applicable here. Old Jumbo was paralyzed in 1892, but by careful nursing he has been kept alive, and as a sacred relic, as a reminder of past greatness, he is once more exhibited to the gaze of the faithful.

The following is clipped from the St. Paul Dispatch for October 19, 1893, which I will send to the clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAUSED BY TARIFF UNCERTAINTY—PARALYSIS OF THE IRON TRADE CONTINUES WITH REMARKABLE TENACITY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *October 19.*

The Iron Trade Review this week says: "It has been apparent for some time that favored producers in iron and steel, whose low-cost possibilities are a fruitful subject of market gossip have exhausted their advantage and are straining every point to keep in operation on a tonnage basis that will save them from loss. It is yet to be demonstrated whether there is beyond the volume of business that has been gained through these special inducements a further fresh supply of orders that will keep mills now active in operation into the new year, or whether the early fall activity has been largely as compensation for the inroad consumption made upon stocks in the long shut down of Western mills. Nothing has developed within the week to indicate that demand is sensibly growing.

The effect of the tariff uncertainty in iron and steel, visible in all departments of trade, in paralyzing demand, is illustrated in the failure of an important and hitherto prosperous Eastern Pennsylvania concern. How long the iron trade at large can stand the strain, depends on how long certain gentlemen at Washington persist in being as those who having eyes see not.

Mr. BOEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to that statement of The Iron Trade Review. It indicates that the production of iron has exceeded consumption; that the supply exceeds the demand, and then says:

Nothing has developed within the week to indicate that demand is sensibly growing.

The demand for an article, a commodity, or a certain line of goods is largely determined by the ability of the class of people using it to pay for it. When money circulates freely in a community, the inhabitants buy freely such articles as they require. When money is scarce, purchasers are correspondingly scarce. During a money famine a farming community, for instance, will buy very little machinery, fence wire, tools, etc. They must economize, and they do it. To illustrate: Machinery that last year was regarded as worn out was this year fixed up and pressed into service again. Had the financial outlook for the farmer been brighter, he would have bought millions of dollars' worth more of iron during the past season, and the article from which I quote would not have been written. Again:

The effect of tariff uncertainty in iron and steel, visible in all departments of trade in paralyzing demand, is illustrated in the failure of an important and hitherto prosperous Pennsylvania concern.

According to my way of thinking it is not fear of "tariff reform" that has clogged the wheels of industry; it is the low price of farm products, or, if you please, the high price of money, the farmer being thereby made unable to buy as much as he did before, as shown by the following table of figures credited to the New York Sun:

The following table shows, in five-year averages, the gold value per acre (in the local farm markets) of the product of the five staples named, for quinquennial periods, since 1866, and an estimate of the value, with average yields, of an acre under each such staple in 1893 at present prices:

Staples.	Value of an acre's product.					
	1866–'70.	1871–'75.	1876–'80.	1881–'85.	1886–'90.	1893.
Corn	$12.84	$11.30	$9.62	$10.25	$8.81	$8.35
Wheat	13.16	11.90	12.00	10.20	9.07	6.00
Oats	10.92	9.81	8.58	9.17	7.50	5.75
Hay	13.28	14.38	11.57	11.15	10.19	10.00
Cotton	28.01	28.55	17.65	15.63	13.84	10.65
Totals	78.21	75.94	59.42	56.40	49.44	40.75
Average	15.64	15.19	11.88	11.28	9.89	8.15

If, as is altogether probable, the revenue derived from the cultivation of each acre of the staples named has not since 1885 been in excess of the cost of production, then it is readily seen that the workers among the 30,000,000 who inhabit the farms of the United States have for eight years received no more than laborer's wages, and could purchase but the barest necessaries. As prices now current are 21 per cent below the average of 1886 to 1890, it follows that the products of the farm are now sold below the cost of production, and that the farmer is wholly without purchasing power other than such as results from his wages as a common laborer.

The same article continues:

As 206,000,000 acres are now employed in growing staple crops, it follows that the power of the farmer to purchase is this year $1,563,000,000 less than it would be if he was receiving the prices of 1866–'70 for his great staples.

If that amount of money had been distributed among the farmers of the United States for their last crop in addition to what little they did receive, and exclusive of the vastly increased sum that they would have received for pork, beef, dairy products, wool, and so on, there would not now be in this country an uncultivated field, a closed factory, a silent workshop, an unemployed workingman, an idle freight car, a "busted" bank, a tramp, or a pauper. [Applause.]

Even the politician, he whose business it is to feed on his fellow-man; who gets his living, not by the sweat of his brow, but by the swagger of his jaw—he too would have an easier time of it, as his peculations would attract less attention. And right here I have mentioned a matter that is sure to touch the heart of this House.

What does it avail anyone to have a large stock of goods on hand when it can not be sold? Give the farmer a dollar a bushel for his wheat, the planter a shilling a pound for his cotton, for other farm products proportionately, and you will see an activity in the land such as never before was witnessed.

There are in this country to-day vast stocks of the products of the field, factory, and workshop, all that is necessary to make everybody comfortable and happy. Yet from every State and Territory in the Union goes up a cry of distress, a complaint of want and hunger and misery, plaintive enough to move mountains to tears. Our unlimited resources are undeveloped, and there is work for everybody. Still millions of willing hands are idle! Hunger and want in a land of plenty; idleness where there is too much to do!

The Government of these United States is now in the hands of the goldbugs. They are the enemies of our country and of our people. They have forced on us the European money system, monometalism, which means European economic conditions, such as low wages for both farmer and mechanic; low prices for the products of soil and toil. The codfish aristocracy of New England has been evolved into the national bank aristocracy, the modern pirates who are levying tribute on the commerce of the country on land and sea. They demonetized silver, well knowing that gold as money will never circulate among the people. Result: bank vaults full of money, madhouses and prisons crowded to their utmost capacity with unfortunates.

Believing in "freedom for Loki, as well as for Thor;" in equal rights to all; in free trade for everybody, or equal protection to all. I prepared and introduced the following bill, which the clerk will please read as part of my remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Fifty-third Congress, first session.]

H. R. 2335.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

September 11, 1893.—Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOEN introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide for admitting into the United States free of duty any goods or articles of foreign manufacture if bartered or exchanged for certain farm products, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any goods or merchandise manufactured in a foreign country shall be admitted into the territory of the United States free of duty if bartered or exchanged for wheat, cotton, corn, barley, oats, rye, rice, potatoes, butter, cheese, eggs, poultry, meat, pork, tobacco, or wool raised or produced in the United States: *Provided*, That an inspection fee of 1 per cent ad valorem on all goods admitted into the United States under this act shall be collected and covered into the Treasury of the United States, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe for that purpose.

SEC. 2. That none of the products of the United States hereinbefore enumerated shall be used as an article of such barter or exchange more than once and any person, firm, company, corporation, or organization offending against the provisions of this act with the intent of evading payment of duties or for the purpose of defrauding the Government shall, on conviction thereof, be punished for fraud against the Government, as provided by law.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and promulgate all rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and to cause this act to be enforced.

Mr. BOEN. Mr. Chairman, although I wrote that bill myself I can not discuss its legal worth, as I am only a farmer and without knowledge of law. But I believe it expresses with sufficient clearness my idea, namely, that the American farmer should have the right to buy in a free market as well as he must sell in a free market.

It is said that there always are two parties to every bargain, but that does not apply to the farmer. Whether he sells or buys, the price is fixed by others.

I presume that even under existing conditions the domestic manufacturer would be willing to exchange products with the farmer; but, having the tariff at his back, the manufacturer would determine the price of his own and of the farmer's products, and he would assess the farmer a sum equal to the tariff on the goods given in exchange. Under my bill there would be no premium in favor of the manufacturer, and the farmer would have a voice in the transaction.

I said that the tariff, whatever its amount, is that much premium placed on the domestic article as compared with the corresponding article of foreign make. That premium, which under existing laws averages nearly 50 per cent, represents the advantages awarded by law to the factory owner over the farmer. That is manifestly a great wrong. My bill aims to right that wrong. If it became law, our farm products would be at a premium over money for the purchase of foreign manufactures, the amount of the premium being exactly equal to the premium or tariff on domestic manufactures.

Thus it will be seen that my bill is a measure of self-defense; that it is fair to all, and places the farmer and manufacturer on an equal footing. That is what we want.

Pass my bill and I do not care if you build around this country a Chinese wall of protection thicker and higher than that erected by the McKinley law, because my proposition provides for a breach in the fortification large enough to admit free all the goods we need, including raw materials for the manufacturer. We have plenty of farm products with which to buy them.

It will be objected that it is impracticable. That objection would not be raised were my bill in favor of the factory owners, banking or transportation corporations. Then it would be just the thing. But measures calculated to protect or further the interests of the common people are always denounced by the people's plunderers as impracticable. "Where there is a will there is a way." Where there is no will there is no way.

The manufacturer asks that we shall sell him our goods at London prices, the lowest in the world, and take in exchange his goods at his own prices, the highest in the world.

If by chance or otherwise we buy goods of foreign make we are mulcted or fined by order of the manufacturers an amount varying from 10 per cent to 300 or 400 per cent of the value of the goods bought. The fine goes to pay fat salaries to those who run the Government.

The farmers have thus far patiently borne the burden. As long as we could get a fair price and ready sales for our products we were contented and cheerfully paid all the bills. Now there is no money among us, no price for our products. Taxes are as high as ever, if not higher, and our other expenses are as high as ever, while our income is greatly reduced. Money has disappeared from among us. We must therefore come to a system of exchange without the intervention of money. How can that be done?

If my bill or some similar measure were law, we would in my neighborhood proceed about as follows: In the township where I live is a railway station called Wall Lake. There is a small grain warehouse built and owned by ourselves; also a store building. Wheat is our chief crop. It is that with which we pay our debts, purchase our implements and necessaries of life.

We could fill our elevator with wheat, each man getting credit for the amount put in; then arrange with some manufacturer, whether domestic or foreign, for such an amount of goods as our wheat would pay for; the goods, if of foreign make, being held in bond at the port of entry until our wheat could reach that port and release the goods in bond. On receipt of the goods thus purchased, they could be put into the store building, and from there turned over to the owners as and when required, each one having charged to his account the goods taken out by him until he had received goods to the amount which he had to his credit for wheat, less cost of handling, freight, and insurance. When necessary, more wheat could be shipped for merchandise, machinery, etc.

Thus we could easily, conveniently, and cheaply carry on our business without the use of money for other purposes than freight and insurance. And as our wheat would be at a premium over money for the purpose of buying steel rails, for instance, to the premium equaling the tariff on steel rails, it might happen that the railway company would be glad to receive wheat in payment for transporting our grain to the port of entry. In that case the whole transaction would be made practically without the use of money other than money of account.

This bill is therefore a rather far-reaching measure, and it does not require a very vivid imagination to foresee that it will meet with opposition. It relieves or releases the farmer from the burden of the tariff. In other words, he can buy in a free market as well as he must sell in a free market.

A new system of taxation—direct taxation—including a graduated income tax, must be adopted, as there will be very little income from duties on imports. The farmer and the manufacturer will be equally protected. But overshadowing all that in importance is the fact that the farmer can do business with so little money that he will have no occasion to borrow any from the banks.

The bulk of the crops and merchandise and machinery can then be moved and distributed all over the land, and the banks can neither accelerate nor retard the process. Now the banks levy tribute at will on the commerce of the country. The agricultural part of commerce would be practically exempt from the bankers' domination and interest on money would fall, owing to its decreased use.

"Your bill contemplates class legislation," says some one. The voice sounds familiar. It is the voice of the most persistent advocates of class legislation, the banker and the manufacturer.

If it is class legislation to protect the farmer against the robbery of the other classes, then my bill aims at class legislation. But the laws that give to the banker the control of the currency of the country; the manufacturer the right and opportunity to dictate to the farmer the price he must pay for his machinery, etc.; the common carrier the power to exact from the farmer freight rates based on "all that the traffic will bear"—that is not class legislation in their eyes. Oh, no. I propose to secure to the farmer the same right that is demanded by the manufacturer, and granted to him.

If the theory of protection is right, it is right that it should be extended to both producing classes alike. The farmer and his employés are entitled to the same protection as the manufacturer and his employés. No more, no less. The manufacturer demands protection against foreign competition; the farmer must therefore seek protection against the oppressive prices demanded by the manufacturer. My bill provides that protection for the farmer.

As a class we are tired of being robbed by all other classes and on all occasions. We ask no favors of anyone—only insist on our rights.

The following will fairly illustrate the farmer's importance, year after year, in our national economy:

In 1892 we, the farmers of the United States, fed the popula-

tion of this country, estimated at over sixty-six millions. Besides that, we furnished for export agricultural products to the amount of $793,717,676. All other products exported were only $236,560,354, an export excess of farm products over all other industries to the amount of $557,157,322. We fed the people; we paid the expenses of the Government, State and National, and the interest on the public debt. We supported the banking and transportation systems of the country and made several millionaires at home and abroad, all in one year. Yet you talk about the farmer as if he were an object of charity.

Quit plundering the farmer and he is all right. [Applause.]

[Mr. HUDSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. MALLORY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HAINES. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4825) for the relief of Emmart, Dunbar & Co., and the same was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 5216) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 5217) to regulate and discharge the payment of contracts in any money made a legal tender by law for the payment of debts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5218) to amend the Articles for the government of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 5219) to amend sections 5579 and 5591, Title LXIII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5242) providing for leaves of absence to certain per diem employés of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OATES: A joint resolution (H. Res. 109) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States as to the term of office of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. Res. 110) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States as to the composition of the House of Representatives of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. Res. 111) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States by limiting the term of office of the President thereof to six years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: A resolution relating to the issuance and sale of United States bonds—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEARD: A resolution for the benefit of the widow of Harvey W. Cockerill, deceased, late clerk of the Committee on the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. McLAURIN: A resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for information regarding employés in the Navy Department from South Carolina—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a resolution calling upon the Secretary of War for information regarding employés in that Department from South Carolina—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a resolution calling upon the Postmaster-General for certain information regarding employés in the Post-Office Department from South Carolina—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a resolution calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture for information regarding employés in that Department from South Carolina—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for certain information regarding employés in that Department from South Carolina—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for certain information regarding employés in that Department from South Carolina—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. PIGOTT: A resolution relating to the establishment of Congressional districts in accordance with law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN: A bill (H. R. 5220) for the relief of James Stewart—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: A bill (H. R. 5221) granting increase of pension to Oliver T. Everhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 5222) for allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, commonly known as the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5223) for the relief of Allie V. Askew, administratrix of W. W. Neely, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5224) for the relief of James Stewart—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5225) granting an increase of pension to William O. Martin, of Brocton, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 5226) authorizing the refunding of duty on a clock and chime of bells for St. Timothy's Church, of Catonsville, Baltimore County, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5227) for the relief of D. W. Boutwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 5228) to remove charges of desertion against Benjamin F. Saintaben—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to David M. Strang—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) granting a pension to Henry Bloomfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) granting a pension to Byron Dwinelle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) granting a pension to William L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5233) to pension Mollie Crandall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 5234) for the relief of Walter S. Kimmel—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 5235) to provide an American register for the steamer Goldsworthy—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 5236) to perfect the military record of Franklin B. Pope—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) to amend the military record of Charles Hentz, late private of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of James Ware, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5239) for the relief of Charles C. Burke, administrator of Elizabeth Burke, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 5240) providing for the adjustment and payment of the claim of the American Transportation Company for dredging done at Fairport Harbor, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 5241) to grant a pension to Mitchell Pearce, a soldier of the war of 1812—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. APSLEY: Petition of 51 business men of Maynard, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 584 employés of the Assabet Manufacturing Company, of Maynard, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, especially on wools and woolens—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN: Petition of citizens and laborers of Tower and Soudan, Minn., requesting that the present duty on iron ore be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of laborers and citizens of St. Louis County, Minn., against reducing the duty on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Protest of citizens of Arickaree, Colo., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of citizens of Delta County, Colo., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of citizens of Las Animas County, Colo., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNDY: Petition of O. P. Doty and 82 others, citizens of Green Township, Scioto County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of Geo. W. Dewald, of Mattoon, Ill., asking that a special act of Congress be passed for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COVERT: Petition of R. N. Penny and 80 other citizens of Suffolk County, N. Y., for the retention of existing duty on potatoes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition of the wool-growers of Yates Center, Kans., protesting against placing wool on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of members of American Flint Glass Workers' Union, Pittsburg, Pa., in favor of a protective tariff and against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of green flint glass bottle-makers of Pittsburg, Pa., against reduction of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of window glass workers of Alexandria, Ind., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Typographical Union, No. 7, of Pittsburg, Allegheny County, Pa., in favor of Government control of telegraph lines and of House bill 4478 and of Senate bill 1136—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS: Protest of those interested in the manufacture of toys in the State of New York, against the reduction of duty on toys and praying for a tariff of 35 per cent ad valorem on the same—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of 18,000 Good Templars of Maine, for a commission to investigate the liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Home Market Club, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of Mrs. William H. Conners, widow of William H. Conners, deceased, of Madison County, Tenn., asking the reference of the claim for stores and supplies taken by the Federal forces for their use, to the Court of Claims, under the provision of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce, of Kansas City, Kans., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Petition of the employés of the Bound Brook Woolen Mills at Bound Brook, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Protest of 458 employés of the George Gilbert Manufacturing Company, of Gilbertsville, Mass., irrespective of party, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 31 citizens of Springfield, Mass., employed in the manufacture of toys, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 49 shirtmakers, of Dunkirk, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a request of A. D. Lake, M. D., that one or more agency physicians appear in Washington to discuss the subject of increase in salaries—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of 63 citizens of Somerset, Perry County, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 34 farmers, merchants, and laborers, of Paxton Township, Ross County, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 190 employers of laboring men, and others, of Middleport, Meigs County, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 48 farmers, mechanics, and laborers, of Jefferson Township, Ross County, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 75 farmers, mechanics, merchants, and laboring men, of Logan, Hocking County, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 150 farmers, mechanics, and laboring men, of Jackson Township, Vinton County, Ohio, against the so called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of Ann Arbor (Mich.) Typographical Union, No. 154, urging the passage of House bill 4478, providing for the Government ownership and control of the telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of cigar manufacturers, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of H. F. Boyd and others, relative to placing on the retired list men who have served twenty-five years in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEARD: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars, for a uniform rate of 35 cents on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania: Petition of 42 citizens of Tioga County, Pa., against any change in the duty on cigars and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 14 citizens of Tioga County, Pa., against any change in the duty on cigars and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McETTRICK: Petition of Churchill & Bean and others, members of the Merchant Tailors' National Exchange, that the duty on ready-made clothing and wearing apparel be made 80 per cent ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of dealers and granite-cutters of Quincy, Mass., to maintain the present tariff duty on dressed granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of workmen, granite-cutters, and polishers, of Quincy, Mass., to maintain the present duty of 40 per cent ad valorem upon granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Lodge No. 264, International Association of Machinists, of Boston, in favor of the Government ownership of the telegraphic systems of the country—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a petition of the Rubber Garment Workers' Local Union, No. 51, of East Braintree, Mass., in favor of the Government ownership of the telegraph system of the country—to the Committee of the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. O'NEIL: Petition of Boston Lodge, No. 264, International Association of Machinists, of Boston, Mass., in favor of Government ownership of telegraph lines—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Trimountain Garrison, No. 98, Regular Army and Navy Union, for an amendment to the act of February 14, 1865, relative to the retiring of enlisted men—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, remonstrance of Merchant Tailors' Association, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Petition of 179 citizens of Lymansville, R. I., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARSON: Petition of J. B. Myers and 24 other citizens of Toronto, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIGOTT: Remonstrance of the Shaler & Hall Quarry Company, of Portland, Conn., and Cromwell, Conn., against putting freestone or sandstone on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of glass-cutters, Mount Washington Glass Company, New Bedford, Mass., protesting against any reduction in the tariff as it now stands, and against the substitution of ad valorem for specific duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of glass workers in the employ of N. Packwood & Co., protesting against a change in the tariff on cut glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIPE: Petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars,

for a uniform rate of duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 91 workers in glass factory of W. H. Hamilton & Co., of Pittsburg, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade of South Side, Pittsburg, on tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Workingmen's Protective Tariff League of New York, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade of McKeesport, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the lithographic workmen of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, protesting against the reduction of duty on lithographic goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 1,200 employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of the Twenty-second and Twenty-fourth Congressional districts of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 185 glass manufacturers and workers of Jeannette, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 200 companies of the United States, interested in mining, protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 300 miners of lead ore of Missouri and Kansas, protesting against an ad valorem duty on lead ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred W. Hayne, 107 Hudson street, New York, praying that every publisher or publishers of newspapers, magazines, and trade journals be compelled to publish his or their sworn circulation; also, to abolish the law that no publisher can send through the mails, as second-class matter, his paper and at the end of the year demand payment of the nonsubscriber because he did not return the paper through the post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial from 134 miners and others, citizens of Ironwood, Mich., protesting against the proposed placing of iron ore on the free list, the mere suggestion of which has closed the mines and caused widespread suffering and distress to prevail in that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from Capt. William Trebilcock and 143 other miners and citizens of Ironwood, Mich., protesting against the placing of iron ore on the free list, and affirming that such action will work great hardship to the people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 114 workingmen, employers of labor and others, citizens of Norway, Mich., irrespective of party affiliations, protesting against the placing of iron ore on the free list, and declaring that the inevitable result of so doing would be lowered wages and reduced employment—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from 129 workingmen, employers of labor and others, citizens of Escanaba, Mich., regardless of party, remonstrating against the proposed legislation permitting the free admission of iron ore, and affirming that the effect of such action would be to reduce wages and bring starvation to the people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial from R. M. Sampson and 250 others, citizens of Norway, Mich., regardless of party, remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list, and affirming that such action would bring great hardships upon the people of that section—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial from Walter Fitch and 405 others, citizens of Champion, Mich., irrespective of party, representing the suffering and distress now among them, resulting from the danger of the Wilson bill passing, and especially praying that the duty on iron ore be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petition of Stained Glass Workers of Allegheny City, for reduction of present duty on stained glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Typographical Union, No. 7, of Pittsburg, for passage of bill directing the Government to take charge of telegraph lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of E. W. C. Cook and 43 others, citizens of Galena, Delaware County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 16, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Vice-President being absent, the President *pro tempore* took the chair.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts suggesting the absence of a quorum, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Frye,	Lodge,	Quay,
Allison,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Roach,
Berry,	Gorman,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Blackburn,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Oregon,	Stockbridge,
Call,	Harris,	Morrill,	Teller,
Carey,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Turpie,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Palmer,	Vest,
Chilton,	Hunton,	Perkins,	Vilas,
Cuniel,	Irby,	Platt,	Washburn,
Davis,	Jones, Ark.	Proctor,	Wilson.
Faulkner,	Kyle,	Pugh,	

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The roll call develops the fact that 43 Senators are present. There being a quorum present, the Secretary will read the message of the President of the United States.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Congress:

I transmit herewith copies of all dispatches from our minister at Hawaii relating in any way to political affairs in that country, except such as have been heretofore laid before the Congress.

I also transmit a copy of the last instructions sent to our minister, dated January 12, 1894, being the only instructions to him not already sent to the Congress.

In transmitting certain correspondence with my message dated December 18, 1893, I withheld a dispatch from our present minister, numbered 3 and dated November 16, 1893, and also a dispatch from our former minister, numbered 70 and dated October 8, 1892. Inasmuch as the contents of the dispatch of November 16, 1893, are referred to in the dispatches of a more recent date now sent to Congress, and inasmuch as there seems no longer to be sufficient reason for withholding said dispatch, a copy of the same is herewith submitted. The dispatch numbered 70 and dated October 8, 1892, above referred to, is still withheld for the reason that such a course still appears to be justifiable and proper.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
January 13, 1894.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the message and accompanying documents——

Mr. HOAR. I move that the message and accompanying documents be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to address the Senate upon that motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is suspended, and the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to speak upon the motion for five or ten minutes. Perhaps it would be more convenient to the Senate to have the routine morning business first transacted. I make that suggestion, and ask consent that this matter may stand until the transaction of the routine morning business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The message and accompanying documents will lie on the table for the present, and the Senator from Massachusetts will be recognized after the routine morning business.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 108) authorizing Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Summer Hill, Ill., remonstrating against a reduction of duty on wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Winter Wheat Millers' League of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of such legislation as will cause the removal of the discriminating duties now imposed by foreign countries against the importation of flour; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of fruit-growers and shippers of Michigan and dealers in Chicago, Ill., praying that an appropria-

tion of $25,000 be made for the improvement of the Kalamazoo River in Michigan; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WASHBURN presented the memorial of E. C. Hall and other citizens of St. Louis County, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of 50 citizens of Hocking County, of 140 citizens of Miami County, and of 100 employés of the Jeffrey Manufacturing Company, of Columbus, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Clair, Ohio, soldiers in the late war, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Fairfield, Lindsey, Wells, Mohican, and Turtle Creek, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORMAN (for Mr. MCPHERSON) presented a memorial of employés of R. H. and B. C. Reeve, manufacturers of floor oilcloth, of Camden, N. J., remonstrating against any change in the present tariff law; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MANDERSON. I present a memorial of citizens of Dixson County, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill. The memorial is quite numerously signed. I observe that the political proclivities of those who signed it are mentioned, and that a majority of the signers sign as Democrats and as members of the Populist party. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented memorials of H. B. Sturtevant and 278 other workingmen, employers of labor, and business men of Ironwood; of Watson Fitch and 422 workingmen, employers of labor, and other citizens of Champion; J. B. Knight and 248 workingmen, employers of labor, and other citizens of Vulcan and Norway, and of D. A. Stewart and 105 workingmen, employers of labor, and other citizens of Norway, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Fair Haven (Mich.) Stave Company, and of the Standard Hoop Company of Michigan, remonstrating against the placing of hoops and staves on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE. I present a petition of the Central Labor Union of Boston, Mass., praying for the reopening of the navy-yard at Charlestown for the construction and repair of shipping, etc. The petition sets forth that the yard has been put in a high state of efficiency by recent appropriations; also the discrimination which has been made against it in not being used; and the great distress among the workingmen of that city. The petitioners state that the reopening of the yard for the ordinary work of a navy yard would give employment to a number of persons. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON presented the petition of John A. Spielman and 33 other honorably discharged ex-soldiers of the Union army, praying for the passage of a service pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS presented memorials of G. W. Wallace and 700 other citizens of Tower and Soudan; of O. G. Korb and 93 other citizens of Ely; of E. H. Hall and 80 other citizens of St. Louis County, and of Peder Handburg and 88 other citizens of Ely, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on iron ore; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Pressmen's Union No. 14, and of W. J. Ralus and other citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of F. W. Betz and other citizens of Fairmount, Minn., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Good Templars of Maine, by request of its grand lodge, representing 18,000 members, praying for the appointment of a national commission of inquiry to investigate the alcoholic liquor traffic; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the early completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge at Cape Ann, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the placing of iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented petitions of Herman Hoffman and Ed. Olson, of Greencastle; of C. Wirth and 10 others, of Terre Haute; of Jacob Rief and 3 others, of Lawrence; and of A. M. Miller and 6 others, of Lebanon, manufacturers and makers of cigars in the State of Indiana, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on all unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of M. W. McCoy, a cigar manufacturer of Evansville, Ind., praying for the repeal of the tariff law of 1890, regarding the duty on manufactured tobacco, and for the retention of the present duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PUGH presented the petition of J. W. Drewey and 5 other physicians of Barbour, Ala., praying for the establishment of a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. DANIEL presented memorials of sundry operators and miners of Wells Branch, West Va., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on coal and coke; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Clinch Valley coal operators of Wise County, Va., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on coal; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the owners and operators of blast and zinc furnaces in Southwest Virginia and the Shenandoah Valley, Virginia, remonstrating against a further reduction of the duty on coal, iron ore, and zinc; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of miners and other employés of the Big Creek mines, in Tazewell County, Va., remonstrating against a further reduction of the duty on soft coal, coke, and iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Board of Trade of Pocahontas, Va., and of coal producers of the Pocahontas coal fields of Virginia and West Virginia, remonstrating against a further reduction of the duty on soft coal; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Big Stone Gap, Va., remonstrating against the placing of coal, iron, and lumber on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the All Tobacco Cigarette Manufacturers' Association of the United States, praying for a separate classification and remonstrating against any reduction of the present duty on all-tobacco cigarettes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of James Harvey and 146 other citizens of Grayson and Carroll Counties, Va., and of W. D. Sale and 33 other employés of the Pennsylvania Zinc and Iron Company, of Ivanhoe, Va., remonstrating against any reduction of the present duty on pig iron; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the board of directors of the Louisville (Ky.) Silvering and Beveling Company, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on German mirrors, and opposing a reduction of the duty on mirrors to 5 cents per square foot; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of J. W. Hawkins and other cigar-manufacturers of Charlottesville, Va., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of sundry citizens of Salem, Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing a postal governmental telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

ANNIVERSARY OF LAYING OF CAPITOL CORNER STONE.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported a joint resolution (S. R. 51) to provide for the printing of the report of the joint committee of Congress and proceedings at the centennial celebration of the laying of the corner stone of the Capitol; and submitted a report thereon,

The joint resolution was read the first time by its title.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the joint resolution was read the second time at length, and considered as in Committee of the Whole, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the report of the joint committee of Congress, appointed under the joint resolution approved August 17, 1893, upon the ceremonials at the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary

of the laying of the corner stone of the Capitol of the United States, together with the proceedings and public addresses on the commemoration of that event, be printed in a memorial volume, with such illustrations as may be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, and that 5,500 copies be printed, 1,500 for the use of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for distribution by the citizens' committee on the celebration, and the sum of $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry this joint resolution into effect.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1137) to provide for the printing of the report of the joint committee of Congress and proceedings at the centennial celebration of the laying of the corner stone of the Capitol, reported adversely thereon, and moved its indefinite postponement; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1431) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to regulations made by miners; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1432) to open to settlement and provide for the disposal of the public lands of Fort McPherson military reservation, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WASHBURN introduced a bill (S. 1433) granting to the Hot Springs Water Company a site for a reservoir for cold water upon the permanent reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COKE introduced a bill (S. 1434) for the relief of the estate of Sylvanus Sandford, deceased, late of Cass County, Tex.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE. By request of the secretary of the Maritime Association of New York I introduce a bill, and ask that it be twice read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 1435) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Rutherford Leach; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1437) granting a pension to Jacob Niebels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN (for Mr. MCPHERSON) introduced a bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Louis A. Yorke; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (for Mr. MCPHERSON) introduced a bill (S. 1439) to amend the Articles for the government of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (for Mr. MCPHERSON) introduced a bill (S. 1440) for the relief of John G. Rose; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (for Mr. MCPHERSON) introduced a bill (S. 1441) granting a pension to Ella Hatfield, invalid daughter of Maj. David Hatfield, First Regiment New Jersey Infantry Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. MCPHERSON) introduced a bill (S. 1442) to provide for the enlargement and improvement of the United States naval hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1443) for the relief of Henry Marcotte; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1444) to authorize the Oklahoma Central Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Railroads.

Mr. HIGGINS introduced a bill (S. 1445) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of David Miller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill. I should like to say a word, with the consent of the Senate, in regard to the amendment. It proposes an appropriation of $25,000 "to enable the Director of the Geological Survey to make a careful examination of the gold-bearing black sands of the coast and rivers of California, Oregon, and Washington, with a view of determining as to their geological origin and contents, including an investigation as to the possible methods by which the flour gold of such sands might be saved, and also an investigation into the platinum, iridosmine, and nickel ores of the State of Oregon, their origin, quality, and extent, and report thereon."

I have had some correspondence with the Director of the Geological Survey in regard to this matter, and I hold in my hand a communication of some importance bearing upon the question. I move that the communication be printed in connection with the proposed amendment and referred with it to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS ON A NOMINATION.

Mr. CALL. I submit a Senate resolution, with an accompanying notice for a change of the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

I give notice that I will move the Senate to suspend the following part of Rule XXXVIII, paragraph 2, viz: "All information communicated or remarks made by a Senator when acting upon nominations concerning the character and qualifications of the person nominated; also all votes upon any nomination shall be kept secret," so far as the same relates to the proceedings of the Senate in relation to the nomination of the internal-revenue collector for the State of Florida. The object of this motion is to have the nomination of the internal-revenue collector for Florida considered in open session.

Resolved, That so much of Rule XXXVIII, paragraph 2, as is contained in the following words: "All information communicated or remarks made by a Senator when acting upon nominations concerning the character or qualifications of the person nominated; also all votes upon any nomination shall be kept secret," shall be suspended in the consideration of the nomination of the collector of internal revenue of the State of Florida.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Florida propose to refer the resolution?

Mr. CALL. I do not, sir. I shall ask that it be considered by the Senate without a reference. I suppose under the rule the resolution will lie over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution lies over.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Florida whether it should not be brought up first in executive session?

Mr. MANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Then, if it seems to the Senate——

Mr. CALL. I do not suppose it should, Mr. President, unless it be done by a vote of the Senate. I can see no reason why a proposed change of the rules should not be discussed in open Senate.

Mr. HOAR. It would seem to me, as at present advised, that it is my duty to suggest that it shall be considered in executive session, which suggestion being made, if any other Senator agree with me, would require it to be first considered there. Then if, after explanation by the Senator from Florida, the Senate thought that it was a matter for open session, the Senate would so order, under the rule: but it seems to me that as the subject is by the rules submitted to the Senate in executive session the special reasons why it should be made an exception can not be otherwise stated.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Massachusetts submit a motion?

Mr. HOAR. I make that suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. MANDERSON. If this matter is to be taken up now, I certainly second the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not think that this is a proposed change of the rules. It is rather a request for unanimous consent that as to the particular nomination named the injunction of secrecy shall be removed. That surely is a matter for executive session. I second the request that the doors be closed, if the matter is to be considered now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would suggest to the Senators from Nebraska and Massachusetts that the Senator from Florida does not ask for the present consideration of his resolution, but he asks that it lie over under the rules.

Mr HOAR. I wish, if I may be allowed to make——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator from Massachusetts asks that the doors be closed at this time, and the Senator from Nebraska seconds it, it is the duty of the Chair to order the doors to be closed.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to make one suggestion. I do not wish to interpose in any matter against what the Senator from Florida desires, as he knows very well, but, on the contrary, desire to support any wish that he may have. My suggestion is not at all made in reference to this particular case, of which I know absolutely nothing, but because I think it is a very important matter of general practice. If this matter be considered in executive session the Senator can, of course, make his reasons known to the Senate and the doors can be at once opened if the Senate think so; but I am obliged to notify the Senator that I

shall be compelled to make this suggestion whenever the matter is considered.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The suggestion being made at this time, and seconded by the Senator from Nebraska, it is the duty of the Chair to order the galleries cleared and the doors closed.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator will withdraw his resolution.

Mr. CALL. I do not ask for the present consideration of the resolution. I do not wish to oppose the wishes of any Senator in regard to its consideration, but it appears to me the question whether a rule should be suspended is not a matter for secret session. It does not involve any discussion——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Florida withdraw the resolution? The question is not now debatable.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Florida does not withdraw the resolution, but he asks that the resolution——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Sergeant-at-Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors of the Senate.

The doors were thereupon closed, and at the expiration of twenty minutes were reopened.

FLORIDA RAILROAD GRANTS.

Mr. CALL. I desire to give notice that on Monday next, after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall move to take up the resolution introduced by me to refer to the Judiciary Committee the action of the Interior Department with reference to certain Florida railroad lands claimed as grants, and submit some observations to the Senate upon it.

CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment be required to examine into the condition of the civil service of the United States and the expediency of its retention or increase, and to report to the Senate by bill or otherwise.

UNITED STATES CONVICTS IN UTAH.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit a resolution which I ask may be read, and, when it is read, I ask that a letter from the Attorney-General may be read to explain why the resolution should be passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to report to the Senate the amounts due the United States from the Territory of Utah on account of costs and expenses of prosecutions for offenses against any law of the Territorial Legislature of Utah required to be paid out of the Treasury of said Territory under the act of June 23, 1874, entitled "An act in relation to courts and judicial officers in the Territory of Utah."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks that the letter of the Attorney-General be read. It will be read, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, D. C., January 8, 1894.*

SIR: It is suggested to the Department that the attention of Congress should be called to the large amounts due the United States from the Territory of Utah, expended by the Government in the support of Territorial convicts under the act of June 23, 1874, commonly known as the Poland bill, section 2, paragraph 4, of the act being: "And the costs and expenses of all prosecutions for offenses against any law of the Territorial Legislature shall be paid out of the treasury of the Territory;" the offenses prosecuted under the act by the United States attorney being "as well under the laws of said Territory as of the United States."

For many years there has been an annual appropriation mainly for the support of the penitentiary, usually denominated "Expenses Territorial courts of Utah."

The amount of expenses thus incurred can be ascertained from the office of the First Comptroller of the Treasury.

This matter is brought to your notice because this Department has disbursed these appropriations. It would be held responsible if this information was not communicated to you and it should be overlooked.

Very respectfully,

RICHARD OLNEY,
Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT *of the United States Senate.*

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

LIGHT AND FOG SIGNAL AT BUTLER FLATS, MASSACHUSETTS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Are there further resolutions, concurrent or otherwise? If there be none, the morning business is concluded.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 156, Order of Business 176.

Mr. HOAR. I ask my colleague if the bill will take any time?

Mr. LODGE. I think not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill, the title of which has been read?

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to have the bill read for information, subject to objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be established, on or near Butler Flats, entrance to the lower harbor of New Bedford, Mass., a light and fog-signal station, at a cost not to exceed $45,000.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCOUNTS OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. HUNTON. Mr. President, I ask——

Mr. HOAR. I understood the order of the Senate was that at the close of the routine business the President's message should be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The message of the President of the United States has been laid before the Senate. It is lying upon the table at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Massachusetts is now recognized by the Chair.

Mr. HUNTON. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to permit me to ask for the consideration of House bill 4340, in regard to the mode of settling the accounts of the post-offices in the country with the Post-Office Department.

Mr. HOAR. Will the bill require any debate?

Mr. HUNTON. I think not. It was brought up the other day by me and its consideration then asked for, but the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] asked that it lie over until the return of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL].

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HOAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUNTON. I ask for the present consideration of House bill 4340. It will be recollected that I reported the bill from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. It was recommended by the Post-Office Department and by the commission appointed by the two Houses of Congress to consider such matters. As I have stated, at the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] it was laid over until the return of the Senator from Missouri, who is now here, and I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion to print and refer the message of the President of the United States is now before the Senate, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire, before the President's message containing some information in regard to the proceedings in Hawaii passes from the power of the Senate by reference or by the order to print, to call attention to one matter, which I think should be understood now.

It will be remembered—I do not think any intelligent American is ignorant of the fact—that the President of the United States, deeming that it would be a shame, a foul shame, to expose the persons who had been engaged in the recent establishment of the present Government of Hawaii to the vengeance of a cruel and semibarbarous ruler, demanded from her an undertaking that there should be complete pardon and amnesty to all the persons engaged in that revolution. Nobody, however severe a critic of the present Administration, questions the wisdom and humanity of that stipulation. The Queen had many times broken her promises and her oath of office. She had been dethroned by her subjects for an attempt, by her own authority and without right, to impose a new constitution upon her people and to violate the old one.

When that suggestion was made to her, she was asked by Mr. Willis to issue a proclamation of amnesty, and she said that she thought the persons ought to be beheaded, their property confiscated, and their children driven from the realm, and she would not consent. Upon that the proceedings stopped for a time.

But I want to call attention to another matter, and that is, that the Queen also informed Mr. Willis that she had no consti-

tutional or legal right to make that promise. She hesitated a moment, and then slowly and calmly answered, says Mr. Willis in his report:

There are certain laws of my government by which I shall abide. My decision would be as the law directs.

Then he goes on asking her if she fully understands the meaning of her words, and he further asked her:

Suppose it was necessary to make a decision before you approach any ministers, and that you were asked to issue a royal proclamation of general amnesty, would you do it?

She answered:

I have no legal right to do that, and I would not do it.

Mr. President, that answer of the Queen was well founded. The constitution of Hawaii, which has been furnished to us in one of the documents which have been laid before the Senate and of which I hold a copy in my hand, contains several provisions on this subject. Article 27 is:

That the king, by and with the advice of the privy council and with the consent of the cabinet, has the power to grant reprieves and pardons after conviction for all offenses.

Then there is another provision of the same constitution, article 78, which says:

Wherever by this constitution any act is to be performed by the king or the sovereign, it shall, unless otherwise expressed, mean that such act shall be done and performed by the sovereign by and with the advice and consent of the cabinet.

The cabinet is not, as under our Constitution, within the control of the executive head of the nation, because no cabinet can be removed except by a vote of want of confidence by the Legislative Assembly, which will be found in the forty-first article.

So it appears that this promise of amnesty which has at last been extracted from the Queen, so far as it is found in her ambiguous and doubtful letter (which I will ask to have read presently and printed as a part of my remarks), was a gross violation of the constitution of Hawaii. Every constitutional lawyer, every intelligent citizen understands the distinction between a power to pardon after conviction, which can extend only to a particular offender and which can only be exercised by a discretion instructed by the proceedings of a trial with the full knowledge of the particular fact bearing upon the particular guilt of the particular criminal, and a general sweeping proclamation of amnesty.

So what President Cleveland through his minister, Mr. Willis, was urging upon that sovereign to do was as gross a violation of her constitution as could be suggested or supposed; and the Queen notified our Government of the fact. She protested twice, "I have not a legal power to do this thing." The life, the property, the right of these men and their children to abide in their country are dependent upon a promise so extorted, by an authority which was informed when the promise was extorted that it was a grossly unconstitutional and illegal promise that had been obtained.

Mr. President, there is but one point of sympathy between the present Executive of the United States, who sent out Mr. Blount, and the deposed Queen of Hawaii, and that is a purpose on the part of both recklessly to disregard the constitutions of their country; the only difference being that the President of the United States disregards our Constitution recklessly and without provocation, and the Queen of Hawaii in this instance proposes to disregard the constitution of Hawaii only for the great temptation of a throne and on the urgent solicitation of our President.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the answer finally given by the Queen that she would extend amnesty is capable of the construction that she would only extend that amnesty after conviction?

Mr. HOAR. I do not think it is. As I said, her letter, which I shall have read in a moment, is ambiguous and doubtful. But if it were, the Queen could not do it without the consent of her cabinet.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I understand that.

Mr. HOAR. And the cabinet could not be removed, if it refused, except by the order of the Legislature.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. What I desire to get at is what is the real meaning of the consent finally given?

Mr. HOAR. I will have the letter read.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Was it intended that she would extend amnesty at once before conviction, or did she mean to be understood that she would extend it only after conviction?

Mr. HOAR. I will send up to the desk the Queen's letter. I have it here in a paper, but the official copy is more convenient. Let the Secretary read the Queen's letter, contained in No. 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON PLACE, *Honolulu, December 18, 1893.*

SIR: Since I had the interview with you this morning, I have given the most careful and conscientious thought as to my duty, and I now, of my own free will, give my conclusions.

I must not feel revengeful to any of my people. If I am restored by the United States I must forget myself and remember only my dear people and my country. I must forgive and forget the past, permitting no proscription or punishment of anyone, but trusting that all will hereafter work together in peace and friendship for the good and for the glory of our beautiful and once happy land.

Asking you to bear to the President and to the Government he represents a message of gratitude from me and from my people, and promising with God's grace to prove worthy of the confidence and friendship of your people, I am, etc.,

LILIUOKALANI.

To His Excellency ALBERT S. WILLIS,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
United States of America.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, that letter is either a compliance with the condition of a proclamation of amnesty or it is not. If it be a promise of pardon it is an unconstitutional engagement, as the authorities of the United States had been again and again notified by the Queen herself. If it be not, what becomes of the transparent and shallow pretense that the liberty or the impunity of the persons who engaged in the revolution has been secured?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts upon his tender regard for the maintenance of the constitution of Hawaii. His constitutional argument this morning has been characterized by his usual perspicacity. I do not know, though, whether the insistance of the President of the United States upon amnesty and full pardon and oblivion for all acts committed by those who took part in the revolution of January, 1893, was not a wise condition, notwithstanding the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts would still insist that the Queen, notwithstanding a compliance with that condition, should have tried and was bound by her constitutional duty to have tried those who had engaged in the revolution, or should withhold all executive clemency from those who had been tried and convicted of treason against her Government.

I believe that the President of the United States was right in saying that he would exact such a condition from her before he would intervene or exercise his good offices with the Provisional Government in her behalf, and that he was able with the power with which he was clothed, and that the United States were able, to make good that promise and to see that it was fulfilled. I do not know but that the argument is a little late, as the whole matter has dropped short of any exigency of that kind. As soon as the dispatch from Mr. Willis was received, as I understand from the message and the documents which have been sent to us, a dispatch was at once sent to him that the matter was closed and was to remain where it was left by the Queen's refusal.

But be that as it may, I do not think that even for the purposes of a moot question here on what is a proper constitutional view to take of the powers of the Queen under the constitution which has been overthrown, the contention of the Senator from Massachusetts is likely to play much figure in this constitutional discussion.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware, not being able to meet or to answer the force of what I said, has proceeded to make a most extraordinary distortion of my language. The Senator says that the Senator from Massachusetts manifested a tender regard for the constitution of Hawaii, and that I insisted the Queen should have those people tried. Mr. President, it requires all my respect for that Senator to suppose that he believed that when he said it.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator will allow me; I think he misunderstood me.

Mr. HOAR. I wrote down the Senator's language.

Mr. GRAY. Not that they should be tried, but that they should not have extended to them amnesty and pardon.

Mr. HOAR. That I insist they should not. Well, take it in either way.

Mr. GRAY. Take it in that way.

Mr. HOAR. I will repeat what I said, and I challenge the Senator to stand in his place and deny it. I said that when the promise was exacted from that woman it was a void promise, a promise which would be in violation of her oath of office, and that the Queen notified us that it was a void promise. She said, "I am bound by the law and I can not legally do this thing." Now, the Senator gets up and says that I insisted those people ought to be tried, when I pointed out and read the constitution to show that she was right, because she can not issue a proclamation of amnesty before trial, because the constitution confines her to a pardon after conviction, and she can not issue a pardon after conviction because the constitution says she can only act by the advice and consent of her cabinet, and in this particular

case by the advice and consent of the cabinet and privy council both, both of which are necessary to a pardon.

When I make that suggestion and the Senator gets up and says I am arguing that those people ought to be tried or punished, it is a plea of guilty in behalf of the Administration; and the Senator gets up and says something else, and puts into my mouth something else and undertakes to defend something else.

I think those men ought not to be tried; I think they ought not to be punished, not because I think they ought to be pardoned, but because I think they have done nothing worthy of punishment. They ought no more to be tried or to be punished or to be pardoned than William Russell, or Algernon Sidney, or John Hampden, or George Washington, or Benjamin Franklin, or John Dickinson ought to have been tried or punished or pardoned. They were defending constitutional liberty in the way which, if not pointed out in the constitution, is established and sanctioned by the custom of free men, and has the force of law everywhere.

Mr. President, another thing which the Senator from Delaware said, it seems to me, requires a little explanation, and that is that the President, with the power with which he is clothed, would be able to have kept this void, unconstitutional promise, in violation of an oath of office given to Mr. Willis. With what power is he clothed? Is he to do it by an act of war, without the consent of Congress?

Mr. GRAY. The Senator has not quoted all that I said.

Mr. HOAR. I have quoted that which the Senator said, and that is what I am dealing with.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator is not dealing with all that I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will address the Chair.

Mr. HOAR. Suppose the President of the United States had the war power and was clothed with it, as somebody seems to think he is, is this a treaty? Is this a promise that the United States can insist upon? Is it a promise which the Queen, in the first place, notified Mr. Willis was unconstitutional, and a promise, in the second place, which can not rise to the dignity of an international promise, because the treaty-making power of the United States has never accepted it? It is not possible for the Queen of Hawaii, if she were clothed with absolute power, to make a binding promise to the United States which could be enforced by international processes, either of war or peace, unless by a treaty to which the Senate of the United States had given its consent.

Mr. GRAY. Or by giving an order to the marines, as Mr. Stevens did.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. Stevens did not. That is another fallacy which I did not intend to enter upon now. Mr. Stevens never gave an order to the marines of the United States and never had and never pretended to have any authority over that subject. The authority to land the marines and the exercise of that authority was lodged in the admiral of the United States, as it could only legally be lodged, on an authority or order given him by the Secretary of the Navy. All that Mr. Stevens did was to bring certain facts to the knowledge of the admiral and to make his request.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I know the Senator wants to be accurate.

Mr. HOAR. I do.

Mr. GRAY. But we have before us in the papers sent in by President Harrison, with the treaty of annexation, a letter of Capt. Wiltse to the Secretary of the Navy, in which he says: "At 4 o'clock this afternoon, by order of Minister Stevens, I landed the ship's battalion."

Mr. HOAR. I do not know what particular phrase may be found in the naval officer's report, and I do not care; but I do know, and the Senator, I think, knows, or will know——

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator cares for the fact, I have stated it, while the Senator stated it to be the contrary. Does it make no difference which way the fact is?

Mr. HOAR. I did not state it to be the contrary.

Mr. GRAY. I state it to be the contrary.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator hear my sentence?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I say I do not care what particular phrase, exact or inexact, may be found in a naval officer's report; the legal authority and the only authority which that man acted upon was the order of the Secretary of the Navy. He could act on no other; and there was no power to put him under the hand of a minister of the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Did the Secretary of the Navy authorize the admiral or anyone else to raise the flag of the United States over the capitol of Hawaii.

Mr. HOAR. That is a matter which, it seems to me, does not concern what we are talking about just now.

Mr. DANIEL. I think I can show the Senator from Massachusetts that it bears very much upon what he is dealing with now. The American commissioner was sent to Hawaii when the flag of the United States was over the capitol of the country. I should like to ask the Senator if that was not a condition of war between this country and Hawaii brought about by the action of the American minister?

Mr. HOAR. Not at all, when it was done by the consent of the lawfully recognized Government of Hawaii.

Mr. DANIEL. It was done by the consent of the hitherto *de facto* Government, but when they recognized the sovereignty of another country did they not cease to be *de facto*?

Mr. HOAR. Not at all.

Mr. DANIEL. They did not claim to be a legal government, except in so far as they were *de facto*.

Mr. HOAR. That is all any government can claim.

Mr. DANIEL. When they turned over all their *de facto* functions, so far as concerns the protection of the lives of British, German, American, Japanese, Chinese, and everybody, and all the property in the Hawaiian Islands to the custody and care of the sovereignty of the United States was not the United States the only sovereign power there?

Mr. HOAR. When there is any evidence that they did that there will be time enough to put that hypothetical question. I do not understand that to be the fact or anything like it. I understand that the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands invited the landing of our troops, but that they were landed with their function explicitly confined to the protection of life and property as they had been instructed by Mr. Bayard as well as by Mr. Foster and Mr. Blaine.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Would it disturb the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HOAR. I certainly can not answer four questions at once. It was said by a certain Irish orator that a man could not be at two places at once unless he were a bird. A man can not argue four questions at once unless his brain is in a very democratic state of confusion.

Now, I was replying to the Senator from Virginia. I say that that function was carefully confined and that Mr. Stevens carefully refused to do anything except to preserve the life and property of American citizens (I do not go so far as to say to preserve order) according to the universal instruction of this Government to its ministers there. Then, when the Provisional Government voted as it had the right, being the *de facto* Government, to offer a treaty of annexation to this country, they put up the American flag there as a matter of respect, courtesy, or honor, in anticipation of what they expected was to come to pass.

But it was done fully with the authority and assent of the existing lawful Government there. Who has not seen on the Fourth of July and on state occasions, as a courtesy, the flag of America in various countries of Europe side by side in a place of honor with the flag of the country where it was raised?

Mr. DANIEL. Would I interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand the Senator to say that the United States occupied Hawaii and raised its flag over the capitol by the invitation of the *de facto* Provisional Government. Now, laying aside its invitation, the question I should like to ask the Senator is, what right had the American minister or the American admiral, at anybody's invitation, to assume the sovereignty of a foreign country in the name of the United States without the authority of the President or of Congress?

Mr. HOAR. None at all.

Mr. DANIEL. And, as the Senator has investigated the subject, I should like to ask him, furthermore, what was the condition of affairs brought about by the establishment of a military protectorate over a foreign country in the name of the United States, and if after that the same legal conditions existed that existed when there was a *de facto* civil government?

Mr. HOAR. There was no such protectorate established; there was no such function assumed; there was no such significance given to the hoisting of the flag. It was an act of courtesy, pure and simple, on the part of the *de facto* Government, as I understand it. It had no more significance than my hanging the United States flag out of my window on the Fourth of July when I was traveling in Europe last summer.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg to call attention——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. HOAR. I do not yield any further.

Mr. DANIEL. All right, sir.

Mr. HOAR. I am not discussing that question. I did not rise to say anything on that point. That will be discussed quite soon enough, I think, for our friends on the other side, or for any of us, when the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations comes in and all the testimony is before us.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to state the point I wanted to put to the Senator. I shall not argue it.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to recall the attention of the Senate and of the country to the one point which I was making, which was all I rose to say, and that is that this pretended stipulation for amnesty came from a ruler just overthrown because she had violated her oath of office, as everybody must admit. No man will claim that she had not been engaged in an unconstitutional act of overthrowing her Government. Not only that, but it came also from a ruler who had no power to carry it into effect, and who fully and fairly twice advised the minister of the United States that it was a totally illegal promise she was making.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. I want two minutes, if the Senator from New Hampshire will give way to me. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said something so personal to myself I think I ought to say a word in explanation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will yield a moment longer.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Massachusetts said I misrepresented him, and that I had distorted what he had said. I will not stop to dwell upon whether I deserve that from the Senator from Massachusetts, or whether that forgetfulness of the courtesy due to any Senator has in my case been forgotten. I did not distort what the Senator said, but the Senator totally misunderstood what I said. I did not say that the Senator from Massachusetts was in favor of those people being beheaded. I said he seemed to be unwilling that the Queen under the constitution should extend amnesty to them if they were convicted. That is all I said.

Now, in regard to the other matter, when I interjected perhaps a little out of order, but the Senator took no exception to it (certainly I did not intend any rudeness to the Senator from Massachusetts), that perhaps the President of the United States might do as Mr. Stevens did, land the marines in order to make good the exaction he had required from the Queen, the Senator said with a great deal of emphasis that Mr. Stevens never ordered the marines landed; that if they were landed they were landed by the authority of the naval commander in those waters, subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy.

I quote to the Senator from the report of Capt. Wiltse himself to the Secretary of the Navy that at such an hour this afternoon "I did land the ship's battalion in obedience to the orders of Minister Stevens." I ask the Senator not to answer it now, but to explain why on the very day or the next day after those troops were landed the committee on safety should proclaim the Provisional Government and sent a letter to Mr. Stevens closing in this way:

> We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

And after that request was made Minister Stevens ordered or requested Capt. Wiltse to land.

Mr. TELLER. How long after?

Mr. GRAY. On the same day.

Mr. HOAR. Now, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOAR. May I be pardoned one moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator himself gives away two-thirds of his previous statement. He says they ordered or requested the naval officer to land the marines. These two phrases which he treats as equivalent contain all the difference in the world.

I may as well state now as at any time (I will interfere with the Senator from New Hampshire with but one sentence) that I do not conceive there can be constitutionally lodged in an American minister or an American citizen by any act of the President the authority to command a fleet or the captain of a ship. Undoubtedly we may say to the commander of our fleet at Constantinople, "If you shall hear from the minister in Greece that he thinks it advisable you shall repair to the Piræus and protect American interests;" but the authority must come from the official superior to the officer, and the request or suggestion from the minister is a mere condition, as if he had said, when the sun rise, or if there be an earthquake, or if there be a fire, or if there be disorder, you shall do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the printing of the message of the President with the accompanying documents and their reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. DANIEL. May I say a few words before that is done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by the courtesy of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not wish to trespass on the Senator from New Hampshire unless with entire convenience to himself. I desire to occupy only about three minutes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will gladly yield to the Senator from Virginia for a few minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. President, I wish briefly to answer the point made by the Senator from Massachusetts, that no power can be lodged, as he says, in a minister of the United States to give orders to the military forces of the United States, a point which he makes for the purpose, I presume, of criticising the conduct of the present Administration.

Mr. HOAR. Not at all. The Senator will pardon me. That was a point entirely introduced by my honorable friend from Virginia, and I made my statement of the law in answer to his question. The remark was not made for the sake of criticising anybody.

Mr. DANIEL. Well, the general trend of the remarks of the Senator are adverse to the conduct of affairs by the present Administration.

Mr. HOAR. Yes; I think so. That I will admit.

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad now that we concur. I thought we did all the time as to that point. I wish simply to answer that point in the brief time allotted me in so far as to say that the point is a much belated one; that it is now over a year old, and should have been previously applied to the conduct of Minister Stevens, who assumed with respect to the military forces of the United States the attitude of a supreme commander-in-chief above the admiral, above the President, above the Congress, above the laws, and above the Constitution of the United States, and who through them made himself, and through himself made the United States, whether rightfully or wrongfully, the supreme sovereign authority in the Hawaiian Islands.

The Senator from Massachusetts refers, as does the late minister of the United States, Mr. Stevens, to the landing of troops for the protection of life and property. If he means American life and property that is one thing, but I call his attention to the fact avowed by Minister Stevens in his proclamation, that he entered the Hawaiian Islands with the strong hand of war, and that the Hawaiian flag was hauled down and surrendered, and the United States flag, under his orders, was raised over the capitol building at Honolulu with martial forces around it to support it there for the protection not of American property, for the protection not of American lives, but, according to the invitation of the Provisional Government, to assume the occupancy of the Hawaiian soil and the sovereignty of the Hawaiian people for the protection of all property, whether English, American, German, Chinese, Japanese, or Hawaiian, and for the protection of all the lives of the 90,000 population.

I ask the Senator, as he has investigated this subject much for the purpose of calling the attention of the American people to any who may have transgressed the Constitution or the laws, where has he found sanction in our Constitution, in our laws, for an American minister to invade a foreign country and assume in the name of the United States the sovereign protectorate over all the lives and property in it at anybody's invitation. It may be all right so far as resigning a weak, *de facto* government was concerned, but is it all right as far as this Government and its Constitution and its laws are concerned?

Now, is it not obvious to the Senator from Massachusetts that when this Government, whether rightfully or wrongfully, whether legally or illegally, had been placed in the attitude of holding the sovereignty over the soil and over the property and over the lives of that people, a condition of things had been created in which all former laws were abrogated and all former powers abdicated, and in which we had to extricate ourselves from a diplomatic mess as best we could? I should like to hear from him when he shall speak on this occasion, from his learned and trained mind, as to what was the status between Hawaii and the United States brought about by this conquest of its soil and this sovereignty over its people.

I beg leave to call his attention to the fact that the attitude in which is placed the American minister by my remarks is the attitude in which, in the Administration of Benjamin Harrison, the letters of the Secretary of State placed him, and that his elevation of the American flag (which the Senator says signified nothing more than his holding a flag out of a window) was regarded by Secretary Foster as an assumption and usurpation of power, and was especially repudiated *eo nomine* by him in legal effect. According to the instructions given the American min-

ister that flag was ordered to be hauled down by Secretary Foster before the present Administration came into power.

This is all I have to say for the present, Mr. President.

Mr. HOAR. I think before we get through I shall show the Senator that the facts are not as he understands them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the motion that the President's message and accompanying documents be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: I understand that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] desires to say something in the course of a day or two on this matter, and therefore, with the leave of the Senate, I should like to have the President's message and documents remain on the table for the present, if there be no objection.

Mr. GORMAN. And printed.

Mr. HOAR. Just let them be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the motion by which the message and documents were ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations be reconsidered, and the message and documents be printed and lie on the table. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TARIFF POLICY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the resolution heretofore submitted by me be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER, December 20, 1893, as follows:

Resolved, That in view of the widespread industrial depression existing in our land, bringing disaster to the manufacturing interests and loss of employment and suffering to the wage-earning classes, it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that it is unwise to attempt any change in the tariff laws now on the statute books during the present Administration, believing as we do that the announcement that the protection to American industries and American labor secured by the McKinley tariff law is to be continued will reopen the factories and workshops of the country, giving remunerative employment to the hundreds of thousands of operatives now in enforced idleness, thus doing away with the suffering and destitution which prevail to a greater extent than ever before in the history of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I believe that if this resolution were adopted the business depression now upon the country would practically cease.

Never since the year in which the President of the United States was born—the terrible year of 1837—has there been such suffering, sorrow, and destitution in our land as exist to-day. From every State of the American Union, and from all classes and conditions of men, the cry for relief comes. From all the great industrial centers and from the laboring masses of our people comes the plea to Congress to leave the existing tariff law intact. In this plea Democrats unite with Republicans, and the employés with their employers. But in the very face of it all, the Democratic party seems intent upon overthrowing the high protective principle and substituting some form of a tariff for revenue only.

While the poor man asks for employment and his children suffer for bread the Democratic leaders coolly propose to enact a law that will necessarily reduce both the amount and the price of labor in this country, and bring the American workingman in direct competition with the labor of foreign nations, from which an army of toilers flee every year to the United States. It is an astonishing and an alarming condition of things, which has already wrought untold misery upon the workingman and brought incalculable loss and suffering to the manufacturers of the North.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE TARIFF.

In his message to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of the second session of the Fifty third Congress the President made use of some most extraordinary language. In alluding to the Wilson tariff bill he frankly avowed that "the local interests affected by the proposed reform are so numerous and so varied that if all are insisted upon the legislation embodying the reform must inevitably fail." What stronger language could any Republican use than that? Indeed, the interests affected by the proposed tariff legislation are varied and numerous. They are found everywhere throughout the North, and upon their continuance depends the happiness and prosperity of intelligent and industrious communities. They have built up magnificent cities and enterprising villages; they have given employment to our people; they have established and maintained a high rate of wage, and they have created a home market for every dollar's worth of surplus product that the farmer has to sell.

But all this is now to be changed. These numerous and varied industries are advised by the President to remain silent while they are utterly destroyed by the Democratic party, in pretended fulfillment of a monstrously absurd promise in a political platform. Possibly they will remain silent, but the indications are that the lion of labor is being unleashed, and the party that passes the tariff bill that the President so strongly commends will have abundant leisure after the scepter of power has been wrested from it to regret its folly.

Again the President says:

Even if the often disproved assertion could be made good that a lower rate of wages would result from free raw materials and low tariff duties, the intelligence of our workingmen leads them quickly to discover that their steady employment, permitted by free raw materials, is the most important factor in their relation to tariff legislation.

THE M'KINLEY LAW GAVE PROSPERITY.

Let us see how that is. From the day the McKinley tariff law was enacted until the inauguration of Grover Cleveland on the 4th day of March last, unparalleled prosperity was upon all the country. No industrious man or woman was involuntarily out of employment in all the North. Every spindle was running, and the music of the loom and the hammer was heard throughout our borders. Wages were higher than those paid in any other land, and relatively higher than was ever before paid in the United States. All was peace, happiness, and contentment. But the Democratic party triumphed on a platform which declared high protection to be unconstitutional and a robbery. Notice was served upon the country that the promises of the platform were to be redeemed.

Almost immediately industrial depression commenced and work became scarce. What other result could reasonably have been expected? When this depression came the President, instead of patriotically declaring that he would oppose all efforts to overthrow protection, hastily summoned Congress together in August last, saying to the country that the whole trouble came from the so-called Sherman silver law, and that when the purchasing clause of that law had been repealed prosperity would again be assured. I did not agree with the President in that view, and on the 16th day of August—nine days after the assembling of the special session—took occasion to express my dissent in the Senate Chamber. Among other things I said on that occasion, speaking of affairs in my own State:

Mr. President, does anybody suppose that the wholesale dry-goods houses are refusing to buy Amoskeag ginghams because they are afraid that when the bills come due they will be allowed to pay them in dollars worth only 60 cents. Is it strange that people do not buy Amoskeag ginghams for future use when the great Democratic party is pledged to practically abolish the duty on them, and open a home market to the stocks that have been accumulating in England since the passage of the McKinley bill?

Is it any wonder that manufacturers hesitate about piling up goods which they may be obliged to sell in free competition with those produced abroad by labor costing only two-thirds what they pay for it here? What is there strange about that, and how will the repeal of the Sherman law help out that condition of things?

Is there anything mysterious in the fact that, with an avowed bitter and all-powerful enemy of every protected industry in the White House, and with both Houses of Congress pledged to carry out his destructive purposes, capital goes into hiding, industry ceases, and bankruptcy runs riot through the country? I discover nothing mysterious in this matter. It is the logical outcome of the triumph of a party pledged to the destruction of high protection in this country.

I need not tell the Senate or the country that those utterances have been justified by results. The Sherman silver law was repealed, largely by Republican votes, but what has become of the President's prophecy? Where is the renewed prosperity the country was to have? Where the labor for the unemployed, and where the bread for the hungry? Equally futile will be his promise that when the numerous and varied industries of New England and the North are crippled by Democratic tariff legislation the poor sop of free raw materials will give steady employment to the workingmen of our country. New England does not ask for free raw materials, but she does ask for legislation that will protect manufacturer and laborer alike from the underpaid labor of Europe and Asia.

FREE RAW MATERIALS A FALLACY.

"Free raw materials." What a fallacy the term is. Why, Mr. President, there is nothing in this universe that can properly be called a "raw material"—certainly nothing that can be moved from one place to another is entitled to that designation. The tree standing in the forest comes the nearest to it, but the moment the ax is laid to the tree it ceases to be raw material. Labor has entered into and become a part of the product, and to that extent it should be protected. Coal and iron ore quietly resting in the bowels of the earth may be called raw materials, but when they are mined and put on cars or vessels, and transported from one point to another, they cease to be raw materials, their chief value being in the labor which has been expended upon them. One definition has it that "actual raw material is a product of the earth in its normal condition." I like that definition, because it is a correct one.

If the Democratic party would only study it a little they would see that the raw material of one class is the finished product of another, and that at every step in the development American labor has a right to demand its full share of protection. New England asks for neither free coal, free iron ore, free lum-

ber, or free wool. In them all is represented the toil and sweat of honest men—toil and sweat which have a right to demand adequate protection from the cheaper labor of Canada, Nova Scotia, Australia, and South America. Free raw materials and reduced tariff duties will primarily injure the workingman by lessening wages, and secondarily the manufacturer, because the laboring classes will have practically nothing with which to buy the products of our mills. It has been our boast that as a nation we consumed per capita more than any other country on the face of the earth (twice or three times as much as some), but all that will change when wages are reduced and the poor man finds it difficult to earn enough to procure food and shelter for his family.

THE UNEMPLOYED AND THE CAUSE.

Mr. President, it was my intention when the resolution was offered to present voluminous statistics which I had carefully collected, showing the number and condition of the unemployed in this country. But every Senator must have reasonably accurate information on this point, and I will content myself with saying in a general way that special reports recently made to Bradstreet's agency show that there are in 119 American cities, in enforced idleness, 801,000 workingmen, upon whom 1,956,000 people depend for support. Extend that to all the cities and large towns of the country, and the magnitude of the disaster which has come upon labor is absolutely appalling. And this is not all. There are other hundreds of thousands who are working at reduced rates and on short hours, thus getting only enough to keep the wolf from the door by the most rigid economy.

As an illustration of how things are going on under the shadow of the impending Wilson tariff bill, one of the leading New England woolen manufacturers said a few days ago that he was running his mills at less than one-half their cap city and on only the cheaper grade of goods. To induce merchants to buy these he has been obliged to practically guarantee them against loss in case the market price should be forced down by the passage, or prospect of the passage, of the Wilson bill. He also said that many of the woolen mills which were starting up were doing so for the purpose of getting out their samples, and not because they had orders amounting to anything. He represented the condition of affairs in the woolen manu acturing business as far the worst he had ever seen during nearly fifty years of practical experience.

With the Wilson bill a law, in his opinion the conditions will be much worse than now and will be more likely to be absolutely ruinous to woolen manufacturing, even with the great reduction in wages that is sure to come. The manufacturer quoted was not talking as an alarmist nor as a politician, but simply as a business man who sees the results of the sturdy efforts of two generations crumbling away and himself utterly powerless to prevent it. He was in a state of despondency over the present condition of his business and its future prospects both for himself and his employés.

Listen to this letter:

MY DEAR SIR: We have yours of the 1st instant, and in reply would say that we are not buying paper at present. Above all, we do not wish to stock up on a falling market. If the Wilson bill passes we may buy our paper in England.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT BRANDT, JR.

TRENTON, N. J., *January 4.*

That was the letter that the agent of the Mount Holly Paper Company, of Mount Holly, Pa., received on the 4th instant. And why not? Why should this house stock up with American paper at present prices (low as they are), when the Wilson tariff bill promises them cheaper paper from the mills of England?

DEMOCRATS AS WELL AS REPUBLICANS OPPOSED TO THE WILSON BILL.

Mr. President, I was greatly astonished to hear a distinguished Senator from a Southern State, a few days ago, declare in impassioned words that Republican manufacturers are closing their mills so as to create public sentiment against the reform of the tariff. It seemed to me that the Senator had not reflected on his words.

Does not the Senator know the condition that exists throughout the North in manufacturing districts? Does he not know that the petitions which are pouring in from workingmen come from Democrats as well as Republicans, and that the mass meetings that are being held in Northern cities to protest against the proposed tariff laws are nonpartisan? Does he not know that Democratic manufacturers, one of them the member of the Democratic national committee from New Hampshire, have been in Washington begging and pleading to be saved from their own folly in helping to elect Mr. Cleveland and a Democratic Congress? If he does not know these things he ought to acquaint himself with the facts before making such a serious charge against the Republican manufacturers of the country.

Does the Senator not know that according to a recent statement from Dun & Co., of New York, this reliable house says that—

Starting with the largest trade ever known, mills crowded with work and all business stimulated by high hopes, the year of 1893 has proved, in sudden shrinkage of trade, in commercial disasters and depression of industries, the worst for fifty years. Whether the final results of the panic of 1837 were relatively more severe, the scanty records of that time do not clearly show. The year closes with the prices of many products the lowest ever known, with millions of workers seeking in vain for work, and with charity laboring to keep back suffering and starvation in all our cities.

STARTLING STATISTICS.

The same trade circular gives the following dismal review of existing conditions:

All hope the new year may bring brighter days, but the dying year leaves only a dismal record. The review of different departments of trade given to-day exhibits a collapse of industry and business which is almost without precedent. The iron industry sustained a weekly production of 181,551 tons of pig iron May 1, but by October 1 the output had fallen to 73,895 tons, and the recovery to about 100,000 tons December 1 still leaves 40 per cent of the force unemployed.

Over half of the woolen manufacture is idle, and, excepting a brief recovery in November, has been ever since new wool came in May, for all sales at the three chief markets in the eight months have been but 106,795,460 pounds, partly for speculation, the price having fallen 20 per cent for fleece to the lowest point ever known, against 212,339,003 pounds in the same months last year.

Sales of cotton goods are fully a quarter below the usual quantity. The small advance attempted in boots and shoes a year ago was not sustained. But with prices as low as ever, the shipments of boots and shoes from Boston are 24 per cent less than last year in December, and though in November the decrease was but 10.8 per cent it has been 22 per cent for the last four months.

Not only manufactured goods as a whole but the most important farm products are so low that producers find little comfort in the outlook. Official and other reports deluded traders with the notion that crops of last year were so short that famine prices could be realized on purchases. Enormous stocks were bought and held with the aid of banks, until heavy receipts in the spring caused a collapse of wheat, pork, and cotton pools.

Disastrous failures helped to produce the alarm which soon made money impossible to get, but even at the worst hour of the panic prices were scarcely lower than they are now. Wheat has repeatedly sold in New York and Chicago at the lowest price ever known, and is but one-half a cent above it now.

Pork fell $7 in an hour when the speculation burst, but sells lower yet today. Cotton was lifted a cent with accounts of scarcity in September, but has lost most of the gain and sells below 8 cents.

BUSINESS FAILURES.

In the matter of failures Dun & Co. say:

In thirty-seven years covered by the records of this agency the number of failures has only once risen a little above 16,650 in a year. In 1893 the number reported has been 16,650. The aggregate of liabilities in all failures reported has in six years not risen above $200,000,000. This year the strictly commercial liabilities alone have reached $331,422,939. The liabilities of banking and financial institutions have been $210,956,844, and the liabilities of railroads placed in the hands of receivers $1,212,217,033. Classified returns show 3,226 manufacturing failures, with liabilities of $164,707,449; 10,683 failures in legitimate trade, with liabilities of $85,527,836, and 302 other failures, including brokers and speculators, with liabilities of $35,662,735.

It should not be forgotten that a very large proportion of these disasters have come upon the country at a time when the banks are glutted with money and the rates of interest unusually low. What is the cause of it all, unless it is that the proposed overthrow of existing tariff laws has paralyzed business by alarming manufacturers, jobbers, and merchants? All are waiting to see what the Democratic party proposes to do for the business interests of the country.

EXPENDITURES EXCEED RECEIPTS.

Mr. President, it is pertinent to ask what is the nature of the relief promised by the so-called Wilson tariff bill? During the month of December the expenditures of the Government exceeded the receipts $7,746,233.51, and for the six months from July 1, to January 1 the deficit is $37,664,329.17. This indicates that at the end of the present fiscal year the expenditures will exceed the receipts at least $50,000,000 and possibly $75,000,000. In the face of this condition of things the Democratic party proposes changes in the rate of duties which they admit will cause a further deficit of at least $70,000,000.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator says on one point. In the published statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury it will be found that the amount of the deficit is constantly increasing, and it is now estimated at $78,000,000 for the present fiscal year.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am obliged to the Senator for that correction. I remember that a very little time ago the present Secretary of the Treasury made a suggestion that the deficit would be $28,000,000. He certainly has revised his figures very materially to have come to the conclusion that it will be $78,000,000. My attention is just called to the Secretary's statement mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. From this it appears that matters are much worse than I had supposed, as the expenditures have exceeded the receipts for the first twelve days in January over $6,000,000. If matters go on in this way the deficit for the fiscal year will be $100,000,000 at least.

In view of this condition of things what sane man can support the Democratic programme? And how is this enormous deficiency in the revenues to be met?

PROPOSED INCOME TAX—A SECTIONAL MEASURE.

The answer comes that one of the war taxes, against which our Democratic friends are in the habit of declaiming, is to be revived. An income-tax law is to be enacted. Tariff duties are to be lowered for the benefit of foreign manufacturers and the inevitable destruction of American industrial establishments, and then our own people are to be directly taxed to support the Government. Such statesmanship as that has heretofore been unknown in this country, and it remains to be seen whether the Congress of the United States will approve of the proposition.

Mr. President, this country had an income-tax law from 1863 to 1873, when it was repealed. It was adopted as a war measure, and used to help repair some of the ravages of the fierce strife of 1861–65. It was found to be inequitable, unjust, inquisitorial, and offensive—a tax upon the prosperity of our own people rather than upon the products and profits of foreign governments. It is said that such a tax will yield a revenue of $50,000,000, and thus make it possible to take off and reduce the duties on some imported articles. But how will this help the laboring man? It will not set a single American mill running or build a new one. On the contrary it will, by encouraging increased importations, close American mills, degrade American labor, and build up foreign interests at the expense of our own country. It will punish the North for its energy, enterprise, and thrift, and fasten upon this country a form of odious taxation, already once tried and repudiated—a form of taxation denounced not only by Republicans but by scores of prominent Democrats and Democratic newspapers in different parts of the United States.

Our Southern friends have much to say about sectionalism, and they never lose an opportunity to charge sectional feeling upon the North. But I know of no form of taxation so offensively sectional as this proposed income-tax law. In answer to a resolution recently introduced by me the Secretary of the Treasury has furnished the Senate tables showing the amounts paid by the several States and Territories during each of the years from 1863 to 1873, when an income-tax law was on the statute book.

These tables are so valuable that I will ask to have them incorporated as a part of my remarks. The tables are as follows:

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of the amount of revenue derived from the income tax from 1863 to 1873.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1883.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue showing the amount of tax derived from income from all sources, under the income-tax law of 1862, for the years 1863 to 1873 inclusive, called for in Senate resolution of the 11th instant.

Very respectfully,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
President of the United States Senate.

Statement showing the receipts from income tax under the law of 1862, by States and Territories, from 1863 to 1873.

1863.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Alabama			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California		$4,813.61	$4,813.61
Colorado			
Connecticut	$65.43	74,311.16	74,366.59
Dakota			
Delaware		4,255.95	4,255.95
District of Columbia	8,932.04	1,296.04	10,248.08
Florida			
Georgia			
Idaho			
Illinois	189.04	30,618.68	30,807.72
Indiana	11,468.01	19,568.41	31,036.42
Iowa	32.17	6,944.92	6,977.09
Kansas			
Kentucky	3,412.16	20,552.75	23,964.91
Louisiana			
Maine	7,896.40	29,442.28	37,338.77
Maryland	266.81	47,325.89	47,592.70
Massachusetts	1,079.77	328,230.20	329,309.97
Michigan		867.22	867.22
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri	6,910.80	17,271.95	24,182.75
Montana			
Nebraska	10.50		10.50
Nevada			
New Hampshire		11,587.07	11,587.07
New Jersey		27,280.44	27,280.44
New Mexico			
New York	372,199.14	554,955.27	927,154.41
North Carolina			
Ohio	1,922.61	86,231.06	88,153.67
Oregon	16,864.84		16,864.84
Pennsylvania	24,429.34	258,323.83	282,753.17
Rhode Island		46,697.39	46,697.39
South Carolina			
Tennessee			

Statement showing receipts from income tax, etc.—Continued.

1864.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont	$62.11	$10,849.67	$10,901.78
Virginia		2,449.45	2,449.45
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin		6,102.04	6,102.04
Wyoming			
Total	455,741.26	1,589,935.28	2,045,676.54
From salaries of United States officers and employés			696,181.71
Grand total	455,741.26	1,589,935.28	2,741,858.25

1864.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From property in U. S. owned by any citizens residing abroad and interest on U. S. securities.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Alabama				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California	$578,785.81	$3,690.01	$15,315.70	$597,791.52
Colorado	17,655.34	2.81		17,658.15
Connecticut	369,825.44	5,346.68	177,600.72	552,772.84
Dakota				
Delaware	75,999.00	296.00	9,607.19	85,902.09
District of Columbia	144,322.92	2,409.57	8,181.71	154,914.20
Florida				
Georgia				
Idaho				
Illinois	584,503.77	1,931.23	94,172.74	680,607.74
Indiana	264,488.88	159.24	66,795.46	331,443.58
Iowa	58,830.71	10.97	10,038.00	68,888.68
Kansas	22,445.04	4.38		22,449.42
Kentucky	351,607.75	1,178.38	50,593.20	403,439.33
Louisiana	29,296.82	3,532.75	13,833.93	46,663.50
Maine	101,213.47	663.43	47,490.74	149,367.64
Maryland	505,551.03	5,534.50	121,319.60	632,405.13
Massachusetts	1,882,915.99	23,414.77	540,437.31	2,446,768.07
Michigan	164,150.66	142.83	9,081.89	173,375.38
Minnesota	15,049.30	97.94	558.23	15,705.46
Mississippi				
Missouri	374,962.49	1,805.59	31,678.82	408,446.90
Montana				
Nebraska	7,303.22	6.75		7,309.97
Nevada	38,936.75			38,936.75
New Hampshire	50,163.40	464.66	27,047.33	77,675.39
New Jersey	462,747.45	3,075.39	64,050.22	549,883.06
New Mexico	1,073.43			1,073.43
New York	4,809,105.10	52,177.86	1,463,441.64	6,324,724.60
North Carolina				
Ohio	1,112,000.15	5,920.75	262,817.20	1,380,798.10
Oregon	36,571.06	25.70		36,596.76
Pennsylvania	2,018,085.71	20,371.32	533,180.65	2,561,637.68
Rhode Island	363,737.64	1,263.65	80,855.45	445,853.74
South Carolina				
Tennessee	25,463.76	1.82	1,924.60	27,390.18
Texas				
Utah	4,039.93			4,039.93
Vermont	38,185.22	280.78	17,107.51	55,573.51
Virginia	40,546.54	84.67	198.80	40,830.01
Washington	7,390.68			7,390.68
West Virginia	37,180.71	67.37	5,421.20	42,678.28
Wisconsin	125,089.81	69.65	13,484.95	138,594.41
Wyoming				
Total	14,790,313.88	134,048.44	3,656,244.79	18,589,607.11
From salaries of U. S. officers and employés				1,705,124.63
Grand total	14,790,313.88	134,048.44	3,656,244.79	20,294,731.74

1865.

Alabama				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California	$711,851.78	$2,007.32	$43,302.78	$757,161.88
Colorado	38,066.38	21.29	287.73	38,347.40
Connecticut	399,514.67	6,757.33	346,409.15	752,741.15
Dakota				
Delaware	108,387.77	1,538.92	19,079.84	129,006.53
District of Columbia	83,620.38	1,266.19	12,069.24	96,955.81
Florida				
Georgia				
Idaho				
Illinois	885,536.26	1,274.08	257,706.90	1,144,517.24
Indiana	444,786.00	705.58	156,444.91	602,036.59
Iowa	121,165.66	92.85	40,894.74	162,153.25
Kansas	54,099.33	49.50	56.60	54,205.43
Kentucky	668,324.78	2,382.37	113,815.34	784,522.49
Louisiana	97,894.59	2,746.55	34,036.56	134,677.70
Maine	99,987.38	1,065.89	97,257.29	198,340.56
Maryland	623,630.14	4,599.50	211,388.92	839,616.66

Statement showing receipts from income tax, etc.—Continued.

1865.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From property in U. S. owned by any citizens residing abroad and interest on U. S. securities.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Massachusetts	$2,163,444.65	$29,475.18	$1,388,825.25	$3,580,745.08
Michigan	204,050.26	541.07	33,912.80	238,504.13
Minnesota	27,950.40	503.41	5,185.90	33,639.71
Mississippi				
Missouri	890,372.51	760.66	104,524.02	995,657.19
Montana	10,446.00			10,446.00
Nebraska	10,761.19		83.75	10,844.94
Nevada	58,059.42			58,059.42
New Hampshire	62,449.96	843.93	64,431.18	127,725.07
New Jersey	604,573.23	5,242.94	190,844.57	860,660.74
New Mexico	18,860.40			18,860.40
New York	6,136,321.07	70,103.34	2,899,829.68	9,106,254.09
North Carolina				
Ohio	1,614,861.46	9,543.81	515,162.40	2,139,567.67
Oregon	23,822.85	1.50		23,824.35
Pennsylvania	3,274,547.70	156,203.76	1,735,472.09	5,166,223.55
Rhode Island	397,360.82	4,276.70	160,178.70	551,816.22
South Carolina				
Tennessee	134,016.92	9.90	8,922.24	142,949.06
Texas				
Utah	7,560.46			7,560.46
Vermont	58,739.53	663.34	43,818.04	103,220.91
Virginia	20,955.70	4.88		20,960.58
Washington	15,700.21			15,700.21
West Virginia	81,659.59	173.81	13,835.23	95,668.63
Wisconsin	198,300.24	351.14	21,713.15	220,364.53
Wyoming				
Total	20,400,671.69	303,326.93	8,519,527.00	29,223,225.62
From salaries of U. S. officers and employés.				2,826,491.82
Grand total	20,400,671.69	303,326.93	8,519,527.00	32,050,017.44

1866.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Special income tax for 1863.	Total tax.
Alabama	$143.91	$9,507.49		$9,651.40
Arizona				
Arkansas	8,603.31			8,603.31
California	1,296,067.29	84,302.20	$20,064.10	1,400,433.59
Colorado	82,622.48	335.45	8,728.40	91,685.33
Connecticut	1,662,652.49	378,539.59	283.50	2,041,475.58
Dakota				
Delaware	225,735.97	19,090.13	10,044.75	264,870.85
District of Columbia	345,277.23	29,754.60	1,555.35	376,587.18
Florida				
Georgia	56,035.99	20,719.29	81.89	76,837.17
Idaho	26,188.30		1,394.30	27,582.60
Illinois	3,451,007.77	428,572.32	16,316.57	3,895,896.66
Indiana	1,509,403.26	170,342.41	3,150.00	1,682,895.67
Iowa	471,776.85	51,237.63	3,559.61	526,574.09
Kansas	143,942.07	3,167.62	23,399.85	170,529.54
Kentucky	1,400,760.21	216,613.64	44,386.36	1,661,760.21
Louisiana	197,483.08	72,941.40	1,100.05	271,524.53
Maine	311,823.36	101,041.28	485.79	413,350.43
Maryland	1,788,731.94	261,402.98	4,576.74	2,054,711.66
Massachusetts	6,761,743.59	1,260,904.62	15,606.06	8,038,254.27
Michigan	783,578.00	47,840.03	31,132.15	862,550.18
Minnesota	81,458.53	11,023.14	3,091.95	95,573.62
Mississippi	60.00			60.00
Missouri	1,364,116.67	116,706.54	23,891.62	1,504,716.83
Montana	45,140.05	56.22		45,196.27
Nebraska	42,533.22	1,240.86	1,123.75	44,897.83
Nevada	88,793.19		5,340.95	94,134.14
New Hampshire	209,165.21	70,338.79	179.85	279,683.85
New Jersey	2,217,865.83	278,087.92	8,434.01	2,504,387.76
New Mexico	26,259.15		9,912.39	36,171.54
New York	18,282,251.56	2,911,067.23	146,681.40	21,340,000.19
North Carolina	695.19	303.31		998.50
Ohio	5,182,377.30	523,735.77	6,246.73	6,712,359.80
Oregon	96,648.67		2,046.06	98,694.73
Pennsylvania	9,686,621.73	1,349,676.32	40,037.03	11,076,335.08
Rhode Island	1,195,378.22	179,711.10	105.05	1,375,194.37
South Carolina	269.30			269.30
Tennessee	304,419.92	18,283.21	12,416.13	335,119.26
Texas	15,215.82			15,215.82
Utah	26,156.79		1,320.09	27,476.88
Vermont	216,904.20	44,405.75	828.69	262,139.68
Virginia	136,172.97	9,925.94	821.17	146,920.04
Washington	22,056.63		1,046.65	23,103.48
West Virginia	254,513.28	8,653.31	2,073.50	265,240.49
Wisconsin	519,231.70	37,330.82	1,086.30	557,648.82
Wyoming				
Total	60,547,882.43	8,716,881.91	452,550.09	69,717,314.43
From salaries of U. S. officers and employés.				3,717,394.69
Grand total	60,547,882.43	8,716,881.91	452,550.09	*73,434,709.12

*This total includes $452,550.09 tax collected on income of 1863 under the joint resolution of July 4, 1864, which was not included in the aggregate of tax collected on income heretofore submitted.

Statement showing receipts from income tax, etc.—Continued.

1867.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.	Number persons assessed on annual list.
Alabama	$385,482.00	$18,554.77	$404,036.77	3,407
Arizona				51
Arkansas	33,157.59	1,022.54	34,180.13	515
California	1,616,075.91	157,250.55	1,773,326.46	12,043
Colorado	75,936.80	952.23	76,889.03	494
Connecticut	1,931,611.09	303,923.70	2,238,534.79	5,832
Dakota	529.03		529.03	
Delaware	182,915.50	17,701.87	200,617.37	1,201
District of Columbia	407,184.57	21,213.84	428,398.41	2,101
Florida	14,197.29		14,197.29	411
Georgia	228,736.13	91,815.94	320,552.07	2,949
Idaho	28,436.44		28,436.44	342
Illinois	2,715,831.58	302,127.08	3,017,958.66	15,349
Indiana	878,767.65	148,163.46	1,026,931.11	5,122
Iowa	353,130.52	71,706.71	424,837.23	3,213
Kansas	134,091.20	4,225.65	138,316.85	871
Kentucky	1,071,813.77	208,348.98	1,280,162.75	5,877
Louisiana	476,557.10	109,725.32	586,282.42	7,250
Maine	284,479.90	107,109.83	391,589.73	1,741
Maryland	1,459,283.92	236,306.01	1,695,589.93	7,194
Massachusetts	7,826,355.07	1,023,398.22	8,849,753.29	23,572
Michigan	596,797.26	69,400.68	666,197.94	5,616
Minnesota	92,435.34	13,584.78	106,020.12	1,152
Mississippi	59,457.22	1,284.31	60,741.53	1,083
Missouri	1,131,832.06	103,781.27	1,235,613.33	4,531
Montana	20,671.19		20,671.19	254
Nebraska	39,429.98	951.32	40,381.30	282
Nevada	99,548.57		99,548.57	2,067
New Hampshire	220,785.13	79,366.01	300,151.14	1,645
New Jersey	2,058,669.61	453,544.47	2,512,214.08	12,418
New Mexico	21,777.73		21,777.73	211
New York	17,794,352.64	2,313,195.25	20,107,547.89	57,425
North Carolina	59,260.95	3,189.63	62,450.58	964
Ohio	4,350,581.21	531,330.09	4,881,911.30	19,618
Oregon	140,090.94		140,090.94	1,189
Pennsylvania	7,075,533.66	1,227,486.58	8,303,020.24	31,825
Rhode Island	1,393,753.59	142,017.34	1,535,770.93	2,958
South Carolina	50,390.75	11,817.73	62,208.48	1,973
Tennessee	368,967.46	27,360.40	396,327.86	2,982
Texas	148,134.97	7,205.83	155,340.80	2,235
Utah	19,713.16	661.47	20,374.63	254
Vermont	206,148.67	64,131.64	270,280.31	1,241
Virginia	178,329.57	26,283.84	204,613.41	2,090
Washington	28,926.75		28,926.75	238
West Virginia	197,708.24	10,350.62	208,058.86	1,689
Wisconsin	579,770.96	33,306.73	613,077.69	3,910
Wyoming				
Total	57,040,640.67	7,943,796.69	64,984,437.36	259,385
From salaries of U. S. officers and employés.			1,029,991.98	
Grand total	57,040,640.67	7,943,769.69	66,014,429.34	259,385

1868.

Alabama	$165,331.46	$14,493.86	$179,825.32	1,071
Arizona	6,622.20		6,622.20	92
Arkansas	35,456.71	2,407.31	37,864.02	259
California	1,846,202.24	180,682.17	2,026,884.41	8,051
Colorado	36,156.75	5,595.80	41,752.55	384
Connecticut	657,179.91	297,821.25	955,001.16	5,751
Dakota	1,757.97		1,757.97	63
Delaware	111,277.51	18,927.63	130,205.14	1,222
District of Columbia	215,536.24	19,449.62	234,985.86	1,678
Florida	24,427.98	2,070.43	26,498.41	252
Georgia	275,952.16	78,851.08	354,803.24	1,743
Idaho	40,306.58		40,306.58	333
Illinois	1,613,387.50	433,147.53	2,046,535.03	16,369
Indiana	315,313.15	171,567.64	486,880.79	5,094
Iowa	190,818.30	84,110.13	274,928.43	3,169
Kansas	54,448.50	7,195.55	61,644.05	847
Kentucky	582,235.33	138,244.29	720,479.62	5,555
Louisiana	420,957.02	88,951.81	509,908.83	5,305
Maine	125,398.43	122,082.41	247,480.84	1,699
Maryland	1,023,473.99	190,965.63	1,223,439.62	7,302
Massachusetts	4,060,590.29	1,048,439.36	5,109,029.65	21,687
Michigan	641,959.68	79,909.23	721,868.91	6,637
Minnesota	80,542.02	19,724.29	100,266.31	1,023
Mississippi	105,969.29	2,639.78	108,609.07	400
Missouri	570,353.85	121,465.91	691,819.76	4,642
Montana	28,681.80		28,681.80	361
Nebraska	24,720.38	4,395.37	29,115.75	433
Nevada	121,853.25		121,853.25	
New Hampshire	166,605.05	67,119.15	233,724.20	787
New Jersey	1,593,650.47	468,429.27	2,062,079.74	12,439
New Mexico	20,109.44		20,108.44	316
New York	9,700,458.28	2,201,426.56	11,901,884.84	53,670
North Carolina	43,712.99	11,175.99	54,888.89	554
Ohio	1,575,620.12	577,326.98	2,152,947.10	18,175
Oregon	157,278.56	350.00	157,628.56	1,367
Pennsylvania	3,739,725.64	1,570,537.43	5,310,262.47	29,239
Rhode Island	377,869.58	125,270.27	503,139.85	2,883
South Carolina	194,142.51	12,582.68	206,725.19	834
Tennessee	229,243.70	27,221.66	256,465.36	1,457
Texas	189,415.27	5,601.27	195,016.54	1,412
Utah	15,694.77		15,691.77	259
Vermont	70,127.54	77,775.89	147,903.43	1,036
Virginia	136,963.52	41,091.59	178,055.11	2,397
Washington	20,338.77		20,338.77	
West Virginia	86,925.29	19,490.05	106,415.34	1,166

Statement showing receipts from income tax, etc.—Continued.

1868.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.	Number persons assessed on annual list.
Wisconsin	$332,823.48	$36,889.31	$369,712.79	4,054
Wyoming				
Total	32,027,610.78	8,384,426.18	40,412,036.96	233,497
From salaries of U. S. officers and employés.			1,043,561.40	
Grand total	32,027,610.78	8,384,426.18	41,455,598.36	233,497

1869.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Alabama	$71,962.56	$9,130.39	$81,092.95
Arizona	4,874.71		4,874.71
Arkansas	31,738.19	1,553.54	33,291.73
California	1,142,343.45	156,797.95	1,299,141.40
Colorado	21,660.80	2,173.20	23,834.00
Connecticut	642,672.86	315,481.92	958,154.78
Dakota	810.15		810.15
Delaware	149,756.87	18,497.66	168,254.53
District of Columbia	184,875.02	18,402.09	203,277.11
Florida	26,727.30		26,727.30
Georgia	190,300.02	100,300.12	290,600.14
Idaho	27,836.37		27,836.37
Illinois	1,463,354.05	878,219.77	2,341,573.82
Indiana	346,865.94	161,381.84	508,247.78
Iowa	205,465.44	96,368.26	301,833.70
Kansas	54,442.16	5,256.82	59,698.98
Kentucky	442,026.81	136,796.41	578,833.22
Louisiana	194,749.22	83,577.74	278,326.96
Maine	106,560.84	111,486.71	218,047.55
Maryland	655,558.45	264,740.25	920,298.70
Massachusetts	2,643,123.17	1,184,774.79	3,827,897.96
Michigan	486,030.89	122,348.74	608,439.63
Minnesota	63,762.21	24,513.18	88,275.39
Mississippi	28,733.08	1,066.46	29,799.54
Missouri	527,652.25	187,626.05	715,278.30
Montana	18,530.62	1,038.47	19,569.09
Nebraska	32,160.19	3,287.90	35,448.09
Nevada	127,827.90		127,827.90
New Hampshire	114,734.20	71,614.01	186,348.21
New Jersey	1,282,295.77	367,535.85	1,649,831.62
New Mexico	10,444.40		10,444.40
New York	8,198,494.55	2,528,274.66	10,726,769.21
North Carolina	41,508.65	19,722.94	61,231.59
Ohio	1,447,157.22	592,381.77	2,039,538.99
Oregon	37,477.45	1,444.59	38,922.04
Pennsylvania	2,657,550.77	1,353,294.10	4,010,844.87
Rhode Island	451,054.63	160,818.26	611,872.89
South Carolina	76,556.09	17,801.15	94,357.24
Tennessee	190,612.24	24,557.75	215,169.99
Texas	102,744.66	3,959.52	106,704.18
Utah	22,939.97		22,939.97
Vermont	50,581.65	69,321.64	119,903.29
Virginia	124,925.78	52,081.30	177,007.08
Washington	11,351.24		11,351.24
West Virginia	74,248.58	18,408.83	92,657.41
Wisconsin	234,983.99	38,787.83	273,771.82
Wyoming	2,955.50		2,955.50
Total	25,025,068.86	9,204,824.46	34,229,893.32
From salaries of United States officers and employés			561,962.52
Grand total	25,025,068.86	9,204,824.46	34,791,855.84

1870.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Alabama	$156,166.68	$29,117.39	$185,284.07
Arizona	6,246.03		6,246.03
Arkansas	76,330.47		76,330.47
California	1,017,297.06	163,883.00	1,181,180.06
Colorado	25,426.65	826.80	26,253.45
Connecticut	709,902.18	340,806.68	1,050,708.86
Dakota	894.80		894.80
Delaware	68,723.44	18,838.39	87,561.83
District of Columbia	189,809.19	49,160.13	238,969.32
Florida	15,884.58		15,884.58
Georgia	228,946.28	132,871.89	361,818.17
Idaho	20,008.40		20,008.40
Illinois	1,166,927.65	798,823.35	1,965,751.00
Indiana	328,283.81	143,600.10	471,883.91
Iowa	163,263.21	111,192.11	274,455.32
Kansas	61,134.98	6,413.97	67,548.95
Kentucky	569,739.00	158,616.83	728,356.43
Louisiana	410,748.56	166,347.31	577,095.87
Maine	153,828.01	126,578.06	280,406.07
Maryland	864,211.84	336,179.02	1,200,390.86
Massachusetts	3,195,353.54	1,310,567.70	4,505,921.24
Michigan	454,145.42	106,794.21	560,939.63
Minnesota	76,154.15	32,699.63	108,853.78
Mississippi	90,808.61	461.81	91,270.42
Missouri	631,506.50	184,295.92	815,802.51
Montana	40,811.14	150.00	40,961.14
Nebraska	58,612.86	4,968.22	63,581.08
Nevada	85,894.85		85,894.85
New Hampshire	117,090.70	52,460.48	169,551.18
New Jersey	1,221,754.82	264,549.75	1,486,304.57
New Mexico	12,873.95		12,873.95
New York	8,145,571.06	2,274,464.44	10,420,035.50
North Carolina	58,207.15	21,940.46	80,147.61
Ohio	1,436,859.38	826,227.54	2,263,086.92

Statement showing receipts from income tax, etc.—Continued.

1870.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.
Oregon	$173,304.65	$942.85	$174,247.50
Pennsylvania	3,721,230.94	1,291,837.69	5,013,068.63
Rhode Island	359,748.99	176,664.53	536,413.52
South Carolina	117,585.14	25,662.06	143,247.20
Tennessee	221,977.90	62,906.21	284,884.11
Texas	105,236.34	5,321.13	110,557.47
Utah	9,595.68	141.23	9,736.91
Vermont	59,091.51	95,403.88	154,495.39
Virginia	180,422.56	82,219.35	262,641.91
Washington	32,104.21		32,104.21
West Virginia	74,696.27	23,705.20	98,401.47
Wisconsin	194,353.73	123,661.77	318,015.50
Wyoming	6,280.55		6,280.55
Total	27,115,046.11	9,551,301.09	36,666,347.20
From salaries of United States officers and employés			1,109,526.42
Grand total	27,115,046.11	9,551,301.09	37,775,873.62

1871.

Alabama	$56,201.47	$22,048.07	$78,249.54
Arizona	5,939.54		5,939.54
Arkansas	17,937.31	157.57	18,094.88
California	513,356.02	88,370.32	601,726.34
Colorado	18,806.34	1,367.25	20,173.59
Connecticut	157,752.72	138,778.66	296,531.38
Dakota	81.17		81.17
Delaware	50,008.51	5,388.57	55,397.08
District of Columbia	62,208.45	12,175.49	74,383.94
Florida	20,918.08		20,918.08
Georgia	97,031.58	83,198.46	180,230.04
Idaho	11,318.74	2,788.38	14,107.12
Illinois	332,063.44	78,328.20	410,391.64
Indiana	82,553.32	72,769.33	155,322.65
Iowa	51,649.58	53,631.62	105,281.20
Kansas	15,128.65	7,364.46	22,993.11
Kentucky	156,416.80	101,053.34	257,470.14
Louisiana	154,286.88	82,077.48	236,364.36
Maine	40,349.23	51,153.02	91,502.25
Maryland	318,507.27	189,577.64	508,084.91
Massachusetts	1,450,748.96	461,059.96	1,911,808.92
Michigan	332,689.42	43,740.84	376,430.26
Minnesota	10,954.29	16,861.50	27,815.79
Mississippi	70,556.34	1,572.33	72,128.67
Missouri	276,582.55	123,558.29	400,140.84
Montana	11,798.21	101.38	11,899.59
Nebraska	2,850.78	1,998.67	4,849.45
Nevada	36,644.64		36,644.64
New Hampshire	32,961.14	36,504.95	69,466.09
New Jersey	264,501.05	148,394.69	412,895.74
New Mexico	8,141.81		8,141.81
New York	6,185,124.87	997,793.73	7,182,918.60
North Carolina	22,619.34	22,790.97	45,410.31
Ohio	475,850.56	355,135.66	830,986.22
Oregon	55,414.18	979.05	56,393.23
Pennsylvania	2,497,575.76	359,441.35	2,857,017.11
Rhode Island	130,476.03	83,807.79	214,283.82
South Carolina	48,867.19	28,842.17	77,709.36
Tennessee	72,105.21	29,979.67	102,084.88
Texas	64,231.27	9,162.46	73,393.73
Utah	9,409.27	2,533.37	11,942.64
Vermont	40,023.32	49,059.40	89,082.72
Virginia	54,443.30	43,162.29	97,605.59
Washington	4,306.50	91.95	4,398.45
West Virginia	19,224.08	12,300.42	31,524.50
Wisconsin	91,636.93	121,338.06	212,974.99
Wyoming	1,507.29		1,507.29
Total	14,434,949.39	3,940,438.81	18,375,388.20
From salaries of United States officers and employés			787,262.55
Grand total	14,434,949.39	3,940,438.81	19,162,650.75

1872.

Alabama	$22,199.96	$13,599.45	$35,799.41
Arizona	1,868.18		1,868.18
Arkansas	8,042.84		8,042.84
California	209,460.20	155,807.93	365,268.13
Colorado	14,750.98	14,701.85	29,452.83
Connecticut	161,195.05	200,261.75	361,456.80
Dakota	85.26		85.26
Delaware	24,846.85	14,910.49	39,757.34
District of Columbia	55,016.52	6,839.15	61,855.67
Florida	5,384.77		5,384.77
Georgia	53,192.86	80,619.01	133,811.87
Idaho	2,706.33	598.49	3,304.82
Illinois	195,748.81	313,522.25	509,271.06
Indiana	66,675.93	96,280.66	162,956.59
Iowa	31,494.69	87,803.43	119,298.12
Kansas	10,654.11	5,829.78	16,483.89
Kentucky	108,797.30	132,860.49	241,657.88
Louisiana	61,977.74	40,624.88	102,602.62
Maine	36,222.00	59,505.64	95,727.64
Maryland	283,852.66	208,768.90	492,621.56
Massachusetts	1,229,434.50	863,499.57	2,092,934.15
Michigan	137,281.66	91,526.40	228,808.06
Minnesota	27,734.23	34,258.54	61,992.77
Mississippi	17,365.12	245.41	17,610.53
Missouri	104,661.92	82,347.90	187,009.82
Montana	5,744.64	599.64	6,344.28
Nebraska	3,029.60	2,652.87	5,682.47
Nevada	21,627.14		21,627.14

Statement showing receipts from income tax, etc.—Continued.

1872.

States and Territories.	Personal tax.	From corporations.	Total tax.
New Hampshire	$16,977.55	$28,505.59	$45,483.14
New Jersey	399,530.92	105,543.77	505,074.69
New Mexico	4,512.94	465.49	4,978.43
New York	3,076,924.80	1,236,798.51	4,313,723.31
North Carolina	15,330.28	26,625.14	41,955.42
Ohio	414,880.64	424,558.14	839,438.78
Oregon	36,144.27	----------	36,144.27
Pennsylvania	1,063,206.13	918,948.78	1,982,154.91
Rhode Island	172,921.85	60,988.47	233,910.32
South Carolina	19,353.52	29,268.88	48,622.40
Tennessee	50,011.78	44,115.19	94,126.97
Texas	57,624.31	17,490.45	75,114.76
Utah	19,235.86	3,864.43	23,100.29
Vermont	24,371.05	58,901.98	83,273.03
Virginia	48,727.03	70,826.04	119,553.07
Washington	5,227.58	----------	5,227.58
West Virginia	21,817.10	12,112.56	33,929.66
Wisconsin	67,932.17	88,933.36	156,865.53
Wyoming	904.07	----------	904.07
Total	8,416,685.87	5,725,611.26	14,142,297.13
From salaries of United States officers and employés	----------	----------	294,564.65
Grand total	8,416,685.87	5,725,611.26	14,436,861.78

1873.

Alabama	$8,305.16	$1,137.59	$9,442.75
Arizona	1,133.07	----------	1,133.07
Arkansas	1,818.32	----------	1,813.22
California	91,438.90	561.97	92,000.87
Colorado	13,350.40	----------	13,350.40
Connecticut	52,532.94	448.49	52,981.43
Dakota	118.74	----------	118.74
Delaware	6,750.81	5,675.51	12,426.32
District of Columbia	11,749.31	----------	11,749.31
Florida	5,487.17	----------	5,487.17
Georgia	16,938.66	1,511.75	18,450.41
Idaho	595.16	----------	595.16
Illinois	79,051.77	4,739.49	83,791.26
Indiana	5,426.63	4,360.52	9,787.15
Iowa	6,302.62	3,930.05	10,232.67
Kansas	347.77	480.60	828.37
Kentucky	10,244.97	11,675.00	21,919.97
Louisiana	7,796.83	618.33	8,415.16
Maine	8,111.11	1,656.80	9,767.91
Maryland	97,382.70	5,116.62	102,499.33
Massachusetts	449,284.83	20,761.94	470,046.77
Michigan	124,960.51	4,454.93	129,415.44
Minnesota	12,911.54	4,580.51	17,492.05
Mississippi	12,462.27	170.81	12,633.08
Missouri	35,531.56	731.27	36,262.83
Montana	2,076.52	----------	2,076.52
Nebraska	1,732.23	741.11	2,473.34
Nevada	14,938.74	----------	14,938.74
New Hampshire	20,489.80	3,675.13	24,164.93
New Jersey	286,907.24	2,203.54	289,110.78
New Mexico	1,253.91	----------	1,253.91
New York	1,504,448.24	584,478.57	2,088,926.81
North Carolina	5,578.85	5,076.98	10,655.83
Ohio	84,295.94	11,138.43	95,434.37
Oregon	4,980.50	----------	4,980.50
Pennsylvania	879,155.93	305,853.18	1,185,009.11
Rhode Island	12,983.44	1,344.11	14,327.55
South Carolina	9,067.09	3,000.57	12,067.66
Tennessee	3,250.57	1,296.61	4,547.18
Texas	8,257.32	2,316.33	10,573.65
Utah	6,503.41	----------	6,506.41
Vermont	4,768.60	8.50	4,777.10
Virginia	4,631.18	23,261.75	27,292.93
Washington	335.69	----------	335.69
West Virginia	3,052.17	510.14	3,562.31
Wisconsin	8,983.42	----------	8,983.42
Wyoming	125.22	----------	125.22
Total	3,927,252.76	1,017,517.14	4,944,769.90
From salaries of United States officers and employés	----------	----------	117,541.72
Grand total	3,927,252.76	1,017,517.14	5,062,311.62

RECAPITULATION BY YEARS.

Years.	From personal income.	From corporations.	From property in U. S. owned by any citizens residing abroad and interest on U. S. securities.	From income of 1863, special duty on.
1863	$455,741.26	$1,589,935.28	----------	----------
1864	14,799,313.88	3,656,244.79	$134,048.44	----------
1865	20,400,671.69	8,519,527.00	303,326.93	----------
1866	60,547,882.43	8,716,881.91	----------	$452,550.09
1867	57,040,640.67	7,943,796.69	----------	----------
1868	32,027,619.78	8,384,426.18	----------	----------
1869	25,623,068.86	9,204,824.46	----------	----------
1870	27,115,040.11	2,551,301.09	----------	----------
1871	14,434,949.39	3,940,438.81	----------	----------
1872	8,416,685.87	5,725,611.26	----------	----------
1873	3,927,252.76	1,017,517.14	----------	----------
Total	284,190,863.70	68,250,504.61	437,375.37	452,550.09

Statement showing receips from income tax, etc.—Continued.

Years.	Total.	From salaries of U. S. officers and employés.	Grand total.
1863	$2,045,676.54	$696,181.71	$2,741,858.25
1864	18,589,607.11	1,705,124.63	20,294,731.74
1865	29,223,525.62	2,826,491.82	32,050,017.44
1866	69,717,314.43	3,717,394.69	73,434,709.13
1867	64,984,437.36	1,029,991.98	66,014,429.34
1868	40,412,036.96	1,043,561.40	41,455,598.36
1869	34,229,893.32	561,962.52	34,791,855.84
1870	36,665,347.20	1,109,526.42	37,775,873.62
1871	18,375,388.20	787,262.55	19,162,650.75
1872	14,142,297.13	294,564.65	14,436,861.78
1873	4,944,769.90	117,541.72	5,062,311.62
Total	333,331,293.77	13,880,604.09	347,220,897.86

AN INSTRUCTIVE ANALYSIS.

An analysis of these tables is instructive and suggestive. It appears that the grand total collected during the eleven years of the income-tax law was $347,220,887.86. Of this amount the sixteen Southern States, including the border States of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and West Virginia, paid $36,624,819.69, while the Northern States and Territories paid $296,706,524.28, the unaccounted balance (about $13,000,000) having been paid by United States officers and employés.

While the entire South paid $36,624,819.69, the eleven distinctively Southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, paid only $10,651,061.30, or about 3 per cent of the entire amount.

The Northern States paid over eight times as much as the South, and nearly thirty times as much as the eleven distinctively Southern States.

The six New England States paid $61,584,093.29, or 70 per cent more than the entire South, and six times as much as the eleven distinctively Southern States.

Massachusetts paid $41,162,496.35, being four millions and a half more than the entire South. Pennsylvania paid $47,748,326.82, being eleven millions more than the South, while New York paid $104,499,939.45, nearly one-third of the entire tax, and almost three times as much as the entire South.

That the tax was an unpopular one, and exceedingly difficult of collection, is shown by the fact that in 1873, the last year the law was in force, Pennsylvania paid 59 per cent as much as in 1872, New Hampshire 55 per cent, Massachusetts 24 per cent, Virginia 23 per cent, Louisiana 8 per cent, and Tennessee and Rhode Island only 6 per cent.

It is now proposed to revive this odious and inquisitorial tax, with the certainty that the North will have to pay the bulk of it, thus enabling the promoters of the Wilson tariff bill to strike down our manufacturing interests in behalf of importers and foreign manufacturers. It is a monstrous proposition, and it remains to be seen whether Northern Representatives and Senators will give their support to such a sectional and unjust scheme of taxation—a law that would necessarily turn a swarm of spies and informers loose upon the country, and pay a premium to tax-dodging and perjury.

And not only is the income-tax proposition sectional and unjust, but the entire Wilson bill is constructed along the same line. Southern rice is enormously protected, while Northern agricultural products are mostly on the free list. Southern oranges are cared for, but Northern apples are ignored. Southern marble is highly protected, but Northern granite is made to suffer. Iron ties for Southern cotton are looked after, but iron bales for Northern hay are heavily taxed, notwithstanding the hay crop of the United States, according to the census reports of 1890, amounted to $400,000,000, and the cotton crop to only $305,000,000. That is the kind of legislation that it is proposed to enact, and Northern Senators are expected to support it by their votes.

A SEVERE BLOW AT NEW ENGLAND IN THE INTERESTS OF CANADA.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to point out the evil effects of the proposed tariff legislation upon the North as a whole. Let me for a moment call attention to its effect upon the industries and products of New England. We are in close proximity to Canada, a country which has a high protective tariff against almost everything we manufacture and produce. The McKinley tariff law adequately protects our lumber and agricultural products against the lumber and agricultural products of our Canadian neighbors. But the Wilson tariff bill absolutely destroys the lumber industry of Northern New England, and in addition by putting lime, wool, vegetables, fruits, eggs, milk, and other articles on the free list, as well as greatly reducing the duties on horses, cattle, butter, hay, potatoes, leaf tobacco, and other agricultural products, the extent of the injury to our agriculturists can scarcely be estimated.

What wonder is it that the St. John Telegraph editorially says, "Now we will have a Canadian boom"? What wonder is it that the Toronto Globe declares that "the free list is most comprehensive" and is "advantageous to Canadians"? or that the Montreal Herald asserts that "our trade with the United States, which has rapidly fallen off for the last ten years, will pick up wonderfully if the Wilson bill becomes a law"? The Montreal Gazette acknowledges that "Canada's interest in the measure is somewhat extensive," and publicly boasts that "it is evident that the fact was not forgotten by the framers of the bill." Of course it was not forgotten. The Wilson bill is fashioned for the benefit of foreign producers, irrespective of nationality or allegiance. It is a world-wide measure, designed to give English, German, French, Canadian, Mexican, and Asiatic alike full access to American markets.

The only people it is intended to injure are American people; and it will not permanently give American consumers a single article for less than is now paid. When the McKinley bill passed Canadian cattle and horses were reduced in price the amount of the increased tariff, and now they will go up again as high as the price in the adjoining States. There is no doubt of that. What wonder is it that a prominent Canadian joyfully exclaims:

The Wilson bill will give Canada a great boom, and kill annexation. If this taking off the tariff by the Wilson bill did not benefit Canadians, what are we rejoicing over? Would we rejoice if the United States got the benefit? This bill is worth millions to Canada.

But, Mr. President, the full extent of the damage to New England can only be understood when it is realized that a tremendous cut is to be made in the duties on the manufactures of wool and cotton, granite, cutlery, jewelry, brick, and many other articles. But the heaviest and most disastrous blow will fall upon the knitting industry of our section of the country. Already the business is paralyzed and wages reduced in these establishments. A few days ago I presented a petition from the employés of the Olzendam Hosiery Company, of Manchester, N. H., signed by both Democrats and Republicans, saying they would hold the men responsible at the polls who would vote in Congress to destroy their best interests.

THE HOSIERY INDUSTRY.

There are knitting mills scattered all over the Northern States which have heretofore been prosperous and have given employment to a great many people at good wages. How do the owners and employés like the prospect now? In the ten years ending with the close of 1890 these establishments were increased one and a half times, or 150 per cent; the number of employés was more than doubled, while the sum paid out to them in wages increased from $7,000,000 to $18,000,000. All this time prices of manufactured goods have been continually growing less, because of improved facilities and home competition. But the new tariff will knock out all this business, unless wages come down to the price paid in Germany. In the McKinley tariff cotton hosiery is in four classes, according to prices, which range from 60 cents to $4 a dozen.

A compound duty is levied, rising from 20 cents a dozen and 20 per cent on the value to $1 a dozen and 40 per cent on the value. Cotton underwear is also put into four classes, from $1 a dozen to $7 a dozen. The duty rises from $1 a dozen and 35 per cent on the value to $2 a dozen and 40 per cent on the value. The proposed new bill sweeps away both the classifications and the duties. It puts upon stockings and underwear under $1.50 a dozen a single duty of 30 per cent on the value. Upon goods of higher grade is laid a duty of 35 per cent on the value, excepting that so-called "fashioned" fabrics shall pay 40 per cent. In the case of most of the articles these changes would involve a reduction of duty from two-fifths to one-half. The reductions upon woolen knit goods would be equally large. There is not a knitting mill in the United States that could continue operations with only a 30 per cent duty on the value of the goods, and pay the wages now paid in this country.

A MESSAGE OF DESTRUCTION.

So here is the message of destruction that the Democratic party proposes to send to the employers and working people in the scores of knitting mills all over New England and New York. Pass this atrocious bill and a thousand hosiery establishments will stop their machinery and close their doors, or else more than sixty thousand American men and women will accept wages such as are paid to the half-starved people of Saxony. One hundred thousand Americans depend for their daily bread upon the knitting industry alone, while as many more employed in spinning yarn and making machinery can prosper only when the knitting industry has prosperity. For all this host of honest Americans, and, indeed, for the men who have built up the business with their capital and enterprise, the advocates of tariff reform seem to have no more consideration than for a swarm of flies.

What is the motive of the attack upon these people? Is it that the fabrics may be cheapened? Never since knitting was invented were they as cheap as they are to-day. It will inevitably operate to the great benefit and enrichment of England and Germany by giving them our markets, or the wages of our operatives must come down so we can successfully compete with foreign countries. That's all there is to it or about it, and the laboring men are making note of it.

REDUCED TARIFF WILL NOT LOWER PRICES.

Mr. President, I know that it is contended that so-called tariff reform will cheapen all articles of consumption, and thus benefit the masses. History teaches otherwise, but even if it were so, how is the laboring man benefited by cheap clothing when he has nothing with which to buy it. President Fillmore, in 1852, pointed out that when foreign countries get possession of our markets they fix the price to suit themselves. It has been so under every low tariff that the country has had, and will be so if the proposed new tariff becomes a law. The experiences of 1837 and 1857 will be repeated, and after great suffering a President and Congress will be elected charged with the commission to again restore the high-protective principle.

Instead, however, of prices having increased under high tariff laws, as our Democratic friends have taught the people to believe, the contrary is the fact. A recent issue of the American Grocer gave a table showing the quantity of food products that $100 would buy at wholesale rates for the past thirty years.

The table is as follows:

Articles.		1862–'67.	1872–'77.	1882–'87.	1891.
Tea, Japan	pounds	187	244	454	500
Sugar	do	606	891	1,333	1,848
Mess beef	barrels	7	8.25	8.25	13
Mess pork	do	4.5	5.5	6.6	8.7
Lard	pounds	666	909	1,143	1,579
Coffee	do	867	518	903	581
Flour	barrels	13.7	16.1	15.1	18
Corn	bushels	120	141	166	175
Bacon	pounds	752	990	1,042	1,316
Butter	do	294	300	370	381
Molasses	gallons	188	285	392	600
Rice	pounds	800	1,111	1,540	1,730
Starch	do	1,052	1,033	2,273	2,665
Soap	do	1,000	1,470	2,000	2,500
Potatoes	bushels	98	120	125	154

It will be observed that in the entire list only one article (coffee) cost more in 1891 than at any former period named in the table, while many articles were bought in 1891 for less than one-half what they cost in some former years.

THE TARIFF OF 1846.

Mr. President, Democratic orators and newspapers make the astounding claim that the tariff of 1846 brought universal prosperity to this country and that the workingmen from 1846 to 1860 enjoyed better wages and better living than for any like period since. Every man who lived during the period of the Walker tariff law knows to the contrary, and yet this statement is made, repeated, and reiterated without a blush by our Democratic friends. They never cease to talk about this period as "the golden era of prosperity." Why, I know a reputable citizen of New Hampshire who says that during that period he cut a cord of green hard wood, split it, hauled it to the market, 8 miles, and exchanged it even for an arithmetic. He must surely have been impressed with the feeling that it was a "golden era of prosperity." A recent letter to one of the leading papers of my State, by an intelligent workingman, shows that utter misrepresentations are being made on this point. He says:

The pay roll of the Gilford Hosiery Mill in Laconia for the month of February, 1849, was taken and averaged at ten hours per day, and the wages, including overseers, averaged 39½ cents per day. In the Ashland Knitting Company's Mill for February, 1893, the pay averaged $1.14 per day of ten hours, including overseers, the same as in the other case. A bill of goods charged on a book kept in John Shepherd's store in this town in the month of February, 1849, amounting to $18.08, was compared with the same bill figured at the price of goods in the same store in February, 1893, and it was found they could have been bought for $14.47 at the latter date. Thus in 1849 it would have taken forty-six days' work to buy the goods amounting to $18.08, and in 1893 it would have taken only thirteen days to buy the same goods then reduced in price to $14.47.

It does not require a great mathematician to figure out the fact that it took three and one-half days' work in 1849 to buy as much as could be bought for one days' work in 1893. And yet the changes are rung on the contention that our people were better off in 1849 than in 1893, even the author of the Wilson bill making that absurd claim.

ENGLAND VS. THE UNITED STATES.

And an equal fallacy prevails as to the relative cost of living in this country and in England. Meat, flour, and many other necessaries of life cost the Englishman more than the American. Possibly clothing is a little cheaper in England, but the

difference is a mere bagatelle when the difference in wages in the two countries is considered.

And this leads me to observe that all the efforts of our Democratic friends to prove that the workingmen of free-trade Great Britain are as well off as those of protection America have utterly failed. Every intelligent and unprejudiced observer has given testimony to the contrary. I have here the observations of a friend of mine, an educated American traveler, a man of large intelligence and of affairs, well known throughout the country, whose conclusions are worthy of the highest credence. They are so complete and thorough that I will give them a place in this discussion.

STATISTICS OF ENGLISH CHEAP LABOR.

FREE-TRADE SLAVERY.

To the workingmen of America:

Four years ago, when Grover Cleveland first appealed to you to indorse his free-trade policy, I went to England to learn with my own eyes what free trade had done for the wage-earners of that country, and to report to you the facts as they existed there. Many years of my life have been spent toiling as a mechanic, and well do I know from my personal experience what a fair day's pay means to the workingman, and the comforts that are given or denied his family according to whether he is well or poorly paid. As I said in 1888, in presenting my picture of the workingman's life in free-trade England, I have no wish to paint the colors any blacker than they are. God knows they need no coloring from me to make them such that no man wants to look upon their like a second time. If every workingman in America could go where I have gone the last two months and see what I have seen among the working classes of England—could take with him the picture of the comfortable and contented homes of our industrial classes, well fed and well clothed, and contrast with them the wretched places called homes in "Merrie England"—if, I say, all of you could have traveled around among England's workers as I did, there would not be one among you who would not denounce as a traitor to this nation the man or the party that advocated a free-trade policy for America.

FACTS NEVER CONTRADICTED.

Though my report to you four years ago went into every city and village in this country, and was mailed abroad as well, I have yet to hear the facts therein stated contradicted or my deductions challenged. The free-trade press has ever since followed me with its vituperations and misrepresentations, but though four years have passed not one of them has attempted to dispute the truth of my statements. I have taken the same care this summer to have my data as to wages and ways of living indisputably established, and I undertake to prove to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced man the truth of every line in this document.

A PITIABLE PICTURE REPRODUCED.

My tour this summer covered much the same territory as that through which I traveled in the summer of 1888. I left New York in July and returned to it September 15. In that time I traveled the Black Country, as it is called, of England, visited many of the same places and saw many of the same faces as four years ago. Time had not dealt kindly by them, especially the women. the sound of whose hammering on the anvil, the clank of the chains at which they work, and the noise of the pit upon which they shovel and wheel coal, were still all too horrible to the ear of one accustomed to seeing the mothers, wives, and sweethearts of his fellow-workman comfortably housed and spared the terrible burdens which these unfortunates have to bear.

Where, in our land of the free, I ask you, can we find mother and daughter—aye, and often granddaughter—toiling day after day for a lifetime, side by side, at the forge or on the coal pit?

Where throughout our broad land are our women made to slave like beasts of burden—ill paid, poorly fed and clad, and looking only to death to relieve them from a toil to which in life there is no ending?

Free trade! No! Slave trade! And even worse than that it is, and the eye that can witness this spectacle undimmed, or the heart that does not go out in sympathy, has no place for humanity. But free trade is the cause of it, and for that reason is the curse of England.

ENGLAND'S ARMY OF PAUPERS.

I landed in Liverpool in August. On the steamer going over I picked up Whittaker's Almanac, and found from its pages that there were 974,421 paupers in Great Britain in a population of 35,246,562. That is 1 to every 36 people. According to our last Federal census we have only 97,265 paupers among the 65,000,000 in the United States, or 1 in every 643 of population. In England 2.8 per cent of the people are paupers and charges on the counties; in this country but .15 per cent. One person out of every 12 in the United Kingdom needs parish relief to keep him from starvation. It cost $40,467,345 last year to support England's paupers. In London, out of 9 persons who die, 2 die in a workhouse, hospital, or other public institution; in Manchester it is but 1 out of every 5; and, in Liverpool and Birmingham, 1 out of every 6. A couple of years ago a return was issued by the Glasgow medical officer of health in which he showed that out of every 100 houses in Glasgow 30 consisted of only 1 room, 41 of 2 rooms, 14 of 3 rooms, 7 of 4 rooms, 5 of 5 rooms and upward. Out of the children born in the one-room houses, 1 out of every 3 died in infancy; in the houses consisting of 5 or more rooms, 1 out of every 50.

What a commentary on the condition of the people of the two countries! The one the greatest protectionist nation in the world and the other the leading exponent of free trade. The one having its people contented and well fed and the other starving or paupers. Remember, also, in making this comparison that our country is annually adding to its population hundreds of thousands of immigrants made up of the poorer classes from foreign nations, and that they form the larger part of our paupers.

PAY OF ENGLISH RAILWAY MEN.

Liverpool reached, my next move was to get to Wigan, 16 miles distant, at the entrance to the "Black Country," where 45,000 people are said to live, but really only exist. At the railway station of the London and Northwestern Road I learned from the engineer in charge of the train that he got $1.68 per day of ten hours. On express trains the pay is $1.80 for ten hours; firemen get $1.32. The conductor told me he had $1.32 per day; that trackmen has $4 cents; track layers, $4.86 per week; laborers, $4.20; machinists, first class, $7.68, and second-class, $6 72 per week. Talking further with this engineer, I learned from him that he had two children at work receiving $1.68 each a week, while his wife worked in a factory for $4.80. He lived in three rooms, for which he paid $1.32 rent per week. Let railway employés in America compare these wages with their own—more than twice as large!

Wigan again, and Bailey's Court! What a picture of hopeless misery and despair it is! The sunshine of life shut out by clouds darker and thicker than those hanging over the town. From tall chimney tops columns of black smoke shoot upward; from great buildings, soot covered and begrimed with the dust of ages, are heard the hum of turning wheels and the roar of busy machinery; trucks laden with stuffs more precious to England than human life—the tokens of her boasted commercial supremacy over land and sea—fill the streets with deafening noise, while long rows of low brick tenements, two stories high, with stone floors, with little windows, affording scarce a breath of pure fresh air or a ray of bright sunshine, stand as mute reminders that the passing throng of poorly dressed men and women have places they call home, however little of home there is in them to an American eye.

Picture such a home in one of New England's thriving mill towns! Imagine Bailey's Court, for instance, in any of our industrial cities! Here are two rows of tenements built of brick with their only breathing spot a stone courtyard in the rear not four feet wide. The largest room in the house is the one you enter from the street, and has but one window, four feet long and two feet high. Little panes of glass but a few inches square make up this "window." The stone floor is bare—sometimes with a rug here and there—an uncovered table serves for the family to eat from, and upstairs are the two sleeping rooms, which are as many as any family, no matter how large, can afford. This "home" costs 84 cents a week rent. Sir Francis Powell, M. P., owns these tenements, and they are over one hundred years old.

THE STORY OF TWO BUTCHERS.

Two butchers who live there told me something of their existence. One has a wife and five children, another a wife and three children. The latter said his food cost as follows: Butter, 26 cents per pound; flour, 15 cents per pound; beef, 8 to 20 cents per pound; pork, 11 to 16 cents per pound; sugar, 4 to 6 cents; rice, 8 to 16 cents; cheese, 12 to 16 cents; milk, 6 cents per quart; chickens, 40 to 60 cents each; potatoes, 20 pounds for 24 cents.

HOW A SLATER EXISTS ON $1.32 A DAY.

A slater whom I met said he earned $1.32 per day and paid 8 cents each night for his lodging. He said he could board by the week for $3.36. He preferred to live another way, though, and paid about the following sum for his meals:

	Cents.
Breakfast:	
Bacon	4
Tea	3
Bread	2
	—9
Dinner:	
Mutton	6
Bread	2
Pot of beer	4
	—12
Supper:	
Bacon	4
Cheese	2
Bread	2
Pot of beer	4
	—12
Lodgings	8
Total	41

As he receives $1.32 per day he has left after this scanty living 91 cents. I asked him what he did with this balance. "I swallow it," said he, meaning that he spent it for liquor. Then I asked him as to the cost of his clothes in a year and got these figures, which are a fair average for a year's supply for this type of workman:

3 pairs of breeches, at $1.92	$5.76
2 coats, at $1.50	3.00
3 shirts, at 78 cents	2.34
3 vests, at $1.08	3.24
3 caps, 24 cents each	.72
2 pairs of shoes, at $1.96 each	3.92
3 pairs of socks, at 32 cents each	.96
Total cost	19.94

I venture to say, though, that no slater in America would wear the clothes this man buys, nor eat the food that he does.

A POORHOUSE THEIR ASYLUM.

Wigan is one of the great coal-producing centers of England, as well as one of its manufacturing places. The town has been literally undermined for coal, some of the shafts running as far as 2,500 feet underground. Close to the center of the city is the Meadows Colliery, where men and women work together year after year, and the first sight that reaches their eyes when they come above ground is the Wigan poorhouse, just opposite the entrance—a constant reminder of the end for most of them, should man, woman, or child stop for a day from their treadmill of toil at the mines!

A WOMAN FORTY YEARS WHEELING COAL.

Forty women of all ages and conditions were at work wheeling coal when I reached the Meadows Colliery. One of them, though old and wrinkled, seemed to have the muscles of an animal. She told me that her name was Eliza Rider, 55 years old, and that she had been wheeling coal for forty years. She earns 40 cents a day of ten hours. When I asked her about her clothes, she said that she wore trousers cast off by the men. On the top of the pit I took photographs also of the women with their clogs on, while wheeling coal from the pit to the dumps. They told me they got 40 cents a day of ten hours. Some were paid 52 cents.

One of the women said that her husband worked in the pit and that her child was kept by her mother. She paid 60 cents a week rent and 48 cents a week for coal. Her husband earns 90 cents a day in the pit, making $5.40 for him and $2.40 for her—making $7.80 in all per week for the family. She said: "I pay my mother 96 cents a week to care for my child, so that I can work. I have worked here for eight years, and before that was in a cotton mill. My supper is usually a pot of potatoes and meat or potatoes and bread; seldom have meat and bread together, as I can not afford both. On Sundays I have green peas and beef (12 to 14 cents a pound for the beef), boiled potatoes and pudding, but no bread. The meat lasts me until Tuesday. Sometimes I purchase two pounds of cheese at 16 cents a pound. My breakfast is usually bread and butter, meat pie, and tea. I have corn cake, bread and butter for dinner." She gave her name as Margaret Fuld, and said that she lived at 46 Sale street. I took her photograph as she was eating the dinner described above.

POOR WAGES IN THE MINES.

About 400 men work in the mines. One of the bosses told me that he worked usually five days a week and made $10.80, but he was frequently laid off and earned nothing. Two men who worked under him were paid $1.56 a day of ten hours. A laboring man gets 90 cents a day. The engineer in charge of the engine on top of this pit gets $1.32 a day. The girls helping to shove the coal cars get 44 cents a day.

CLOGS FOR THE POORER FOLKS.

The working people in these parts all wear clogs, and when they appear on the sidewalks or walk on the stone floors of their houses the clogs sound like hammers. They cost from 48 cents to $1.08 per pair for adults, and the children's sizes from 42 to 52 cents a pair. I bought ten pairs of these clogs of various sizes to let the American people see what the poor people of Great Britain wear. I also bought eight pairs of shoes such as are worn at the iron works. They cost from $1.74 to $2.28, are very thick, with big nails on the soles, and by their looks would last a man or woman a lifetime. The men who make these shoes get $1.20 a day.

THE NAIL-MAKERS OF SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE.

From Wigan I went to Manchester, reaching there on August 22, and from Mr. James Cattan, editor of the Sunday Chronicle, I secured considerable information about the strike of the nail-makers against reduced wages, and also the cuts printed on another page representing the poverty-stricken women working at the smitheries for a bare pittance—which is not so small, however, but that the employers had some thought of reducing. Hence 8,000 men, women, and little children who made nails in the desperate effort to keep soul and body together went out on strike, and their sufferings as a result are beyond my powers of description.

Perhaps the best insight into the condition of these nail and chain makers of South Staffordshire can be given by extracts from an official report of the British House of Commons by Henry G. Calcraft, labor correspondent of the Board of Trade. Mr. Calcraft described his investigations as follows:

PICTURE OF A NAIL-MAKER'S HOME.

"Joseph Wilks, a man of 40, I found making 2½-inch cone-headed nails, for which the price was 6s. 6d. per hundredweight. It took 2,376 of these nails to the hundredweight, and he would make 2 hundredweight in a week ($3.12). With his wife to help him he might make a little more. From this he had to allow for fire, rent of shop and tools, which would be about 1s. 6d. per week. Across the end of his hearth Wilks had a rough seat and bench erected, on which sat two or three of his younger children. He said he would never have married if he had known he had to be a nailer all his life. * * *

"They lived mostly on tea and bread and bacon. On Sunday they might be able to get a morsel of meat or 'beef cheek' (ox cheek) to boil and make broth with. Questioned as to the family budget for the week, the wife enumerated as the chief item of expenditure, two quarters of tea at 6d. a quarter; 4 pounds of sugar at 2d. per pound; bread, 3s. to 3s. 6d.; 1s. 10d. for coal; 2s. for house rent, and 1s. 6d. for bacon (8s. 6d. in all for living, out of 13s. for a week's work, leaving but 4s. 6d. for clothing and all other expenses). Beyond this she could not go, and she was much better informed or more willing to give information than most of the women I questioned.

AT THE FORGE!

"At another fire, Joseph Walters and his wife were employed on dog-head spikes. The man was thin and worn, though his wife was stout. They had a family of eight young children.

* * * * * * * *

The pair of them could earn 16s. or 17s. per week, by working fourteen to fifteen hours a day. From this they had to find breeze, shop rent, and tools, which would run up to 2s. or 2s. 6d. a week. Thus for dog chains of, say, 4½ feet long, made of one-eighth-inch iron, and consisting of 36 twisted links, he paid 1d. each. A very skilful woman could do 14 dozen in a week if she worked eleven or twelve hours per day. Her rent, tools, and fire would possibly run to 4s. for the week.

"Entering a domestic shop I found two women making chains and another making hob nails. One is a woman of 40, who is the mother of six children. She is making spike chain and can earn 3s. a week, but only comes into the shop when she can spare time. Sometimes, however, she works on till 10 at night. In another shop there is a girl of 19, who has been four years at the trade making chains. She is a good hand and can earn 9s. to 10s. a week.

THE LIVELIHOOD OF AN EXPERT.

"Mrs. Davis is the wife of a vise maker and has a family of ten children. Her husband is much out of work. She is making the best small chains, and is one of the best in the trade. One of her daughters blows for her. Mrs. Davis says she might earn 5s. per week if she stuck all her time in the workshop. Two of the family were at work as chain maker and vise maker, and earned 6s. and 3s. 6d., respectively. Their rent was 2s. 6d., and there was 9d. to pay for schooling. How the family lived from one week to another she really could not tell. Several of the children were without shoes, and how to get them for the winter she did not know. They had to be content with bread and butter, or bread and lard, and tea to most meals, but sometimes they would have bacon or fish and bread to dinner. That day they had only gruel. They used 3 pecks of flour a week, at 2s. a peck. They had to make one-fourth pound of tea serve the week, and about 2 pounds of butter, at 10d. a pound. They occasionally got for Sunday's dinner a bit of meat, such as it was. It will be noticed in this case, as in many others, that very large families are the rule rather than the exception among these workers.

BACON AND CHEESE THEIR MEAL.

"Another woman on small chain says she can clear 2s. 10½d. a week, but has to attend to housework. On her smithy hearth she has a box rigged up for the accommodation of three children, which are half her family. Her husband, she said, was a day laborer, and earned 3s. to 3s. 6d. a day. She was generally at work from 7 in the morning to 6:30 in the evening. Their rent was 2s. 9d., but even with her husband's wages and her earnings she did not think she could live well. She had not tasted meat for three days, and bacon and cheese was what they mostly had with their bread. This is a striking case as showing that even where the husband earns a wage, as a laborer, much above the average of the chain makers in this locality, the wife spends nearly all her time in the shop for 2s. 10½d. a week, with the evident result that, at least, all she may earn is lost by defective housewifery and neglect of family.

"There are some children here asleep in a box, where their mothers have placed them. Of these workers, two divide 10s. between them weekly, and the other takes 6s. 3d. They work all day and even have their meals taken to them at the shop. The inspector, they said, had been there the day before and prevented them working long hours, so that they would earn less wages now.

"A question as to how much it cost them for butcher's meat was received with scornful laughter. Meat and potatoes, it appeared, was a treat reserved for Sundays only, and very often they did not have any then. It may be taken as a general rule here that the standard of living reaches always its highest point on the Sunday, and falls off day by day until the Saturday. Even in the case of this man who, with his wife and family, seemed above the average of his fellows, this was so; and on the day of my visit he had breakfasted on oatmeal gruel; not wholesome oatmeal porridge, but thin, watery gruel. For dinner there had been the familiar bread and bacon, of which latter, one-half of a pound had to serve the whole family. A few other items of his weekly budget were: coal, 1s. 6d.; one-quarter of a pound of tea at 6d.; two pounds of butter at 10d.; and potatoes, occasionally, came to 6d.

SAMPLE AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGES.

"Mr. Green has further furnished me with a written statement as to the average earnings of his work people, from which the following particulars are extracted:

Approximate number of work people.	Average weekly wages.
110 men	14s. or $3.36
250 women	7s. or 1.68
30 youths	8s. or 1.92
30 girls	8s. or 1.92
80 young women	7s. or 1.68

"Particulars taken from the books of the firm for a week averages as follows:

	Nailers.		Chain-makers.	
	s. d.		s. d.	
Men	14 2 or	$3.40	20 5 or	$5.10
Women	4 9 or	1.14	7 4 or	1.76
Youths	7 7 or	1.82	12 1 or	2.90
Girls	4 1 or	.97		
Young women	6 7 or	1.58	8 8 or	2.08

Such is the report of the Government investigator!

THE MISERIES OF CRADLEY HEATH.

Cradley Heath is at the other end of the "Black Country" from Wigan, and I went there after leaving Manchester. That is where women by the hundreds are to be found working as blacksmiths. Let me give you a little picture of one "smithy." It was a low brick building, separated from a dwelling house by not more than 3 feet. In the house lived Mrs. E. Fosbrook, who, though married and a mother, was but 21 years old. She was making chain in the smithy when I looked in, and at the forges about her were five other women, all toiling away from 9 in the morning until 9 at night—a stretch of twelve hours—for which each was paid 36 cents. It was a most pitiful sight indeed.

MOTHER AND DAUGHTER SIDE BY SIDE.

Next to Mrs. Fosbrook's blacksmith shop was that of Mrs. Polly Fokes, who was working away at the anvil as I passed by, surrounded by four women and a boy, all making chains. They got 30 cents a day apiece, so they told me. Mrs. Fokes's two daughters were at work, too, and one of them, Miss Polly Fokes, made me a piece of twisted chain 2 feet long in 13 minutes, and another piece of plain chain 2 feet long in 10 minutes. I have both chains in my office in New York City. Polly Fokes blows the bellows herself, and handles the tongs as a man would a piece of meat on a fork. Annie Fokes, her sister, who was 16 years old, earns 30 cents a day; but after paying the blower boy and for coal she has only $1.20 left each week for her work. A Mrs. Frances, who was making what is called No. 1 chain, and is married and 45 years old, earns 30 cents a day. Her daughter works by her side and gets the same pay. The blower boy is paid 24 cents a day. He told me he was 15 years old.

THIRTY-FOUR YEARS AT CHAIN MAKING.

Further down the yard in another blacksmith shop, Mrs. Henrietta Parry, 50 years old, told me she had worked thirty-four years at the forge making chain, and never getting more than 30 cents per day.

Is it to be wondered at that these people often give way under the terrible strain of such daily burdens and prefer the poorhouse or an early grave to such a slave life at the forge?

HUSBAND, WIFE, AND DAUGHTERS.

In another section of the city, called Dudley Woods, the property of Lord Dudley, I found Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Billingham both making chains. Her husband said he made $4.08 a week, when he worked from 5 in the morning until 7 at night. His two daughters worked in the same shop with him, as well as his wife.

DO WE WANT THIS IN AMERICA?

Next door I saw a scene that would touch the heart of the sternest. Mrs. Margaret Tibbitts, 38 years old, was working at the forge, while her two sons and her daughter were hammering chain. In a chair at one end of the shop was her baby, tied in so that the little one could not fall to the floor. Mrs. Tibbitts told me that she had made chain for thirty-three years! She said: "I make from 6s. to 7s. ($1.44 to $1.68) a week. My son earns $1.92, my daughter, $1.20. I pay for rent 2s. 9d. (66 cents). When I can earn enough money by steady work, I have meat two or three times for my meals; otherwise, not.

Returning to Manchester, I stopped at Birmingham. The barmaids at the station told me they worked sixteen hours a day for $96 a year.

TWELVE CENTS AN HOUR FOR STEVEDORES.

From Manchester I went to London and visited the London docks. Stevedores there receive 12 cents per hour for unloading barges and ships. They get 30 cents an hour in America. I went into a restaurant on Thames street, where the laboring men go by the score for their meals, and had breakfast with them. A cup of coffee costs 3 cents, bread and butter 2 cents, and for myself and another I paid 9 cents in all for breakfast. Usually the men have a fish called a bloater, for which they pay 2 cents. When they can afford it they get a meat pie for 4 cents; potatoes 2 cents; bacon 4 cents, or beans 2 cents. These dock men, though paid 12 cents an hour, average much less, as thousands of them are idle at a time, and very few get more than five or six hours a day throughout the year.

A mason in London gets 18 cents an hour, and a bricklayer 19 cents per hour. The policeman on the dock informed me that he received from $5.04 to $7.35 per week, according to grade. In the Bank of England there are 29 men on guard. Of these a private gets 24 cents a day and a corporal 36 cents, working from sunrise to sunset. A laborer in the streets gets from 96 cents to $1.20 per day. An omnibus driver, working fifteen hours a day, is paid $1.92. He begins at 8.30 a. m. and runs until midnight, driving 3 horses at a time and using up 15 horses during the fifteen hours in which he is employed.

THE "CHEAP" CLOTHING CRY.

A great deal has been said about cheap clothing for working people. Take, for instance, a carpenter in New York who gets $21 per week; in fifty-two weeks he earns $1,092. He purchases for himself during a year clothing to the amount of $65, which is a very large sum. He has left $1,027.

A carpenter in England receives $7.92 per week for fifty-two weeks, which

amounts to $411.84. Take from that $43 for his clothing in England, for himself he has left $368.84, while the American carpenter has $1.027.

Now, can any free trader make any figures that will enlighten the American workingman any better than these facts?

HOW ENGLAND RAISES HER INCOME.

It is said by the Democratic party and many others that the English people are not taxed—that free trade being England's national policy the consumer is freed from any tariff on his purchases. But has the American workman ever thought of how England raises her $462,509,299 of yearly revenue? Scarcely an article on the English dinner table is without a tax—and a tax, too, that is directly paid by the consumer. Tea pays 8 cents a pound, coffee 4 cents, beer, which is largely consumed by the whole population, pays $5.98 a barrel tax; cocoa pays 2 cents, chocolate 4 cents; fruits pay various duties. To receipt a bill costs you 2 cents each time, and various other obnoxious forms of direct tax are enforced which fall most heavily on the poorer classes.

The custom-houses of Great Britain return to the government nearly one hundred millions a year, and it can fairly be stated that these tariff duties being on the Democratic plan for revenue only, are indeed a tax and a burden on England's population. Next to the customs duties the excise brings in the largest revenue to the government, aggregating $118,674,801 last year.

IRELAND TAXED TO DEATH.

Well may Ireland say that she is taxed to death when we see that she pays the British Government $21,745,810 each year, or about $4.50 for each person. This is in addition to the salary of the lord lieutenant ($100,000) and his twenty associates, with salaries aggregating $300,000 more. Figures that I got in London show that 3,407,493 of Ireland's people left for America in the last thirty years, and yet Ireland's whole population to-day is only three-quarters of a million more.

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF HOME RULE.

The English Government sends ironclads to Cork and policemen all over the various counties of Ireland. In Ireland the constabulary are a government force; in Great Britain they are a municipal force. Is this discrimination necessary? Before answering the question, let us look deeper. The total number of police in Ireland is 13,983 (including Dublin), and the total cost is $7,606,665.60, or $543.98 per man; and there is one policeman to every 336 persons. In Scotland the police number 4,155, costing in all $1,817,136, or $437.32 per man; and there is one policeman to every 986 persons. Thus the force across the channel is more costly per man than the force across the Tweed, while the cost per head of population is still greater, being respectively $1.63 (nearly) and 44 cents. Thus "the guardians of the peace" in Ireland are not only a more expensive force in every way than those in Scotland, but they are, in proportion to the population, nearly three times as numerous. * * *

FREE-TRADE WAGES AND PROTECTION WAGES COMPARED.

I have secured this statement of weekly wages of various trades in Great Britain and in New York from official sources. If we have free trade in America we must reduce our wages to the same level of Great Britain and other free-trade countries. All the Republican protective policy seeks is to add the difference in labor in America to all imported goods from the other side of the ocean, so that our mechanics may be protected from the cheap pauper labor of Europe. This table of wages answers all the free-trade fallacies of the Democratic party and can not be disputed:

Occupation.	Per week in—	
	America.	England.
Angle-iron smiths	$15.00	$6.48
Blacksmiths	19.18	7.92
Boiler-makers	16.98	9.84
Bricklayers	24.00	9.72
Boilershop helpers	10.50	3.60
Calkers	19.50	8.16
Carpenters, house	21.00	7.92
Carpenters, ship	21.00	8.40
Conductors, express	26.40	5.88
Car-drivers, English 6s. 12 hours, American $2	14.00	10.08
Chain-makers, women blacksmiths		1.80
Engineers, London and Northwestern and New York Central	31.50	12.60
Firemen, express	17.10	5.00
Hod-carriers	16.50	4.50
Holders on, boiler shops	10.50	5.04
Joiners, house, Liverpool	19.50	7.92
Laborer in streets, London	10.50	7.20
Laborers, chemical works		3.96
Longshoremen, London docks, 12 cents per hour	18.00	7.20
Machinists, first class	18.00	6.72
Machinists, second class	12.00	6.72
Masons	24.00	9.72
Molders, iron		8.16
Painters	21.00	7.92
Plasterers	24.00	9.60
Pattern makers		
Plumbers	21.00	8.04
Platers	15.00	8.88
Printers, job	18.00	7.92
Policemen	25.00	6.96
Pavers	27.00	9.72
Riveters	12.96	9.72
Riggers	21.00	7.08
Stage-drivers (same as horse-car drivers)*	14.00	10.08
Station masters on the S. W. R. R.; guard, eleven hours		5.52
Telegraph operators	16.00-20.00	
England:		
Average first year's service		1.88
Average ten year's service		7.43
Train dispatcher	21.00	5.04
Waiters (waiters in England pay for the privilege to wait on guests)	6.25	
Laborers employed in manufactories, steel wire		7.22
Common laborer	10.50	4.06
Drivers of all kinds of one-horse conveyances		6.32
Barbers		6.86-8.51

*English stage-drivers work twelve to fifteen hours a day; American ten.

CHEAPNESS DEARLY BOUGHT.

I have returned to this country with these facts amply established and substantiated by other evidence than my mere say so, in the hope that they will impress those workingmen of America who may still be deluded by the cry of cheap goods. As Governor McKinley has said, "Cheap goods mean cheap men," and the craze for cheapness has made human life the cheapest thing to be had in the industrial markets of England. The American workingman is the most intelligent and best paid in the world. The question that is before him in the pending national contest is whether he will vote to maintain himself and his associates in this proud supremacy, or whether he will place himself and his products in competition with and therefore on the same plane with the pauper paid, poorly fed, and clad and usually ignorant working classes of free-trade England.

I leave the question for the American workman to answer.

Respectfully,

NATHANIEL McKAY.

SEPTEMBER, 1892.

Notwithstanding the warning contained in the above remarkable and truthful document, the workingmen of the United States, under the bad advice of their leaders, voted for the Democratic party in November, 1892. The recent elections in the great States of New York, Ohio, Iowa, New Jersey, and Massachusetts show that they have repented of their folly; but it is a grave question whether the purpose of the Democratic party to overthrow high protection can be thwarted. The old proverb of "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad" seems to be in process of fulfillment so far as that party is concerned. Certain it is, however, that if a low-tariff law is enacted the people of this country will be amply revenged as soon as they can get to the polls in a national election.

The undeniable fact is that under high protection the United States has been the most prosperous country in all the world. Only when the blight of low tariff has come upon it, or the threat of low tariff has hung over it, has its great energy been paralyzed and its marvelous prosperity stayed.

FURTHER FACTS ABOUT ENGLAND.

When we talk (or, rather, when the Democratic party talks) about opening our markets to the nations of the world, it should not be forgotten that there are 32,000 foreign ships, of 23,000,000 tons, ready to carry the manufactured goods of Europe to the United States. They are to-day watching and waiting for the passage of the Wilson tariff bill to start on their journey of destruction, so far as our manufacturing interests are concerned. England alone has 11,965 ships, the tonnage of Great Britain being six times that of the United States.

There are millions of dollars' worth of goods stored in the warehouses of London, Manchester, and other continental ports ready to be shipped to America when the Wilson bill becomes a law. There are millions of pounds of wool in Australia and New Zealand waiting for a cable message that high protection is overthrown in this country. Heaven only knows what will become of our people if the Democratic programme is carried out.

AN ALARMING SITUATION.

Mr. President, the situation is at once serious and alarming. The President coolly says to the workingmen, "Wait awhile and see what prosperity will come to you after free raw materials reduce your wages and tariff reform gets this country out of the narrow home market into the boundless markets of the world." The author of the Wilson tariff bill folds his arms and says, "Be patient, workingmen, until my bill becomes a law, when the increased influx of foreign commodities will, in some mysterious way, start up the closed mills and factories and give you employment." All over the land the cuckoos of tariff reform sing the same song, while the factories are idle and want and sorrow are in thousands and tens of thousands of households. The laboring man wants work, not words; bread, not glittering promises and idle theories.

The outlook is certainly not reassuring. The authors of the Wilson tariff bill frankly tell the country that its passage means that $200,000,000 worth of goods made in this country under the McKinley law will be brought from abroad—one hundred millions under the extension of the free list and one hundred millions under the lower duty list. There is no contention that these goods can not be produced by American labor out of American materials. They are to be imported, as is claimed, because they will be sold cheaper than American-made goods. Is it to be wondered at that in the face of this condition gloom settles over our people and that the future looks dark and uninviting? Under such circumstances why should not people postpone their buying and manufacturers close their mills in anticipation of the American market being flooded with foreign goods?

BUSINESS DEPRESSION NOT AN ACCIDENT.

Mr. President, the depression which has settled upon this country like a pall is not an accident. It is the legitimate and necessary result of tariff agitation and the threatened lowering of duties. We might just as well look the fact squarely in the face that if the assault upon the tariff, led by the President, succeeds, a long period of business depression is inevitable. With

foreign goods flooding our market, and American labor unemployed, our people will not be prosperous even if they do get dress goods a cent a yard cheaper than they do under the existing law.

But this is not all. To hold the rest of the market wages must necessarily be reduced, the income of our people largely curtailed, and their purchasing power greatly lessened. This is the feast to which we are invited; this the reward the workingmen are to receive for their votes at the last Presidential election. They were invited into the parlor of tariff reform, and now they are caught and tangled in the web of free trade—drinking the dregs of idleness and sorrow, and vainly looking to the Democratic party for relief.

DANIEL WEBSTER AND LOW TARIFF.

Mr. President, Daniel Webster, New Hampshire's most noted son, has sometimes been quoted as an advocate of low tariff. Possibly in his younger days he gave utterance to views which justify that charge. But in his mature years, and after long experience in public life, he was an earnest and powerful advocate of high protection. When the Walker tariff bill of 1846 was under consideration—a measure aimed at New England as the proposed tariff bill is—Mr. Webster made a long and eloquent speech in opposition to it, saying among other things:

You indulge in the luxury of taxing the poor man and the laborer. That is the whole tendency, the whole character, the whole effect of this bill. One may see everywhere in it the desire to revel in the delight of taking away men's employment. It is not a bill for the people or the masses. It is not a bill to add to the comfort of those in middle life or the poor. It is not a bill for employment. It is a bill for the relief of the highest and most luxurious classes of the country, and a bill imposing onerous duties on the great industrial masses and for taking away the means of living everywhere throughout the land.

Mr. Webster's words were words of wisdom and truth, amply justified by the practical workings of the Walker tariff law, which he so vigorously denounced. And yet notwithstanding all past experience with low tariffs, it is seriously proposed to enact another. To-day labor is unemployed, the fires are out in the furnaces, and the loom and the shuttle are silent; gloom and misery have taken the place of cheer and contentment; all as a result of threatened tariff changes. Why not abandon the whole thing, and stand by the American protective system, which has heretofore brought prosperity to our country and happiness and plenty to our people? In behalf of capital; in behalf of labor; in behalf of national honor and national prosperity, I appeal to the American Senate to put its seal of condemnation on this effort to hand our country and our people over to the tender mercies of foreign nations.

During the delivery of Mr. GALLINGER'S speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER said: The Senator from New Hampshire will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside until the Senator from New Hampshire concludes his speech, and that it may then continue the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, not losing its place, until the Senator from New Hampshire concludes his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from New Hampshire will proceed.

After Mr. GALLINGER concluded his speech,

Mr. GRAY said: Mr. President, I ask, in pursuance of the unanimous consent given, that the unfinished business, which was informally laid aside so as to allow the Senator from New Hampshire to conclude his remarks, be now laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TURPIE in the Chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President——

CONDITION OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. VOORHEES. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to interpose upon a matter of business?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. VOORHEES. I have in my hand an important communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which I am authorized by the Committee on Finance to ask may be printed as a public document.

I wish to state that I have in my hand the bill alluded to in the communication which I have just sent to the desk, and I also ask that it may be printed in bill form, not as a bill reported from the Committee on Finance, but for the purpose of convenience in considering it and possibly amending it. I ask that when printed in bill form it may be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered in the absence of objection.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am much obliged to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. QUAY. It seems to me, before the order for the printing of the bill and accompanying document is made, it should be read for the information of the Senate. I desire to know what we are ordering to be printed.

Mr. VOORHEES. I have not the slightest objection, except the objection that it would take the Senator from Illinois off the floor, which I would not think of doing. I would not have thought of presenting the document at this time if I had thought it was necessary to have it read.

Mr. QUAY. It seems very brief, and if the Senator from Illinois has no objection I should like to have it read.

Mr. PALMER. I have no objection.

Mr. VOORHEES. I can say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that it will be published in all the newspapers. It was published in some of them this morning.

Mr. FRYE. Why not have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. VOORHEES. That is not necessary. I have asked to have it printed as a Senate document. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], sitting near the Senator from Maine, can inform him as to the proprieties upon this question better than I can.

Mr. CHANDLER. To whom is the letter addressed?

Mr. QUAY. Will the Senator from Indiana state the substance of the letter and of the proposed bill?

Mr. VOORHEES. It is a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Finance by the Secretary of the Treasury, and I am authorized by the Committee on Finance to ask that it be printed for the information and use of the Senate.

Mr. QUAY. If the Senator from Indiana will permit me to inquire, I ask to what does the letter refer? What is the subject of the bill and letter?

Mr. VOORHEES. It relates to the condition of the Treasury Department and the question of financial credit. There is no secrecy about it at all. If it were not for taking the Senator from Illinois off the floor or interfering with his discussion I should ask that it be read.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to say that the Senator from Illinois has just said it would not disturb him in the least to have it read now.

Mr. VOORHEES. Then it may be read so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter with the accompanying bill will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the letter; which is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1894.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your verbal request, I have the honor to submit for the consideration of the Finance Committee of the Senate statements showing the actual condition of the Treasury on the 12th day of the present month, and an estimate of the receipts and expenditures during the remainder of this month and the month of February.

It will be seen from these statements that there is an urgent necessity for such immediate action as will replenish the coin reserve and enable this Department to continue the payment of public expenses and discharge the obligations of the Government to pensioners and other lawful creditors.

When my annual report was prepared it was estimated that the expenses during the current fiscal year would exceed the receipts to the amount of about $28,000,000, and I asked Congress for authority to issue and sell bonds or rather forms of obligations to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, bearing a low rate of interest and having a reasonably short time to run, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to supply such deficiencies as might occur in the revenues.

The estimate then made was based upon the assumption that the worst effects of our financial disturbances had already been realized, and that there would be a substantial increase in the revenues for the remainder of the year. While it was not believed that the deficiency then actually existing would be supplied by increased revenues in the future, it was hoped that no additional deficiency would occur, but the receipts and expenditures during the month of December and up to the 12th day of the present month show that the estimate of a deficiency of $28,000,000 at the close of the year was much too low. The actual receipts and expenditures during each month of the year and the monthly deficiencies have been as follows:

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR 1894.

	Receipts.
July, 1893	$30,905,776.19
August, 1893	23,890,885.30
September, 1893	24,582,736.10
Actual for three months	80,379,621.90
October, 1893	24,553,394.97
November, 1893	23,979,400.81
December, 1893	22,312,627.00
January, 1894, twelve days	10,309,959.37
Total	162,085,394.06

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR 1894.

Expenditures.

July, 1893	$30,675,888.60
August, 1893	33,305,228.48
September, 1893	25,478,010.17
Actual for three months	98,430,694.59
October, 1893	29,568,892.34
November, 1893	31,302,026.41
December, 1893	30,058,260.51
January, twelve days	16,263,655.14
Total	205,643,428.99

Excess of expenditures.

July, 1893	$8,770,112.41
August, 1893	9,414,343.18
September, 1893	896,254.07
Actual for three months	17,560,072.69
October, 1893	5,035,397.37
November, 1893	7,322,625.60
December, 1893	7,746,233.51
January, twelve days	5,893,715.77
Total	43,558,044.94

If the same average monthly deficiencies should continue, the total difference between receipts and expenditures on the 30th day of June next will be $78,167,532.

According to the best estimate that can be made the total receipts during the present month and the month of February will be $41,900,000, and the total expenditures will be $60,300,000, showing a deficiency during the two months of $18,400,000; but this does not include any payments on account of the sugar bounty, claims for which to the amount of nearly $5,000,000 have already been presented and are now under investigation in the Department.

The assets of the Treasury and the current liabilities in excess of certificates and Treasury notes outstanding were as follows on the 12th day of the present month:

ASSETS.

Gold	$74,108,149
Silver dollars and bullion	8,092,287
Fractional silver coin	12,133,903
United States notes	5,031,327
Treasury notes of 1890	2,476,000
National-bank notes	14,026,735
Minor coin	988,625
Deposits in banks	15,470,863
Total cash assets	132,327,889

LIABILITIES.

Bank note 5 per cent fund	7,198,219
Outstanding checks and drafts	5,053,917
Disbursing officers' balances	28,176,149
Post-Office Department account	3,897,741
Undistributed assets of failed national banks	1,927,727
District of Columbia account	142,613
Total agency account	46,996,366
Gold reserve	74,108,149
Net balance	11,223,374
Total liabilities	132,327,889

It will appear from this statement that the coin reserve has been reduced to $74,108,149, and it is evident from the condition of the Treasury that the Department will have no means to defray the ordinary expenses of the Government unless a large part of the payments are hereafter made out of that fund. If this is done the coin reserve will be reduced by the 1st of February to about $66,601,804, a sum wholly inadequate for the purposes for which it was created.

On account of this critical condition of the Treasury I have considered it my duty, in addition to the earnest recommendations contained in my annual report, to appear twice before your committee, and after full explanations of the situation urge prompt legislative action on this subject. With the permission of the committee I have prepared and presented for its consideration a bill which, if promptly passed, would, in my opinion, meet all the requirements of the situation by providing the necessary means for defraying the public expenses and replenishing the coin reserve to such an extent as to assure the maintenance of the parity of all forms of United States currency.

While this proposed measure of relief has not yet been disposed of or considered by the committee, the great differences of opinion which are known to exist in both branches of Congress concerning the propriety of granting additional or amended authority to issue bonds in any form or for any purpose, render it doubtful whether new legislation upon the subject can be secured in time to provide the means which are imperatively demanded in order to preserve the credit and honor of the Government.

Authority to issue and sell bonds for the purpose of maintaining specie payments was expressly conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the act of January 14, 1875, but it has not been exercised since 1879, and, on account of then high rate of interest provided for and the length of time such bonds would have to run, I have not been satisfied that such an emergency has heretofore existed as would clearly justify their issue. But the necessity for relief at this time is so urgent, and the prospect of material improvement in the financial condition of the Government is so problematical, that, unless authority to issue and sell shorter bonds, or other obligations, bearing a lower rate of interest than that specified in the existing law, is granted by Congress at a very early day, I shall feel constrained by a sense of public duty to exercise the power already conferred, to the extent, at least, of providing an adequate coin reserve.

If this action should be taken, Congress ought, nevertheless, to provide promptly for the deficiency in the revenues during the current fiscal year, and I will from time to time advise your committee of the condition of the Treasury, in order that this subject may receive due consideration.

I have the honor to be, yours, very respectfully,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

Hon. D. W. VOORHEES,
Chairman Committee on Finance, United States Senate.

Before the reading was concluded,

Mr. QUAY. I see that the letter which is now being read was printed in the newspapers before it was sent to the Senate. I suggest that the reading be suspended and that the letter be published in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The further reading of the letter will be dispensed with unless objection is made.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to have the bill read. I do not care about having the reading of the letter concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read as follows:

An act to amend section 3 of "An act to provide for resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, be, and the same is hereby, so amended that in lieu of the descriptions of bonds therein authorized, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue from time to time as he may deem necessary, and in such form as he may prescribe, coupon or registered bonds of the United States in denominations of $25 and multiples thereof, redeemable in coin at the pleasure of the United States after —— years from date, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable quarterly in coin, and to sell the same at not less than par in coin; and the proceeds of such bonds shall be held and used to maintain the parity of all forms of money coined or issued by the United States, but the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use from time to time such part of such proceeds as may be necessary to supply deficiencies in the public revenues during the fiscal year 1894.

SEC. 2. A sum sufficient to carry the provisions of this act into effect is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. PLATT. I did not exactly understand what the chairman of the Finance Committee requested with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He requested that the letter and the bill should be printed as documents, and that both be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT. There is no objection to that course, but I understood the Senator from Indiana to make some suggestion about the bill being printed in the form of a bill, when he did not offer it. It can only be printed as a Senate document, I suppose, unless it is offered in the Senate as a bill.

Mr. VOORHEES. In one sense it is offered as a bill. It is a bill prepared and submitted to the Committee on Finance by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is not a bill introduced into this body and referred to that committee, but it was suggested in the committee, I think, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who is quite experienced on subjects of this kind, that I should state that it was desirable to have it printed in the form of a bill, so that it would be easier of consideration and easier of amendment. That is all the reason why I made the suggestion.

Mr. PLATT. It should be printed as a Senate document and not as a bill introduced.

Mr. ALLISON. As I understand the request of the Senator from Indiana, it is not only that it be incorporated in the document, but that it may also be printed in bill form, without in any sense introducing it as a bill.

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa why it should be printed in bill form if it has no author. A bill can come here only reported from a committee or introduced by a Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Indiana gave the only reason which could be given, that I know of.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is all the reason there is.

Mr. TELLER. I did not hear the reason assigned.

Mr. ALLISON. The reason is that when the bill comes to be analyzed and matured some one may probably want to suggest an amendment, and if so it is more convenient to insert amendments when the bill is printed in bill form.

Mr. TELLER. The communication came through the committee. The Secretary of the Treasury had a right to suppose that if his suggestions were agreeable to the committee they would report a bill, and that is a proper thing for the committee to do. If the committee are not agreeable and not in accord with his suggestions they do not need to do anything. There is no precedent for the printing of a bill of this character in the form of a bill when it has neither committee nor Senator back of it, and if I can object to it I will do so, although it is a matter of no great consequence.

Mr. VOORHEES. It is a matter of not the slightest consequence.

Mr. PLATT. The committee can order the bill printed.

Mr. VOORHEES. The bill can be printed in connection with the letter of the Secretary; I care not in what form. We shall find out what is in it before we get through.

Mr. TELLER. It should be printed of course with the other part of the communication as a part of the public document, but it has no business to be printed as a bill.

Mr. VOORHEES. Then do not print it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will order the print-

ing of the letter and the bill as a public document unless objection be made. It is so ordered. The unfinished business will be proceeded with, on which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] is entitled to the floor.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the floor at present in the discussion of this measure. I had understood the consideration of the bill was fixed for to-day, and I had hoped that the chairman of the committee would be present in order to present the views of those who favor this measure in that elaborate and learned form in which I knew he would be likely to discharge that duty. I have no formal argument to address to the Senate. I simply approach the question as it has for years impressed itself upon my mind. I only propose to give my views as they occur to me in the course of the desultory argument which I shall offer to the Senate.

I beg to state in the beginning that I have read the report of the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections as presented by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] and have given attention to the historical statements made by him, both such as relate to the history of this legislation and to the conditions which led, in the judgment of the minority, to the adoption of this law and laws like it.

I may be allowed to speak of myself to this extent, at least, and to state that I have no sympathy with the State legislation to which the report alludes. I believe all that legislation to be cruel, and not only cruel, but a blunder, for I believe that the only mode by which constitutional republican government can be maintained or made effectual to secure popular rights and individual happiness is to give the fullest effect to the true principles of republican government.

The report of the minority, or rather the report of the Senator from New Hampshire, approved by his political associates, gives examples of much State legislation enacted immediately after the war. That legislation was based upon an entire misconception, as I think, of the principles of constitutional government. I think it was based upon an entire misconception of the requirements of the condition. That the colored race, who were freed by the war, were left in the Southern States in that precise condition in which slavery had left them, is apparent. Historically we need no light upon a subject of that sort, but it would have been far wiser, in my judgment—that was my opinion then and it is my opinion now—to have secured to this enfranchised people the fullest enjoyment of their rights.

The colored people were ignorant beyond all question. In 1866 I was at Raleigh, N. C., presiding over a court-martial. The court-martial had occasion to examine a great many colored witnesses. One of them was a negro who was so lately imported, or whose ancestors were so lately imported, that he had scarcely learned the English language. After he had testified, I asked him, "If you had the right of suffrage how would you vote?" He failed to understand me. He said, "Sir?" I said "Suffrage; if you had the right to vote, how would you vote?" Said he, "Sir, I suppose I would vote according to my *intrusts*," and I think in that statement that negro from the rice fields near Wilmington stated the true philosophy of the vote, that a man should vote according to his own interests. I have no doubt that if the Union people had been in the South treated with confidence they would have perceived the unity of their interests and those of their late masters and that the conditions would have been far better than they were after the lapse of ten years.

I am gratified now to believe that these laws have exhausted their force; that the relations between the lately enfranchised and their neighbors are better and that legislation of this sort is becoming obsolete, and it will become so as those people advance in knowledge, in education. I do not mean the education of the schools, but I mean the acquisition of that practical knowledge, the means of earning a livelihood, which is true education after all. I think we may give ourselves but little trouble now in regard to the relations between the two races in the Southern States.

I can not say that in the beginning I disapproved of much in this legislation. I confess at the close of the war I insisted upon giving to the negro man the ballot as being far cheaper and far safer than to give him the musket, because I felt that the National Government was obliged to protect him in his liberty and in the new right to acquire property. I felt that to give him the ballot was to place in his hands a great educational agency, the employment of which would suggest to him to cultivate amicable relations with his white neighbors, and would teach him to vote, as this negro from the rice plantation near Wilmington said, according to his own interest. I favored giving to the negro the ballot. I felt that it was a great educational agency, and by that means I would assist in hastening the time when the races in the late slave States would live in harmony and would consult their mutual interests. Those were my views.

I was not unmindful, though, that legislation which secured the rights of the black men might dangerously affect the rights of other races and the rights of the free people of the States in which slavery had never existed. I may state as another personal matter that from February, 1865, to May, 1866, I was the military commander of the Department of Kentucky under martial law. I saw the dissolution of slavery in Kentucky, that State having been excepted from the operation of the proclamation of 1862. I saw there that under the legislation of the times, in the temper of the times, while the power held by a military commander was necessary, perhaps, for a state of war, it was subversive of all just conceptions of popular liberty. Although I exercised the powers of a department commander for some fifteen months, I declare to-day when I think of the enormous powers that were conferred upon military commanders as the necessary logic of the war, I tremble that so much power was conferred upon any single individual.

It was not that circumstance alone which was startling. It was that large powers were not only conferred by military orders but they were maintained and supported by a public sentiment all over the United States. The people had become so accustomed to the swift and decisive methods of the government of the bayonet that they were impatient of the slow processes of civil government. This feeling was not confined alone to the loyal people of the States lately in insurrection or rebellion, for they were maddened by local strifes, and it was not strange that they should seek to employ force to overcome their immediate neighbors and enemies, because such was the condition of most of the Southern States; but this sentiment prevailed over the whole North, and it is somewhat remarkable, too, that it had taken possession of the great Republican party.

The Republican party in its incipiency was, more than any other party in this country, the party of freedom. Its demand was liberty. It was devoted to individual liberty. But the war had not only infected all the country, but this great party, too, had caught the contagion of despotism, and even in 1872 it had become a purely political party. It had lost that intense, earnest, fervent love that brought into its ranks thousands of men early in the struggle. It had become a mere political organization devoted to the preservation and maintenance of its own power, and it had become thoroughly infected with the despotic principles or the principles of the passions of the war, which cool, earnest men forgot when the struggle was over, but this party perpetuated its passions and crystalized them in the form of much of the legislation that we now seek to avoid.

I beg leave to restate that proposition. During the war patriotic men were earnest in their efforts not only for the restoration of the Union, or the maintenance of the Union, but they were earnest in their attempt to overthrow slavery. At the close of the war men were earnest in giving effect to true republican principles, democratic principles; and the logic of that condition was the civil-rights bill.

I want to state at this point that the civil-rights bill passed in 1864–'65 was of itself the embodiment of the enlightened conviction of the men of the times; and the subsequent amendments to the Constitution were the logic of the war and the logic of liberty. Their purpose was not to mar, but to complete the Federal Constitution. They were not meant to enslave, but they were meant to guarantee and secure liberty throughout the land. They were the inspiration, not of the passions of the war, but of the enlightened sentiments that animated the contest—the spirit of liberty—and the spirit of liberty and the guaranties of liberty were made a part of the Constitution of the country.

The Republican party, however, as I said before, became animated by the desire to maintain itself in power. It was engaged in a great struggle with rival parties elsewhere, and it sought by means of this legislation to perpetuate itself, as I think, and as I think I shall demonstrate in a moment.

The Democratic party, with which I did not act, was made powerless by the war. The Republican party, which I have described, was in the beginning made up of all the elements, the lovers of liberty and others, because, Mr. Blaine says in his admirable book, in substance, that the protectionist cared nothing about the controversy.

He says Pennsylvania felt no particular interest in the great trial, but the protectionists of Pennsylvania were brought into the Republican party because of the vestige of protection which was stolen into the platform at one of the national conventions. He states that during that time thousands of men who voted for Lincoln had no interest whatever in the struggle. Indeed, I beg leave to say that diverse elements were brought into the great

Republican party by its desire to attach the great party of liberty and union to the car of protection, and when that element took control of the Republican party, it for its own purposes sought to maintain itself in power by legislation such as that which the pending report assails.

I do not deny that Congress has the power to regulate the elections of Representatives in Congress, and if a law should be presented which should be uniform in its application and just in its effects I would give it consideration, at least; but at present I am not called upon to discuss legislation of that kind, because I propose to present a counter idea.

I have said before that in my judgment the people of the Southern States were mistaken. Instead of passing laws such as are now quoted in the report of the minority of the committee, it would have been wiser to trust the colored men who were under the protection of the Government. It would have been wiser to give them the confidence of the people and the confidence of the States. It would have been wiser to have conceded them and asserted for them all the powers which the amended Constitution gave them. That is my judgment, and I believe now that the radical defect in Republican legislation is that it is based upon an utter want of confidence in the people of the United States.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], in the views of the minority, says that this proposition of repeal is meant to give effect to the doctrine of State rights. I suppose he means State rights as understood by those who sought to dissolve the Union. I have never understood that State rights involved secession. In fact, I know that the doctrine does not involve the right of secession; nor do I regard it as essentially important to discuss the question of the rights of the States; I mean their mere municipal and political rights. I am discussing the right of the people that lies behind all governments.

I have said already that the mistake when we passed these laws was the failure to trust those who were to be governed. The doctrine I mean to assert as being one necessarily opposed to this legislation is that the laws are based upon a distrust of the people, those for whom governments are ordained and for whom governments should be conducted. That is the radical fault of the laws, and at this moment I present that as a distinct line of objection.

I have said that possibly Congress might pass some uniform law for the regulation of the elections of members of the House of Representatives, and that possibly such a law might be framed to meet my judgment and to meet my approval, but such has not been the policy or purpose of the authors of these laws. The purpose of this legislation has been to secure party success. The purpose of this legislation has been, in my judgment, to give to the minority the right to control the majority, and those laws secure not popular government, but party government, which must have been their original purpose.

Now, here is the point to which I wish to direct attention. The law provides for various officers who are to interfere to a certain extent with the elections. I read from the Revised Statutes:

SEC. 2011. Whenever, in any city or town having upward of 20,000 inhabitants, there are two citizens thereof, or whenever, in any county or parish, in any Congressional district, there are ten citizens thereof, of good standing, who, prior to any registration of voters for an election for Representative or Delegate in the Congress of the United States, or prior to any election at which a Representative or Delegate in Congress is to be voted for, may make known, in writing, to the judge of the circuit court of the United States for the circuit wherein such city or town, county or parish, is situated, their desire to have such registration, or such election, or both, guarded and scrutinized, the judge, within not less than ten days prior to the registration, if one there be, or, if no registration be required, within not less than ten days prior to the election, shall open the circuit court at the most convenient point in the circuit.

I have said the purpose of this law is to perpetuate party power. In this case two or ten citizens of any of the divisions mentioned in the act may put the circuit court in motion, may subvert the laws of the States and supersede the officers of the States, because to render them subordinate to officers to be appointed by the court is in effect to supersede them. This law is intended to guard and protect popular rights, but its application is made dependent upon the will of two or ten or more individual citizens, who are only required to possess character. I believe "good standing" is the phrase used; but I recollect that on a late occasion in the Congressional district in which I live an attempt was made to ascertain the names and the standing of the citizens who made the application that set the courts of the United States in motion, and that led to the appointment of numerous inspectors and other officers to supervise the election.

I remember, I say, that an attempt was made to ascertain the character of the men who made the application, and those in authority would not disclose the names. The whole State machinery was subverted by the act of unnamed and unknown persons. No inquiry was allowed. It was the law. The judge saw them, I suppose, but no issue was allowed to be made there as to the necessity of the subversion of the State laws or the character of the men at whose instance this subversion took place.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will endeavor not to interrupt him for any light reasons?

Mr. PALMER. It is no interruption at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I know he does not wish to convey any erroneous impression. The Senator knows very well that the petition upon which the judge is to open the circuit court and appoint supervisors is a public record of the court. Now, does the Senator mean to convey the imputation upon the court or the judge in the case which he has in mind that he refused to allow an inspection of the court records? If he does, I wish the Senator would kindly state the time, place, and circumstance.

Mr. PALMER. I have made my statement. I say it was never ascertained who it was that led to the appointment in the district represented by Mr. SPRINGER; that the names of the parties at whose instance the machinery of the Government was put in motion were never known.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then will the Senator allow me to say it was simply because no one went to the court record and looked for the papers.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator may speak of that which he knows. I speak of facts of which I am familiar. I make the statement standing by itself. But even if it were conceded that the men were known, the two, or the ten, or the fifteen, and even if it were conceded that they were men of unquestionable reputation, men of the best standing, would that affect the proposition that the whole machinery of the election is changed or that additional machinery is created or employed at the will of this small number of inhabitants?

The laws of the State of Illinois in regard to elections are efficient and ample. They provide for the division of the counties and cities into districts of convenient size. Our legislation is exceedingly careful on that point. We have the benefit, the doubtful benefit, I think, of the Australian ballot. We have all the careful guards that can be thrown around the local elections, and there has been, so far as I know, no complaint of interference in our elections; I mean none beyond the ordinary complaints that may attend an election everywhere, and yet in that county a number of men were permitted by the operation of this law to completely subvert the local system of election.

Mr. CHANDLER. Right there will the Senator allow me again?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I merely intervene to suggest that he is making a mistake, which he does not wish to fall into, I presume. He has two or three times said that the United States officers supersede the local officers; that the United States officers subvert the local officers. He has said that the local machinery is a perfect machinery in Illinois. I ask the Senator to be candid enough to state that the United States supervisors do not supersede or interfere in any way whatever with the local election officers of the State. They are mere lookers on at the election, as the Senator, I think, very well knows. Therefore, I think he wants to correct his language when he says that the supervisors supersede the State officials and subvert the State officers who are engaged in conducting the election under the wise laws which he describes.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I am not at this moment prepared to follow the Senator in all his suggestions. He says they are mere lookers on. Does he mean by that to express the truth and the whole truth and nothing else but the truth? Is that all they are—mere lookers on?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think so. That is the whole theory of the law. If the Senator will read the powers of the supervisors, which are before him enumerated in the statute, and thinks that they are anything more than lookers on, then I shall be glad to have him show the Senate and the country what they do more than look on.

Mr. PALMER. I am anxious to confine the Senator to his own language. He says they are mere lookers on. By that he means to affirm or assert that they have no other power than that of standing by and looking on. Is that what the Senator means to assert?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that on page 21 of the minority report that statement is repeated:

The latter are merely witnesses of what is going on. They are only watchers. The whole plan of the present law is based upon the principle of noninterference with the conduct of the elections.

There is this qualification, if there is any qualification of what I have said:

It is true that the special deputy United States marshals are authorized under certain limitations to aid in keeping the peace at the polls; that criminal acts of citizens are punishable by national laws in the national courts, and that the supervisors make and preserve records of what they see, and testify to and prosecute such crimes as come to their knowledge.

But with reference to what takes place upon election day, when the State officials receive the ballots and count them, the supervisors are mere lookers on and do not hinder in the slightest degree the election officers in the performance of their functions.

Mr. PALMER. How does the Senator explain the numerous arrests that are made by United States officers on election day, if they are mere lookers on? How does he explain the complaints of numerous arrests made on election day?

Mr. CHANDLER. Arrests of illegal voters.

Mr. PALMER. Then they are something else besides lookers on, are they not? They are efficient, active lookers on, and give effect to that which they discover.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator must get my admission before he takes advantage of it. The Senator said they supersede the State officers or the local officers of election.

Mr. PALMER. I do say that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I say they do not supersede the local officers. They conduct the election precisely as if the supervisors were not there. Now, the supervisors witness offenses committed by persons who illegally register and who illegally vote, and those men are complained of. If the Senator will find cases in which election officers are interfered with by the supervisors in the performance of their duties, then I shall think they do something more.

Mr. PALMER. Section 2018 of the Revised Statutes defines the powers and duties of these mere lookers-on, as follows:

SEC. 2018. To the end that each candidate for the office of Representative or Delegate in Congress may obtain the benefit of every vote for him cast, the supervisors of election are, and each of them is, required to personally scrutinize, count, and canvass each ballot in their election district or voting precinct cast, whatever may be the indorsement on the ballot, or in whatever box it may have been placed or be found; to make and forward to the officer who, in accordance with the provisions of section 2025, has been designated as the chief supervisor of the judicial district in which the city or town wherein they may serve, acts, such certificates and returns of all such ballots as such officer may direct and require, and to attach to the registry list, and any and all copies thereof and to any certificate, statement, or return, whether the same, or any part or portion thereof, be required by any law of the United States, or of any State, Territorial, or municipal law, any statement touching the truth or accuracy of the registry, or the truth or fairness of the election and canvass, which the supervisors of the election, or either of them, may desire to make or attach, or which should properly and honestly be made or attached, in order that the facts may become known.

This imposes something more than the mere duty of looking on. It imposes upon this class of officers positive, active, specific duties—something more than merely looking on.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator now state how that interferes with the State officers? How do they look on? They see, they look at the ballots, they count them, but how do they interfere with the State officers or supersede the State officers or subvert the State officers in the slightest degree?

Mr. PALMER. Can the Senator imagine two equal political powers operating upon the same subject at the same moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, Mr. President, but I can imagine the Senator painting a gorgeous picture and myself looking on to see how well he does it and taking note of it and preparing to testify about it.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator rather evades the inquiry. At this point there must be some paramount authority. The word "paramount" has been used very much lately, and it is understood to mean superior. On that occasion one or the other, the State authority or that of the United States, is the superior and the paramount authority.

Mr. TELLER. Which is the paramount authority under the existing statute?

Mr. PALMER. I understand that according to the interpretation given to the Constitution and laws of the United States they are paramount, and that the laws of the United States are paramount whenever enacted in pursuance of the Constitution. I understand that this is for the time the superior authority.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to be fair with the Senator. He has read the statement as to what the supervisors have a right to do. The national law is paramount; they can not be interfered with in doing it; but in what respect do they supersede, or subvert, or hinder the State officers who call the elections, hold the elections, make the count, and make the return thereof?

Mr. PALMER. I ask the Senator again, if they do not affect the action of the State officers, if they do not control them, if they do not influence them, why do they exist, why are they appointed?

Mr. CHANDLER. For the purpose of watching the election and furnishing proof to be used in an election contest or upon the prosecution of crimes against the national election laws, or, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] suggests to me, crimes against the State laws.

Mr. PALMER. That the Senator regards as mere on-looking, as no active power, but the simple negative power of seeing that some other person does his duty?

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the whole theory of the section which the Senator has read.

Mr. PALMER. But it is not the practical effect of the law, Mr. President.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Illinois will allow me a moment, the Senator from New Hampshire has said over and over again that the powers conferred by the statute upon the supervisors are merely those of watching and observing what is done by another set of officers.

Mr. CHANDLER. At the election.

Mr. GRAY. At the election. Whereas the section of the statute which the Senator from Illinois has just read provides expressly that their duties are active, not passive. It is required of them that they must be present, and, in the language of the law, "personally scrutinize, count, and canvass each ballot in their election district or voting precinct cast, whatever may be the indorsement on the ballot, or in whatever box it may have been placed."

It is impossible, it seems to me, to say that that is merely the passive duty of on-looking. It is the duty of scrutinizing, counting, and canvassing each ballot. That is all the State officers are required to do. They are required to scrutinize, count, and canvass each ballot; and here is another set of officers provided for by the statute of the United States, who are to intrude themselves into the voting places and into the control of the boxes sufficiently to enable them to perform their duties, in order that they may perform the same duties the State officers are to perform. The Senator from New Hampshire says that is merely passive, merely watching, merely on-looking, and yet he admits that they may go further, and be the ground upon which public prosecutions may be had against the officers of elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have the honor, if the Senator from Illinois will allow me, to ask the Senator from Delaware the same question I asked the Senator from Illinois, and which has not yet been answered; that is, in what way the performance of the duties which the supervisors are commanded to perform in any way supersedes or hinders or subverts the State election officers in the duties which they are performing at the same time?

Mr. GRAY. With the permission of the Senator from Illinois, in the first place, there is this sentimental objection—and I shall come to the practical objection afterwards——

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it is all sentimental.

Mr. GRAY. That it is an indignity placed upon the State officers and the State autonomy; it is a proclamation by the Congress of the United States that the States of which this Union is composed are not fit to be trusted in the conduct of their own elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is hardly a fair answer.

Mr. GRAY. One moment. It is a proclamation by this high legislative body, the Congress of the whole Union, that the States which compose this Union, and which are the primal factors in creating this Government under our principles of separate State government and local self-government, are not qualified for and not fit to be trusted with the most important governmental function of all—that is, the conduct of a State election.

Now, to the practical matter. Aside from that indignity which is put upon the State, that degrading of a self-governing community, there is this practical result, that the intrusion of these Federal officers into the voting places provided for a State election is an assumption of superiority and supervision on the part of the Federal officers and of inferiority on the part of the State officers. It results in this practical thing, that these supervisors have the right, and have frequently exercised the right, to call upon the United States marshal to arrest the State officers and drag them or bring them before United States committing magistrates and hold them for trial.

Mr. TELLER. That was an abuse of power, was it not?

Mr. GRAY. Possibly.

Mr. TELLER. Yes, that is an abuse of power not authorized by law.

Mr. GRAY. There ought not to be that opportunity.

Mr. CHANDLER. I dislike to intrude upon the Senator from Illinois——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. With the permission of the Senator from Illinois, I thought that the Senator from Delaware, when he began to answer my question how the performance of their duties by the United States supervisors interfered with the State officers, would make a speech on the subject of State rights and would make a sentimental objection, that an indignity is put upon the States by the presence at the polls of United States officers. That is the staple argument which is developed in the report of the majority of the committee. I do not propose

now to deal with that, although I think it will not be difficult to show that there are some reasons why the nation might well distrust the operation of the laws of some of the States.

But my question was specific, and that was, how the supervisors in looking on, in counting the votes, in making a record of the vote, and in returning it to their chief supervisors, interfered with the performance of their duty by the State officers. I respectfully submit that the Senator from Delaware has not shown in the slightest degree how there is an interference with the State officers under the law. He does not state it; he does not pretend to state it. He says that the presence of the supervisors there, which is offensive to the advocates of State rights, tends to create disorder; but he does not point out that the statute itself either contemplates or justifies anything of that kind; while the Senator from Illinois began his proposition by saying that the purpose and intent of the statute was to supersede State officers and subvert State authority, while I say that the purpose and intent of the statute is directly the other way.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Illinois, I will say that practical illustrations to the common mind are worth a great deal of theoretical exegesis of the working of a law, and I want to say to him that at the very last general election in my own town I think about sixty State election officers were arrested at the instance of Federal supervisors, taken from the place at which they were performing their duties under the State law, and held in $3,000 bail, answerable to the district court as to whether they should be indicted under the provisions of this law.

Mr. CHANDLER. For doing what, will the Senator be kind enough to state? For what were they held?

Mr. GRAY. I think it would be pretty difficult to convince those honest men—they were poor men, workingmen, to be sure, who had not studied the statutes with the learning and equipment of the Senator from New Hampshire—they were honest workingmen, who had been brought up to believe in the power of the people of the States to conduct their own affairs and their own elections, and they had a very wondering look, a very bewildered look when they were brought, not before a State officer, but before a United States officer and held in bail which it would not be possible for many of them to obtain—$3,000 bail—to answer to the United States court for what the supervisors had charged them with doing.

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator from Delaware kindly state where that occurred?

Mr. GRAY. It occurred at the last election in my own town.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator had stated the case as fully and as fairly as he usually does——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PALMER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for the purposes of the occasion.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Delaware had stated the facts as fully and as fairly as he usually does, he would have stated that those election officers were arrested for preventing the supervisors from performing their duty under the law. The law undoubtedly in the next sections, 2019 and 2020, provides that the supervisors shall not be interfered with when they are watching the State officers, and if they are interfered with by any private person or by an election officer, that is a crime under the United States statute; but the Senator has stated nothing which shows that the supervisors performed any act whatever in reference to the conduct of the election except to watch the State officers.

Mr. GRAY. If that is not a pretty important act, affecting the liberty of the citizen of the State, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. PALMER. If I may be allowed to resume, it is undoubtedly true that a small number of citizens may put into operation an election machinery which is superior in authority to that of the State. To that extent it is intrusive and subversive, because to create an authority superior to another is to supersede the inferior authority, and this law, which is so earnestly defended and upon such nice grounds by the Senator from New Hampshire, in section 2019 says:

> The better to enable the supervisors of election to discharge their duties, they are authorized and directed, in their respective election districts or voting precincts, on the day of registration, on the day when registered voters may be marked to be challenged, and on the day of election, to take, occupy, and remain in such position, from time to time, whether before or behind the ballot boxes, as will, in their judgment, best enable them to see each person offering himself for registration or offering to vote, and as will best conduce to their scrutinizing the manner in which the registration or voting is being conducted; and at the closing of the polls for the reception of votes, they are required to place themselves in such position, in relation to the ballot boxes, for the purpose of engaging in the work of canvassing the ballots, as will enable them to fully perform the duties in respect to such canvass provided herein, and shall there remain until every duty in respect to such canvass, certificates, returns, and statements has been wholly completed.

Why was this law passed? In the first place, why should such power be granted on the request of any two or ten or fifty citizens, at their own sovereign will and pleasure, without any reason, without any fact being stated?

If the Senator objects to my position that they usurp or supersede the State authorities, I suppose he will admit that they may create authorities superior to those of the States, because whatever the State officers may do in the discharge of their office these persons have an imperative, conclusive right to be present when such acts are done; they are present to watch, and these officers are under the supervision of men created at the will of ten or twenty or fifty irresponsible inhabitants of a particular district. Why is that? Why shall the free people of this country be subjected to such supervision?

With respect to the sentimental question, I have already said that the sentiment of manly self-respect is essential to the maintenance of popular liberty. The citizen must not only be secure in his rights, but his rights must be respected, and I maintain that when fifty men—I assume the highest number—obtrude upon me and upon my neighbors, men who are appointed by an irresponsible authority, it is a humiliation, a disgrace, and it leads me to undervalue my manhood and my liberty. That is sentimental. Mr. President, liberty is a sentiment, and without that manly love of liberty, which is a sentiment—a noble, grand sentiment—and which can never be insulted or degraded with impunity, liberty would be worthless.

The idea of a freeman wholly unconscious of respect for his own rights and for his own liberties, a freeman who is subjected to the will of a master! The master may be benevolent, he may be kind, he may never strike a blow, he may never humiliate the slave by any positive act of outrage, but there he stands a menace, and the freeman is conscious that he is the inferior of the master, and the American freeman at the polls is conscious that there is an irresponsible authority watching over him, watching over his officers. He may be honest, but he is a master nevertheless, and that of itself degrades popular elections.

Mr. President, it is remarkable that since this law was passed there has been more corruption and more in the spirit of resistance to this despotic legislation than there ever was before. I know that it is believed by many that the American people in some sense or other need continual nursing and continual watching, and there is an idea somewhere that some person, somebody, may be intrusted with the guardianship of popular liberty, while the essential truth of our American idea is that liberty must be maintained by the people themselves, and the only apology for a despotism or for despotic legislation is that the people can no longer be trusted.

Mr. President, I have already said that the particular objection to me in the election law is that it places the government and control of the elections in the hands of a few men who may put the machinery of the law into operation. In point of fact, is it not true that the election laws in the district in which I live are whatever fifty men may determine they shall be? If any fifty men anywhere conclude that my fellow-citizens, in a district which casts many thousand votes, are incapable of acting honestly or of protecting themselves, those fifty persons have but to create the machinery by which every elector in that election district is placed under the control of those irresponsible public officers.

We speak again of State rights. Mr. President, the term State rights has been abused perhaps more than any other, unless it is the term religion or Christianity. They are both holy things. Each properly understood expresses an idea of magnificent conception, but gentlemen who represent a certain class of sentiments, or perhaps two classes, believe that State rights signify disintegration. The better and the wiser, the Jeffersonian idea, the Democratic idea as I construe Democracy, is that our system of government is based upon the clearest conception of the possibility of harmonizing local self-government with the National Government, and I had supposed there was no conflict between the system of State governments and that of the United States; I had supposed that those who claim that States may secede are better friends to liberty than those who claim that popular rights are under central supervision. I believe to-day if I had my choice I would take my chances in a government controlled by the people, however small, rather than I would in a despotism, however magnificent in its boundaries, however magnificent in population and wealth.

I believe, therefore, that those who insist upon the constant supervision and watchfulness of the people are the enemies of popular liberty. They must be aware of the fact that popular liberty depends upon the people themselves, and they must be aware that this exercise of extraneous force is degrading and demoralizing, and to demoralize the citizen is to destroy that high self-respect which should characterize an American freeman.

I go back now to the point I had in view at the start. This

law authorizes a limited number of persons to create the officers whom the Senator from New Hampshire defends. These officers go to an election, an election ordered by State law. They take their seats in the presence of officers created under the State law. Do I attach any significance to the fact that these laws are enacted by the States? Not in the slightest. To me their value consists in the circumstance that these laws were enacted by the people, and that the State is the mere agent of the people, the efficient means by which popular will takes the form of law. I care nothing about the source of law, and if the Federal system should be so modified as that the people themselves under the operation of Federal laws should control their own elections, the fact that the law was Federal rather than State would be no objection to me. The system exists. The one is national; it is despotic.

It is remarkable that all the officers of the Federal Government hold their offices at the will of a geographically distant authority. The marshal, the judges, the supervisors of election are appointed by the United States judges. The people are not consulted; they have no voice in the matter. Masters are named for them, and to those masters they must submit without the right of appeal, without the right of protest.

Such is the election law which I am condemning and denouncing. If the Federal election law allowed free action of the popular will, the objection would simply be that it interfered with the harmony of a system which has existed for more than a hundred years, and which I trust will be perpetual. So it is in all the arguments which are based upon any preference between Federal and State authority.

I say again that these are mere agencies for the convenient distribution of power, and the reason I prefer the State agencies is because they are popular agencies.

They are controlled by the people; and the true underlying philosophy of that control is that their interests are largely local; and this machine we call the State government lives in the popular will and it moves under the impulse of popular thought and popular preference, while this great system, which overshadows all, is despotic in its nature; the powers of the officers are discretionary largely; and what is to me more, the officers are not subject to the popular control by means of popular elections. If the Federal Government shall ever be so reformed as that Senators here shall be elected by the people, that this horde of officers who perform the service of the Federal Government shall be chosen by the freemen, then much of the difficulty which we perceive would be obviated.

Mr. President, I had intended merely to introduce this discussion. I go back again to my original proposition. I believe the mistake of those who support this law is predicated upon a belief that some changes have taken place in the popular mind, in the popular morals, which make new and more stringent regulations necessary to maintain the purity of elections.

I notice that the war has bred these new ideas. I have alluded to the fact that our people became fond of the swift and decisive rule of the bayonet; and the poison is not there alone. We have fallen in love with arbitrary, forceful methods; we distrust ourselves; we invoke force to govern us, to control us, and we look in vain to some distant and external authority, or some authority external to ourselves, that we may find repose in its superior force and wisdom. That is the prevailing vice of the times.

My belief is that if these laws are repealed and elections are again left in the hands of the people, there will be much less ground for complaint; for, mark you, the Senator from New Hampshire himself is eloquent in his denunciation of the corruptions of elections in the large cities. These corruptions exist and have not been cured by Federal election laws. If it could be shown to me that these laws had, on the whole, been favorable to the purity of elections, they would be more tolerable in my judgment; but, according to the complaint we hear, the elections are still corrupt in the great cities, notwithstanding the law exists, and the State officers are overshadowed by those of the United States. I used the term "State officers." I desire to avoid and disclaim it at the outset. It is the people's officers who are overridden; and notwithstanding this swarm of officers and the thousands of dollars that are expended in the large cities, the same complaint exists.

The Senator from New Hampshire in one chapter of his report speaks of the recent corruptions in New York, where John I. Davenport himself lords it over the election, and yet the Senator complains that in that great city this corruption still exists. According to his theory the law ought to remain, although the corruptions and evils are not removed by its existence.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to correct the Senator again.

Mr. PALMER. I yield with great pleasure.

Mr. CHANDLER. The recent frauds, of which I speak in the report, were in the odd years when there were no supervisors of election. The supervisors are at the Congressional elections. The national laws do not keep down frauds then, but when the odd years come, then there is a perfect carnival of fraud in New York City and in Jersey City.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to make a statement, which I should like to know if anybody questions?

Mr. PALMER. With pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. I was told by a very eminent New York Democrat, whose name would be received with respect if I were at liberty to give it, this fact, that since the passage of the election law of 1871 or 1872 there had not been a single election contest in the State of New York, either in regard to the choice of a member of the House of Representatives of the United States or of an assemblyman or a member of the New York senate, embraced in a certain district, who had been voted for at the time when an election had taken place under this law. Before that the contests and the charges of fraud were frequent.

I do not myself know anything about this matter. I have not investigated that statement; I have made it on that authority, and have never heard it contradicted. I should like to know what the Senator from Illinois knows about that.

Mr. PALMER. I know that the State of New York has its own election laws, which are as fair as those of Illinois or any other State.

Mr. HOAR. I want to see if we can not get at that fact as a fact to start with.

Mr. PALMER. I know the Senator asserts the fact, either by inference or intimation, that these good results have been in consequence of the election laws.

Mr. HOAR. That is a good deal of a fact.

Mr. PALMER. That fact is one which remains to be established, and when established it will have merit.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I ask if he is in a position to controvert the statement which I have made on the authority I have mentioned? I am told—indeed I have read the document—that a committee of the House of Representatives, the House then being Democratic, I think—but I will not be so sure about that—at any rate, a committee of the House of Representatives was appointed to investigate elections. They had heard these accusations, which they characterized as pretty wild, talked about; but on full investigation they reported—Mr. Cox, Gen. Slocum, then a member of Congress at large from the State of New York, and one or two other Democratic members of the House of Representatives being members of the committee—that the charges against these laws were unfounded; that they were excellent laws, and that they hoped they would remain and that their beneficent operation might be extended to the rest of the country. Among the witnesses whom they called to testify in a way which justified that report, was the late Secretary Whitney, then the Democratic corporation counsel of New York City. Does the Senator know about that? Can he state whether that report was correct or not?

Mr. PALMER. I will be perfectly delighted to read the report.

Mr. HOAR. I shall show it to the Senator.

Mr. GRAY. I would say, as the Senator from Illinois was not a member of the Senate at the time, that in the debate on what was called the force bill, the whole matter of that report of the House committee, to which the Senator from Massachusetts alludes, was very thoroughly ventilated. I think it was during that debate that something was said on both sides of the question regarding that report. I am not disputing what the Senator from Massachusetts says.

Mr. HOAR. I want to get at the fact. I think it is quite important.

Mr. GRAY. There were some comments made upon the report then and some explanations made in relation to it. They can be revived now.

Mr. HOAR. Then, in regard to what we were speaking of, the malpractices going on in cities in spite of the law of 1871, I do not understand that either the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Delaware, who has charge of this repeal bill, are in any condition to deny—whatever the value may be we shall settle afterwards, but we will get at the facts—will deny, first, that where there had been constant election contests before this law was put in operation—for in 1868 sixty thousand fraudulent naturalization papers were issued in one court in two or three days—when this law went into operation the election contests stopped, both State and national, for some elections afterwards; nor will either of those Senators deny that the men who were chosen by the House of Representatives as a Democratic election committee asserted that these laws were excellent, that the charges against them were mistaken, and they hoped that they would be extended to the rest of the country. As to whether

that is valuable or not we may differ, but I want to get at the fact. I do not understand that anbody contradicts this statement.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator means the Federal election law.

Mr. HOAR. I mean the national law. I do not call it Federal, I call it national.

Mr. MILLS. "A rose, by any other name would smell as sweet."

Mr. HOAR. It depends upon the nostrils, if I may be permitted by the Senator from Illinois——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that. I was asking the Senator from Illinois if I might be permitted to answer the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PALMER. I have yielded to the interruption of the Senator from Massachusetts beyond question.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, with the leave of the Chair, I desire to observe to the Senator from Texas that whether the word "national" or "Federal" smells as sweet in certain nostrils depends upon the nostrils, and that there have been times when the word "national" did not smell very sweet in Democratic nostrils.

Mr. MILLS. It is sometimes the case. That occurred, too, with the people from whom the Senator comes. There was a time when they were about as rebellious against this Government as were the people whom I represent on this floor.

Mr. PALMER. I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts why, if the election laws operate so wholesomely, they have not been applied to all the Congressional districts in the United States?

Mr. HOAR. I will answer. Because of a very unreasonable and very persistent clamor made by the Democratic party in the Congress preceding the last.

Mr. PALMER. If the Republican party had the power to pass this bill, they had the power to pass such a bill as the party thought judicious and advisable. Why should the party which had the power to pass this bill make its operation depend upon the will of two or ten citizens of any particular locality?

Mr. HOAR. That also is very easily answered, if the Senator desires an answer now, as I suppose he does.

Mr. PALMER. I am exceedingly anxious to get an answer.

Mr. HOAR. It was very thoroughly discussed at the time. The reason which satisfied my mind then and does now is that there were a very large number of districts in the Union where there was no difficulty. I never heard from any Democratic quarter a suggestion of any interference with free and fair elections in nearly all the Congressional districts in Massachusetts. I suppose the same is true of Vermont and New Hampshire.

Mr. PALMER. Now, will the Senator——

Mr. HOAR. I have not finished my answer.

Mr. PALMER. I beg pardon.

Mr. HOAR. It seemed to me when that bill was reported it was hardly worth while, when nobody wanted such mechanism and nobody wanted the cost and trouble of appointing these officers, that they should be appointed; and therefore a certain number was required. I have forgotten what the number was under the bill proposed in the Congress before the last; I think it was fifty.

Mr. PALMER. Not so many.

Mr. HOAR. I may be wrong in my memory. I am speaking of the bill called the force bill.

Mr. PALMER. Ten.

Mr. HOAR. Whatever may have been the number, it was in the nature of a unanimous consent where the petition was not made. There are a hundred things done in the Senate which, if any one or two members of the Senate object, would not be done. General consent is the whole of it.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator tell me why this law, which has produced such advantageous results in its operation, is made to depend in its effect and operation upon the will of two or ten citizens in any district?

Mr. HOAR. I have answered that question, I think.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator tell me upon what theory he justifies the lodging of this power in the marshal upon the application of two inhabitants? I read from the statute:

Whenever an election at which Representatives or Delegates in Congress are to be chosen is held in any city or town of 20,000 inhabitants or upward, the marshal for the district in which the city or town is situated shall, on the application, in writing, of at least two citizens residing in such city or town, appoint special deputy marshals, whose duty it shall be, when required thereto, to aid and assist the supervisors of election in the verification of any list of persons who may have registered or voted; to attend in each election district or voting precinct at the times and places fixed for the registration of voters, and at all times and places when and where the registration may by law be scrutinized, and the names of registered voters be marked for challenge; and also to attend, at all times for holding elections, the polls in such district or precinct.

There is the marvelous provision that two citizens, with or without character, may set the law in operation.

Mr. HOAR. They have the character of citizens.

Mr. PALMER. But two citizens. The act is very carefully guarded. The number shall not be less than two, and these two citizens may, upon application to the marshal, procure the appointment of numerous officers who shall attend the polls, with the right of arresting citizens and enforcing the orders of the supervis rs.

This law, which authorizes two citizens to invoke all the authority of the United States Government and appoint officers for the control of the people, is defended as a wholesome law and as one in harmony with sound political principles.

Mr. President, I have not so understood Republicanism at one time in its history. Republicanism in its early history was willing to take arms for the defense of human rights. Republicanism was willing to summon armies to battle for human rights and human liberty. Republicans to-day are willing to subject the people of the United States to the domination of any two citizens who may call out or create officers for the control of the people without allowing them the slightest voice in creating, selecting, or appointing the officers.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator whether I understand him correctly, to indicate a very strong preference to having this matter settled by a fight and by military process rather th n by process of law? That seems to be what he is urging at present.

Mr. PALMER. I feel no hesitation in answering the Senator. I would rather be governed by a master who would assert his authority and give me the opportunity of defending myself than by a master who would summon and invoke all the powers of this great Government to control me. I prefer the right of resistance to giving to two citizens the power to create officers to govern me.

Mr. HOAR. All I have to say is that I differ with the honorable Senator. I would rather have the Government.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator says he would prefer the Government. The Senator has a right to select his own mode of being governed; I mine.

Mr. VOORHEES. May I ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. VOORHEES. The Senator from Illinois has been the governor of a great State, and I ask him whether from his knowledge these two men might not have been in the penitentiary for criminal conduct and been restored to citizenship by pardon or by the expiration of their sentence?

Mr. PALMER. A certificate of good conduct would entitle them to the restoration of all their rights.

Mr. VOORHEES. And all the powers of the Government, which the Senator so well points out, might be invoked by men who had served in the penitentiary for their crimes if the question of citizenship alone determines the matter.

Mr. PALMER. That is all. The two men, as I have said, may, under one section of the law, set the powers of the Federal courts in motion. Under section 2021 of the Revised Statutes two citizens may apply to the marshal, and the marshal upon their application shall appoint deputy marshals. And by section 2022 it is provided that—

The marshal and his general deputies, and such special deputies, shall keep the peace and support and protect the supervisors of election in the discharge of their duties, preserve order at such places of registration and at such polls, prevent fraudulent registration and fraudulent voting thereat, or fraudulent conduct on the part of any officer of election, and immediately, either at the place of registration or polling place, or elsewhere, and either before or after registering or voting, to arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who commits, or attempts or offers to commit, any of the acts or offenses prohibited herein, or who commits any offense against the laws of the United States.

Mr. President, two citizens with the mere right to vote may create and put in motion this enormous force. I understand it is not limited by the law. The people of Illinois and Massachusetts find themselves confronted with a class of public officers with power to supervise their conduct and arrest them on view without any responsibility to the people themselves, and perhaps with no pecuniary responsibility, so as to answer in damages for a violation of the rights of the citizen.

I speak of this source of authority. I insist that this is subversive of all true ideas of popular government, and that such laws ought to be condemned and repealed, because the corruption implied in such a mode of electing officers is more odious and detestable than is possible under the general election laws.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator now allow me to answer, as he introduced what he said by an appeal to me?

Mr. PALMER. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. The power which is lodged in the marshals or deputy mashals is the ordinary power of a peace officer. It is the power which every constable bears with him all the ye ar round at common law and under the laws of all the States where they have

constables, to keep the peace, to arrest persons who are breaking the peace in their presence, and so on. I submit, with great respect for the experience and ability of the Senator, that he is sticking in the bark in his dealing with this subject. He is making an apparent and not a real objection.

The substance of the law is that to protect national elections against disorder and fraud of the kind of which unhappily we have had such experience, there should be national officers appointed by the marshals, as a matter of course. Then, somebody raises the question: Out of the three hundred and fifty or four hundred Representative districts in this country, and out of the fifty or one hundred cities of more than 20,000 inhabitants there will be a great many districts and a great many cities where, as a matter of course, the elections are orderly, lawful, peaceful, and where there is no need of any public officer. So, instead of providing that in every case this force of marshals should be appointed the law said simply they shall be appointed if any citizens desire. It said there shall not be less than two, in order to have at least two persons. In other words, it said in substance, they shall be appointed unless there is a unanimous assent to the contrary. That, in substance, is what it means.

Now, as to the criticisms made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], suppose these men to be men who had been pardoned from the penitentiary; suppose it was Mr. Mullens, who was convicted of fraudulent voting, and whom Mr. Cleveland pardoned as one of the first acts of his last Administration; the answer is that a man who has had his citizenship restored is a man, and you can not say in theory of law that one citizen is any less entitled to the rights of citizenship than another. Therefore, in ascertaining whether there is unanimous consent that there shall be no marshals appointed, it is the substance of this provision that if any two citizens say it ought to be done the law shall take its course.

Whether that is wise or not; whether, after all, upon the question which is raised here so often by our friends on the other side, the old practice of letting the State authority secure national elections is one that ought to be continued, is a great question of constitutional law and of public policy, so far as it is not settled by the decisions. But in the minds of those persons who thought with Gouveneur Morris and, as I think, the framers of the Constitution, that the elections of members of the national House of Representatives should be secured by national sanction, and that the State sanction had in fact failed, experience having shown it, having come to that conclusion, rightly or wrongly, it was the attempt of the framers of this statute and of the proposed statute of four years ago to provide a method by which, if nobody wanted a marshal, and the thing was absolutely peaceful, he would not be appointed.

If all citizens were like the Senator from Illinois they would not need any State law or any election law. They would gather together and vote as a matter of course, and would conduct themselves as if the Senator had some guests in his own parlor. Unfortunately, there are people who are not like the Senator from Illinois and who disturb elections. Therefore, if it is the power and the duty of Congress to protect our national elections by national law, I say it is wise to provide that it shall be done in any community, except where there is unanimous consent to the contrary. The only way to ascertain whether there is unanimous consent to the contrary is not to go around with a paper and get everybody to sign a declaration that he does not want it, but simply to say that it is to be done if anybody signs a declaration that he wants it. That is the whole of it.

Mr. PALMER. But the provision simply is that it shall be done if you can get two citizens to ask for it. I have listened with great pleasure to the answer of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I must confess that he has answered almost every difficulty except the one I pointed out to him. He tells me that these officers have only the powers of ordinary peace officers. That I may grant or deny as seems proper; but that does not meet the point. Is it consistent with sound principles of government, that upon the application of two citizens, peace officers, the most important officers of the country, may be created without limit as to number, who are to exercise control and jurisdiction over the people of a district, or a local municipality, or a ward? I care nothing about whether they have been pardoned, as Mr. Cleveland pardoned the man to whom the Senator from Massachusetts alludes. But they may be timid men, men who are full of fear; they may be party men; they may disregard popular rights; and if two men make the application, the marshal must appoint supervisors. The Senator asks, what, after all, is the effect of the appointment; that it is only to multiply peace officers.

Mr. GRAY. May I interrupt the Senator right there? I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that a section of the statute provides that the marshals so appointed may arrest with or without warrant anyone engaged in violating the election laws, thus making the marshal a judge as well as the executive officer—a judge as to whether the law is violated, and clothing him with the power to arrest.

Mr. HOAR. May I inquire of the Senator from Delaware whether every constable in Delaware has not that power now?

Mr. GRAY. I am thankful to say no.

Mr. HOAR. He has in Massachusetts.

Mr. GRAY. I am thankful to say that in that respect we do not imitate Massachusetts, although I confess in a great many respects we might imitate Massachusetts to our advantage.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps that is the reason why there are charges from Republicans as to the manner of the execution of the election laws in Delaware, and no charges from Democrats that the elections in Massachusetts are not fair.

Mr. GRAY. We have never had any complaint about it.

Mr. PALMER. I have no disposition to press this branch of of the discussion further, because the Senator from Massachusetts concedes that two persons may at their own discretion, without giving any reason, create or provide for the creation of a number of officers who possess the enormous power of conservators of the peace, with the special powers conferred upon them by the statute. Would the Senator in his own town in Massachusetts tolerate a law that allowed an indefinite increase in the number of constables upon the application of any two citizens who might think them necessary, upon an affidavit or complaint or petition to the town council or the city marshal, and that the town council or the city marshal should be compelled upon such suggestion or application to increase the number of deputy marshals or deputy constables with the powers conferred upon them by the act I have read? He would not do it. Why? Because the Senator knows it is contrary to sound principles of government that any citizen should be permitted to determine the number of officers in any community.

This is an objection which it seems to me is insuperable. But the Senator says the law operated well in New York in one period of its history, and he referred me to the reports made by one committee which he mentioned. There has been a later report as to elections in New York which points out the horrible abuses which have been practiced upon the free people of New York under the law which it is proposed to repeal.

Mr. GRAY. That report was made to the House of Representatives.

Mr. PALMER. It was made to the House of Representatives. But such a law can not operate well. There is an old maxim that I heard quoted years ago, and I have not yet lost my faith in its truth. It is that error must in its nature be harmful. Wrong must produce wrong results. Right must be right and must produce right results. Here is a radical departure from the principles of republican government, and it can not be defended.

The Senator says there are districts in this country where the law is not needed. Is he willing that any two citizens shall determine that question for any district in Massachusetts, and that if there should be a time when his party in Massachusetts should be in the minority some two men shall fill the district with swarms of executive officers, with power to arrest and with the large powers conferred by the existing law? Would that be tolerated for a day in Massachusetts? I apprehend not.

Mr. HOAR. It would be welcomed.

Mr. PALMER. Then Massachusetts now is not the Massachusetts of Charles Sumner.

Mr. HOAR. If there was any human being who was in favor of the law of 1871 it was Charles Sumner.

Mr. PALMER. Charles Sumner may have been in favor of that law under passionate impulses. In his earnest desire to protect the poor people South, he may have gone far; too far, perhaps.

Mr. HOAR. I dislike to be interrupting my honorable friend so, but he appeals to me, and I should like to be permitted to say a few words.

Mr. PALMER. I do not complain of the interruption.

Mr. HOAR. In the first place, the law was framed chiefly for New York, and not for the South. The Republicans had possession of nearly every State in the South when the law was passed.

Mr. PALMER. They had possession of a good many of them.

Mr. HOAR. There were three or four exceptions, old States which had gone into the rebellion, but we had possession of the others. It was a law passed for the North. Now, when my friend appeals to me whether, if the Republicans in Massachusetts were in the minority they would like that provision, I say it would be welcomed in Massachusetts. It has been invoked again and again by Democrats in Boston. He says: "Oh, if that be true it is not the Massachusetts of Charles Sumner," to which I reply that Mr. Sumner was one of the most strenuous support-

ers of the law. Then my honorable friend says Mr. Sumner was very much excited.

Mr. PALMER. I beg pardon; it was not that the Senator said he would welcome. He said he would welcome the increase of peace officers. I asked the Senator whether he would accept that condition for his own State. He said it would be welcomed. I say such was not the Republicanism of Charles Sumner, because no man was more devoted to individual liberty nor more distrustful of the powers employed to invade individual rights.

Mr. President, this branch of the law can not be defended. Now, one other view of this case and I am done. My experience is that men only love liberty when they are denied the exercise of the rights that pertain to liberty. I have seen this great patriotic Republic when men lost faith apparently in civil means and civil agencies, when the musket was invoked and military power was resorted to and looked to as the only sure means for the defense of popular rights. I have seen step after step these perversions of law, and I have struggled year after year against the bad influences forced upon the popular estimate of popular rights.

I said in the beginning that I commanded the Department of Kentucky for more than a year and possessed powers that belonged to a commander of a department under martial law. Before I left the Department of Kentucky I addressed a letter to the man whose name is now often mentioned in terms of bitterness, but he, I think, was the giant of his day and generation, the great war minister who organized and controlled and directed the affairs of this great Republic, Stanton. I addressed him an elaborate statement of my views of the condition in that State, and which I believe was not only true then, but it contained what I conceive to be truths applicable to all conditions of the nation. I said to him, "This department has been too long governed by military force. The people have ceased to trust themselves; they have lost confidence in civil agencies; they look to force as a protection against wrongs when they ought to defend themselves by the employment of the agencies created by the civil law."

I said to him, "It will require a quarter of a century" (and I regret to say that even that quarter of a century did not accomplish it) "to convince these people that all their interests are safe under the protection of civil law enacted by themselves and enforced by themselves." Some time ago a friend of mine from Illinois came and met the President, as the story goes. He is a very witty man. He stammers very much. Said he, "Mr. President, I had determined never to come back to Washington until there was a Democratic Administration, and I do not know but that I have come too soon now." [Laughter.] I thought twenty-five years would enable the country to recover its tone and would inspire the people with a confidence in themselves and a supreme love of liberty, and would enable them to turn their faces upon power, and that they would govern themselves, which after all is the only means by which government can be maintained.

The slightest exhibition of power, lawful power or unlawful power, is to me a subject of alarm. I have seen the tramp of these deputy marshals. I never felt their power. In the small city in which I live I saw probably a hundred of them. They were to us, however, the most harmless fellows in the world, because they were our neighbors, but every one of them was himself a living embodiment of a lawless force, a force imposed upon the people in a manner not in consonance with the true principles of republican government. I am fearful that the twenty-five years have not accomplished it, but I trust to see this proposed law passed, and with improved laws of the States the people trust themselves and discharge their own duties. The people being trusted they will respect themselves. The people being trusted they will maintain their liberties; and they will conduct their elections properly because they will feel that the responsibility is upon themselves. Wisdom comes with responsibility.

I have seen fanatics. I recollect in early life when there were men in this country known as fanatics. Those men in the progress of time became leaders in the dominant party, and when responsibility was thrust upon them, they became wise and profound and conservative as men regard conservatism. Place the responsibility upon the people; let them take the consequences of bad government themselves, and we need no security after that for popular liberty.

I trust that these statutes with all that remains of these signs of ancient feuds and strifes and all this mass of force, this sword in a gloved hand, may be stricken from the statute books, and that the people of the country may be held responsible for the purity and fairness of their own elections; and I promise them that all will be well.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I had hoped that before the Senator from Illinois finished he would explain to us a little more clearly the precise point of time when the Republican party went wrong. He began by what I thought was or would be a very warm eulogy of these laws. Indeed it seemed to me that the tenor of his discourse was somewhat disappointing to the Senator from Delaware, who has the bill in charge. In the first place, the Senator from Illinois eulogized the Republican party and said it was the party of liberty; that it was a party that had done great deeds for the Republic; that it was the party that took up the sword in behalf of liberty and the nation—the same sword which as he closes his speech he deprecates the use of. So the Senator went on, even stating that the laws were constitutional in his judgment, although he stands with a majority of the committee uniting in a report which says that the laws are not constitutional. Am I mistaken in supposing the Senator said he thought the laws were constitutional?

Mr. PALMER. I have not denied the constitutionality of the provisions which I have criticised.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is a member of the majority of the committee which have put themselves on record as declaring that it is unconstitutional for Congress to pass any laws regulating the election of Representatives in Congress. They have adopted the report in the other House made by an able and cogent Representative in that body, who is now here upon the floor. The majority themselves made no report; they adopted that report. It is the report of the majority, to which the Senator from Illinois is supposed to have subscribed; and, after eulogizing the Republican party, he tells us that Congress has, unquestionably, the constitutional power to pass laws regulating the election of Representatives in Congress.

Up to this point, therefore, I say I had some hope—I think the Senator from Delaware had some fear—that the Senator would conclude on the whole that the laws had better remain upon the statute book.

Mr. GRAY. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will speak for himself and allow me to speak for myself.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly. If I did not correctly interpret the countenance of the Senator from Delaware, then I will withdraw that interpretation. It may be that the Senator looked gloomy because he was reflecting upon some other past events, and it was not in connection with the speech of the Senator from Illinois.

Precisely at this point the Senator from Illinois diverged. Up to a certain time he says the Republican party was the party of liberty, the party that drew the sword in favor of liberty, and that it had done noble deeds which ought to go down in history. Then suddenly down the Senator drooped, and the Republican party got into a bad way at the very point of time when the Senator left it. On a previous occasion I endeavored to get the Senator from Illinois to define more clearly and distinctly why it was that the noble Republican party which he had then and has now so strongly eulogized, ceased to be entitled to the confidence of the people.

Mr. President, in connection with this discussion I am prepared to the best of my feeble ability to defend the great acts of the Republican party, beginning with its opposition to the Missouri compromise down to and including the national election laws. I want the privilege of maintaining the essential wisdom and integrity of the Republican party and its patriotism down to the time of the enactment of the election laws, and down to this hour; and I do not defend it merely down to the time when the Senator from Illinois, who had been a Republican governor of Illinois, left the Republican party. He now comes here to pronounce it a party of patriotism as long as he belonged to it, but a party which suddenly turned around upon liberty, suddenly turned around upon everything that was good, and from that time down to this hour has been nothing but the party of evil.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will conclude in a moment; if the Senator will let me ask him a question I will then hear the Senator's reply; I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. In defending the Republican party on this floor, if it is possible to defend it, I want to know exactly where it needs defense in the judgment of the Senator from Illinois. Down to a certain period it is a noble and a patriotic party. Suddenly it went down in his opinion. Now, he has given us no specification except that it passed the national election law. If a party debate is to be forced by the majority of the Senate in demanding the repeal of these wise and beneficent laws it is important that we should know exactly the whole indictment against us.

The Senator from Illinois ought to tell us when and where he thinks the Republican party first went wrong. I submit in all

fairness he ought to give us some other reason why the Republican party was a noble and patriotic party up to 1868 and is now a party to be condemned when his only specification is that it has passed these laws and kept them upon the statute book. I wish the Senator would open his whole mind and give us the whole case, so that we may reply to it all at once.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like consent to call up Senate joint resolution No. 8. The election bill will probably go over for to-day.

Mr. GRAY. I suppose the debate this afternoon is about exhausted on the unfinished business of the Senate, and I ask that it may be temporarily laid aside, in order to allow the Senator from Nebraska to call up the measure he has indicated.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be laid aside informally.

Mr. GRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may go over until to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

GOLD COIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before submitting the request of the Senator from Delaware the Chair will lay before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury in response to the resolution of the 12th instant, directing him to inform the Senate from what source or sources the gold coin in the country outside of the Treasury of the United States was increased.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest that the letter be printed and referred without being read further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. HOAR. As a large part of the letter has been read and will be printed in the RECORD, the rest of it ought to go in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is also asked that the letter be printed in the RECORD in full.

Mr. GORMAN. And printed in document form also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska, as amended by the suggestions of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1894.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the following resolution, adopted by the Senate on January 12, 1894:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate from what source or sources the gold coin in this country outside of the Treasury of the United States was increased to the amount stated in his recent report for the year 1893; and if derived from different sources, give the sources, respectively, from which derived and amount thereof."

In answer to the above resolution, I respectfully submit the following statement:

The amount of United States gold coin in the United States on November 1, 1892, was estimated to be		$577,387,444
Of this sum there were in the Treasury	$166,135,247	
Outside of the Treasury	411,252,197	
Total	577,387,444	
Coinage of gold by the mints from November 1, 1892, to November 1, 1893		40,699,588
Making a total of		618,087,032
The exports and imports during the same period were as follows:		
Exports	$83,002,720	
Imports	34,903,280	
Excess of exports	48,099,440	
Add to this United States gold coin melted for recoinage during the same period	1,749,014	
Amount of gold coin estimated to have been used in the arts during the same period	3,500,000	
Total loss		53,348,454
Estimated stock of gold coin November 1, 1893		564,738,578
Of which amount there were in the Treasury	$66,616,899	
Outside the Treasury	498,121,679	
Total	564,738,578	
The estimated amount of United States gold coin in the United States on November 1, 1892, was		577,387,444
Amount in the United States on November 1, 1893		564,738,578
Showing a loss of United States gold coin during this period of		12,648,866
Which is accounted for as follows:		
Excess of exports over imports	$48,099,440	
Amount estimated as used in the arts	3,500,000	
Amount melted for recoinage	1,749,014	
Total loss		53,348,454
Deduct from this gold coined from November 1, 1892, to November 1, 1893		40,699,588
Showing a net loss, as above, of		12,648,866
Amount of gold coin in Treasury November 1, 1892	$166,135,247	
Amount of gold coin in Treasury November 1, 1893	66,616,899	
Showing a net loss to the Treasury of		$99,518,348
From this deduct amount of loss accounted for as above		12,648,866
Making the gain of United States gold coin outside of Treasury		86,869,482
The amount stated in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, page 13, outside of the Treasury, November 1, 1892, was	$411,252,197	
On November 1, 1893	498,121,679	
Making a net gain of gold coin outside of the Treasury of		86,869,482
The exports and imports of gold for the fiscal year (from July 1, 1892, to June 30, 1893) were as follows:		
Exports	$108,966,655	
Imports	22,069,380	
Excess of exports over imports as stated on page 10 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.		86,897,275

Respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SPECIAL AGENTS MOORE AND WOODSON.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that the Senator from Nebraska may call up a Senate joint resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senate to consider the joint resolution (S.R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause the settlement of the accounts of Special Agents Moore and Woodson, under the treaty of 1854, with the Delaware Indians, and so forth.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to cause administrative action to be taken upon the accounts of said Moore and Woodson, and to allow to the said Moore the sum of $3,658, and to the said Woodson the sum of $3,697.84, in full settlement and satisfaction of their respective claims for services under the treaties aforesaid, and pass the said accounts to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury for final settlement: and the acceptance of the said sums by said claimants, or their legal representatives, shall be taken as a full and complete relinquishment and satisfaction of their claims for services under the treaties aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I think either the report ought to be read or the substance of the joint resolution stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there is no written report accompanying the joint resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. There is no written report accompanying the joint resolution. However, this measure has been before the Senate on one or two occasions and has passed. The substance of it is found in a case entitled The United States *vs.* Brindle, in 110 United States Supreme Court Reports. Brindle was a colleague of these parties. The question came up whether he was entitled to 1 per cent upon the sale of certain Indian lands of the Wea and other Indian tribes in Kansas. It was held that he was entitled to that commission.

That was taken as a test case. The joint resolution simply proposes to put these parties or their heirs (if I recollect aright at least one of them is dead) upon identically the same grounds that the Brindle case was decided on, affording them the same compensation, 1 per cent commission for the sale of the lands, as was declared by the Supreme Court in that case to be correct. No interest or anything of that kind is allowed.

Mr. HOAR. From what committee was the joint resolution reported?

Mr. ALLEN. From the Committee on Indian Affairs. The report is unanimous. The case was thoroughly investigated by the committee. The joint resolution allows simply the principal sum without interest.

Mr. ALLISON. Were these Indian lands?

Mr. ALLEN. They were Indian lands.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment of the committee to the preamble.

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the preamble be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed to the preamble.

The SECRETARY. The committee report to strike out the preamble and insert:

Whereas the accounts of Ely Moore, deceased, a special register and superintendent, and of Daniel Woodson, a special receiver and superintendent, for the expenses of the sale of the Iowa, and of the eastern and western portions of the Delaware, and of the Wea, etc., Indian trust lands in Kansas,

under the several treaties of May, 1854, with said Indians, require further adjustment and final settlement: Therefore,

Mr. ALLEN. Let the preamble be stricken out. I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the preamble be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN subsequently said: I find in striking out the preamble of the joint resolution just passed that it makes the measure read very awkwardly, and I ask a reconsideration of the vote by which it was stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the vote striking out the preamble of the joint resolution be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the motion to reconsider is agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, to strike out the preamble and insert the substitute which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

PORT OF BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask the courtesy of the Senate to call up the bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 17, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 16, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for completing a sewer to run from the Potomac River near Easbys Point to Fifteenth and E streets northwest, and for repairs to piers of Aqueduct bridge; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were severally referred as follows:

A bill (S. 1126) granting the De Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

A bill (S. 757) to provide for the erection of a first-class fog signal at or near the present position of the Cape Arago life station—to the Committee on Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees.

JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES COURTS IN ALABAMA.

Mr. OATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back with a favorable recommendation a bill (H. R. 4666) to regulate the jurisdiction of the United States district judges and the courts over which they preside in the State of Alabama; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF MINING LAWS.

Mr. KRIBBS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back adversely a bill (H. R. 3459) to suspend the provisions of the mining laws of the United States, requiring assessment work on quartz-lode mining claims for the year 1893; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees for reports.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and I ask unanimous consent to make a personal explanation. In the press reports——

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, is this in order? Does the gentleman rise to a question of privilege?

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent to make a correction of certain reports published in some of the Western papers, attributing to me remarks which were really made by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, a misrepresentation which makes it very unpleasant for me, and doubtless for him also. I shall occupy but a moment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I suggest that the gentleman wait until the gentleman from Iowa is present, as some question may arise.

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not affect him in any way.

Mr. DINGLEY. If that is so, all right.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman desire to correct a report appearing in the newspapers or in the RECORD?

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to make a correction of remarks attributed to me in some of the Western papers.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, if that is the gentleman's purpose, I do not think we can fool away our time in making corrections of misrepresentations that the newspapers may publish.

Mr. SPRINGER. This relates to the pending bill, and puts into my mouth a denunciation of this bill which was really made by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, and I want to correct the misrepresentation.

Mr. REED. Perhaps he was only anticipating you by a year or two. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. That is possible, but I would like to give him the benefit of his statement now.

Mr. REED. If that is all that is wrong, I would not mind that. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to make this personal explanation.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to read the paragraph which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

He [Mr. SPRINGER] pictured the condition of affairs in 1856, when the low tariff was threatened, comparing it with to-day, when 3,000,000 people are idle. The saddest sight he ever witnessed, he said, was the Philadelphia delegation of manly young men in the Ways and Means Committee room a few months ago, pleading not for their employers, but their employment. [Applause.] They represented 200,000—one-fifth of the population of the greatest manufacturing city of the country. He spoke of the Mills bill, and said it was a measure which in comparison with the pending bill seemed like the work of a statesman.

Mr. SPRINGER. The report published in the Illinois State Register contained only the latter clause of that paragaaph. I desire to state that the remarks there attributed to me were really made by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER; that I made no comparison whatever between this bill and the Mills bill; that I commended this bill very highly, and that I did not make the remark in regard to the laborers who had come before the Ways and Means Committee which is there attributed to me. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what will be the condition of my mind a year or two from this time, but I am willing to say now that if the predictions of the gentleman from Iowa shall prove to be true I shall be quite ready to correct myself at that time, and I trust that the gentlemen on the other side will be equally willing to correct the misimpression which they are now trying to give the country when they find that this bill produces prosperity instead of calamity.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.; and,

A bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 299) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company;

A bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River within Shawnee County in the State of Kansas;

A bill (H. R. 3627) granting certain lands to the Territory of Arizona; and

A bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union to further consider the bill the title of which the Clerk will report. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will take the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

TARIFF.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill the title of which has just been read.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 58, paragraph 339, line 12, strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen." Line 15, strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen." Line 18, after the words "action leather," insert "25 per centum ad valorem."

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The effect of this amendment is to reduce the rate on leather generally from 20 to 15 per cent, and to increase the rate on "piano-forte action" leather from 20 to 25 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I send to the desk another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to facilitate the understanding of the amendments as read, the Chair has directed that the Clerk, after reading the page designated in any amendment, pause long enough for members to turn to that page of the bill. The amendment sent to the desk by the gentleman from West Virginia will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 56, in paragraph 327, line 22, strike out the word "twenty" and insert "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. REED. What is the ground of the amendment?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. It reduces from 20 per cent to 10 per cent the duty on "furs dressed on the skin, but not made up into articles, and furs not on the skin."

Mr. DINGLEY. Will this apply to anything except seal skins?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. It applies to all furs.

Mr. DINGLEY. But do we, as a matter of fact, import furs dressed, other than seal skins—of course not made up into garments, but dressed and colored seal skins, except, of course, hatters' furs.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. It simply applies to furs dressed on the skin, but not made up into articles——

Mr. DINGLEY. And it reduces the duty to 10 per cent?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman whether any information was given before his committee as to whether we are successfully dressing and coloring seal skins in this country.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I remember none.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have the impression—perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] may confirm it—that evidence was presented to the committee in 1890 that there was an establishment in Albany that was very successfully dressing and coloring seal skins.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. In any event the judgment of those who concur in offering the amendment is that 10 per cent will be a sufficient rate.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose the amendment is really in the direction of relieving the minds of workers who are employed in making hats; is it not? In other words, the object is to get around putting a protective duty on hats by these little "sops" to the workmen in that branch of industry.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The amendment is in the direction of giving the workmen free material to work with.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment as read will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 68, in paragraph 408, line 20, strike out the words "and not rebound within twenty years from said date" and insert the words "and all hydrographic charts."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, this amendment will be regarded as agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I ask that the amendment be read again.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether the words "and not rebound within twenty years from said date" appear for the first time in the free list in this proposed bill?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will state to the gentleman that the form in which the clause is here printed is not the form in which it was intended to be printed.

Mr. PAYNE. Does not this clause appear for the first time in this bill?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. It does.

Mr. PAYNE. And you say it has crept in through mistake.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Our attention has been called to a meaning which might be put upon the language and which we did not at first detect. We did not intend to abridge the importation of old prints. The language we adopt now corresponds with what has heretofore been the law; and we think by this amendment the language of the bill will be improved.

Mr. PAYNE. How in the world was the committee imposed on in such a way as that?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The language in the bill is simply an unintentional form of expression, such as happens very often to the gentleman himself.

Mr. PAYNE. It is a blunder, then?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. A blunder; that is it; and we now correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. O'NEIL. I object.

The question being put, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I send to the desk another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 30, in paragraph 195, line 16, amend by striking out the word "and," and inserting "2 cents per pound."

Mr. DINGLEY. How will the paragraph then read?

The paragraph as proposed to be amended was read, as follows:

Milk, preserved or condensed, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MARVIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to amend the amendment by proposing to insert "8 cents per pound" instead of "2 cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The question will be first on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Before that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some member of the committee why this discrimination is made between condensed milk and sugar of milk? I understand that sugar of milk is a higher product of manufacture, which is put at an ad valorem rate of 20 per cent, whereas you propose now to put condensed milk at 2 cents a pound. If you are going to change from ad valorem to specific rates why not change the whole paragraph, and have sugar of milk come in at a specific duty just as the condensed milk?

If one class of these manufactures is to be protected and benefited, it seems to me that there is no reason why both should not be. Of course I want to vote in favor of the protective duty, and if you are going to put a protective duty of 2 cents per pound on one class of milk, I hope there will be no objection to adopting the same course with reference to the other; they being somewhat similar. I would like information, therefore, from some gentleman on the other side as to the reason for this proposed discrimination.

Of course I must seek the information elsewhere because, in the way that these amendments are brought up, we have no knowledge in advance of what they are and no opportunity to look into the matter; so that we must depend upon the gentleman who proposes the amendment to give some reason for its support.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will answer the gentleman from New York by saying that I do not think there is a very strong reason either the one way or the other. For myself I have no objection to putting both on the same basis if the gentleman can show any particular reason for doing so. But because we give a specific duty in one case there is no reason why we should in another when we are disposed to be reluctant to give it in either case.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. What is the ad valorem equivalent of the proposed amendment?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will say perhaps a little over 60 per cent at the present rate; that is to say, the ad valorem rate as applicable to sugar of milk, which would be about that.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But what is the ad valorem equivalent on the proposed amendment?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Well, a little over 22 per cent, I should think. The gentleman can readily make the calculation. It is about 34 per cent now, and the duty is 3 cents a pound and we leave it at 2 cents, which would make the ad valorem about 23 or 24 cents.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. What objection would there be, since you are going to make a change and put the duty on condensed milk specific instead of ad valorem, to make it specific on sugar of milk?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. None, as far as I am aware, if the gentleman can submit an argument in favor of the proposition. But it is a small question in all of its parts.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Would not the same argument that induced the committee to put a specific rate on condensed milk apply equally well to the sugar of milk? And if the committee are now changing, as to a part of the bill, it seems to me it would be wise instead of fixing the rate at 2 cents, as proposed here, to insert a specific rate for both products.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, perhaps he does not see the objections that might arise in this case.

Condensed milk is dutiable under the present law at 3 cents a pound, which is equivalent to about 34 per cent ad valorem. Of course, at 2 cents a pound, the ad valorem rate would be at 22 or 23 per cent. Sugar of milk, on the other hand, is dutiable at 8 cents a pound, or about 65 per cent ad valorem, being a higher grade of manufacture than the other. I understand we make all that we consume in this country. Of course we have plenty of cows, and milk, and opportunity, and all that we want is to make up the difference in the cost of the product and the cost of the wages. I see no reason why that should not be done in this case. Sugar of milk should pay a duty on the basis proposed here of at least 4 or 5 cents a pound in order to preserve the relation between the two articles.

Mr. DINGLEY. Or 6 cents a pound.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, or 6 cents a pound perhaps; and if the gentleman from New York will allow an amendment to his amendment I will move as a substitute that milk preserved or condensed, including the weight of the packages, be fixed at 3 cents a pound, and sugar of milk at 8 cents a pound in the same paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] please reduce his amendment to writing?

Mr. PAYNE. The Clerk will find it in paragraph 239 of the present law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] now offers a substitute for the pending amendment and the proposed amendment to that amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. A substitute for the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute for the paragraph.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to offer any observations upon the first section of this paragraph, relating to milk preserved or condensed; but on the second, "sugar of milk, 20 per cent ad valorem," I desire to offer some observations, and will repeat in part what I stated to the House in addressing it last week. Sugar of milk was upon the free list previous to the passage of the McKinley bill. At the time the McKinley bill went into effect, which put a specific duty of 8 cents a pound upon sugar of milk, the trade in sugar of milk was controlled by a few importers in New York, and the product sold at wholesale for 28 and 30 cents a pound. In 1886 the Secretary of State addressed a communication to the President, with Consular Reports, which he transmitted to the House April 21, 1886, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, House Executive Document No. 188, relating to the manufacture of sugar of milk in Switzerland. The Secretary advised that the information collected by our consuls be sent to the country. Previous to that time one factory had been started in New Jersey, but had failed to conduct successfully the business.

Since the McKinley bill protected this product by a specific duty several factories have been started, one large one in St. Lawrence County, in which I live; another one in Jefferson, N. Y. There are others in New York, one factory in New Jersey, and one in Vermont, as well as several in the Western States. These factories produce about two million pounds of sugar of milk per annum. The result of establishing these factories has been to reduce the price of sugar of milk from 28 to 30 cents a pound, for which it was sold previous to October 6, 1890, to 14 cents a pound for the first half of the last year, and since July it has been sold on our markets at 11 cents a pound. That is about its cost to the American producer. Wages in this country are quite double what they are in Switzerland. I have a communication written in Switzerland on the 21st of October last, offering to sell the secret process by which this product is made in that country. It states the cost to be from 5 to 6.4 cents per pound. If the duty is levied as proposed in the pending bill, the foreign product will be brought into the United States at from 6 to 7½ cents per pound, duty paid, and the result will be to close the sugar-of-milk factories in the United States, and we may expect to pay after the enactment of this bill the high rate at which it was sold when there was no local competition.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have in my district one of the large factories engaged in the manufacture of sugar of milk. I know the individuals, most of them, who are connected with this industry. I can verify the statements made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS]. I know the situation of affairs. In the factory in my district they use the milk of a large number of cows. It is an industry which is quite extensive now, and I am informed by those engaged in it that if the bill becomes a law the result will be to immediately close their factory.

Now, I am also informed that 2 cents a pound upon condensed milk is fairly protective of the industry of this country. If so, then that is probably all we ought to claim; but I see no good reason why we should discriminate in favor of condensed milk and exclude sugar of milk. If we undertake to protect the industries of condensing and manufacturing of milk in any form, why not protect all the branches of that industry? Now, I believe the statements of my constituents when they say that they will be forced to immediately close their factories engaged in the production of sugar of milk if 20 per cent ad valorem, which is equivalent to about 2.2 cents per pound, is the only duty imposed. They will be forced to lose whatever they have put into the industry.

This will lessen the consumption of milk, and interfere with and endanger the interests of a large number of citizens. If we undertake to protect condensed milk, I would be glad to know if there is any earthly reason why we should not in the same degree protect sugar of milk. There can be no doubt about the fact that since our factories have started in this country the price of sugar of milk has been reduced from somewhere about 20 cents a pound to 11 cents a pound.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Still it is not as low as in foreign countries?

Mr. NORTHWAY. No, sir.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I think I can give the gentleman very good reasons for not going any further than the committee have gone in this direction. The gentleman of course knows that sugar of milk was on the free list until the passage of the McKinley bill in 1890.

Mr. NORTHWAY. May I ask the gentleman where we were manufacturing any at that time?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I do not hear the gentleman.

Mr. NORTHWAY. May I ask the gentleman where we were manufacturing any at that time?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. We were manufacturing it then.

Mr. NORTHWAY and others. Where?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. In New Jersey. I remember when we were considering the Mills bill we received some very handsome samples of sugar of milk.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Will you name the manufacturers?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I can not recall the name out of memory at this time, but I do state that there was such a factory.

Mr. NORTHWAY. My constituents sent me the names of every factory and the date of the organization, and have informed me, giving me the date in each case——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. If the gentleman will kindly allow me to finish my statement he can contradict it as much as he chooses. The gentleman will find in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee when the Mills bill was being framed statements were made giving in detail——

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I can not hear the gentleman, and I desire to hear him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair again requests members if they desire to converse to retire to the cloak rooms. It is impossible to transact public business where there is so much conversation.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I say, that if the gentleman will turn to the hearings had before the Committee on Ways and Means when we were formulating the Mills bill, he will find what I distinctly recollect, that there were representations made to the committee in regard to sugar of milk. I remember distinctly that very handsome samples were sent to the committee by the proprietors of the factories of this country, at least by one factory. I kept the sample I received for some years, as it was quite a handsome affair to look at. They complained that they needed some duty. They never had any duty prior to that, and we did not give them any duty; but this fact remains, that they did reasonably well without any duty. And while we do not leave the duty at sixty-odd per cent, where it was placed in the act of 1890, yet I submit that when we leave it at 20 per cent, when they have demonstrated that they can get along very well without, they are in a perfectly safe condition, and I know, while the convictions of the gentleman's constituents may be to the contrary, however honest, they are undoubtedly erroneous.

Now, in regard to making a specific duty upon condensed milk. I stated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if he knew of any good reason why it should be extended, that I would be glad to hear it. Instead of giving a reason, he replied giving his opinion, and evidently he knows of no good reason or he would have given one. But condensed milk stands to some degree upon a different footing. We have still left a considerable specific duty on tin plate which is used as a covering for condensed milk, and while that is perhaps a small part of the cost on the article, still it is a shadow of some claim for making the duty specific. Now, there is no very strong reason in any direction, and it is one of those small matters where you are controlled more by the tendencies of things than by any strong footing that they may stand upon.

Mr. NORTHWAY. The gentleman from Arkansas has correctly interpreted my position when he states that probably I do not know the facts. I confess to him that I did not know anything about the manufacture of sugar of milk and the figures connected with its manufacture until I was informed by my constituents, and I do not know that that is anything against a Representative.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Not at all; I meant what I said in no sense of reproach.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I said in my opening remarks that I knew nothing about it except what I had been told by those who were engaged in the business, and that I believed them. They are intelligent gentlemen, and they have told me it was not being manufactured in this country, or to any extent, when the McKinley bill was passed. I did not know that myself, and hence I asked the gentleman to name the places where it was manufactured. The gentleman does not pretend to deny that at the time the McKinley bill was passed sugar of milk was being sold, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] said, at 28 to 30 cents a pound, and that it is now down to 11 cents. He does not pretend to deny the figures given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS], that it can be manufactured in Switzerland and other countries at from 5 to 6 cents a pound.

I believe my constituents when they tell me that they can not manufacture this article at all with a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem, and that they will be obliged to close up. They have sent out a circular challenging, I presume, the attention of each member here, and is there anybody prepared to contradict their statement of fact? If not, I take it for granted that it is true, and I believe their statement that the passage of this bill will ruin the industry in this country, and that in one year we shall be compelled to pay from 15 to 20 cents a pound for sugar of milk.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will state that I hold in my hand the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee in 1890, containing some information about the then existing manufacture of sugar of milk, and, without wearying the House to read it, I tender it to the gentleman from Ohio. He will find it on page 921.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in a communication forwarded to this House on the 20th of April, 1886, President Cleveland stated, on the authority of the Secretary of State, Mr. Bayard, that this was not an industry conducted to any extent in this country at that time. I have a communication on this subject, and I have had an interview with one of the largest dealers in the country, in which I have been informed that there was no manufacture of this article in this country when the McKinley act went into effect, and that the sugar of milk that was used in this country was the product of the manufacturers of Switzerland. I think my friend from Arkansas will discover that the article to which he referred was the crystal, and not the perfected article. Was the article to which the gentleman referred powdered and in condition ready for use, or was it the crystal?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. It was the crystal.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Well, that is very far from the completely manufactured article. I have here a sample of the finished product, manufactured at the Potsdam factory, in my district. It is as fine as flour, a fine granular substance. There was no manufactory producing this article, as I am told by a well-informed gentleman, at the time the McKinley bill went into effect, and the gentleman from Arkansas is under a misapprehension when he says that it was produced here before that time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have before me the hearings of 1890, and I recollect very well that we had some information of efforts to manufacture sugar of milk in this country, but the parties engaged in it found that they could not carry on the business without some protection, and accordingly a protective duty was put upon this article by the tariff act of 1890. Now, without any further knowledge upon this subject, the committee propose to cut down that duty to about one-third. Under the existing law we have developed an industry which supplied all our wants, though the consumption of this article has greatly increased. It is used in preparing food for infants, and the committee propose by this amendment to compel our American infants to be brought up on foreign milk, foreign sugar of milk. [Laughter.] Now, I am so much of an American that even were I a free trader in everything else I would insist in having our infants brought up on the American product. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I rose not so much on this question as to protest against this way of going through this bill, making it even more ragged than it was at its inception. We had an amendment sprung upon the House a few moments ago to reduce the duty on foreign furs prepared for hatters' use from 20 to 10 per cent. A number of persons made communications and statements to the committee in relation to that subject. One was the firm of W. A. & A. M. White, who seemed to present the matter very clearly, and whose statement was indorsed by others familiar with the subject, and I will ask the Clerk to read what they said, showing the mistake this committee has made this morning in reducing the duty from 20 to 10 per cent without referring to the information that we spent two or three weeks in obtaining.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Hatters' furs" were dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem in the tariff of 1842, 10 per cent in 1846, 8 per cent in 1857, 10 per cent in 1861, 20 per cent in 1862, and 20 per cent in every tariff enacted since 1862. When the tariff act of 1870 placed on the free list the raw material from which hatters' furs are prepared, namely, "Fur skins not dressed in any manner," or its briefer equivalent, "undressed furs," a portion of the business of manufacturing "hatters' furs" was transferred from England, France, and Germany to this country. During twenty-three years the present tariff has proved protective without being prohibitory. Although having a large factory in Connecticut in which we produce the article in question, we are not able, with the present protection to the industry, to manufacture over one-half of all the hatters' fur we sell, importing, at 20 per cent duty, all the medium and lower grades.

The present tariff thus secures to the consumer the benefit of a free and continuous competition between the American and foreign manufacturers to sell in this market.

The American manufacturer would be driven out of the business, as they were prior to 1870, by any serious changes in the schedules.

In every revision of the tariff from 1870 to 1890 the subjects received a full share of consideration, and in every case the final decision of the committee has been to continue the classification and duties as already quoted. We respectfully ask that no change be made now.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. A. & A. M. WHITE.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I move to strike out the last word. The argument so far on this bill for a "tariff for revenue only" has been conducted on the line of finding out how much protection each article needs. It has been shown by people who understand this question that if this amendment goes into the bill the industry which has been built up under the promise of this Government will be destroyed.

Mr. WALKER. That is the intention of the bill.

Mr. BOWERS of California. That will be the effect. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to another case. The State of California is, I believe, the only State in this Union that produces raisins. She shipped this year nearly 3,000 carloads, and 99 pounds out of every 100 of those raisins are produced in the district that I have the honor to represent, or, at least, try to represent on this floor. The present duty is 2½ cents. This bill proposes to reduce it to 1½ cents. The raisin-growers have received 3¾ to 4½ cents a pound, and it costs 3½ cents per pound to produce those raisins. Now, if you reduce that duty 1 cent a pound, you put it in the power of the foreign growers to get control of the American market.

Mr. WALKER. Does not the gentleman know that California is a Republican State, and that therefore one of the objects of this bill is to strike at her industries?

Mr. BOWERS of California. Yes, my friend; but California went by a small majority for Cleveland.

Mr. WALKER. But they have no further hope there.

Mr. BOWERS of California No; we will never do it again. [Laughter.] Every raisin vineyard in California will be at the mercy of the foreign growers if you pass this bill in this form. I have here some of this American product grown in my own county. Unlike the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], who showed his Herculean strength the other day by tearing to pieces an old coat in trying to make a point against American manufactures, though he did not know whether it was American or of foreign manufacture, I come in here with an article that I do know to be the product of our own country. These are American raisins [exhibiting them].

I know where these raisins grew; they grew in the El Cajon Valley, in San Diego County, Cal., near the farm that I worked for years. They are a straight American product. There is no "shoddy" about them. Old Spain never produced any superior, if equal. Those raisins are sold where they are produced at 3½ cents

a pound. For the same raisins you pay in this town from 20 cents to 25 and 30 cents a pound. I want gentlemen to look at these raisins; they are a straight American product—they are the product of an industry which by this bill you propose to destroy.

A MEMBER. Pass them around.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Yes; I want to have them passed around. And I want some of them passed over to the other side of the House. I want gentlemen there to realize what kind of an industry it is they propose to destroy. For if this bill passes in its present form the foreign growers can destroy this industry and the raisin-growers must plow up their vineyards and turn them to other uses.

Mr. ENLOE. I rise to a point of order. My point is that members are destroying the gentleman's argument. [Referring to the fact that members were eating the raisins which Mr. BOWERS had exhibited.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. That is right. I want the gentlemen to eat these raisins. They may inoculate gentlemen on the other side with a little knowledge and a little Americanism. They may catch something of the American spirit by eating American raisins. I think gentlemen on the other side ought to eat a pound or two of them; they will do them good.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, we will swallow the argument.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I move pro forma to strike out the last word. I would like to have the gentleman in charge of this particular amendment give to the House the reason why condensed milk under the proposed amendment should come in at a specific duty while sugar of milk bears an ad valorem duty. The law of 1890 imposed on condensed milk an import duty of 3 cents a pound and on sugar of milk 8 cents a pound.

Now, as this bill was originally prepared by the committee who had it in charge and when it was presented to the Republican members of the committee, an ad valorem duty was imposed upon both condensed milk and sugar of milk, but for some reason, which has not been communicated to the Republican members of the committee, the gentleman now in charge of the bill proposes to change this item so as to impose, as I have said, a specific duty on condensed milk while the ad valorem duty is retained on sugar of milk.

Now, sir, sugar of milk is a higher finished product than condensed milk, and there is no question that under the operation of the duty imposed by the law of 1890 this industry has vastly increased and multiplied in this country. Not only that, but the statistics which I have before me and which I propose, by permission of the House, to incorporate in my remarks, show that since the imposition of a duty of 8 cents a pound on sugar of milk the price of that product in this country has decreased 17 cents or more a pound. With such a showing it seems to me that there ought not to be the discrimination now proposed. If the results of the duty imposed by the McKinley bill had not been such as it was claimed at the time of the enactment of the law would result I could see some reason for modifying this provision of the law, but when even the enemies of that great measure come into this House and admit, as they do, that most beneficial results have followed from the imposition of a specific duty of 8 cents a pound on this article, I can see no reason for changing it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. What is the price at this time of sugar of milk?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The price at this time is 11 cents a pound.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. How much reduction does the gentleman say that is in the price?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I say that when the law of 1890 imposed a duty of 8 cents a pound, the price was from 28 to 30 cents; and it can now be bought in the market for 11 cents, showing a reduction of 17 to 19 cents.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Then I understand the gentleman to say that in 1890 the price of this article was 26 cents a pound.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. From 28 to 30 cents.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. And since that time, according to the gentleman's statement, the price has come down to 11 cents a pound.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I simply wanted a fair understanding of the gentleman's statement of fact.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But the point to which I wish attention more particularly is the question why the committee proposes to lay a specific duty in the one case and an ad valorem duty in the other. If any reason has appeared for changing the duty on condensed milk from an ad valorem to a specific duty it would seem that the same reasoning would require a similar change in the duty on sugar of milk. Upon that point I would like to hear from the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, in 1890 a witness before the Ways and Means Committee—William M. Van Syckle, I believe was his name—stated, speaking of the condition of things at that time:

> In the United States there are five factories, located respectively at Lansing, Mich., Oxford, N. Y., Burlington, Vt., Unionville, N. Y., and the factory at Hamburg, N. J.

The latter is doubtless the factory to which I alluded in my first remarks. He also stated that in 1889, sugar of milk was worth not 28 or 30 cen s a pound, but 14 and 16 cents a pound.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is entirely wrong in his assertion that the price of this commodity has been reduced from 28 and 30 cents a pound in 1890 to the present rate. It could not have been reduced beyond the price paid for it, which is shown by this testimony to be from 14 to 16 cents a pound.

These gentlemen also tell us that this industry was started in this country six years prior to the passage of the McKinley act, on page 917 of the testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means, and it will be seen that these facts are substantially confirmed by the testimony of others to be found in the same volume.

This witness states also, on page 920, after having previously stated the difficulties the industry met with in its early and experimental condition, as is the case with all industries, and after stating that it was a new industry throughout the world, having been prosecuted nowhere longer than for about twenty years, that during the last three years of the industry it had been successfully conducted in this country. Therefore you are brought to this conclusion, that all your witnesses show that you have gone through the experimental stages of the industry, that for the three years prior to 1890 it was more or less in a state of prosperity in this country—I will not attempt to speak accurately as to the condition of all of these establishments—but during the last three years of the six of which I speak it was successfully conducted without any duty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we leave a duty of 20 per cent on this article, and I submit that by all reasonable construction nobody has a right to complain. For my own part, I believe it ought to have been placed on the free list. But I can not understand by what process of reasoning, in the face of facts like those I have cited, that gentlemen can conclude that free trade, or a 5 per cent duty, or a 10 per cent duty, or a 20 per cent duty, the duty proposed, is not adequate even from their own standpoint.

As to the other point of inquiry, as I said before, so far as I know there is no great or strong reason one way or the other. I preferred an ad valorem duty on both. But if there is any strong reason why there should be a specific duty on condensed milk, for my own part I say candidly that I do not see it. If the gentleman knows any real reason for the change I should be very glad to have him state it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Arkansas, I desire to say that I have with me here a statement prepared as to the sugar of milk industry at Amsterdam, in New York, showing the prices that prevailed prior to the adoption of the McKinley law in 1890, and establishing the fact that the rate then paid in this country was from 28 to 30 cents a pound. But for the purpose of this argument I am willing to take the figures given by the gentleman from Arkansas himself, and say that the price was only from 14 to 16 cents a pound. Now, the record shows that since the adoption of the McKinley bill the price has been reduced from the figures he gives to 11 cents a pound; which shows an enormous reduction in the price of the product to the consumer under the existing law.

Now, I do know from personal knowledge that many industries have been started and are on a fair way to success in this country under the stimulus of protection given by the law of 1890. One of the largest and most successful of these was started in my own county since the act of 1890, in the city of Elgin, Ill. They started under a belief that the specific duty of 8 cents a pound was to be maintained. They invested largely in machinery, in the construction of buildings, and the purchase of ground and all that was necessary to give the finished and complete product to the people of this country, and it is doing them great injustice now to change the law, especially to make it an ad valorem duty and bring them in direct competition with the Swiss manufacturers.

The gentleman from Arkansas says that there is no special reason for this. If there is no objection against a specific duty on this article, then I contend that sugar of milk should be treated precisely as condensed milk is treated in this bill. Every person admits that it is a more highly finished product than condensed milk; and yet, according to the statement of the gentle-

man himself, they propose to put a specific duty upon condensed milk, which is a larger ad valorem equivalent than the ad valorem duty put upon condensed milk. There is no reason, there is no sense, Mr. Chairman, if I may be indulged in that statement, in making the change that is proposed by this committee. If an ad valorem duty is what these gentlemen contend for, then I see no reason why they should not put it upon both products. But if they desire to protect these industries as they should, under the showing that is presented here, then from the statements of the gentleman himself, it seems to me that a specific duty should be adopted upon both articles.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] quoted from the testimony given before the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. Van Syckle to show the number of factories in the United States engaged in the sugar of milk industry, and he very properly named the five existing factories, but omitted, however, to read the next paragraph following the recital of the number of factories in the United States:

Owing to the prevailing low prices—

This same witness says—

at which the foreign article is unloaded on the American market, the companies operating at Lansing, Oxford, and Burlington have been forced to shut down business.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The gentleman will remember that I stated that I did not pretend to say that they were all then in a prosperous condition.

Mr. BURROWS (reading):

The company at Hamburg was the first industry of the kind established in this country. This was about six years ago. At that time sugar of milk wholesaled in the New York houses at prices averaging nearly 40 cents a pound.

Here to-day we see the benefit of protection in bringing the price down to 15 or 16 cents a pound.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Eleven cents a pound.

Mr. BURROWS. Eleven cents a pound to-day. This same witness [Mr. Van Syckle] further says something which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] omitted to read:

As stated above, the wholesale price in the American market in a few years has gone from 40 cents a pound to 15 cents. Foreign competition has done this. This great reduction in price has not benefited either the consumer or the retail purchaser.

* * * * * * *

It is understood to be the policy of our Government, regardless of party or condition, to foster all infant industries; and this should be doubly true in regard to the industry of sugar of milk, a business benefiting especially the agricultural classes.

It is a fact that milk sugar can be manufactured much cheaper in Switzerland than in the United States. Labor in that country costs scarcely nothing. The wages there are not more than 25 to 40 cents a day. For $1,000 a whole town can be employed. Fuel also costs but very little, and much of the wood used in the making of milk sugar is stolen from the mountain sides.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The gentleman, I believe, stated that the price had been reduced from 40 cents to 26 cents a pound, did he not, at the time that statement was made?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. It has been reduced now to 11 cents.

Mr. BURROWS. The witness stated here 15 cents.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. But that the price had been 40 cents.

Mr. BURROWS. I have but five minutes, and the gentleman will please excuse me. The gentleman also called the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTHWAY] to page 921 of the statement of the American Milk Sugar Company, and I desire to read a passage or two from the statement:

In the year 1884, a few gentlemen of this city who were interested in developing improved dairy processes employed an expert chemist to assist them. While engaged upon the line of work they were interested in, the chemist's attention was called to the fact that a large amount of sugar of milk was being lost, by reason of its crude material, whey, being thrown away as of little value, at many of the cheese factories in the dairy sections of the country. This led him to investigate and experiment along the line of the manufacture of this article.

After a long series of experiments he developed a process by which the article can be made to advantage. He submitted the matter to the gentlemen who are now interested in this company, and after investigation they concluded to form a company for the special purpose of the manufacture of sugar of milk, although investigation showed them the attempt to make it had been several times made, but had always failed, often disastrously.

Owing to various unexpected hindrances, no sugar of our manufacture was offered in the market until late in the year 1886. The quality was very superior, and it was preferred by the leading consumers to the best of the foreign importation. We have continued the manufacture of it from that time until the present, but, we regret to say, without ever getting our company on a paying financial basis. We have invested a good deal of money in plant and in experiments, but so far have been unable to make a dividend, while the stockholders have had to submit to several assessments to furnish means to continue the business, else by giving it up they would have lost what had been invested in the plant.

* * * * * * *

If it were not for foreign competition, there is no question but that we should be able to supply all the milk sugar required in this country.

Then Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State under President Cleveland, made a report, submitted as Executive Document No. 188, to the House of Representatives, a report from our foreign consuls——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Does the gentleman read that as Mr. Bayard's language?

Mr. BURROWS. I am reading what is in the book.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The gentleman must know that that is not the language of Mr. Bayard, but the language of the consuls.

Mr. BURROWS. I was surprised to see that the book quoted it as the language of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Clearly the gentleman who quotes it is in error.

Mr. BURROWS. Then the book is in error.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. He is quoting the statement of the consul.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask my friend not to take up my time. There can be no controversy about it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. There ought to be.

Mr. BURROWS. I will read this, and if this testimony given before the committee, or this statement misrepresents Secretary Bayard, it is not my fault. I supposed it to be his language. If the gentleman knows to the contrary, why, that is all right.

We beg to call your attention to a pamphlet containing a series of reports from the consular officers of the United States in Switzerland relative to the manufacture of the article in that country.

This was stated before the committee.

This pamphlet is Executive Document No. 188 of the House of Representatives of the Forty-ninth Congress, and was transmitted by President Cleveland to the House on April 21, 1886.

In this report Hon. T. F. Bayard, then Secretary of State, said:

Now, that would lead me to form the impression that he said it.

In this report Hon. T. F. Bayard, then Secretary of State, said:

"The manufacturing of this product is not at present pursued to any extent in the United States, though the large and valuable dairy interests would seem to offer an opening for its introduction, an end which may be attained by these reports describing so minutely the details of the process."

He refers to these reports. It looks as if Secretary Bayard was talking.

In thus directing public attention to this industry of the—

Seems to be speaking for somebody—

the Government will be performing a function legitimately belonging to it, seeking to extend and promote the industries of the United States without offering, directly or indirectly, to maintain this new manufacture to the profit of one part of the community and at the expense of the other part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURROWS. I call attention to that, that we might see that the Secretary of State recommended this very industry to governmental consideration.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Of course the gentleman knows that I dispute the correctness of the citation, and I will produce it to show.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman does not suggest that I did not read it correctly?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Not at all. I hastily read it myself.

Mr. GROUT. If the gentleman will allow me to hand this book back to him he will see the same thing.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I know. It is an extract from a consul's report, not Secretary Bayard's statement, as I now take it; and in the reports of Secretary Bayard you will never find any remarks of the kind that seems to be.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman from Arkansas, in view of the facts developed in this running debate, would the gentleman have any objection to restoring the duty on condensed milk and sugar of milk as it now stands under the existing law?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I believe, in view of the facts that have developed in this debate, that sugar of milk ought to be put on the free list.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia, and the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARVIN].

The amendment and the amendment to the amendment were reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 62, noes 99.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of West Virginia was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], which will again be reported.

The substitute was again reported.

The question was taken on the adoption of the proposed substitute, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CHICKERING. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 115.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 34, paragraph 231, line 24——

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, before the question is put on that amendment, I would like to ask if an amendment could be offered to paragraph 193, the section just amended?

The CHAIRMAN. Amendments to this section would be in order later, after the Chair has recognized the committee to offer its amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. I think the amendment would be apropos now.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment would not be in order now, but would be later. The fact that this paragraph has been amended will not preclude the offering of amendments to it at a later period.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 34, paragraph 231, line 24, insert the word "gum" at the beginning of the line; so as to read: "gum, 1 cent per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection this amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 139, section 53, line 22, after the word "cigarettes," insert the words "wrapped in paper."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia states that he desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. But I believe I addressed the Chair first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman in charge of the bill, after which he will recognize other gentlemen.

Mr. BURROWS. I would inquire whether the gentleman offered the amendment as presented by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from West Virginia to be presenting committee amendments.

Mr. BURROWS. Do I understand the gentleman from West Virginia to be offering his amendments as amendments from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I am offering amendments of the majority of the committee, but not from the committee as a whole.

Mr. BURROWS. But not from the committee. Now, Mr. Chairman, although we had this question thoroughly debated yesterday——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman if he has any additional authorities.

Mr. BURROWS (continuing). I think I can throw some little light on this, in view of some of the statements that were made on the other side. I have examined the matter since I raised the point yesterday, and since it was argued on the other side, that in the consideration of the tariff bill of 1890 the same course was adopted, and I find that the statements made are misleading, to say the least.

The consideration of that bill was entered upon under the five-minute rule on the 12th of May, 1890, and from the 12th to the 15th of May a large number of amendments were offered, and only five were offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The very first amendment offered was by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKENRIDGE], in Committee of the Whole.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] offered a large number of amendments, and, as I said, Mr. McKinley, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, offered only five or six. On Thursday, after a hundred and ten paragraphs had been considered, during which time members were recognized without regard to the fact whether they were on the Committee on Ways and Means or not, no one claiming that the exclusive right to recognition was with the chairman of that committee and he himself not claiming it, then a special order was adopted providing that the balance of the bill should be read through and should be open to amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to interrupt him to ask a question for information? The proceedings that the gentleman has been referring to up to this point were while the bill was being considered under the five-minute rule?

Mr. BURROWS. I distinctly so stated. Gentlemen were recognized on both sides without regard to whether they were on the Committee on Ways and Means or not. Then a special order was passed, providing for the reading of the balance of the bill and opening the bill to amendment all the way through. It is then stated in the RECORD that under that order the presiding officer in the Committee of the Whole recognized the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to offer hisamendments in the first instance, and it has been stated here that something over eighty amendments were offered by him.

Now, I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McKinley) in charge of that bill either asked unanimous consent to offer his amendments or else offered them as the amendments of the Committee on Ways and Means and so stated. Whether the Journal or record of the proceedings of the Committee on Ways and Means bears out that statement or not I do not know, but it was stated on the floor that they were offered as amendments of the Committee on Ways and Means, and for that reason the gentleman from Ohio was recognized to offer them. But, to show what coloring is given to this matter, after this special order was adopted, on the very next day, forty amendments were offered by Mr. McKinley. It has been stated here that he offered in all some eighty amendments; but the gentlemen making that statement, unintentionally, of course, omitted to state that forty of them were offered in one amendment, and that those forty constituted a portion of the eighty and were offered not as a matter of right by the gentleman from Ohio as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, but by unanimous consent. He used this language:

Mr. Chairman, I ask consent of the committee to make a few verbal amendments in the bill, amendments which do not change rates, and so on.

He then offered a schedule embracing forty amendments, and by unanimous consent they were made; yet, as I have stated, these forty amendments are cited as a part of the eighty and odd which Mr. McKinley is said to have offered by reason of his being chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, though in reality, as I have shown, he asked and obtained unanimous consent to offer them.

Further on Mr. McKinley offered a number of amendments, embracing two or three pages, and practically they were offered by unanimous consent. In every single instance, I believe, so far as I have been able to examine the RECORD, he offered the amendments as amendments from the Committee on Ways and Means.

I simply make this statement for the purpose of putting this point in its proper light before this Committee of the Whole, and in order that the present ruling may not be drawn into a precedent.

Now, it is stated in the Digest that the chairman of the committee reporting a measure has a right to present to the Committee of the Whole the committee amendments first. Nobody disputes that, and if these amendments were offered by the gentleman from West Virginia as the amendments of the Committee on Ways and Means there is no question but that the Chair, following the practice of the House, should recognize the gentleman as chairman of that committee. But when the gentleman rises in his individual capacity and presents amendments, I say that under the practice and under the very precedents cited and under the rules of the House, he has no more right to recognition than any other member of this House.

I remember, in reading over the debate, that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] took strong ground against the Chair recognizing the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, for those amendments, although no formal point was made; and I remember that the gentleman made the very same argument that has been made here, that the chairman of the committee, under pretense of offering amendments of the committee, might consume the whole time and cut off the other members from the exercise of their right. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] made the same objection, and asked that all the amendments of Mr. McKinley might be read and acted upon at once, so that other members of the committee might have an opportunity to offer amendments.

The reason Mr. McKinley was recognized was that he asked unanimous consent to offer forty amendments at once, and his other amendments were offered as coming from the Committee on Ways and Means; and the reason there were no more amendments offered by the minority was because their course was ob

structive from the beginning to the end; and a further reason, as will be remembered, was that we had a high trial here during that period, in which a member was arraigned at the bar of the House, and in fact more than half the time was consumed in debating matters outside of the bill merely for delay.

I present these facts simply for the purpose of insisting on my right and on the right of every member here to be recognized on an equality with the gentleman from West Virginia when he stands in his place and asks to be recognized for amendment after amendment day after day, not amendments from the Ways and Means Committee, but simply in his own individual right, and receives such recognition from the Chair simply because, forsooth, he happens to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I understand that that is not sound parliamentary law; and it ought not to be the practice in this committee. Therefore I ask to have my amendment read.

Mr. MCMILLIN rose.

Mr. REED. As I understand from the gentleman from Michigan, there was no instance whatever where recognition to offer amendments was given to Maj. McKinley——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] is recognized.

Mr. REED. Except as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BURROWS. Not once. He was recognized as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to offer "committee amendments."

Mr. REED. And when the Chair enumerated yesterday eighty-eight times that Maj. McKinley had been recognized, he included forty amendments which were offered by unanimous consent.

Mr. BURROWS. He included forty amendments which were offered in one bunch by unanimous consent.

Mr. REED. I am sorry the Chair did not tell us that yesterday. The question would have been better understood by the House.

[The Chairman rapped for order.]

Mr. REED. The chairman can not drown that fact by any amount of hammering.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is not in order.

Mr. REED. That is very true.

Mr. MCMILLIN. In reply to what the gentleman from Michigan has said, it is only necessary to take a comprehensive view of what went on and how it was transacted to see that all he has stated, which is borne out by the record, is consistent with the position we took yesterday. He said that Mr. McKinley asked consent to offer forty amendments. What did that consent mean? It meant that Maj. McKinley wanted the consent of the House to offer forty amendments at once, whereas under the rules there could be pending at one time only one amendment and an ameadment to that amendment. It is not pretended, it can not be pretended with the record before us, that Maj. McKinley ever asked consent, or ever obtained consent, to get precedence over other members of the House, because he assumed from the beginning, and the House acted upon the assumption, that he had that precedence.

Now, there is an inconsistency in the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan. He says it is presumable that all these amendments were offered by consent, and yet he discloses the fact that I, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, resisted the action taken by the committee in the first instance on the ground that it would give this priority which Mr. McKinley assumed and which the chairman of the committee is exercising now. I said then that if that rule were adopted it would, under the practices of the House, make it possible for the chairman of the committee to hold the attention of the House indefinitely for purposes of amendment, to consume in this way the time of the House, and not give the other side a chance to offer any or all their amendments.

I gave that as a reason why the proposed rule should not be adopted, the time limited for the consideration of amendments being so short. There was not given in that instance, as there is in this, twelve days for the amendment of the bill; there was not given then, as now, nineteen or twenty days for the full consideration of the measure. But when we had considered only sixteen pages of the bill a limitation of time was adopted, allowing thereafter only five days, with one hundred and fifty-six pages of it untouched.

The gentleman from Michigan is right in saying that I resisted at that time, but that resistance was based on the adoption of the rule limiting the consideration of the bill to so short a time. Yet he goes on the presumption that I was sitting here with the rest of the members and consenting to the jurisdiction assumed by the chairman of the committee in offering those amendments.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman, I suppose, does not dispute my statement that the forty amendments alluded to, which created so much enthusiasm on the other side, were offered by unanimous consent and in gross.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The chairman stated that there were forty amendments which were merely clerical in their nature.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. MCMILLIN. We knew that the quicker we got through with those amendments, in which there was no substance, the quicker we would get to the merits of the bill. Hence consent was given that forty amendments might be offered at once, instead of forty amendments being offered under forty different recognitions, and ten minutes being allowed upon each amendment. That was all.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the gentleman think it was entirely frank to say that Maj. McKinley was recognized forty times on amendments when he presented them all at once?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not say that.

Mr. BURROWS. The Chair stated that there were some eighty amendments in all, and these forty were included among them.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The Chair stated that Maj. McKinley had been recognized for the introduction of eighty amendments, which is borne out by the record.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir; and in those eighty were included forty which were offered by unanimous consent.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Forty amendments at one time instead of forty times. But, if that gives you comfort, let us come——

Mr. BURROWS. Do you think that entirely fair?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let us come to the other forty for which no consent was given, and which, as the gentleman from Michigan has himself disclosed, I was opposing.

Mr. BURROWS. Let me call the attention of my friend right there to the fact that in those cases Maj. McKinley offered the amendments as committee amendments, and so stated.

Mr. MCMILLIN. And that is the point wherein the records of this House do not bear out the statement of the gentleman from Michigan; it is that point to which I was coming.

There never was an authorization of the committee to the offering of the amendments then submitted. They were brought in by the majority of the committee, as the amendments proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia have been, and Maj. McKinley acted in that case for the majority just as the gentleman from West Virginia acts in this case. And the record, as read by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], shows that there never was a meeting of the committee at which these amendments could have been adopted. We had an efficient clerk of the committee, one of the most elegant, painstaking, and able gentlemen ever connected with the committee in a clerical capacity or in any other way, Maj. Carson, known to everybody as a man of the highest character, integrity, and ability, and there is not a scratch of a pen by him showing that the members of the committee, assembled in committee, ever authorized the offering of these amendments. They were offered by the gentleman from Ohio in his capacity as chairman of the committee and as representing the majority side of the House alone.

Mr. BURROWS. I beg pardon of the gentleman, but he does not mean to say that I have misrepresented what the RECORD shows?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Oh, no; not at all. I was referring to the record of the Ways and Means Committee to show that there was no order made by the committee, as such, for the offering of these amendments. The chairman of this Committee of the Whole has acted as his predecessor did then. This, Mr. Chairman, is all I wish to say.

Mr. BURROWS. But let me say that Maj. McKinley—and I read from one single paragraph here—several times called the attention of the House to this matter and indicated in express terms that he offered these amendments from the committee. He said, for instance:

> I ask attention for a moment, and would like very much to proceed with and conclude the committee amendments to-night.

Several times he refers to the fact that they were committee amendments which he was offering.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. They were treated just as these amendments were treated on yesterday and to-day, which were offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BURROWS. There was no objection raised on the part of anybody on the ground that they were not committee amendments.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, the difficulty about the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] is that he is endeavoring to substitute for the record of the House the record of the Committee on Ways and Means.

He will admit on reflection at once, as every one will admit

who considers the matter, that the only thing that governed the question and the statement made in the House by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and recognized by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, was that committee amendments were being presented. Whether Maj. McKinley was authorized or not to offer such amendments was a question that should have been raised then and there; but their passing undisputed, whatever may be the facts so far as the Committee of the Whole was concerned, gave them the force of committee amendments; and as such had their standing for consideration, not because Maj. McKinley was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, but because he was the organ of a body appointed by the House to investigate the proposed amendments.

Now, we have gone far in this House in the matter of recognitions of individuals under similar circumstances, because they had been put in charge of the pending bill; but nobody was ever recognized as against any other member to offer a series of amendments upon the ground that he was the chairman of the committee when that committee had never authorized him to act in such capacity. The chairman of this committee was not authorized to act in offering these amendments. He is not the organ of the House. The committee were authorized to act, and they are the declared organ of the House, and as such have the right to present amendments.

I submit, in addition, whether it was perfectly ingenuous on the part of the chairman to make a comparison in the statement he made on yesterday between the amendments offered on either side, and say that Maj. McKinley was recognized for eighty-eight amendments, when, as a matter of fact, he was recognized for forty-four of them at one time, to ask unanimous consent for their consideration.

What did the chairman mean in his own mind? For I take it for granted that he must have been misled about this thing. What was in his mind when he said that? He was talking about recognition, and he said Maj. McKinley was "recognized." He was talking about recognition as chairman of the committee. Now, he was recognized as an individual, and asked unanimous consent. That was in no sense a recognition of his right as chairman of the committee, or as the organ of the committee; and when he came forward and said that he offered a committee amendment, what did that mean? That meant that he claimed the floor as representing an organ of the House, and if nobody challenged him, whatever might be the fact, that was the attitude which he had in the Committee of the Whole and that was the ground on which it was done.

Now, this thing is not only not supported by the examples which have been cited, but it is contrary to the whole principles which govern the five-minute debate in this House; and if this system which was so much reprobated by gentlemen on the other side, but which it seems has been greedily adopted by them—if this thing is to prevail in the future, it is of the utmost importance that as much of the liberty of the individual member should be retained as possible; and the right of the individual member who happens to be chairman of the committee should be strictly confined to what he does as representing the committee and its action, and there is no pretense here that the committee have authorized any such amendment, because the chairman has frankly admitted that such was not the fact. And if Maj. McKinley stated the thing as being a committee amendment, he must have done it through inadvertence if it was not. But whether he did it or not, the House accepted it, and gentlemen on the other side accepted it. It was going on under his right as the representative of the committee, and I hope the committee will not permit itself to swerve from the doctrine of the equality of the members upon this floor.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to remind gentlemen upon the other side of the House that the matter of recognition rests in the sound discretion of the Chair.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman look at his book of rules?

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman has any point, he can state what it is.

Mr. REED. The rules of the House provide that when two members rise at the same time——

Mr. SPRINGER. The question of recognition, as I said before, rests in the sound discretion of the Chair, and it frequently happens that the Chair recognizes a gentleman who has not spoken, while some other gentleman has spoken, and no one in my recollection here has ever questioned the right of the Chair. It is simply playing upon words to intimate that the Chair misrepresented the fact in regard to the proceedings in the Committee of the Whole in recognizing Mr. McKinley. Whether Mr. McKinley was recognized to offer amendments from the committee or to ask unanimous consent to offer amendments, he was recognized all the same. It was simply a question of recognition, and after the Chair had recognized him he had the floor to make any parliamentary motion he might desire to submit.

Now, so far as the rules of this House are concerned—and the rules of the House govern the Committee of the Whole House—no member by reason of the fact that he is chairman of a committee has any more right than anybody else. The Chair does not recognize the right of any chairman of any committee, or any member under the rules, as being superior to those of another.

Mr. REED. The Chairman says he does.

Mr. SPRINGER. On this floor we are all equal, and all have equal rights; but under the precedents which have prevailed, and which are now being followed strictly by the Chair, the gentleman who has introduced a bill, whether he represents himself or a majority of the committee reporting the bill, has at all times, so far as I can remember, been recognized to propose such amendments as would perfect the bill before the Chair recognized other members of the House.

This is simply a custom. The Chair need not recognize this custom under the rules unless he sees fit to do so; but it is a custom that in its observance has become equal to the law of the House itself, and whether the gentleman who is chairman of this committee desires to be recognized to offer an amendment proposed by himself, or by a majority of the members of that committee, or by the Committee of the Whole House, his rights are the same, and no different under either case. The chairman of the committee reporting the bill, therefore, no matter in what capacity he rises, whether to ask unanimous consent or to insist upon an amendment that may not be favored by the committee, has the right to that recognition until that measure has received the complete sanction of the gentleman reporting it, and until it is fixed up in such a way as he desires it to be considered by the House or the committee. That is for the purpose of facilitating business——

Mr. BURROWS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield——

Mr. SPRINGER. Otherwise we might be discussing matters that the committee desired to amend. So by this means the Chair is facilitating the business of the House in bringing forward, first, amendments which seek to perfect the bill, and then we may contend about other matters afterwards. I will now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to have the gentleman explain, if he will, what is meant by the statement in the Digest that amendments reported from the committee have precedence over other amendments, and when reported with the bill are considered and treated as pending amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is where the committee reports the bill at the time to the House, and has reference to a bill reported back to the House with amendments.

Mr. BURROWS. Oh, no.

Mr. SPRINGER. I submit that it is in order to dispose of the amendments authorized by the committee.

Mr. BURROWS. Amendments reported by the committee have precedence.

Mr. SPRINGER. Those reported back with the bill have precedence.

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the bill had been recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means and reported back with amendments those amendments would be considered by the ruling of the Chair and not by any rule or by the custom of the House.

Mr. BURROWS. It makes no difference whether the bill was reported with amendments or whether they are recommended by the committee: they are committee amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. To this extent we agree.

Mr. BURROWS. Very well.

Mr. SPRINGER (continuing). That if they had been reported with this bill they would be in order to be considered first?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. The precedents and practice of this House in time past have been that the Chair recognize the gentleman that reported the bill to the House to offer such amendments as he desired. He was first recognized to offer such amendments as would perfect his bill, and this side did not object when Mr. McKinley reported amendments and, after disposing of his amendments, the Chair recognized other gentlemen to offer them. Mr. McKinley offered the amendments of the majority.

Mr. REED. That is just the point. He did not represent the majority; he represented the committee. That was what he said.

Mr. SPRINGER. He represented the majority in one instance and himself in another.

Mr. REED. The record of the House shows that he said he represented the committee, whether he meant to say so or not.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the records of the committee do not show that he did.

Mr. REED. But the records of the House show that he did.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the records of the committee are just as much the records of the House as the record of the House is.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of this committee should report an amendment that would be voted down by the House, or an amendment should be voted upon and not agreed to, the other side would have been regarded as having the right to offer an amendment to the bill, so that we are now proceeding in an orderly way to perfect this bill, and it will facilitate business to pursue the practice which the Chair has pointed out. It makes no difference whether the amendments offered by Mr. McKinley were authorized or whether the amendments he offered were forty or eighty. He stated that he desired to offer the amendments, and nobody objected, and I hope no further objection will be made.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ENLOE. I yield to the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I simply call attention to the fact that, in addition to the forty amendments offered by unanimous consent at once, a large number of other amendments were offered upon the statement of Maj. McKinley, as follows: "I ask unanimous consent to offer the following amendment." "I ask unanimous consent to offer another amendment;" and in no single instance did Maj. McKinley take the floor and claim the right, as an individual member, to be first recognized to offer amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman allow me now to state——

Mr. BURROWS. In not a single instance did he do it.

Mr. SPRINGER. He did not ask unanimous consent to be recognized. He was recognized, just as the Chair has recognized the gentleman from West Virginia to offer amendments. He asked unanimous consent to offer amendments, and there were no objections.

Mr. BURROWS. That is too small a difference to take notice of.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is what we are talking about—recognition.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I am rather inclined to the view that has been taken by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] in regard to this question, considered from a technical standpoint. I believe he is technically correct. The chairman of the committee, speaking in behalf of the majority, in substance represents the committee, yet unless the committee as a whole has passed upon these amendments and authorized them to be offered, I do not believe that he can as chairman claim recognition as a matter of right.

I believe, however, Mr. Chairman, that this difficulty may be settled upon a different basis and without departing from correct parliamentary practice. I would like to preserve the individual rights of members as far as possible against the rights of committees, for I have seen the individual member suppressed in this House by the committee and by the Chair in a manner that I do not care to see again, and I do not know into whose hands the next House of Representatives may fall. [Laughter.]

A Republican MEMBER. We know over here.

Mr. ENLOE. No, you do not. You thought you knew before, but were mistaken. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, it does rest within the sound discretion of the Chair to recognize any member. The rule, I admit, states that the Chair shall recognize the member who first rises and addresses the Chair; but every member of the House knows that there is no practical force in that rule, that it has been overridden by the practice of the House, until the custom has become stronger than the law. I stated yesterday, and I repeat to-day, and I do not think I exaggerate when I say that a hundred times I have seen the Chair recognize a gentleman who was in his seat while there were a dozen other members standing upon the floor clamoring for recognition.

That often arises in this way: An arrangement has been made privately with the Chair by the member for recognition at a certain time; the time arrives and the member, not being attentive, does not rise and claim the floor; but the Chair keeps his promise and calls the name of the member, who thereupon rises and takes the floor. I think that under that discretion and under the practice of the House, the Chairman has the perfect right to recognize the gentleman from West Virginia for the purpose of offering his amendments to this bill, and I think it is proper that the Chair should recognize him because he is, in substance, in this instance the representative of the Committee of Ways and Means. He represents the majority in offering these amendments, and it is the right of the majority to perfect their bill before other amendments are considered. Upon that ground I hope the Chair will continue to recognize the gentleman from West Virginia until the amendments proposed by the majority shall have been acted upon, and there will still be abundant time left for recognition of other members.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule upon this question. The first point to which the Chair will address himself is the suggestion made by some gentlemen here that the Chair was not frank and ingenuous in quoting the precedents in Committee of the Whole when the bill known as the McKinley bill was under consideration. The Chair stated that he had counted the amendments during the Christmas vacation or prior to this meeting of the House, and what he said yesterday was this, quoting from to-day's RECORD:

> The Chair found by actual count, unless he is mistaken in that count, that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, in charge of that bill, after the House had passed the special rule, similar to the rule under which we are now proceeding, which took that bill out of the usual course of its consideration in committee—that is, by items and paragraphs, and had determined to throw open the remainder of the bill for amendment at any point—the Chair finds by actual count that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, was recognized by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to offer eighty-eight amendments.

The Chair, it will be seen, did not state that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, had been recognized eighty-eight times. The question was as to the number of amendments that he had offered, and the Chair stated that, according to his count, the number was eighty-eight. The Chair did not say that forty-two of them were offered at once, as the gentleman from Michigan now states; but that does not change the effect of what the Chair did say, which was that eighty-eight amendments had been offered by the gentleman from Ohio. They were distinct amendments, and if the Chair's statement was in any degree misleading, or led the committee into supposing that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, had had eighty-eight separate recognitions, still the fact is not controverted that the gentleman from Ohio had forty-six separate recognitions to offer amendments, that being the difference between forty-two and eighty-eight. Now, forty-six recognitions of the gentleman from Ohio would establish the point that the Chair was attempting to establish quite as well as eighty-eight.

Mr. BURROWS. Perhaps the Chair would have made the case clearer if he had said that the gentleman from Ohio was recognized once to offer forty-two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but after offering forty-two amendments, the gentleman from Ohio offered forty-six amendments upon separate recognitions. Now, it is insisted on the part of some gentlemen that Mr. McKinley offered those amendments on behalf of the Committee on Ways and Means, but that is a point in controversy. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, did not make that claim when he offered several of his amendments.

It will be found from the RECORD that after he had offered the forty-two amendments at one time he yielded the floor. Then the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Candler, offered an amendment, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HENDERSON, offered an amendment, and other gentlemen offered amendments. Then the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, offered quite a number of amendments. Then the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. TUCKER, offered an amendment, and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. FUNSTON, offered an amendment, and so on. Again Mr. McKinley took the floor and offered a number of amendments. The point is, that as long as the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had amendments to offer he was recognized to offer them and they were acted upon by the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair made reference from recollection yesterday to a proceeding which was had in the House. I have that before me now. It appears on page 5077 of the RECORD of that Congress. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, offered an amendment in these words: "I offer the following amendment;" and the Clerk read the amendment. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas said: "Let the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee explain." Mr. McKinley said: "I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GEAR." Mr. GEAR: "That is a defect in the bill," and so on.

Then Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky rose and said:

> Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means how many amendments are in the widow's cruise of oil that never seems to give out, that he seems to have in his desk.

Mr. McKinley said:

> If my good friend will patiently wait he will learn.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: I am very patient; but my friend from Ohio said to us on Saturday that was the last amendment that the committee had; and we put that in the RECORD until Monday morning; and now it is Tuesday evening; and the gentleman seems to have an unlimited supply of amendments; and I would like to know how many more there are.

Mr. MCKINLEY: That statement was quite correct at that time.

What statement? The statement that that was all the amendments that the Committee on Ways and Means then had. And now the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. MCMILLIN, states that there was no meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means (and the minutes of the committee utterly fail to disclose any such meeting) in the meantime, or that there were any amendments agreed to in the meantime by the committee. Yet on Tuesday evening Mr. McKinley was offering quite a number of amendments.

Now, what the Chair wants to say is this: It has always been conceded that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means when a tariff bill is pending has the floor until he offers the amendments which he sends up in behalf of the majority of the committee. That was not controverted during the pendency of the discussion on the McKinley bill. As long as Mr. McKinley offered amendments they were considered. If he offered them all at one time they were considered; if he let in other amendments in the meatime and then desired to recur to his own amendments the Committee of the Whole permitted him to do so until he was through with the amendments which he desired to offer.

Now, passing away from the question that has just been considered by the Chair and referred to in debate, the question of recognition is absolutely in the discretion of the Chair, as all gentlemen concede. The Chair wants to be fair in exercising this discretion. Shall the Chair stop, before this bill is perfected by the gentlemen who have it in charge, and permit a number of amendments to be offered and possibly adopted to different sections, and then have the Committee on Ways and Means afterward calling up those different sections for further amendment? The Chair thinks that such a course ought not to be pursued.

The Chair will be pardoned for saying that the question of recognition referred to in the rule which has been quoted is largely recognition for debate; but the question of recognition before the Committee of the Whole now is recognition to offer amendments; and if the discretion is given the Chair to recognize in debate absolutely that discretion, it would seem to the present occupant of the chair is much more strongly vested in the Chair to give recognition on amendments.

The Chair begs leave further to say that he wants to follow precedents when they are right. There are precedents for the course he has pursued in recognizing the gentleman from West Virginia, who has charge of this bill, to offer amendments until he shall have concluded the offering of such amendments in behalf of the committee. This is the course pursued by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole while the McKinley bill was pending.

Mr. CRAIN. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. In a moment the Chair will have concluded his statement. In the Fifty-first Congress, when a bill was under consideration—and the Chair asks attention to this matter because it involves a ruling of the gentleman from Maine who is now bringing into issue the ruling of the present occupant of the chair—the gentleman from Maine was presiding as Speaker of the House of Representatives. There was pending a bill providing for the issuance of Treasury notes upon silver. A special rule was adopted in the House under which that bill was considered, and an hour was fixed when that bill should be voted upon.

While that bill was pending the gentleman from Maine recognized a Republican member to offer an amendment to it; he then recognized a Republican member to offer an amendment to that amendment; he then recognized a Republican member to offer a substitute; and then he recognized a Republican member to offer an amendment to that substitute; and then when the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BLAND, demanded recognition the Chair quietly informed him that all the recognition within the power of the Chair had been given and that no further amendments were in order.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to state in that connection that I was on my feet demanding recognition from first to last, and was wholly ignored.

The CHAIRMAN. That is unquestionably true. The gentleman from Maine as Speaker exercised a discretion and power which he then had to make four recognitions for four different amendments, all that could be offered to the pending measure, all on the Republican side of the House, and did not permit any amendments to be offered by the minority. The Chair refers to page 5813 of the RECORD, Fifty-first Congress, which shows this proceeding.

Mr. REED. It would have been rather a surprising circumstance if the gentleman from Missouri had been the only member on his feet demanding recognition at that time. [Laughter.] My impression is that there were so many gentlemen on their feet demanding recognition at that moment that I should not like to be called on to identify any one of them.

Mr. BLAND. I was the only one on my feet on this side of the House.

Mr. REED. I can hardly credit that. Unless the gentleman from Missouri asseverates from his personal recollection that such was the fact, I can hardly think it possible.

Mr. BLAND. My recollection is clear; for I had charge of the bill on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was going to make that statement. The minority conceded to the gentleman from Missouri the right to offer one amendment in behalf of the minority; and he pressed for recognition upon it, and was the only member of the minority demanding or asking recognition.

The Chair simply refers to this matter as a precedent in the line of action which the Chair is now taking. The Chair thought yesterday, and still thinks, that the gentleman from West Virginia, representing the majority of the committee, has the right to offer these amendments, and the Chair recognizes him. The Clerk will report the amendment which has been sent to the desk.

Mr. CRAIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAIN. I wish to ask if the Chair uses the term "discretion of the Chair" in a parliamentary or an arbitrary sense in regard to the recognition of other members of the committee for the purpose of offering amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to be perfectly impartial in recognizing gentlemen on both sides of this question.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 27, paragraph 177, amend by inserting at the end of the paragraph: "Chair cane or reeds, wrought or manufactured from rattans or reeds, 7 per cent ad valorem; and strike out 684 from the free list."

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The effect of this amendment is to take from the proposed free list in the bill the articles mentioned there, and restore them to the dutiable list at 7 per cent. Under the present law the duty is 10 per cent.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I read the testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means, or submitted to the committee what purported to be a declaration of Secretary Bayard touching a certain industry in this country, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] criticised me and asserted that no such language had been used.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. It was an error on both sides, as I think I can explain to the gentleman.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from Arkansas challenged the correctness of the statement I made as to the language of Secretary Bayard.

I hold in my hand "Miscellaneous Documents and Messages from the President of the United States" for 1885–'86, and I find on the 20th day of April, 1886, the following:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State on the manufacture of milk sugar in Switzerland.

(Signed) GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *April 20, 1886.*

The report uses the following language:

I have the honor to transmit a series of reports from consular officers of the United States in Switzerland, relative to the manufacture of milk sugar in that country. The manufacture of this product is not at present pursued to any extent in the United States, though the large and valuable dairy interest would seem to offer an opening for its introduction, an end which may be attained by these reports describing so minutely the details of the process.

Then following to the end of this report what I read:

Respectfully submitted.

T. F. BAYARD.

So the statement I made is exactly confirmed by the language of the Secretary himself, and the gentleman from Arkansas had apparently overlooked the fact that such a communication had been submitted by the Secretary of State.

Let me state that my attention was called to this matter by the gentleman from New York [Gen. CURTIS], who had intended to use the report himself in the debate.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose, as soon as we resumed debate on amendments, to call attention to an error into which I think the gentleman from Michigan as well as myself has fallen.

In hastily looking at the quotation made by the Committee on Ways and Means I read the deductions made by the witness:

It is evident—

Said the witness—

that the honorable Secretary saw in this an opportunity to foster and build up an industry as yet undeveloped in this country.

And the witness went on to state—

That it was a case in which the application of the American principle of protection to new industries in their beginning was greatly needed.

I think it is a fair construction of language to say that the witness states that the Secretary saw it was a case where protection could properly be applied, and upon observing that, upon a hasty examination, I was under the impression that the quotation professedly from the Secretary of State was a statement of that doctrine. Looking at it hastily and seeing the use to which the gentleman from Michigan was putting the quotation, I was rather confirmed in that impression.

Now, no one who knows our distinguished representative at the Court of St. James believes for an instant that any utterance of his advocating the doctrine of protection has ever been found over his signature or correctly quoted from his mouth.

When I came to a more careful examination of the quotation I find it states exactly the reverse of what I thought it stated. It states exactly the reverse of anything that would support protection; nor can the gentleman from Michigan justly quote it in that connection. While the witness was correct when he attributed the language to Mr. Bayard, he is incorrect when he made the deductions he did from the language.

What did Mr. Bayard say? I wish to emphasize it. He said:

In thus directing public attention to this industry the Government will be performing a function legitimately belonging to it—

That was the encouragement he proposed to give it, simply to furnish information. And that was to benefit it how?—

seeking to extend and promote the industries of the United States without offering directly or indirectly to maintain this new manufacture to the profit of one part of the community and at the expense of the other part.

I had overlooked that language. I did not question the integrity of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] in his quotation. I was simply questioning the integrity of the text. I had mistaken the true contents of the text. Yes, the witness quoted from Mr. Bayard; that is true. The gentleman from Michigan read from the testimony of the witness in a correct manner. Whether he read it all or not I am not now prepared to say. Mr. Bayard did seek to encourage the industry by publishing information, but not by protecting it; and he laid down the good old Democratic doctrine that it must not be encouraged at the expense of any part or class of the people of this country, and that is true; and if we had followed Mr. Bayard we would have left the article where it was when he made that publication—upon the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia] that he is getting fresh light upon this subject all the time and is inclined to put a protective duty upon additional articles in this bill. These articles, when they are manufactured for chair-makers' use, were on the dutiable list in 1883. Some other articles of similar manufacture, used for hat-makers, were put on the free list by the law of 1890, but, for a reason which was then thought to be sufficient, those used for chairs or manufactured for chair-makers' use were left on the dutiable list at 10 per cent.

In the hearings before the present Committee on Ways and Means only one firm appeared in reference to this particular class of goods, Messrs. Foppes & Partisch, importers, of New York, whose statement appears at page 501 of the hearings. They desired to have these articles put upon the dutiable list, and although they simply expressed their desire, and, as they said, the desire of some manufacturers who used them and some importers, the committee seem to have jumped at the conclusion that it ought to be done without any further examination, and they have put them on the free list, and so reported their bill. They will be found in paragraph 684. But it seems the committee is getting new light every day.

Now, if there was less haste on the part of the committee, if they only would examine more into the industries of the country and the relation of these duties to the industries of the country, I am convinced that they would not stop at these rattans to be used by chair-makers, but that they would go through the whole bill and every schedule and every paragraph of the bill, and give "incidental protection" to all the manufacturers under it.

I am in favor of this amendment. I do not see why they stop at 7 per cent and why they do not give us 10 per cent, which is a very low duty and would not raise your ad valorem in any appreciable degree on the whole bill. Why do they not give 10 per cent for the benefit of the workingmen engaged in this class of industry in the United States?

Of course those opposed to the general theory announced by my colleague yesterday and those who believe that the more you reduce the duties and the more free trade, the wider market you have—the more extended market you have and the greater wages for the workingmen—if you were honest in that yesterday and if you really believe that free trade all along the line would increase the industries of the country and would increase the price of the laboring man's wages, you should not put this amendment on this bill; but if you believe, with this side of the House, that to protect our industries builds up our manufactures, increases our home market, and gives greater wages to the American workingmen, of course this amendment is right. But do not stop at these little things. Go along the whole line and make the bill a protective bill and suit the majority of the interests of the country.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask for a vote.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I desire to amend the amendment by inserting the present law, which is 10 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to amend the amendment by striking out the work "seven" and inserting the word "ten."

The question being taken on the amendment to the amendment, offered by Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois) there were—ayes 65, noes 98.

Accordingly, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 683, page 89, by striking out all after the word "provided,' and insert—

"That any of the articles mentioned in paragraphs 672 and 683 inclusive, when imported from any country which lays an export duty on the same or any of them, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Just read the first part of that again.

The amendment was again reported.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 686, page 90, by inserting at the conclusion of the paragraph, "Provided, that this section shall take effect on and after the 1st day of August, 1894."

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition, I understand, that the committee had under consideration last night. They propose, so the papers report, to still further postpone any benefit to the American people from free wool. They will follow this with a proposition to postpone the date on which the lower duties on woolen goods shall take effect. Do you not think that the Democratic party has been slow enough in giving the people the benefit of free wool? If they have to pay high prices this winter why should they have to pay them next winter? I want to make it perfectly clear to my Democratic colleagues that this is a proposition to postpone the benefits of free wool and lower duties on woolen goods, and that therefore the committee's amendment should be voted down.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who want our people in the country to get the benefit of free wool just as quickly as possible. If that schedule could go into effect on the 1st day of February it would be best for the whole country, for the manufacturer as well as for the consumer of woolen goods. If it were possible to put it into effect the 1st day of March, I think that that would be a good time, although there might be some minor inconveniences.

But the whole business of the manufacture of woolen goods is divided according to seasons, in periods of six months. If it is a possible thing for us to do it, to pass this bill, to put this tariff into operation on the 1st day of February, let us have free wool on the 1st day of February. If it is possible for us to have free wool on the 1st day of March let us have it; but if it is not possible to have free wool in time to include the calculations for the opening of the pending season of manufacture to be made upon that basis—if it is impossible for us to have free wool in time to give woolen goods more cheaply to our people for next winter's wear, then, sir, we ought to arrange to have free wool go into effect for the next season of wool manufacturing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WARNER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Do you not think the manufacturers have been taxing us long enough to divide a little?

Mr. WARNER. My dear sir, if I could get anything out of the woolen manufacturers I would be glad to do so; I would be delighted to do it. I want to cut them down to 25 per cent as a maximum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. That is another proposition.

Mr. WARNER. But the question here is whether or not we shall break into the middle of a season and thus leave no chance for the American manufacturers and no market for American wool for six months to come, and until after we have had that season of wreck and disaster.

Mr. PICKLER. But you say that that will give us better prices.

Mr. WARNER. If we had free wool to-day we would get better prices than we will by keeping it open until the 1st day of August, but if we can not get it on the 1st day of February or the 1st day of March, then the only chance for a market for the wool of the American farmer for the next season is to have the present season of manufacture undisturbed.

Mr. BOWERS of California. But you give 40 per cent duty to the mill-owner.

Mr. WARNER. I have already proposed to cut it down to 25 per cent as the maximum, and I am willing to go farther if necessary—indeed, I hope we may soon succeed in cutting it off altogether.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out the date proposed in the original amendment and insert instead thereof the 1st day of October, 1898.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose that for two or three reasons. I understand the present amendment is in the interest of the manufacturer, and is in the interest of the importer. It is put in this shape in order that these two classes of individuals may shape their business and shape their matters to provide for this radical change in this schedule; to enable them to get rid of their present stock, and to know what to manufacture in the future, and what to import in the future, and to know when to take their goods out of bond and put them on the American market.

I am in sympathy with that idea if you are going to change the rate. I think the workingman engaged in the woolen mills ought to be protected in this respect not only, but for all time. But I want to raise my voice in favor of that class of the people of this country who very often in debate, where words cost nothing, find a great deal of favor on the other side of the House. I want to raise my voice in behalf of the American farmer and the American sheep-owner. Give him plenty of time to prepare and adjust his crop and his production to the radical change which you propose in this bill. Woolen goods can be made in a few months, but it takes a number of years to raise a flock of sheep to produce wool. The change in the American farmer's product should not be made suddenly. You gentlemen should have a little consideration for him, and the same reasons which would impel you to put off the date when this bill should go into effect in order to accommodate the manufacturer and the importer, ought to impel you to put off the date for the purpose of accommodating the American farmer and sheep-raiser.

Then there is another reason. There will be an election in 1896, an election of a President and of a Congress. Let this matter go before the people. Let them understand what you propose to do with the sheep industry of this country, and with the wool industry. Go before them with that issue, and it will then be a clean-cut issue. No demagogues from your party can come into my State and tell the farmers that we have got to raise a hundred and seventy-five million dollars of revenue by tariff taxation, and that any tariff bill that provides for such an amount of revenue as that will necessarily at the same time afford sufficient protection to every class of labor and manufacture in this country. You can not deceive the people in that way in 1896, because they will have before them your naked proposition to put all wool on the free list. Nay, they will know that it will be on the free list on the 1st day of October, 1898, unless they vote to change the programme. So, for all these reasons it seems to me entirely proper and reasonable to put off this evil day until the time I have named in my amendment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to put off until the 1st day of October, 1898, the time when this provision of the bill now under consideration putting wool upon the free list shall take effect. I am in favor of having this provision of the bill take effect at once, because it is the provision that furnishes free materials to our manufacturers. Last year the wool imported into this country, the wool covered by this clause of the bill and now to be put upon the free list, was valued in Europe at $18,416,000, and in addition to that the importers had to pay $8,159,000 of duty upon it. Twenty-six million dollars were, therefore, paid by the manufacturers of woolen goods in the United States during that one year for the foreign wool that they were compelled to use in their manufactures. Now, it seems to me that no greater boon could be given to the manufacturers of this country than free wool, in view of the fact that they had to pay upon their importations of last year a tariff tax of $8,000,000.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Is free wool in the interest of the manufacturers, or in the interest of the consumers of clothing?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is in the interest of both. I am for it because it is in the interest of the consumers, but at the same time I do not begrudge the manufacturer the advantages which it gives him. You can not cheapen the production of woolen goods in this country unless you let the manufacturer bring in his foreign wools free. And, Mr. Chairman, this will not interfere with the price of the domestic article. Goods are made by mixing foreign with native wools, and the demand for native wool for that purpose will be largely increased if you admit foreign wools free of duty, because there will be a larger production of woolen goods and a larger demand for them.

The woolen manufacturers will not be required to pay $8,000,000 a year more for their foreign wool than its actual price, by reason of our tariff legislation; they will get the benefit of saving that $8,000,000, and therefore they can afford to pay more for the native wool which they will require to mix with their foreign wools, and I believe they will pay higher prices for native wool, because there will be a largely increased demand for their goods. Hence the policy which we should pursue is to put wool upon the free list at once upon the passage of this bill, in order to enable our manufacturers to complete their stocks out of free wool before their rivals, who also have the benefit of free wool, can come into this market to compete with them.

I would put the manufacturers' schedule off until the date fixed in this bill and even to a later date, say the 1st of October next. It seems to me only just to the manufacturers of our country that they should be permitted to get into our markets with their stocks made out of free wool at least as early as, if not earlier, than their foreign rivals, who have the same advantage of free wool. I would leave an interval at least of six months.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] differ very radically in their ideas about this matter, although they are both on the same side of the question. The gentleman from New York says if we can not pass this bill so manufacturers can get free wool at once why should we strike down the wool-grower by putting his wool on the free list now? But the gentleman from Illinois says we shall get just as good a price for wool if it is upon the free list as we get when it is dutiable. Now, which gentleman is right?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Neither of them.

Mr. PICKLER. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, every wool-raiser in the country knows that on the fear of this reduction of the tariff mutton and wool are only worth half as much as they were last year. That is our experience, and so far as my own constituents are concerned, the placing of wool, on the free list is ruinous to them. It will hurt us worse, in my opinion, than any other provision in the bill. Our farmers and our wool-raisers know that since this tariff has been in operation we have had a better price for wool and a better price for mutton than previous. We have in our region of the Union a country devoted to sheep-raising, and our farmers desire to assist in raising the 60,000,000 sheep that are yet necessary for consumption in this country. Yet we are stricken down by this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the price of wool had gone down within the last year or two years?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. SIMPSON. Since the passage of the McKinley bill?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir; in last year.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then, in spite of the protection put on wool, the price has gone down?

Mr. PICKLER. It was up before this Administration came into power.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman admits the price of wool has gone down under the high protective tariff put on it by the McKinley bill.

Mr. PICKLER. I admit no such thing.

Mr. BOWERS of California. It has gone down under the apprehension created by Democratic efforts to put it on the free list.

Mr. PICKLER. The price went down a few cents after the passage of the McKinley bill; and it went down in the markets of the world three times as much as it did in this country. It was only by virtue of the McKinley bill that it stayed where it was.

Mr. BURROWS. That is the point.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from New York confesses the very point of this matter when he says that if the woolen manufacturers can not have free wool this season then we ought not to ruin the wool-raisers during the present season. In that remark he confesses the whole case, the great reduction of price of wool. Still you propose to strike down this important industry of our region of country.

Why is it—I have asked the question before on this floor, and

I put it now to the gentleman in charge of this bill—why is it that you compel the wool-raisers of the United States to raise wool in competition with the wool-raisers of the world, and yet you protect the woolen manufacturers? Why is not that question answered? Why did you not distribute this burden? Why did you not give the wool-raiser some protection and the wool manufacturer some protection? Why cast the whole burden upon the wool-raiser? I suppose this has been done for the same reason that the price of every article that the farmer is interested in selling is reduced by this bill. I defy the leaders on the other side to name a single farm article in respect to which this bill does not leave the farmers in a worse condition than it found them.

Mr. WALKER. Southern rice.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, I grant that. I do not envy the Southern farmers the fact that they have a little help on rice and cotton ties. I am thankful that farmers in some part of the country have some little show in this bill. But in the West and the North they are stricken down on everything; there is not an exception. The very party that has been claiming all these years to be protecting the interests of the farmer, to be caring for agricultural productions, comes in here now and strikes down the farmer at every possible point, while still protecting the manufacturer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, is there pending an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. There is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Then I offer an amendment as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in order. The Clerk will read the proposed substitute of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 90, in paragraph 686, insert:

"*Provided*, That this paragraph shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the contention seems to be that under this bill, as it stands, we do not give the woolen manufacturers time enough; that this reduction will take effect in the midst of a season. Now, I am willing to oblige the woolen manufacturers by having the provision take effect as early as possible; and the earliest date at which it can go into operation is the day of the passage of the bill. I am willing that in this respect the free wool schedule should be made to suit them. This amendment will carry out our promises to the people as nearly as possible. We can not satisfy them any sooner. I therefore propose that the placing of wool upon the free list shall take effect not on the 1st of June as proposed in the bill, nor on the 1st of August as proposed by the amendment of the committee, but on the day of the passage of this act.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am in sympathy with the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] which would postpone until 1898 the operation of this measure so far as wool is concerned. If that can not be adopted, I am not in sympathy with the proposition of the Ways and Means Committee, that the placing of wool on the free list shall be postponed until the 1st day of August; and for this reason: If there was any one thing that was certainly in the minds of everybody when the Democratic party came into power, it was that they were to place wool on the free list.

That was their specialty; it was talked at every crossroads. The result was that, without reference to the duty upon foreign wool, the dealers in wool and the manufacturers of wool all over this country at once discounted the effect of placing wool on the free list. It was so in Illinois to my personal knowledge. I apprehend that every man within the sound of my voice who has any personal knowledge of the matter knows that the wool crop of last year was bought at the same price as foreign wools of like quality.

This the manufacturer did on the practical business plea that he had to sell his goods substantially a year in advance, and as wool had to go on the free list before his product was delivered he would not use the wool except at a price that it would be when his goods were delivered. Now, when you postpone the time for the taking effect of that law until August 1, if it is to go on the free list at all, you do not benefit the farmer, whom you strike at and whose finished product you strike at, but you only benefit the importer and the manufacturer, who has practically already had his wool as if it had been on the free list, though he may, as to the product that he and they place on the market before the 1st day of August, get the extra price up to that time without helping any wool-raiser or any farmer one cent. And when the Ways and Means Committee come in here and posture before the country by postponing until August 1 the date that wool shall go on the free list, if it goes there at all, they are either in my judgment not informed or not sincere. I want to place the date, as the gentleman from New York has suggested, up to 1898; but if it is to go on the free list at all in the next twelve months, then the sooner you put it there the better.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of very great importance and one to which the majority members of the committee have given as much anxious investigation as to any question connected with the whole tariff bill, and I shall endeavor to state frankly to the committee why we seem to be resistlessly driven to the conclusion we have been driven to, by the offering of these amendments, namely, to adopt the 1st day of August as the date for putting wool upon the free list, and the 1st day of December for making the corresponding reduction in the schedule of woolen manufactures.

I confess I sympathize with the feeling of my friend from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON]. He is not more eager than I am myself—he can be no more eager, to relieve the American people from what I consider to be a blot on our civilization in the high duties maintained in this woolen schedule; and when I was probably in the same stage of investigation that the gentleman from Ohio now is, my opinions in regard to the matter were exactly those that the gentleman has uttered here upon the floor.

When this bill was first prepared we had fixed the date of the passage of the bill as the 1st day of March, hoping it would become a law by as early a date as that time. Free wool, then, would have taken effect upon the 1st day of March, according to the provisions of the original proposal, and the reductions in the woolen schedule would have gone into effect on the 1st day of December. Nobody now can say that the bill can become a law by March 1, or at least nobody can definitely state or accurately prophesy on what particular date it will be enacted into law. We have got to take into consideration existing business conditions in the country, and the regular courses of trade; we have got to take into consideration the present condition of the woolen manufacturing industries, and as stated by the gentleman from New York, there are two great seasons for manufacturing woolen goods in the United States.

Ordinarily, were there no uncertainty as to the law, the manufacturers of woolen goods would be to-day receiving their large orders from the jobbing houses for the woolen goods to be consumed by the American people next fall. As long as doubt remains as to the date when these changes will go into effect, the jobbers are withholding their orders. They will not give them to the American manufacturers for goods for next fall, if there is a prospect that they can in a few months order the same goods from foreign manufacturers, made upon a free-wool basis, and with the taxes on the finished product graduated according to a free-wool basis. We must, therefore, take into consideration that condition of affairs. We must take into consideration the course of trade and manufacturing in the woolen industry.

It is simply a question as to whether our own manufacturers shall remain idle during these winter months, and whether the employés in the woolen mills shall be out of employment in these winter months, because of the uncertainty, or whether this House shall definitely say and say now, "You can go on with your winter manufacturing and we will fix these dates far enough ahead to prevent the destruction of your spring business." Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have learned the course of the trade in woolen manufactures, orders are taken from this time until late in the spring by the American manufacturers, for goods to be used next fall.

[The time of Mr. WILSON of West Virginia having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The jobbers and the woolen trade generally, the wholesale clothing-makers and the retail storekeepers are all to-day uncertain as to what they should do. If they will not give their orders to the manufacturers the mills can not start. If the mills can not start there is no market for the American farmer. He must be allowed to work off his spring clip, which he can do before the 1st of August, and then, with the bars thrown down, with the invitation to the wool of all the world to come here to help clothe the American people at reasonable prices, the woolen mills can start up again; and, with the duties taken off of woolen goods, by the 1st of December the American consumer can get his choice between imported goods at the new rates of duty, and home-made goods made of untaxed wool at the new rates of duty.

It was for this reason that reluctantly and slowly—as reluctantly as I ever consented to anything in my life, but yielding to what seemed to me to be the resistless logic of the situation—I moved from the view occupied by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and with my colleagues of the majority of the committee determined to report these as the proper dates for the going into effect of the woolen schedule.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Does not the gentleman know or believe that the spring clip which he speaks of would sell as if on the free list, to be manufactured into a fabric that is to go into the fall and winter trade; and does not the gentleman also know that the clip of the present year has been selling as if it was on the free list already?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That is not the fault of the present bill.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am speaking of the existing condition. I am not talking politics now, but I am talking business.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. As to the gentleman's first question, to which I wish to give as intelligent an answer as I can, I will say the amendment which I have presented fixes the 1st day of August for free wool, and I shall follow that up with another amendment fixing the 1st day of December for reductions in the woolen schedules. That gives the farmer time to work off his spring clip under existing conditions, to be made up into fabrics to be sold under existing conditions.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Does the gentleman think the farmer will get any more for his spring clip of wool than if it went upon the free list immediately on the passage of this bill?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Of course if the American mills get the orders from the jobbers as usual, and start up in the manufacturing of woolen fabrics, there will be a market for the farmer which ought to maintain the price of his wool.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will that enable him to get a larger price for his wool?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. A better price than he would have received if the mills remained idle. That is just the point.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The question is, Would he get a better price than he would if wool went on the free list immediately upon the passage of the law?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has expired.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], to have this clause take effect as to free wool on the 1st day of January, 1898. I do not propose, however, to enter into any extensive argument in support of it. I will simply say that it would be a fair proposition to let the American people pass deliberately upon the question of free wool.

Mr. SPRINGER. They have done that already.

Mr. GROUT. I reply to the gentleman from Illinois, no, not yet. This course would, together with the further amendment in line with this proposition, suggested by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], have the duties on manufactured goods take effect six months later, and thus present the whole question, which could in that way be submitted fairly to the people for their decision.

The gentleman from Illinois says it has been submitted already. No; not in any intelligible form, nor has it been passed upon by the American people understandingly. There was an election a year ago last fall. There was another this fall. Now I undertake to say that the voice of this last election is even more to be heeded than that of a year ago. It is more recent and more emphatic, and prudent Democrats can not but be notified that the people are not in favor of this bill.

The election of last fall ought, at least, to raise a doubt as to whether they have rightly construed the verdict of 1892. This amendment would remit to the people for their approval or disapproval the proposition to put wool on the free list. This would be perfectly fair and would result in a decision in which all would acquiesce.

I rose, however, not to make a speech or argument, because I see that such is of no avail, and that this Democratic procession moves on just the same, however reasonable the protests may be against the passage of this bill which is neither for revenue, protection, nor free trade, but is unjust and unequal in every feature. Now, to inform the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] concerning the fall in wool, I will read him something right straight from a farmer in his own handwriting up in my State. It is from a gentleman who writes very intelligently as to the effect of the proposed bill upon the business of the farmer, and after speaking concerning also the misfortunes which came in with the present Administration because of its menace to our industrial system, he says:

Last year wool sold at this time for 22 to 25 cents per pound; to-day farmers are offering it for less than half. Sheep one year ago sold on the average for $4.28. George Phillips, the drover in this town, is now buying them for 65 to 80 cents per head.

Now, this shows when wool fell to its present ruinously low price—practically a free-trade price; for the passage of this bill is already discounted by the American people, and by no class more promptly and intelligently than by the American farmer. But this writer says further:

The farmers do not beg for justice, but demand it. If the bill passes as it is, so sure will the farmer rise in his righteous indignation at the polls next fall and leave nothing but a "grease spot" of the Democratic party; but he can not wipe out its past infamy.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to address the committee, but when we have so many friends talking for the the American farmers, as one of that class I desire to return my thanks for their anxious solicitude.

There are some things that some of us would like to have explained. They tell us that the farmer gets back the amount which he pays as tariff in the increased price of products. It was sought to be incorporated in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], assuming to represent words used by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that the tax that is placed upon the American farmer is placed by him upon the consumer of American products, and, therefore, the farmer does not pay it.

Please explain how we get our share of this protection money. If we get it at all, we get it in the price of our cotton, wheat, and other staples. These prices are made in Europe, where we sell the bulk of our cotton and the surplus of our grain and meat. Were it not for the European demand for it, cotton would not bring 3 cents per pound. Under normal conditions the price is made for each day at Liverpool, where the sun rises three hours earlier, before the New York brokers get out of their beds. What authority is there in England to compel the spinners to pay us more than they pay for Indian and Egyptian cotton?

We sell in competition with the cheapest labor in the world. How are we reimbursed when we must come back and pay a tariff tax of more than 40 per cent out of the free-trade price we got for our products? How with the wheat-grower? He ships his surplus to Liverpool. The price is made over there, because when they do not pay more it is thrown back upon the market here, which puts the price down. How does the consumer of wheat bread pay the tax upon binding-twine, when the market is made in Liverpool, where there is no tax? I trust the gentlemen who talk so much about our interests will answer these questions and show us how we are protected.

Now, a word, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who rushed into this debate so dramatically while the gentleman from South Dakota was speaking. Mr. PICKLER asked in what interest was this bill drawn, and the gentleman from Massachusetts rushed in to exclaim, "Southern rights."

I say to him that I had proposed to sit here without opening my mouth during this debate and vote for this bill; this bill which gives to Massachusetts alone, his own State, more money in the shape of protection than it does to the entire cotton States of the South. And yet he comes in here crying about "Southern rights." We know what that means.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman said "Southern rice," not "Southern rights." [Laughter.]

Mr. MOSES. Then I beg the gentleman's pardon, as he objects only to Southern rice. Why use the word "Southern"? Does that make the term odious? But the gentleman objects to a tariff upon anything the benefit of which goes to the South, and this bill has been denounced by other gentlemen as a Southern measure. They charge that we maintain the duty upon rice. The Wilson bill reduces that duty 25 per cent, while the next article—rye, "Northern rye" if you wish, is increased 300 per cent. Now I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if Georgia had received the protection accorded to Massachusetts, if Georgia had received the enormous pension sums which we poured into your lap, if she had been able to save the interest which since the war we have had to pay your people made rich upon the spoils of war; if you had let her alone and kept your hands out of her people's pockets, the world to-day would see in her borders a degree of prosperity in comparison with which your rocky New England would be a howling wilderness. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTMAN. Why did you not furnish the soldiers and then you would have the pension money?

Mr. MOSES. Have you no respect for the man who lived in Georgia and answered the call of his State? Our fathers loved the Union, but they loved Georgia more. Many of them followed her call with tearful misgivings, and after she had gone down in blood and disaster, dearer even then was she to them than she was in the day of her pride and power. I have no respect for the man who lived in your State and did not respond to the call of his State and join the Union Army, and I have still less respect for the man, and you have no respect for the man, who

lived in Georgia and claimed to be loyal to the Union. My friend will not say that I misrepresent him.

Mr. MERCER. What wages do you pay on your plantation?

Mr. MOSES. I am glad that the gentleman asked me that question.

The land-owners furnish all the capital; feed and clothe the cropper and his family during the year; at the end of the year the profits, if any, are divided equally; if there are losses the landlord must assume the entire loss. Do you give that much? In addition to this he sends the cropper's children to school five months in the year, and in the case of the colored tenants, who are in the great majority, pays for the tuition.

Georgia gives out of the pockets of her white citizens a half million dollars annually to the education of colored youth. What has your party done for the colored people? I defy you to point to a single law enacted by you which has been of benefit to them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, the question before the committee is whether the woolen manufacturers and the market for wool in this country shall both remain paralyzed for another year.

If this amendment can be adopted there will be an immediate market for such wool as is in possession of the American farmer and there will be a coming market for the spring clip. The business of woolen manufacture, in which the district I represent is engaged perhaps as largely as any other in the country, is almost absolutely paralyzed.

At least one half of the mills in my district are silent and most of the others have reduced production and discharged labor to a great extent, so that, as a business, it is practically dead to-day in my district and in this country, and it will remain so until the new conditions which we expect, if this bill passes, are settled, unless we can ascertain now in the preliminary stage of this tariff legislation what is likely to be the condition during the period required for another season's manufacture of raw material into the finished product and its disposition upon the market. If this amendment be adopted, orders will be given at once and the manufacturers will purchase wool; it being understood that there will be no market for foreign wool or woolen goods in this country for another season, or until another stock of goods can be disposed of upon the market.

If that can be settled, no matter whether this bill passes or fails to pass in the end, business will revive immediately to a certain extent, because the American manufacturer, whether manufacturing native or foreign wool, will see that he can hold the market for this season's finished product, and, for a brief period at least, he will be comparatively indifferent as to what becomes of this bill. Now, people all over the country are starving and freezing, and there is more distress in New England, though she says very little about it, than I have heard demonstrated upon this floor to exist throughout the entire West, either as a result of our silver legislation or from other causes; so that this amendment proposed by the chairman of the committee is, as I conceive, an amendment that ought not to be trifled with, but that ought to be supported by members on both sides of the House.

It is in the interest of an immediate revival of business, and that, even for a brief period, will help us through this cold, bad winter until we can forecast the future. I will vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]—possibly it may do some good; but the essential question is whether the amendment proposed by the chairman of the committee be agreed to. Knowing what is threatened in this bill, there being no employment, and there being the necessity for existence, the manufacturer will say to his help now out of work, freezing, starving: "Here, you see that we can manufacture for a time to compete with the pauper labor of Europe upon a basis that will give you existence. The goods must be sold in a depreciated market, for prices must be upon the foreign basis even before the bill becomes a law. Are you ready to work and resume business on the same basis as if the Wilson bill is to become a law?" And, for the sake of existence, they will agree to that, so that business will revive and the present and impending distress in this industry will be relieved.

Mr. DE ARMOND. It is with much regret, Mr. Chairman, that I find myself unable to follow the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means upon the pending amendment. I think the amendment is wrong in principle; and looking at it as a citizen, looking at it as a Democrat, I think it would be bad in its effect. Mr. Chairman, we are right or we are wrong in regard to this tariff matter. The Democratic philosophy, as I understand it, is that no tariff duties should be imposed except for the purpose of raising needed revenue. This proposed postponement is in the nature of a decree that manufacturers may manufacture for a year more under the McKinley tariff, and that consumers for a year more shall be compelled to purchase under the McKinley tariff. If this be a necessity, to that necessity we must bow. If it be not a necessity, we ought not to submit to it.

I concede, Mr. Chairman, that the committee have given long and careful consideration to this subject, and to all kindred topics involved in this tariff inquiry; and I appreciate fully that one whose knowledge of the subject-matter is only casual and rudimentary is at a great disadvantage in discussing such propositions. But I think propositions like this resolve themselves into original principles, and that they depend fundamentally for their decision upon the correctness of the Democratic or the Republican theory of tariff taxation. Now, if this postponement takes place, it is in order that manufacturers may now be invited to proceed to manufacture, with the assurance that they can sell the product of that manufacture at McKinley prices.

I am more concerned, Mr. Chairman, for the welfare of the thousands and hundreds of thousands—aye, the millions—the real distressed people who buy the products of these factories—I am more concerned for the effect upon the prices which they shall pay than I am about this other question, whether the mills shall start up this week or next, this month or next, the coming spring or next summer or next fall. By the adoption or rejection of this amendment we shall determine whether we will invite the American people to a contemplation of another year beset with hardship, dark with disaster pending and disaster threatened—whether we shall invite them to another year of the policy, the wages, the prices, the principles which we have denounced over and over again.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would like a few moments more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I thank the committee for its courtesy, and will endeavor not to abuse it.

The question pending before us is whether we will follow the principles of Democracy, letting the manufacturer take care of himself, or drop back to the principles of Republicanism and take care of him. Are we proposing to say to him, "My good friend, proceed further under the McKinley law, and our word for it, we will protect you in the advantages which it gives you." To the consumer we shall be saying, if we adopt an amendment to postpone the day of the people's relief, "Suffer through another season, with blight and disaster about you, with darkness everywhere; suffer the rigors of another winter; submit to the hardships which we have denounced, and which you have voted shall be lifted from you. Endure them for a while longer, and in the sweet by and by the relief often promised, often delayed, often denied, shall come." For the adoption of the committee amendment now pending, if it be adopted, will insure the adoption of the companion amendment, to delay until December the reduction upon woolen goods.

For one, Mr. Chairman, whoever may vote otherwise, I can not vote for that policy. On the other hand, if we leave this bill as it stands in this particular—aye, better still, if we adopt the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], and put this particular paragraph into effect just so soon as the bill shall be passed—what will be the effect? Grant, if you please, that mills will be idle, or comparatively idle, until the tariff law is passed. From every corner of the land will come up a cry, louder and stronger and more imperative for prompt action upon this bill. That cry has been raised; that cry is echoed over the land to-day, and it will gain increased force.

Such a provision as that proposed by my friend from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] will hasten the passage of this bill. It will be a spur in this House if needed; it will be a spur in the Senate. The country—everybody in it, manufacturer and consumer, high and low, rich and poor, employed and idle, prosperous and suffering—will unite in one mighty voice calling for prompt and speedy action, for almost immediate action upon this measure. And then when the bill is passed, when the people know what law they are to operate under, sell under, buy under, live under, then the spindles will be set whirling, then industry will be stimulated in the right way; then mill-owners will seek mill hands; then there will be work for all who desire to work; and then there will be for the consumer prices upon the Democratic basis of free raw material and a revenue tariff. I think the substitute of the gentleman from Ohio ought to be adopted as a change toward the right.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] putting off the time when this paragraph shall go into effect for five years, and I wish to state my reason. Long before that time the farmers that gentleman on the other side talk so much about will tell you emphatically what they think of legislators that give the big mill-owners of the country six months' protection

under the McKinley bill, during which time the small farmer, the small wool-grower, is to furnish these manufacturers free wool with which to carry on their business. It seems to me, gentlemen, that you are in a hurry to knock out the farmer; but it is consistent with the bill from beginning to end. All through it you have selected the big mill-owners, the wealthy classes, to receive your favor. Everywhere that you had the opportunity to do so you have struck the farmer.

You talk here about the beauties of a revenue tariff; you denounce protection. That is the way you talk, but you have got to vote another way; you have got to vote for the most illogical, the meanest, protective tariff bill that ever was launched before this House.

Mr. Chairman, my district in California produces, I believe, more wool than any other district in the United States; and I know something about the business. I know that until the last election was decided, the wool business was all right; but when we knew that Democrats had got into power, and when we recalled the action of that party on the bill of Mr. SPRINGER in the Fifty-second Congress, we knew that the party was committed to free wool, and then prices went down. To-day in the city of San Diego, where my home is located, great warehouses are piled full of wool.

It can not be sold. Why? These rich manufacturers are waiting for their friends on the other side of the House to stand up for them and give them a McKinley protection for their products and the free wool of the farmers; and of course they will not buy their wool until they know the result of your action here. But when wool is put on the free list they can say to the Australian, and to foreigners generally, "Come on, bring in your wool," at the same time saying to the farmers of the United States, "Now you can not help yourselves; you have got to take what we give you for your wool or it will remain unsold." I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers will speak in tones that you gentlemen will be forced to understand. They will tell you what they think of such business as this. They will give you an opinion of that policy which sacrifices their business to the advantage of the rich and prosperous mill-owners and importers that you can not misunderstand.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] have told us what the farmers of this country will do if they ever get another chance at the Democratic party. The farmers of their districts have already told the country what they would do, not in the future, but in the past; and they can not hurt the country any more in the future than they have done in the past as far as the election of Congressmen is concerned. [Laughter.] They can not do any worse in that regard than they have done.

Mr. BOWERS. Well, as far as that goes, I am willing to stand up with the gentleman and try the question of average.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not mean to reflect on the gentleman from California or the gentleman from Vermont, who represent their districts so well. They seem to reflect the opinions of their people, and I have no doubt they do. But these gentlemen forget that there are many districts in the United States that they do not represent, and if the people in their districts understood that the Democratic success in the last election meant free wool and a reduction of the tariff, perhaps the people in all other districts throughout the country understood it equally as well and gave their verdict accordingly. If the election of the Democratic Congress meant—in view of the declarations of the Democratic party—that the people of this country wanted free wool, the gentlemen have no reason to suppose that the great bulk of the people will not in the next election want it just as much as they do now, and will elect to Congress to succeed us Representatives who will see that that policy is faithfully carried out. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman suggests that some of the farmers in Vermont are stirred up about this matter, and that there will not be a "grease spot" left of Democracy if we do not carry out the policy he suggests. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we carried out the policy of Vermont, as suggested by the gentleman and advocated by his farming community, as we are told, there would not only not be a grease spot of Democracy left in Vermont, but there would not be a grease spot of Democracy throughout the nation. [Laughter.] But as a matter of fact we do not adopt our policy upon suggestions from Vermont.

Mr. GROUT. You might do so with propriety.

Mr. BRYAN. We adopt our policy as dictated from a higher source. The people spoke at the last election when they selected a Democratic House and a Democratic Executive. The policy of the Democratic party was well known to the people. The people throughout the country declared in favor of free wool and a reduction of the tariff, and the farmers want free wool because they can not be hoodwinked and deceived any longer, as these gentlemen seem to think. They understand the question better than they give them credit for.

Besides that, gentlemen seem to forget one very important fact. There is not one farmer in ten who raises sheep, and if he should succeed in carrying out his policy and compel the payment of a larger price for his wool, by having a protection upon it, of course the other nine farmers will be obliged to pay more for their wool, and an injustice is done to nine for the benefit of one. But the last election shows that the nine defeated the one farmer in the contest, and the men who wanted cheap woolen goods proved to be more numerous than those who wanted a tariff on wool.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Then why keep it from them?

Mr. BRYAN. I would like to have it now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, let us have it now.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman can not bring free wool too soon to suit me.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have got to recognize this fact, and this is one of the greatest objections to the protective system, that your industries depend on legislation instead of natural laws; they stand idle until they know what legislation is to be given to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Let us start them up now.

Mr. BRYAN. And it is not strange that the woolen industry should be standing still until they know what is to be done. They do not know whether this bill will pass the Senate or not, or what rates we will put on woolen goods, and they must necessarily stand still until they know, because their business depends on an act of legislation and not on natural laws; and, Mr. Chairman, I hope the time will soon come in this country when our industries will stand upon their own feet and not on laws; and when they will not stand in constant dread of legislation which they fear will have disastrous effects upon their business. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I say, Mr. Chairman, we recognize the existing condition, and we have reported this amendment believing that, as we can not give the reduction at once, we had better state the time when we can give it to them. And, therefore, I reluctantly favor this amendment as the best thing we can do at this time. I regret that it postpones to the people of this country cheaper woolen goods, when they are paying 98 cents duty to-day——

Mr. BOWERS of California. Woolen goods were never so cheap as now.

Mr. BRYAN. When the gentleman talks about the interests of the farmer I wish he would plead more for the nine farmers who are wearing 98 per cent taxed woolen goods and not so much for the one farmer who is raising wool.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will the gentleman allow me me just one questien?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] has expired.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great pleasure to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], as I always do, and to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], and I have made up my mind to support, in the main, whatever the Committee on Ways and Means recommend to this House, because they have given the matter long, patient, industrious, intelligent, and earnest consideration, though this bill falls far below my expectations.

But, Mr. Speaker, I take inspiration from their own utterances to oppose what the gentleman proposes to this House.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the reason of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] is to apply, then it must be against himself, because he says that the reason this postponement should take place is that the mills will not begin until they have their orders in, in order that they may go to work. If, then, they will not begin their operations until their orders are in, there is no necessity to continue for the mills the extension of their protection until December, because their orders will be in upon all the wool they will buy between now and August; and it is a mistaken policy to extend to them until the fall, protection upon those things which they will have sold already before they begin in the spring or in the summer to make them.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am interested not so much in how many blanket or woolen manufactories will remain at work, but I am much more interested in who will buy their products and what they will pay for them? Say there are 8,000,000 of people in this country interested in the making of them; there are 60,000,000 people interested in the buying of them; and I stand here for the 60,000,000 people against the 8,000,000 people who are interested in the manufacture.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this law which is now in force is a Republican law; but if the Democrats extend it, they will make it to that extent a Democratic law, and the Democratic

party should not give one breath of life to so infamous a system. Let me tell you, sir, that the declaration of the Democratic party has gone forth for free trade. This is but a voice crying in the wilderness——

Mr. REED. That is so. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUTCHESON. It tells you to prepare and to repent, and you had better take the warning. It tells you that the day of free trade or fair trade is at hand. We trust it may come without crucifixion. We hope that they will take the salvation we offer them without the necessity of draining the dregs of the cup; but if crucifixion should come, thank God it will be followed by a resurrection as glorious as any since the days of Calvary, and will give to the nations of this world a policy international, extended to Jew and Gentile, and not confined to the Judea of the Eastern manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COFFEEN. Mr. Chaieman, I had not expected to speak upon this question of free wool, in the shape in which the amendments have now come, but it is as well to state our position now as at any other time. The discussion seems to take the shape, as usual, going into all the details of prices and times and seasons for the manufacturing interests of this country to make their profits. I want to say now that I verily believe the minds of more than two-thirds of the members of this House are confused as to what to do with the question as to free wool.

I want to say, further, in behalf of the people of Wyoming, whom I have the honor to represent, that it was not understood in that State that the Democratic platform demanded free wool; but, on the other hand, it was understood in that State throughout the campaign that a tariff for revenue was the emphatic and declared and essential element of the Democratic platform. And I want to say to my friends on this side of the House here, that in the case of wool—from which you have been receiving more revenue than from any two products put together—that you propose in this bill to strike from the tariff list and put on the free list, there is no tariff for revenue in that action; and I want, if I can, to help the gentlemen on this side of the House to get their minds clear upon this subject. If it is a tariff for revenue we want, then raise some of the revenue that ought to come to our Treasury upon wool, instead of putting wool on the free list and getting no revenue at all on wool imports. In other words, let us have a due and fair proportion of tariff for revenue purposes based on the wool product.

Now, another fact; it is curious that for some reason or other nearly all the farm products are termed "raw material." The very name you apply to the products of farms and mines is one that puts these industries to a disadvantage. I want to say to you on both sides of the House that I am not sure which side is responsible for the invention, but this term of "raw material" is an invention that misleads many minds. What is the raw material of one man is the finished product of another who produced it, and all of the farmers' products you have practially counted in the raw materials; and now under this misleading term you seek to put the products of the interior on the free list. That is wrong to the farmer, and you of the Democratic party must represent the farmers of the whole United States as well as the manufacturers of the Atlantic seaboard, if you expect to perpetuate yourselves in the favor of American people. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Let not the erring brethren on the Republican side be too prompt in searching for consolation in what I may say to my fellow-Democrats, for the Republican party has built up and fostered every monopoly of modern times as far as I know, and especially the tariff monopolies of the Atlantic seaboard. Therefore, I am in favor not only of a reasonable and proper tariff that is a revenue tariff on the woolen product of the South and West, but upon all their products, including those of the mines as well as the farm. I am surprised that we have not a better organization here in behalf of the interior products of this country than we have. It seems that those in favor of retaining a reasonable tariff on iron in some States, and in other States a reasonable tariff on coal, and in others those who are in favor of tariff for revenue on wool, as I am, with incidental protection to the producers, are without organization, and therefore vote against one another, when, instead of that, we should be in combination for the assistance of one another in looking after the fair treatment we should have toward the so-called raw materials produced in the interior of the country.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. COFFEEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he as a Democrat did not inform the intelligent Democracy of Wyoming that during the Fifty-second Congress the Democratic party well expressed its views upon the wool question by voting unanimously in favor of putting wool on the free list, and hence that must have been fully understood by them?

Mr. COFFEEN. I do not know what the gentleman's estimate of the proper management of a campaign might be, but I say that I held up at all times in contrast with your theories our theory of tariff for revenue: and I say right here and now, that I believe, in common with the Democracy of this country, that you on that side of the House from which this question is asked, have been subverting the very foundation principles of good government when you use the taxing power of the Government to take out of the pockets of one class to put into the pockets of another.

We can not therefore follow the Republican party on this question of protective tariffs as against revenue tariffs. One is to turn the Government into a commercial machine to guaranty profits to its favorites, the wealthy factory and mill owners, that are in such highly organized and associated conditions that they can command their servile tools in the Republican ranks to give them what they want. This is your protective system in its nakedness.

The other and Democratic doctrine, as I understand it, is to maintain the Government as a guaranty that all classes in all parts of the country, the poor, as well as the rich, shall be protected against unjust discriminations and special class legislation so that all may be subject only to such taxation as is necessary for revenue to support the Government for all legitimate purposes. This is freedom secured by just laws. The other borders on the verge of slavery.

Again, to you who would compel the many to pay constant tribute to the tariff monopolies, let me say that, practically, your McKinley tariff on wool, related as it is to your other higher protective and almost prohibitive duties on woolen goods, is either an excuse or a failure.

The very monopolies that you have built up along the seaboard have used their power to press down the price on domestic wool, and have so controlled the wool markets that our wool-growers last year were forced to take less for wool than ever before; that is, for the crop of 1892, before you had any chance to say it was the result of Democratic victories, for the Republican party was in power and McKinley tariffs at their highest point. These are the conditions under which wool fell to the lowest prices known up to that time.

And in 1893, with full knowledge that the McKinley tariffs would reign for another year, wool fell still lower, so that the people of the far West could not get even so much as the tariff duties on their wool, clearly showing that prices were governed by other forces than the rates of duty on imported wools.

Then, since the farmers have had nothing but reverses and falling prices on wool under the rule of the Republican tariffs, we will not be so blind as to look to that party to redeem prices.

I am, therefore, inclined to believe that changing the whole system to a revenue basis, reducing on wool and other interior products in the same proportion as we reduce tariff duties on the manufactured articles, will tend to restore the prices on wool to normal conditions, and I believe that will increase prices.

I am quite sure wool prices will rise if the manufacturers' corners on the markets for wool are broken. The trouble has been that wool-growers have been compelled to accept whatever the tariff-protected combines were willing to give them for several years. My position, therefore, is a fair-play revenue tariff on wool and all other competing products.

Another thing is clear to our people, that if the price on wool should remain as low under either free wool or a revenue tariff as it has fallen under the McKinley scheme, and sheep-raising in Wyoming should become so unprofitable as some would prophesy, that the vast herds of our sheep-owners should actually decrease, still, cattle will quickly take the place of such decrease in sheep and occupy our unfarmed plains and ranges. So that a check to the one industry will almost certainly stimulate the other, and no class of live stock can be more quickly converted than sheep into some other form of investment.

Besides this, there are many, perhaps a majority of the people of our State, who believe that the ranges, for general grazing purposes, are more quickly ruined for general purposes by sheep-herding than by any other means, and especially are there many small owners and settlers who desire to keep a few cattle and horses about them that fear to see too great an increase of sheep around their homes.

Therefore while we favor taking wool off the free list and giving it that incidental protection that would arise from a proper revenue tariff on wool, yet we do not stand as beggars before you for special favors. The people of my State are too proud and too sensible to take such a posture before you, and we will not give the tariff monopolies even the consolation of believing that they could injure us if they would in this question of free wool.

We have a free and enterprising and thrifty people in Wyoming. Our mountains are full of minerals of all kinds. We have oil-bearing strata full of petroleum, and lakes of soda and ledges of coal in greater abundance than almost any other region of like extent in the world.

Our valleys and plains under irrigation produce grains and vegetables that in both quality and quantity surprise all who behold them, and the people of Wyoming on these various products carried away from the World's Fair at Chicago, that greatest exhibit of comparative merits ever organized, a larger proportion of medals and prizes than any other equal number of people in the world.

We have established a constitution of the most progressive character, and uphold the law and the rights of settlers against all invaders from whatever source, and grant to our women absolute justice in the rights of property ownership, and absolute equality in the right of suffrage.

We look upon our beautiful mountains and feel as free and independent as they are.

We are not, therefore, in this Congress as beggars before you for a small favor in the shape of a tariff on wool, but only we demand fair play, which you should be as ready to grant to the sheep-owners of my State as we to ask it.

Does anyone ask me whether we will vote for the Wilson bill if we fail to get our proposed amendment?

We shall answer without the least hesitation that the Wilson bill should be supported whether our special and minor amendments are carried or not.

We shall rejoice to vote for it at an early day, and if the general reductions all along the line were still greater, we should vote for it still more heartily.

What we may lose in Wyoming on account of wool being carried to the free list, if that shall be the final outcome of this debate, we shall gain many times over in the great reductions made in woolen goods alone.

The tariff under the present McKinley law on goods made wholly or in part of wool is reduced from an estimated average of 90 per cent ad valorem to 45 per cent under the pending bill. I have sold goods in Wyoming for the last nine years, and I believe $40 per capita is a fair estimate of the per capita expenditures in our State for all this class of goods under former prices. We use a very much larger proportion of woolen goods in our climate than many other States. We shall save about $10 per capita (or $50 per family of five persons) on an average by the reduced prices on these goods if this bill carries. This will be so great a saving to our 75,000 people that it far outweighs any difference in price that can arise on our wool product as prices now exist. And again these benefits go to the poorest and humblest of our citizens.

If $750,000 is thus saved by the passage of the Wilson bill to our people on the woolen-goods schedule alone, still greater is the saving by tariff reductions and consequent lower prices on all kinds of goods provided for in the bill. And do you ask me again how the deficiency in revenue shall be made good if any shall arise? We answer for our people without any doubt as to their views on this that we would raise it by an income tax.

We do not believe that it will cripple or ruin the rich men of our country whose incomes are yearly over $4,000 if they shall be called upon to pay 2 per cent tax on their incomes above that amount.

We believe men ought to pay taxes according to their abilities and out of their surplus incomes rather than tax the necessities of the people. We are willing that this entire system of tariff monopolies and restricted and unfair trade should hasten to oblivion if you can establish in its place a properly graduated income tax, trusting that by this means the toilers of this land may be relieved from bearing the unjust burdens of taxation that they have too long and too patiently borne thus far. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. HALL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have said on this floor sometime ago, that so far as the interests of the farmer of the United States are concerned, from the standpoint I take, he is of all men the man who wants a clear field and a fair fight. I believe there is no class of men in the United States who come as near bearing the entire burdens of the protective tariff as the agricultural class. The reason I believe it is on account of that well settled and fairly announced principle laid down first by Adam Smith, where he says, "No one bears the burden of taxation if he can throw it off in what he calls the 'higgle and barter of trade.'"

I believe the farmer is the only one who buys all that he has to buy in a protected market and sells what he has to sell at the price fixed in a free-trade market; therefore I am on principle in favor of cutting it down as rapidly as possible and cutting it down as low as possible. But we must recognize the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means, or the majority members of it, are of the same opinion that we are upon that question. They have dealt with this subject, and we Democratic members ought certainly to sympathize with them, and recognize the fact that they have gone into these questions under great and trying difficulties. They proposed and have brought forth this bill, and after they have labored as hard as these gentlemen have labored we ought to stand by them.

Therefore I insist upon this proposition: While this particular item may appear against the interests of the agriculturists as a single proposition, yet when coupled with the other propositions I intend to vote for this measure, believing it infamous, as I do, because we know it is incomplete, and not as full as the majority members of the committee would desire, yet it is one thing to have a measure which we can vote for at all, and you can not take the duty off all things immediately and at once; and for that reason I think it is the duty of every Democrat on this side to stand by this committee on this matter of wool as well as on all others.

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment proposed to extend the time until the 1st of October, 1898, for two reasons. First, it will permit the people of this country to reverse the verdict which they have entered; that reversal to take place in two elections, one in 1894 and the other in 1896. [Laughter.] Second, it will permit the sheep-growers of this country, in the event it is determined that free wool shall obtain, to dispose of their flocks and herds within a reasonable period, and not force them all into the market at once, thus reducing prices.

It has been asserted that under a free-wool policy the price of wool will be raised, and that under a tariff the price of wool has not been increased in this country. I desire to state a few facts that are worth more to our people than all the theories that can emanate from all the free-trade brains in this House. Take my own State. We are immediately south of and adjacent to Canada. An imaginary line separates the two countries, the one from the other. We have exactly the same kind of soil on the one side of that line as on the other. We produce the same kind of nutritious grasses in Montana that are produced in Canada. The sheep in Montana drink at the same streams as the sheep in Canada; the same sun shines on the sheep in the one country as in the other.

Now, in 1892 the wool-growers of Montana received for their wool, of exactly the same quality as that which was raised by their Canadian brethren on the other side of the line, from 15 to 23 cents a pound, while just across the line the Canadian wool-grower received from 10 to 12 cents a pound. [Applause on the Republican side.] What was the reason for that? Exactly the same conditions of climate, of food, of quality, of market, entered into the problem, yet the wool-grower on the one side of the line received from 15 to 23 cents per pound for his product, and on the other side the farmer received from 10 to 12 cents.

What was the reason of it? The reason was simply this, that the protective tariff compelled the Canadian farmer when he came to our line to put down his good 11 cents a pound for the privilege of coming into our market and selling his wool to our people. That and nothing else was the cause.

Let me go to another point. I recollect distinctly that on the 27th day of last August the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia] rose in his place upon this floor and told the House and the country that if we would only pass the Wilson bill, repealing the "infamous purchasing clause of the Sherman law," prosperity would again knock at every man's door, the spindles would whirl again in every factory in the land, mines would be unsealed, industry would stalk forth in all its manhood, and labor would receive employment in every part of the land.

I wonder if that prophecy ever comes to disturb the dreams of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia? I wonder if to-day, when he predicts such beneficial results from the pending bill—this second iniquity of which he is the father—I wonder, I say, if he recollects the prophetic pictures that were so beautifully portrayed by him when he was urging upon this House that very measure? I wonder, after all, whether he is a prophet, or the son of a prophet, or only the mouthpiece of the stuffed prophet of Buzzard's Bay? [Great laughter and applause].

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, the first suggestion that arises is this: Too much on both sides of this Chamber has the amendment proposed by the Ways and Means Committee been treated as a matter of tariff. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] on that side, and two or three gentlemen on this side, have emphasized the real point in the matter, and it is that while it would be better for the farmer if free wool went into operation on the 1st day of February next, yet, in consideration

of the woolen business as established by seasons and by customs, unless the tariff can go into operation at the beginning of either one season or another the question becomes one not of tariff but of supply and demand.

Whatever may be the Democratic principle in handling the tariff, I trust that we all upon both sides of the Chamber agree that we should so arrange our legislation as to promote the demand for every American product. In regard to the importance of the effect of this legislation upon the consumer, I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON]. But, sir, the situation is this. No one expects that this bill can possibly go into operation before April or May.

Now, under the substitute of the gentleman from Ohio, the result would be that we would have an enforced paralysis of the woolen mills of this country until the date was fixed, paralyzed by uncertainty affecting the question of supply and demand.

As to the consumer, the result upon him would be simply this: We manufacture and consume so large a proportion of the world's woolen goods that if you put the manufactures of this country into paralysis for any considerable number of months, you so reduce the supply of woolen goods in the world that, after you have gotten your free woolen goods, you will have to pay more for them than you did before. The only way in which we can get the full advantage of the reduced rates upon woolen goods is meanwhile to keep our own manufactures in such lively employment that there shall be a sufficient amount of woolen goods to meet the demand when we have free woolen goods.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Does the same thing apply to other branches of manufacture?

Mr. WARNER. It applies to every manufacture that is under similar conditions to those of the wool business; but if the gentleman knows any such I wish he would so state.

Now, the chairman of the committee has suggested that he proposes to follow up this amendment with a proposition fixing an interval of four months before the time when the rate on woolen goods shall go into effect. I agree that if that time were fixed six months later our manufacturers would get a large share of the profits. But every day that we cut off from a six months' interval means that they must either lose a part of their market or else must compete in furnishing Americans with goods as cheaply as they will be able to get them elsewhere a few months later.

I wish the time could be fixed at an earlier date; I wish the tariff were cut down to 25 per cent; but the one thing we must not do is to force a paralysis of business and thereby not merely deny our farmers a market for their wool, but deny to our people the supply of woolen goods which can only come through the maintenance of our manufactures, and upon the abundance of which supply must depend the fulfillment of any hope they have of promptly getting the effect of tariff reductions upon woolen goods.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, the complaint is frequently made on this floor by gentlemen on the other side that the farmer buys the articles that he consumes in a protective market, and sells his products in a free and open market. The gentleman from Missouri who a short time ago took his seat, and who, I understand, is a farmer, as I am, complains of the Republican legislation which compelled him and his compatriots in that business to sell their goods in a free market and buy their supplies in a protected market.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is what is the matter.

Mr. MARSH. I believe I have stated their position correctly on that question. Is that statement correct?

Several MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MARSH. Now, the policy and the purpose of protective legislation has been to give to the farmers of this country a protected market, and not require them to depend upon a free-trade market. Hence the duty in the McKinley bill upon barley; and the farmer who produces barley has found in this country a protected market. Hence the duties in the McKinley bill upon live stock; and under the protective duties of that bill the American farmer has found a market for his live stock.

Mr. MOSES. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MARSH. And under the protective features of that bill every industry in this country in which the farmer is directly interested has found a protected market at home for its products. Now, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSES (rising with a book in his hand). You speak about the protection to barley. Did you know that the Wilson bill——

Mr. MARSH. If you are going to read from a pamphlet I will not yield.

Mr. MOSES. Did you know that the Wilson bill——

Mr. MARSH. If you can ask me a question without reading it out of a book, I will answer it.

Mr. MOSES (laying down the book). You speak about the protection to the raisers of barley. Did you know that the Wilson bill gives 4 per cent more protection to the raisers of barley than the McKinley bill?

Mr. MARSH. I know that it does not; and any man who knows how to read, and will read the two bills knows that it does not.

Mr. MOSES. Let the Clerk read the provisions of the two bills.

Mr. MARSH. You can have them read in your own time. I can show you that under the McKinley duty upon barley the importation of barley into this country was largely reduced. From 11,000,000 bushels of importation from Canada it was reduced in 1893 to about 3,000,000 bushels. And the importation of barley malt was reduced under the operation of the McKinley bill from nearly $400,000 worth to 19 cents worth in 1893.

Now, I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that the design and effect of the McKinley protective tariff bill upon farmers' products was to give a home market for those products. But gentlemen on the other side refer to the operation of the duty on wheat. That duty has not yet inured to the benefit of the American farmer; but wait awhile, Mr. Chairman. Give us the existing law with its protective features operating upon wheat, and in a little while the farmers of this country will raise barley instead of wheat, when you have shut out the fifteen or twenty millions of barley that Canada has been sending into this country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means proposed this amendment to-day, accompanied with his explanation of it, I was inclined to give it my support. The chairman of the committee, however, was apparently somewhat reluctant in offering the amendment. He did not offer it, he stated, until after long consideration and careful inquiry into the matter, so that there seems to have been some doubt in the minds of the committee as to the propriety of the action proposed.

Now, sir, it was stated by the chairman of the committee that it was expected this bill would go into operation by the 1st of March, when it was first framed, and hence the bill was reported in its present form. But in view of the fact that we can not at this time fix the date at which it may pass Congress and become a law therefore this change must be made.

I insist, sir, that we are anticipating too much. As a matter of course if the amendment is adopted, no matter if the bill does take effect by the last of March or the 1st of April, we have given the manufacturer the benefit of this amendment. I say I do not believe we are warranted in anticipating that. This bill will pass this House during this month; the Senate will have a month or six weeks, or even two months to consider it, and in time, so far as the manufacturers are concerned; and I do not think we ought to adopt the amendment by extending the date of its going into effect two or three months longer than the time it takes to pass the bill.

Now, sir, wool is cheap at the present time, like every commodity in this country, by reason of causes that I need not now stop to name. We hope and anticipate that the time will come soon after the passage of the bill that prices may begin to rise; when wool and everything else will improve in value. But we can not anticipate that these prices will rise before the wool clip that comes off next May, and before the farmer can put his wool on the market and sell it. This amendment would force him to sell at a lower price.

The tariff on wool—I can not speak from knowledge—but I think it does not exceed probably 30 per cent, and we have given the manufacturers an average of about 40 per cent, if I understand the protection covered by this bill. So that to some extent they are protected by the bill itself against the tariff on wool. And if I had my way with the bill, I would so frame it as to reduce the tariff on woolen goods down to not more than 25 per cent, agreeing with the gentleman from New York in that regard, and I certainly think that they can manufacture at 25 per cent with free wool. They can resume work in the mills at once, even if the tariff on wool remains as it is for a short time, with the assurance of free wool in the future, and especially with cheap wool at home.

Now, I expect to support this bill. It is not such a bill as I would like. I would like to see the tariff duties reduced all along the line lower than it is on manufactured products, and especially on woolen goods. I think the woolen manufacturer has benefits in the bill far beyond the necessities of his case, and when they ask me to postpone the date at least one year when the benefit of cheaper clothing will come to the people, I must decline, and in justice to what I believe to be the best interests of the masses of the people, vote against it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that the range the debate has taken has tended to mystify my mind, and no doubt the minds of many others on this floor, but I believe I shall vote

for the amendment of the gentleman from New York, because it comes closest to my views, though I am free to say that I am more in favor of present conditions.

I have watched with considerable interest the scene that has taken place on the other side of the Chamber this afternoon. We have seen first the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] planting himself firmly upon the back of the free-trade horse, saying that he wants free trade not in the future, but that he wants it now, and riding him rapidly around the ring with varying success; then rises the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], for the time endeavoring to ride the protection horse, just for a few minutes only, in the interest of his constituents; and then my friend from Wyoming [Mr. COFFEEN] rises in his place and endeavors to perform the same act on the back of the tariff-for-revenue animal. He ought well to have known what the policy of the Democratic party has been for many years on the wool question. If there is any one question in the world upon which there is no doubt as to where the Democrats stand it is upon the question of free wool, and as a citizen of his State he should have informed the people of the true condition, and not have deluded them.

But I am reminded now of the scene that took place in this House near the close of the session yesterday; and it seems to me that the time has arrived when the Democratic party must again call into its midst that gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]; who so gallantly rushed to the front into the circus ring—I was going to say as the clown, but out of respect for him shall not use the words—but will say assuming the position of ringmaster, planted his feet on the free-trade horse, with the reigns of the tariff-for-revenue horse on one side and the high-protective animal on the other, rode round and round the ring arousing the plaudits of the multitude; faster and faster he rode amid the cheers of the galleries, lightly stepping from one to the other, finally dismounting and handing the reins to one of his chosen suit, he smilingly exclaims, See how easy it is to ride three horses when you have learned and practiced in the proper school. Show me if you can the party, be he Populist, Democrat, or Republican, who can excel me in this direction. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to the strong and plain statement in regard to this amendment made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia]; but I consider this a very important matter, and it has given the Ways and Means Committee, or at least the Democratic members of that committee, a great deal of anxious thought, and it has received at our hands the most careful investigation.

There are two items in the bill about which the question of the date of enactment requires special consideration.

Gentlemen will observe that the duty upon tin plate, for instance, is made to take effect upon the 1st of October. That question, like this question, is purely a business matter, wholly disconnected from any question of rates. Whatever might be our action, whether we levy a rate upon tin plate and a rate upon woolen goods, or whether we were to put them upon the free list, we would still have to consider this particular question of dates in regard to these two items. Now, why did we make the reduction upon tin plate go into effect upon the 1st of October and not upon the date of the enactment of the bill? For this reason: That in the very large fruit and vegetable canning industries of this country they make their cans during the winter and spring.

We were unable to guarantee that the reduced rates on tin would take effect before the period for making these cans had expired. People would not make cans out of high-taxed tin, to be used in competition with those who could can their fruit and vegetables with low-taxed tin. Therefore we would necessarily close until our bill became a law, or until late in the season, every can-manufacturing establishment in the country, whether we put tin at a reduced rate or put it upon the free list, unless we deferred the operation of our proposed legislation until after the canning season, thus securing the consumption of the cans that would be made under the high rate. That is a plain business proposition, and I submit to gentlemen if it is not wiser, in launching the ship which we are launching, to do it in an easy and logical way, instead of trying to break as many timbers as possible.

Now, the question of wool is on all fours with that. I am as anxious as anybody on this floor to give relief to the people, and to give relief to the industries of this country as quickly as possible. There is no gentleman here who looks forward with a warmer hope than I do to the time when we can have not only free wool, but free woolen goods. There is no gentleman in this House who is a more ardent free trader than I am. But we must be considerate when we are changing an existing condition. There is not a rate upon anything, except a few luxuries, in this bill which, if we were at the beginning of the system and called upon to enact legislation, I would not oppose. You would have none of these rates with my vote if we were at the other end of the system. But we are repealing, and we must regard existing conditions.

Now, the woolen business divides itself into two seasons. They begin with the 1st of January to manufacture goods that are to be consumed the following autumn and winter. They should manufacture these goods during the present winter and coming spring. Now, unless the manufacturers are permitted to sell the goods under conditions corresponding with those under which they make them of course they will not manufacture them at all.

[The time of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas having expired, on motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman and the committee for this kindness. The manufacturer knows perfectly well that if he is compelled to manufacture out of taxed wool, and then to sell such goods in competition with goods that have been made out of untaxed wool, a very heavy and ruinous loss will fall upon him. What would you do under such circumstances? You would do what I would do, or what any man would do, for the proposition is obvious. As a matter of course the manufacturer would under those circumstances close down his mill. If we could have given free wool on the 1st of January, have promised this reduction on woolen goods to go into effect, say, late in the spring, it would have been an ideal adjustment of the dates.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Is not wool to-day lower than it ever has been in its entire history, and is it not cheap enough for a manufacturer to buy in competition with foreign wool?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The gentleman must view the question of prices relatively.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I hope the gentleman will answer my question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will answer the question, and I will broaden it a little. Some grades of American wool are, I believe, as cheap if not cheaper than the same grades of wool abroad. Perhaps all grades are, but we do not know that. It is a question of dispute, and, what is more potent, it is a question of doubt. I think our wool, as a whole, will not fall; but there are hundreds of classes of wool, and no one, so far as I know, can speak with confidence of the price of all of them. But we manufacture also a great deal of woolen goods out of imported wool, and that is not as cheap here as it is abroad by the full amount of the tax. Therefore, our manufacturers are forced by existing law, which we are powerless immediately to repeal, to manufacture for next fall under present conditions. If the fall market is not secured for the manufacturers and merchants so as to protect them from these onerous conditions, they will not load up with the goods. If that loss is to be located on them, as a matter of course they will not go into the transaction. They suffer. But they do not suffer except from a temporary stoppage, while the laboring man suffers——

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. And the American wool-grower.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. And the wool-grower also suffers, because you stop the demand for American wool, and when my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] speaks of a hasty policy in regard to this he drives the rowels of his spurs into the flanks of the workingmen, whom we can not save from suffering except in the way the committee proposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Tell us something about the interest of the consumer; we have not heard that discussed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I will, with a great deal of pleasure. The consumer, if such an amendment as my friend from Ohio proposes should be adopted, would get cheaper goods a few months earlier. But of course the future will be anticipated considerably by dealers, and this benefit is consequently somewhat exaggerated. There is no question about that, but I ask you to consider two things. Would that compensate for the loss to the wool-grower in the demand for his wool in the spring, and would it compensate for the temporary but acute suffering that would be forced thereby on the wage-workers of the woolen mills?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Yes, unless free wool is wrong.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. It is not a question of free wool or of free goods. It is a question of how to put free wool and lower rates on woolen goods into operation. It is a

question of the adjustment of the dates to the usages and needs of business. That is where gentlemen make a mistake in treating this particular question of dates in this particular industry with its special seasons for work and sales as a question of free wool and considering the merits of the question of the tax on goods and the merits of the tax on wool in this connection. This thing you would have to do if the provision were made for free wool and free goods, because we must preserve the market to the manufacturer until he exhausts those goods that existing law forced him to make of wool that paid a tax, or else he will not make them during that period at all.

Now that we have fought this great fight for tariff reform through all these years, and at last acquired the great power intrusted to us, is it wise, is it right for us to enter upon any part of our great work in a punitive spirit? Should we go at our great work considerately, or like a man who tries to mend a watch with an ax? And I say to our friends that while the Committee on Ways and Means came to this conclusion reluctantly, for we earnestly desire earlier results, yet let it be understood that after the most exhaustive consideration we came to this conclusion firmly; and we ask our friends to stand by us. We want to do what is right, and this is the wise, proper, and right thing to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to members of the Committee on Ways and Means on this question, and I do not want any better argument than they furnish for putting wool on the free list at once. They say there is a stagnation in business, and that doubt and uncertainty will keep the factories longer idle. Remove this doubt and uncertainty the first minute you can do so, and that will be the minute when the bill goes into effect. You can not do it any sooner than that, or my amendment would have provided for the earlier date.

The manufacturers want free wool quickly. Why not take advantage of the influence of their lobby, a power that we have felt exerting itself upon our committee in a wrong direction (that is to make the bill worse), by the adoption of the substitute I propose, which makes wool free as soon as the bill is passed? The influence of the lobby then will be in the direction of hurrying up the Senate, which is not noted for acting quickly. This influence will then be in the direction of saving time to the people.

Why does the committee propose December 1 as the date for lowering the duties on woolen goods? The only effect I can see will be to maintain monopoly prices longer. You who are in favor of free wool and lower duties on woolen goods in the interests of the consumers should use every effort to bring both changes about quickly. If the committee have, as I believe, made a great blunder in proposing this amendment and the one to follow, it is the duty of the Democratic members of this House to vote down the amendments. It is more important that we should act courageously than that we should make a display of courtesy to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, there is little inspiration to an advocate in a case who is informed in advance by the court that a judgment has already been entered against him. Therefore we as protectionists have not much occasion for enthusiasm on this side, when it is known in advance what will be the fate of this measure, though we may present the most conclusive reasoning and the most favorable showing in support of our opposition to it; but, sir, it is at least, limited as it is, some consolation to know that an opportunity is offered us now and here, through this House and to the American people to enter our earnest protest against the injury which is about to be inflicted upon so large a portion of our own people, and upon such an immense proportion of their wealth. There is satisfaction also in another direction, Mr. Chairman, in knowing that at last the veil has been cast aside, and we are to have this issue presented for the first time as an issue should always be presented in its true and real meaning.

In former years we have been deceived by appeals upon this question on the part of the free trader, in his argument to the wool-growing interest of this country, by the statement that placing wool on the free list would be an advantage to him, that as the duty was lowered it would produce a corresponding increase in the price of his wool, and would have a tendency to raise the price of wool in the American market in proportion as foreign wool was reduced in price by reduced duties; also, that it would have another effect, namely, to give the American manufacturer an opportunity to import the foreign wools necessary for the production of many fabrics by admixture with our domestic wools; that all this would increase the manufacturer's market and wool would rise.

This humbug appeal has been exposed. The consumer now hears but one argument—that wool must be free, that the manufacturer may have a better opportunity; that this country can not produce many of the grades required. I hold in my hand the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee of this Congress, where several of the ablest experts of American woolen manufactures appeared and testified that even the last assumption to which I have referred is fallacious; that this country is able and has been able in times past to produce wools of the necessary quality required for admixture with the majority of American wools to produce the finest fabrics worn by civilized mankind, and that it is able to produce and has been able to produce a sufficient quantity of those wools under sufficient protection. Mr. Chairman, now the appeal is addressed to the American people in behalf of the reduction of duty upon the ground that it decreases the price of wearing apparel to the consumer. The whole argument is that by destroying the American wool industry, now embracing 50,000,000 sheep and yielding over $100,000,000 annual income to our own people, we shall have cheaper clothes! They say this will be an immense benefit.

It is obvious, however, that a special fallacy accompanies this argument as to the extent of that reduction. Admitting that there would be a reduction of price in one point of view, what would be its extent? Upon this question I call particular attention to testimony which will be found in the report of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Justice, of Philadelphia, probably one of the most profound students of the wool industry in this country, on examination before that committee most completely exposed the free trader, and demonstrated the extravagance and real falsity of his statement. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE put to him the free trader's familiar position by saying:

I suppose the farmers in the older States where farms and flocks are small have to pay more protection on the woolen goods purchased for their families than they receive in protection on the wool they sell. The difference in this tariff tax would be a losing business to them, would it not?

Mr. Justice answered:

I do not think so. For instance this suit of clothes—

Pointing to his own suit—

contains 3 pounds of wool. If we had free wool, the woolen goods in it would probably cost 90 cents. Under the McKinley law as at first proposed it would cost $1.80. The farmer who wears a suit of clothes like this pays 90 cents more under the McKinley bill than if he had sold his free wool in London.

Mr. Justice further testifies that there is an average among the farmers of Ohio of about 200 sheep per capita, that the sheep will yield about 5 pounds of wool each—that is, about 1,000 pounds for the flock; that in scouring the shrinkage will be one-half, leaving 500 pounds of scoured wool.

Now, if the farmer sells that wool at 60 cents he gets $300 for his scoured wool, but if he sells it in London at the free-trade price he gets only $150. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] put to the witness this interrogatory: "You are not prepared to say whether the farmer makes or loses by the tariff on the wool schedule?" To which the witness made this significant answer: "The wool [for two suits for four in family] in free-trade clothes saves him $7.80 and reduces his income $150." Mr. BRECKINRIDGE said: "That is based on the calculation you have just given." Mr. Justice says: "Because you take the ground that you are not going to reduce the wages of labor." This suit given as a sample was one costing $27 at wholesale, at retail not less than $30, and the wool cost was 90 cents. Now, take a suit costing $13.50 and the wool cost to the consumer would be about 45 cents, and this on a most comfortable wool suit. This is the enormous sacrifice he makes for protection!

I want to call particularly to this point the attention of gentlemen upon the other side who are assuming to be the especial champions of the poor consumer, and who have magnified the cost imposed upon him by protection without at the same time reminding him of the innumerable advantages conferred upon him by the protection policy. And while deceiving the people in this way assurances have been given to the laborers of the country, and to the operatives in the woolen factories of our country, that whatever might be the fate of wool, whether it went up or down, but especially if it went down by reduced duties, there should be no diminution in their wages. I want that particularly to go out to the country, and let the workingmen take the one proposition with the other.

The very most that can be expected in the way of reduction in the price of a superior suit of woolen clothes is 90 cents, and that "All wool and a yard wide." There are, as I have said, many compensating considerations which will far more than outweigh the 90 cents, but my limited time will not permit me to present them to the committee. In conclusion, I desire again to protest in the name of one-half of the population of that far-distant State on the western confines of the Republic, which I have the honor in part to represent, which population is most extensively interested in wool growing, and who see before them a sacrifice of their flocks, now yielding an annual revenue of $4,000,000, and the abandonment of vast acres of pasture lands no longer suit-

able for other purposes. They have come before us in memorials, in petitions, through chambers of commerce, through boards of trade and through oral appeals they have beseeched the Representatives of the American people in this Chamber to respect not only the important interest of the wool-grower, but also the many other interests which are directly and indirectly connected with that industry.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I have been inclined to subordinate to some extent my own opinions upon this subject in order to follow the lead of the Committee on Ways and Means. I must confess that in agreeing to vote for the bill I am compelled to concede something of my own opinions because this bill does not go far enough and it does not go fast enough in the direction of free trade. Some of the advocates of protection have been appealing to us to do something to protect the farmer. I answer that appeal, as the representative of an agricultural district, by saying that I want to protect the farmer against protection. That is the only protection the farmer needs. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] insist that this bill ought not to pass because it gives no protection to the farmer. Mr. Chairman, if there is any class in this country which does not want any legislation in its favor to protect it, that class is the farmer class.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is, the farmer ought to be in a condition not to need protection?

Mr. ENLOE. The only protection the farmer needs is protection which would consist in the repeal of the laws which impose unjust and unequal burdens on him. He only wants an equal opportunity in life under the law.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is right.

Mr. ENLOE. And when we give him that, we have done everything that legislation can do for that class of labor. But we have professional farmers here. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who said this morning that he wanted to raise his voice in behalf of the farmer, is the representative of such farmers as spoke at a meeting in New York which I find reported in the New York Press of Saturday, January 13.

Mr. SIMPSON. Wall street farmers!

Mr. ENLOE. That meeting included in its membership a number of persons who had assembled to protest against the passage of this bill.

Speaking for the hatters of the United States, one of those men, Walter Bates, spoke as follows: "I've been through the South, and I know that you don't see a factory there in a day's ride. Then why on earth do they have Southern Congressmen to legislate for workingmen? Why do they go down and get these goose farmers to make laws for us? They are experts in raising peanuts and cotton. They don't know what a workingman wants." That is the kind of a farmer the gentleman from New York represents. A man who denounces farmers as ignorant geese, because they protest against being picked any longer by the tools and slaves of corporations and monopolies.

No doubt a district which produces more Wall street Bulls and Bears than any other agricultural product entertains the opinion that we do not know what the workingman wants. Those of us who come from agricultural districts can speak for the farmers. We voice their wants and their will. Let the gentleman content himself as a spokesman for the protected industries which he represents.

The term "laboring man" has become a technical term, and the construction placed upon it by the advocates of protection is that no man is a laboring man unless he works somewhere sheltered from the sun.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for a class of laborers in this country who work out in the open sunshine, the noblest, the bravest, the most patriotic class of men in this or any other country. They rise in the morning with the sun, and work until the sun sets. There is no eight-hour law to limit their hours of toil. Yet, certain workingmen in the cities who get a much greater compensation for their labor than farm laborers in this country receive, and who work little more than half the time that the farmers work, have the impudence to say that the "goose" farmers do not know what the laboring men of this country want. These "protected" laborers, who are thrown out of employment under the highest rate of protection this country has ever known, are not competent critics of the intelligence of the farmers, and will not be, so long as they demand that this state of affairs shall continue, and are content to exist by the grace and favor of the lords of trust and monopoly, who rob both producers and consumers in the name of the laboring man. Protection has made labor in the protected industries the poor, destitute, and discontented slave of capital.

Hunger and despair unsettle reason. The slave whose cries for work and bread are heard above the rattle of his chains deserves pity rather than rebuke. The meetings of workingmen to protest against their emancipation from such a bondage are the strongest appeal to the American people to hasten the hour of their deliverance.

Now, let us see what the McKinley bill has done for the farmers of this country. You say it afforded protection to the farmer on corn. I will take for illustration the statistics as to corn, wheat, oats, and meat products as among the principal farm products of this country, exclusive of cotton. Under the former tariff law there was imported in 1889, 2,401 bushels of corn. We then had a duty of 10 cents a bushel on corn. The McKinley bill placed the duty at 15 cents a bushel, and in 1892 we imported 15,290 bushels. In 1889 we imported under a tax of 10 cents a bushel on oats 22,310 bushels of oats. In 1892, under a tax of 15 cents a bushel, we imported 20,208 bushels. In 1889, with a tax of 20 cents a bushel on wheat, we imported 130,649 bushels, and in 1892, under the McKinley tax of 25 cents a bushel, we imported 2,459,602 bushels. So high taxes did not decrease importations. We did not, I believe, import any meat products in either year. Now, let us look at the exports. We exported in 1892, 41,590,460 bushels of corn, yet you say that the man who raises corn needs protection against the foreign producer. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] wanted to protect the corn-raisers of Illinois.

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. ENLOE. I do not want to stir up a cyclone. If the gentleman will be moderate——

Mr. MARSH. The gentleman ought not to refer to me and then not have the manliness to allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. ENLOE. I have the "manliness" to do it, if the gentleman has the politeness to interrupt in a polite way. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARSH. I do ask you in a polite way.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, proceed with the question; what is it?

Mr. MARSH. I have almost forgotten now what it was.

Mr. ENLOE. When the gentleman thinks of it I will yield to him.

Mr. MARSH. I will give it to you now: Will you not state to the committee the number of live stock imported into this country previous to the McKinley bill and the number imported since that time?

Mr. ENLOE. Well, that is a very insignificant item. I could furnish it to the gentleman in a moment, but my time is limited. He knows how to read and can find it for himself.

Mr. MARSH. I want you to put that in alongside of your wheat statistics.

Mr. ENLOE. I know that the shoe pinches the gentleman, because his argument is not tenable.

In the matter of oats, we imported in 1892, 20,208 bushels; and we exported 3,842,559 bushels. Take the article of wheat, which the McKinley bill protected with a duty of 25 cents a bushel, so that the American wheat-grower might not be obliged to compete with the wheat-grower of India. In 1892 we imported of this article 2,459,612 bushels, and we exported 161,000,000 bushels.

Now, do you think that the farmers of this country who raised the 161,000,000 bushels of wheat are suffering from want of protection against the 2,459,612 bushels of seed wheat which we imported into this country last year? Their surplus product was sold in open competition with the wheat-growers of the world.

Another of the principal agricultural products is meat. The beef cattle and the hogs raised by our farmers are slaughtered and the products are exported in the form of beef, pork, bacon, lard, and tallow. We have a duty on those products; yet in 1892 not a pound of meat product was imported into the United States, so far as I have been able to find from the statistics. We exported in 1892, $34,436,169 worth of beef products and $85,116,566 worth of hog products.

Corn, oats, wheat, and meat products constitute the bulk of the agricultural products represented by the gentleman who comes from the great agricultural State of Illinois. They constitute the bulk of agricultural products in the West and the Southwest. I am not astonished that a professional farmer in Vermont should write a letter to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] proposing to punish the Democratic party because the McKinley bill has put the price of wool down, as he admits, from 22 cents to 11 cents a pound. That farmer is about as wise as are the laboring men who protest against the modification of the McKinley bill, which has brought panic and stagnation upon the country and installed the gaunt specters of hunger and want as familiar guests at the firesides of millions of working men and working women throughout the land.

Though this bill is not such a bill as ought to be passed, it is perhaps better in its present shape than the bill we will be able to pass. I think it is the best we can do to stand by the Committee of Ways and Means and speed its passage through this House. When we can not get what we want we must take the best we can get. It is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I might make an argument similar to the ar-

gument so familiar to us here. I have thought it would be well to illustrate the absurdity of attempting to frame a bill to suit every protected local interest. I might protest against this bill because it puts iron and coal on the free list, I might protest because it puts eggs on the free list. The McKinley bill took eggs off the free list and put a tax of 5 cents a dozen on them. We ought by all means to protect the American hen from competition with foreign hens—the "pauper" hens of Europe. They ought not to be allowed to compete with the mothers of our Democratic roosters. Under the fostering care of the McKinley law our American hens have laid all other hens in the shade. They have brought great distress on the hens of other countries and greatly discouraged all efforts at competition, and it stands to their credit that we produced the largest crop of Democratic roosters in 1892 that was ever known in our history. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I suppose, notwithstanding these persuasive facts, that a large industry in my district will have to be suspended, I will vote for the bill nevertheless, and trust to the patriotic pride of our hens to sustain their reputation against all comers.

I will say, in conclusion, seriously, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the argument of protectionists, who claim to represent the farmer, that this bill discriminates against him, because the statistics show that the McKinley bill afforded him no protection against competition, and the prices of his products have steadily declined since it passage. These facts are indisputably true, and no amount of sophistry and misrepresentation can change them. The farmers understand their interests in this matter and they will not be misled.

The argument that the passage of this bill will destroy our industries and diminish the opportunities of labor for profitable employment is the invention of those who have grown rich on the profits of class legislation. The alleged facts used are made to order, and the arguments based upon them are a tissue of fallacy and deception. I have been ready and anxious to vote on this bill since the day it was reported. What the country wants is action. The sooner we can have it the better for the country and the better for the Democratic party.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee has referred to the imports of corn and of some other farm articles into the United States since the passage of the McKinley law. I notice that he omitted any allusion to the imports of barley, and as he has forgotten it I want to call his attention and the attention of the committee to the facts. In 1884, according to a statement which I hold in my hand, and furnished by a malting company of the city of Milwaukee, we imported 8,593,902 bushels of barley of the value of $5,919,965, and the quantity increased somewhat until 1891, after the McKinley law had taken effect, when we imported only 5,076,471 bushels, of the value of $3,221,189; in 1892 we imported but about 3,000,000 bushels of barley, of the value of $1,591,000; and in 1893 only $921,000 worth of barley was imported, giving the market almost entirely to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. ENLOE. If the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. I can not yield in my limited time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I wish to ask the gentleman if the price of home barley has gone up to the home raiser since the passage of the McKinley bill?

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois (continuing). I recollect, Mr. Chairman, (I can not yield to the interruption of the gentleman from Kentucky) I recollect distinctly during the discussion of the McKinley law it was asserted here over and over again that we could not produce barley suitable for the manufacture of malt and beer in this country. Now, I want to say that according to this gentleman, we are to-day supplying the wants of our people with our own production of barley, and he says in this statement, that the barley produced in the Northwestern States is superior to that produced in Canada. I will quote his exact language. He says:

The full effects and benefits of the 30 cent duty are now just beginning to make themselves manifest. The excellent quality of the barley raised in the States above referred to is rapidly making friends for it everywhere, and more particularly in the sections of the country where formerly Canadian barley was used.

And he further says: "It can not be claimed that the American cereal is inferior to its foreign rival," and that if the present duty is not disturbed Canadian barley will eventually be driven from the United States.

This is the language used by the gentleman referred to, and he protests against any reduction in the rate.

Mr. ENLOE. I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not think that it would be much better and safer for him to quote the official records instead of the letter he has in his hand, because his statements are inaccurate?

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. I am assured the statements as to imports of barley quoted by me are correct, and I believe they will be so found.

Mr. PICKLER. How much barley do we import, according to the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. ENLOE. I will give the gentleman the figures. I have them here, and he can read them for himself.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of so much importance that I feel I am justified in giving my views on the subject to which it refers.

The discussion has taken a very wide range, covering the propriety of the reductions made in the woolen schedule, and also the question of whether these reductions are such as the members of this House would have desired. I am very candid to admit—and this is an admission that has been made by most of the members on this side of the House who have engaged in the discussion—that there are many things in this bill that do not fully meet my views of the reductions that ought to have been made; but no tariff bill can be framed except by concession on the part of all those who are willing to support tariff reform, running from the extreme free-trade Democrats to those who talk tariff reform before election, and reluctantly support a bill with such material reductions as characterize this, and are sometimes called "protection Democrats."

Now, this amendment is not a question of rates; it is not a question whether we shall have free woolen goods or shall not have free woolen goods; but when shall free wool and the rates we have adopted go into effect? I am frank to say that I would like to have both free wool and free woolen goods, and to have them immediately. But I recognize the fact that the tariff reformers of this country who must make tariff reform a success, if it is ever carried to a successful issue, have not the purpose to injure or destroy manufacturers, but to liberate both them and the consumers from burdens by enlarging opportunities to the former and cheapening goods to the latter. In framing this bill we have gone as far as we felt we could and secure its passage through both Houses. We were influenced by the same motives in offering this amendment, and ask those of you who believe we ought to have free wool and woolen goods now to make such concessions to the existing condition of things as shall not injure tariff reform with the very people who have assisted us to make tariff reform a possibility.

It has been suggested—I hope inadvertently—by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] that the committee has been influenced, and influenced in a wrong direction, by lobbyists, in framing these amendments. I pass that by, because I do not consider it worthy of notice or discussion. As to this amendment, I wish to say that when we began its consideration my colleagues and I stood exactly where the gentleman from Ohio does, differing, I suppose, in one respect from him, and that is that we are anxious that the manner and time and method of putting our reform in operation shall be such as not to unnecessarily injure the Democratic party among those people whose assistance has enabled the people of the South and West to make tariff reform possible—I mean the merchants of New York and the cities, and a goodly number of the manufacturers of the Eastern States, who are with us on this question. Becoming, after patient and careful consideration, satisfied that this amendment would best subserve this purpose I felt it our duty to urge its adoption.

[The time of Mr. MONTGOMERY having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I appeal to the members on this side of the House to be governed by the principles which have actuated the committee in offering this amendment, and to do nothing that will unnecessarily injure industries of any kind in this country, but do what I understand all tariff reformers want to do, give freer conditions to manufacturers and cheaper goods to consumers, and do this in such a method as to enable the manufacturers to adjust themselves to the new conditions, so that we may proceed as rapidly as possible to absolute freedom from the tariff burdens now impoverishing the laborers and consumers of this country. Your committee believe that the time and method of putting the bill in operation provided by this amendment and the one that will follow, will best subserve this purpose, and for this reason ask its adoption.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have reached this conclusion because I believe if you put this woolen schedule in operation as the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] proposes, you will destroy and paralyze the woolen manufacturing industry of this country, so far as the production of the goods which are to be consumed next fall are concerned.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Did the gentleman consider that the 1st of March, the time originally fixed, was a proper time for this bill to go into effect? Did he so consider it at the time it was fixed?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I will answer the gentleman's question. These dates as originally put into this bill were put in while we were giving this question the most careful consideration we could, but before we had the amount of information upon which we finally acted, when we adopted the amendments. We have been carefully considering this question from the very beginning, because the committee all the time considered it the most difficult question connected with the important woolen schedule. And these amendments have been finally decided on as the fairest and justest solution of the difficulty.

Mr. BLAND. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have not concluded my answer to the question. When we fixed the dates now in the bill, we were driven to the point where we had to present the bill to this House, and we were hopeful at that time that it would pass more speedily than is now possible, giving them free wool from the early date, March 1, and that they would be able to manufacture out of free wool the goods which they are compelled to sell, if they sell them at all, in the market for next fall.

Mr. BLAND. Suppose the bill should take effect on the 1st of March. Does the gentleman think that would paralyze the woolen manufacturer?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If I could have any hope that this bill would go through by the 1st of March I would stand by the dates that are in it now; but I have no such hope, and I do not think anybody in this House can expect that the bill will pass both Houses and become a law before the middle of May.

Mr. BLAND. Suppose, for instance, the bill should take effect by the middle of April or the 1st of April—and certainly we could get the bill through by then—would the difference of one month be a very serious difference?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I will tell you what the trouble is in that regard. The woolen manufacturing industries of this country, as has been said on this floor, are paralyzed now.

Mr. BLAND. Are not a great many of them paralyzed for a purpose, and is not that purpose the lowering of wages?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Not in this case.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Not, in my judgment, in the woolen manufactories.

Mr. BLAND. I do not suppose they are in this case.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am talking about this case, because I do not want to get off from this subject. Now I am not one of those who, as some gentleman on this floor has said, want to punish the manufacturers at all; but on the contrary, as I have said, I want to build them up, and if I did not believe that from the date this bill goes into effect the manufacturing interests of this country would increase and grow instead of diminishing and at the same time goods be cheapened, I would vote against the bill with the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BLAND. I hope the gentleman does not wish to put me in the category of those who want to injure American manufacturers.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do not. I do not want to injure but build up manufacturing; still less do I want to do anything in this House that will prevent the laboring men of this country from getting work and relief from their conditions, and getting it immediately. I believe if you fix these rates to go into effect the 1st day of August for free wool, and the greatly decreased rates on woolen goods provided in this bill on the 1st of December, the woolen mannfactories will start up immediately, because the manufacturer will know that he can manufacture goods from tax-paid wool for the fall market, and have four months to sell them under the same conditions. Now, I am as anxious as the gentleman can be to get rid of all taxation on woolen and all other goods as soon as it is possible.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me for another question?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Certainly.

Mr. BLAND. It is this: Supposing that we find that the manufacturer knows that the bill can become a law on the 1st of April, I do not think we ought to change it; but suppose that in the meantime we ascertain that it can not be done; still I say there is ample time after the bill has passed this House to examine this question and to determine it finally.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Do you think the workmen of the woolen manufactories of this country, who have been out of employment some months now—I do not say from what cause, because I am not discussing that—would agree with you that we ought by legislation to compel the woolen mills to stand still until the 1st of April, or maybe the middle of May, during which time they must suffer from starvation through not being able to get any work?

Mr. BLAND. Not at all, and that is not included in any question I have asked, nor what I have said. What I have meant is this: That if it is ascertained that this bill ought not to take effect until the 1st day of August, then it should be amended, but if it shall pass the House and go to the Senate, and they pass it within a month or six weeks, your whole objection is not good.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. What will the manufacturer be doing in the meantime, and what will his workmen be doing?

Mr. BLAND. But will the gentleman allow me? How can the manufacturer know what to do at any time. We are simply passing this bill through the House. It is not passed until it passes the Senate, and not until it becomes a law; and nothing that the House can do will bind the Senate.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. But every manufacturer in this country knows that when this House passes these amendments fixing these dates that the body at the other end of the Capitol will not be less liberal with him than we have been, and that he can safely give his workmen employment, relying on the terms and dates this House has fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, this matter seems to me more a question of fact than anything else. I do not know what you gentlemen have against New England and against the manufacturers of the North. I can conceive something of your having prejudice against the manufacturers as a class, but the manufacturers as a class are not the people who are involved here, but it is the men who work in the mills. They are the parties who are affected; and it is in the interest of those workingmen of the North, and especially of that portion from which I come, that I desire to speak. I have in my hand a letter from a personal friend, who wanted me to look up a pension matter, who also inclosed in his letter a petition or remonstrance against the passage of this bill; and he has also written me in respect to the matter.

He circulated a remonstrance against the passage of this bill and at the same time a request or a petition for its passage. He was not able to get a single signer among the citizens, manufacturers, and laboring people of the village in which he lives in favor of the bill, but he did get their signatures to the remonstrance, and that I have placed in the possession of the Committee on Ways and Means. Everybody signed it, without respect to party. And let me tell you that some of the men of most intelligence in the State of New Hampshire who desire the defeat of this bill are leading Democrats who are, and some who are not, engaged in manufacturing, and all parties joined together with the laboring people in the remonstrance against its passage. But I wish at this moment to show why the amendment should be adopted, as we all know the bill can not pass for some months.

We know very well it is of the utmost importance that these people should have employment in order to live during the hard winter and for the next few months. If this bill is not changed, and becomes a law as it is, the farmers who did not sell their wool will be compelled to sell it when it will meet in the market the foreign production; and if you put in this provision extending the time when the bill goes into effect until next August, the farmers in California and other parts of the country who now hold their wool will sell it at once, and when you reach the period that this bill takes effect they will have their coming clip at the factory before foreign wool can get there. I now want to read this letter to you. It is from William B. Fellows, esq., a man of character in his community, and accompanies the remonstrance. I know the place very well; it is the village in which I received much of my early education, and perhaps there are 1,800 or 2,000 people living in the town. Its academy and its manufactures are its life. He says:

TILTON, N. H., *January 4, 1894.*

DEAR SENATOR: I hand you herewith a protest against the passage of the Wilson bill. The signers are reliable people and know what they want and don't want.

Of course a few would not sign it. To them I offered the petition in favor of the bill, which I inclose. I was unable to get anyone to sign that. They say we must have protection, but sit trembling, unwilling to commit themselves one way or the other. That number, however, is growing less daily, and with the continuance of these times will either die or get on our side.

One large hosiery mill here is entirely shut down for lack of orders. They usually employ 150 hands. Another, ordinarily employing 225 hands, has been closed till this week, when it has started on reduced prices with 25 hands on a small order for cotton goods. Two woolen mills (one corporation) are running full time just now on early summer goods. At this time of year they should have large orders coming in for heavy goods for another winter. They haven't received an order o that kind and can't get one. Goods that they sell for 27 cents a yard are protected by a specific duty of 22½ cents a yard. That is struck off by the Wilson bill. Anyone can see the reduction to help on that basis. A third woolen mill is running a little, but the superintendent told me to-night they should close entirely in a short time; can get no orders. A new hosiery mill, just completed, shows no signs of starting. An eyeglass factory, usually employing 100 hands, is practically doing nothing; no orders. That's this village!

Yours, truly,

W. B. FELLOWS.

Hon. HENRY W. BLAIR,
Washington, D. C.

Now, that state of things prevails all over my district. The district is made up largely of small villages and small cities.

The largest city in our State has about fifty thousand people. The mass of my district is made up of populations like that which is described in this letter, living in that way, and I tell you that many people there are cold and hungry, and by defeating this amendment, by refusing to say that this bill shall not take effect until after this year's clip can be made and marketed without competition from abroad, you are simply saying that these people shall go on living there in idleness and suffering for the next six months. If you have the ordinary emotions of human beings you will see the necessity of doing what is here proposed; and I sought the floor a second time simply to read to the committee this statement in order that gentlemen might know the truth. This is not a party question in our State.

We have reached the point where partisans are merged in men. It is a question of humanity and patriotism; yes, sir, of self-preservation.

Mr. WEADOCK. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. I am very much amused to hear gentlemen on this side of the House continually talking about "free trade" without saying a single word as to how the $400,000,000 necessary to pay the expenses of Government are to be provided. Free trade at this stage of the case is impossible, and what we are trying to do by this bill is to devise a method of tariff rates to raise revenue for the support of the Government. The question of free wool has been discussed time and time again. The Fifty-second Congress voted to place wool upon the free list. The great tariff message of 1887 said that wool ought to go on the free list, and the people of this country voted at the recent Presidential election that they wanted it placed on the free list.

But, Mr. Chairman, this House well understands and the country understands that the important question we have to settle now is when this bill shall become law, for then business can adjust itself to the change. The idea that placing wool upon the free list will have the effect that some gentlemen profess to believe it will have upon the market for wool produced in this country is, in my judgment, unfounded, and in this my judgment agrees with the opinions of people who are familiar with the subject. I ask to have read by the Clerk a letter from a former member of this House, a gentleman who is engaged in the business of raising wool. This letter was written in answer to one of the circulars which our friends on the other side refer to so often here.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recently a firm of Philadelphia middlemen sent him a circular letter regarding the prospects of the market for the future. The dealers advised him that the threatened changes in the wool tariff were operating against the market and that they thought prices would continue to decline. They added, however, that a strong effort would be made to induce Congress to retain wool on the protected schedule, and requested him to join in a petition to that effect. They also incidentally wanted to know if he needed an advance in cash on his present clip. His reply was as follows:

"DEAR SIRS: Yours of the 27th at hand. I have also noticed your name in connection with petitions to Congress, asking it not to disturb the wool duties. Now, I am a grower of wool, and I will petition Congress to put it on the free list, and the quicker the better, as wool will be enhanced in value by so doing. As for shipping you the wool, I do not wish to do so, neither do I want an advance upon it. I am not scared by this bugaboo of free wool, and I trust and hope and also believe that Congress will take the sensible view of it they have already started out to do, and put it on the free list where it belongs, and let you growers, who do not grow wool, see that you are wrong in your theories. I should be glad to receive your circulars if you see fit to send them, but do not attempt to scare me with a bugaboo.

"Yours, etc.,

"S. O. FISHER."

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal to-day about the farmer. I represent an agricultural constituency, and as to this statement that the protective policy has outraged the farmers of America, I want to enter my solemn protest against it. On the 8th day of November, 1892, in the markets of Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York, the farmers of the United States received larger prices for their products with one exception than at any time in the history of this country, that one exception being wheat. On that day the price of wheat in those markets was about 80 cents. Although the Democratic party declared in the campaign that if they were successful wheat would go to $1 a bushel, yet ten days after the election it had dropped in my State over 15 cents a bushel.

Now, sir, I represent Pennsylvania farmers, and I make this declaration without fear of successful contradiction, that if any man who says that the farmers of this country have been outraged and oppressed by the Republican policy of protection for the last thirty-two years will go with me into my State, up through the Chester valley, Lebanon valley, and the other great valleys of that State, I will show him a country that in beauty and magnificence would put out of sight Eden itself. [Laughter and applause.]

Why, sir, the policy of protection has made our farmers rich in Pennsylvania. I do not care whether they export grain or import it. The Republican policy has filled my State with factories and artisans and mechanics, consumers of the products of the farm; it has given them a market at their own doors, so that even to-day, with a million of people idle around them, they are getting good prices for their products. If there is any one thing that specially characterizes the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania it is her well-to-do farmers; and my observation is that a man who has a good farm and has it paid for, if he exercises the same thrift, foresight, and economy that the man who succeeds in mercantile life or in professional life is obliged to exercise, not only keeps his farm free from mortgages, but after a few years he buys another farm. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I submit as a part of these remarks a tabular statement of prices in Philadelphia and Chicago on the 8th day of November, 1892:

Articles.	Prices November 8, 1892, in—	
	Philadelphia.*	Chicago.†
Wheat, per bushel	$0.77	$0.71
Oats, per bushel	.40	.35
Corn, per bushel	.48	.42
Clover seed, per bushel	6.50	7.30
Potatoes, per bushel	.70	.70
Rye, per bushel	.62	.52
Beans, per bushel	2.50	1.85
Pease, per bushel	1.60	1.90
Hay, per ton	14.00	11.50
Wheat straw, per ton	7.50	.....
Rye straw, per ton	10.00	.....
Eggs, per dozen	.26	.22
Butter, per pound	.30	.28
Chickens, per pound	.11	.09
Ducks, per pound	.10	.10
Turkeys, per pound	.11	.10
Tallow, per pound	.05	.04
Lard, per pound	.10	.10
Onions, per barrel	2.50	2.00
Apples, per barrel	3.00	3.00
Steer, 1,000 pounds	40.00	55.00
Hog, 200 pounds	9.50	11.80

*Philadelphia Press. †Chicago Times.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the Pennsylvania farmers that they are broad-gauge men; they are intelligent, educated, broad-minded people. My friend from Nebraska wants nine farmers to be benefited by striking at the industry of the tenth. I wish to say that if there is a farmer in my State whose hills are covered with flocks of sheep, he has not such a mean, sordid, closefisted, dog-in-the-manger spirit as to desire that persons in another district who have no flocks of sheep should suffer for his advantage.

Mr. PICKLER. They are protected in something else.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir. The farmers of Pennsylvania are willing to pay a reasonable duty on the articles which they consume—binding-twine, etc. They are opposed to this Wilson bill because they want the mechanics, the artisans, the laboring men of Pennsylvania to have good wages with which they may be able to purchase the products of the farms.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HICKS. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENLOE. Before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] resumes I want to ask him whether he attributes the sudden decline in the price of wheat, which he says fell 15 cents a bushel in his State, to the threat of passing the Wilson bill and reducing the duty on wheat 5 cents a bushel?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir; but I attribute it to the fact that the people of Pennsylvania have enough intelligence to know that the passage of a bill of this kind will close up all the great industrial establishments of the State, throwing out of employment 2,000,000 people, who have 8,000,000 more dependent upon them; so that those 10,000,000 people, instead of having wheat bread and beef to eat will have to subsist on corn bread and bacon.

In addition to that the farmers of the State of Pennsylvania are to-day contributing, out of the liberality of their hearts, money running up into millions to feed the unfortunate people who are out of work. The one thing that the farmers of that State want is a chance to vote your Democratic party out of power at the next general election. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, our Republican friends want to postpone free wool and cheaper woolen goods until 1898. Practically they might as well postpone that much-desired consummation until the day of judgment. [Cries of "That's right!" on the Republican side.] Their proposition comes in the nature of a motion for a new trial in a case which

the great jury of the American people has twice decided against them. Why do they want to make this postponement? I will tell you: so that in 1896 they may again "fry the fat" out of the manufacturers, debauch the people of the country, and elect a Republican President again if possible. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That is the milk in the Republican cocoanut. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] says that if the Wilson bill be passed there will not be enough left of the Democratic party to make a grease spot. Do the Republicans believe that? [Cries of "Yes!" "Yes!"] Not a bit of it. If they did, every devil of them would vote for it [laughter and applause]; for, of all things dreamed of in their philosophy, to kill the Democratic party is what they most desire; but it can not be done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say something to the Democrats. Protection is either good or bad. There is no middle ground about it. It is not, like certain Christians of the church of Laodicea described in one of the epistles, neither hot nor cold, but lukewarm. It is either good or bad. If it is good, let us have all we can get of it; if it is bad, let us get rid of it altogether. [Applause.] Let me tell you another thing: To the man who freezes in the winter of 1894 and 1895 and 1896 and 1897, it is going to be very cold comfort to tell him that he will have a good coat on his back in the winter of 1898. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] says that as soon as Grover Cleveland was elected, wheat in his State went down 15 cents a bushel; therefore the election of Mr. Cleveland sent down the price of wheat. Grover Cleveland was elected; and we had a very hard winter. Therefore, according to the gentleman's reasoning, the election of Mr. Cleveland caused the cold weather. [Applause.] One proposition is just as good logic as the other. [Laughter.]

Wheat went down because manufacturers, to influence legislation here and to raise the cry of hard times, closed down their mills, threw thousands of men out of employment, and thereby diminished the demand for wheat and the consumption of wheat. Mr. Cleveland's election had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Chairman, in the campaign of 1892 we made the welkin ring with our denunciations of the McKinley bill. From every hilltop and in every valley we declared that protection was an unmitigated fraud and that it was unconstitutional. Yet we here stand, fifteen months after that election, in which we won an unprecedented, an overwhelming victory, and we have done nothing to remove the fraud; we have done nothing to wipe out this unconstitutional legislation. And we now have a proposition to postpone the operation of this relief to a further day. [Laughter on the Republican side.] We will do no such thing. Were we honest then? If so, we ought to be honest now and put in practice what we preached in 1892.

Mr. BOUTELLE. You were just as honest then as you are now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And we are just as honest now as we were then, and we are going to do it; and don't you forget it. [Laughter.] We have both the power and the courage of our convictions, and we are about to do what we promised. The quicker it is done the better for all concerned. Cutting down the tariff will bring relief. Uncertainty means mischief.

Mr. Chairman, "procrastination is the thief of time." That is a piece of old philosophy. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." I am in favor of curing the heart disease of the American people by giving them cheaper clothing and giving it to them at once. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. I ask that my colleague's time be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank my colleague and the committee. We are getting down to business now. The Democratic heart is being warmed up. We are getting together. We are about to redeem our pledges. Heaven be thanked!

The gentleman from Michigan asks where we are going to get the revenue to make up the deficiency caused by this bill. It will not take me very long to tell him. We are going to impose such an income tax as will make the eyes of the multi-millionaires bulge out. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will you do it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, we will do it, and I will do my full share to help the good work along.

Now, let us briefly consider this sheep question. There is one-half of a sheep to each man, woman, and child in the United States. The wool clip is 4 pounds to the sheep; that is a fair average. The tariff is 11 cents a pound. Therefore, granting (which is not true) that the price of wool is augmented by the amount of the tariff, then every man, woman, and child in the United States, possessed of half a sheep, would be benefited only 22 cents by the retention of this duty, while the tariff on the commonest wool hat, the cheapest woolen dress that any woman ever put on her back, on the cheapest pair of breeches that a man ever wore, on the cheapest baby dress in this country, is more than the average citizen will get out of the duty on the average half of a sheep. [Laughter.]

Granting, for the sake of argument—which I deny utterly—that the wool-raiser would lose the tariff on wool, he would make it back twenty times over by the saving in what he will expend for woolen woods, even under the modest reductions of the Wilson bill; and, unless I misunderstand the temper both of this House and of the country, the cuts in the woolen schedules will be made much deeper before we get through with this work of reform. [Applause.]

But it has been demonstrated over and over again that the tariff on wool does not raise the price of wool. If it does, how does it happen that under the McKinley bill wool went down, down, down, till last fall it touched the lowest price within the memory of the oldest inhabitant? The truth is that free wool would raise the price of American wool; because we need the different grades of foreign wools to mix with American wools to make certain kinds of woolen cloths. So that the wool-grower will find the wool he has to sell go up and the woolen goods he has to buy go down.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] the other day said, by way of threat, as I interpreted it, that the manufacturers were able to take care of themselves.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no; not by way of threat.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I will modify that part of it.

A MEMBER. Take the tariff off. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If they are able to take care of themselves I am glad to know it; but if they are, then in the name of common decency why do not they do it, and not depend on the Government to support them? Representing one of the most fertile agricultural districts on earth, richer than the valley of the Ganges or the Delta of the Nile, I say that the farmers of this country are amply able to take care of themselves and of their own interests, if the manufacturers would only take their grip off the farmers' throats, pull off the vampires that are sucking the lifeblood out of the farmers' veins; and take their hands off of the farmers' pocketbooks. [Applause.]

Our farmers are not beggars. They ask charity from no man. They want nobody robbed to help them. All they demand is justice, fair play, and an honest chance in the race of life; and I tell you that they will and can take care of themselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They are not such fools as the protectionists seem to think. Being exporters, they know full well that no tariff can raise the price of exports, and that their wheat and corn and cotton and live stock and beef and pork are sold in the open markets of the world in competition with all creation. Being importers, they understand thoroughly that the tariff largely increases the price of nearly every article they buy.

They demand that if they must sell in a free-trade market (a thing which no tariff can prevent), they shall be permitted to buy in a free-trade market, and that when they reach home with their purchases they shall not be mulcted in large sums for not having bought of some American plutocrat. They think it is a poor rule which does not work both ways. They know that before the high protective system was inaugurated, they were the most prosperous class in America; and they know only too well that after thirty-two years of the so-called blessings of that system they are the least prosperous. They want that iniquitous system abolished. They know that in the last analysis they bear the brunt of all taxation, and they want their heavy burdens lightened.

They want the Government which they support with their brain, brawn, sweat, and money to quit interfering with the laws of commerce.

They know that then, and not till then, will the American laborer, of whatever occupation—whether farmer, mechanic, artisan, railroader, molder, glass-blower, merchant, clerk, carpenter, bricklayer, blacksmith, teacher, every species of wage-earner—receive the full recompense of his toil and be reinvested with the inalienable right conferred by Almighty God to trade wheresoever, with whomsoever, and upon any terms whatsoever he pleases—to sell in the highest and buy in the cheapest markets of the world.

This Government has precisely the same authority—and not one whit more—to say that we shall purchase our woolens of John Smith, our cottons of Bill Jones, our groceries of Tom Brown, our cutlery of Sam Johnson, and so on to the end of the chapter, and that, too, without regard to price, as it has to say that we must not buy of Englishmen, Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Germans, or any other people without paying heavy fines to our tariff barons for so doing.

It should not legislate for the benefit of any particular class, but for the good of all.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] talks of appealing to the farmers. Well, they have been appealed to. They have settled the question as far as they can settle it. They did it in 1890; they did it again in 1892. There was no mistake about their desires. There was no lack of emphasis in their opinion. They forced the election of Grover Cleveland in 1892, and they did it solely because of that brave, wise, and manly message which he sent to Congress in December, 1887. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. Why did not they reëlect him in 1888?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He was not elected in 1888 because you had got the "fat fried" out of your manufacturers [laughter]; because of pious John Wanamaker and his $400,000 of campaign slush funds, and because of men like unto him; because you had Dudley and his blocks of five in Indiana; because you debauched the people of two States; because you used a good deal of "diplomacy and soap," as Mr. Chester A. Arthur declared at the Delmonico banquet. [Laughter.] That is why he was not elected in 1888.

Now if you want to ask any more questions, crack in. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word at this time to corroborate the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Gen. HENDERSON] with regard to the effect of the protective tariff on the industry of raising barley in this country. The letter from which he quoted was printed from a letter received by myself. It was written by Mr. Bruno E. Fink, of Milwaukee, one of the leading maltsters and dealers in barley in this country, who has given a great deal of study and research to the question and to the business in this country.

But I desire to give a local application to the question propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] a few moments ago when the gentleman from Illinois occupied the floor, and when he made this inquiry: "Is it a fact that as the result of a protective duty on barley the price in this country has been materially advanced?" I answer this question by saying yes; it has been advanced. In Wisconsin, in the year 1889, the production of barley reached the figure of 12,524,000 bushels. The average price of barley on the Board of Trade in the city of Milwaukee for that year was 48¼ cents a bushel.

In 1891, after the McKinley bill had gone into operation and its effects were being felt on the markets, and assuming that the crop of the State of Wisconsin would be from the same acreage and of the same yield as the preceding year, the prices on the Board of Trade in Milwaukee having gone up to an average of 62¼ cents a bushel, the result was an increase of 14 cents a bushel in that State on account of the increase of duty from 10 cents a bushel by the tariff act of 1883 to 30 cents by the McKinley act of 1890; and that increase, Mr. Chairman, benefited the farmers of the State of Wisconsin $1,696,000, or nearly $1,700,000 in one year on this one article produced in that State. I would ask if that is not a very considerable benefit to them? Who paid for it? My Democratic friends say the consumer did. Not a bit of it. I can see in the faces of many gentlemen on the other side eloquent evidence that the beer glass of 1891 was just as large and the price just the same as in 1889.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Are you in favor of a duty for the protection of anyone which operates to prevent any importation from coming into this country?

Mr. SHAW. I am in favor of making an American market for the American farmer.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Has the average price of barley since the passage of the McKinley bill been any higher than it was for three years prior to its passage?

Mr. SHAW. Yes; it has.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. The figures do not show it.

Mr. SHAW. And later in this debate I shall present evidence which will convince the gentleman of the correctness of my statement. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been an interested listener to the debate which has taken place upon the tariff question to day, and which has produced oratorical music which has run the chromatic scale from sugar of milk up to free wool, stopping on the way to pay its attention to the minor chords of British gum and rattan chairs. I have been very much interested; but I have discovered that it is evident that the utterances of a former candidate for President on the Democratic ticket had found some lodgment in the minds of gentlemen here on this floor. Gen. Hancock once said that the tariff was a local issue. It seems to be so.

Gentlemen come here from South Carolina and ask for and obtain a protection of 71 per cent on rice. They are satisfied with that, but they want every other product put on the free list. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. COFFEEN] favors protected wool, and I respect the gentleman for his manliness, and for the fact that he is supporting his constituency on this question; but if they do not obtain protected wool, they are going to vote for the Wilson bill just the same, and thus vote for a bill which will put their special industries on the free list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think one's industrial surroundings have much to do with his position on this question. I believe it to be true that the legislatures of the Democratic States, the Southern or free-trade States, have not considered industrial questions in making their apportionments in the Congressional districts. They have made geographical lines, based on political considerations only. The result is that we have gentlemen here who represent rice, who represent lumber, who represent iron ore, who represent sheep; and they all come here, each one clamoring for the protection of the one predominating, overshadowing interest that he represents, but they are all willing to sacrifice everybody else. Now, it may be owing to my environment that I look at this question in another way.

I have the honor to represent a constituency of cosmopolitan composition and metropolitan instincts, a district in which the congestion of bustling cities blends into the more roomy areas of interurban territory and then again into cities, and so on radially from each embyronic metropolis in the district, so gradually that the industries and occupations of the favored people of that locality could be depicted upon a chart by a harmonious mixture of the more intense with the more delicate tints of the rose. It is a district in which the brawny Scot, the hardy Scandinavian, the phlegmatic Teuton, the sturdy Briton, the moon-eyed Mongolian, and the lineal descendant of Rory O'Moore mingle with the people of every other nationality from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand. [Laughter.]

It is a district in which the voice of the cuckoo is hushed forever in death [laughter], but a district in which the song of the whippoorwill in the evening continues as a melodious refrain the harsher music of the factory whistles, a district in which the rush, roar, and bustle of the mills and other hives of industry of the cities are taken up and continued by the hum of harvest machines in the golden wheatfields of the surrounding farms; a district in which illiteracy is unknown, in which the brawn and brain of the wild and wooly West are arrayed in harmonious juxtaposition to the culture and refinement of the effete East.

It is a district, Mr. Chairman, in which the ethics of partisan politics are so well understood that, in the discussion of economic questions, in the conduct of a campaign of education, such as we are conducting in this House at this time, the opposing factions meet with such a force that the shock of Milton's angel cohorts does not even suggest the idea of impact, and is no longer used as a comparison for that purpose [laughter], and the amenities of a situation which would elsewhere be distressing are so well preserved that defeated candidates consider it an honor to be beaten by courteous adversaries; and the average of intelligence—and a high one it is, too, I assure you, Mr. Chairman—is reached by an aggregation of means without any violent extremes. We have to go outside of our district to find an example of the "ward heeler" or bucolic statesman.

Mr. Chairman, the district which I have the honor to represent covers a greater number of industries, and presents more phases of human activity than any other district represented upon the floor of this House. We are producers and consumers. We grow barley, which we have been discussing this afternoon, and we make it into beer, the product of that barley. We manufacture lumber in that district. We manufacture that lumber into the more advanced stages of manufacture—into sash, doors, and blinds. We grow wool in that district, and we manufacture the wool into the product of the woolen industry. In many ways we are not only the producers, but consumers.

Is it any wonder, then, that the people of my district are surprised at the position which has been taken by the gentlemen on the other side of this House? Is it any wonder that the people of my district believe that this great idea of American prosperity, of industrial prosperity, is a superstructure which is supported on all the original elements of national success—on agriculture, on commerce, and on manufactures, on education, and on the greatest base upon which any structure can stand—the protection of American labor? Do they not know that you can not destroy one of those elements without ruining the entire structure?

I say, Mr. Chairman, we must consider this question in its entirety. We can not make up a tariff bill by piecemeal, as has been attempted to be done here; and whenever a tariff bill is made it must be made by the friends of the measure and by the friends of protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHAW. Just one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. I was going to say simply, in the way of conclusion, that the pending tariff bill would have been pronounced by the statesmen of 1857 to be "neither fish, flesh, nor fowl;" but as it is patched up to-day, and as it will be patched up for the next two weeks by our free-trade friends, it can only be described in the polished diction of the gentleman from Massachusetts as "a heterogenous aggregation of eccentric incongruities." [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. I want to ask the gentleman a question before he sits down. In the political ethics of your district, during the campaign, did the people there know what is meant by the question, "You know what the governor of North Carolina said to the governor of South Carolina?"

Mr. SHAW. The celebrated conversation between the executives of two of the Southern Commonwealths is quite familiar to me, and it is possible that that conversation was repeated many times during my campaign, but it was confined almost exclusively to the free-trade Democrats of that district. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this discussion has now drifted into this strain, and has brought up the question as to the profit going to the agricultural classes of this country under protection, I think it would be well to have some facts. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] the other day said that a "quart of facts were worth a bushel of theories," and on yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] also disputed some facts given him by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I have here in my hand the statistical report of the State of Illinois of the State board of agriculture. Illinois, every gentleman will agree, is the best agricultural State in the Union.

A MEMBER. Except Missouri.

Another MEMBER. Except Ohio. [Laughter and confusion.]

Mr. SIMPSON. No, I will not except any State. The farmers in the State of Illinois produce crops under the most favorable conditions of any State in this broad land, both as to soil climate, and means for transportation.

Now, gentlemen, let us see what the facts are in regard to this tariff policy and its effect on the farmers. In the twenty-one years beginning in the year 1873 and ending in 1893 the farmers of Illinois produced 651,000,000 bushels of wheat. According to this report the total cost of raising wheat was $476,000,000, or an average of 73 cents a bushel. The total value of the wheat product was $541,000,000, or an average of about 83 cents a bushel; leaving an average net profit of 10 cents a bushel. For the ten years beginning in 1881 and ending in 1890 the wheat-growers of Illinois produced 290,000,000 bushels of wheat and it cost $227,000,000 to raise it, or an average of 77½ cents per bushel. They received $228,000,000, or an average of 78 cents per bushel; leaving the farmer a half of 1 cent per bushel profit on an average for his wheat for ten years.

In 1893, when we had begun to get the full benefit of the high protective tariff, the farmers of Illinois produced 18,000,000 bushels of wheat, at a cost of $16,000,000, or an average of 89 cents per bushel, and they received $9,000,000 for it, or an average price of 48 cents per bushel, leaving a net loss to the wheat-growers of Illinois for the year 1893, of 41 cents per bushel for every bushel produced. Yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] will get up here and in the face of these facts state to the committee and to the country that the farmers of this country have the best market they have ever had in our history. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A Republican MEMBER. Where did the gentleman get his facts?

Mr. SIMPSON. Facts! These are facts given by the Republican State board of agriculture in the State of Illinois—facts which you gentlemen will not dare to dispute.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. There is no Republican State board of agriculture in the State of Illinois.

Mr. PICKLER. Who makes these reports?

Mr. SIMPSON. I will tell you who makes them. The same circular, on page 5, contains a similar table of statistics of the cost of other crops for the same twenty years. The farmers of Illinois produced 1,000,000,000 bushels of oats, and it cost them, according to this report, $515,000,000, or an average of 28 cents per bushel to raise it, and they received $478,000,000, or 26 cents per bushel, leaving a net loss to the wheat growers on an average for twenty-one years of 2.2 cents per bushel.

Those are the figures for wheat and oats. Now, let us see as to rye. The rye crop of the State of Illinois, according to the report of this board, was produced at a loss of $390,000. Then take barley. Under this high protective tariff they raised their barley crop of 1893 at a loss of $47,000. The area devoted to barley this season was 19,000 acres, 3,445 acres less than the area in 1892, and the average yield per acre was 19 bushels, the smallest yield ever known in Illinois, with the exception of that of 1874, 1876, 1877, and 1887. The total yield of barley this year was 390,000 bushels, for which the price on August 1 was 35 cents a bushel. This report does not give the statistics of the corn crop. They leave that out; but here are three or four of the principal crops that the farmers produce, in one of the best agricultural States of the Union, and they were raised at a loss, as set forth by this agricultural report made under a Republican administration.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. SIMPSON'S time was extended for five minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Does not the gentleman know that all over this country, in the North and the South, the East and the West, the most intelligent investigation by scientific as well as by practical farmers shows that the cost of the production of a bushel of wheat, including 6 per cent interest on the money invested in the land, is 51 cents. If there is any man who knows anything about farming, and who believes that it costs 74 cents a bushel to raise wheat in this country, or in a State like Illinois, I can take him out in a clear moonlight night and in less than five minutes convince him that the moon is made of green cheese. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I will say in reply to the gentleman that if he sets up his judgment in regard to the cost of raising a bushel of wheat in Illinois against the judgment of a board selected by the Republican administration of the State of Illinois, I will leave it for the country to decide which is the best authority.

Mr. FUNK. By what authority does the gentleman from Kansas state that the State board of agriculture is appointed by a Republican administration? That is about on a par with some of his other statements. The State board of agriculture is not a political body.

Mr. FITHIAN. Let me answer the question. While it is true that the State board of agriculture is not appointed by the State administration, yet the majority of that board are Republicans.

Mr. FUNK. I do not believe that proposition is true, either. You will find that the board is about equally divided politically—sometimes one party predominates and sometimes the other.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am informed that the gentleman from Illinois has a brother on the State board of agriculture, and I presume he is a Republican.

Mr. FUNK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. But it does not make any difference whether the members of that board are Republicans or Democrats. It is fair to presume that those gentlemen have gone into the facts and have made a fair and correct report. I received yesterday a statement from the Statistician of the Agricultural Department, furnished at my request; and this statement sets forth that the average price of wheat in the United States this year has been only 51 cents a bushel. Now every man who is a practical farmer (and I have been a practical farmer for fifteen years, raising wheat) knows that wheat can not be produced at that price anywhere in this country except at a loss.

Mr. FUNK. Why did you not read that entire report as to the farm products of Illinois? Why did you select simply one or two items?

Mr. SIMPSON. Because I had only five minutes. [Laughter.] I apprehend the gentleman would be stirred up just as much by the balance of the report as he is by what I have read. It shows that the hardships resulting from protection have fallen upon the farmers of the country—why? Simply because they represent unorganized labor. They have no trades unions to force the capitalists to surrender a part of the plunder which they exact from the people. That, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said, is the only power to which capital will yield so as to be induced to give up a part of its plunder.

Mr. CHILDS. I ask the gentleman whether he has stated these figures upon his own authority, or whether he is simply quoting them from the report of the State board of agriculture of Illinois?

Mr. SIMPSON. I have cited the figures from the report of the State board of agriculture of Illinois.

Mr. CHILDS. I refer to the figures as to the average cost of production of a bushel of wheat.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have read those figures as given in the report.

Mr. CHILDS. I ask you whether you know that statement of the cost to be correct?

Mr. SIMPSON. I found that statement of record, giving the cost of producing a bushel of wheat, a bushel of oats, a bushel of rye, and a bushel of barley in the State of Illinois.

Mr. CHILDS. Will you tell us the elements entering into the estimated cost of a bushel of wheat, an estimate covering millions of bushels and many years?

Mr. SIMPSON. If the gentleman will secure me an extension

of time I will very gladly go into the details and tell him, article by article, what enters into the cost of the production of a bushel of wheat; because, as I have already stated, I have been raising wheat for fifteen years and know something about the business. I will tell the gentleman that under this beautiful system of "protection" I have in my granary to-day what is left out of my three years' crop of wheat; and this wheat, which I should be able to sell at a profit, I am feeding out to hogs and cattle and other dumb brutes, while under your protective policy millions of men are on the verge of starvation for want of that wheat. This is the result of that sort of "protection."

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois obtained the floor.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Before the gentleman from Illinois proceeds I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment be limited to ten minutes.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no!

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the request. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be concluded in ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BOWERS of California and others objected.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. What time would gentlemen suggest?

Mr. BOWERS of California. This is an important clause and ought to be fully debated.

Mr. GROUT. There are several gentlemen on this side of the question who want to speak.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I have not attempted to limit the debate, although it has had a very wide range, because I am desirous that all members who may wish to speak shall have the opportunity.

Mr. REED. I suggest to the gentleman that the friends of the farmer are very numerous here, and they will talk this subject out either on this amendment or some other; and perhaps it would be just as well to let the discussion go on now.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I do not propose to do anything to interfere in any way with the "friends of the farmer;" but speaking in behalf of the committee, I desire to get our amendments out of the way as quickly as possible, so that other members wishing to offer amendments and secure a vote upon them may have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], in his reference to the character of the report which he has read, was as wide of the mark as he usually is when he attempts to discuss a question in which the farmers of the country are interested. This report is prepared by a nonpolitical body. I have not, up to this time, had the opportunity or the occasion to make a critical examination of the figures presented in the report, and do not know whether the conclusions drawn by him as to the articles of wheat, rye, and barley are correct or not. But when the gentleman undertakes to indulge in the "calamity howl" about the farmers of Illinois, that is so common when he talks of the farmers of Kansas, I say that the gentleman is in error, and I wish to point out the reason why.

Mr. Chairman, I was born in Illinois and have lived there all my life. If there is any one class of people in this country that I am familiar with from my daily associations, it is with the farmers and their condition, and I know that there is not a more prosperous class of citizens in any section of the Union or in any other trade or profession than the farmers of that State.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I can not yield.

I remember, Mr. Chairman, under free-trade days when the farm lands in the county where I was born and in the section where I have lived all my life were sold for $5 an acre. Under protective tariff laws and Republican Administrations I have seen these same farm lands increase in value from year to year until the $5 an acre lands now sell for $60 an acre. Take all the counties where we have large manufacturing industries established and the farm lands that sold for $5 an acre in the years gone by have increased until they sell for from $75 to $100 per acre. I have seen the log house under free-trade times give away to the frame house with all the modern conveniences and improvements.

I have seen the straw shed of free-trade times give place to the splendidly constructed barns that are an ornament to the farms all through Illinois. I have seen great tracts of land ranging from 160 to 1,000 acres in one inclosure, divided and subdivided from year to year until now forty acres is considered a large tract of land for one inclosure. The live stock on the farms in free-trade days were few in numbers and of an inferior quality. To-day Illinois farms are stocked with the most approved breeds of horses, cattle, and hogs. Some of the finest and best stock farms in America can be found in Illinois. All the conditions which make a prosperous and successful community have been placed at the feet of the farmers of Illinois by our protective tariff laws and Republican administration.

Last year it was my pleasure to address an assemblage of farmers of more than three thousand in number, men who earn their living by daily toil upon the farms, and I counted more than twelve hundred covered carriages amongst the assemblage. Just think of that for one moment, and then contrast it with the dark picture painted of their condition by such professional farmers as the gentleman from Kansas. And, Mr. Chairman, every one of these men was well dressed, his wife and children were well clothed, and the assemblage was one which bore the highest testimonial of the benefits of tariff laws and Republican legislation. In no other country in the world can such intelligent and prosperous farmers be found.

Now, I say, sir, the gentleman from Kansas may speak for the people of his State, but the farmers of Illinois want no such leader to represent their condition, because they are as prosperous a class as we have in that great and glorious Commonwealth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I would like to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WELLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know if the farmers on the floor will not be willing to consent to put off the further discussion of their interests and continue them another day, and let us take a vote on the pending amendment. I want to keep an engagement this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this discussion has taken a very wide range, considering the question pending before the committee. The proposition, as I understand it, is one that relates solely to the time to be fixed for putting into effect the provision for admitting raw wool free of duty.

A MEMBER. All woolens.

Mr. MAGUIRE. No; I understand it applies not to woolen goods, but to raw wool only, and that the Chairman proposes to offer another amendment covering the case of manufactured woolens. Am I correct?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Now the arguments that have been made in favor of the committee's present amendment apply more properly to the amendment which the chairman of the committee proposes to offer hereafter. The proposition is that because the manufactures proceed by periods, because the manufacture of winter supplies must commence in the preceding spring, there must be an intervening period of uncertainty to the manufacturers, if it be not determined now that the changes to be made in the woolen-goods schedule shall not take effect until December. I agree that reasonable provision should be made for that purpose, not on the ground that protection for any purpose is necessary or proper, but because uncertainty will in the meantime injuriously disturb the woolen-manufacturing industries.

But with respect to raw wool, sir, I believe that the interests as well of the manufacturers as of all consumers of woolen goods demand that raw wool shall be put on the free list at the earliest possible moment; and I deny absolutely that the farmers are to be benefited in any way by maintaining the present tariff on wool until the 1st of August. The wool-producers of the United States produce a kind of wool that does not make complete cloth of the kind that the American market demands. It requires a mixture of long-staple wools, which must be imported; and if the importation of that wool is barred by the tariff barrier which now exists, it will cause a hindrance to the manufacture of woolen goods without giving any benefit whatever to farmers or wool-growers.

The thing that will benefit wool-growers is to start the factories just as soon as they can be started; to remove every impediment to their successful operation. The demand for wool will be increased by permitting the immediate importation of the other kinds of wool that are needed to mix with the American wools. I say let raw wool be placed on the free list at the moment this bill goes into effect in any of its parts, and let the provision be made, which has been mentioned by the chairman of the committee, for putting into effect the new schedules on manufactured goods.

Mr. BURROWS. A few moments ago my colleague [Mr. WEADOCK] had read a letter from Mr. Fisher, a former member of this House.

Mr. WEADOCK. Yes, I so stated.

Mr. BURROWS. I find by looking at the Congressional Directory that Mr. Fisher is a large lumber dealer and banker.

Mr WEADOCK. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. BURROWS. He is a banker and lumberman, and a Democrat. Those are the three occupations in which he is engaged, although perhaps the latter is more in the nature of a disease than a business. [Laughter on the Republican side.] That gentleman is advising us what had better be done in the way of free wool. Now, I desire to have read a letter from a very intelligent gentleman from our State in reply.

Mr. WEADOCK. Will the gentleman allow me to correct him as to a matter of fact——

Mr. BURROWS. I have but five minutes and I wish to have that letter read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTANTINE, MICH., *November 20, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to say that the "condition of the wool-growing industry in this, St. Joe County, Mich., was, up to the time it was influenced by apprehensions and fears concerning the removal of the protective duty, in a satisfactory and flourishing shape. This fall, as a direct result of the said fears, the business is destroyed or rendered profitless.

(2) We can not raise wool here as cheaply as in the countries of Australia and Argentine Republic for the reason that we employ men to assist us in the care of our sheep, and pay them the wages due to men. It also costs us more to house and feed our sheep, partly due to the value of the land we own and the civilization we enjoy. In those countries "wool grows itself, almost." Here it is the embodiment of enterprise, capital, and labor—Americanism in the highest.

(3) The wool I sold in a ready market last season at 22 cents per pound finds slow sale now at 12.5 cents per pound.

(4) I will not attempt to say what wool would sell for when it is put on free list, but no farmer here will be in the business then. We will do just as well to raise 55-cent wheat at 75 cents cost. We would not be able to compete with "self-raised wool."

5. This is east of the Mississippi River, but sheep-raising has become interwoven with our "farming" to such an extent that it is indispensable; we can not farm with any profit without sheep as an auxiliary. They are our winter crop. We have built up by degrees and in good faith this business until there are fed in this county alone over 60,000 head of sheep each winter, and it is simply an outrage and robbery to subject us to so great a loss for the purpose of bolstering up the vagaries of a purposeless Administration. The wool-growing industry belongs to us by every right that is known to law, because it is our creation. No party has any authority to legislate us, or our business—a la Poor Lo—to some other reservation. You can not raise sheep in the United States for the prices of the above-mentioned countries without degrading the profits and processes to those of the other countries.

6. We "are slaughtering sheep" here now, for the reason that unless we can sell wool for about the prices heretofore commanded it will not pay us to raise or feed them. This is a matter of fact, drawn from experience.

7. We own the land upon which our sheep graze in summer and from which their winter feed comes. It constitutes our homesteads, and upon its proper valuation we pay taxes, which go to sustain our institutions. In order to do this it is necessary to receive commensurate prices. We are put to the expense of building large sheds for winter feeding and protection during the six or seven months of cold weather. As wool can be raised by grazing alone in the countries mentiond unless we are protected by proper duties we could not compete with outside raisers. With the McKinley duty of 11 cents removed we could not compete with Australia. Big sheep barns that sheltered 2,000 sheep last winter will stand empty this winter.

The wool from these sheep sold last February and March, as soon as off, for 23 cents, and to-day it would not bring 12.5 cents. The difference in feeding lambs, say, last October, and now is, last October they had ready sale at 5 cents. Same time this year are slow at 3.5 cents. Lots of stock ewes are being sent to the slaughterhouses this fall, where they only bring $1.20 per head. The same sheep cost $4 per head two years ago. The same farmer who hauled his wool to market last market time by hay-wagon loads will haul it there next time in a one-horse buggy.

10. I can only say that when there was absolute free trade before, and there was no duty on wool; when, in fact, our fine woolens and cloths were produced mostly, if not altogether in Europe, the price for a suit of clothes made from woolen cloth was so high that "the masses" you mention had to run around with their extremities protruding out of linsey-woolsey and Kentucky jeans—made of hemp and cotton—the masses could not raise either wool or money enough then to suit themselves.

There is nothing that will excuse the Government for meddling with any of our industries—of which sheep-raising has been one of the most lucrative. Both we and the hired help we employ, and, so far as I am able to judge by observation and other information, all patriotic citizens of the country are willing to pay the (doubtful) extra dollar a suit of woolen clothes will cost as a consequence of the present duty. If we can go on selling the products of our farms, whatever they be, at the fair profits of only one year ago we will be able to buy Georgia cotton, Louisiana sirup, and Pennsylvania iron, and be glad that it all is "protected" to them and for us.

11. This time last year sheep were worth from $4 to $5 per head here. Now they sell slow at from $1.20 to $2 per head. The cause is the fear of the promised "free wool."

12. There was a good demand for sheep this time last year. Everyone wants to sell now. Reason same as above.

13. There has been considerable reduction in number of sheep here in last few months. Cause as per above. Those sold have mostly been slaughtered.

14. There has been a wonderful diminution in the amounts of both wool and—the profits are all gone just in anticipation of its being made free.

Trusting that these truthful and earnest statements may assist you with data for use in the coming battle, I remain,

Very truly,

T. O. FUREY.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. WEADOCK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in regard to the author of that letter that I am proud to say he is a Democrat and a good one——

Mr. BURROWS. The author of the letter just read?

Mr. WEADOCK. No, the letter of Mr. Fisher that you found fault with. Mr. Fisher is also a lumberman and a banker. He is also a grower of sheep, and has perhaps more sheep on his ranch in Colorado than there are in the county from which this gentleman writes, whose letter has just been read. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word with reference to the figures presented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] as to the price of farm products in the State of Illinois. It will be noticed that they were the prices of this last year. He spoke of the cost of producing the different grains named and then gave the figures as of August 1, which was the very time of the lowest prices of last summer, when there was a collapse in prices if not in actual values of from one-third to one-half, not only in agricultural products, but in stocks and values of every kind, so that the figures given are no guide whatever. The extent of that collapse is indicated by the testimony of this witness from Michigan, whose letter has just been read, who calls attention to the fact that wool fell from 24 cents a pound last year to 12½ cents a pound this year. So these low figures which the gentleman read with such a flourish as the farmers' protection prices were really the prices of a period of general business prostration at the prospect of a free-trade tariff. If they show anything they show the effect of the ruinous tariff agitation with which the Democratic party is now blessing the country.

Now, I wish to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that the gentleman from Vermont did not himself speak of the oleaginous spot which was to mark the future resting place of the Democratic party. [Laughter.] It was the language of a farmer from my State from whose letter I read. It was his language, not mine. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] also says that Republicans do not believe that if this bill be passed it would wipe out the Democratic party, that if they did every devil of them would vote for it. Perhaps they would if they were devils; but, Mr. Chairman, it so happens that they are patriots as well as Republicans, and would if possible save the country from the swift destruction to which the passage of this bill would certainly carry it.

Great misfortune is already upon us in anticipation of its passage; but the disaster would be more complete were it to become law, because then we would have to await the verdict of the people for the restoration of the policy under which the country has been so prosperous.

It is true the passage of the bill would more completely seal the fate of the Democratic party, but it would more completely ruin the country at the same time; and as Republicans and patriots we must, if possible, prevent this. Besides, the Democracy is dead anyway. [Applause.]

Let me repeat, for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri, that when up before I gave him the language of the solitary farmer up in Vermont, but now I will give him the language of the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of the United States, as expressed by their legislative committee.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] a moment since quoted someone as saying that the farmers did not know what they wanted. Well, I submit if the following appeal from this duly accredited committee sounds as if they did not know:

[The National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry. Legislative committee: J. H. Brigham, Delta, Ohio; Leonard Rhone, Center Hall, Pa.; John Trimble, Washington, D. C. Office of the legislative committee, 514 F street.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 4, 1893.*

To the members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives:

GENTLEMEN: In behalf of the farmers of the United States we ask your honorable committee to leave undisturbed the duties now imposed upon agricultural products which are imported into this country to be sold in competition with the products of the farmers of the United States. It is generally conceded that, in former revisions of the tariff, agriculture has not received the same measure of protection accorded to other industries; and, in the late revision, the farmers appeared before the committee and secured, in nearly every instance, such duties as have proven of great benefit to them—

By the "late revision" is meant the McKinley bill—

and they desire that these duties be maintained as long as protection is accorded to any industry in the land.

We earnestly protest against the removal of the duty from any agricultural products, such as wool, vegetables, fruits, hay, eggs, live stock, dairy products, and tobacco, unless the products of the factory and mine be also left without protection. Wool is the finished production of the farmer, just the same as cloth is the finished product of the manufacturer.

We seek no class discrimination in our favor, and ask that none be made against us.

Very respectfully, yours,

J. H. BRIGHAM,
LEONARD RHONE,
JOHN TRIMBLE,
Legislative Committee.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The first name read is that of a political farmer from Ohio.

Mr. GROUT. He is the master of the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, the only nonpolitical farmers' organization in the country; and if anyone is authorized to speak for the

farmers certainly he is, and there can be no more authoritative declaration from the farmers of the country than the above.

Now, while they make this appeal, what is proposed in this bill? The comparative statement submitted by the committee shows that last year there was a duty of $11,902,000, almost $12,000,000, paid on agricultural imports. It is a favorite proposition of the free trader that protection puts the duty into the pockets of those protected. It is class legislation, they say. They claim, for instance, that the protection which the manufacturer gets goes into his pocket and enriches him. Now, if this be true, the same is true of the farmer when protected.

Here is $12,000,000, according to their doctrine, which has gone into the pockets of the farmers in the last year by the McKinley bill, and yet they say he is not protected. Now, while you leave a duty on manufactured woolen goods of 40 per cent, and leave a duty on almost all other manufactured goods, why will you not respect the appeal of this legislative committee representing the farmers and leave the present duty on wool and other agricultural products? Why not leave them the whole $12,000,000 protection which now accrues to them by the McKinley bill? But instead thereof this bill reduces the duties on their products over $4,000,000. It takes away over one-third of their protection, and this is the way the free-trade Democracy, with its loud pretensions, shows its friendship for the farmer. [Applause on Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, I propose to say a few words in favor of the proposition of the Committee on Ways and Means to defer the date when the operation of the law removing the duty on wool shall take effect. I am in favor of it because I believe that it is in the direction of deliberation and good judgment.

We have here, in the removal of the duty from wool, probably the most radical change that is proposed by our Democratic policy. It not only affects the farmer, but it also affects the manufacturer of woolen goods, the manufacturer of clothing, and the merchant.

The policy under which these industries are now carried on has been in existence for much more than a generation, and I submit that it is but just and proper that some little time should be given them to adjust the complicated interests to the new situation. If we have endured the evils for so long a time we can, with the certainty that the change is to be made, wait a little longer in order to save them from the confusion and disaster inevitable upon a change made in the middle of the business season. We are not here, as Democrats, to perform a surgical operation, but by the use of adequate remedies to build up the industries of the country and make them permanently prosperous. It is not our policy to destroy or cripple any existing industry, but to make them more vigorous and virile.

I was sorry to detect in some of the speeches that have been made an evident bias against our manufacturing interests. We can not afford to entertain any such prejudices, for they form too large and important an item in the history of our country's progress, and present the most promising field for our future.

Believing that they have been hampered and kept back from a healthy development by an unwise policy, we propose to relieve them from their embarrassments by the inauguration of a better policy, but in making such radical changes we should bear in mind the conditions under which they have existed for so many years, conditions for which they are in great part not responsible, and not attempt to effect by violence what can better be done by conciliatory methods—methods that will convince them that we are not careless of their interests. Otherwise we may bring odium and injury to the cause of revenue reform.

I sincerely believe that the woolen industries of the country have suffered more than any other from an erroneous tariff policy. The proof of this assertion is found in the fact that while nearly every other class of manufactures have succeeded in equaling those of competing manufacturing nations, they almost alone of the whole number are far in the rear—so that while we to-day are able to export nearly everything that we can make, not one dollar of woolen goods can be shipped to a foreign country.

Having been the greatest sufferers by a policy that has complicated their interests with those of the producers of the raw material, they should be more carefully considered. I do not believe, therefore, in forcing this change at the season of the year that would be the most detrimental to their interests. I therefore favor the proposition of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLAND. I believe the gentleman is an experienced merchant, from headquarters, and I would like to ask him a question for information.

Mr COOMBS. Certainly.

Mr. BLAND. If you postpone the time when lower duties will take effect under this bill until December, on what theory will the merchants of the country import goods from foreign countries? Will it not act as giving a monopoly to the woolen manufacturers?

Mr. COOMBS. No. The clothing manufacturer makes during the summer the woolen cloths for the following winter. Now is the time for him to make contracts with the manufacturer of cloths out of which to make his clothing. If this change is made the manufacturer can safely manufacture to supply his wants, and he can safely buy, for he will have disposed of his product before cheaper cloths can be supplied. The consumer will benefit in anticipation by the natural desire of the merchant to unload all of his stock before the change. It will, in other words, offer some guaranty of safety to him in doing this season's business.

Mr. BLAND. I understand all that; but the question is, On what basis will the importer act who imports clothing, woolen goods, and wearing apparel if the lower duties do not take effect until next December in importing woolen goods for next winter's wear?

Mr. COOMBS. I do not think he will import them. Those that are imported are not usually used in the manufacture of ready-made clothing. At all events the conditions would not be changed from what now exist.

Mr. BLAND. But I speak of those who do import goods. They will not import them under the McKinley bill if the date for this bill to go into effect is put off until next December. If they do import them at all it will have to be done under the McKinley bill, will it not?

Mr. COOMBS. Doubtless; it is simply putting the change ahead to a season when it can be done with less injury or risk of injury.

Mr. BLAND. But my question is as to the merchant who does import woolen goods. In other words, if this bill does not go into effect until next December the duties on all goods imported in the mean time will be levied under the McKinley law.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Now, I wish to put my proposition to the gentleman. If the time for this bill to go into effect is extended until next December the duties under the McKinley law will be collected on all woolen goods during that time.

Mr. COOMBS. That has not been suggested yet, however; but I should of course approve of it.

Mr. BLAND. I know, but that is the proposition.

Mr. BLAND. Now, if you were an importer during that period you would have to pay the duties levied under the McKinley law, and would not that have the effect of practically giving a monopoly to the home manufacturer and shutting out the importer?

Mr. COOMBS. I do not think so. I do not see how it would change existing conditions. It only passes over one season, and I do not see how we can bring our reforms into operation, even were the bill to pass both Houses this month, to make it effective for the season already upon us. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, as I am representing one of the largest woolen manufacturing districts in this country, if not the largest, and as I have not expressed myself yet upon the principles of this bill, I feel that it is my duty before the debate upon this amendment closes to say a word in favor of the amendment. I believe, sir, that this amendment is the most important one that has been or that will be offered to this bill. I believe that, because I know that the people who are engaged in woolen manufactures in the part of the country which I represent, and throughout New England generally, are looking to have the uncertainty which hangs about this bill settled, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we should settle the question by adopting this amendment to-night, within forty-eight hours after that vote has been taken the woolen manufacturers of New England will have orders placed for hundreds and thousands and perhaps millions of dollars worth of goods.

In the district which I represent there are to-day thousands and tens of thousands of laboring people who are out of employment. There are thousands of people in that district who are to-day dependent upon charity, public and private, simply because the mills in which they have been accustomed to work are stopped, and because this uncertainty exists in regard to tariff legislation, so that the owners of the mills can not go on with their work—can not place orders for their goods. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it will be for the interest of all the parties concerned in the woolen industry of this country to have this amendment adopted and to have it adopted promptly. I understand if this amendment is adopted the other amendment proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means

will follow, and that will settle this question so that the mills will be started immediately upon the receipt of the news that this point has been settled.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I know of one concern in my district employing 2,000 hands, where they have cut down the time to one-third of their usual running time, and the mill will soon stop entirely unless some measure of relief is given in this bill, and given soon. I know of another establishment, a hosiery manufactory in my district, employing 500 hands, those 500 employés representing at least 1,200 or 1,500 people who are dependent upon their earnings for support, and I know that the owner of that factory has attempted to place orders where last year he had one order for $50,000, in the city of Chicago, but his orders are refused simply because it is not known when this bill is going to take effect.

So, Mr. Chairman, regardless of all these other questions, it is important, it is for the interest of all concerned, and especially for the interest of the working people, that this should be settled. It will keep them from the poorhouse; it will save them from almost starvation: it will keep them out of the hands of public and private charity, by which they have been humiliated in consequence of the uncertainty that has attended this tariff question.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted, and adopted this evening.

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer to this substitute before a vote is taken. This is a very important question.

The amendment of Mr. BOWERS of California was read, as follows:

Amend the proposed substitute by striking out the words "on the passage of this bill," and inserting "December 30, 1899."

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to Representatives here that for twenty-five years of my life I have been a small farmer—not one of your large farmers engaged not only in farming but in banking and in the lumbering business and in the wool-growing business. I have been one of those small farmers not able to hire help to any extent, one who has held the plow himself, who has followed the harrow, who has sowed the grain, and in the early days in Wisconsin cradled it, or followed the cradler raking and binding, and then hitched my horses to the thrashing machine and followed that for three or four months each year for many years. Having been a small farmer, I know what I am talking about when I speak of the interests of farmers. I am not talking like a farmer who has been brought up in a lawyer's office, or a doctor's office, or a real estate office, or a manufacturing establishment.

I know there are some poor farmers, just as there are some poor lawyers and some poor doctors. But I despise this talking about the "poor farmer." You have never heard me use that term. The farmers of this country are not here as suppliants or mendicants asking for charity. They are here as American citizens, asking to be treated as American citizens, asking to be accorded the same rights that every man ought to enjoy in his own business, the rights accorded the big mill owners, the same protection.

My colleagues from California know that I, though coming here as a Republican, represent the views and wishes of nine out of ten of the Democratic farmers of that State. They know that the majority of the wool-growers of that State are Democrats; and I represent them when I oppose the proposition to put wool on the free list. In every county of that State the wool-growers have got together and are opposing the passage of the Wilson bill. Not a day passes when I do not receive some telegram on this subject.

My desk at my room is full of resolutions passed by the wool-growers of California against the passage of the Wilson bill. When I talk about the farmers, I know what I am talking about. I represent the Democratic farmers of California better than any Democrat on this floor that supports the Wilson bill. I have a letter here——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Has my time expired? Will you not let me read one sentence, which will occupy only a minute?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in regard to the pending amendment, on which the discussion seems to have taken a very wide range. I do not think we can well overestimate its importance, and I entirely agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. PAGE] when he says this is the most important amendment we are likely to discuss during the consideration of the bill. I am heartily in favor of the amendment and I hope the Committee of the Whole will adopt it. I have received to-day a telegram from a large manufacturing concern in my district advocating the passage of an amendment with this object.

But I pass from the consideration of this special question to say a few words in regard to the tariff in general, in its relation to the farming interests. Like the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS], I am a practical farmer—one who, as I believe, has held the plow handles as many days as any member on this floor. As a farmer, I want to say that I consider protection has utterly failed to improve the condition of the farmer—at least, in our section of the country; and I speak from the standpoint of a farmer of the State of New York. In proof of this proposition that the tariff has failed to benefit the farmers as a class, permit me to say, that in our State—in New York—one of the most important, even from an agricultural standpoint, in the Union, there is not to-day, after thirty years of protection, a county in the whole State into which you can not go and buy a farm or your choice of a dozen farms for less than half the cost of the improvements that have been put upon it.

There is no gentleman on this floor from the State of New York, knowing anything about the value of farms as compared with that of thirty years ago, who does not know that they have within that time depreciated instead of appreciating. By a report which was submitted to the Legislature of the State of New York in 1891 by the board of equalization of taxation, it was shown that the present value of farming lands in that State, including all improvements thereon, is only 7½ per cent of the aggregate value of the property of the State. Sir, this statement, it seems to me, carries the conclusion that, however we may differ as to the relative value of protection to the manufacturer and his employés, it has utterly failed to protect the farmer or to advance his interests.

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Cries of "Vote! Vote!"]

Mr. FUNK. Mr. Chairman, like my distinguished friend from California [Mr. BOWERS] I claim to be a practical farmer. I am not a lawyer, a physician, or any other kind of a professional man, but have lived on a farm all my life. It was my lot to be a farmer's boy, and I have kown something of the practical workings of this tariff question with reference to the farmer, while gentlemen on the other side have been studying the philosophy of the matter in the schools.

As my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] would have you believe that the farmers of Illinois are just on the ragged edge of starvation, I want to say that I represent one of the best agricultural districts in this country, in the central part of Illinois; and that to-day in McLean and adjoining counties lands are selling from $75 to $100 per acre. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, what has caused this? A protective tariff system inaugurated and sustained by the Republican party.

I can well remember, sir, the "good old days of Democracy" that we have heard talked so much about here. Let me tell you what was the condition under the free-trade system in the days of 1850, or from 1850 to 1860. Why, sir, in our country, and I can show you the figures to prove it, corn sold for 10 cents a bushel, and in order that the farmer might be able to buy an ordinary farm wagon, that cost then $130, he was compelled to haul to market 1,300 bushels of corn. In our days how does this compare with prices? Why, a better wagon can now be bought for $50. Why? Because the laws that have been in operation for a number of years, enacted by the Republican party, have all been in the interest of cheapening commodities to the working classes. The high prices were the result of free trade, the same principle that is sustained by your party now. [Applause on the Republican side.] To-day the same farmer can go into the markets of this country and for a hundred bushels of corn buy the same or a better wagon.

Now compare the good old "golden days" of prosperous Democracy, of which we have heard so much here in this debate, and you can see for yourselves where the difference lies. Why, sir, in those days the farmers and the laborers were paid $8 a month; to-day they receive in the same State from $20 to $25 per month. What brought this about? Simply because we have had a proper protective system that has resulted in the benefit of the farmers throughout the country; so that they are able to pay these wages under existing conditions. It gave them a market for their produce at good prices. Let me give you an illustration of how this thing works.

In 1858 my father was paying at the rate of from $8 to $10 per month for labor, and had one extra hand, a gentleman from the Emerald Isle, an Irishman, a good workingman. At the end of the year my father said to him: "Timothy, do you think you would like to work for me next year?" "I think I would," was the reply. Said my father, "What do you want for wages?" "Ten dollars a month," said Timothy. "I am willing to work for that." Father said, "Timothy, I am going to give you $13 a

month, because you have been a good hand and are worth it." [Laughter and applause.] It was then talked about through the community that old Ike Funk was ruining the country by raising the price of wages from $10 to $13.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in those days we had what they called a mowing machine. It cost $150, and it took you all day with that machine to mow 5 acres. To-day, under the operation of an improved system—not the free-trade policy—we have a machine which you can buy for $50 that will cut from 12 to 14 acres a day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the gentleman will be permitted to continue his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has arrived when the committee must rise: and the committee can not extend the time.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will perform the duties of the Chair at the evening session, which will be devoted, under the special order, to debate on the pending bill; and in accordance with the order of the House, the hour of 5 o'clock and 30 minutes having arrived, the Chair now declares the House in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by Mr. BROOKSHIRE as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is now in session for the further consideration of the tariff bill, and under the special order will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. LANE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, while this bill does not, in my judgment, make a sufficient cut in the duties on manufactured articles, it is, nevertheless, a movement in the right direction. It is an indication of the trend of public sentiment toward the uprooting of a system whose abuses have overshadowed its benefits. It is a partial response at least to the demand of an enlightened public sentiment, that a policy which so unequally distributes its favors shall no longer find sanction in law.

Mr. Chairman, we have thoroughly tested the protective system. We have seen its workings for the last quarter of a century. Under its influence favored industries have blossomed as the rose, while on the masses of the people its rays have fallen as the scorching sun of the desert.

Its blessings have been extended to rocky and sterile soil, and its blight to lands enriched by nature. Fortunes have been amassed at the expense of taxpayers. It has clothed the East in purple and fine linen. It has left the West in ragged garments.

This disparity in the distribution of wealth is owing to no natural cause. The Mississippi Valley, in natural resources, is rich beyond all other countries. Her broad acres of wheat and corn wave as an endless sea. Her limitless mineral resources rivet the attention of capital. Her boundless forests invite the ax and saw, and all her material greatness passes in review. Yet she enters not the charmed circle.

Nor is it due to lack of industry or enterprise. In all the light of day, the Western farmer knows naught but work. As year treads upon year his life is given to seedtime and harvest. Toil with insufficient renumeration, often want amid abundance, the pleasure and even the necessaries of life mocking him as a mirage—such is his lot.

To him removed from the scene this statement may seem overdrawn. It is not. My own district, a fair sample of others in the West, may be taken in evidence. Within its borders dwell an industrious, enterprising people. From the Mississippi River in the east over and beyond the Ozarks of the west, farms and hamlets stud as brilliant gems its broad bosom. Nature yields lavishly to the touch of the husbandman. On wheels of commerce roll his products to the market. And yet withal, standing in the background, may be seen the bread-winner grimly waiting for returns that do not compensate. Despite statistics to the contrary, he realizes that his pecuniary condition annually grows worse.

Do not misunderstand me. I make no tirade on the wealthy. From the crown of my head to the sole of my feet is no taint of communism. I would have men build and accumulate, if they do not break that which should run through all their transactions, the golden thread of right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But when I observe the great bulk of mankind prostrate beneath the heel of greed and avarice; when I observe a small number reveling in ease and luxury, and reflect that this condition is in the main produced by unjust laws, I am sometimes amazed at human forbearance. I may at least be pardoned that intense sympathy I have for the poor. Their lot, their hopes, are mine, and, like Ruth of old, their God is my God, and where they die there will I be buried also. [Applause.]

Let us shift the scene. The sun shines not brighter in the East than in the West. The seasons come and go with the same unvarying regularity. But there neither on the surface nor in the bowels of the earth can be found the means of living. Yet in this high-tariff blessed region is centered the overwhelming preponderance of the wealth of the United States.

The last census report shows that the State of Massachusetts, with a population of nearly a half million less than Missouri, and 800,000 less than Illinois, has an assessed valuation per capita of $962.12, while Missouri has only $293.50 and Illinois $190.11, in round numbers four times as great as Missouri and five times that of Illinois. Maine, with a population of little over 600,000, has a per capita of $467.61, while the State of Kansas, with a population of 1,427,096, has but $244.17. New Hampshire, with about half the population of Maine, has $371.19, while Ohio, with her 3,672,316 people, has but $484.20. Vermont, with less population than New Hampshire, has $515.26, while Indiana, with 1,978,336, has but $386.19. Rhode Island, with but two hundred and seventy odd thousand population, has $962.12 per capita, $57.97 more than the States of Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota. Connecticut has a per capita assessed valuation of $480.95 for each of its 746,258 people, greater than Kentucky and Tennessee combined.

To place these figures in another form, the nine North Atlantic States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—have an assessed valuation per capita nearly three times that of the eight South Atlantic States—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; nearly twice that of the twelve North Central States—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, and nearly three times that of the South Central States—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. In other words, these nine North Atlantic States have a greater per capita of assessed valuation than both the South Atlantic and North Central States combined, and almost as great as these two with the South Central States added, and yet they contain much less than a third of our population. If we eliminate New York, which does not to the same extent live off the bounty of the Government as the other eight of its group, they comprise but one-fifth of our entire population.

It will be seen further from the census report that these nine North Atlantic States own nearly one-half of the total assessed valuation of property in the United States, and yet their increase per cent of population has fallen far behind that of the North Central and Western States.

These figures, Mr. Chairman, indicate the superior prosperity of those sections. The luxury, refinement, and education which wealth alone can bestow sit here enthroned. Here, too, this side the Alleghenies reside the Modocs of finance, ever ready to issue from their lava beds of gold and precipitate a panic on the country and charge it to the Sherman law, or any other law they can think of.

Here, too, reside the gentlemen who contribute trifling sums to Presidential campaigns; though afterwards the New Yorker does penance by voluntarily expatriating himself, while the Philadelphian unblushingly enters into his reward. All of which illustrates the total depravity of the Pennsylvania Republican. [Laughter.]

What produced this wonderful transformation? What gave to this small percentage of our population such immeasurable advantages? It has been said to be Eastern pluck. Yes, but it is a pluck exhibited in getting hold of the public teat and sucking it for all there is in it. Far be it from me to underrate the Easterner. Wherever the interests of No. 1 are concerned, count him a host within himself. His tact and ingenuity elicit my undisguised admiration. He has performed many wonderful things in his day.

I withhold from him not one iota of his just meed of praise. But all that he has accomplished in the past is as nothing to the miracle he has recently wrought. Why, he can convince the Eastern wing of the Democratic party and the Western wing of

the Republican party that it is absolutely right to demonetize silver, although such measure is obviously disastrous to the West. He can convince a small section of the Democratic party and all of the Republican party that, during a Democratic Administration, a civil-service system which retains as many Republicans and as few Democrats in office as possible is that millennial era of political reform of which Mugwumps talk and dream. Sir, there is no limit to his capabilities. [Renewed laughter.]

"No pent-up of Utica contracts his powers." He can soar beyond the empyreal realm of the civil service and stampede Democratic aspirants for post-offices. In fact, his Mugwumpian genius can make a Democratic and a Republican Administration look as much alike as two black-eyed peas. [Laughter.]

But there is one thing, let us hope, he can not do. Let us hope he can not longer lay tribute on the West and South under the name of protection.

Let us examine the philosophy of this system. It rests on the principle that man is absolutely independent; that he needs no help from any source beyond himself; that so far as he is concerned he could perform the functions of his being just as well as though he were the only human being on earth. He is an independent, self-contained atom, sustaining no necessary connection with the universe, and "amid the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds" will defiantly loom up in space, and like Tennyson's brook, "go on forever." As his conditions and relations were not thus fixed in the divine economy, we can at best but speculate on this position. And speculating we may be pardoned for surmising that he will eventually stop somewhere, and that that somewhere will not be the place where there is no tariff on salvation, but that other country which sustains no trade relations by reason of the flaming walls that do hedge it in.

As with individuals so with states that adopt prohibitory tariffs. They assume their independence of all other states. All the means of obtaining the necessaries and luxuries of life are found within their borders. The torrid, the temperate, and the frigid zones are theirs. Every variety of soil and all the treasures of buried earth are there encompassed. The productive resources and capabilities of the entire globe are drained into this promised land, while the mutual dependence of man upon man, of states upon states, is dismissed as a dream of Utopia.

This is the logical position of protection. Indeed, its spread-eagle orators have more than once admitted its correctness by wishing the Atlantic were a sea of fire, that all possibility of foreign intercourse might be destroyed. They would sever all trade relations.

The surplus of the farm and shop they would cast to the winds. They would create anew the Monster Error, imagining that no Red Castle Knight will cut off her head, leaving her thousand cubs to lap up her blood and die of satiety. For as protection feeds upon itself, the inevitable result must follow that the few must draw their nourishment from the many. The exactions becoming more and more extortionate the people will rise in their wrath. Then will come the death not only of the system, but of those it supports.

The proposition is clear that a government which permits one class of its citizens to sell their wares to another class for 50 per cent more than they are worth in the market, and which at the same time, as I shall presently show, limits the labor and products of this latter class to their simple value, must inevitably produce the extremes of wealth and poverty which we see to-day.

There is no protection for the farmer or laborer. Manufacturers are no more humane and philanthropic than other people. They are as active in the pursuit of this world's goods as others, and presumably in such pursuit are no more troubled with qualms of conscience. Their angelic side is not turned with abnormal love and regard upon their workmen. They will pay what wages they are compelled to pay. No more. Therefore, the price of labor is fixed in a free-trade market, where the laborer must not only meet and compete with all comers of his own land, but with the paupers of other countries. Whatever advance in wages he may be able to effect is brought about by intelligent united action and by that alone. No philanthropy is involved in the process. It is the old, the new, and the never-ending battle of self-interest. It is the struggle for bread, which must eventually win, for it has both right and numbers on its side.

And yet, the tariff barons, in the deep disinterestedness of their own concerns, tell us that the fear of the Wilson bill not only injures the cause of labor, but accounts for the present gloomy business outlook. The bowels of their compassion yearn for the poor workman. Their memories are certainly very short. If they will read a chapter from the past, even they may learn to measure more carefully their words. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is well known that the war tariff was in force in 1873, and yet the panic of that year rocked our business interests to their very foundations: and for the five years following, gloom and despondency brooded over the land. It was calculated that 3,000,000 men were thrown out of employment; and it was all under Republican rule.

The Republicans were also in power from 1881 to 1886. During that period of high protective tariffs, 1,323,203 men struck either for higher wages or against a reduction of wages. In 1883, when the Republicans again revised the tariff in the interest of manufacturers, 9,184 business houses failed; the loss being $228,343,000. In the year following business stagnated and a million of men went out of employment, notwithstanding the tariff stood at 50 per cent. Armies of unemployed marched up and down the country and destitution hovered like a vampire over the land.

And now, in this year 1894, we are told that the present business depression is owing to the fear that the Democrats will tinker with the tariff. This depression commenced last summer, when the average tariff was nearly 50 per cent, and from quite a different cause. It came, like that of 1873, at the mandate of the money power, who wanted to put the country on a gold basis. It is a significant fact that the two periods of the most widespread business disaster—1873 and 1893—came at periods when the life of our silver money was taken and gold made the sole standard of values. No man will go further than myself in lifting the burden of taxation from the people. No one can more earnestly advocate a reduction of tariff duties. I believe the tariff to be the legitimate parent of trusts and tramps, and one of the main contributing causes of business disaster, and I believe its reformation will, in a degree, restore better times. But I do not intend that the fact shall be obscured that the greatest curse of this country is the insolent, merciless reign of Lombard and Wall streets. [Applause.]

Yet, gentlemen point to the tariff in the interest of labor.

Madame Roland at the guillotine, exclaimed. "Oh, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" And paraphrasing we may well exclaim, "O, Labor, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" There never was a wrong crystallized by force but it was dressed in the garb of right. When Antony sought to flood Rome with tears, it was that his bark might glide to a throne! When Napoleon attempted the subjugation of Europe, it was that the white-winged messenger of peace might spread its pinions over the world! When England puts to fire and sword the natives of Africa, it is to Christianize them—and obtain their inheritance! And so when Protectionists demand that the Chinese wall shall not be leveled, it is to benefit the workman!

Why, sir, this standing song for all occasions was sung with good effect a short time ago. We were told the Sherman law had precipitated a panic and brought ruin on the country. And yet behind that cry stood a sordid, grasping throng, only content if by this means they could perpetuate their power. How the heart of Wall street bled for the poor in that memorable period! No doubt the angels laid down their harps and all heaven turned an astonished eye. Here were misers who forgot their gold, gamblers who threw down their cards, and bankers who locked up the people's money that their grief might have uninterrupted vent at the prospect of the poor laboring man being afflicted with a debased currency. [Applause.] No doubt in that great act of self-immolation the words of the Psalmist came to them:

Blessed is he whose sin is covered.

Sir, when the artist of the future shall place on canvas a representation of patriotic devotion, let him not select for his sketch that seaman who—

> When death careening on the gale,
> Sweeps darkly round the bellied sail,
> And frighted waves rush wildly back
> Before the broadsides' reeling rack—

goes down with the cry, "Don't give up the ship." Nor that other Revoluntionary character, incomprehensible, perhaps, to some of this day and generation, who spurned an offer of bribe with the remark that, poor as he was, the King of England had not money enough to buy him. No; not these. But with the divine genius of a Parrhasius, let him picture hypocrisy personified in the crocodile tears of a Shylock, flowing as if in commiseration of the ruin he has wrought. Let him add unfading colors to the accursed love of greed and avarice, and once more paint the living truth, that no transaction is too shady for gentlemen of this kidney. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Aye, the song was sung, and like the siren's but to wreck the listener. And where are the halcyon days that were to follow? The clouds have yet no silver lining. Darker grows the darkness upon the people, albeit the sun shines on the money centers.

Time at last sets all things even.

Shelley's Swellfoot is a tyrant who, long intrenched in power, hears no sound save that of flattery. The complaint of his op-

pressed subjects interrupts not his apostrophe to Ceres. But, turning to that goddess he exclaims, By thy—

power divine
These graceful limbs are clothed in proud array
Of gold and purple, and this kingly paunch
Swells like a sail before a favoring breeze,
And these most sacred nether promontories
Lie satisfied with layers of fat, and these
Bœotian cheeks, like Egypt's pyramid,
Sustain the cone of my untroubled brain
That point, the emblem of a pointless nothing.

But his meditation is broken by the voice of the oracle:

Choose reform or civil war,
When through thy streets instead of hare with dogs
A consort queen shall hunt a king with hogs,
Riding on the Ionian Minotaur.

And the legend runs, that the king, heeding not the oracle, was verily hunted down with hogs, and dethroned by the Ionian Minotaur.

Fortified by class legislation and impervious to public protest, our financial dictators pursue their way. They hear no sound save that of sycophancy. The polished surface of the walls in which they dwell reflect their self-complacency, as in unctuous meter they do sing—

Great and high,
The world knows only two.
That's Rome and I.

[Laughter.]

But that tune shall be interrupted by another oracle, and it shall be fulfilled.

Choose reform or political banishment, when through your streets shall shortly ride, instead of coach with liveried footman, the sovereign voter, in the chariot of the People's will.

Sir, the people are pretty tolerably slow to get mad. But when they do get mad, their action is pretty tolerably swift. Those Democrats of modern monometallic faith, who now in their new-born zeal out-Herod Herod, and gravely inform us that the money question is settled for all time, and in the next breath scream for a new bond issue, will have occasion to revise their opinions later on. [Applause and laughter.]

When Presidential bees are humming, and tickling their ears with sweet music, a cold wind will creep out from the west, chilling and killing these little winged messengers of hope. Many idols will be shattered. No Democrat who has repudiated the Chicago platform will be elected President. [Applause.] The tail will not wag the dog. The principles of Democracy will be upheld by men who prefer honorable defeat to false victory. No man is necessary to the party, and no man can destroy the party. Its principles, emanating from Jefferson and illustrated in Jackson, are laid broad and deep in the framework and in the very essence of our institutions, and will live with them through all the years. Men may come and men may go, but these shall abide. And to-day coming from the East and the West and from the North and the South are evidences of a determination to anchor the party in its old moorings.

As the opposition to tariff reform in its ranks melted away so will the opponents of its bimetallic policy melt away.

Pardon this digression. As stated, the price of labor is fixed in a free-trade market. Protection simply enriches the manufacturer. It is the keystone arch of governmental favoritism. Gentlemen tell us it has elevated the condition of our wagemen above that of other countries. This is a rule that works but one way. The laborer of England is better paid than that of Germany, France, or Italy, and yet the first is a free-trade and each of the others a protective-tariff country. It is not germane to seek for the cause of this disparity, since it is not owing to tariffs. A reasonable solution might be found in the characteristic, social, and economic conditions of those countries. There, cast, allied individual and corporate interests bask in the light of government favoritism, while the masses live practically by sufferance.

Bayonets and bullets preserve the inequal relation. So far as tariff legislation is concerned, there is no reason why there should be a particle of difference between the wages of the American and the foreigner. I challenge gentlemen to point to a single law enacted in the interest and calculated or intended to raise the price of labor. It can not be said that laws protecting our manufacturers, and thus insuring their continued prosperity, is in aid of labor. These would exist without protection. They are able now to manufacture cheaper than foreigners. Indeed they have already entered the foreign markets. It is not to be supposed they are doing this as a gratuity. It is presumably profitable. Certainly we should not fall back on the absurd proposition that our ability to enter foreign markets should draw its support from taxation of the home consumer. If the people are to be taxed not only to create millionaires, but, having created them, to enable them to undersell foreign competitors, as they are now doing, let us be honest, and admit once for all that the Republican policy is correct—that the many should be taxed for the benefit of the few. And this, in a word, is the quintessence of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No, the laborer here is free and intelligent. He has comprehended his relations with the capitalist. He knows that he is the creator of wealth, and knowing this he has taken the only course he can take to preserve his rights, and that is to organize. It is not the laborer who is objecting to a reduction of the tariff. He is no longer beguiled with this twaddle of his employers. No, the wail has been heard too often to be deceived as to the source from whence it comes. The robbers have been too long in power to surrender without a struggle.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents are mainly farmers. Not one thing they produce is or can be protected.

No foreign wheat or corn can compete with them in our markets. They have enough for home consumption, and a large surplus to spare. Now mark the injustice. For every bushel of that wheat and corn sold at home or abroad, they receive free-trade prices—prices that are fixed in England. They must pay an average duty of 50 per cent over and above the reasonable cost of nearly everything they buy, and part with thir products at their simple market value. Do not insult their intelligence by placing a duty on wheat and corn. What benefit will it be? They have, and from the very nature of circumstances can have no competitors in the home market. Do you wonder they are complaining? Has it dawned upon your intellects that they will no longer submit to this injustice? Shall the millions of our farmers be compelled forever to work this endless treadmill, that grinds out wealth to scarce a tenth of our population? [Applause.]

Sir, every civic virtue may die out in our populous centers, patriotism become a byword, and political rottenness revel without rivalry, yet in the valleys and on the mountain tops, where nature prevents the warping of man and freedom draws inspiration from the unfettered breeze, is found the last refuge of free institutions. And this is a class more than all others that a high tariff oppresses. It would seem as though the originators of that scheme had purposely selected as its victims not only this patriotic but this most patient element of our population; an element which in the throes of anarchy or communism has ever sustained the cause of law and order.

A system like this, which produces vast extremes of wealth and poverty, is vicious, and an infringement on natural rights If my neighbor is enriched by means of a law which permits him to appropriate the fruits of my labor he is a legal robber. In an honorable and equal competition the race is to the swiftest.

All can not engage in the same avocation. All can not manufacture. Some must plow and some must mine. And that only is protection which permits the free interchange of these diversified products. Remove unjust restrictions, and man, adapted to his environments, with his enterprise and varied skill, will set flowing the natural streams of trade.

This natural interchange of products insures fair compensation and moderate prosperity to the whole. Because all stand upon equal vantage ground, each benefited by reason of his natural advantages. You would not, for example, plow in the granite rocks of New Hampshire, but in the fertile soil of Missouri. You would not mine for the precious metals in the rich agricultural lands of Illinois, but in the regions of the Pacific Slope. You would not look for wealth in a country naturally destitute of it and of the means of producing it, unless you knew it had been carried there at somebody else's expense.

But high tariffs operate in other respects injuriously to the farming interests. They destroy the markets for surplus crops. This is not due to that standing joke "overproduction." Under just economic conditions, where trade is free and the laborer receives a-live-and-let-live remuneration, many mouths now hungry would be fed, many bodies now shivering with cold would be warmly clad. The present destitution would disappear and contented industry take its place, additional markets would be created and that moderate prosperity of the whole, the infallible indication of just laws, would prevail. Trampism is not the normal or desired state of any considerable body of our people. The idle are the exception, and the immense body of the unemployed to-day are shut out from work solely through iniquitous legislation. [Applause.]

The miners of the Pacific Slope march up and down the country hunting work that can not be found, not because their continued employment was not profitable to them and to the country as well, but because this Government in its determination to create a plutocracy has without remorse and with cold-blooded premeditation assassinated their business. Such an act of vandalism ought to meet with that reckoning its atrocity demands. You point to the smokeless chimneys of factories as a result of the menace of this bill; and yet those fires died out last sum-

mer, under the rain that fell from Wall street. Onward swept the storm, submerging all business interests. An "object lesson" was necessary to teach the people what they were about to forget—that the money power is their despotic master, and that its mandates must be implicitly obeyed. And now, to sing last summer's song to this winter's tune, this condition is ascribed to "tinkering with the tariff." Manufacturers running their plants half the year, and under present conditions filling their coffers, may well in view of vanishing bonanzas join in the new fad refrain. Well may they afford for a month or even a year to close down, if by this means they can perpetuate a system which enormously enriches them at the expense of the people.

But to proceed, our prohibitory duties are fast destroying our foreign trade. Exports are annually decreasing, as was desired in the passage of the McKinley law. Trade is reciprocal; a policy of isolation annihilates it. Our surplus wheat, corn, and cotton no longer finds a market. It is dead capital. If this policy continues, Statistics, the great comforter, for all the consolation he can impart will have to go out of business. The beggar no doubt would feel flattered to read of his opulence in the great dailies, and for a while this might stay the pangs of hunger. But nature must eventually assert itself. Despite the pictures of glowing wealth with which we are regaled from time to time, believe me, in the immediate future, the farmers and laborers will turn from their contemplation to seize the helm of government, and run it in the interest of all the people. And they will do it under the banner of Jeffersonian Democracy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, to the objection that any considerable reduction of duties will create a deficiency in the revenues, now already insufficient to meet the current expenses of Government, it may be answered, Democrats are estopped from making this argument. Our contention has always been that a high protective tariff decreased imports, and therefore revenue. The McKinley law, if it could live a little longer, would be a living demonstration of the truth of this contention.

That tariff, therefore, which invites and does not repel trade—in other words, placed on a purely revenue basis—is one of the efficient means of raising revenue; and, like the gentleman from New York, Mr. COCKRAN, I believe this bill will, to an extent at least, relieve the depleted state of the Treasury, that legacy left to us by the Republican party. But, aside from all this, there are other methods of meeting the difficulty, and the best one is a tax on incomes.

Gentlemen rail against an income tax as though it were something unprecedented. The fact is, it has been in operation in many European countries for a number of years. England has tried it continuously for the last half century, where it has shown an increasing growth and met all deficiencies in the revenue. There, even in that gold-standard country, they are not called upon, in junctures like the present, to issue bonds, but meet the deficit by taxing incomes. They do not have that horror of offending the rich which some men here profess to have. They evidently do not believe it puts a premium on perjury. If it does, the increasing taxes raised by it are an evidence that the perjury is committed in the interest of the Government, and not of the taxpayer. What a humiliating and astounding proposition, that the men of large incomes in the United States are so lost to all sense of honor and decency that they will, through perjury, evade this tax.

Sir, I have said many hard things about plutocrats, but never in my life have I brought them so low as this. I do not, can not, believe it. I am not ready to admit that the men of England, Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, Bremen, Austria, Italy, and Switzerland, where this tax prevails, are more honest, more upright than the citizens of the United States; and I do not believe they will thank gentlemen for this unpardonable slur on their characters. No, Mr. Chairman, they will pay this tax, as they pay all other taxes; for in nature and essence it differs from no other, except that it is more just.

You say it is inquisitorial. Indeed, what taxes are not? In my State we have an officer called an assessor. He goes around to the farmer and asks him some such questions as these:

How much money have you got?

What amount in notes and mortgages have you?

What amount do you hold in stocks, bonds, etc.?

How much corn, wheat, and potatoes have you?

How many horses, how many mules, how many cattle, how many hogs?

Has not your wife a sewing machine? Has she not a finger ring hidden in the bureau? Where are the ear rings she wore last Sunday to church?

Now, you swear this is everything you have on earth, and you have not hidden anything, so help you God? [Applause and laughter.]

Does not that smack a little of the inquisitorial?

Are the feelings of the farmer so coarse and blunt that he can endure this process stoically, while the very minute it is applied to a man with an income of $5,000 his fine feelings are so outraged that he resorts to perjury as a relief? [Applause.]

This system places the burden where it ought to rest. It is notorious that a large proportion of our wealth escapes taxation. Land, horses, and cattle are always in sight, but money, stocks, and bonds are not sought after by the taxing power.

The necessaries of life, more largely used by those of moderate means, are heavily taxed by tariffs, while the luxuries largely escape taxation. This policy should be reversed. Those who have more at stake, and consequently requiring a more extensive exercise of the protective powers of the Government, should be made to pay in proportion to the benefits thus received. All wealth is produced by labor of body or mind, or both, which in either case creates surplus means. Of whatever these means consist, they and they alone should be principally taxable. We should not tax the body or mind. We should tax the effect and not the cause. Whatever is clear gain over and above the comfortable means of living should be made to contribute to the support of Government. I had hoped the bill which I introduced, taxing all incomes in excess of $2,500, would be reported by the committee. This amount is ample for the support of the average family, and is far in excess of what the great bulk of the people receive.

I shall not, however, antagonize any bill of this sort because it does not in this respect meet my full wishes. Great reforms are not accomplished in a single stride. Slowly, but surely, advances the banner of reform. Though temporarily checked here and there it is unfurled in the light of ultimate triumph.

Mr. Chairman, this bill strikes at a principle whose insidious root has taken strong hold on public opinion. Under the spur of self-interest men have been driven to espouse paternalism. Self-reliance has been undermined, individual exertion discounted, and the Government turned into a great almshouse, whither all may go for maintenance. Ingenuity grows perplexed in discovering new fields in which to scatter governmental bounties. Public expenditures mount correspondingly higher, while labor, which sustains the burden of all, must submit to still greater exactions.

It is the province of Democracy to call a halt; to advert once more to the idea that it is the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government the people; to rehabilitate decaying energies, and place the citizen on the broad plane of equal opportunity, where each may run his allotted race.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, with the Democratic party in full control of all branches of the Government, we can emphasize this elementary principle by redeeming our tariff pledges.

Recent Republican triumphs on local issues, nor manufactured thunder of protective organs, should frighten us from the work. Through the years has the Democratic party fought to relieve the people of unjust taxation. It now stands on the threshold of its accomplishment. Behind is the disappearing fortress of a robber tariff; before, a people entering on an era in which the shackles of trade have been struck from energies that may leap and bound into new life. In this final hour shall we listen to the seductive whisperings of local interests? History tells us of two princes of the sixteenth century who were friends of a lifetime. The Scandinavian monarch of that period wishing to remove one seduced the other into a promise to effect the purpose, and the reward of his treachery was to be no less than the hand of Christiana, the fair daughter of the King. His heart beating in anticipation of possessing such a treasure, he approached his old friend with a view of carrying out the kinlgy design. But when the time for action arrived the better instincts of friendship and the nobleness of his nature prevailed, and what was intended as a treacherous assault was converted into an increasing attachment.

Sir, if there is one principle dear to the Democratic party it is that of tariff reform. By this cause has it stood through evil as well as good report. And now, on the commanding heights of victory, the seductive whisperings of special interests would bid it betray its policy. Listen some may to the tempter's song, beguiled a while by its sweetness, but when the time for action shall come I doubt not the ties of party fealty will prevail in renewed attachment to the time-honored principles of Democracy.

[Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. ELLIS of Oregon addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McDEARMON withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. CARUTH Mr. Chairman, I began my legislative life at the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, when President Cleve-

land sent in his celebrated tariff message. During the debate on the measure known as "the Mills bill," framed in accordance with his recommendations, I gave expression to my views in regard to the proposed legislation. I have seen no occasion to change my position. On the contrary, time has strengthened my faith in the correctness of the Democratic doctrine that the power of the Congress to tax the people is restricted by the Constitution to the needs of the Government for revenue, and that to go beyond this limitation is to violate the provisions of that sacred instrument, which the Representatives of the people are solemnly sworn to uphold and defend.

Although the pending bill does not in all particulars satisfy my mind, it tends in the right direction, and shows that the Democratic party proposes to redeem the pledges of the platform upon which it solicited popular support and secured at the last Presidential election such emphatic popular approval.

It is the policy of the political organization now in the ascendency in this Government not to confine the sale of the products of American labor to a narrow home market, but to afford our citizens an opportunity to trade with the people of every nation and of every clime.

To accomplish this much-to-be-desired object, it is not only necessary that we should have wise tariff laws, but in order to maintain our position among the nations of the earth—in order to preserve or to extend our commerce—we must have a safe and stable currency which shall pass as money in all the marts of trade.

This necessity was so ably, clearly, and eloquently set forth by the present distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John G. Carlisle, in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on the 21st of November, 1893, that I quote his remarks in full. On the occasion referred to Mr. Carlisle said:

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: The subject presented by the sentiment just read is so large and involves so many considerations, not only of public policy but of public and private honor and good faith, that I scarcely know how to respond to it on such an occasion as this, where brevity of statement will be more appropriate than elaborate argument. I am somewhat embarrassed also by the fact that I am to talk to an assemblage of gentlemen who, by reason of their personal experience in commercial and financial affairs, are at least in as good a position as I am to understand and appreciate the value of a sound and stable currency and to foresee the injurious effects of a departure from correct financial methods.

Money and its representatives constitute the tools with which the merchant and the banker perform their parts in the numerous and complicated transactions necessarily occurring in the growth and development of our trade at home and abroad. It is not possible to do perfect work with imperfect instruments, and if it is attempted the consequences will not fall upon you alone, but must be felt sooner or later in every part of the land. Confidence would be destroyed, trade would be interrupted, the obligations of contracts would be violated, and all the evils which have invariably attended the use of a base or fluctuating currency would afflict, not the commercial and financial classes only, but the country at large. But our commercial interests are not confined to our own country; they extend to every quarter of the globe, and our people buy and sell in nearly every market of the civilized world.

A very large part of our farmers, mechanics, and other laboring people find constant and profitable employment in the production and transportation of commodities for sale and consumption in other countries, and the prices of many of our most important products are fixed in foreign markets. Without exception these prices are fixed in the markets of countries having a gold standard or measure of value either by express provision of law or by a public policy which keeps their silver coins equal in exchangeable value to the gold coins at the legally established ratio. The value of our trade with the people of other countries during the last fiscal year was more than $1,700,000,000, and more than $1,100,000,000 of this was with the people of Europe, while with the whole of Asia it amounted to a little over $100,000,000, and with all the countries of South America, excluding Brazil, which has a single gold standard, it was $46,000,000.

While it would be unfair to attribute this unequal distribution of our trade with the outside world to the character of their fiscal legislation, I think it may be safely asserted that this country could not long maintain its present position as one of the most conspicuous and important members of the great community of commercial nations which now controls the trade of the world, unless we preserve a monetary system substantially, at least, in accord with the monetary systems of the other principal nations.

There can be no international legal tender without an international agreement, but there must, from the very necessities of the case, always be a common basis upon which bargains are made and a common currency in which balances are settled. No one nation can determine for the others what that basis shall be or what that currency shall be. It may establish a currency for itself and for the use of its own people in their domestic trade, but the value of that currency will be ultimately measured and conclusively fixed by the international standard, whatever that may be. The stamp on its coins attests their weight and fineness, but it adds nothing whatever to their intrinsic value, and nothing whatever to their exchangeable value in the markets of the world; so that a nation's stock of international money always consists of its uncoined bullion, and the bullion value of its coins.

It can not augment its stock of such money to any extent whatever by overvaluing either gold or silver in its coinage laws, nor can it diminish its stock to any extent whatever by undervaluing either metal. While the number of its nominal dollars, or shillings, or francs may be increased or diminished, as the case may be, the actual value of the bullion or coins will not be changed in the least, for no act of Congress, or other legislative body, can repeal or alter the laws of trade or the laws of finance; and every attempt to do so must result in disaster sooner or later.

No matter, therefore, what our monetary system may be here at home as established by own laws, we must either relinquish a large part of our share in the commerce of the world or conduct our international trade upon such basis as the general judgment of commercial nations may establish. We can not possibly change this situation and, consequently, the only practical question is, whether it is better to establish by law an inferior kind of money for use at home exclusively and another kind for use abroad, or to have all our money good enough for use in every market where our people trade. I believe the people of the United States are entitled to have for use in their domestic trade just as good money as any other people in the world have, and that they are entitled to have just as much of it as may be necessary to carry on their business regularly and profitably. Whether it be gold or silver, or both, or paper based upon the coins of the two metals, the people have a right to demand that it shall be in fact what it purports to be—a just and true measure of value, or the representative of a just and true measure of value.

Gold is the only international money, and all trade balances are settled in gold, or, which is the same thing, on a gold basis, all other forms of currency being adjusted to that standard. It is useless for the advocates of a different system to insist that this ought not to be so; it is so, and we can not change the fact. But the gold eagle and double eagle are not accepted at a particular valuation in these settlements simply because the United States of America have declared by law that they shall be legal tender at their nominal value, but solely because the bullion contained in them, if uncoined, would be worth every where the same amount.

This is a great and powerful Government, but there is one thing it can not do—it can not create money. There are some things, however, which the Government can do for the establishment and preservation of a sound and stable currency. In the exercise of its constitutional authority to "coin money and regulate the value thereof," it can suspend or limit the coinage of either metal whenever it is ascertained that the coins of the two metals, of the same denomination, are of unequal value; or it can change their legal ratio so as to make them as nearly equal in value as possible; or it can maintain the parity of its coins by receiving them and their paper representatives in payment of all public dues and discharge all its own obligations in whatever kind of money its creditors may demand.

The principle or rule of law that the option as to the kind of legal tender with which an obligation shall be discharged belongs to the debtor, and not to the creditor, has no just application in a case where the Government issues its notes to circulate as a currency among the people and, by making them legal tender, compels the people to receive them. The private citizen may very properly avail himself of the lawful right to discharge his private obligations, held by voluntary creditors, in any kind of legal-tender money, because he has only his own personal interest to protect and owes no public duty in the premises. But when the Government of the United States has undertaken to supply the country with a currency, and has issued its obligations in the form of notes to circulate among the people in the transaction of their private business, and has received for every dollar represented by such notes a dollar's worth of the people's services or a dollar's worth of the people's property, its honor, as well as sound public policy, demands that they shall be redeemed upon presentation in money current in all the markets of the world.

No government can honorably disparage or depreciate its own obligations, and especially obligations which it has forced its people to accept; nor can any government honorably discriminate between the different kinds of money or currency which it puts in circulation. Whatever may be the differences in the forms and qualities of the currency while it remains in circulation, when the time for ultimate redemption comes all must be treated alike.

The country has recently heard a great deal about bimetallism and a double standard, and it is possible that these subjects will continue to be discussed to some extent in the future. For my part, I have never been able to understand what is meant by a double standard, or double measure of value, and I have never found any one who could tell me.

To my mind it seems as absurd to contend that there should be two different standards or measures of value as it would be to insist upon having two yardsticks of different lengths or two gallons of different dimensions. If there were two standards, or measures, not equal in value, it is evident that one of them must be a false measure; and if they were of equal value, it is evident that, no matter what the law might declare, there would be in fact but one measure, although composed of two different kinds of material. If, for instance, the silver dollar and the gold dollar were of precisely the same value and could be so kept at all times, there would be, in fact, but one standard, one unit for the measurement of values. Whatever that actual standard may be as established by the laws of trade and finance, whether it be so many grains of fine gold or so many grains of fine silver, it is the duty of the Government to conform to it in the payment of its obligations and in all its dealings with the people.

It does not follow from anything I have said that nothing shall circulate or be recognized as money or currency except gold, or paper issued against gold, nor that the prices of commodities ought to be, or will be, fixed upon the hypothesis that gold is the only money in the world; but it does follow that no part of our currency, whether it be silver or paper, should be permitted to depreciate below the established and recognized standard. Any financial policy which would encourage or permit such depreciation, or create a reasonable apprehension of such depreciation, would unsettle values, paralyze business, arrest the growth and expansion of our industries, and ultimately bring almost universal bankruptcy and ruin upon the country. It must be remembered, however, that it is the function and duty of the legislative department to establish the policy of the Government upon this and all other subjects, and to clothe the Executive with the necessary authority and means to carry it out. When the authority and means are granted, the executive department is responsible for the manner in which the law is executed, but beyond this it has no power to act, and, consequently, no duty to perform.

Gentlemen, the question whether the obligations of the United States will be paid in coin current in all the markets in the world has already been settled, and it has, in my opinion, been settled for all time to come. It has been settled, not by any specific act of Congress prescribing the exact mode of payment, but by the spirit and obvious purpose of the whole body of existing legislation upon the subject, and by the deliberate judgment of the American people and the declared purpose of those who have been intrusted with the execution of the laws. The disposition and ability of the Government to maintain its own credit at the highest possible standard, and to preserve the integrity of all the forms of currency in circulation among the people, can not be reasonably doubted, and ought not to be subjects of serious controversy hereafter.

This does not imply that silver is to have no place in our monetary system. What is to be the ultimate fate of that metal is one of the problems which time and events alone can solve; but for many years, notwithstanding all our legislation in its support, the fluctuations in its value have been so sudden and so great as to demonstrate the fact that it can not be safely coined without limitations into money of final redemption at the existing ratio or at any other ratio that might be established. It is not possible, under existing circumstances, for any one government to establish and maintain a stable relation between the two metals, and for this reason alone, if there were no others, we are bound to place some reasonable limitations upon the coinage and use of silver. How much of it can be safely coined, and upon what conditions it can be safely used, are questions upon which there will be wide differences of opinion; but after all that can be said on both sides they will be finally determined by circumstances which can not now be fore-

seen, and by the natural increase of our population and the natural growth of our industries and trade.

It is enough to say at present that we have already on hand a stock of silver, coined and uncoined, sufficient to meet all the probable requirements of the country for many years to come. The mints of the United States have coined 419,332,550 standard silver dollars, and we now have 140,699,760 fine ounces of silver bullion, which, at the ratio of 16 to 1, would make $181,914,841, or $601,247,391 in the aggregate. Besides this, we have $76,977,002 in subsidiary silver coin, which is legal tender to the amount of ten dollars, and is by law redeemable in full legal-tender money on presentation. Our total stock of gold coin and gold bullion is $659,167,949.

The five countries constituting the Latin Monetary Union, with a combined population of more than 80,000,000, exclusive of their colonial possessions, have $975,000,000 in gold, $725,000,000 of full legal-tender silver, and $95,000,000 of subsidiary silver coins; and yet they found it necessary several years ago to discontinue the coinage of legal-tender silver and enter into an arrangement by which each country agreed to redeem in gold all its own legal-tender silver coins when presented by any other member of the union. Thus gold has been made to support a limited quantity of silver coin at par in France, Belgium, Italy, Greece, and Switzerland, as it has been required to do in the United States since 1878, and as it must continue to do hereafter, here and elsewhere, unless a great change shall occur in the relative values of the two metals.

Being the greatest silver-producing country in the world, and having on hand a large amount of silver coin and bullion, the United States can not be otherwise than deeply interested in every measure designed to enhance its value and increase its use as money upon a safe and sound basis, but we can not alone maintain its unlimited coinage as full legal tender in opposition to the policies of the other great nations of the earth; and the country is to be congratulated upon the fact that we have at last placed ourselves in a position which enables us to preserve our own monetary system intact and exercise a potent influence in any movement that may be hereafter made for the permanent adjustment of this very important and difficult question.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the supporters of our recent legislation upon this subject were animated by any feeling of hostility to the continued use of silver as money to the largest possible extent consistent with the stability of our currency and the preservation of the public faith. The wisest and safest friends of that metal are those who have had the sagacity to foresee the inevitable effect of its continuous accumulation in the form of bullion in the vaults of the Treasury, and the courage to remove from the statute book an experimental law which from the time of its enactment was a constant menace to the welfare of the whole country.

In conclusion, Mr. President, permit me to thank you and the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York for affording me this opportunity to meet so many of the leading business men of this great business city. Although your organization has been in existence more than one hundred and twenty-five years, and has passed through many trials and vicissitudes, it is but simple justice to say that its counsel has always been wise and conservative, and its action patriotic and beneficial. All that is needed now to insure the early inauguration of an era of great prosperity is such action upon the part of this and similar organizations throughout the country as will inspire confidence and revive the spirit of enterprise among the people. Now that our credit has been greatly strengthened and our currency made more stable and secure, an opportunity is afforded those who control our commercial and industrial interests to resume operations under more favorable conditions than have existed for many years, and I am sure you will cheerfully coöperate in any effort they may make in that direction.

I believe that the pending bill will stimulate our industries, afford remunerative work to our mechanics, assist in breaking down trusts and combines, cheapen the necessities of life to our people, open up new markets for the product of American labor, and promote our commercial standing among the nations of the earth. Inspired by this hope, I earnestly support this measure.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, if no other gentleman desires to occupy the floor to-night I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. LANE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. BAILEY (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURBOROW: A bill (H. R. 5243) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the reproductions of the caravels of Columbus to the Columbian Museum of Chicago—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 5244) to provide for purchase of a site and erection of a hall of records thereon—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOSEPH: A bill (H. R. 5245) to provide for an irrigation survey of the great plains and of the semiarid belt of country between the ninety-seventh and one hundred and ninth degrees of west longitude in the United States—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 5246) providing for inspections of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 5247) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within the counties of Wyandotte and Johnson, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5248) to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (by request): A bill (H. R. 5249) for the relief of purchasers of certain lots in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 5250) to provide for storing distilled spirits other than fruit brandy in special bonded warehouses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAIR: A bill (H. R. 5251) to increase the pension of Harrison D. F. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5252) for the relief of Solomon Hyams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5253) for the relief of John M. Curry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5254) granting a pension to William W. Mullenix, Company I, Seventy-first Missouri Enrolled Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5255) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel McBirney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5256) for the relief of John B. Domm, of Fort McPherson, Ga—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5257) granting a pension to Michael Knauber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COGSWELL: A bill (H. R. 5258) granting a pension to Hannah Lyons—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5259) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Alfred Robinson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5260) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Corigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5261) to reimburse the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5262) for the relief of Manfred S. Friend—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) granting a pension to Goodson Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) for the relief of the heirs of J. D. McKenzie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) for the relief of the heirs of James D. McKendzie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5266) to grant an honorable discharge to James Acla, formerly private Company I, Eighth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5267) for the relief of John F. Byars, of Newton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of cigar manufacturers and makers of cigars, for a uniform duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Resolution of Colorado Forestry Association, relative to rapid and unlawful removal of timber on Government lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union of Colorado, relating to coinage of seigniorage of silver, demanding free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, and protesting against any issue of bonds in time of peace—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Remonstrance of cigar-makers of Leavenworth, Kans., against any increase of internal tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of William O. Martin, of Brocton, Ill., for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVERETT: Protest and petition of Charles E. James and 21 others, employés of the Pearl Button Company of Lynn, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Samuel Fryer and 104 others, citizens of New Jersey, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Friedman & Co. and 8 other firms of New Jersey, for raising the proposed duty on parasols and umbrellas and walking sticks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Leonard & Roess, Brattleboro, Vt., and 12 others, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial of 325 residents of Canton, Ohio, and vicinity, laborers, farmers, and business men, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL of Minnesota: Petition of E. Woodbury and other citizens of Goodhue County, Minn., in favor of the retention of the present duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the employés of Messrs Burgin & Sons, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the reduction of glass bottles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Avonmore, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Memorial of Dr. Asa Horn and 7 other physicians, of Dubuque, Iowa, urging the establishment of a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDRIX: Protest of a mass meeting of hat-finishers in Brooklyn, N. Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a protest from the Hat-makers' Union, of Brooklyn, N.Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Remonstrance signed by 20 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, evidence in support of the pension claim of Brigham Perkins to accompany House bill 3805—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of George Brennan and others of Philadelphia, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of Alfred Payne, executor of Silas K. Payne, deceased, praying that his claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARSON: Petition of Patrick Toland and 23 other citizens of Toronto, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIGOTT: Remonstrance of J. W. Barker, of Westerly, Conn., and others, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Petition of J. W. Divilbiss and others, cigar manufacturers and makers, of Canton, Ill., praying for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Armstrong and others, cigar manufacturers and makers, of Canton, Ill., praying for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of of W. H. Eyerly and others, cigar manufacturers and makers, of Canton, Ill., praying for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry Loudmeyer & Co., of Peoria, Ill., in favor of 1-cent postage—to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAYNER (by request): Petition of members of the medical profession, such as Drs. William H. Welch, Louis McLane Tiffany, and many others, of Baltimore, Md., urging that a bureau of public health be organized within the Treasury Department of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Michigan: Petition of the Cigarmakers' Local Union, No. 46, Grand Rapids, Mich., signed by Charles L. Carpenter, president; Albert Anderson, secretary, and 42 manufacturers, asking that the tax be not increased on their factory products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of E. A. Miller and 45 others, farmers and dealers in barley, and residents of Hixton, Jackson County, Wis., against the reduction in the duty on barley proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of 436 citizens of Connecticut against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Follaw and others, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Memorial and resolutions of the Board of Trade of Chicago, praying the passage of House bill 4182, in reference to animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of 666 citizens, Republicans and Democrats, of McKean County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, and against any modification of existing tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEET: Memorial from the Legislature of Idaho relative to the improvement of certain rivers in said State—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of Ralph C. Britain, A. B. Taylor, L. E. Veits, C. Reid, and 115 other citizens of Saugatuck and Ganges, Allegan County, Mich., asking for an appropriation of $40,000 for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of D. C. Putnam, William Plummer, William Kerr, and 111 others, of Douglas and Ganges, Allegan County, Mich., asking for an appropriation of $40,000 for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Emil Heinze, Robert Leman, John Kenter, Robert Moore, and 14 others, of Douglas and Ganges, Allegan County, Mich., asking for an appropriation of $40,000 for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of George W. Waldo, T. F. Plummer, Nathan Wells, C. E. Bird, and 52 other citizens of Douglas and Saugatuck, Allegan County, Mich., asking for the appropriation of $40,000 for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Fred Wade, John Docking, Charles Thew, Thomas Bennett, and 20 others, citizens of Saugatuck, asking for an appropriation of $40,000 for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Fernando Smith, George H. Plummer, Frank Kirby, E. E. Weed & Co., and 31 others, citizens of Douglas and Ganges, Allegan County, Mich., asking for an appropriation of $40,000 for the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of E. F. Brown, George W. Skinner, and 60 others, of Three Oaks, Mich., asking for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition from Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of a bill to establish a bureau of public health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition from Messrs. Hugh and John O'Hare, Cohoes, N. Y., favoring duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of F. Ricke, of Breese, Clinton County, and of M. S. Dickerson and 3 others, of Flora, Ill., praying for a uniform duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 17, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass;

A bill (S. 299) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company;

A bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the construction of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within Shawnee County, in the State of Kansas; and

A bill (H. R. 3627) granting certain lands to the Territory of Arizona.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. QUAY presented a memorial of 168 citizens of Spring City, Pa., remonstrating against any change in the duty on window glass; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials signed by sundry glass-workers of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on green and flint glass bottles, as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY. I present a memorial of the employés of Thomas Potter, Sons & Co., of Philadelphia, manufacturers of oilcloth and linoleum, remonstrating against a reduction of the duties on these materials as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill. As the memorial is very brief I should like to have it read.

The memorial was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the employés of Thomas Potter, Sons & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., manufacturers of oilcloth and linoleum, at a meeting assembled, respectfully call your attention to the oilcloth schedule in the proposed Wilson tariff bill, and urge you most earnestly to consider the facts we lay before you, of the injustice and disadvantages under which we as workmen in that industry will be placed if that schedule be adopted.

Three of the principal raw materials used in this industry are: first, burlap, proposed rate 30 per cent ad valorem; second, linseed oil, proposed rate 15 cents per gallon; third, white lead, proposed rate 1½ cents per pound, whereas on the finished oilcloth and linoleum the proposed rate is only 25 per cent ad valorem. The injustice of this is apparent, as the rates on the principal raw materials are in excess of the rate of the finished article. At the present time when we work for a full week of sixty hours we are paid the following rate of wages:

Skilled labor, $12 to $20 per week; unskilled labor, $9 to $12 per week; which, while not high wages, yet are fully from 100 to 125 per cent in excess of that paid in Great Britain, and from 200 to 300 per cent higher than in Germany, where there are a number of oilcloth and linoleum factories.

Gentlemen, with these facts in your possession we respectfully urge that you as our representatives see that this injustice is rectified, that we may enjoy as good a livelihood in the future as we have done in the past with our present rate of wages.

SAMUEL HIMMELBRIGHT,
WILLIAM R. HALL,
HARRY KEYES,
Committee.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Boston Society of Water-Color Painters, held January 6, 1894, indorsing the free-art clause of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Gloucester, Mass., praying for the early completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge at Cape Ann, Massachusetts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented a memorial of 59 employés of the Smith Paper Company, of Lee, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Gloucester, Mass., praying for the early completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge at Cape Ann, Massachusetts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 120, of Lynn, Mass., praying for the Governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a memorial of about 300 residents of Streator, Ill., who are engaged in the manufacture of window-glass, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, and especially against the proposed reduction of the duties upon manufactures of that article. I desire to state that the memorial comes from a little city which is now made up almost entirely of men engaged in that and other manufactures of a similar nature. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I present the petition of H. C. Yetter, a member of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of an act to establish governmental ownership and control of the telegraph service. This is a petition largely in the nature of an argument on the subject, and I ask the Senate to allow it to be printed as a document so that it can go before the Committee on Interstate Commerce in a shape to be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection the petition will be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the American Lacteal Company of New York City, manufacturers of milk sugar, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on that article; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the memorial of S. W. Connell and 85 other citizens of Gogebic County, Mich., remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a petition of the Wool-Growers' Association of Columbus, Ohio, adopted at a meeting held January 10, 1894, praying that no reduction be made in the duties on wool or woolen goods. This is a petition from a very responsible body. It contains a great many facts and figures which I think are important. I do not think it is quite so bulky as it appears to be, and I should like to have an order made to print it as a document, and have it referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the petition be printed as a miscellaneous document?

Mr. SHERMAN. Without the signatures.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without the signatures. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of 50 citizens of Barlow, of 68 citizens of Norwalk, of 100 citizens of McArthur, and of 88 citizens of Ward, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar-Makers' Union, No. 173, of Zanesville, Ohio, remonstrating against a further increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented the petition of William T. Wade, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Herman Ridlen, of Greenfield, Ind., praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a communication in the nature of a petition from the Central Labor Union at Concord, N. H., in favor of Government ownership of the telegraph service. The petitioners express a desire that Congress shall pass a law to place the present telegraph lines under Government control as part of the postal business or build new ones.

I move that the communication be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 754) for the relief of the Southern Railroad Association, lessees of the Mississippi Central Railroad Company, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 288) for the relief of Clara A. Graves, Lewis Smith Lee, Florence P. Lee, Mary S. Sheldon, and Elizabeth Smith, heirs of Lewis Smith, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 435) granting the right to personally inspect and have attested copies of all evidence and reports filed or used in proceedings to obtain a pension, and for other purposes, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FRYE. I reported from the Committee on Commerce a few days ago the bill (S. 497) to amend "An act to amend section 4400 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the regulation of steam vessels," approved August 7, 1882; and also to amend section 4414, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes, "regulation of steam vessels," and stated that later on under the instructions of the committee I would file an amendment. I ask leave now to report the same bill from the committee with the amendment and have it take the place on the Calendar of the bill reported at the former date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair). In the absence of objection it will be so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1215) for the relief of Lenness A Jackson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 117) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

A. P. H. STEWART.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am instructed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1325) for the relief of A. P. H. Stewart, to report it without amendment, and submit a report thereon. The bill proposes to appropriate $185.69. A similar bill has passed the Senate heretofore, and I ask the consent of the Senate to put it on its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that the bill be now considered? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be read at length as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reëxamine and settle the following

claim for tax on bagging and rope wrongfully paid on Government cotton, alleged to have been illegally assessed and collected, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts of taxes so found by said Commissioner of Internal Revenue as aforesaid to have been illegally and improperly assessed and collected, to the party hereinafter named: *Provided*, That the amount paid in any case shall not exceed the amount hereinafter named:

To A. H. P. Stewart, $185.69.

Mr. HOAR. Is there a report with the bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is so stated.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon will state the substance of the report without having it read in full.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The committee at this time have readopted a report submitted at the last Congress by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. The bill as introduced originally covered a number of claims—some five or six. All were eliminated, however, from the bill except this one claim of $185.69. It is a claim for taxes alleged to have been illegally collected by the Government, and that question is by the bill submitted to the Department.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me one moment, I wish to call his attention to what I think is the importance of the matter. The question under what circumstances the Government or the people of one year should repay taxes wrongfully exacted formerly is a very difficult one, and any decision of it has very far-reaching consequences. For instance, there are some gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who think we should refund the cotton tax, in regard to the constitutionality of which the Supreme Court were equally divided. We have a measure for that purpose brought up at every session. It has not been the general rule of Congress, I suppose, to refund a tax when it was illegally collected simply because, under the provision of law, the claimant has a remedy for recovering the tax. It seems to me that whether it is a few dollars or a half million dollars there ought to be a clear statement of the principle on which in such a case the committee proceeded so that we may see we are not getting ourselves into difficulty and making a precedent.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That is very true; but I understand that this was a tax collected upon rope and bagging used in packing cotton and it turned out that those were articles not subject to tax.

Mr. HOAR. It was an internal-revenue tax?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. An internal-revenue tax.

Mr. HOAR. How could there be an internal-revenue tax on rope or bagging?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. There is none, but it was collected all the same. The proposition of the bill is to refund the tax to this man.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. If I may have one word more before the Senator from Iowa proceeds, who no doubt understands the matter better than I do, I will state that there have been a number of instances where merchants and manufacturers in my own State have made application for a refund of internal-revenue taxes and customs duties, and the Committee on Finance have declined to give them a remedy; and in the cases where they have declined, although I presented the petitions, I think I was satisfied the committee were right, certainly in some cases. It is very important whenever it is done that there shall be a clear statement of the rule.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear the report read so as to show why this applicant did not file his claim with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under the statute and make his case for a refund of the tax within the statute of limitations.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I can answer the question of the Senator from Iowa, I think, to his entire satisfaction. He supposed he had made the claim as provided by the statute and within the time, but it turned out that it was made in such a bungling way that the Commissioner did not regard it as a proper presentation of the claim. It was presented by a letter of John W. Bell, attorney, which is very brief. The letter, it will be seen, covered a lot of claims without specifying particularly what each claim was. It reads as follows:

DICHMAN, BELL & CO., ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
OFFICE NO. 412 FIFTH STREET,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1871.

SIR: I desire to file with the Bureau of Internal Revenue the cases of Messrs. Stewart & Co., J. L. Reese & Co., Robbins & Aram, J. A. Sample, Root & Williams, Johnson Hobs & Co., C. A. Weed & Co., and others for the refunding of the tax paid for tare on the baling and roping of cotton. The necessary proofs are being prepared now, and I desire thus to file the claims informally, so as to come within the limitation prescribed by general orders, etc.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOHN W. BELL.

Gen. A. PLEASONTON,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

This man placed his claim in the hands of Bell as his attorney and supposed it had been presented in proper form. It was not done, as is evident from this bungling letter. There is another letter here from Mr. Mason, the Commissioner, which I will read if the Senator desires to hear it.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be read.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. However, the bill to which the letter relates covered a number of claims in addition to Mr. Stewart's. The letter is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Claims, and is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1892.

SIR: I am in receipt of yours of the 2d instant inclosing a copy of bill (S. 1730) for the relief of A. P. H. Stewart and others, and requesting that I cause to be forwarded for the use of the Committee on Claims all papers on file in this Department relating to the claims, and also that I favor the committee with my opinion as to the merits of the same.

Senate bill 1730 proposes to authorize and direct the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to reëxamine and settle certain claims, as follows:

1. A. P. H. Stewart, for $185.69.

That is this claim.

This is a claim for the refunding of taxes alleged to have been paid on tare of cotton in September, 1865. The claim was filed in this office February 13, 1888, and was rejected by my predecessor in office for the reason that it was not presented within the time prescribed by section 3228, Revised Statutes.

Claimant relied on a letter addressed to this office by his attorney, J. W. Bell, August 1, 1871, to save the bar.

That is the letter I have just read. The Commissioner proceeds:

I am satisfied that the $185.69 was erroneously collected by the United States as tax on tare of cotton, and I believe that the letter of August 1, 1871, filed by Mr. Stewart's attorney, should be considered as the informal filing of the claim; but as the case was decided by my predecessor with a full knowledge of all the facts, he deciding that the Bell letter identified neither the claim nor the claimants, I have no authority to review his decision.

This communication is signed by John W. Mason, Commissioner.

That is all of the letter which relates to this claim, and I have stated all I know about it.

Mr. ALLISON. The bill involves a small sum, but a great many of these claims have been presented to the Committee on Finance, and I understand we have made a uniform rule that the claimant must show some reason why he did not file within the specified time his complaint before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or he must show that he had filed it and for some reason the claim was disallowed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Commissioner states that if this was a case of first instance he would hold that it was a sufficient filing.

Mr. ALLISON. He thinks it is a just claim?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. But it seems this is one of a number of claims. May I ask the Senator what becomes of the rest of them?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The rest of the claims were for taxes on cotton, which we disallowed.

Mr. ALLISON. Were they included in the Bell letter?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes; they were.

Mr. ALLISON. Then this is the only claim in the Bell letter, which the Senator has read, that has been allowed by the committee?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It is the only one. I will call attention to what the other claims were. The next claim was in favor of this same claimant, A. P. H. Stewart, for internal-revenue tax paid on 183,400 pounds of Government cotton, amounting to $3,668. The next was for $4,642.32 internal-revenue tax paid on 232,116 pounds of Government cotton.

Mr. HOAR. In what State or district was that?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It was in Kentucky, I believe.

Mr. HOAR. What is the date of the payment of the tax?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In 1865.

Mr. ALLISON. Nearly thirty years ago.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Those are the only two claims in favor of Stewart. Then there was a claim of C. A. Weed & Co., also included in the Bell letter, for $794 for tax paid on cotton. The committee disallowed all those claims, but it allowed the amount of $185.69 paid on tare of cotton on the statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the tax was illegally collected.

Mr. ALLISON. Although this is a small sum it may involve other very large sums. It seems to me the committee should make a careful report upon this particular bill, giving the reasons why they have allowed the claim, with the letter of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and so on, in order to exclude other claims that may be involved. I know we are in the habit here of allowing claims, and then after a few years the allowance becomes a precedent for other claims. I remember very well that some years ago we allowed the Chickasaws a certain claim on account of a misstatement of accounts long before in the Interior Department. That claim, after a good deal of consideration, was finally allowed, after having been adjudicated in

the Interior Department; but after we allowed the principal of the claim and it was paid, I understand that now there is a bill pending in this body providing for interest upon the claim for forty years, more or less, the interest being double the amount of the original claim.

Unless we are careful as respects these questions we shall involve the Government in the payment of very large sums. I know there are a great many claims pending where parties desire to have the bar in the statute of limitations removed; and I think the report should show that the committee consent to the removal of this bar, because there was really no laches on the part of the claimant. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he allow the bill to go over until a careful report can be made.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am willing to do that, but I desire to state my understanding of the case. I did not make the report at the last Congress. It was made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. My understanding is that this is a case covered by a certain section of the Revised Statutes providing for the refunding of exactly this kind of a tax, and the only question in reference to the matter is whether the letter was presented in time. That is all there is to it.

Mr. PLATT. That there are other cases of this sort I happen to know from an incident in my own Senatorial life. A party in Connecticut, having a right to have a refund of tax illegally paid, had made his claim within the time allowed by statute. It was the fault of the collector of internal revenue that it had not been forwarded to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue so reported. The claim was small, but I took a great interest in it and argued it before the First Comptroller as if it had been a case in the Supreme Court. I thought I had convinced the First Comptroller that the tax should be refunded, but I found that he had written a long opinion applicable to such cases, and he would not take back his former opinion. I know that there must be a great many of these cases.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Before the bill goes over I ask that the letter of June 5, 1893, from the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be read. Then I will ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the letter will be read as requested.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me suggest that it be printed with the report. If it is printed in the RECORD we will not find it when the bill is called up again. Let it be printed as a part of the report, to accompany it. Then we shall have it on our files.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. All right.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill will go over for the present and take its place on the Calendar. The report of the committee will be printed.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION AND NATIONAL MUSEUM REPORTS.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the reports of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Museum for the year ending June 30, 1893, in two octavo volumes, 10,000 extra copies; of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 5,000 copies for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, and 2,000 copies for the use of the National Museum.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1446) to amend sections 5579 and 5591, Title LXIII of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1447) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Miami and Southern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1448) for the relief of James A. Mitchell, of Sebastian County, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth L. Traweek, of Sebastian County, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WHITE of California (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1450) to provide for an irrigation survey of the Great Plains and of the semiarid belt of country between the ninety-seventh degree of west longitude and the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountains; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1451) for the relief of George B. Cosby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1452) to construct a road from Springfield, Ill., to the national cemetery adjacent thereto; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1453) for the transfer of a portion of the exhibit of the Department of State at the World's Columbian Exposition to the Columbian Museum of Chicago; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also introduced a bill (S. 1454) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the reproductions of the caravels of Columbus to the Columbian Museum of Chicago; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1455) for the relief of Jennie E. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 1456) to fix the pay, allowances, pensions, retirement and rank of the veterinarians of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. QUAY, it was

Ordered, That George R. Burnett have leave to withdraw his papers filed at the Fifty-second Congress with Senate bill No. 3665, entitled a bill for the relief of George R. Burnett.

HARBORS OF SUPERIOR AND DULUTH.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission of engineers to examine and report upon the cost of deepening the harbors of Superior and Duluth and their entrances to a uniform depth of 20 feet.

Whereas Congress has sanctioned by legislation the project of a 20-foot waterway between Buffalo and Duluth and Superior; and

Whereas the channels in Superior and St. Louis bays at the west end of Lake Superior are the last connecting links in this chain of improved navigation; and

Whereas more than two-thirds of the commerce passing the Sault Ste. Marie goes to or from Duluth and Superior; and

Whereas the deepening of the channels between the Great Lakes, costing very many times that of the betterments needed at Superior and Duluth, will be of small account unless vessels drawing 20 feet can readily and safely enter Superior and Duluth entrances and get up to their docks: therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint a commission, to consist of three engineers, to examine the harbors of Superior and Duluth and the entrances thereto, with a view of ascertaining the cost of deepening said harbors and entrances to a uniform depth of 20 feet, and to report their conclusions to the Secretary of War without delay, to be by him transmitted to Congress.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on December 21, 1893, approved and signed the act (S. 1021) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on December 25, 1893, approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 43) relieving the employés of the Record and Pension Office who were injured in the Ford's Theater disaster from the operation of the law restricting the amount of sick leave with pay that may be granted by heads of Departments.

The message further announced that the President of the United States had, on January 15, approved and signed the act (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask an order of the Senate that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Privileges and Elections 2,000 additional copies of Report No. 113, part 2, the views of the minority of the committee against the passage of the election repeal bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the order will be granted.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that a request for the printing of additional copies?

Mr. CHANDLER. For the printing of 2,000 additional copies for the use of the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not make the order to print the majority and minority reports together.

Mr. CHANDLER. The reports are printed separately, but I have no objection to printing them together.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not see any of the Senators present representing the majority of the committee, but there certainly ought to be an equal number of the majority report as well as the views of the minority printed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will submit a motion that 2,000 copies of each of the reports be printed.

Mr. PLATT. Together?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; separately.

Mr. COCKRELL. They ought to be printed together. I suggest that that would be a great deal better.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is always better to have the majority and minority reports printed together.

Mr. CHANDLER. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, and I ask that an order be made that 2,000 additional copies for the use of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be printed of the report, parts 1 and 2 together.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection. The Chair hears no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.; and

A bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no other resolutions, concurrent or otherwise, the resolution offered by the Senator from Florida coming over from a former day is now before the Senate, and will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL on the 16th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment be required to examine into the condition of the civil service of the United States and the expediency of its retention or increase, and to report to the Senate by bill or otherwise.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I should like the Senator from Florida, before I know whether I shall desire to object to his resolution or not, to state the real object and purpose and scope of the proposed inquiry. If the expectation or the desire is that the civil service shall be retrenched, then I am most heartily in favor of the resolution. If, however, it is a proposition to further extend the rule of the civil-service law over and above what it has been heretofore extended, then I am opposed to the resolution.

It seems to me that the civil-service law has already been extended far beyond the purpose and intent of the first law; it seems to me it is being used for purposes which were never intended by the Congress of the United States when it became a law. It has been extended to railway mail clerks, to post-office inspectors, to physicians at Indian agencies, and it has been extended in various and divers other directions which were not contemplated, as I conceive, by the original civil-service law.

In addition to that, I am told that the present Postmaster-General extends what he calls the spirit of the law, but not its letter, to the fourth-class postmasters throughout the United States, and that a rule has been made authorizing and permitting them to hold their offices for the period of four years from the date of their appointment.

We all know that there is no term fixed by law for fourth-class postmasters; we all know they hold their offices at the discretion of the Postmaster-General, and that the civil-service law neither in its letter nor in its spirit was ever intended to apply to such cases as those to which it has been extended, not in the letter—that is not claimed—but that by the spirit of the law fourth-class postmasters are permitted to hold office for the period of four years, unless charges of some character or description are brought against them.

I think this is an unfortunate rule. I think that such a rule tends to cause men to prefer charges which possibly ought not to be preferred. I believe that under the law which stands on the statute book the present Postmaster-General should appoint men in harmony with the party to which he belongs to the fourth class post-offices, and not seek to use either the letter or the spirit of the civil-service law to extend the period of their service. The fourth-class post-offices have always been regarded as held at the pleasure of the Postmaster-General, and the almost universal custom has been to change them as an Administration changed from Democratic to Republican, or *vice versa*.

The result under the present rule by the last Administration was to change the fourth-class postmasters as rapidly as they could be appointed; yet under the present Administration some of them are permitted to hold their offices for four and even for five years. I, for one, say that I believe that there is a great deal of humbug about this civil-service business. I am not in favor of extending it one iota beyond what has already been done. [Applause in the galleries.]

There is one other point to which my attention has been called. Just before and even after the present President of the United States was elected there were a number of cases where Republicans then holding such offices resigned the office and had some other Republican appointed in their place, and now it is held that that Republican is entitled to fill the office for four years, unless a charge of some kind is made against his character.

I say, Mr. President, that this is not my idea of republican government and it is not my idea of the way this Government should be run. I am unalterably opposed, as I said, to any extension of the civil service beyond the point to which it has already been extended.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the resolution has nothing whatever to do with the subject of the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. The Civil Service Commission, the statute which created it, and its proceedings are one thing, and the civil service of the Government of the United States is another thing.

The resolution has no party reference, no connection with party politics. It is a question whether or not the persons performing the civil service of the United States have been properly apportioned according to law amongst the people of the different States. Petitions are before the Committee on Civil Service for an examination into the subject, particularly with reference to the State of Florida. It is claimed that the assignment of persons in the civil service who properly belong to that State has not been regarded; that an undue proportion has been given to other States, and that persons who are not residents of the States from which they purport to come are in the service credited to States to which they do not properly belong.

Quite a number of statements of this kind in reference to citizens of different States have been made, and as that committee is properly charged with the subject of investigating and reporting to the Senate in regard to the civil service of the United States and in reference to its retrenchment, two specific subjects committed to it, it was thought proper that a resolution should be introduced specially authorizing it to inquire into these subjects. The resolution has no reference to any party distribution of the appointments or to any increase of the service.

It does not matter what may be the motive with which a resolution is introduced, the question is as to the propriety or expediency of an inquiry proposed by the resolution and its advantage to the public service.

I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment in order that they may examine and report upon it.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, one word. If the Senator from Florida had no reference to the civil-service branch of this Government, his resolution is very unfortunately worded, for it bears that impression upon its face, and such is the general understanding of its object.

I am glad to hear the Senator say that he has no purpose by the resolution to extend what is called civil-service reform to other branches of the public service. If his purpose be only what he has said, I have no objection to his resolution. It was for the purpose of calling out the intention and scope of the resolution that I called upon the Senator for an explanation. If it is not his intention to increase the branches to which the civil-service law shall apply, I have no objection to the proposed investigation.

There was one thing else which I failed to say in connection with this matter and the evils which I conceive have grown up by the extension of this system. The law, it is true, provides that the President of the United States may from time to time extend its provisions to other branches of the service. I am informed that just before President Arthur went out of the Presidency of the United States he made a large extension of the classes to which it should apply; I am informed that President Cleveland in his last term did the same thing to a certain extent, but probably not to the same extent, and that President Harrison, just before the expiration of his term, extended this law to another class of the service to which it had not been extended before.

I think these are subjects which ought to be remedied, and if the Committee on Civil Service will report a bill to restrict the extension of the system, I shall be glad to aid the Senator from Florida in the passage of such a bill.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I did not understand the resolution of the Senator from Florida to touch at all the subject of improving and extending the domain of the Civil Service Commission of the United States, into which partisan consideration and strife should not enter. But I understood it to refer to increasing the efficiency of the present civil service whatever might be the mode or principle of appointment or selection. But as the Senator from Arkansas has made the observations which the Senate has heard, I do not think that they ought to pass without an expression of emphatic dissent.

Whatever may be the difficulties in a complete application of

the principle of what is known as civil service-reform, and whether the action of the present Executive and the present Administration or of past Administrations has come up to that principle, I do not see how anybody can desire to continue a system which has prevailed certainly since the time of Andrew Jackson, if not before, of using the offices of the United States, offices intended and created to serve the people, to bribe them to activity in the service of political parties.

When I came into public life here in 1869 the matter had already gone to a scandalous extent, and great public offices, postmasters, officers for the collection of the internal revenue, officers of customs, even judgeships were used as a reward first and primarily of service to a particular political party, and afterward as rewards for service within the party to the fortunes of particular political chieftains. It had become a scandal in my own State, it had become a scandal in New York, that the great custom-house in which two-thirds or three-quarters of the whole customs revenue in the country is collected should be managed in the interest of party. I think there is a general feeling among the people in favor of the reform. I do not think you will get any applause anywhere for the doctrine uttered by the Senator from Arkansas except from an officeholder or from an office-seeker.

Mr. ALLEN. With the consent of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair.) Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts does not the civil-service law as now construed have a tendency to fasten upon this country a distinct class of officeholders entirely apart from their merits?

Mr. HOAR. I do not think it has that tendency or that it ever will have that tendency. If it have or if it ever does have that tendency hereafter, it will be very easy to amend it so as to prevent such a result without interfering with its fundamental principles. But I do not see what reason can be given for the selection of a fourth-class postmaster not on consideration of his efficiency, of his likelihood to introduce good and efficient reforms into the service, his having a place of business, if the Government does not provide one which is most convenient to the public; of his being a popular, worthy, and estimable citizen; but solely on consideration whether he is likely to do good and active and efficient work for the Republican party or the Democratic party, and such a motive for political activity is, in my opinion, debasing and degrading.

I do not think it was a good thing when the present Administration came into power that all the consulships of the United States should be suddenly and promptly changed. The expression which has got into the press of "looting" consulships is hardly an extravagant statement. In saying this I wish to repeat what I said a minute or two minutes ago, that the scandal grew up and grew to its head under Republican administration in the past and that the present President, although in many respects he has failed, as it seems to me, to come up to his own professions, and certainly has he, like all his predecessors, failed to come up to the full strictness of the doctrine as avowed by civil-service reformers, has, on the whole, set an example which is better than that set by the early Republican Presidents.

I do not make this remark for the mere sake of making a point upon an Administration with which I differ; but admitting that the same thing has been done in the past, I think it is not a good thing that every foreign consulate and embassy of the United States should be filled by a new man and a supporter of the dominant political party every time there is a change in political administration.

Mr. President, the blame for the changes in the consular service of the United States has been attempted to be placed by the civil-service reformers upon a well-known gentleman of my State, Mr. Josiah Quincy. It is unjust. The men who undertake to attack that gentleman, who, I believe, is the chairman of the Democratic State central committee in Massachusetts, or has been at any rate recently, intend, it seems to me, to make a scapegoat of him and to do him an injustice.

It is a timid and time-serving attack which is made upon him by these professed civil-service reformers. He was not President of the United States, and the appointing power of these officers is lodged by the Constitution and the laws in the President of the United States. He was not the constitutional adviser of the President of the United States in the Department of State; and you might as well undertake, if the President of the United States had dismissed from our country the representative of a foreign country owing to some diplomatic difficulty, to criticise the doorkeeper of the White House for the act, as to undertake to criticise Mr. Quincy for these changes in the consular service. The responsibility, be it right or be it wrong, is with the President of the United States, and the attempt to transfer it to Mr. Quincy is nothing in substance but an undertaking to introduce in modern times the old fashion when a boy king was growing up of keeping another boy with him who should be whipped when the baby king did wrong.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, in justice to a gentleman with whom I differ politically, but who is a respected and honored Democrat in Massachusetts.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts said we would find no sentiment in this country opposed to the present mode of civil service or that would indorse the remarks that I have made probably, to speak accurately, except it was an officeholder or an office-seeker. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts there are a good many thousand Republican officeholders who will not indorse what I have said, because they want to hold on under the civil-service law. Those who are holding office are likely to agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator is mistaken if he thinks that the public sentiment of the country is that you shall build up a class of officeholders who shall have the right to these offices, who shall hold them for life, who are responsible not to the people or any one else, who will be intrenched, and who will cut off all other applicants save and except the fortunate few who may happen to be in office.

I wish to say another thing to the Senator from Massachusetts. He said the consuls and various other officers ought not to be changed. Mr. President, I believe a Democratic President ought to be surrounded by Democratic advisers and Democratic friends. I do not believe you can successfully run any Administration when the head of the party has one political faith and the officeholders under him are of a different political faith, and all seeking, by every means in their power, to drag him down and make his Administration a failure. I think the President of the United States ought to be surrounded and aided in his office by his party friends, and not by his party enemies. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the duty of the Chair to admonish persons in the galleries that expressions of approval or disapproval are violations of the rules of the Senate, and they must not be indulged in.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I was in hopes that the Senator from Florida would broaden the resolution so as to embrace the inquiry as to whether it would be expedient to repeal the present civil-service law or not. The party to which I belong is not now in power, but in view of the fact that it is likely to come into power in 1896 if the present condition of affairs exists, I should be very much pleased indeed to have the civil-service statute, which I believe to be inefficient, wiped out so that we can have a fair and clear field at that time.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that the results of the civil-service statute as it now exists are vicious and wrong. I think I am clearly within the truth when I say it has a tendency to grow up in this country a distinct class of officeholders, who are to hold their offices indefinitely in consequence of their ability to answer certain formulated educational questions put to them by overnice examiners. It is to take out of the hands of the great body of the American people the control of their Government and to put it in the hands of a very few that the law was, in my judgment, passed. Inquiry in quarters that are reliable satisfies me that the civil-service law as now administered, and as it has been administered since its enactment, is a mere snare and delusion. I believe that the great mass of the people of this country, as they come to understand the workings of the law, are beginning to condemn it, and I do not believe the Senator from Massachusetts voices the sentiment of the people when he speaks to the contrary.

I should like to see the pending resolution broader, so as to authorize and direct the committee to make a thorough inquiry into the effect of this legislation, and ascertain whether it is expedient to repeal it and institute some other and efficient legislation in its place.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the declaration made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] touching the civil service law and its operations it seems to me can be properly challenged on this floor. When the Senator says that nobody in this country but officeholders and office seekers are opposed to the present civil service of the Government, I think he misapprehends the temper and the feeling of the people of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. If he thinks I said so, he misapprehends what I said.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I should like to get it exactly correct. Perhaps he wants to reply to what I said. It was that I did not think anybody would applaud the sentiment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] except persons in the two classes named.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a distinction without a difference, Mr. President. The Senator from Massachusetts is always technical, and he always takes exception to any criticism that is made upon his language.

I do not propose to detain the Senate for more than a moment upon this question. I am opposed absolutely and utterly to the civil service law as it exists to-day. In the other House I voted for its repeal and I would like to have an opportunity before my term of service in the Senate expires, to vote against it here. I do not wish to weary the Senate, but I desire to call attention to the fact that while this technical examination is insisted upon when men and women enter the service of the Government, the same men and women can be degraded in the service, can be promoted arbitrarily, can be dismissed without cause, and neither the Civil Service Commission, nor Congress, nor the President apparently has the power to stop that procedure. It is an injustice that can readily be verified by any Senator who will take the trouble to verify the matter.

Mr. President, take two instances of the workings of the civil service law. A young lady of excellent qualifications and high character came from my State and successfully took the civil service examination more than two years ago. I understand that she was placed at the head of the New Hampshire list. She has waited during that entire time for an appointment under the civil service law, and has been told from time to time that the quota from the State is full. What are the facts? Take the names of those who are accredited to New Hampshire under the civil service law, and I scarcely in my life ever heard of any one of them. I think I know the people of my State. I think I know whether the persons accredited to New Hampshire are residents of my State or not, and I stand here to say that in my judgment three-fourths of the men and women accredited to the State of New Hampshire under the civil service law have no voting residence or domicile in the State. One man is in the service, accredited to New Hampshire, whose father never lived one single hour in the State, and the only claim he has upon New Hampshire is that his mother was born there. And yet he holds a high position and excludes bona fide residents of the State from getting positions in the service.

Take another case. A distinguished physician submitted himself for examination a short time ago in the city of Washington. For what position? For the privilege of going out to doctor the Indians in the Indian Territory. He wanted to go there because his wife was ill, and he thought it would benefit her health. He has been a physician in the city of Baltimore; he has been a physician in the city of Washington; he has performed capital operations in surgery, and he stands high in the profession, but he was rejected because he could not answer a certain percentage of technical questions, and doubtless some young man just out of college, who perhaps has never had a patient in his life, will be given the place. The older physician knows enough to treat the intelligent and wealthy people at the capital of the nation, but he does not know enough to give pills and powders to the Indians.

Tell me that that is a desirable administration of the affairs of this Government, and I say to the Senator from Massachusetts and to the Senate of the United States that I believe if the people of this country could get at the thing and correctly understand it the result would be very different from what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts apprehends.

Mr. President, I simply rose to dissent from the opinion expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts, and to say that in my judgment the people of my State at least do not sustain with unanimity, nor does a majority of them in either party sustain the civil-service law as it is being administered, and I believe they would gladly welcome an opportunity to make known that fact.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not propose to go into any long discussion of the civil service question. It is not presented by the resolution before the Senate. But if the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire be true it is a statement of some exceptional case, some extraordinary case. Statements of the unjust and unfair application of the present civil-service examinations and rules have been made and they have been triumphantly refuted whenever they have been brought to the attention of the persons engaged in administering the law under either Administration. But if it were true that an occasional abuse of that kind has taken place, and that some worthy old doctor, as I understand is the case which my honorable friend quotes——

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not say old. I will correct the Senator to the extent of saying that I did not use the term "old."

Mr. HOAR. I know; but I understand that some worthy old doctor——

Mr. GALLINGER. He is not old.

Mr. HOAR. Who has been healing by the hem of his garment up in New Hampshire——

Mr. GALLINGER. He did not come from New Hampshire, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HOAR. I yield, of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will simply suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that I did not say he was an old doctor. I did not say he came from New Hampshire. He is neither old nor has he resided in New Hampshire.

Mr. HOAR. Some worthy doctor who did not come from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is better.

Mr. HOAR. Whether it is better or worse I will leave to the Senator to determine for himself.

Mr. GALLINGER. Whether it is better or worse, it is true.

Mr. HOAR. And some saucy and bumptious young doctor got the place. Such things happen in this world in all sorts of public and private vocations. But, on the other hand, I have seen the case where throughout great commonwealths and for a long space of time the real test for holding public office in this country was devotion or want of devotion to the particular fortunes of some ambitious chieftain. I have seen good soldiers, honest men, men having the confidence and friendship of their fellow-citizens wherever they were known, soldiers' widows, soldiers' orphans, driven from public service in order that some henchman or active political politician, advancing the fortunes of some political chieftain, might be substituted.

I am not speaking of Democratic proceedings now. I am talking about a time when my own party was in power in every Department of this Government, and it was foul scandal, a sore, a cancer on the body of the country. Is it not notorious that when the time has approached when Presidential candidates were to be nominated the country has believed that the whole South was permeated and honeycombed with this evil, and that the offices of the country were being used to promote one nomination or defeat another nomination?

If it be true that occasionally some person will be retained under the present system when he has gotten past efficiency; if it be true that occasionally some worthy person is postponed in favor of some unworthy person, the evil is slight and trifling compared with that which the civil-service law is designed to cure and which largely it has had the effect of curing.

As I said, I do not propose to discuss this question now, but I can not conceive a good reason why the postal service of this country, the custom service of this country in its lower department, the consular service of the country in its lower department, should not be organized on the same principle and in the same way in which banks or railroads or manufactories or insurance companies or all the other great business conveniences and instrumentalities of a great commercial and manufacturing nation are organized. Is there any reason why the persons who give the people of a country town in New England or in the South their letters at the post-office in the morning should have applied to him the test of whether he favors or does not favor a particular political administration? It is not the custom in other countries. It is a principle which the fathers of this Republic condemned. James Madison declared, as my honorable friend from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] will remember, that a President of the United States who should carry into effect the doctrine which the Senator now lays down should be driven from office by impeachment and incapacitated to hold office thereafter. But as I said, I did not rise to discuss this question.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I believe the resolution offered by the Senator from Florida, which has for its object an inquiry into the condition of the present civil service of the United States and as to its expediency, whether that service shall be retrenched or increased, is a wise one, and that this is an opportune moment to consider the resolution. It was my intention to submit a similar one, and I should have done so before this time had I not been a new member in this honored body.

The question under consideration is not whether the policy of civil-service retrenchment and reform, which has been adopted, is a wise and judicious one, but whether it shall be restricted or extended. So much has been said upon the subject that I desire to add but one or two words. I must dissent from my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and my friend from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY]. There is no reason in my opinion why the business of this country should not be conducted upon recognized business principles. There is not a corporation, not a manufactory, not a banking institution or any successful manufacturing establishment in this country that gives a man a posi-

tion on account of his political affiliations. I have the honor to control in part a company which employs 3,000 men, and I do not know the politics or the religion of five employés of that company.

I am inclined to think from the last Presidential election they were all Democrats; but be that as it may, not one of them has had sufficient political influence to obtain a position in the employ of the company. He is employed upon his merits alone, and upon his knowledge of the business of the company and its affairs. Nine-tenths of those in the employ of the company have worked their way up from the bottom round of the ladder. Such should be the case with employment under our Government. Why should not the same wise and judicial rules that make a private business successful control in the management of the affairs of the Government?

I believe the Civil Service Commission has done a wise and good work thus far in the administration of the affairs of the Government; and if there is one thing which, in my opinion, is deserving of the commendation of the people of the United States it is that President Cleveland has been in favor of a wise and judicious civil service reform. Why should a faithful clerk who has worked up from the place of a messenger in the Treasury Department to the highest position be removed because he, being the custodian of his own conscience, thinks politically different from the head of that Department.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that a great many just such men have been arbitrarily dismissed from office during the present Administration? Does he not know that men who have been in Government employ a very long time and have distinguished themselves in the service have been arbitrarily dismissed?

Mr. PERKINS. I am aware of that fact, and for that reason I believe we should inquire into the matter and correct the wrong where it exists. Two wrongs never made a right. A few days since I voted for the confirmation of an officer in the Treasury Department simply because by years of faithful application to duty he had shown himself eminently qualified for the high position which he occupied and I believed it was a deserving recognition of his merit.

I agree with my friend from Arkansas that the heads of Departments should be in accord politically with the Administration. I believe it proper that the party which is charged with the administration of the Government should take into its councils heads of the Departments who are in accord politically with it. But this does not apply to those in subordinate positions. I think the Civil Service Commission has done a noble work in preventing political managers from assessing clerks in the Departments. I believe it is entitled to the thanks of the people for that alone, if it has accomplished nothing more.

But I shall not weary the Senate. I hope the resolution will be adopted. I hope that the matter will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service Reform and Retrenchment, and that that committee will give it careful consideration and report to this body their conclusions, that we may each one act in accordance with what we believe to be our duty to the whole people, to the country, and to this great nation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was not present in the Senate when the resolution was introduced, but I think I apprehend its scope, which is to examine into the general condition of the civil service of the United States with a view to its better organization and greater economy. As I gather from the debate which I have heard there are propositions to extend the inquiry so as to examine into the proceedings of the Civil Service Commission and the operations of the classified service which comes within the control of the Commission. I sincerely hope, as a friend, as I am, of the system of civil service reform, as it is called, that that extended inquiry will be ordered. I do not think it is a matter that can be investigated too often or too thoroughly; and whenever it has been investigated, which has been a great many times, it has always resulted in the strengthening and the further extension of the system.

I do not propose at this time to enter into an argument as to the merits of the reform system as compared with the old system. I do not believe that the American people or the majority of any responsible political party have any more idea of overthrowing the classified service and returning to the thoroughly base and un-American system of favor and patronage than they have of giving up electricity and going back to the tallow candles. I do not defend the system as absolutely perfect; very few systems of human device are perfect; but it is wonderfully good as compared with the miserable business of favoritism and patronage which it has replaced.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] made a point in regard to the injustice of arbitrary promotions, reductions, and removals. The point is very well made. There are arbitrary promotions, reductions, and removals, and the reason for those injustices to meritorious clerks arises from the fact that neither promotions nor reductions nor removals come within the scope of the law in any respect; they remain within the range of favoritism and patronage. That is the reason why they bristle with injustice at every point.

As to the matter of quotas, to which the Senator from New Hampshire refers, very great efforts have been made to make the quotas just and fair. It has only been attempted within a comparatively short time. That there are many persons borne on State quotas who properly ought not to be there I think can not be questioned by anybody who has looked into the matter. I am sure that I for one would most cordially support any legislation to provide the most stringent regulations that every State may have its just quota. The States are now nearer to their proper representation than they have ever before been in the history of the Government. An investigation will I am certain develop that fact.

Both parties are elaborately committed in countless platforms to the principles of the law of 1883. The civil service law is here for Congress to repeal, if they believe it ought to be repealed and if they think public opinion demands it. The law has been in operation for more than ten years, and its operation can be investigated either under the resolution as it stands or as it may be amended. I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee will push the investigation and bring out all the defects of the present law and also in bills, that the system may be strengthened and further extended. I said at the beginning of my remarks, the thing to do is to investigate the system fully and to the bottom, and the more it is investigated the more strongly it will stand.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. President, I am not altogether certain as to how I stand upon the civil service law, because I have had some peculiar experiences with relation to it. I am disposed to think that it is a law very good in theory, but a little indisposed in practice. I conceive that a system, if it can ever be brought to that point which will result in a fair distribution of the patronage of the Government to those most entitled to it will be all that can be desired. I admit that the former plan, whereby office was made simply the reward of political activity without corresponding ability to discharge the duties of the place was not a good system.

I recognize another evil which has not I believe been spoken of this morning. Where members of Congress, whether of this body or of the other House, are constantly required to apply for their friends at the various Departments and seek to obtain positions for them much of their time and attention is taken up—time which might be valuably and effectively employed in carrying out the policies they have been sent here to maintain.

But that some investigation of the system is desirable I believe to be obvious. In the first place, there is no just distribution of the so-called quota. In regard to my State no one pretends that there is anything like a just distribution. Probably it is because California is so far away that many ladies and gentlemen from other parts of the United States believe that if they assert that they came from California there will be nobody to deny it.

A Senator has remarked that a certain person was charged to a certain State because of the presence of a relative in that State. I have received authentic evidence of the appointment of a very estimable gentleman some years ago under civil service rules as a Californian who claimed that he was a Californian because his mother-in-law resided in that State. [Laughter.] This relationship, somewhat obscure as a foundation for the establishment of a just quota, was, however, effective. At present it is apparent to those of us who are familiar with the subject that the distribution is not only unfair now, but that it has been unfair from the beginning.

We may speak quite impartially about the distribution of patronage in the Departments of the Government here because we have but little of it. There was a time when we aspired to some of it, but we do not now expect many favors of that kind, because we find that the civil service regulations as enforced have absorbed all the places, and that we are consequently barred.

I think it would be well to probe this matter, and that if some method of establishing the identity of parties who claim to be from a specified State could be adopted, it would further the desirable ends for which the law was established.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from California allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WHITE of California. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator aware of the proof which is now required by the regulations as to citizenship?

Mr. WHITE of California. I am aware of the proof which is required by the rules.

Mr. LODGE. It is the certificate of a county clerk, I believe, and of one or two residents of the county.

Mr. WHITE of California. The certificate of the county clerk is obtained in many cases upon reports of a third party, upon hearsay—almost always so in remote States. Of course, there are instances where a clerk gives a certificate bona fide, and most clerks will always believe that they are certifying to the truth, but they are not as careful about that matter as they should be, and the parties who would know and who do know are too seldom consulted. However, the outcome is as I state it.

I believe that it would be well, and that it is absolutely necessary, that some system shall be established and maintained which will take the immense patronage which would otherwise be put in the hands of those whose duty it is to do something else, and place it in charge of those competent to discharge it. Senators frequently have said to me that half of their time is even now taken up in listening to appeals for office, and most of which must be necessarily ineffective.

I am not prepared to say that the present system is excessively popular. I doubt very much whether upon a vote it would be indorsed by a majority of the people of the United States. Nevertheless, I would not vote for its abolition, because I believe it to be a step in the right direction, and I think that experience and bona fide exertion will finally perfect the scheme.

I think that the present Administration is carrying out the law more strictly than it has ever been enforced. It is not carried out in its extreme strictness even now but in the matter of permitting a postmaster who has already served nearly four years and who resigns just at the end of the preceding Administration so as to have a successor of his own political faith appointed, the appointee being permitted to hold for four years more, I think probably we are now going further than anyone else has ever pretended to travel.

I believe that the resolution of the Senator from Florida should pass. I believe that an investigation made under it will result in advantage. I might add that some of the examinations proposed by the Civil Service Commission are to my mind rather absurd. There are many cases where a person is examined who is an absolute expert as to the particular subject-matter concerning which his administrative ability would be called into exercise, but who has no knowledge of that particular branch of science or learning concerning which he is interrogated, and he fails because he does not reach the standard in a special branch which does not pertain to the duties which he would be called upon to discharge if he were appointed to the position he seeks. This, however, is not a defect in the law, but it is an error in the administration, and may be cured without any abrogation of the statute simply by amending the rules under which it is administered.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I beg leave to call the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] to what I conceive clearly to be an oversight in his understanding of the civil-service law. The Senator speaks about the extension of the civil-service law and the retention of postmasters under that law. There is not one letter, nor one word, nor one line in the entire civil-service law which holds any man in office. The Senator from California is therefore entirely mistaken when he attributes to the civil-service law the retention of any Republican postmaster. The civil-service law has no bearing whatever upon the retention of anybody in any office.

Mr. WHITE of California. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me a moment?

Mr. COCKRELL. With pleasure.

Mr. WHITE of California. I did not assert, I think, that the civil-service law provides for the retention in office of any postmaster, but the theory upon which postmasters have been retained is that it is in accordance with the spirit of that enactment and the tendency of the legislation, a view with which I do not agree, I will say.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no such tendency in legislation. The civil service law was passed with the distinct understanding and with the open declaration on this floor made by myself and every one who advocated the passage of the bill at that time that it had nothing on earth to do with the exit from office. It was only a guard upon the entrance to office, the door, and not the exit. There is not a line in the civil service law that refers to the retention of an appointee under that law. Every appointee under the civil service law can to-morrow, without any violation of that law, be discharged. It is no violation of that law.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With pleasure.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Does the Senator understand that there is nothing in the law to prevent the head of the Treasury Department, for instance, from removing a third-class clerk or a fourth-class clerk in that Department, who is there under the classified service?

Mr. COCKRELL. I say there is nothing in the law to prevent it—not a letter, not a syllable, not a word, not a line, not a sentence. Republican postmasters in fourth-class offices under a Democratic Administration retained in their offices, are there at the will of the Democratic Postmaster-General. Under a Republican Administration Democratic postmasters in fourth-class offices retained in their offices are there at the will and pleasure of the Republican Postmaster-General. It is because the Postmasters-General under either Administration prefer the retention of Republican or Democratic postmasters to the appointment of those of their own political faith.

I do not want the civil service law to be made a subterfuge for anything else. Let it stand or fall upon its own merits, but do not let it be saddled with the preferences and the likes and dislikes of this or the other head of a Department. The civil service law is no pretext and no excuse and no mitigation in any shape, manner, or form for the retention of anybody in a fourth-class post-office beyond the pleasure and will of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I understand that to be the case so far as fourth-class postmasters are concerned, but I confess to my ignorance in reference to other matters. If it is as the Senator states, and I have no doubt it is——

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no question about it. When the civil-service law was passed and I had the honor of addressing the Senate upon it at great length, I showed beyond any doubt, and no one disputed it, that the President of the United States under the then existing laws had together with the heads of Departments every right and power which the civil-service law would give him when it was enacted. The civil-service law did not vest in the President of the United States and heads of Departments any right or power or authority which they did not then possess under the law. I voted for it because there was then a Republican Administration and had been for years, and the leading Republicans said their civil service needed reform and the law was necessary. There was an open and frank admission on the part of the Republican party at that time that the civil service needed reforming, and it was asserted that the law was necessary It was passed.

It was intended, and was so declared by Dorman B. Eaton and others who wrote in regard to the proposed law, simply to guard the entrance into office, and had nothing to do with the back door or the exit. It protected no man in office. It was simply to relieve the Departments and all from the pressure for appointments and changes in subordinate positions in the Departments, and to make a test of fitness and qualification for those places before appointments were made.

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator from Missouri pardon me for a moment?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. Is it not a fact, however, that the Civil Service Commission put a construction upon the law, probably made a regulation to the effect that there must be reasons for removal in most of these cases, in the postal service and customs service?

Mr. COCKRELL. The executive administration of the civil-service law is a very interesting matter. I wish I had time to lay before the Senate exactly what the various Presidents have done under that law and what the Civil Service Commission has done. It is remarkable that the three Presidents who have occupied the Presidential chair since that law was enacted never saw the beauty of the extension of the law to a largely increased force until just about the expiration of their terms of office. That is the record.

President Arthur made the extension very largely just before he went out of office. President Cleveland, on the 31st day of December, 1888, made an extension of the civil-service law so as to include the railway postal clerks and others. That was quite a great extension, and it is rather amusing to read what occurred just then in regard to it. I will get in a moment all the orders of President Cleveland and President Harrison in regard to the matter. December 31, 1888, after the Presidential election of November, 1888:

Order No. 218.

By direction of the President of the United States, and subject to and in accordance with section 1 of an act entitled "An act to designate, classify, and fix the salaries of persons in the Railway Mail Service," etc.—

The Railway Mail Service was classified and placed under the civil-service law and regulations. There were some other orders in regard to it that I thought I had my finger upon right here, but I do not see them just at this moment. That order placed the Railway Mail Service and railway postal clerks, I believe, under the civil-service law and regulations. I read another order:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *Washington, January 4, 1889*—

Just exactly two months before the expiration of a Presidential term—

The above rules are hereby approved to take effect March 15, 1889; pro-

vided that such rules shall become operative and take effect in any State or Territory as soon as an eligible register for such State or Territory shall be prepared, if it shall be prior to the date above fixed.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

It will be seen that that was to take effect on the 15th day of March, just eleven days after the expiration of the Presidential term. President Harrison came in on the 4th of March, 1889, and here is the following order:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, March 11, 1889. (Received March 12.)

Whereas civil-service rules for the Railway Mail Service were approved January 4, 1889, to go into effect March 15, 1889; and
Whereas it is represented to me—

By what?—

by the Civil Service Commission, in a communication of this date, that it will be impossible to complete arrangements for putting said rules into full effect on said date or sooner than May 1, 1889: It is therefore
Ordered, That said railway mail rules shall take effect May 1, 1889, instead of March 15, 1889, provided that such rules shall become operative and take effect in any State or Territory as soon as an eligible register for such State or Territory shall be prepared, if it shall be prior to the date above fixed.

BENJ. HARRISON.

Under President Cleveland the Civil Service Commission said, "Let this order take effect on the 15th day of March," and just as soon as President Cleveland went out of office and President Harrison came in they turned around and said to him, "It will not do to let it take effect on the 15th day of March, but let it take effect on the 1st of May, 1889;" and by the 1st of May at least between two and three thousand railway postal clerks who had been appointed under President Cleveland and who scarcely constituted one-half of the railway postal clerks were turned out, and under the law of reinstatement the old Republican railway postal clerks were put back in the service. I do not know how true it is, but it is said the work was so laborious that it was continued a month or more after the 1st of May, 1889, and all the work done in that time was dated back anterior to the 1st of May, 1889.

President Cleveland had been in office four years. If he had seen proper to have brought these men under the civil-service law and it was such a glorious blessing to extend it, it might have been done in time to have saved the heads of the Democrats who had gotten in under it; but President Harrison made it to suit himself, and thus the benefits of a nonpartisan service were destroyed.

President Harrison came in, and what do we find him doing toward the close of his term? We find him extending the civil service. Why not at the beginning of the term in order to test the efficiency and virtue of its extension instead of waiting until near the close of the term? I have not had time to look it up, but I believe he put the navy yards and then the Indian service under the civil-service regulations, extending it even to physicians and to Indian agents and the teachers in Indian schools.

President Harrison and President Cleveland during their two terms of service, and mostly toward the close of their terms, placed 15,000 officers who were eligible to appointment, residents of any State, under the civil-service law and extended the system very largely. If I had had time I would have given the dates of all the extensions, so that Senators might see exactly what was done.

There is now a conflict in regard to the civil-service law. All the actions of the Executive Departments that are not agreeable are charged to the civil-service law, and it is made the scapegoat of many sins for which it is not responsible. It is made the scapegoat to retain inefficient officers, which it does not do, as I have said. It has nothing in the world to do with the retention of anybody in office.

It has been extended to such an extent that it embraces offices that ought never to have been brought under a civil-service law and opened to competitive examination, because in many offices something more than a mere technical knowledge which can be developed by a civil-service examination is essential. Take a physician to an Indian agency. He may be a graduate of what is said to be one of the finest medical schools in the world, as the University of Virginia, but may know very little about actual practice, and yet he will pass at a higher grade than a physician who has been practicing years and years. It is the same way with teaching school. A young graduate may come in and pass the highest possible examination who has never had an hour's experience in public-school teaching.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it becomes the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope, as the Senator from Missouri has not concluded his remarks, he will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution come up to-morrow.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no amendment——

Mr. CHANDLER. I submit an amendment, which I ask may be read and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill the following additional section:

SEC. 4. At every election in any State of a Representative in Congress, each candidate for Representative nominated by any political party or by a nomination paper signed by one hundred resident voters shall have the right to appoint in writing signed by him one watcher to represent him at each voting district, precinct or place where votes for Representatives are to be cast. Every such watcher shall have the right to be present at the registration of voters who are to cast their votes within his district, precinct or place, and also to be present at the election therein, and he shall have the right to freely witness all the registration proceedings and the receiving and counting of the ballots for Representative in Congress and the making and signing of the returns thereof, and every such watcher shall be allowed to be and to remain so near to the place where the names are registered and the place where the ballots are received, counted, and a return thereof made, that he may easily and fully perform his duties; and any person who shall in any way, directly or indirectly, by bribery, intimidation, or violence, or any device whatever intentionally hinder, delay, obstruct, or prevent any such watcher from the discharge of his duties shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or by both, such punishments at the discretion of the court. In case any rules or regulations for conducting Congressional elections shall exist in any State which would contravene the provisions of this section, such rules or regulations are hereby amended and altered so as to conform to the rule and regulation made by this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GRAY. I merely rose to ask who had offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish the amendment voted upon at this time. I ask to have the amendment printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that the amendment be printed. It is so ordered, if there is no objection. The pending question, however, is on the adoption of the Senator's amendment. Is the Senate ready for the question? [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. PLATT. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am afraid there is no quorum present.

Mr. TELLER. Let the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, it becomes the duty of the Chair to order the roll to be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Frye,	Jones, Ark.	Shoup,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Kyle,	Squire,
Bate,	George,	Lodge,	Teller,
Berry,	Gibson,	Martin,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Oregon	Vest,
Caffery,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Vilas,
Call,	Gray,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Carey,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Walthall,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Pettigrew,	White, Cal.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Platt,	White, La.
Davis,	Hoar,	Pugh,	Wilson.
Dixon.	Hunton,	Roach.	
Faulkner,	Irby,	Sherman,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, as I did not catch the first part of his amendment, to what is it an amendment? I should like to have it read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add the following——

Mr. GRAY. To add the following to what, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is an additional section to the repeal bill.

The amendment was again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the object of this amendment is in order that, if all the existing election laws are swept from the statute books, there shall at least be a provision of national law entitling every candidate for Representative in Congress to have a watcher representing him at each place of regis-

tration and at each election precinct where votes are cast, which watcher shall not be hindered or kept from the registration place or voting place by any person whatsoever. The object is to make this a paramount right under the national law, and to alter any regulation of any State so that each candidate for Congress may have a watcher at the registration place and at each polling precinct.

I have thought that notwithstanding Senators upon the other side are determined to strike from the statute book the great body of laws which provide for election supervisors, which provide for marshals at the polls, which provide for punishing under national statutes crimes against the suffrage committed in the States in connection with Congressional elections, they yet would think that it was worth while to give this one right, enacted, sanctioned, strengthened, and made paramount by a law of the United States, to every candidate for Congress in every district in the United States. I hope that before the discussion ends upon the pending bill the Senators upon the other side will conclude not to vote against this provision, and that they will be content to have at least this little piece of legislation upon the statute book as a testimonial to the national power and as a recognition and assertion of national power under the clause of the Constitution which gives Congress the right to make or alter regulations for the conduct of elections of Representatives in Congress.

Mr. PLATT. It would be no expense to the Government.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is a very simple provision. It incurs no expense to the United States. It does not put a Federal official at the polls, but it gives a very simple protection and guard to the Congressional elections. I believe that it will be the judgment of Senators upon the other side to add this provision to the bill before it passes this body, if it does pass. I am quite sure that the amendment will commend itself to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] who spoke yesterday. The Senator began by admitting the constitutionality of action by Congress under that clause in the Constitution, which, however, I believe is universally condemned by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber; the majority report at least sets out that the clause is unconstitutional which purports to authorize Congress to make regulations for the government of Congressional elections. The majority have planted themselves upon that ground.

The Senator from Illinois dissents from that ground and says that he believes Congress has a right to legislate under that clause; and I shall ask him with great confidence to vote to leave this little remnant of national power upon the statute book in case the great body of the national legislation is stricken therefrom.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to interrupt the Senator from New Hampshire for a moment. The Senator from Illinois is present, and of course I do not presume to answer for him, but the Senator says he understood the Senator from Illinois to admit the constitutionality of the laws which we are trying to repeal. I did not so understand him.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator admits, I think, that Congress has the constitutional power to pass these laws. I think the Senator said that he was in favor of these laws when originally passed. I will look and see. He said:

> I can not say that in the beginning I disapproved of much in this legislation.

The Senator also said, I think, very distinctly that he believed in the constitutional right of Congress to pass national election laws. He said:

> I do not deny that Congress has the power to regulate the elections of Representatives in Congress.

If I understand the majority report, the report made in the House of Representatives, I understand its purport to be a declaration that the United States can not pass a law regulating the conduct of national elections unless the State or the States absolutely fail to make any such laws. There is a long constitutional argument in the majority report of the House, adopted in language by the majority of the Senate committee, which is now on the desks of Senators, and a declaration that as long as the State undertakes to perform its duty there can be no constitutional law passed by Congress; that the constitutional right of Congress is to legislate when the States neglect or refuse to perform their duty.

Now, I understand the Senator from Illinois, who undoubtedly unwittingly gave his assent to the language of this report, to say that in the beginning he was not opposed to this legislation; that he believed in the constitutional right of Congress to pass laws regulating the election of members of Congress, and certainly the Senator from Illinois will admit that a simple provision of the laws of the United States, which gives each candidate for Representative in Congress a watcher, the right to designate under his signature one person in each voting precinct to witness the registration and to witness the election, is not an unreasonable statute. It is not an extensive assertion of national power; it is not satisfactory to me as such assertion of power, but it is a provision for guarding the suffrage and for the assertion of national power for the purpose of guarding the suffrage, which I think the Senate ought by a unanimous vote to adopt.

I was sorry to see the disposition manifested on the other side of the Chamber to vote down my amendment without so much as having it printed or making any investigation into its merits, and I am afraid, with all due respect to Senators, without a fair consideration of its merits.

Mr. President, I do not desire to argue the amendment at this time any further. I only spoke because I was invited by the Senator from Delaware to explain the amendment, and I trust I have made at least its purport and intent so clear that Senators will think it worth while at least to consider it over night before recording their votes against it. I certainly do not ask any unusual courtesy in suggesting that the amendment having been seriously offered by me, I believing that it ought to be adopted, in asking this additional consideration of it.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me—I only speak for myself—after the two or three weeks' delay which has occurred in the consideration of this matter, so as to give ample time for the minority to prepare its report and for Senators to be prepared for the discussion of the bill, if he suggests further delay, I will state to him that I am rather inclined to think that that is asking the courtesy of the Senate beyond what was anticipated.

As to voting for the Senator's amendment, without having it printed or without sleeping a night over it, the Senator will recognize, as a matter of course, that his amendment goes to the very gist of the controversy between the two sides, as perfectly understood now as it will be to-morrow or next week, and that on this side of the Chamber, without going at all into the discussion of the constitutional power of Congress to legislate, in our view there ought not to be any Federal supervision whatever over these elections by Congress or by the President.

That is a subject which must be left entirely to the States. No matter what has occurred in the past; no matter what emergency there may have been, this is now a time of peace, and with better feelings and better conditions in the governments of our States, these statutes ought to be wiped from the statute book entirely. Unless the elections as conducted under the direction of the people of the several States are as pure and good and free as they can be under our human system then the Government is a failure. Those of us who are in favor of repealing these laws are content to leave the regulation of elections to the people of the States, to trust them. If they can not be trusted, as I said before, Mr. President, the whole theory of our Government is a failure.

That is the broad question presented by the Senator from New Hampshire. He will pardon me for dissenting from any suggestion and declining to comply with any request for a postponement of this matter, because the line is too clearly drawn, too well understood. We can vote upon his amendment as intelligently now as we can at any other time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I had not made any request, I think, for the postponement of the bill itself. I did say to the Senate that I preferred that it should not be voted upon at this time because I thought the Senate ought to receive such enlightenment as the debate might give before a vote should be taken, but I now do say to the Senator from Delaware and to the Senator from Maryland that, acting in all good faith toward the Senator in charge of this bill, I do not find that any Senator upon this side of the Chamber is ready to proceed with the debate this afternoon.

I have made inquiry of all the Senators who are to speak. I find that some dozen Senators have intentions more or less definitely formed to speak upon the bill, and some half dozen who have positively decided to speak thereon, and I have asked those Senators if they were ready to speak and have been informed that there is no one ready to speak at this moment. Therefore I now suggest to the Senator from Delaware and to the Senator from Maryland that they allow the bill to go over until Monday next, and then take it up for consideration with a view of proceeding with it until it shall be disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not the least desire to delay a vote on the bill or to postpone action upon it in any way, but I desire to speak upon it. I had hoped to be ready this week, but our long session on Monday and some other matters have so interfered with me that I have been unable to be ready to speak this week, as I had hoped. I therefore desire to give notice that, with the kind permission of the Senate, immediately after the morning hour on Wednesday next I shall ask the liberty to address the Senate upon the pending bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. I desire to speak upon this bill, to put upon record my protest against it, and in a feeble way attempt to vindicate the constitutionality of Federal supervision of the elec-

tion of Federal officers, about which I have not a shadow of doubt, but I am not ready to do so now. I have just got the report of the minority of the committee, which I desire to study carefully. It came to me yesterday. I have not had a spare hour since. There is plenty of time for this bill; there is no election coming on just now, and the bill is as certain to pass as the existence of the Democracy. There is no question about it, and we may as well take it easily and not crowd ourselves about it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I did not interrupt the Senator from New Hampshire in his kind references to me, because I think in all probability I have less sensitiveness on the point of mere consistency than any other Senator on this floor. I have never felt that to arraign an argument of mine or to assail me successfully it was necessary to refer to any incidental or accidental remark I had made. On yesterday I objected to this bill. I pointed out its difficulties; I presented my objections to it as nearly as I could. Incidentally I alluded to other subjects. I certainly did say yesterday:

I can not say that in the beginning I disapproved of much in this legislation. I confess at the close of the war I insisted upon giving to the negro man the ballot as being far cheaper and far safer than to give him the musket, because I felt that the National Government was obliged to protect him in his liberty and in the new right to acquire property. I felt that to give him the ballot was to place in his hands a great educational agency, the employment of which would suggest to him to cultivate amicable relations with his white neighbors, and would teach him to vote, as this negro from the rice plantation near Wilmington said, according to his own interest—

As I illustrated by the story of the negro whom I met in North Carolina.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the arrangement of these measures belongs to another branch of the argument, which I addressed to the Senate yesterday. I regarded the war as having its own law, and I regarded the close of that great contest as making requirements that were purely accidental to and resulting from the war. I deemed it indispensable that the Government should protect the negro in the exercise of his rights, and I was surprised when I was told by the Senator from Massachusetts that the law was not passed for the South, but that it really was passed for New York. Then even my slight approval of the legislation seems to have been mistaken. I said again:

I do not deny that Congress has the power to regulate the elections of Representatives in Congress.

Who can deny that which is in the express language of the Constitution? I surely would not part with that power.

Mr. GRAY. Let me recall, if the Senator will allow me, that it is very justly said that no one can dispute the words of the Constitution. Those words are:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. PALMER. I am not disposed myself to contract or limit that power. It belongs to the great powers which were given to the Government for its own preservation, and I think I can see that it might become necessary—I am not sure but it has been necessary in our past history—that Congress should exercise this power not by legislation alone, but in the various methods by which Congress did assert and assure to districts representation in the House of Representatives.

There are great powers which belong to the Government which are to be invoked when the occasion demands it, but these are exceptional powers and to be exercised only when the preservation of the Republic becomes necessary. If Senators will take occasion to examine the whole Constitution they will find deposits of power which may be termed extraordinary which are to be invoked under extreme circumstances, not to be summoned into exercise on ordinary occasions when the general principles of free government move on or are applied without difficulty in all sections of the country.

I repeat I do not deny that Congress has the power to regulate the election of Representatives in Congress. Of course I use that term in the sense of the Constitution itself; but I said:

If a law should be presented which should be uniform in its application and just in its effects, I would give it consideration, at least; but at present I am not called upon to discuss legislation of that kind, because I propose to present a counter idea.

I then proceeded to present that counter idea, that the underlying principles of free government demand that the people shall be intrusted with the administration of their own government. I quote the remark here of a distinguished jurist. I remember that in 1862, when I, with others, was occupying the city of Nashville with a military force, I met an old lawyer whose name is familiar to Senators from that State, old Mr. Fogg. He told me that the courts were closed and he wanted to talk law to somebody. I myself had been away from the courts until I felt the same hunger. I asked him to give me his views upon a question which I submitted to him. He said:

War has its own laws. When the war is over the national necessity will be to return to judicial interpretations of the Constitution and yield these military interpretations.

We have reached that point now. I admit the existence of some power in the Government. I admit the right of Congress to declare war; but I should be astonished if the Senator from New Hampshire should propose to exercise that power to-day, for there is no occasion for it. I admit the power of Congress to the extent of the Constitution to regulate the election of Representatives, but there is no occasion for doing so to-day; and why? Because the people themselves are peaceful, they are intelligent, they love liberty, love law, love order; they appreciate the value of the institutions of free government, of a government by the people, and hence there is no more occasion for invoking the particular power to which the Senator adverts, and which I concede to-day, than there would be for the exercise of the power to declare war. Those are extreme powers to be employed for emergencies.

I am content to be judged by my own theory, and that theory is that the people of the United States, of the localities, the townships, the election districts, or whatever may be their municipal organizations, have the right themselves to control and regulate and conduct their own elections without the help of a watcher.

Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if he means merely to preserve the vestige, if he means merely to show that there is a rod that may be held over the people, an innocent, gentle, kindly switch, as over school children, to teach them that the master is present—if that is what he means, he has well chosen his agency. If he means simply to assert the power of the Government, perhaps this mild, gentle requirement may accomplished that much; but if he means to accomplish anything more than the mere assertion to freemen that they have a master, his proposition simply fails.

I shall at some future time perhaps, I trust, give an answer to several questions propounded to me by my kind friend from New Hampshire, and particularly that most interesting question which he and I have discussed so much, as to why I left the Republican party. That seems to be one of the points which interests him very much and it interests me very much, and I know of no gentleman in the country to whom I am more disposed to be responsible than to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know any gentleman in the country whom I should be quicker disposed to follow out of my own party into the opposition than the Senator from Illinois, if I were convinced that I ought to do so. Therefore I await with some trepidation the reasons which the Senator has failed to give us.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Illinois had better not give them.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has failed to give us those reasons as yet, but he has now promised to give them to us at some length, and until I hear from him I shall stay with my own party.

I wanted to ask the Senator a question, which I intended to ask him before he sat down. He closed by stating that he believed the people of every township—those were his words—ought to control their own affairs; that they ought to control their own elections. I believe the Senator is sincere and honest in all his convictions and in his expressions when he has carefully studied a subject. Therefore, I want to ask him in all sincerity if he has examined the laws of some of the Southern States and has noticed how the townships are allowed to govern themselves? For instance, on page 30 of the minority report there is stated as to the election laws of South Carolina:

The governor appoints for each county a supervisor of registration, and also three commissioners of elections, and the commissioners appoint three managers of elections at each polling place.

The townships in South Carolina have put over them election officers who are appointed by three commissioners of the county, who are appointed by the governor, and the registration for each county is made by a supervisor appointed by the county.

Now, I call the Senator's attention, on page 32 of the minority report, to the case of Virginia:

In Virginia the Legislature every two years, by resolution, names and elects three residents of each of the one hundred counties and ten cities in the State as an electoral board for that county or city. This board appoints a registrar for each of the election districts within the county or city (there being about 1,500 districts in the State), who register the votes of his district.

This board, that is to say this electoral board of three named in the Virginia State capital by a resolution of the Legislature, also appoints three judges of election and two clerks for each district.

Without referring to other States, I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to these two, South Carolina and Virginia, where the power of appointing the local election officers, who are to call the election, receive the votes, count them, and certify the result to the canvassing board, are appointed and named at the capital of the State either by the governor or the Legislature; and if by the Legislature, then by a caucus of that Leg-

islature, and I may say that, inasmuch as these States are Democratic, by a Democratic caucus of the Legislature. Now, I ask the Senator whether that is home rule, whether that is local self-government, and whether that system would be tolerated a moment by the people of Illinois? If he says it would not be, then I ask him why he is willing to repeal these national election laws, which afford some protection to voters, under such circumstances, and to leave the people of every township to the mercy of such unfair and barbarous laws as these?

Mr. PALMER. It affords me great pleasure to answer the Senator from New Hampshire that I emphatically and as earnestly and in language as strong as I can use and be respectful, condemn the laws to which he refers. They would not be submitted to in Illinois, in any county in that State.

Mr. ALLISON. Why not?

Mr. PALMER. Because they are wrong; they violate popular rights.

Mr. ALLISON. That is a good reason.

Mr. PALMER. But I remember that in Louisiana in 1876–'77, nd in ot he r States, I found States under the control of Republican boards equally despotic in their power. They were the outgrowth of the unhappy conditions produced by the war. I had hoped that we had escaped from them all. I have spoken of the laws referred to. They are unnecessary, in my judgment, and do not and will not in the end accomplish the results hoped for by their authors, unless they hope for injustice or the retention of power for the present, which is the most dangerous acquisition that men can have. I remember during reconstruction times, when the Republican party, of which I spoke yesterday, had possession of those States, that I found returning boards in a number of them that were organized. They were political boards. I witnessed the operation of one of them, at least, and I found that the purpose was to retain in power a particular party, and that purpose was accomplished.

Perhaps I ought to say, lest I should be charged with doing something that I would not be guilty of, that I think the result of that canvass was to place in the Presidency one of the best men the country has produced, not the equal of his competitor in point of ability, but the equal of any other man in purity and elevation of character. I desire to pay that tribute to Rutherford B. Hayes, lest I may do injustice to a friend and a comrade.

Those were conditions which belong to the past. I condemn those laws because they are not consistent with popular liberty. I condemn this system by which marshals are created.

Mr. President, I have very little to do with the past. I am dealing with the future. I have no power to correct the evils of which the Senator complains, but the remedy of the marshals does not and has never cured those particular evils. Those evils are incurable, and will only yield to the progress of intelligence and of sound and just principles. This is no cure for them. The Senator says why reject this nostrum which he proposes for the cure of evils. I say I reject it simply because it will not in the slightest degree relieve the disease. It may have many virtues, but I reject the medicine because it will not cure the complaint. I object to this system of marshals because it does not cure any of the evils of which the Senator complains, nor does it in the slightest degree mitigate the operation of the laws which are so justly condemned.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator be kind enough, if it is agreeable to him at this time, to also state whether he objects to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire, and, if so, why he condemns it?

Mr. PALMER. Simply because it is childish. It is a mere bare assertion of a useless power, a mere assertion of power which is as offensive to all just conceptions of popular liberty as if it had some meaning to it; and I think the Senator claims for it nothing more than I conceive, that it is a mere rod, a mere symbol of power. The State Legislatures are abundantly able to provide for conditions like these, and they have not failed to do so.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] proposes to secure to each candidate having a sufficient number of voters behind him to show that he is not a mere pretended candidate the right to have a person present who shall know what the election officers do. Is such knowledge, in the judgment of the Senator, childish, or is such security childish?

Mr. PALMER. It is. It is based upon a false conception. Can it be possible that candidates have as much interest in the purity and justice of elections as the people themselves? What is a candidate? A candidate is one who proposes himself for popular suffrage, proposes himself for the consideration of his neighbors. Does he acquire any specific vested right from the mere fact that he intimates a willingness to be voted for? Does that give him a right that he may assert?

Mr. HOAR. Is not he the person, if the Senator will pardon me, upon whom we in all our customs devolve the right; and does not public sentiment, at least, devolve the duty of contesting elections upon him? I suppose the Senator will not deny that there have been such things as fraudulent elections in this world—not in New England and not in Illinois, perhaps.

Mr. PALMER. I have heard it said that such a thing has happened, even in Illinois.

Mr. HOAR. Then so much the worse.

Mr. PALMER. Yes, somuch the worse.

Mr. HOAR. Somebody is expected, if there be a fraudulent certificate or an apparent result produced by fraud in violation of the rights of the people, to present the facts to the House of Representatives, who are the constitutional judges, to gather them, to know them, prove them, argue about them, and that has always been done, and probably always will be done, by the candidates. Now, this proposition is that the candidate shall be entitled to have a witness of the action of the election officers. That is all.

Mr. PALMER. It is entirely unnecessary and needlessly offensive.

Mr. HOAR. Offensive to whom?

Mr. PALMER. Offensive to the people themselves, offensive to those charged with the duty of conducting the election.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Is he of opinion that the existing laws in the various States of the Union, as they stand and as they are put together in the minority report, are reasonably sufficient to secure honest elections? Does he approve them?

Mr. PALMER. I am of the opinion that they are reasonably secure——

Mr. HIGGINS. If the Senator from Illinois will allow me, I call his attention to the fact that where the Australian ballot system has been adopted, as I think it has been in almost all of the States of the Union, it is one of the principles of that system that a candidate shall have an official recognition before he shall be voted for, so that his name can be printed upon the official ballots, which are prepared by official authority. There must be a proper certificate from the convention or other nominating body, or, if not by a convention, then by a sufficient number of citizens of their own motion, made to a secretary of State or other proper officer, so that the candidate can receive official recognition by having his name printed upon the ballots.

I merely make the suggestion in view of the Senator's inquiry as to whether or no a candidate has any vested right by reason of his candidacy.

Mr. PALMER. I am aware of the fact to which the Senator refers, but it would be simply a useless, irritating interference by Federal authority, by a distant authority, with the right of the people to conduct their own elections, and an imputation upon the justice and fairness of elections conducted by the people themselves.

I have no desire to go further into this matter now. I hope I have answered the questions which have been propounded to me in regard to my past action, for which I decline no responsibility.

Mr. ALLEN. With the consent of the Senator, I should like to put him a question.

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I will ask the Senator if he knows anything about the character of the persons who are usually selected as deputy marshals at the different polling places, and also whether the tendency of the law now under consideration has the effect of depriving to any extent respectable citizens of the right to vote?

Mr. PALMER. I answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska by saying that my observation is that the class of men who are usually assembled around the polls are not chosen by their neighbors; they are not men who possess popular confidence; they are often called that they may simply get their pay for the day or for a number of days, and their presence is a deterrent to self-respecting men, who would otherwise take part in the elections in the States.

Mr. ALLEN. I will ask the Senator the further question whether the practical operation of the law now under consideration has the effect of transferring the control of local elections to national authority, and in that sense destroys the efficiency and power of the local authorities?

Mr. PALMER. I fully agree with all that is implied in the question of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator misunderstands me. I did not imply that that was true. I simply asked as a matter of information.

Mr. PALMER. I accept the implication and concur with the suggestion. The suggestion is a pertinent one. I will say that the present law tends to degrade the elections and degrade those

who are charged with the duty of conducting elections, and I conclude by repeating the proposition I advanced yesterday, that the cultivation on the part of the election officers and of the voters of respect for themselves and respect for their own rights as independent freemen is essential to the purity of popular elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, nothing surprises me more than the idea which the Senator from Illinois appears to entertain, and which the Senator from Nebraska advances, that this bill is a bill to promote the control by the people in their own localities of their own elections. That this bill should masquerade under that pretense seems to me most astounding, when it is only a bill for Federal observation so far as the conduct of the election is concerned, as was developed yesterday, and when the bill proposes to remit to certain States the control of their own elections without Federal observation, not by townships, as the Senator from Illinois says, not by the people themselves in their own voting places, as the Senator from Nebraska says, but to oligarchies, a little handful of men at the State capitals of the various States, who control the elections in the voting places, and not the people in each locality.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does not this subject, after all, resolve itself to this proposition: The relative honesty of the men who are in control of the elections?

Mr. CHANDLER. The relative honesty?

Mr. ALLEN. The relative honesty of the men who are in the control of elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. In actual control?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. No, sir. If the Senator will allow me, it involves a great principle. The Senator from Illinois wants to apply it in one way. He wants to apply the principle of local self-government by giving it to oligarchies at the State capitals. I want to apply the principle of local self-government by giving it to the people of each locality.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, why should the Government, by the intervention of marshals and deputy marshals, undertake to interfere with or to observe the elections held in the different States? What is to be gained by it? Is it not a confession that local self-government is itself a failure? Is it not a confession that the people of the different States of the Union can not be intrusted with the election machinery of their own States?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is an assertion of national power over the election of Representatives in Congress, and, to the extent to which that implies that there is a need of such supervision, it is a distrust of the machinery of the States, which is amply justified by the history of the past and the laws of the States which are now upon their statute books.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to ask the Senator, with his permission, one more question. Is it not a notorious fact that, in the cities where the election law is sought to be enforced, the deputy marshals are notoriously thugs who are brought there in consequence of their notoriously bad and desperate character to control the election?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it is notoriously otherwise. The Senator has got hold of a Democratic campaign lie of some twenty years' standing, which has been exploded for nineteen years, and is repeating it in the Senate. The Senator is, however, entitled to an answer to his question. It is not notorious. It is not the fact.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the character of the persons usually employed to observe the elections, that is, with reference to their being responsible, law-abiding, and honorable citizens?

Mr. CHANDLER. As a whole, excellent, as good as the character of any election officers in the Senator's State or any other State.

The Senator has only begun to read up on this subject. He has started back to 1871. If the Senator will kindly read down to 1893 he will find—for his question is entitled to a fair answer—that, with few exceptions, the character of the Federal supervisors and the character of the special deputy marshals has been excellent. They have not all been men who, if left to themselves, would find their way into the United States Senate.

I repeat to the Senator that, take the history of the national election laws for now some twenty-one years, the character of the Federal officials who have been employed, the supervisors and deputy marshals, has been on the whole as good as that of any election officers in the States.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to make an observation at this point in reply to a suggestion of his?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I have endeavored to ascertain the correct workings of this law, and wherever I have been able to obtain any information which I regarded as reliable, I have not failed to do so. The impression made upon my mind all the way through of the workings of this law is, that it has been a law to perpetuate in power the political party which happened to be in power at the time the election was being held, and that it is a virtual transfer of the election machinery of the different States into the hands of the National Government; and, as a rule, the persons who are charged with the duty of inspecting the registration and observing the polling of the vote are of a lower character than the persons over whom they are set to watch.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to read now from the report of a committee of the House of Representatives made two years ago. I read from page 7. Speaking of certain arrests the committee say:

> With a few exceptions, the United States marshals and supervisors who made these arrests were in appearance most disreputable. Almost all of them were grossly ignorant, and in general they had been evidently recruited from the lowest mass of the population of a great city. Decidedly the best of them were the colored marshals, who were able to give their evidence in an intelligent manner. Undoubtedly, among the United States marshals and supervisors who were appointed at this election were very many respectable men, but those chosen to make these partisan arrests were of the lowest class of our population. It is a matter of regret to the members of the committee who were present on election day and heard the evidence in regard to these arrests that it is not possible to reproduce in description the contrast which existed between the persons who were hired to make these arrests and the citizens who were thus arrested, charged with offenses of which they were innocent and thereby deprived of their right to vote.

I desire to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that this extract is a correct portrayal of the information I have had upon this subject. I do believe that the whole purpose of this act is to transfer the control of the election machinery in the different States into the hands of the Federal Government, a power which ought not to be exercised in common fairness and honesty to the States, and that the power to control the election machinery of the States at this time in the history of this country should be left with the States themselves.

I had no purpose, Mr. President, in participating in this Republican and Democratic discussion. I do not know that I have any interest in it particularly, but I do believe that the Federal election law ought to be repealed.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senator what in principle or reason there is why the election of a member of the National Congress should be dealt with by any other authority than the nation? What right have the States to deal with it at all? I understand that the matter of the State dealing with that subject is a matter of mere convenience. The States hold elections, and, therefore, it is well when they are having their elections to have our elections held at the same time, so that the expense may be saved of a double arrangement; but, in constitutional principle, why have the States any right to come and say, "We demand to control this authority; you keep off of it," any more than they would have the right to say about the appointment of custom-house officers, or collectors, or of foreign ministers? I should like the Senator's view of that proposition before he sits down, if he will give it.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the Constitution itself does not confer the first power upon the States, subject, of course, to be altered or changed by the General Government? Is not the power conferred by the Constitution itself on the States to control elections?

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Arkansas does not need to ask me that question. He knows the answer, and he knows that I know the answer. It is a matter of convenience.

Mr. BERRY. That is a correct statement. The Constitution says that elections shall be controlled by the States, subject to be altered or changed by the General Government.

Mr. HOAR. To be altered or changed—exactly, and that is done as a matter of pure convenience, as stated. Undoubtedly the Constitution says so, just as the Constitution might have said Congress should confer the function to make United States postmasters upon the selectmen of the towns or places where they are to serve, or any other national function. But my question was deeper and broader than that answer. I am speaking now of the matter of constitutional principle. We are a nation. I suppose the honorable Senator from Nebraska is as decidedly of that opinion as I am.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir; I have been aware of that for some time.

Mr. HOAR. Nobody denies it. We are a nation, not a league of nations. In regard to matters which are within our national domain we are a sovereign, not a league of sovereigns, although the States undoubtedly, in my judgment, have very large powers of sovereignty, and one of the things which is purely national

is the United States House of Representatives. The members of that body do not represent States as do the Senators; they represent districts of the United States and the people thereof in their relation to and as a part of the national legislative power. Therefore, in all logic and in all reason the function of choosing those is a national function, the superintendence of that function is a national duty, securing that right is a national obligation, and the fact that the Constitution itself says that, as a matter of convenience, while the States are holding their elections, we will let them manage these, reserving our complete control over them, seems to me to indicate that it is not a sound principle to say that it is a State function primarily.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Massachusetts evidently misunderstands my position. I do not deny the power of the General Government in a certain measure to supervise these elections; I do not pretend to say that they are State elections in the sense in which the Senator from Massachusetts would indicate; but I do say that, granting that the General Government has power to control these elections or to supervise them to some extent, it is not wise, it is not good policy, for the Government to interfere with the election machinery of any State or Territory unless there be a controlling necessity for such action. The very safety of this Government, in my judgment at least, depends upon a wide distribution of power and the placing of responsibility for the control of our elections and the machinery of our Government out among the people, and keeping it there.

The General Government should never reach its hand into any State or Territory to control its elections, unless there be a controlling necessity for it, unless the people of that State or Territory have shown themselves manifestly incapable of having a fair election. In my judgment, the experience of this nation under the law now under consideration has been that the elections are infinitely worse, as a rule, in the hands of Federal supervisors than those in the hands of the local authorities.

On the question of the right of Congress to pass an act such as this and to supervise the elections, I thing I agree perfectly with the Senator from Massachusetts. I agree with him in the further statement that this is a nation and not a league of States; but it is a nation with limited and controlled powers, a nation which draws its powers from the Constitution, and not from any authority outside of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am confident that if we had only to deal with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nebraska on the other side of the Chamber, we should succeed in reaching a common basis upon which a large portion of these laws might be saved. They might insist upon some amendments of the present law, but I think those two Senators could easily be induced, if the debate were prolonged, to assent to some measure of assertion of national power over the election of Representatives in Congress.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. CHANDLER. I was going to ask the Senator a question, but certainly I will yield to him.

Mr. ALLEN. The party platform of the People's party, the party to which I have the honor to belong, provides for the control of those elections by the Australian ballot system, and, in my judgment, that is the only wise plan.

Mr. CHANDLER. Are they in favor of a national Australian ballot law?

Mr. ALLEN. It is not stated whether it shall be national or State.

Mr. CHANDLER. They have not reached that point yet.

Mr. ALLEN. But I infer the intention is that it shall be State.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will allow me again to compliment him upon the spirit of large nationality which was disclosed in his closing remarks, which give me hope that, if we could get at the People's party on this question, we could induce them to consent to support a national election law applicable to the choice of Representatives in Congress, having the Australian features in it. Therefore I do not regard him as I do not regard the Senator from Illinois as the proper champion of this bill. I hope to see upon the floor of the Senate before the discussion ends some of the Senators who seek to belittle national power, and therefore wish to repeal these laws. The Senators who have already spoken, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nebraska, have too broad a nationality to be even the advance guard of this assault upon national power. I say, and I repeat it, that if we had to deal with those two Senators alone, we should have no doubt of the preservation of some portion of these laws upon the statute books.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me to emphasize the fact that I recognize the national authority and right to supervise elections of Representatives in Congress whenever that may be necessary; but I dissent most emphatically from the position made by the Senator from New Hampshire and the implied position of the Senator from Massachusetts that there is any necessity for a law of this kind.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the position.

Mr. ALLEN. Whenever in the history of the country the time comes, if it ever does come, that it is essential, in order to preserve the purity of our elections which fill the lower House of Congress and possibly the upper House, for the Government to legislate on the subject of elections, in my judgment it will have the power to do so. I do not dispute the question of power.

Mr. CHANDLER. We welcome the Senator, then.

Mr. ALLEN. But, in my judgment, the effect of the law has been not only destructive of the rights of the citizens in a great many instances, but I recall cases where, under the guise of national power, or the claim of national power, legislative bodies of different States in the Union have been overturned by the strong military arm of the Government; and I deny that the Government has the power, when it comes to that question, under this law or under the Constitution or under any statute which can be framed, to destroy the autonomy of a State Legislature. I deny that the Government has that power. I deny that there is any cause or any occasion for the existence of a law such as the one under consideration.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he would be willing to vote for a national Australian ballot law?

Mr. ALLEN. Whenever it is essential; whenever it is necessary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Would the Senator vote for it if it were pending now?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir; it is not necessary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, I repeat (and everything which the Senator has said confirms me in my previous statement) that I should expect to retain the laws if we only had to address ourselves to Senators like the Senator from Nebraska, because his heart is right on the fundamental principle of the assertion of national power. He is mistaken only in his facts. He is mistaken in asserting that there has not been occasion for the exercise of national power. He is mistaken in the belief that there is no need now for the election laws. After the pending bill is passed the Senator will have abundant occasion within the next four years, in my belief, to wish that his vote had been given for keeping the laws on the statute book.

I ask the attention of the Senator from Nebraska a moment in reference to the character of the persons who have been appointed to administer the law in the States. I desire in the discussion of this question to deal with entire candor and fairness with every question that is put to me. The Senator is convinced that the marshals who have been appointed under the law have been persons of bad character, unfit appointees. I supposed at first that the Senator had had called to his attention a list of alleged disreputable appointees that has been paraded as an argument against these laws for the last twenty years. I desire to say to the Senator with reference to that list, which will be called to his attention and will undoubtedly be introduced into this debate, that I understand it to be an alleged list of marshals who were appointed under the law of July, 1870, which was a naturalization law.

Two sections were attached to that law in which there was authority given to a United States judge to appoint two citizens as watchers, and the United States marshal was authorized to appoint special deputies to preserve order. That law was in use in New York City at the election of November, 1870. It was subsequently repealed, and it was replaced by the law of May 31, 1870, which, amended by the law of February 28, 1871, is the present statute.

The list which has been paraded in debate may have been to some extent the subject of criticism. There may have been upon that list the names of bad men, although I am sure an analysis of the names which were cited would show and has shown that the statements about these deputy marshals was a gross exaggeration, and that the criticisms of the list were properly reducible to a minimum. Since that time, during the whole twenty-one years of the enforcement of the present law, there have been developed very few specific cases of incompetent or dishonest or characterless officers appointed to execute it.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Most certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it not true as a rule that the persons who are appointed deputy marshals to attend at the polls are the partisans of the party procuring their appointment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator mean that they belong to the party which procures their appointment?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the contrary to be the case. The supervisors, the Senator understands, are to be of different

political parties, and they are appointed by the court. The deputy marshals are appointed by the marshal, and he is responsible for their appointment. I understand that the marshal of the city of New York has always appointed two persons in each election district and that he has appointed one from each party. I may be mistaken about it, but that is what I understand to be the case.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. It is true under the law, is it not, that the deputy marshals have plenary power at the polls? They have power to arrest without warrant and to take persons arrested before a commissioner or a court and require bail or imprisonment. Now, is there any provision for a remedy to the persons who are wrongfully arrested other than the pecuniary responsibility of the marshal himself?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know of any extraordinary provision. What provision would the Senator suggest?

Mr. ALLEN. Is there any provision for the deputy marshals to give bond for the faithful discharge of their duties, or are they simply gathered up and sworn in without any bonds, having no responsibility whatever except their pecuniary responsibility to the person arrested where they may commit a trespass?

Mr. CHANDLER. They are appointed by the marshal of the district upon his responsibility. His bond covers their acts. What would the Senator have?

Mr. ALLEN. I must beg the Senator's pardon. Certainly the bond of the marshal does not control the acts of the deputies.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does not the bond of the marshal cover the acts of his deputies?

Mr. ALLEN. Not necessarily so. These officers, I understand, are taken promiscuously without any bond, and act without any responsibility whatever.

Mr. CHANDLER. They are appointed for election day. I do not think they give bond; but I am quite confident that the bond of the marshal covers the acts of the special deputy marshals whom he appoints for election day.

Mr. ALLEN. Allow me to ask the Senator from New Hampshire another question. Suppose one of the deputy marshals in discharging his duties at the polls should unlawfully arrest an election officer and carry him off to prison, so as to make him guilty at common law of trespass, does the Senator pretend to say that the bond of the marshal who appointed him would be responsible for that act?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am inclined to think that if he got judgment against the deputy marshal, the marshal would be responsible.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is certainly at fault. The only remedy of the honest citizen who is disgraced and who is prevented from discharging his duty, is the pecuniary responsibility of the deputy marshal, if he happens to be pecuniarily responsible.

Mr. CHANDLER. In an action for false imprisonment.

Mr. ALLEN. What would that amount to, if the deputy marshal had no property that could be taken to satisfy the judgment?

Mr. CHANDLER. What would the Senator have? Would he have the deputy marshal beheaded?

Mr. ALLEN. Is there any criminal responsibility upon the part of the deputy marshals for an excessive use or abuse of their power? There is none whatever.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, he is making a speech instead of asking a question.

Mr. ALLEN. I beg pardon.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will permit me, I want to ask him some questions.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suppose deputy marshals have the same responsibility that rests upon all other officers when they make arrests. Why should a person who is arrested for a fraud in connection with an election be protected from unlawful arrest in any way different from any other citizen who is subject to unlawful arrest, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know that I understand the Senator. If he will repeat the question, please, I shall try to answer him.

Mr. CHANDLER. Why should a person wrongfully arrested for an election fraud have any other remedy against the officer arresting him than has a citizen arrested for any other offense?

Mr. ALLEN. He should not have, but he should have the same protection from wrongful arrest for that offense that he has for any other.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does he not have it?

Mr. ALLEN. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, if he will permit me, that there is not a State or a Territory in the Union where an officer of that character is not required to give bond and whose bondsmen are not responsible for an excessive use of his power. A bond is required to be given especially for that purpose and for no other purpose.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator's suggestions are certainly worthy of investigation, and if I could convince him that the election laws ought to be kept on the statute book I perhaps would join with him in a suitable amendment of the law.

Now, Mr. President, I will go on in reference to the deputy marshals. I have spoken of the deputy marshals in 1871. If the Senator from Nebraska will remain where my voice can reach him I wish to ask him some other questions.

The Senator has read from a recent House report with reference to deputy marshals appointed, I think, in New York City at the election in 1892. I do not think that report is entitled to be credited as to the character of the deputy marshals. I myself once read the report, and I am not prepared to take its assertions as derogatory to the deputy marshals appointed by the marshal for the southern district of New York at the time when the censure of the committee of the House was placed upon him. They were appointed by the United States marshal at the time, and I have no doubt whatever that the marshal who made the appointments which were censured by the committee will be abundantly able to vindicate the character of his appointees.

I was about to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question in reference to the views which he submitted concerning the encroachments upon the principle of local rule affected by the national election laws, but as he has left the Chamber, and as I see the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is getting impatient at the unusual extension of the debate this afternoon, I will reserve the question until I again see the Senator from Nebraska in the Chamber.

Mr. VEST obtained the floor.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. VEST. Certainly, with great pleasure.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, the question seems to have arrived at a parliamentary stage when a vote might be taken; but I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire in regard to the probable course of the debate on the side of those who are opposed to the repealing bill. When does the Senator think we can fairly get the measure before the Senate for a final disposition of it? I have been appealed to by the Senator from New Hampshire and by others on that side, for whom I have great regard, to delay the consideration of the bill on the ground that they are not ready now to address themselves to its consideration; but it must be borne in mind that those who are charged with the responsibility of bringing the measure to the front and of keeping it there occupy a very delicate position.

It seems to me, after a delay of nearly three weeks, in which, in order that the convenience of Senators might be consulted, ample notice has been given on more than two occasions that the bill would at an interval of a week be brought forward and its consideration pressed, that they can hardly now desist from what seems to be the manifest duty of asking for a vote when debate stops, either now or to-morrow or any other day when the Senate may be in session and the bill remains the unfinished business. I should like to have some expression of opinion from the Senator from New Hampshire, who seems to be in charge of the matter on the other side.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am unwilling to proceed with the debate in the absence of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]. The reasons which called that Senator from the Chamber are very well known to the Senator from Delaware. I have had the honor to submit a report which makes very serious reflections upon the election laws of the State of New York, and certain results which have been accomplished in that State mainly under the direction of the senior Senator from New York. I myself am certainly unwilling to debate that part of the report in the absence of the Senator from New York. If the Senator from Delaware knows when the Senator from New York will be here I should say we could begin the debate at that time, end it, and have a vote within a reasonable period thereafter. Is that satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. GRAY. I very much appreciate the delicacy the Senator from New Hampshire has shown in regard to the absence of the Senator from New York, but it so happened that in the course of my duty as a member of the committee having charge of the bill, I constantly consulted the senior Senator from New York in reference to its consideration, and when he went away he indicated that he wished no delay at all. He appreciated the fact that the matter ought to come before the Senate and be proceeded with, and he would take the responsibility of being here in time to have his share in the debate; but at all events, he certainly expressed no desire to have the matter continued, knowing it would come to the front, and that notice had been given that it would be taken up yesterday.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from New York could hardly have said he was willing that the debate should proceed to an end and that a vote should be taken in his absence.

Mr. GRAY. He did not say anything about a vote. I consulted with him as a Senator who was very much interested in the matter of the repeal of these laws and he knew the bill was to be brought up yesterday. So I think I can speak for him in that regard. He was more than willing that it should come to the front and take its parliamentary course. That suggestion, therefore, does not appeal to me at all, for the reasons that I have stated. But I should like to know whether there are other reasons why the Senator from New Hampshire would like to have the matter go over now.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Delaware is entitled to a perfectly fair and frank answer from me. I stated to-day that there are a dozen Senators who, I thought, had more or less intention of speaking on this subject. There are a half-dozen Senators who have definitely decided to speak, and I have urged them to be ready. There certainly is no desire on this side of the Chamber to shirk debate. We have no desire to avoid a full discussion of the questions involved in the pending bill, and if we are a little dilatory in getting ready, Senators must not attribute it to a lack of zeal, but rather to some of the extraordinary events of the last week.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator in his place indicate what day will suit the Senators on his side to take up seriously a discussion of the bill and proceed with it as such things are usually proceeded with where it is the intention to reach a result?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish to take offense at anything the Senator has said, but he does not mean to say that we have not been serious in discussing the bill so far?

Mr. GRAY. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator does not mean, when he asks us when we shall be ready to discuss the bill seriously, that we have not been dicussing it with seriousness and gravity thus far?

Mr. GRAY. I did not say so; but I understood from what the Senator said that he had not himself considered that the bill had been taken up in the way he wished it to be taken up by those who are opposed to its passage.

Mr. CHANDLER. To that construction of the word I make no objection.

Mr. GRAY. That is what I gathered from what the Senator said.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree that it is time for a serious discussion of the subject in that sense.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator indicate when, in that sense, serious discussion ought to commence?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like the assistance on that question of my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. There are other Senators who want to speak.

Mr. HIGGINS. I will state, in answer to the suggestion of my colleague [Mr. GRAY], that we on this side of the Chamber will be ready to take up the subject on Monday next. I wish to submit some remarks, and I think I will be ready at that time.

Mr. GRAY. I have been told more than once that there are a number of Senators on the other side who wish to submit remarks on the bill. The only question is as to the time. The time can not be indefinitely postponed, of course.

Mr. HIGGINS. It is probable the Senate will adjourn over Saturday, possibly over Friday, and only to-morrow will intervene. I presume it would suit all to say that the debate shall begin on next Monday and go on *die in diem*.

Mr. GRAY. Is that the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, if the Senator from Maine will permit me, whether it is his understanding which my colleague has just expressed?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to hear from the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. GRAY. I yield, of course, but I want the Senator from New Hampshire to express his opinion about it.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, it was very decidedly my intention to make one or more speeches on the pending bill, but, as the Senator from Delaware knows, my time has been very thoroughly occupied for the last fortnight upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, where I am compelled to be at 10 o'clock every morning. I have not a mind that has capacity enough to hold three or four things at the same time. It is now taken up largely with the Hawaiian question.

Then, again, it is very hard work to discuss a question where the affirmative side of the proposition have nothing to say. I do not mean to charge the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] with saying nothing yesterday, but I should like to be able to reply to somebody——

Mr. GRAY (to Mr. FRYE). Reply to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FRYE. I should like to reply to the Senators from Mississippi; I should like to reply to the Senators from South Carolina; I should like to reply to the Senators from Florida. If the election laws are to be repealed and we are to be remitted to the State laws, I should like to have those gentlemen show that their State laws are in proper condition now for us to rely upon.

Mr. GRAY. If I may be permitted to speak for them in their absence, I have no doubt that they would like to reply to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FRYE. We are perfectly dazed here by finding an extraordinary proposition before Congress and the Democratic party having nothing to say to convert each other. When the silver bill was under discussion there was no lack of argument on the other side of the Chamber. Democrats had to try to convince other Democrats.

When the tariff bill is before the Senate I have no doubt the Democratic side will find itself in precisely the same condition; Democratic Senators will be compelled to convert Senators on their own side and to make speeches for their conversion. When, for instance, the question of Hawaiian affairs is before the Senate I have no doubt there will be Democrats enough who will have something to say, and that they will be compelled to say it, too, for the purpose of convincing gentlemen on their own side of the Chamber.

But here is an extraordinary proposition which seems to need on the affirmative side of it absolute silence practically. The South introduced the proposition into the other House and insisted that the election laws must be repealed, and led their Northern allies to support the repeal. I imagine the South as represented in the Senate is insisting upon the repeal of those laws, and that it has brought into the service as figureheads distinguished Democrats from the North rather than themselves to take the lead.

Now, I am surprised that while on every other question there is division, there is discussion, there is give and take, there is something said which calls for reply, in this case there is nothing. While the Democratic party is divided on everything else, whilst now it has immense difficulties within its own limits and its own borders on every question of any importance that comes before the Senate, it is very noticeable that when there is a proposition which opens up the ballot box to opportunities for fraud there is no division whatever on the Democratic side; they are as one man, of one mind; they are solid; they are enthusiastic even to the extent of absolute silence. That question is always certain to unite the Democratic party. I am not entirely certain that the question has not been brought before the Senate for one purpose and one only, to unite the discordant ranks of the Democratic party.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator ought not to begrudge us one measure on which we are united.

Mr. FRYE. I do not begrudge it, but I should like to have the Senators on the other side give some reasons why they are so united on the question of the repeal of the election laws, in order that I may have an opportunity to reply to a certain extent.

Mr. GRAY. Being so united there is hardly any necessity for any special attempt on the part of one Democrat to convert another, as the Senator said awhile ago was done during the recent financial debate.

Mr. FRYE. I do not fancy the cold-blooded method in the United States Senate of a Senator rising in his seat with a pile of books before him, and for an hour or two or three hours reading, with perhaps only one Senator, generally the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN] or the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], apparently listening to the effusion.

It is not agreeable talking under those circumstances. If we can have a debate even on the Federal election laws, I think it would be a delightful thing and would bring the Senate back to the old times of years ago. I would a great deal rather enter into a controversy, if you please, or a contest, notwithstanding the Democrats are so united, than in a cold-blooded way rise in my seat to oppose a proposition which has been made by the other side and is hardly supported by a word.

Mr. GRAY. I congratulate the Senator from Maine on the fact that he has changed somewhat his attitude toward an important measure and the mode in which it should be put upon its passage or be considered by the Senate; but there are some of us who recollect that about three years ago when a question quite as important as the repeal bill was before the Senate—I refer to the proposition to pass what was known as the force bill——

Mr. FRYE. What was said by the other side to be the force bill.

Mr. GRAY. What was said on our side to be the force bill.

I am willing to so accept it. I remember that then the tactics by which the bill was brought before the Senate and by which it was proposed to pass it were absolute silence on the other side, and an attempt to draw out the Senators on this side, and to confine the speaking as largely as possible to those who were opposed to the passage of the bill. I recollect very distinctly that as speech after speech was made on this side of the Chamber in opposition to the bill, the chairs on the other side were rapidly emptied and their occupants found refuge in the cloakrooms or committee rooms, or some other place that was more congenial to them. That is precisely what was done.

The pending bill has been brought forward in regular course and according to the usages of the Senate, without the violation of any courtesy, I may say, and with every disposition, as manifested on the floor, to extend the utmost indulgence and consider to the uttermost in this debate the convenience of all Senators, especially those who are opposed to the bill. I do not think the Senator from Maine will deny that.

If there is no occasion for arguments addressed by one to another on this side, as the Senator from Maine seems to have admitted by saying that we present a solid front, and that we are at last perfectly united, then there is not the same occasion for the Senator from Maine to insist upon one or another coming forward to speak. I suppose that this debate will be conducted as all other debates have been conducted and must be conducted in the Senate, according to the usages that have obtained and the convenience of individual members of the Senate. When a man wishes to speak or thinks he has anything to say he will be apt to say it; and if the debate does go on I have no doubt that much will be said on both sides.

But that is not now the question. The question is, when the other side, after all that has been conceded on this side in regard to their convenience, are willing that this matter shall be taken up and proceeded with, *die in diem*, as my colleague said, until a conclusion. If the Senator from Maine agrees with my colleague, and they are willing to proceed on Monday, that course shall be pursued, in view of the suggestion my colleague has made that it is possible we may adjourn from to-morrow over until Monday, and I have no objection to letting the whole matter go over until then.

Mr. FRYE. I do not exercise the right of having anything to say about when the debate shall close or when it shall commence. I do not regard any speeches of mine as of sufficient importance to delay a measure or to ask for any procrastination in its consideration.

Mr. GRAY. That is from Wednesday until next Monday. Upon the Senator from New Hampshire, who is a member of the committee and an important member, who submitted the views of the minority, saying that he agrees with what my colleague said——

Mr. CHANDLER. I have never.

Mr. GRAY. I have no doubt he means to deal fairly with this matter. I have never suspected otherwise.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from Delaware means to deal fairly with the subject. I am aware that he has subjected himself to some criticism for not getting the bill through right away, within a week or two. I had an idea the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] wanted it passed right off. I have not supposed that a bill could be passed in that way. There is no closure rule yet in the Senate, and until there is a closure rule if a half dozen Senators wish to speak upon a bill and are not quite ready in the midst of other exciting events, I take it for granted that the time will be given to be ready, and that it will be assumed when the request is made that it is made in good faith and not for the purposes of delay.

I assume also, on the other hand, that as long as there is no closure rule in the Senate, unless Senators intend to prolong debate and prolong the consideration of the bill unfairly, they will, after the debate has been sufficiently prolonged to allow everybody who wishes to speak to do so, consent to the fixing of a time for taking the vote. But the Senator from Delaware, the other day, pushed up as I supposed by others, got the floor before the debate had commenced, as it seemed to me, to ask me whether I was prepared to fix a time when the debate should close and a vote be taken. I was not prepared to——

Mr. GRAY. The Senator is not prepared now to answer the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not prepared now to answer that question.

Mr. GRAY. Very well. Now, I want——

Mr. CHANDLER. I had not got through.

Mr. GRAY. I beg pardon; I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wished to say to the Senator that I do not think the usual course has been pursued in this body; that I think there was a disposition in the beginning to distrust the minority and to assume that we wanted unreasonable delay. There has been no intention of that sort.

Mr. GRAY. That seems very absurd, if I may be permitted I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, in view of what has taken place on this floor on three several occasions. When the suggestion was made by the Senator from New Hampshire on two several occasions that the matter should go over a week hence it was acceded to on the ground that it would consult his convenience and that of his colleagues. It was acceded to without a word or without criticism; and yet now after nearly three weeks he says the matter has not been conducted in the usual way. The only thing unusual about it has been the unusual concession which has been made and the unusual disposition, so far as I have observed the Senate, to indulge in every way the Senators who are opposed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I do not rise to make any complaint of the Senator from Delaware. On the contrary, so far as I have observed his course in this matter it is not liable to any complaint or exception whatever. For my part I have not been here all the time. I do not think that it would be profitable at this moment to go into a discussion of the proceedings in regard to the management or conduct on either side of the contest over the election bill. Therefore I will not take the time of the Senate at present by narrating that history as I understand it. But as the Senator from Delaware has made a statement about it, I think I ought not to let that statement pass without simply observing that I do not agree with him. I think the Senator is mistaken in his statement about the history of the debate on the election bill.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator means the bill called the force bill on this side?

Mr. HOAR. I do mean exactly that measure.

Mr. GRAY. It must be very fresh in the recollection of most Senators in this Chamber that the election bill to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers was brought forward on the very day after Congress met in December, and was resolutely kept to the front from that day until a conclusion of some kind was reached—some six, seven, or eight weeks—without any intermission whatever. There was no time given; no indulgence conceded to those who were opposed to the passage of that bill. They were expected to be ready to debate it. Not a word was said on the other side; and when two or three speeches on this side had been delivered, I recollect, so far as I contributed my humble part to that debate, the Presiding Officer was about to put the question to a vote when I took the floor, and everyone sat silent on the other side, although not one speech had been made on that side in favor of the bill——

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. Except by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. That is something.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] has been ignored in that respect to-day.

Mr. FRYE. I apologize for that.

Mr. GRAY. I apologize for this, then. There was an opening speech by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. That measure was introduced in the previous session of Congress, and I do not suppose there was an intelligent small boy in the country old enough to observe the current political history who did not know, who did not believe, at any rate, that there was a purpose on the part of the opponents of the bill to prevent a vote being taken upon it, to consume time by debate and by other parliamentary processes if it had taken till doomsday. After the bill had been introduced, had been explained and discussed not only by me but by other Senators on this side of the Chamber in the previous session, it became apparent that if the measure was not put in advance or if it were postponed there would be either upon the tariff bill or on it such prolonged debate upon the part of the minority that neither measure would reach a vote. I do not say that that was avowed, but it was understood; and there was talk of a cloture.

There were consultations on the part of the friends of that bill. There was an agreement by an entire majority of the Senate upon the form and terms of a cloture rule, which it was thought might be necessary. Then the matter went over to the first Monday of December with notice that it was to be taken up and pressed through when Congress came back at the new session. All that had preceded the history which the Senator from Delaware states. When we met in December there were arrangements to fill up the time day after day. At 5 o'clock some Senator would come around and say, "I do not feel very well to-night, and wish you would let the bill go over until to-morrow," or "I do not want to take the floor at 4 or 5 o'clock," and more in good nature than wisdom I would yield; and I was more than

thankful I did in one case, it happened, where I should have been sorry all my life if I had not.

That is the history of that matter, without going into it any more fully. Nobody ever said in terms, "We shall talk until doomsday." I suppose their purpose was concealed under parliamentary methods. But we on our side supposed that was the purpose, and I suppose now that it was the purpose. Afterwards, some three or four Republican Senators, for reasons satisfactory to them, united with the Democrats, and the bill was postponed, and that was the end of it.

Now, I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware, while I do not think any useful purpose can be subserved by this narrative, we agree about it. My friend insisted upon referring to it after I said I did not want to state it; and I have stated my understanding of the matter.

I do not conceive that anything of that kind comes up now. The Democratic party is in the majority in this body and they have the right, after reasonable debate, to have the measures they propose brought to a vote. It is the right of the American people that they should be brought to a vote; and if anything has been done on the other side or by anybody else it would not, in my opinion, justify a resort to that kind of tactics on our side now. I do not believe there is a Senator on this side of the Chamber who either expects or desires anything but a reasonable debate in conformance with the importance of this subject, but which, as compared with other great debates, will be a brief one, in the due and orderly course of business, and then a vote.

I do not believe there is any other purpose anywhere. I have not seen, or heard, or suspected any such purpose. If this matter be taken up Monday morning, or Tuesday morning, or Wednesday morning, or any other morning, it will be through in the ordinary, natural course. Several Senators who desire to speak on it say they are not ready to speak to-day or to-morrow. That is the whole of it. Of course, there is plenty of opportunity for wrangle and discussion and debate upon the exciting experiences of the past, and if the Senators want it we shall have it. I do not myself propose to waste any time over it.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President——

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me one moment, I merely want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I am disappointed in a perfectly candid effort to arrive at an arrangement that will suit the convenience of all sides on this subject.

Mr. HOAR. What does the Senator want?

Mr. GRAY. I asked the Senator from New Hampshire to indicate whether he would act on the suggestion of my colleague, but he declined. I have made the attempt and I am sorry it has not been responded to in the spirit in which it was made. If the Senator from Missouri, who has the floor, will permit me, as the hour is late, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Delaware to withhold that motion for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw the motion?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator left the floor complaining of me, when he interrupted me while I was answering his question. He took the floor and engaged in debate with the Senator from Massachusetts and did not wait to hear my answer to his question.

Mr. VEST. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GRAY. I renew my motion, Mr. President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and twelve minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 18, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1894.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William I. Buchanan, of Iowa, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Argentine Republic, vice John R. G. Pitkin, resigned.

CONSULS.

Edward W. S. Tingle, of Montana, to be consul of the United States at Brunswick, Germany, vice Cyrus W. Field, recalled.

Allen Thomas, of Florida, to be consul of the United States at La Guayra, Venezuela, vice Philip C. Hanna, recalled.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John F. B. Beckwith, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for the district of Savannah, in the State of Georgia, to succeed Tomlinson F. Johnson, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 24, 1894.

Marion M. Hutson, of South Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Beaufort, in the State of South Carolina, to succeed Robert Smalls, resigned.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John M. Burks, of Nebraska, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska, to succeed Henry C. McArthur, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 17, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SURVEYS FOR GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Secretary of the Interior for reproducing plats of surveys for the General Land Office; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL FITZHUGH, ADMINISTRATOR, VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of the court in the case of Samuel Fitzhugh, administrator of Henry Fitzhugh, deceased, vs. The United States—which was referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. WANGER, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of George R. Burnett, without leaving copies.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR STANFORD.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order fixed for next Saturday at 2 p. m., for the delivery of eulogies on the late Senator Stanford, be postponed until Saturday, the 10th of February, at the same hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] asks unanimous consent that the order fixed for next Saturday, for the delivery of eulogies on the late Senator Stanford, be vacated and fixed anew for Saturday, February 10, at the hour of 2 o'clock, the same hour as the present order. Without objection this order will be made.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE CHANGES.

By unanimous consent, at their own request, the following members were excused from further service on the committees named:

Mr. DE ARMOND, from the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SIBLEY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COMPTON, from the Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

The Speaker announced the following committee appointments:

To the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. MONEY.

To the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. DE ARMOND.

To the Committee on Naval Affairs, Mr. GRIFFIN.

To the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, Mr. GRIFFIN.

To the Committee on the Library, Mr. COMPTON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania.

LOVICA HALL.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3195) the title of which is "granting an increase of pension to Lovica Hall, a widow of a soldier of the war of 1812."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the laws for pensioning sol-

diers and their widows of the war of 1812, the name of Lovica Hall, widow of Asa Hall, late a private of Captain James Houser's company, United States Artillery, at the rate of $25 per month.

The committee reported the following amendment:

In line 8, strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert the word "twelve," so as to read "at the rate of $12 per month."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. What rate is this lady receiving now?

Mr. HOOKER of New York. None whatever. There is a mistake in the title of the bill, which we propose to correct. She receives no pension whatever.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the present consideration of the bill. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOOKER of New York, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The title was amended to conform to the body of the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonner's Ferry, Idaho;

Joint resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause the settlement of the accounts of Special Agents Moore and Woodson, under the treaty of 1854, with the Delaware Indians, etc.; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 51) to provide for the printing of the report of the joint committee of Congress and proceedings at the centennial celebration of the laying of the corner-stone of the Capitol.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the reports of the Smithsonion Institution and the National Museum for the year ending June 30, 1893, in two octavo volumes, 10,000 extra copies, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 5,000 copies for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, and 2,000 copies for the use of the National Museum.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.;

A bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department; and

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.

INDEBTEDNESS OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4449) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Salt Lake City, in the Territory of Utah, may become indebted to an amount in the aggregate, including existing indebtedness, not to exceed 6 per cent on the value of the taxable property within said city, to be ascertained by the last assessment for Territorial and county taxes previous to the incurring of such indebtedness; and all bonds and obligations in excess of such amount given by said city shall be void.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAWLINS. I ask the Clerk to read the report of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The report (by Mr. GOODNIGHT) was read as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4449) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City, in the Territory of Utah, submitted the following report:

The limit of indebtedness which may now be incurred by cities in the Territories is fixed at 4 per cent on the value of the taxable property within the city limits.

Recently it has become necessary for Salt Lake City to construct an expensive sewerage system, by reason of which the present limit has been reached while the improvements are far short of completion. It will work a great hardship to increase the present rate of taxation on account of present stringency. To stop the improvements in course of erection would render valueless large expenditures already made, and throw many people out of employment now greatly in need of the assistance which will come from expenditures made on improvements, the need of which is imperative. The bill is urged by the Delegate from the Territory and desired by those most concerned.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, let that bill be reported again.

The bill was again read.

Mr. COOMBS. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any tax on personalty?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. COOMBS. Had you reached the 4 per cent?

Mr. MARSH. I would like to ask the gentleman if it will affect in any manner the indebtedness already contracted?

Mr. RAWLINS. Not at all.

Mr. COOMBS. Has it reached the 4 per cent?

Mr. RAWLINS. It has reached the 4 per cent.

Mr. MARSH. Does it exceed the 4 per cent?

Mr. RAWLINS. It may have exceeded it to some extent.

Mr. MARSH. Is this a bill that would enable you to repudiate the excess of the amount of debt contracted?

Mr. RAWLINS. It does not. It is in order that the obligations made may be paid. It is absolutely necessary, and it is recommended by all classes of citizens and parties in Salt Lake City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF BIG SANDY RIVER.

Mr. PAYNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish the House of Representatives at the earliest day possible information as to the amount necessary to complete the improvement in the Big Sandy River, at Louisa, Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to consider this resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now call the committees for reports.

RELIEF OF SETTLERS ON PUBLIC LANDS IN OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 268) for the relief of settlers on the public lands in Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL LAND OFFICE IN NEW MEXICO.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 355) to establish an additional land office in the Territory of New Mexico; which was ordered to lie on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees, and under the order heretofore adopted the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to consider the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

THE TARIFF.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union, for the purpose of considering a bill raising revenue. The Clerk will report the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 686, page 90, by inserting at the conclusion of the paragraph, "*Provided*, That this section shall take effect on and after the 1st day of August, 1894."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "August 1, 1894," and insert "October 1, 1898."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the proposed substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 90, in paragraph 686, insert:
"*Provided*, That this paragraph shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "immediately after the passage of this act," and insert "December 30, 1899."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment proposed to the amendment by the gentleman from New York, in order that the text may be perfected.

Mr. BURROWS. May I ask on what page that is?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 90.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, during this discussion I have listened over and over again to the charge made by gentlemen on the other side, that a Democratic House, a Democratic President, and that a Democratic Senate were elected by an overwhelming vote of the people in 1892. Now, the idea occurs to me to ask gentlemen on the other side whether they have heard that there was an election last fall, and that the great empire States of New York, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, and Massachusetts reversed that verdict?

Mr. DALZELL. What about Pennsylvania?

Mr. MORSE. And Pennsylvania. The great empire State of Pennsylvania, too, reversed that verdict by an overwhelming decision against the Democratic party.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that these gentlemen should not go back too far into ancient history, but they should come down to the events of modern times. And I submit that if the election of last November had been a Congressional election there would not have been any Cherokee Strip on this side of the Chamber; and, while I am neither a prophet nor a son of a prophet, yet I do predict that in the next Congressional election the Republicans will have charge of this House by a large majority and there will be no Democratic strip on this side of the House.

Now, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], because he proposes to postpone to a future day, until 1898, until another Congressional and national election, until after the voice of the people shall be heard again, the operations of this free-wool clause of the bill; and I would be glad to postpone the date when the whole bill should go into operation until the people will have had time to repeal and reconsider the Chicago platform of the Democratic party adopted by the people in 1892. I also charge that the national election to which our Democratic friends have so often referred was carried against the Republicans by misrepresentations on the part of the Democratic papers and speakers. They charged that the manufacturers were reaping an unfair and unjust proportion of the profits and that the laboring people of this country did not enjoy their fair share of remuneration.

Now, the country has lived to learn that the manufacturers' interests are the interests of the laboring people; that injury to the manufacturers is injury to their employés; that destruction of the American market for agricultural products is an injury to the farmers of the West. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in his remarks on the binding-twine amendment which I offered went on to show how much larger a proportion of people ate wheat than manufactured binding-twine.

Does that gentleman suppose that he can destroy the large cordage industry of New England and turn out the twelve thousand men engaged in it into the streets without injuring the agricultural interests of this country? Suppose you succeed in destroying that cordage industry, in taking work away from the twelve thousand men employed in it, and from those dependent upon them, what then? Why, the inevitable result will be that they will immediately proceed to crowd into other occupations.

Mr. GRESHAM. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRESHAM. You speak of the twelve thousand laboring men in New England engaged in the cordage industry. There was a cordage factory in my town and the trust bought it out with the express understanding that it should continue to be run, but before long it was closed up and the laborers engaged in it were thrown out of employment. Was that in the interest of the laboring people, or was it in the interest of the trust?

Mr. MORSE. In reply to the gentleman I will say that there may be some instances like that to which he has referred, but the cordage industry, which I represent on this floor, is an independent industry, and belongs to no trust, but carries on business for itself, and for nobody else. Now, I say, suppose you do succeed in destroying that industry and turning out these 12,000 men upon the streets without work, what will be the result?

The result will be that they will crowd into other trades and professions, and, failing to get work there, what then? They must resort to the business of last resort, agriculture, and we must plow the stony and sterile soil of New England in order to increase our own food supply, instead of buying it, as we do now largely, from the farmers of the West; and yet our Western friends are trying to destroy the great manufacturing industries of this country!

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The gentleman is mistaken. His friends from the West are not trying to destroy anything.

Mr. GRESHAM. Before the parties in my town would sell out the factory an agreement was made by the trust that they would keep it running, but afterwards they stopped work and threw 200 or 300 men out of employment. Now, I ask the gentleman was that in the interest of the laboring people, or was it in the interest of the trust?

Mr. MORSE. I am not defending any trust on this floor. I am speaking for my own constituents, who do not belong to any trust.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] on several occasions, and I have heard him again and again ring the changes upon the charge that the manufacturers are the enemies of the laboring people; I have heard him denounce the railroads as unjust and extortionate monopolies. I hold in my hand a map of the railroads that have gone into insolvency since the Cleveland "retrenchment and reform" began, and I submit that my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. DRAPER] stated the exact truth when he said in his speech here the other evening that the manufacturers of New England make only a small per cent on the capital invested in those great industries. The dividend on manufacturing stock of Massachusetts, based on the selling price from January 1, 1882, to January 1, 1892, was only 3.87 per cent; on railroad stock for the same date was 4.29 per cent, and on bank stock 4.53 per cent. In the light of these figures what becomes of the charges of extortionate profits made against these Northeastern corporations and manufacturers of New England again and again on this floor?

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent Mr. MORSE'S time was extended.

Mr. MORSE. Now, I submit Mr. Chairman, that when the gentleman from Kansas, or any other gentleman, strikes a blow at those great corporations which give employment to thousands and perhaps millions of our people; when he strikes a blow at the railroads, those great arteries of trade, those great arms of commerce, he strikes not only a blow at the laboring people of this country, but at the "poor farmer" as well, whom the Democratic and Populist parties profess to love so much; and if anybody wants evidence of the effect upon the great corporations of this country of the present policy, and of the Wilson bill now impending, let him look at this map of the railroads that have gone into insolvency since that policy was announced.

Mr. MOSES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. MOSES. The gentleman spoke just now of 12,000 men being thrown out of employment in the cordage industry of New England, being compelled to turn to agricultural pursuits. Suppose the wages of the agricultural laborers are made so low that they will have to leave the farm and crowd into manufacturing pursuits? To-day the cotton-raiser does not get 40 cents a day.

Mr. MORSE. I submit in answer to the gentleman that never since God said "Let there be light," never in any country on the face of the earth, have the farmers' interests been as prosperous in this country as under the McKinley tariff bill, as set forth by my friend from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] yesterday. What is the matter with the agricultural interests of this country now? The matter is that you gentlemen have destroyed and are trying to further destroy the home market. Talk about the foreign market for agricultural products—why, it is a mere bagatelle compared to the home market. What we want to do is to develop and enlarge the home market. What we want to do is to encourage our manufacturing interests so that they

will create an increased demand for products of the farm, instead of destroying our manufactures by free trade and putting agricultural products on the free list.

Mr. DAVIS. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. If farming is so profitable, why is it that Kansas is loaded with mortgages on real estate to the amount of $235,000,000, Illinois $384,000,000, and Pennsylvania $613,000,000?

Mr. MORSE. My answer to that question is this: Hundreds and thousands of people in this country, many of them emigrants, go out into the agricultural sections of the West, upon the prairies, and take up land. Some of them do not carry anything with them but an alimentary canal and an appetite; and what do they do? They begin farming operations.

Having no means, they look around for somebody to lend them money. Pretty soon, perhaps, some Eastern man with capital steps in and loans them the money they require. Prosperity at once begins. They rapidly pay off the mortgages on their farms; for the statistics show that these mortgages, under the wise protective policy of the Republican party as embodied in the McKinley bill, were rapidly being discharged.

Mr. DAVIS. Pennsylvania is not a new State; what do you say about Pennsylvania?

Mr. DALZELL. The mortgages in Pennsylvania are not generally on farms——

Mr. DAVIS. But they are on land.

Mr. DALZELL. In our State the mortgages generally are upon property in the great cities, and they represent enterprise.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, one more question in the same line. Why are the farms of New England selling on the average at one-half the cost of improvements?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that great harm has been done not only to agricultural interests but to manufacturing interests by the threatened free-trade bill, or bill in the direction of free trade, now pending in this House. May I take time to give one individual illustration of the hardship this bill is working to the laboring people of my district? There is a man of my acquaintance who has been out of work for some time—a man of family. Finally he got employment—only last week. One day he sat down while at his work. The superintendent told him that it was against the rules for him to sit down at his work. He thereupon rose and went on with his work.

Pretty soon the superintendent came round again and found him sitting down, and again rebuked him. The man then replied, "You would not scold me so much if you knew how little food I have had to eat during the past month. Practically all I could get to eat I have given to my children; and I have myself eaten within three days only two or three apples." That is the condition to which gentlemen on the other side would reduce the laboring people of New England by these propositions to put binding twine, cordage, agricultural implements, and other manufactured goods and the products of other great New England industries on the free list. I appeal to those gentlemen on the score of humanity to stay their hands.

Sir, I have a letter received only yesterday from a laboring man in my district. He says he has never voted anything in his life but a Democratic ticket. Let me read a page of his letter.

During the war we used to say, "We are coming, Father Abraham, three hundred thousand more." The following letter speaks for millions of the working people who have been deceived by Democratic papers and speakers:

ALLSTON, MASS., *January 15, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: I feel like writing this to you. I have always been a Democrat. Soon as I got my voting papers I voted for Buchanan; in 1861, Douglas; in 1865, McClellan; 1869, Seymour; 1875, Greeley; 1877, Tilden; 1881, Hancock, 1885, Cleveland; and 1889, Cleveland. Since I came to the country, in 1851, I have been coached by the Democrats, no Republicans came near me, but lately I have been told I was taxed to enrich the rich on tin and clothes and other things, and I voted for free trade.

Now the scales have fallen from my eyes, and I signed a petition that went to Congress that their hands might be stayed. Now then, yesterday I read in the editorial of the Herald that we were "dragooned into signing." That is cruelly unjust and makes my blood boil. I have been a fool to read such a paper and vote with it. To do it again would make me a knave.

My brother travels for a steel firm on Oliver street—Wetherell Bros. They represent a mill in Pittsfield, Pa., and a wire mill in England, and now since the tariff begun to change the home mill is discharging its help and the English mill is increasing theirs, and they write: "If the Wilson bill becomes a law, in hopes to double our trade with you and are preparing for it." The Pittsfield mill says: "If the Wilson bill becomes a law we shall feel our way cautiously. * * * Shall lower wages," etc.

Respectfully yours,

B. A. JOURDAIN.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Now, I put that letter against some of the talk of gentlemen on the other side who charge that men of this character were dragooned or forced into signing petitions against the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, to resume what I have already said, or tried to say amid so many interruptions, I say during this discussion I have listened over and over again to gentlemen on the other side who have rung the changes upon the overwhelming Democratic success in the election of 1892.

I charge that the Democratic victory of 1892 was brought about by a misrepresentation made to the people of this country by the Democratic speakers and papers, especially the deception that was practiced upon the working people of this country.

They were told that the manufacturers were absorbing an unjust proportion of the profits. That free trade or a tariff for revenue, while it might somewhat injure the manufacturer, would in no way injure them, and that it would enable them to buy their goods cheaper.

The farmers were told that Democratic success meant increased prices and increased markets for their products.

How have these promises been fulfilled? It is needless to answer; "he who runs may read" the answer. But, gentlemen, how is it about the last election held in this country, after an experiment of nine months of Democratic control of every department of the Government, and after the Wilson bill was foreshadowed by the country?

I repeat, let the great empire States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa answer. Why, the gentlemen on the other side forget that these great States repudiated the Democratic party and the Wilson bill, and in Ohio voiced the sentiment of the country by indorsing the author of the McKinley bill by a majority of 80,000; and had Grover Cleveland announced his Sandwich Island policy prior to the last election Ohio would have given Maj. McKinley 20,000 more, and Massachusetts would have given Governor Greenhalge 10,000 more.

I do not wonder that the gentlemen on the other side are in a hurry to pass this bill. If you will defer it until after another Congressional election you can never pass it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I have listened on this floor for days and nights to the denunciation of the great manufacturing concerns, the corporations, and the railroad companies that do the great business of the country and give employment to millions of our countrymen.

If you could believe these gentlemen these manufacturing concerns, these corporations, these railroads were the enemies of the country, who are living upon the lifeblood of the people, and absorbing an unjust and unfair proportion of the profits.

How long shall this mad and insane cry prevail, "Down with the manufacturers!" "Down with the corporations!" "Down with the railroads?" I suppose until the country learns when these great arteries of commerce and trade are successful and prosperous the country is prosperous, and disaster and misfortune such as is represented by this map which I hold in my hand means disaster and misfortune to the whole country and all the people in it, such as we are now suffering.

I repeat, gentlemen on the other side speak as though you could destroy great industries of the country and turn thousands of workmen into the streets without affecting the agricultural interests and other industries of the country; such a supposition is idle and absurd. Under such a policy the men engaged in these varied industries cease to become consumers and become themselves producers of agricultural products, and thus one business reacts upon another and the whole business of the country is injured.

I tell you, gentlemen of the West and South, that you can not destroy a great industry of the country by free trade without inflicting an injury upon your own section. When one member suffers all suffer. The whole protection system of the country (for the whole country) stands or falls together.

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. WILSON of Washington. You say your friend who always voted the Democratic ticket, voted for Horace Greeley. Was Horace Greeley a Democrat?

Mr. MORSE. Well, he was an adopted Democrat. [Laughter.]

The following map of railroads which have gone into the hands of receivers and became bankrupt since the last national election, shows the effect of the Democratic economic and financial policy (as announced in the Chicago platform) on these great arteries of commerce. The New York and New England Railroad, however, has gone into the hands of a receiver since this map was made. This map shows that nearly one-fifth of the railroads of the country are bankrupt in January, 1894. In other words, the map shows the Wilson bill and Cleveland "re-

trenchment" and "reform" as applied to the railroads of the country. This map is an illustration of the Democratic demagogue campaign cry, "Down with the manufacturers!" "Down with the corporations!" "Down with the railroads!"



Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I append to my speech the following resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature introduced by Senator Kittredege, of Boston. I expect it will be adopted and received here soon:

That the senators and representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in general court assembled, believing that the passage by Congress of the Wilson tariff bill, so called, will be detrimental to the business interests of the country, respectfully protest against its passage, and request the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth to use their influence against the passage of the same.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and also to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

The following communication is a specimen of numerous similar votes and resolutions transmitted to me by labor organizations, which speaks for itself:

TAUNTON, MASS., *January 16, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Cotton Mule Spinners' Association, representing about one hundred members, it was voted unanimously to appeal to you to vote against any clauses in the Wilson bill which will reduce the tariff on the goods we produce.

Most all of our members are employed in the hosiery business. And we believe the present condition of our industry is caused almost entirely by such threatened reduction in tariff as will flood our market with imported goods.

We greatly object to being deprived of work and wages for the benefit of foreign manufacturers. And we hereby give notice to help no man nor party who insists upon starving our children and ourselves by bringing our wages down to the European standard.

Hoping you will comply with our request, and oblige, yours, very respectfully, on behalf of the committee,

ARTHUR HERBERT, *Secretary.*

To the Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE.

I also append to my speech the petition of the workingmen of Boston, Mass., adopted at the meeting in Faneuil Hall, January 3, 1894:

To the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, working people of Boston, Mass., without regard to party, respectfully represent that we believe the present deplorable condition of industry is due almost wholly to the danger of such reductions in the tariff as will flood the market with imported goods. We object to being deprived of work and wages for the benefit of foreign producers. Those of you who directly represent us are hereby instructed to vote against the Wilson tariff bill, or any other bill which will tend to increase foreign competition with goods that we produce, and we hereby give you plain notice that we will not hereafter support any man or party which upholds a policy the effect of which is to deprive us of employment or reduce our wages.

The old cradle of liberty never rocked to a better purpose than at the great mass meeting that adopted the above petition to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat has followed in his remarks the line which has been too frequently followed on his side in this discussion, of charging the present business depression upon the threat of a change from a protective system to a tariff for revenue. Some gentlemen have gone so far in their reckless statements as to say that these are "Cleveland times," insinuating by such expressions that the election of Mr. Cleveland as President has caused this depression in the business condition of the country. The great leader on the other side of the House, in his remarks on the day before yesterday, used this language:

Because to-day all industry is arrested by reason of the mere threat of adopting another system.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom of Republican orators in defending protection to point to one fact as establishing the wisdom of their policy, and as also showing that it is calculated to give greater scope for employment in this country. I call the attention of the House to some facts concerning the commerce of this country preceding the election of Mr. Cleveland. I quote from the Treasury reports on foreign commerce and immigration for December, 1892. I take therefrom a table showing a comparison of the imports and exports for the last six months of 1891 and the last six months of 1892. I shall print this table in the RECORD:

Comparison of imports and exports for last six months of 1891 and 1892.

Month.	Exports.		Excess, 1891 over 1892.	Imports.		Excess of 1892 over 1891.
	1891.	1892.		1891.	1892.	
July	102,668,893	858.401,758	$4,267,135	$67,012,035	$71,526,865	$4,484,830
August	72,635,541	64,846,682	7,838,859	65,953,330	77,216,797	11,263,467
September	82,854,085	62,908,483	19,945,602	61,504,737	72,933,408	11,428,671
October	102,877,243	87,860,919	15,016,324	66,836,259	79,122,762	12,286,503
November	110,103,587	97,708,824	12,330,713	64,890,507	73,220,096	8,329,589
December	119,985,896	87,545,274	32,390,622	69,448,023	70,451,710	1,003,647
Total	551,125,195	459,266,940	91,858,255	395,774,921	444,470,638	48,695,717
			48,695,717			
			140,553,972			

This table shows that the exports of this country began to fall off as early as July, 1892.

Compare the value of our exports month by month from that month with the value of our exports month by month from July, 1891.

The falling off of the value of our exports for the last six months of 1892 as compared with the same period of 1891 amounts to $91,858,255.

How much that falling off of the sales of our productions contributed to the financial depression of 1893 can not be stated. Let us consider the table now as to our imports during the same period.

It shows clearly an excess of imports during the same six

months from the beginning in July, 1892, over the imports during the same months of 1891. The excess over the imports in 1891 was of the value of $48,695,717. There was a falling off of exports from this country in the six months—five of the months preceding the election of Grover Cleveland—of $91,000,000, as compared with 1891. To that extent—$91,000,000 worth of products of the people of this country—they failed to find a market abroad; and gentlemen who are talking so much of the home market might offer a suggestion as to a remedy. From your standpoint the McKinley bill worked badly. Why did not the home market use up these ninety-one millions of products and enable the price of these commodities to be kept up? Instead they failed to find a foreign market or any market.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I can not yield; I have but five minutes. We bought in the period in 1892 over $48,000,000 from abroad more than in 1891, and sold abroad over $91,000,000 less. Investigation of the table shows a swinging over of the balance of trade against us in that length of time to the amount of about $140,000,000. If there is anything in your argument concerning the balances of trade, here is a condemnation of the system under which we were living just before Mr. Cleveland was elected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I should like to have five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection the gentleman will proceed for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. On page 6 of this record I find that there was a decline of $42,089,753 worth of exports during 1892 as compared with 1891, and an increase of $47,877,236 of imports, making a total change of trade against us, according to your way of stating it, of $89,966,989 in the total commerce of that year.

Mr. BURROWS. What year?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Eighteen hundred and ninety-two.

Mr. BURROWS. The fiscal year?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; not the fiscal year, but the year 1892.

Mr. BURROWS. What portion of the year?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The total of the year, unless my notes are wrong.

Mr. MARSH. You mean the calendar year.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I mean the calendar year.

Now, as against the declaration of politicians for political effect on this floor, I wish to read an extract from an interview with an eminent Republican of the State of Pennsylvania recently had and quoted in the public press of the country. Ex-Governor Beaver says:

The wave of business depression was due.

That is, the time had come that the political system of taxation under which we have been living so long had brought about a condition of affairs that made it inevitable that business depressions would ensue.

DEMOCRATIC POLICY NOT TO BLAME.—EX-GOV. BEAVER SAYS THE WAVE OF BUSINESS DEPRESSION WAS DUE.

[Special to the World.]

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *January 13.*

The Herald publishes the following interview with ex-Governor James A. Beaver, which it is alleged was had with Gen. Beaver recently while in the north of this county:

"To be candid, I do not believe this depression in business is the result of Democratic policy. This wave of business depression was coming, and it is only the good fortune of the Republicans that the Democrats got in power in time to be caught by it. It is one of those periodical depressions that regularly affect the country, and nothing could have averted it. I do not believe the Democrats or their policy have anything to do with it. It would have come anyhow, and if Harrison had been elected it might have been even worse."

For myself I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, but that the business condition might have been even worse if Harrison had been elected.

How does that statement of Governor Beaver compare with the allegations of gentlemen on this floor, that the apprehension of a change in the system of taxation was the cause of this business depression? And where did the depression begin? Did it begin with the producers or the consumers? It began with the consumers, the consumers of manufactured articles. The great farming interests of the country not selling abroad and not selling at home found themselves incapable of purchasing the manufactured products of the country. It was not a fear of reduction of taxation that prevented the consumers from buying. It is simply absurd to say that such could have been the case. It began with the consumers failing to buy. For if it did begin with the manufacturing capitalists alone, then it would have the appearance of a great lockout, the most odious, detestable, and cruel that could be conceived. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] sees fit to laugh. I do not say that it began there—I did not accuse——

Mr. REED. "Sees fit to laugh!" I was forced to do it.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I say if it did begin there, it deserves to be stigmatized as I have stigmatized it, as the most atrocious abuse of capital which ever occurred in the country, and which could not have been possible under any other system of government than the system of protection.

These statistics that I have quoted are the statistics that were presented not by a Democratic authority, but the statistics that were presented during the Republican Administration. They are statistics that come from the report of a Republican Secretary of the Treasury, and he shows, or these figures show, as clearly as it can be written, where this calamity began and how it began. It is a part of the great business depression that extends around the globe. It would have come anyhow, and as ex-Governor Beaver says:

I have no doubt whatever that if Benjamin Harrison had been reëlected President it would have come, and I almost regret that it did not occur—

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

and I almost regret that it did not occur during his Administration, so that the people of this country would not have had the least ground for doubting that the protective system under which they had lived was the greatest curse that legislation had ever inflicted upon a free people.

Mr. REED. They do rather doubt it now, do they not?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. A few of them doubt it.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman has referred to our foreign trade. Will the gentleman explain how it was that under the tariff of 1846, from 1846 to 1860, the balance of trade was against us every year but two?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not care anything about that. I have been applying recent facts.

Mr. BURROWS. The balance of trade was against us during the whole time except two years. How do you account for that?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not account for it at all. I have been using your argument that the balance of trade being in favor of the country was an argument to sustain the protective system, and to show you that within a year after the passage of the McKinley bill it began to swing against us, and has continued against us until recently.

Mr. MARSH. Does the gentleman mean the blance of trade or the balance of exchange?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Balance of trade, they call it.

Mr. BURROWS was recognized.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the gentleman make that request as soon as I get through? I will take but five minutes.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] states that within a year after the passage of the McKinley bill, which was October 6, 1890, the balance of trade commenced to go against us.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Perhaps it was a little more than a year.

Mr. BURROWS. The statement that it was within a year does not happen to be correct.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I was mistaken in saying it was within a year. I meant within the succeeding year, in the year 1892.

Mr. BURROWS. And the gentleman says that our exports have been falling off. Now, as a matter of fact our exports for the year ending June 30, 1890, were $857,000,000.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You can not claim anything for 1890 under the McKinley bill.

Mr. BURROWS. If my friend will allow me to make this statement of figures, I will be obliged to him. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, our export trade had risen to $884,000,000. The McKinley bill had then been in force about nine months. The next year, under the operation of the McKinley bill, our foreign export trade rose from $884,000,000 to $1,030,000,000 under a year's full operation of the McKinley bill.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But now explain why it did not continue.

Mr. BURROWS. Simply for the reason that you have declared in favor of free trade, business has stopped, and that is the reason why I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that under the tariff of 1846, from 1846 to 1860, there were only two years that the balance of trade was not against this country; and it is because of the operation of that very condition of things now, or the fear of it, that the balance of trade is shifting the other way.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The apprehension, then, began as early as July, 1892?

Mr. SPRINGER. When the balance of trade was against us in the estimation of the gentleman it was really in our favor.

Mr. BURROWS. When?

Mr. SPRINGER. Between 1850 and 1860. I mean we imported more than we exported, and that is what I call in our favor.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman means that when we buy more abroad than we export that then everything is prosperous? [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] According to the

gentleman's idea, if we can get to the position where we can buy everything abroad and get nothing at home we will be on the high road to prosperity!

Mr. SPRINGER. If we can reach the time when we get everything abroad and send nothing out of the country for it, we will be getting richer all the time. The gentleman is proceeding on the theory that the more he gives away and the less he gets the richer he will be; but the truth is that the more that comes into the country and the less that goes out marks the difference of our prosperity, and increase in wealth.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Another Daniel come to judgment. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; that is not another Daniel. It is an old maxim that every gentleman ought to understand by this time. In Great Britain——

Mr. BURROWS. I supposed I had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought the gentleman had yielded the floor to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BURROWS. I had not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to protect the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I beg pardon of the gentleman.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not think the Chair can. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Am I recognized for five minutes?

Mr. BURROWS. I yield the balance of my time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Am I to understand the gentleman to say that the more goods come in the better we are off?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will answer the question. It has confused the minds of the people of all countries for many years, but it seems to me that it is a very simple proposition, and when accurately understood there need not be any misconception in regard to it. In Great Britain the balance of trade, so called, has been against that country for the last twenty-five or thirty years to the amount of $500,000,000 a year, and in recent years the balance has been nearly twice that amount.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. For nearly fifty years the balance has been against her.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from West Virginia says for nearly fifty years. For the last thirty years the so-called balance of trade has been against Great Britain to the amount of $500,000,000 a year or more. Now, according to the theory of the gentleman from Michigan Great Britain is getting poorer every year by this difference in the balance of trade.

If that is so, there would not be wealth enough left in the two islands of that country by this time to run two manufacturing establishments, whereas England has been getting continually rich all the time; so that at this time the people of the rest of the world owe the people residing in the British Isles over $10,000,000,000, and it takes more than $500,000,000 a year of the earnings of all the rest of the world to pay the people of Great Britain the interest upon British investments abroad. That is what makes the balance of trade against Great Britain, and the earnings and the wealth of the world are pouring into that country at the rate of more than $500,000,000 in one year and all the rest of the world is engaged in working for the subjects of Great Britain to pay the interest upon these British investments abroad.

Mr. SIMPSON. If the gentleman will allow me, I desire to suggest that the farmers of this country have paid that debt or a part of it, for the last year in 60-cent wheat, as was said at the other end of the Capitol this year.

Mr. SPRINGER. By reference to the Statesman's Year Book, 1893, page 76 and 79, it will appear that the total imports into Great Britain for the ten years from 1883 to 1892, inclusive, were valued at £3,995,268,000, or, allowing $5 to the pound sterling, $19,976,340,000. The exports for the same period amounted to $11,709,370,000. The imports for these ten years exceeded the exports by $8,266,970,000. These figures do not include gold and silver, but the imports of gold and silver during this period exceeded each year the exports. For the year 1892 the excess of imports of gold and silver over exports was $15,580,000; and this may be regarded as a fair average for the ten years previous. For the year 1892 the imports of merchandise per capita in Great Britain amounted to $57.60, while the exports per capita amounted to only $32.70.

The imports of merchandise in Great Britain for 1892 amounted to £423,892,000, while the exports were only £227,060,000. The excess of imports was £196,832,000, or $984,160,000. The excess of imports of gold and silver, as I have before stated, was $15,530,000. The total excess of imports over exports for 1892 of merchandise, gold, and silver into Great Britain was $999,690,000, or nearly $1,000,000,000. And gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber would have us believe that Great Britain was made that much poorer by this enormous balance of trade against her in one year!

How long could a country having only 37,000,000 population endure such a drain upon her national wealth?

This is not a balance of trade against Great Britain. It is a balance in her favor. She is getting richer every year to the extent to which her imports exceed her exports.

I hope gentlemen will understand me. If we send our products abroad and get nothing in return for them we would get poorer by the amount sent out. But when there has been a balance in merchandise and the coin account has been balanced between the two countries, and when it appears that there have been more imports of values (taking into consideration coin as well as merchandise) a country in that condition is prosperous, because it is getting more into it than sending out. Under these conditions the more of imports a people have the richer they will be.

Mr. HULICK. Are you going to vote for this present measure with that object in view, namely, that it will produce a balance of trade against us, after its adoption in our commercial relations with foreign countries?

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the time will come under the operation of this bill, and that in the near future, when the general balance between this country and other countries will show that our imports, including coin, exceed our exports; and in my opinion that difference will show our net income and we will get richer by the difference.

Mr. HULICK. Will the adoption of this present tariff law result in the balance of trade against this country, and do you vote for it with the expectation that that result will be beneficial to this country?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the effect of the adoption of this bill will be beneficial, that is, that we will import more, including coin, than we export. I believe that when you take coin, as well as products, into consideration, when we get more into the country than we send out, we will be better off by the difference. That is what I mean and that is what I hope and believe will be the effect of the passage of the pending bill.

I can not understand how gentlemen on the other side can believe that our national wealth will be increased by sending out as exports more values than we get in return. The movement of coin each year must always be taken into the account. Governments do not import or export any goods. The aggregate of our imports and exports is the aggregate of the individual transactions of those who reside in the respective countries. Each trade is an exchange of products, and seller and buyer are presumed to give and get *quid pro quo*. If the mode of valuation were the same everywhere, and there were no interest and credit accounts between the countries to be adjusted, the trade transactions, including coin, would always balance. That is, the man in one country who sells to a customer in another any article, would get back in coin or products an amount in value equal to the value of the article that he sold and sent out.

What is called "the balance of trade" between different countries, whether it be large or small, is caused by credit accounts, by financial operations, by loans, by investments, by dividends on foreign stocks, and such like transactions. Great Britain is a creditor nation. The rest of the world owe her subjects $10,000,000,000, which have been invested in other countries. In settling trade balances the interest on this debt must be paid and it requires products to pay it. That accounts for what is called the balance of trade against her. It is really a balance in her favor, and shows the annual increase of her national wealth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia wants to fix some limit to debate, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this debate has run quite liberally, and has taken a very wide range; and as I am exceedingly anxious to get through with one or two amendments, so that members of the House may offer other amendments, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is too short a time.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. What time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. DINGLEY. Half an hour.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think that the gentleman ought to yield an hour at least.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think, as this interesting proposition has been brought in, we should have a little discussion.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I am willing to agree to twenty minutes, if that will suit the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. There are several gentlemen on this side who have not yet spoken and who would like to occupy a short time.

As this proposition in relation to the balance of trade has been launched upon us, I think we had better have a brief discussion of it.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. All these questions can be discussed at any other point in the debate. They are no more appropriate at this point than at any other.

Mr. PAYNE. But it will not take any more time to have the discussion now than later.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The committee feels that it is taking too much time for its amendments and wants to give other gentlemen an opportunity to offer the amendments which they desire to present.

The CHAIRMAN. What time does the gentleman from West Virginia suggest?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be ended in twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, before the question is put I want to say that I think we shall expedite the matter by having the discussion now. This question has been thrust upon us and I think we shall save time by discussing it now rather than by postponing it to the next amendment. There will be no time saved by putting off the discussion. I suggest that the gentleman agree to forty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in thirty minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do I understand the gentleman from West Virginia to suggest thirty minutes, with twenty minutes given to this side?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Yes, sir; thirty minutes; twenty minutes to be allowed to the other side.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am willing if I can have a part of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if an agreement is made the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] or the gentleman from Maine to control the twenty minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like about ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And I would like about fifteen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from West Virginia that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to thirty minutes, twenty minutes to be occupied by the minority. Is there objection?

Mr. MARSH. I object. If the gentleman will ask that the debate close at 1 o'clock I will not object.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in thirty minutes——

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think if the Chair will wait a moment we can arrange this matter by agreement, so as to save time. I suggest to my friend that there are several gentlemen who desire in good faith to occupy ten to fifteen minutes in the discussion of this subject, and I think we may as well have the discussion out now as later.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois (to Mr. WILSON of West Virginia). Say 1 o'clock.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I think that if the gentleman from West Virginia will ask unanimous consent that the debate be closed at 1 o'clock, one hour from this time, there will be no objection. That allows only thirty minutes to each side.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asked for only forty minutes, and I am willing to give the other side twenty-five minutes of that time.

Mr. REED. Say an hour. Let the debate close at 1 o'clock; the time to be equally divided.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Very well; Mr. Chairman, I will agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and pending amendments thereto be closed at 1 o'clock, the time to be equally divided; and inasmuch as the Chair might be embarrassed in making recognitions, if this request be agreed to and there be no objection, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from West Virginia to control one-half the time and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] to control the other half. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. I yield ten minutes to my colleague [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I had not proposed to enter at this time upon any discussion of the question which has arisen with respect to the balance of trade; but in view of the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] I desire to make a few observations.

In my remarks in general debate on Thursday last I called attention to the fact that the friends of the pending bill claimed that while it appeared on its face to reduce revenue to the extent of $76,000,000, nevertheless, in consequence of the increase of importations which would result from the reduced duties upon imported goods, there would be speedily a supplying of this revenue from increased imports.

I called attention to the fact that that would necessitate an increase of imports to the amount of $250,000,000 in the next fiscal year; that this $250,000,000 of imports, being dutiable goods, would nearly all consist of articles which we could manufacture in this country without any natural disadvantages, and that to throw into this country in a single year $250,000,000 worth of additional imports, goods which we have been accustomed to make in this country during the past few years, would inevitably result in decreasing the amount of production that would be open to the industries in this country in which such goods have been made, and also in a reduction of the opportunities for labor, and that that would result in great injury to the best interests of this country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], in his remarks on Saturday last, when calling attention to what I had stated in my observations of Thursday, said it was a surprising statement that an increase of $250,000,000 in imports, in wealth brought into this country in a single year, would result in disaster to the prosperity of our country rather than to its advantage. I called attention in my remarks of Thursday last to the fact that this increase of imports which was proposed was to be the importation of articles which we were accustomed to make ourselves, and that necessarily if we should transfer to another country the manufacture to this extent of articles which we had been in the habit of making for ourselves, it must result in crippling our own industries and our own prosperity.

If the importation should consist of articles which we did not ourselves produce, and which we needed for our consumption, the importation would tend to increase our prosperity, which has been the inevitable effect always whenever we have had a protective era; but if the tendency was to increase the importation of articles which we are accustomed to make, and can make in this country with no greater expenditure of labor than abroad, the inevitable result would be to cripple our industries.

The gentleman from New York inquired how we expected imports to come into this country unless we were to pay for them. I replied that for the time being—temporarily, as was the case during the period from 1846 to 1860—articles which we could produce ourselves might come into the country in two ways, first, by a shipment of gold, which lies at the very basis of our currency and forms a part of our capital on which our productive industries are carried along; or, secondly, by sending abroad evidences of indebtedness; but that this was laying the foundation of disaster, and could not proceed long without bringing the country to disaster, as it did in 1857 and 1858.

Now, the gentleman from New York, as I understood, took the position laid down by Bastiat, the greatest dialectician of the free-trade school, that if we in this country give up any industries because the products of those industries can be produced abroad cheaper in money, but not cheaper in labor or service, then the labor which has been employed in those industries goes at once into other and more lucrative employments. That is the doctrine laid down by the greatest dialectician of the free-trade school. Now, the difficulty about that contention in practice is, first, that it assumes that because an article costs more in money here than it does abroad, therefore it costs more economically. That is not true. If it be true that it requires more labor to produce an article here than to produce the same article abroad, then the proposition would be economically true that its production here would be a loss.

But so long as any article costs no more in labor to produce here it can not cost more economically to produce it here than it costs abroad. The difficulty arising in all this contention is that gentlemen of the free-trade school assume that men are consumers only, not producers to the extent that they are consumers; and they make the further assumption that men pay ultimately in money for all they buy, when in fact they pay ultimately in labor or service. The question, therefore, is not the relative money cost, but the relative labor cost.

If, for example, a coat costs $1 more in money in the United States than it costs in England, and the wages of labor are $1 a day in England and $2 a day here, which is the cheaper coat, economically speaking, the coat that cost six days' labor or the coat that costs only four and one-half days' labor? Economically, the coat that costs four and one-half days' labor is cheaper than the other.

Now, what is the whole doctrine with respect to cheapness? That article is cheapest which costs the least in labor—not necessarily the least in money. We seek cheapness when it can be accomplished by labor-saving devices; that is a boon to the world. But when cheapness is secured by reducing the wages of labor, that is an evil. Why, sir, there has not been a time in recent years in this country when articles were so cheap, expressed in money, as they are now; and there never was a time when, expressed in labor or service, articles were so dear. We are living in prospect of the free-trade paradise.

Last January when it became known that there was to be a revolution in the economic policy of this country, every industry began to prepare for the evil day. What happened then? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] says that if manufacturers began to draw in their operations, they did it without cause. Now, that is not true. Let me illustrate.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman will pardon me for interrupting him; I do not think I said anything of that kind.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that if manufacturers began to do that there was no cause for it, and they were reprehensible in so doing.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I did not use any such language or design to express any such thought.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then the gentleman will excuse me. I so understood him.

Now, what took place last January and in subsequent months? I take my own city as an illustration. Soon after it was ascertained that the Democratic party had secured in the elections not only the President, not only the House of Representatives, but also the Senate, and were to carry out the tariff policy which they had enunciated in their platform, what did manufacturers do?

It must be remembered that manufactured goods are made from six months to a year in advance of the time of consumption. Manufacturers must look forward in their business In January last gentlemen engaged in these industries began to see that the duties were to be so far reduced, as they supposed and anticipated, that there would be a larger importation of foreign goods such as we make in this country—$250,000,000 increase is what the gentleman from New York expects; and that as I understand is precisely one of the objects this bill undertakes to accomplish.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPRINGER). The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. What time?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. REED. I yield to my colleague five minutes more.

Mr. DINGLEY. As I was saying, in January last manufacturers began to see that they must curtail their operations. In my own city was one manufacturing corporation which had intended to extend its operations; and I may say its directory was largely Democratic. When they found what was to be, as they thought, the tariff policy of the future, they said to themselves it will not do for us to extend operations in view of the dangers that beset us, and therefore they discontinued their plans. Other operations that they intended to enlarge were of course discontinued, and the result was, following this, there began to be a discontinuance of orders by the jobbers, who thought that they would be able to obtain imported goods at lower rates, and orders were reduced.

Pretty soon there was a stoppage of the machinery, and a discharge of labor, followed by a reduction of the wages and the hours of labor. Now, it was inevitable in such a condition of things as this, commencing as it did in consequence of the distrust of the future by the threatened tariff revolution; it was inevitable, I say, all along the line, gradually, step by step, that distrust should strengthen, that industrial operations should be contracted, and that consumers would have less to expend than formerly. So that it has gone on strengthening from month to month, while there came a money panic to heighten for a time the distress. Yet this has gone on from hour to hour and will continue until it shall be known finally what will be the industrial policy of the future, so that those connected with manufacturing may be able to adjust their operations and reduce wages of labor to the new conditions that are to be imposed upon them.

It is inevitable, gentlemen, that when you bring into this country $250,000,000 more of goods, such as we have been accustomed to manufacture, taking it away from our own labor, you will cripple those industries and decrease the opportunities for employment. When the gentleman from New York says that the men who are engaged in these manufacturing operations can go into other employments, I ask what other employments they will go into next year, for example? Why, the farm is left to him, we are told. What will become of the farmer if all of the men who are engaged in manufacturing industries shall leave them and go on the farms? The result will be such an increase in the productions of the farmers as to decrease prices and bring every farmer in the country into bankruptcy. It would not only increase the farmer's products abnormally, but you would decrease the demand for those products by making those previously employed in manufacturing producers themselves instead of purchasers of the farmers.

What has been the effect industrially wherever manufacturing industries have been set down by the side of the farmer? Wherever there has been taken from the farmers the burden that is bearing down upon them in the cost of transportation of their raw products, by giving him a market at his own doors, most of the saving has gone to the farmer himself. Where the manufacturer has been set down by the side of the farmer and a home market established, there the farmer has done best. But the policy which looks to the importation of these goods, instead of their manufacture here, and that the people of this country go into agricultural pursuits and the cruder industries, would result in carrying the country back where it was a hundred years ago.

I am aware of the free-trade theory that, if we put ourselves into open competition with the world on the world's basis, if we put our high standard of living and high standard of labor in competition with the world, then if we are driven out of one industry that we will go into another where we have a natural advantage. Why, Mr. Chairman, talking about natural advantages, it is a natural advantage which every man should have in this country to work on a high-wage standard and on a high standard of living, and we contend simply that when products come into this country, made cheap by cheaper labor abroad, that those products should pay into our custom-houses a duty equivalent to the difference of wages here and abroad, the amount which has been withheld by the foreigner from his laborer and that has been paid by our producers to our laborers, in order that competition may go on here on the basis of the high wages of this country instead of the low wages of foreign machine-using countries. That is the whole sum and substance of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. I have been prevented by illness from taking any part in this discussion, and I will esteem it a personal courtesy on the part of the House if I am permitted to proceed for the five minutes allotted to me without interruption. I have not been physically able to make anything like a speech on this tariff bill, since I returned to the House only last Saturday. I desire to speak to the simple proposition of free wool.

I have been a practical wool-grower for twenty-four years. I have had on my farm, near the city of Hannibal, a flock of pure Southdown sheep since the fall of 1869. I sold my first wool clip from this flock in the spring of 1870, and have sold it as unwashed wool to the wool-buyers of the city of Hannibal each year since the spring of 1870. Since I have been a member of Congress, during the different tariff discussions that have occurred since the Forty-sixth Congress, I have been a very close student of all of the statistics and all of the facts and figures that have been presented, either to the Committee on Ways and Means or to this House, in regard to the effect of a tariff tax upon wool as it affected the American wool-grower.

I have not time to go into any elaborate discussion of this subject, except to state the unquestioned facts, that can be verified by a number of gentlemen upon this floor, who, like myself, have been interested every spring in the price of wool. I want it distinctly understood that I do not carry a flock of sheep upon my farm with any idea of deriving a profit from the wool clip alone, nor do I believe there is in the State of Illinois or Missouri a farmer to-day—certainly not one out of a hundred—who carries a flock of sheep upon his farm for the profit in the wool clip alone.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is one element of profit.

Mr. HATCH. It is the very smallest element of profit in it, and it has been made the smallest element in the profit of sheep-raising, simply because of the action of the Republican party in insisting upon a high tariff taxation on wool. [Applause on the Democratic side]. The chief value of a flock of sheep in all the older States of the Union is in the market value of high-grade mutton for food.

Ever since 1870 whenever the tariff taxation has been raised on wool American wool has decreased in price. I will publish in connection with my brief remarks the figures taken from a report, No. 501 of the Fifty-second Congress, first session, from the Committee on Ways and Means, giving the price of medium Ohio wool, in currency and in gold, in the city of Boston, commencing with March, 1866, and ending with December, 1890.

In 1870 the highest price quoted for Ohio medium wool in Boston was 48 cents in currency and the lowest 45. In 1871 the highest price was 62 cents in currency, and so on. I commenced

selling wool in 1870, and I have been gradually getting a lower and lower price for my wool clip, except in two or three years in the interim, as I will show from this table, down to the passage of the McKinley tariff act. I got less for my wool in 1890 than I ever received for it before. I got less for it in 1891 than I ever received for it before, and I sold my wool clip in 1892 for less than I ever received for it before; and in 1893 I sold my wool for the highest price that wool brought in the city of Hannibal, at the date I delivered it, because my wool clip was graded as choice medium wool, and I sold it for 16½ or 17 cents a pound—the exact figures I have not at hand—the lowest price I have ever sold it for.

[The time of Mr. HATCH having expired, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia yielded to him two minutes more.]

Mr. HATCH. The point I want to make is this: All American wool, or at least the great bulk of it, is bought by the wool manufacturers of the United States. They can not make cloth in competition with the manufacturers of woolen goods in the world without an admixture of certain grades of foreign wool not grown in this country, and the higher price you make them pay for that foreign wool, the less they will pay the American wool-grower. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Sitting right in front of me now is a wool-grower from the State of Texas [Mr. GRESHAM], who has at this time 25,000 pounds of wool on hand, the clip of 1893, that he tells me he has been offered only 8 cents a pound for, and that under the operation of the McKinley bill. Put wool on the free list. You can not make it any cheaper to the American wool-grower. You can not get the price any lower.

There is not a sheep-raiser in the Mississippi Valley to-day, as far as my personal acquaintance extends with the farmers of that great section, who does not say "Put it on the free list. We do not want any tariff. We have tried a tariff until it has broken up the industry, and now let us try something else."

And now, Mr. Chairman, I do not claim and do not want to be understood as claiming that the tariff act alone is responsible for all this. Wool has gone down like every other product that the farmer raises in the United States, and in addition to this robber tariff and this depressing system that has dragged it down, is that other and more potential cause, inaugurated by the Republican party, the infamous war that has been made upon silver in the United States beginning in 1873. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That, and its twin iniquity a high protective tariff, has destroyed the value not only of wool, but of all the farm products of the United States, until the farmers are confronted to-day with an average valuation of less than 50 per cent of what their earnings and their holdings were worth before the demonetization of silver in 1873. Their baneful influences are felt throughout the country and they are as inseparable and as closely united as the Siamese twins.

Average price in Boston of Ohio medium wool and average price in London of Port Phillip fleece in American currency, 1866 to 1890—both washed wools.

[London quotations from Windeler & Co.; American prices from Mauger & Avery, Boston.]

Year.	Month.	Ohio medium (currency).	Ohio medium (gold).*	Port Phillip fleece (gold).
		Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1866	March	65	60	52
	June	60	40	44
	September	67	46	48
	December	60	44	45
1867	March	53	39	44
	June	55	40	44
	September	49	34	43
	December	46	34	42
1868	March	43	31	42
	June	48	34	42
	September	45	31	38
	December	48	36	40
1869	March	50	38	36
	June	50	36	32
	September	48	35	34
	December	48	40	34
1870	February	46	39	36
	May	47	41	36
	July	45	39	34
	September	48	42	32
	December	48	43	33
1871	February	46	41	35
	May	52	47	39
	July	60	53	43
	October	62	55	46
	December	62	57	48
1872	February	72	65	54
	May	80	70	47
	July	70	61	50
	September	60	53	53
	December	60	53	55
1873	February	66	60	50
	May	53	45	52
	July	48	41	53

Average price in Boston of Ohio medium wool and average price in London of Port Phillip fleece in American currency, 1866 to 1890, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Month.	Ohio medium (currency).	Ohio medium (gold).	Port Phillip fleece (gold).
		Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1873	October	53	49	55
	December	52	48	51
1874	February	54	48	51
	May	56	50	50
	June	53	48	52
	August	54	49	53
	December	54	48	52
1875	February	56	49	49
	May	52	45	50
	June	49	42	48
	August	50	44	46
	December	50	44	47
1876	February	52	45	45
	May	49	44	42
	June	35	31	37
	August	40	36	40
	December	40	37	45
1877	February	43	41	42
	May	40	37	39
	June	44	42	43
	August	44	42	42
	December	44	43	43
1878	March	45	44	43
	May	43	43	42
	July	36	36	44
	September	37	37	42
	December	37	37	40
1879	March		35	40
	June		34	42
	September		38	40
	December		43	43
1880	February		54	46
	April		60	49
	June		48	43
	September		48	44
	December		48	44
1881	March		40	40
	June		44	41
	August		44	41
	September		46	41
	December		46	42
1882	February		46	43
	May		45	44
	August		45	44
	September		45	44
	December		45	43
1883	March		43	43
	June		44	43
	September		41	41
	October		40	41
	December		40	42
1884	February		40	40
	May		38	39
	June		34	39
	July		34	40
	November		34	39
1885	January		33	38
	April		32	37
	July		31	36
	September		35	33
	December		35	33
1886	February		36	32
	April		34	29
	July		33	34
	September		38	37
	December		38	33
1887	February		38	34
	April		37	34
	July		37	32
	September		36	30
	December		36	31
1888	February		35	31
	April		34	31
	July		33	32
	September		34	33
	December		34	34
1889	February		38	33
	April		37	34
	July		30	36
	September		37	38
	December		37	40
1890	February		37	37
	May		36	34
	July		37	32
	October		37	34
	December		37	32

*The prices reduced to a gold basis were calculated upon the value of currency at the dates indicated as given in the Quarterly Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879.

S. N. D. NORTH,
Secretary National Association of Wool Manufacturers, Boston, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED. I will reserve my time.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM].

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I trust what little time I shall occupy will be in explanation of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia; that the time for the schedule, placing wool on the free list, take effect on the 1st day of next

August, to be supplemented with an amendment to be offered that the schedule relating to woolen goods shall take effect on the 15th of December or the 1st day of January. It is absolutely necessary, Mr. Chairman, for the woolen manufacturers of the country to know now exactly when this bill, so far as these schedules are concerned, will go into operation. If we could put these schedules into operation now, as some gentlemen insist, I would be in favor of doing it; but the trouble is that the manufacturers are in a state of uncertainty in which they will be from now until this bill shall pass and become a law.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BYNUM. Certainly.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Does not the first paragraph of the bill fix the 1st day of June as the day on which the bill is to go into operation?

Mr. BYNUM. I will come to that. The bill does fix the 1st day of June as the day on which the bill shall go into operation, but gentlemen know that the probabilities are that it will not be passed much before the 1st day of June or the 1st day of July.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I hope it will be passed before that.

Mr. BYNUM. I hope so too. I would pass it to-day if I could. But here is the trouble. The products for next fall's supply of manufactures are made this spring and the jobbers will not give their orders to the manufacturers so long as there is any doubt as to when wool will be put on the free list, and the manufactories are practically closed at the present time. Now, if there is any uncertainty the jobbers are not going to give their orders until they find out what time the bill goes into effect. If the act should go into operation on the 1st day of June, the jobbers would not give their orders to the manufacturers, for the reason that part of the supplies can be made after the 1st day of June. No manufacturer is going to make goods out of the wool on which he has to pay duties when the same must be sold in competition with products made from free wool; it will practically close up the manufactories from now until the time wool will go on the free list.

Now, the season is divided, as the chairman of the committee well said, so far as the manufacture of woolen goods is concerned into two periods, from January until July or August, when the supplies are made for the next fall, and from August until January the supplies are made for the succeeding spring and summer wear. The consequence is, that by postponing the time when the free-wool clause will take effect until August will be to give to the manufacturers the opportunity of getting their fall supplies out of the wool that is taxed, and extending the time until the middle of December will allow that whole product to be consumed; so that the woolen manufacturers, dealers, and the consumers will stand upon the very same footing.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield to me for another question?

Mr. BYNUM. Certainly.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then the effect of this amendment is to cause the wool-wearers of this country to wear taxed woolen goods until December of this year?

Mr. BYNUM. Certainly; if it is postponed until that time. There can be no question about that; but this question is simply this: Would you rather keep the woolen mills closed in the country for the next six months and their operatives out of employment than to postpone the benefits until that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. But you say that they will open as soon as they can get free wool; then would not they open in June, and will not they keep closed until they get free wool?

Mr. WARNER. I would ask the gentleman if it would be possible, should the factories remain closed until June, for them to manufacture enough goods to prevent the price from going higher on account of the inadequacy of the supply when compared with the demand?

Mr. BYNUM. I do not think they would. They would manufacture some. The jobbers' orders are made and the patterns are designed and the orders taken a year ahead in the manufacture of woolen goods; and they would get, of course, a very small portion of the orders of the fall's supply. That is the whole question. I think it would be much better to extend the time rather than to have the prevailing uncertainty and loss of employment that will occur between now and the time this bill should go into operation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I hope the gentlemen on the other side will consume their time.

Mr. REED. I reserve my time.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. If the gentleman does not desire to debate, I hope we will have a vote upon this question. I do not desire debate, if they do not.

Mr. REED. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, to the amendment in question I want to say a word if I can have the attention of the committee. There are woolen manufacturers on the other side of this House, one or more of them, I think, on the Ways and Means Committee. Now, I want to make this statement, if I can have the attention of gentlemen on the other side of the House as well as on this:

Mr. GROUT. You do not expect to have any effect upon the other side, do you? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, yes. I think that when I tell the truth it will have an effect upon any fair-minded man who wants to hear the truth. The wool produced in the United States since the 1st day of June last and now can be bought and is being bought and can go into manufactures by our woolen manufacturers as cheaply as it can be bought in Australia, with freight added. In other words, the woolen manufacturer of the United States to-day can take his orders for delivery next fall and can fill those orders by buying American wool and manufacturing it into his products as cheaply as it can be bought anywhere on this earth. Now, if I am correct about that, where is the farmer to be benefited if wool is to go on the free list by a postponing of this date until the 1st of August?

If I am correct about it, why can not the American manufacturer manufacture out of this product as cheap now as he can hereafter? In other words, gentlemen, you have discounted the fall in the price of wool by the promise to put it on the free list. That is all I want to say about that, and when I have made that statement it seems to me that it shows the impropriety of postponing the date when this schedule shall take effect until the 1st day of next December, if it is to take effect at all. The only effect, as I said yesterday, is to give the importer the increased profit, to enable him to close out what he has bought, his stock on hand, at the higher price, without benefiting the consumer on the one hand or the wool-grower on the other; and, to my mind, this amendment smells of the influence of the importer and the woolen manufacturer rather than of a sound economic policy.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I want to say upon that point, and, as I am not fond of talking generally upon an economic question when gentlemen are talking louder than I am and it is but disturbing the air, I will yield the remainder of my time back to the gentleman from Maine, and seek some other opportunity to say certain things that I would be glad to say in reply to gentlemen who hold theories upon this subject, if I can succeed in turning their attention for a short time from their own theories to listen to the theories of somebody else.

Mr. GROUT. The facts of somebody else. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has ten minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. REED. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Chairman, if we can apply to trade between individuals the terms we use concerning the trade between nations, it is doubtless true that a millionaire, who lives upon the income of invested wealth, imports more than he exports. But this fact is not the cause, but the result of his prosperity. He buys but he does not sell, and he draws interest money sufficient to enable him to pay for what he buys.

Now, suppose you enjoin upon the poor man, who not only does not have any income from invested wealth but who has to pay interest upon borrowed money, suppose you enjoin upon him the policy of the millionaire; suppose you say to him: "Buy more than you sell; consume more than you produce and more than you sell to some one else?" According to your theory you would be showing him the way to prosperity. So, when the case of England was instanced a few moments ago, and we were told that she imported every year $500,000,000 worth more than she exported, that statement conveyed to us the information that England was the millionaire nation of the world and that the rest of the world paid her, in interest upon money which she had invested, $500,000,000. In the broad sense the balance of trade is not against England.

Mr. Chairman, this balance-of-trade question does not need to be argued. It merely needs to be stated. A nation or a man at the end of the year must have received, either in goods or in money or credits as much as he has expended, or in the end bankruptcy ensues. I was interested in that passage in the eloquent speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] the other day when he said, in converting his controversy with the gentleman from Maine into a proposition which I did not think it was exactly convertible into, that it was for our interest to import goods and not money, and for this reason. He said: If we import two hundred and fifty millions of money every year, the result is that we bankrupt foreign nations, and it is our first interest to maintain the solvency of those with whom we trade; and he declared that if the world continued to export its gold to us it would become bankrupt.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that if it would bankrupt foreign nations if they continued to export their gold to us it would bankrupt us if we continued to export our gold to them.

If the measure of our increase in national wealth, as our antagonists seem to argue, is the excess of our imports over our exports or our gain in foreign goods, let us so frame our laws as to make the adverse merchandise balance 1,000,000,000 instead of 250,000,000. Foreign nations will sell us to an unlimited amount for, according to the beautiful theory I have heard advanced on this floor, the more we import the richer we become, and the richer we become, of course the better will our credit be abroad.

Now I wish to say a word upon the amendment of the gentleman from West Verginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia resumed the floor.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPRINGER). Eighteen minutes of the hour are at the disposal of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], and six minutes yet remain to the other side.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That will take us beyond 1 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Some interruptions have occurred, which have not been counted by the Chair as part of the hour.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. What time does the gentleman from West Virginia yield ot the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]?

Mr. COCKRAN. The chairman of the committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia] is kind enough to say that he will not limit me except so far as the rule just adopted makes necessary; the time I may occupy will depend somewhat on the attitude of my friends on the other side.

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] who is always entertaining and instructive, and never inconsistent except under the stress of party necessities, has done me the honor to answer with some elaboration the criticism of his speech which I made on Saturday last; and the gentleman who has just sat down [Mr. MCCALL] has carried that criticism to its logical conclusion when he asks with a candor that was refreshing and an innocence that was admirable, why an export of gold from this country would not be as dangerous for us as it would be to foreign countries if we import gold from them. I answer, if such a condition existed his criticism would be perfectly just; but a gentleman acquainted with the first elements of political economy would never have propounded a question based on such an assumption. My answer is that under no circumstances can trade be carried on where a movement of treasure in one direction is maintained for any continued length of time, provided the amount of treasure be sufficiently large to endanger the solvency of trade in the place which it leaves.

That brings me back to the proposition of the gentleman from Maine. I say, that the importation of $250,000,000 worth of goods can not occur unless you export $250,000,000 worth of goods to pay for them. You must pay for them in some form or another, because nobody has suggested in this House as a possibility in actual life the presentation, as a gift, of a large quantity of goods by one nation to another. I except from the operation of that remark the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is not bound by the ordinary rules of controversy or the ordinary limitations of common sense. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]—and the answer may simplify this discussion—whether he accepts the new doctrine laid down by the other gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], the leader of the minority, that the value of labor, or the wages of labor, does not depend upon the law of supply and demand?

Mr. DINGLEY. I may say in respect to that, that it depends a great deal——

Mr. COCKRAN. I only ask whether the gentleman agrees with the other gentleman from Maine who made that remark?

Mr. DINGLEY. Undoubtedly my colleague [Mr. REED] and I do agree; but I desire——

Mr. COCKRAN. You do agree?

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to say that if in the term supply you include standard of wages and all the elements that refer to the conditions of men, and if you include in demand all the elements which go to enlarge industries, together with the competition of products from abroad, I would say yes. But if you mean simply that the number of persons seeking employment at a particular time and the number needed in employments at that time, coming together, alone fix wages, I say no.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am afraid the gentleman shows more ingenuity than candor. I will repeat my question and will put it in another form. Does the value of wages depend upon the competition among laborers for employment? I put it in that way.

Mr. DINGLEY. In reply to that I want to suggest to the gentleman——

Mr. COCKRAN. I do not want any suggestions; I want an answer.

Mr. DINGLEY. Very well; then I will take my own time to answer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy; the barrenness of the answer is, I know, due to the cause which he represents. The gentleman from Maine contends that if we have an importation of goods into this country, and we happen to be engaged in the manufacture of the same goods, that importation is a national misfortune. Am I right in that? I know that the gentleman would correct me if I am in error, because he is the very apostle of truth himself.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman will proceed; I will take my own time to answer.

Mr. COCKRAN. I assume that I am stating the gentleman's position correctly. Now, if this importation of $250,000,000 worth of goods occurs, I do not believe the gentleman will dispute the proposition that they must be paid for by other goods which we export. The gentleman has told us while he was upon the floor to-day that the use of money is but to exchange commodities; and surely the importation of $250,000,000 worth of goods must be met by the exportation of a corresponding quantity, the exchange being accomplished through the medium of money, as he says; in other words, the $250,000,000 worth of goods brought into this country are met by an exportation equal in value, causing an increase in the total trade of the nation.

Now, I proceed a step further, following out the gentleman's argument. Will the gentleman dispute that if these goods be imported into this country, the importation occurs because they are produced cheaper abroad than we can produce them here? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If, therefore, we obtain $250,000,000 worth of goods in exchange for an equal amount of our commodities, it means that we get more goods by importing them than if we manufactured them ourselves. But if we obtain more goods by importation, we must manufacture more goods to meet them, to pay for them, and that means a broadening of the field of labor and an increase of production in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If there is any gentleman on the other side who has the slightest suggestion to make, I would like to yield to him.

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. Would you favor the importation of Chinese labor because it is cheaper than our own?

Mr. COCKRAN. You can import, and do import, cheap labor from a great part of the world under your tariff act. We want to raise the value of labor in this country by increasing its production. We want to stimulate production so that we can get into the markets of the world and command tribute from the people of every nation that finds a dwelling place upon this globe. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] suggests that if this rule be carried out to its legitimate end, it will drive people from one occupation after another, back to their original condition of tillers of the soil. He tells us that if we destroy the diversification of industries which your tariff claims to have established, and which I believe it has established, the necessary result will be that all the people of the country must go back to agriculture.

Sir, that is a libel upon this land. If it were true, the people of the world would not be flying to these shores. They do not come here looking for industrial opportunities depending upon fleeting, evanescent laws which may be amended and changed as the result of every campaign, but because God Almighty has filled the earth with wealth which labor can draw from its bosom. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is because we believe the resources of this country are practically inexhaustible: because we believe that our opportunities are not limited to tilling the surface of the soil, but because we can open the bosom of the earth and take treasures from its womb: because a day's labor can produce more in this country than it can produce anywhere else in the world, that we are opposed to legislation which, by your own confession, restricts production by making it more expensive. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I would not do justice to this subject if I failed to refer to the very important economic discovery which was made in the course of the debate last Monday, when gentlemen upon the other side declared that their policy of enriching manufacturers was justified by their belief that somewhere or other there was an agency that would take from the manufacturers a portion of their profits and distribute them among the laborers. The precise nature of this agency has not been defined. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] declared it was the trades unions that would accomplish this beneficent result.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], the leader of the Republican party, declared that the trades unions and Almighty

God together would achieve it. [Laughter.] While the latter influence may be sufficiently potent to achieve the result, the first has never shown itself able to overcome human selfishness or to reverse economic laws.

Because, in the course of that debate, I referred to a strike in Pennsylvania last year, as illustrating the operations of this tariff law, it has been said that I criticised the rate of wages which these particular men obtained. Mr. Chairman, this committee misunderstood the purpose of that reference if they conceived that to have been my purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask that the gentleman be allowed to proceed such time as he desires.

Mr. COCKRAN. I only want two or three minutes.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has four minutes more, which he can yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has four minutes, and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has six.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] will have his time extended at least long enough to tell us what he knows and what he favors about the present amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the rebuke is just. I apologize to the committee. I was following a Republican example set me by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is a safe thing to do. Democrats are never right unless they follow a Republican example. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. They are always in trouble when they do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired unless it is extended. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has six minutes, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], four.

Mr. REED. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] one-half of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has three minutes more.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am grateful for the courtesy of my friend from Maine. I always believed him to be a gallant opponent; in this instance he proves it. I desire simply time to explain what was meant on th s side of the House by the reference to that Homestead trouble. I did not say whether those men were justified in any particular claim which they made, whether they were asking sufficient wages, whether they were contending against an unwarranted reduction, and with the evidence before me I could not assume to decide that question.

The purpose of that allusion was this: If you justify your tariff law on the ground that the trades unions will enforce a fair distribution of its fruits, then any resistance to trade unions would be criminal while they were asserting the claim to distribution of profit that you yourselves say they have a right to assert, that they will assert, nay, that they are bound to assert under the operation of a tariff law.

A MEMBER. He is not the only manufacturer under the tariff.

Mr. COCKRAN. No, he is not the only manufacturer who is trying to break down trades unions who ask for a division of the profits with them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The tendency of these protected capitalists to break up the trades unions is just as strong as the disposition to hire the cheapest labor, and both are conditions that every candid man will admit who is a protectionist; and therefore your tariff law is in the nature of a public robbery, because they provide no adequate means by which its spoils can be divided between its immediate beneficiaries and those laborers whom they have induced to assist them in a war for high protective rates on a promise that they should share its benefits. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Maine desire to consume his time?

Mr. REED. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman unless the gentleman from Maine yields him the time. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word, as personal reference has been made to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no power to recognize the gentleman unless the time is yielded to him by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Maine abandons his three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine says he will not consume his three minutes.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to recall the committee to the question upon which it is now to vote. I shall not follow the discussion of the gentlemen upon the other side in their attempt to prove that the farmer is prospering under the present system. If the farmer is satisfied with his prosperity, all right. If he himself is not satisfied, I presume he will speak out when the opportunity offers. Neither shall I controvert the doctrine laid down by the gentlemen on the other side, that the object and operation of a protective tariff is to take care of capital, and then capital will take of labor—if labor can make it do so. I have always understood that that was the idea of the protective-tariff system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call the attention of the committee to the amendment upon which we are about to vote. The amendment which I have offered on behalf of my fellow-members of the Democratic side of the Ways and Means Committee is to fix the date when the provision for free wool shall go into effect as the 1st of August, to be followed up with an amendment fixing the day at which the reduction contained in the woolen schedule shall take effect as the 1st of December. We were just as reluctant to present this when it was introduced yesterday as the most impetuous members on this side to whom its first presentation seems to be an unwelcome proposition, but the whole question is summed up in a few words.

The great jobbers of the country, Marshall Field, Arnold Constable, and other great purchasers of woolen goods, are hesitating now, this very day, whether to give their orders for the fall trade to foreign manufacturers or to American manufacturers; and unless we fix these dates definitely they will probably give the great bulk to foreign manufacturers, taking the chances of bringing them in under the reduced tariff rates. With the dates fixed at the days we propose they will put their orders to a very large extent with the home manufacturers. Our own mills can do the usual work through the winter months and our own farmers can find a market, the only market they have, for the sale of their spring clip of wool. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that we have presented these two dates and ask the committee now to vote upon them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 90, section 636, amend by inserting at the close of the paragraph, "*Provided*, That this section shall take effect on and after the 1st day of August, 1894."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the proposed amendment to this amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. Just a moment. I understand this is the amendment to put wool on the free list. I would like to have the paragraph read in connection with that amendment, so as to see how it would read.

The section was read, as follows:

636. All wool of the sheep, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all wool and hair on the skin, noils, yarn waste, card waste, bur waste, rags, and flocks, including all wastes or rags composed wholly or in part of wool.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I should like to have the first paragraph of the bill read, which shows the time at which it would otherwise take effect.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the first paragraph of the bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of June, 1894, unless otherwise especially provided for in this act, there shall be levied and collected, and paid upon all articles imported from foreign countries, and mentioned in the schedules herein contained, the rates of duty which are, by the schedules and paragraphs respectively prescribed, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the proposed amendment to this amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "August 1, 1894," and insert the words "October 1, 1894."

The question was taken on the amendment to the amendment, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PAYNE. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 81, noes 151.

Mr. PAYNE. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 68, noes 154; so the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, under what rule does the Chair hold that the vote on that amendment should come before the vote on the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have the rule read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RULE XIX.

OF AMENDMENTS.

When a motion or proposition is under consideration, a motion to amend and a motion to amend that amendment shall be in order; and it shall also be in order to offer a further amendment by way of substitute, to which one amendment may be offered, but which shall not be voted on until the original matter is perfected, but either may be withdrawn before amendment or decision is had thereon. Amendments to the title of a bill or resolution shall not be in order until after its passage, and shall be decided without debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Does the Chair hold under that rule that the amendment to the substitute is not the next thing to be voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule is explicit upon the point that the text must be first perfected. If the paragraph of the bill is the text, it must be perfected; but if the proposed amendment of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is the text, it must be perfected.

Mr. SPRINGER. The committee has refused to perfect the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia. Now a substitute is offered, and to that an amendment is proposed, which is in order. When that is voted upon, if it is not agreed to, the committee will then vote upon the substitute and then upon the original proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to conform to the practice that has been generally adopted here.

Mr. REED. What is the question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The question submitted is whether the vote should now be taken on the proposed substitute and the amendment to it, or upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. REED. The regular order would be, first to perfect the amendment of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). To perfect the text. Will the gentleman from Maine please repeat his statement; the Chair did not hear it distinctly, owing to the confusion on the floor?

Mr. REED. The first proposition is to perfect the original amendment, then to perfect the substitute that is offered for it, then to vote on the substitute, and then to vote on the amendment. That is the regular course.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question in the mind of the Chair was whether the first thing was not to perfect the text of the bill, to vote on the amendment to the text, which has not been voted upon.

Mr. McMILLIN. The rule is to vote first on the amendments that may be offered, one after another, or on that amendment which is offered to the amendment presented by the gentleman in charge of the bill. If no further amendment is offered, then, as has been stated by the gentleman from Maine, to vote on the amendments pending to the substitute that is proposed, and, when you have got the substitute clear of all amendments, then to vote on the proposition to substitute it for the original proposition.

Mr. REED. I understood that the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia was the basis; that that was the matter first before the committee, then to that an amendment was offered, then a substitute for it, and then an amendment to the substitute. It was upon that idea that I made my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the proposed amendment of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is the text. The question, then, will be taken on the proposed amendment to the substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "immediately upon the passage of this act" and insert "December 30, 1899."

The CHAIRMAN. That is offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS].

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. BOWERS, and it was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], which will be read.

The substitute was read, as follows:

Provided, That this paragraph shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act.

The question being taken, the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 89.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. WILSON of West Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 112, noes 102.

So the substitute of Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio was agreed to. [Applause.]

The question being then taken upon the amendment as amended by the adoption of the substitute, it was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I had designed to offer an amendment fixing the 1st of December as the day for the woolen schedule to go into effect, but as our Republican friends on the other side have voted in favor of the free-wool provision going into effect immediately, I will not offer that amendment but will ask the reading of another, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 94, amend section 7 by striking out all of the section from line 21 down to the word "built," in line 25, and inserting, "That all articles of foreign production which may be necessary for the construction of vessels, including machinery and equipment;" so as to read:

"SEC. 7. That all articles of foreign production which may be necessary for the construction of vessels, including machinery and equipment, built in the United States for foreign account and ownership, or for the purpose of being employed in the foreign trade, including the trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, after the passage of this act may be imported in bond, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe," etc.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY].

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, this section relates to the matter of the construction of vessels in this country to be used in the foreign trade and the trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of this country. The language of the bill as reported by the committee is the exact language of the existing law, which has been carried down in the revision of what is known as the free-ship law for many years. When that law was first enacted and this language introduced into our statutes, it was in the days when shipbuilding was materially different from what it is at the present time. It was in the days when wooden ships and sailing vessels were carrying the principal commerce of the world. There has since been a revolution in the matter of shipbuilding, and there has also been some revolution in the meantime in legislation affecting it. The bill as reported by the committee, which in this respect is the provision of existing law, provides—

That all lumber, timber, hemp, manila, wire rope, and iron and steel rods, bars, spikes, nails, plates, tees, angles, beams, and bolts, and copper and composition metal which may be necessary for the construction and equipment of vessels built in the United States—

may be imported in bond.

Now, many of these articles specified in the existing law and specified in the original text of this bill have, by laws heretofore enacted, been placed absolutely upon the free list. Some others of them are included in the proposed enlargement of the free list as embraced in this bill.

Now, if it was proper and wise that, in the existing law and in laws which have existed in the past, such articles as these enumerated should be permitted to be imported in bond free of duty for this purpose, and to give employment to American laborers in the construction of vessels, then it is equally important that our provision on this subject be made as comprehensive as the exigencies and demands of the industry may require. Therefore, to make this provision more specific, to take away from this measure the appearance of admitting in bond certain articles and commodities which for all other purposes are upon the free list—to clear up all ambiguity and make this provision as comprehensive as the demands of the business require, we have drafted the amendment now offered, which simply provides that all commodities or articles of foreign production that may be necessary in the construction and equipment of these ships may come in under bond and without the payment of duty.

Mr. DINGLEY. What benefit would it be to American labor to authorize the importation free of duty of a completed marine engine?

Mr. TARSNEY. If marine engines and all other commodities entering into the construction of a vessel cost a larger price in this country than abroad, if the competition of the shipyards upon the Clyde and in other places in Europe where shipbuilding is carried on is able to build these ships even for American capitalists, even those that are to sail the American flag and carry American commerce, cheaper than our ship constructors can build them, and therefore our capital instead of building ships here in our own shipyards and giving employment to our own laborers is diverted and sent to the Clyde and to the machine shops of Europe to furnish employment for labor in the construction of ships and machinery over there, taking away even that employment which the fitting up of this machinery might give by inducing the greater construction of ships in this country——

Mr. BOUTELLE. They can not put these vessels under our flag.

Mr. TARSNEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Maine

that five are being built now in the State of Pennsylvania to sail under our flag.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Precisely; but they are not being built on the Clyde.

Mr. TARSNEY. I did not say that they were.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And they are not going to be permitted to import their engines from Europe.

Mr. TARSNEY. Will the gentleman from Maine give this House any sufficient reason why the shipbuilder should be permitted to import lumber, timber, wire, steel beams, and all like articles entering into the construction of a ship and not be permitted to import these other things that are necessary for building and equipping such ships?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I could give the gentleman as one answer that ought to be satisfactory to him, although it would not be entirely so to me, that under the very theory you are advocating of admitting what you designate as "raw materials" for the purpose of stimulating industries in this country you could justify the importation of iron, copper, and all the other materials in bulk or in crude form to be worked up in this country, when you could not possibly justify the importation of an entire marine engine or an electrical apparatus or the entire finished equipment of the ship. That is the difference between having all the work of manufacture done in this country and having the completed and finished machinery and equipment of a vessel imported from abroad.

Mr. TARSNEY. Are not our working people engaged in making the steel beams, manila rope, and wire rods?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Precisely so, and that is just where I take issue with the gentleman from Missouri and his party fundamentally. I take issue with you because I would not admit in that manner free raw materials.

Mr. TARSNEY. Why did you?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I did not.

Mr. TARSNEY. Why, you incorporated it in the existing law.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I did not do it myself, but if I had done so I would not be subject to the criticism of having opened wide the door to the importation of finished manufactures or a completed ship.

Let me say this to the gentleman from Missouri on this proposition, you are absolutely proposing to reverse the policy established in the United States and successfully carried into effect within the past ten or twelve years under which we emancipated ourselves from our dependence upon foreign countries for materials until within seven years past, when it was alleged on the floor of the House that we could not build a modern high-power marine engine, we have gone forward in demanding that the American Navy should be American in its materials, design, and construction, until we have demonstrated not only that we can build modern marine engines, but have actually built the finest marine engines in the world, and to-day we have afloat the fastest ships on the ocean. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TARSNEY. Now, let me say to the gentleman that he has succeeded in almost emancipating shipbuilding from the country; and let me say to the gentleman further——

Mr. BOUTELLE. What was that remark?

Mr. TARSNEY. Wait a moment. The gentleman says he did not vote for these propositions. He voted for the McKinley bill and this is contained in the McKinley bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will accept the full responsibility of approving of it. I meant to say I was not here at the particular time when that policy was originated.

Mr. TARSNEY. Did you not vote for the McKinley law?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Undoubtedly. I meant to say that I was not here when that policy was originated years ago.

Mr. TARSNEY. Did you not vote for that law?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, undoubtedly.

Mr. TARSNEY. Then you voted for all these things except the provisions with reference to marine engines?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Undoubtedly I voted for the existing law. What do you deduce from that?

Mr. TARSNEY. Now, I will ask you what distinction you make?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want to say to the gentleman that since that was adopted we have gone on by our legislation in this country, by Republican votes—legislation in which I feel proud to have borne an humble, although a very persistent part—we have gone on until, in contrast with the time when the Chicago, Boston, Baltimore, and Charleston, among the first of our ships of the new Navy, were built of material, important portions of which were imported from Europe, because gentlemen like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] stood up here day after day and said we could not produce those things in this country, because gentlemen on the Democratic side insisted on putting into bills that were brought into this House clauses declaring that the Secretary of the Navy should only use American materials in cases where he could get it "at a reasonable price and within a reasonable time," making that depend upon the relative cost and the relative facility with which we could obtain these materials at home and abroad—I want to say to the gentleman that it is one of the proudest achievements of the Republican policy that within the past six or seven years we have altered all that, so that instead of being absolutely dependent, as we were, upon European forges and factories for the steel plates with which to build our ships, or for the armor plates with which to protect them, for the great forgings with which to build our guns, and for the hollow steel shaftings required for modern shipbuilding—instead of being dependent upon Europe for all that, now, under the stimulus of the protective principle, under legislation which offers inducements to American capital and American skill and enterprise, to occupy this new and great field which had lain fallow since the close of the war, we have built up in this country at Bethlehem and other points the great establishments that to-day not only compete with but exceed the capacity of the Krupp establishment in Germany, or the Whitworths in England, or the Creusot works in France, or any other of the great armor-producing and steel-forging plants in the world.

I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY], as an American citizen, if he does not feel proud when I tell him that whereas eight years ago we could not put out a single ton of heavy steel forging in this country, that to-day in the city of Bethlehem, Pa., we have an establishment with more powerful machinery than any other on the face of the earth; that in a few years we have caused the establishment of this magnificent plant; that while the great Krupp establishment at Essen has boasted of its ponderous machinery, and to-day its heaviest hammer wields a blow of but 90 tons, we have at Bethlehem, to forge American steel, to build up our American Navy, a mammoth hammer that brings down a blow of 125 tons at every stroke. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, the gentleman says we have emancipated ourselves out of our shipbuilding business. I would like to have him visit the splendid shipbuilding plants that have been erected within a decade at San Francisco, at Philadelphia, at Newport News, at Bath, and elsewhere. I would like to have him take the cars and go to Philadelphia, where he will find to-day on the stocks the largest amount of tonnage that ever was put in process of building in that city since it was founded; where he will find to-day in a gratifying condition of progress the structures of great steamships that are to be put upon the ocean under the American flag, that when they are equipped will be superior to any other vessels of their class on the waters of the globe, and that the American flag will again be restored to that supremacy on the ocean which was once the pride not only of this country, but the boast of the Democratic party in the olden days. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, the principles involved in the tariff bill now before the House have been prominent issues in every campaign for the past thirty years, and have been discussed over and over again in every town, village, and city in this broad land. And, after all, it is only a question of revenue, or, in other words, how the money needed to defray the necessary expenses of the Government shall be raised. There is no difference of opinion about the amount needed, but there is a great great diversity of opinion as to the method of raising it. The Republican party has, ever since its organization, earnestly advocated a system which would protect all classes of our people against competition from the Old World and thereby give to all an opportunity to enjoy the blessings which the Almighty in His infinite wisdom has seen fit to bestow upon this great country; that the man who depended upon the work of his hands for his daily bread should be able to provide his family with a home of their own, to supply them with the comforts and many of the luxuries of life, and to educate his children and make of them intelligent American citizens.

On the other hand, the Democratic party with equal persistency has advocated the English idea of free trade, and to that end has demanded that all barriers of protection shall be removed and our people placed in direct competition with the Old World, where it is well known that life is in many places a struggle for existence; where, at a very tender age, the work of the child is needed to help its parents earn a livelihood, the child thus growing to man's estate dwarfed in body and mind. To me the proposition to do away with the protective system—a system which has developed the greatest nation on earth—is one fraught with many perils, and should this bill become a law the result to all of the laboring, manufacturing, mining, and agricultural classes would be disastrous.

I have the honor to represent in this House a large and intelligent agricultural constituency, who are vitally interested in the

measure under discussion, and whose interests are in a greater degree jeopardized by the proposed legislation than any other class of our people.

The foundation of the prosperity of the American farmer and the American laborer is the continued operation of the American factory. When the factory fires are extinguished nothing follows so surely as the enforced idleness of the laborer, and when this comes the home demand for the farmer's products is gone. Every condition in American life is affected by the question of a protective tariff, and every man under the flag receives in a greater or lesser degree its benefits. It is no exaggeration to say that under the provisions of the bill under discussion the foreign manufacturer and foreign laborer would receive these benefits, and the American farmer at the same time would be deprived of his home markets; while the factory operatives, deprived of their means of livelihood, would be forced to the farm, thus increasing the supply of agricultural products and further lowering the prices of the same.

The wool industry, which has made rapid strides since the passage of the tariff bill of 1890, under the provisions of which an increased duty was placed on foreign wool, is now threatened with extinction should this bill become a law. As evidence of the threatened extinction of the sheep industry, I have but to call your attention to the fact that in the world's greatest live-stock market, Chicago, this season there has been such a deluge of lambs that the price declined 50 per cent in less than ninety days, and lambs sold at a price less per hundred pounds than sheep, something never before known in the history of that market. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], in his able presentation of this subject, has well said:

In the case of the American wool-grower it is not within his power to reach the conditions, if such a step was desirable, which would enable him to successfully compete with the foreign producer. High-priced lands, a rigorous climate, American wages, and the cost of transportation offer an irresistible barrier to the successful prosecution of this industry in the United States under free trade. How can our flock master contend with Australia in an open market, where 600,000,000 pounds of wool are produced annually from flocks grazing on lands which are rented for a penny an acre a year? Or with the 460,000,000 pounds of annual production in South America, where lands are free and labor commands only 8 cents a day? Or with Russia's 350,000,000 pounds produced with 15 cents daily labor? Or with South Africa, Turkey, and Asia, where 10 cents a day is the highest recompense awarded in this industry? Under free trade these countries could put their wool down in our markets at a price less than the cost of production here, and the consequence would be the complete destruction of this great and growing industry in the United States. This would be attended with a sacrifice of 47,000,000 sheep, in which 2,000,000 farmers have invested $100,000,000 in capital, and the abandonment of extensive ranches with all their valuable improvements. It is idle to contend that with free wool this industry could survive.

The safety of our American institutions against foreign invasion lies not only in a patriotic citizenship which at a moment's notice would create a volunteer army of defense, but it also consists in the great natural resources we enjoy. Destroy the wool industry and what would be the result in case of a foreign war, with our ports blockaded and dependent upon foreign wool to clothe our army and our people? This is, in my opinion, one of the strongest reasons for protecting and fostering the productions of wool.

I desire here to submit the correspondence between Gen. Andrew Jackson and Dr. Colman, of Warrenton, Va., in 1824, when Gen. Jackson was a candidate for the Presidency.

DR. COLMAN TO GEN. JACKSON.

WARRENTON, VA., *April 21, 1824.*

DEAR SIR: Being one of the six members of the Virginia Assembly in the caucus last winter who voted for you as a fit and proper person to be supported by the people of the State for the Presidency of the United States, and having since heard that you are in favor of the "protecting duty policy," I take the liberty of desiring you to inform me whether you intend voting for the tariff bill now before Congress. I wish to have information on this subject as soon as your convenience will permit, that I may answer the Fredericksburg committee who invite my cooperation in getting up a ticket for the hero of New Orleans. In this county you have many friends, and some think your support will be better in Petersburg than in any of the contiguous counties. We are antitariff here; and candor required me to say that should you be the advocate of a measure to which our interest is evidently opposed, the zeal with which you have hitherto been supported will be relaxed.

I am, etc.,

L. H. COLMAN.

GEN. JACKSON TO DR. COLMAN.

WASHINGTON CITY, *April 26, 1824.*

SIR: I have had the honor this day to receive your letter of the 21st instant, and with candor shall reply to it. * * * You ask me my opinion on the tariff. I answer that I am in favor of a judicious examination and revision of it; and so far as the tariff before us embraces the design of fostering, protecting, and preserving within ourselves the means of national defense and independence, particularly in the state of war, I would advocate the support of it. The experience of the late war ought to teach us a lesson; and one never to be forgotten. If our liberty and republican form of government, procured for us by our Revolutionary fathers, are worth the blood and treasure at which they were obtained, it surely is our duty to protect and defend them.

Can there be an American patriot who saw the privations, dangers, and difficulties experienced for the want of a proper means of defense during the last war who would be willing to hazard the safety of our country if embroiled, or rest it for defense on the precarious means of national resources to be derived from commerce, in a state of war with a maritime power which might destroy that commerce to prevent our obtaining the means of defense and thereby subdue us? I hope there is not; and if there is, I am sure he does not deserve to enjoy the blessing of freedom. Heaven smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. That same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us we deserve not the continuation of His blessings. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with lead, iron, and copper—and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool.

These being the grand materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our own manufactories and laborers may be placed on a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential to war. * * *

This is a short outline of my opinions, generally, on the subject of your inquiry, and believing them to be correct and calculated to further the prosperity and happiness of my country, I declare to you I would not barter them for any office or situation of a temporary character that could be given me. I have presented you my opinions freely, because I am without concealment, and should indeed despise myself if I could believe myself capable of acquiring the confidence of any by means so ignoble.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

ANDREW JACKSON.

Mr. PICKLER. From that letter there seems to be very little of Jacksonian Democracy in the majority of the Democratic party now.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is true.

Mr. POWERS. That letter was written when Gen. Jackson was for the first time a candidate for the Presidency, and four years later he wrote another to Senator Ray, of Indiana, reaffirming the same statement.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

The tobacco industry of Wisconsin alone brings to the farmers something over $2,000,000 yearly. Since the election of 1892 the acreage has decreased from 26,300 in 1892 to 23,200 acres in 1893. If the fear of proposed legislation would decrease the acreage in one State over 12 per cent in a single year, what would be the result of the passage of the bill? In my opinion, it would practically destroy the tobacco industry in Wisconsin, and the effect could not be different in other States. So depressed has been this industry that the crop of 1892 is still in the warehouses of Wisconsin, with no immediate prospect of sale, and with the crop of 1893 demanding storage, and no money in the hands of dealers to move it. The tariff bill of 1890 provided for a duty of 30 cents per bushel on barley, and to show the effect of the law I append the following statement, showing the imports for ten years, from 1884 to 1893, inclusive. Comment is unnecessary; the table speaks for itself, showing a falling off from 1890, when the importations were 11,327,052 bushels, to 1893, when the importations were only 1,969,761 bushels.

According to the official report of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department the imports of barley from the Dominion of Canada for the past ten years were as follows:

Year ending June 30—	Bushels.	Value.
1884	8,593,902	$5,919,965
1885	9,964,870	6,530,827
1886	10,194,107	7,175,397
1887	10,351,893	6,170,060
1888	10,445,751	7,812,814
1889	11,325,881	7,721,475
1890	11,327,052	5,617,377
1891	5,076,471	3,221,180
1892	3,144,918	1,591,305
1893	1,969,761	921,301

The sudden falling off, beginning in the autumn of 1890, is ascribed to the fact that on October 6, 1890, the McKinley bill, which raised the duty from 10 cents per bushel to 30 cents per bushel, became operative as a law. The decrease would have been still greater had the law gone into effect a month or so sooner, for in the brief interim Canadian shippers rushed over the border fully 4,000,000 bushels of the then new crop of barley, so as to embrace the old duty of 10 cents, and thus avoid the impending duty of 30 cents per bushel. It is a matter of record that, in order to provide for the proper entry of this extraordinary influx of barley, the collectors of customs at the ports of Buffalo and Oswego kept their respective offices open until midnight of October 5.

I desire to call the attention of this House and of those interested in agricultural products generally to the proposed decrease in duties on farm products as per the following table:

Articles.	McKinley tariff.	Wilson bill.
1. Barley	30 cents per bushel	Reduced to 20 per cent ad valorem.
2. Corn	15 cents per bushel	Do.
3. Oats	do	Do.
4. Rye	10 cents per bushel	Do.
5. Wheat	25 cents per bushel	Do.
6. Beans	40 cents per bushel	Do.

Articles.	McKinley tariff.	Wilson bill.
7. Tobacco (Sumatra wrappers).	$2 per pound	$1 per pound.
8. Butter	6 cents per pound	4 cents per pound.
9. Cheese	do	25 per cent ad valorem.
10. Hops	15 cents per pound	8 cents per pound.
11. Onions	40 cents per bushel	20 cents per bushel.
12. Potatoes	25 cents per bushel	10 cents per bushel.
13. Wool	44.3 per cent	Free list.
14. Milk	5 cents per gallon	Do.
15. Broom corn	$8 per ton	Do.
16. Cabbages	3 cents per head	Do.
17. Eggs	5 cents per dozen	Do.

There are also many things in the present bill that would seem to require explanation, and the query arises why the duty on wheat and potatoes should be but 20 per cent, while the duty on rice is over 70 per cent; or in other words, on the present basis of values, why wheat should pay a tariff of about 12 cents per bushel, while rice, the product of the South, pays 90 cents per bushel.

It would seem to one looking at this bill without prejudice, that the farmer, and in fact the entire agricultural interest, had been selected to bear a greater portion of burdens than any other class. The ruling majority of the Democratic party, which has formulated this bill, comes from the South, where cotton is the staple product, and where the cry has ever been made for cheap labor and the free markets of the world.

It is not only in the proposed tariff legislation, however, that the interests of the American farmer are sought to be destroyed, but also in the administration of the great Department of Agriculture, which was created to foster and promote his interests, evidence is daily given of the hostility of this Administration to his welfare. The district which I have the honor to represent in this House gave to the country the great head of that Department the lamented ex-Secretary Rusk, who was appointed by President Harrison upon the formation of his Cabinet, and who for four years labored with untiring zeal, and with an eye single to the benefit of the American farmer; and I desire here to call the attention of this House to some of the results achieved by that Department under his administration.

1. Contagious pleuro-pneumonia, which threatened the entire cattle industry of the country, completely eradicated.

2. Losses from Texas fever almost entirely prevented.

3. The treatment of cattle on board ship regulated, and cruelty and avoidable losses prevented.

4. The danger of introducing disease with imported animals removed.

5. The prohibition against the admission of our pork, which had been enforced for years by Germany, Denmark, Austria, France, Italy, and Spain, removed.

6. From one-half to 1 cent per pound added to the value of our pork in the markets of the United States and Great Britain, when bearing the United States Government inspection certificate.

7. The triumphant refutation of allegations of contagious diseases among American cattle shipped abroad, as the result of a system of inspection of American live cattle abroad and of individual identification.

8. The sugar industry placed upon a footing which promises ultimately to supply the entire domestic consumption with a home-grown product.

9. Indian corn successfully introduced as a human food in the leading countries of Europe, with a likelihood of adding to the value of that crop, even in years of the greatest production.

10. The first steps taken toward the extension of our trade in agricultural products throughout Latin-American countries.

11. Measures adopted to effectually check the growing imports of raw cotton from abroad.

12. The saving to farmers and horticulturalists, annually, of millions of dollars, by successfully combating the depredations of diseases and insects on vegetation.

13. The wide extension of the Weather Bureau service in the special interest of agriculture.

14. The publication of the three books, viz, Diseases of the Horse, Cattle, and Sheep, have alone been worth more to the agricultural interests than the entire cost of the Department for four years under Secretary Rusk.

By a comparison of the year 1892 with the year 1889, the last year of the first Cleveland Administration, we—

Increased our exports of bacon, hams, and lard by $19,000,000.

Exported $12,000,000 more of beef products.

Exported $16,000,000 more live cattle.

Exported $150,000,000 more of cereals; namely, wheat, $115,000,000; flour, $28,000,000, and corn, $7,000,000.

Exported $2,500,000 more seed.

Exported $1,500,000 more fruits and nuts.

Exported $2,000,000 more oil cake and meal.

Increased the foreign sale of all agricultural products by $275,000,000.

And what, let me ask, is the farmers' department of this Government doing under its present head? Instead of expanding and continuing the efforts inaugurated by Secretary Rusk to elevate the American farmer and promote his material interests, a system of false economy has taken the place of the intelligent and progressive policy maintained for the four years of President Harrison's Administration. Meat inspection, the keystone to the successful raising of the foreign prohibition of our meat products, has been curtailed, sugar experiments practically abandoned, preventive measures against the recurrence of pleuro-pneumonia withdrawn, and the work of the scientific divisions of the Department contracted. The cry of "paternalism" is interposed when a proposition is made to expend money in researches in the interest of agriculture, and this great wealth-producing class are continually taunted with being, in a sense, mendicants, asking for alms from the Government to whose prosperity they contribute so much. It is pleasing to note that the farmers' organizations of this country will not permit this treatment of their great interests to go unrebuked, and this seemingly studied attempt to belittle their work in adding to the greatness of their country to go unnoticed. [Applause.]

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of every method of restoring our foreign carrying trade and building up our merchant marine except by the payment of subsidies. The last census report shows that in 1856 the values of the imports and exports coming into and leaving our ports on foreign vessels amounted to $159,336,576, while the values of the imports and exports carried on American vessels were $482,268,274, the per cent carried on American vessels being 75.2. In 1866 the values of the imports and exports carried on our vessels had shrunk to $325,711,861, while the imports and exports carried on foreign vessels had increased to $685,226,691, the per cent carried on American vessels being 32.2.

In 1876 the values of the imports and exports carried on American vessels were $311,076,171, while the values of the imports and exports carried on foreign vessels were $813,354,987, the per cent carried on American vessels being 27.7. In 1886 the values of the imports and exports carried on American vessels were $197,349,503, while the values of the imports and exports carried on foreign vessels were $1,073,911,113, the per cent carried on American vessels being 15.5. For the fiscal year 1893 the values of the imports and exports carried on American vessels were $197,765,507, while the values of the imports and exports carried on foreign vessels were $1,428,316,568, the per cent carried on American vessels being 11.5.

I am in favor of giving the shipbuilders of the United States free raw materials; and I believe the shipbuilders of this country can and will successfully compete with the shipbuilders of Europe, because they have said repeatedly before committees of Congress that if Congress would give them free raw material they would compete with the shipbuilders of Europe and build ships as cheaply in this country as any country on earth. In 1869 Mr. John Roach, then a prominent shipbuilder, said before a committee in Congress:

> America has lost her commerce, and what has she obtained in exchange for it? Simply the right of a few men to charge $9 per ton in gold on the importation of pig iron. Pig iron is the basis of all other metals connected with the making and repairing of ships. There has been a revolution in shipbuilding, and iron is the material from which they are now built. The high cost of iron produced by the tariff upon it is one of the principal difficulties our commerce has to contend with. I did not come here to ask a bounty. I came here to tell you that while all other articles of American produce are protected to a great extent there is no protection for American ships. If Congress will take off all the duties from American iron, reducing it to the price of foreign iron, then we are prepared to compete with foreign shipbuilders. The labor question is misstated; we are prepared to meet that difficulty, and to ask no further legislation on the subject.

Later, Mr. Charles M. Cramp, now the greatest shipbuilder in the United States, said before a committee in Congress, in answer to the question as to the amount of duty that was levied upon shipbuilding materials, that that duty was—

> about 40 per cent, and if our shipbuilders could be relieved from that they could compete successfully with foreign builders. The difference in the cost of labor would be overcome by the superiority of American mechanics. Wooden ships will no longer be built, since iron ships are superior in every respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDANNOLD. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITHIAN. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in this Congress has prepared and submitted to this House a report in favor of allowing ships built in foreign countries to be brought into this country and the American flag placed upon them, and to be sailed as American ships; and when-

ever that goes into effect, so soon will the commerce of America be carried on American ships, and no sooner.

We have resorted to the expediency of subsidies time and again. Bill after bill has been passed by Congress giving ships subsidies for the purpose of restoring, as claimed by subsidy advocates, the carrying trade of the United States. In the Fifty-first Congress, when the Farquhar proposition was introduced, the object of which was to give to all classes of ships, both sail and steam ships, a certain subsidy per mile, when that proposition was defeated and what was known as the ocean mail subsidy enacted, the advocates of that proposition claimed that it would be of great benefit and of great advantage to American commerce, because it would build up our foreign carrying trade, that was gradually dwindling year by year to nothing. That expedient has been tried. That law has been in operation since its passage in the Fifty-first Congress, and yet we find that the statistics every year show that the foreign carrying trade is dwindling down until it is now almost nothing.

In 1891 it was 12 per cent, and in 1893 it had dwindled to only 11 per cent, and unless a free-ship bill is passed, giving to the American people the right to go into the markets of the world and buy their ships where they can buy them cheapest, and place the American flag upon them and sail them as American vessels, you will find that the per cent of our foreign carrying trade will continue to dwindle until it will amount to absolutely nothing.

In this connection I desire to call the attention of the committee to a statement made by an eminent gentleman who now occupies a seat in the other branch of this Congress, Senator SHERMAN, of Ohio. He said:

> Since we can not build these vessels within 20 or 30 per cent of the cost in England, why not admit them? Why not admit them duty free, raise the American flag upon them, put American officers upon their decks, and have American lines instead of British lines? Why, sir, if that bill should pass, authorizing foreign ships when owned by American citizens to be used for the present, for three years under the American flag, one-half the lines between New York and England would be American lines in sixty days.

And Senator MORRILL, the venerable Senator from Vermont has said:

> Is it practicable to recall our shipping? I think it is, and by the simplest process. Not a dollar of subsidies. Give us cheap materials and we will do it. Give us the ground on which we stand, so that we shall have our materials just as cheap as they can be afforded elsewhere, and then all these shipyards and all that skilled labor will be at work at once, and you will find that we shall restore the balance of the shipping interests on the ocean that now stand against us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, my apology for addressing the House so soon after taking my seat must lie in the necessity of the occasion. On the banks of the Delaware, in the district which I represent, we have founded an industry which is a glory to the workmen of our country. We challenge competition with any nation of the world, to such an extent that the nations of Europe have sent their experts to examine into the system of shipbuilding which takes place on the banks of the Delaware, which may be called the Clyde of America. We have sent and borne the flag of our country into foreign parts, and now you propose to strike down this industry by allowing finished machinery to come into competition with our home production.

Come with me, gentleman, to the land where the City of New York, which bears our flag, has gone, the newest republic of the western continent, and I will demonstrate to you what will be the result if you pass this amendment to this bill. Brazil buys her ships—has them built on the Clyde. Brazil imports her machinery and puts it in; and now that her navy is called into requisition, where does she stand? Her great men-of-war—none better exist—lie in the harbor of Rio helpless, because she has not the shipyards or the works to repair the damage that takes place by the terrible results of war. Do our Democratic friends mean to pull our country down and put it on a level with the South American republics?

Do you mean, gentlemen, to take away the pride of the American nation and haul down our flag, as you did in Hawaii? [Applause.] Or do you mean to let it fly and float all over the world and protect our interests? There are 7,000 workingmen supported by charity in the city of Philadelphia at this time. The day before I left my home to take my seat in this honored body, a circular such as never before darkened the doors of the City of Brotherly Love was delivered by the postman at every house. It came from the committee of citizens' relief, saying that it was necessary for the people of Philadelphia to contribute $10,000 a week in order to keep alive—whom? paupers?

No; but as good, honest, hardworking American mechanics, skilled and unskilled, as any nation ever produced in the world, who had reached perfection in their respective arts, and who had been supporting and educating their families under the beneficent influence of the glorious doctrine of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.] And yet, now, having threatened our cotton mills, having threatened our woolen mills, you would, by this bill, go further and take away the ship-building interest, which we claim belongs not to Philadelphia, not to Pennsylvania, but to our country from one end to another, for you can not do without it. [Applause on the Republican side.] In addition to this you are striking not alone at the actual yards, but you are striking at the plants which have grown around them, at Bethlehem, at Midvale, and at other places, to supply the necessary elements and materials of the ship-yard.

Pause, my Democratic friends, before you take away the protection necessary to maintain our American interests in foreign lands. You are reaching out in a foreign policy; you must have a navy to enforce it. Strike down our ship-yards, the only yards that amount to anything in America, and you are helpless before England or any other nation from which you must procure your ships and your supplies. This is a matter of patriotic necessity. If we wish to maintain our supremacy on the seas and to hold our heads up among the nations of the earth, we must have a navy that can enforce our mandates and protect our commerce. You can have no extension of commerce whether with free materials or free finished machinery, unless you have a navy that can protect it in every quarter of the world—a navy able to say that our flag shall be protected wherever it may float. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I undertake to say that the continuance of our present system of navigation laws, indorsed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], is the greatest outrage ever perpetrated upon any free people under God's sun. What has been the result? They have compelled the American people to pay annually more than $150,000,000 to the owners of foreign ships. They have reduced our carrying trade, which formerly was carried in American bottoms, from 87 per cent down to about 11 per cent. Whereas under Democratic rule the sails of your commerce whitened every sea and the flag of your mercantile marine was saluted with honor in all the ports of the civilized world, to-day the American traveler sailing the ocean will seldom see the American flag, unless upon some ship of war or solitary transport. Such has been your system of navigation laws supported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and at the same time put into the pockets of our own people more than $100,000,000 of that now sent abroad.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I wish to ask him whether there has been any change in the navigation laws? Are they not precisely the same as they were at the time he speaks of, when our foreign commerce was so prosperous?

Mr. TERRY. There has been substantially no change in the navigation laws themselves, but there has been a change in conditions; and your navigation laws have not been changed to conform to those conditions. As the result of this system of laws, which ought to have been abolished long ago, you have given your foreign trade almost entirely to foreign bottoms——

Mr. FITHIAN. Iron ships have taken the place of wooden ships.

Mr. TERRY. That is it. When England found that under her old system of legislation we were getting the advantage in foreign commerce, she modified her navigation laws, just as we ought to do now under the changed condition of things. By such a change of policy we would build up a carrying trade, as England has done, and cheapen freight upon our farm products.

Gentlemen speak of the glory of the American flag; yet they have deliberately by their laws stricken it down upon the highway of the nations. I am in favor of the proposition advocated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY], looking to the restoration of the American flag to its former glory upon the seas.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and advocated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] proposes to admit free of duty completed marine engines and other completed machinery for steamships. The law as it stands now, and has stood for many years, allows the free entry of all materials necessary for the construction and equipment of vessels to be employed in the foreign trade.

Mr. TARSNEY. That statement of the gentleman is a little too broad. The proposition is to admit those articles specifically enumerated in the law.

Mr. DINGLEY. And that embraces about everything?

Mr. TARSNEY. No, sir; it comprises probably all things required in the old days——

Mr. DINGLEY. Carrying out the principle of admitting materials in the proper sense of the term, is the gentleman willing to limit the amendment to the only things not already covered—materials for the construction of machinery?

Mr. FITHIAN. And repairs?

Mr. DINGLEY. Materials for repairs are now covered by the law.

If this amendment is intended to apply to materials, properly speaking, that is one thing. The law now admits free of duty nearly all materials for the construction and equipment of vessels except materials for the construction of marine engines and machinery. Now, if the intention of the amendment is simply to extend the policy which has prevailed for so many years of admitting free the materials for the construction of the hull and for the equipment and machinery of steam vessels for the foreign trade, then, of course, it is in the line of what we have been doing for a great many years. But the gentleman's amendment provides, I understand, for admitting free of duty completed marine engines and all the completed machinery necessary for steamships.

That is something more than the mere admission of materials. If the gentleman intends only to cover materials in the proper meaning of the term, he should modify his amendment so that such limitation may not remain in doubt.

Mr. TARSNEY. In order that there may be no misunderstanding I will state to the gentleman from Maine that I would be in favor of admitting the entire ship free——

Mr. DINGLEY. Ah!

Mr. TARSNEY. And being in favor of admitting the entire ship free, I am in favor, and that is the purpose of this amendment, of admitting every part of it free.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then when the gentleman talks about being in favor of the free admission of materials for vessels, he means that the completed vessel—the completed marine engine and other completed machinery—should be admitted free of duty. Let us understand each other.

Mr. TARSNEY. I want every raw material or every completed engine which constitutes a component part in the construction of a vessel to be admitted as lumber and hemp and iron and other things entering into the construction of ships have been admitted for years.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been for a long time the policy of this country to admit free of duty materials intended for the construction or manufacture of any article for export. The effect of this is to give what is called free raw material when you wish to construct an article intended for export. It has been extended for many years to the construction of and equipment of vessels that enter into the foreign trade on the ground that that was in the nature of an export, and on the theory that coming as they did in competition with foreign vessels, it was but an act of justice that they should have their materials in the same manner as materials for making articles for export.

In the line of the policy that existed for so many years, if the amendment should be modified so as to add material for the construction of the machinery which would enter into the construction of a marine engine, o course it would not be any variation of the policy. But the gentleman avows that his purpose is not to do that. He wants the engine and machinery constructed abroad, instead of here, without furnishing any labor to our American laborers. If you admit the materials which would enter into the construction of marine engines and machinery free of duty into this country, then the engine and machinery could be built here by our labor. But you propose to have it constructed abroad. That is your proposition, if I understand it; and if that is not the intention you should modify your amendment.

In order to make it perfectly clear what is intended, Mr. Chairman, I will offer an amendment which will make it in line with our previous legislation on this subject.

I am not going to enter into a discussion of the free-ship question to-day, for that is not involved in the amendment. It is not a proposition to admit the complete steamship free of duty.

Mr. TARSNEY. Not at all.

Mr. DINGLEY. That will come up on another bill before the House. This is to admit free of duty the completed marine engine and the completed machinery of the ship, which is practically a proposition providing for the construction of marine engines and of the machinery of steamships abroad and to be sent into this country. That is not in line with the policy which serves to encourage our own industries. There is no country in the world which is building better marine engines than our own at this time.

Mr. TARSNEY. Then there will be no fear of the operation of this law.

Mr. DINGLEY. A few years ago we were not building marine engines to any extent in this country, while to-day we are building the very best that are built in the world; and if they do cost something more than the foreign engines it is because our labor receives more. But the building ought to be done here, and not abroad.

I offer an amendment to the amendment, so as to make it simply a material proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the words "all vessels, including machinery and equipments," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "equipment and construction of machinery of vessels."

Mr. DINGLEY. That makes it simply a material proposition. Under the law already existing, and which has been in force for many years, it admits the materials for the construction of the engine, but not the completed engine itself.

Mr. TARSNEY. We understand the amendment. If the amendment I offered is adopted it will admit the finished engine.

Mr. DINGLEY. Precisely. My amendment provides for having the work of building the engine done here; yours for having it done in Great Britain.

Mr. FITHIAN. If our American workmen could have the material here they could build as cheaply as in Europe.

Mr. DINGLEY. But you do not propose to admit the material; you propose to admit the completed machinery and engine.

Mr. FITHIAN. I propose to admit the material for building the machine and also everything else free.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, but we can not build marine engines if placed in open competition with the cheaper labor of Great Britain in that way. It is simply a proposition to transfer the building of marine engines from this country to Great Britain. That is all there is to it. If you want to do that, go ahead.

Mr. FITHIAN. You are talking about labor, when the shipbuilders of this country have said that if they could get material free they could build as cheaply in this country as in any country in the world—that the labor question was misstated.

Mr. DALZELL. But this is not material.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman let us know whether he wants these engines built here or not? That is the whole question.

Mr. FITHIAN. We want ships built here.

Mr. WALKER was recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], and will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] later.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, there has been no epithet that could be applied to manufacturers, no criticism or depreciation of their character, their patriotism, and their intelligence, within the technical lines of parliamentary law, that has not been visited upon them, both upon those manufacturers who are representing their constituents upon this floor, and all the other manufacturers in this country; and I, for one, protest against the further conduct of debate in that manner.

Let me say here that this proposition of the Ways and Means Committee, that protection is a robbery, but that they propose to continue this robbery to a degree only, rises to the same level of morals that they rise to in political economy when they propose to take off half of the protection now and five years hence the other half. It rises to the same dignity in morals and in political economy that it would in surgery if a physician proposed to amputate a man's leg four inches to-day, four inches a month hence, and four inches at the end of another thirty days, and so on, in order that he might be saved the pain of taking off his whole leg at one time. [Laughter.]

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to you, and to the House through you, that there is not a manufacturer in this country who does not demand absolute free trade now and once for all, rather than to take it by piecemeal. It is better for the manufacturer. He cares nothing whether you have a tariff or do not have a tariff, except for the size of the market, and it will simply reduce the wages of the workingmen, and will not affect the manufacturers who are left by the smallest fraction. This question of protection is one of wages and wages only, and is proved conclusively to be so by the fact that the profits of manufacturers, which are public and known, are not as high as the profits in banking, railroading, and other general industries in this country.

Now, when I put to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] the question whether he would favor bringing into this country free of all charge, and present as a gift to the people, depositing on their doorsteps in the morning so that they might take it into their houses, every dollar's worth of woolen goods that they would need to use for a year, and every dollar's worth of cotton goods they would need to use for a year, and thus throw out of employment and leave to starve or to seek other occupations the men, women, and children engaged in the cotton and the woolen industries, what reply does the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] make? What conclusive answer does he give to that question? What does he say, that shall settle all controversy

and leave the answer clear to the minds of every member of this House?

He sleeps on it from Saturday till Sunday, and between his devotions on Sunday he says to himself, I will say, "The gentleman from Massachusetts is not bound by the ordinary rules of controversy or the ordinary rules of common sense." That is the conclusive answer that is made by this orator from New York, much of whose oratory, when he gets into a difficult position and can not answer, consists in pounding his desk to make so much noise as to drown his voice. [Laughter on the Republican side.] He sleeps on it again until Monday morning, and on Monday he whispers to his friends on the other side of the House. "I will fix him, I will answer him conclusively." [Laughter.] "The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] is not bound by the ordinary rules of controversy or by the ordinary rules of common sense." [Laughter.] "He is a manufacturer, and a man who has been said by one of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means to have his hands in the pockets of all the workingmen, taking out of them their money to make himself rich." That is the conclusive answer this great orator from New York makes to my question.

A MEMBER on the Democratic side. Is it true?

Mr. WALKER (continuing). On the Democratic side they cheer the gentleman whether he sits up or sits down, whether he stands up or stands down, on his head or on his feet. [Laughter and applause.]

Monday morning he repeats it, Tuesday morning he presents this delicious, this conclusive answer, this great discovery in political economy; and then this morning, after having enjoyed the luxury of it by telling it over and over to his personal friends, he comes in and tells it to the House, "Mr. WALKER is not bound by the ordinary rules of courtesy and the ordinary rules of common sense."

Mr. COCKRAN. Will you allow me for a moment?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I will.

Mr. COCKRAN. I merely desire to say that the gentleman is mistaken as to my saying, "Mr. WALKER is not bound by the rules of courtesy." That would be an absolutely improper remark, and an unfounded remark.

Mr. WALKER. "Controversy."

Mr. COCKRAN. As to that, I can not do violence to the truth of history. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEIL in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALKER. He has furthermore a conclusive answer; and you will find that when he——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCKRAN. I move to strike out the last word, and yield to the gentleman five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. I do not think that that will do.

Mr. COCKRAN. May I ask indulgence of the committee to permit the gentleman to proceed longer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has been extended.

Mr. WALKER. Now, then, when the gentleman gets on his feet again I hope he will do something besides pounding his desk. [Great laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Would you rather I pound you? [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. Yes; I think it would do better service to pound me, for it never hurt me to be pounded. [Great laughter.] I have had my share of it in this House and have given some. I never take any exception to being pounded by great or small, even by a man who rises so much higher than the manufacturers as the gentleman from New York.

It takes genius and overpowering intellect to make so conclusive an answer as that: "Mr. WALKER is not bound by the ordinary rules of controversy or the ordinary rules of common sense." [Renewed laughter.]

Another great economic proposition which he puts to the House, and that is, when anybody replies to him he will quote about four words at the beginning and about four words at the end, putting in about three in the middle and adding about two, and then he will say, "That is what he said." [Great laughter.] "Is there any gentleman on this floor that will say that that is not the proposition the gentleman makes?" [Renewed laughter.] "I gave him time to answer every time," but every time he answered he adds further to the misrepresentation. He is as unfair a man in controversy as I ever discovered. [Laughter.] Then he says, "Will not a day's labor produce more here than it will produce in England or France or Germany?"

That is consistent with the fairness of the gentleman. That is in accordance with the gentleman's fairness of debate and of stating a proposition. Why did he not include "with the same appliances"? Then his question would have been a fair question. "A day's labor with the same appliances." Do we produce here more than they produce in England France, or Germany with the same appliances? No! I tell you, no. I tell you that I have seen more than a hundred workingmen in my district who had worked at the loom and at the anvil and the forge in England and in France and in Germany, in my office, and they gave me the yards and feet and pounds they produced in Europe; and they produced just the same there as here, "without variableness or shadow of turning." They have the same machinery there. They take our machinery as fast as we can produce it.

I say, "No." I say there is, possibly, a small margin. We are about five years ahead of them on the general average. We are about five years ahead in economics, and at the end of each five years there is nothing that can not be bought here cheaper than in Europe at the date just five years previous. With the exception of steel and iron, by the Bessemer process particularly, and in other inventions of steel and iron, the gentleman can not mention to me a solitary thing that has not been cheapened first here and then the machinery taken there. Then, again, the gentleman [Mr. COCKRAN] says, "The value of wages depend upon the competition in employment." I suppose that this great economic authority, who has his desk piled sky-high with musty volumes, so old that they are out of date, to quote from—I suppose what he meant to say was, "Does the 'cost' of wages depend upon the competition for employment"?

I tell him no. I tell him no! [Laughter.] And when I have time, which you will not give me now, I will conclusively prove it to you. I tell you it was never known since the world began that you could crowd the wages of workingmen down. They will starve, their wives and children will starve with them, but they will never go down. When it comes to that the countries will decay first. Workingmen will go down a little, but I mean they will never go down substantially, and when I come to have the ear of this House for an hour I will show you why. Never have wages gone down in this country substantially. In 1844 they were ninety eight and they went down to ninety-two, and it took sixteen years to get them back to one hundred, just two points higher, through all those years of agony. It was precisely the same from 1873 to 1878. Thousands upon thousands of the workingmen walked our streets. Tramps were on all our roads. Nearly all the States of the North passed laws concerning tramps, because American workingmen would not go down in their wages.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes more.

Mr. COCKRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to continue for five minutes. I would like to have him explain the distress between 1873 and 1878, during a high-tariff period.

Mr. WALKER. That explanation is exactly what I will give the gentleman if I can have time. Does not the gentleman remember that our tariff was paid in gold, that from 1873 to 1879 it took a large premium on gold to pay the tariff? Does he not know that we paid for our foreign goods in gold, and that that formed a large element also in the price of the goods, even between 1873 and 1879, though it had been a great deal larger before; so that the economic result was that the tariff was being practically reduced as the price of gold went down, and that made the panic of 1873 chargeable as a result of a practical reduction of the tariff. And you never knew a hard financial crisis, long-continued industrial depression in this country, that it was not under a Democratic free-trade tariff; as in 1837 under the sliding downward tariff of 1832; that of 1857 under the tariff of 1846, from 1873 to 1879, under the resumption of specie payment, the economic equivalent of a tariff reduction; and now, in 1893, it comes because you threaten the tariff so that manufacturers do not dare operate their factories, nor the jobbers buy goods, or retailers of jobbers, and therefore men can not find employment.

Mr. BLAND. Does the gentleman admit that the tariff goes up as the premium on gold goes up, and down as the premium on gold goes down?

Mr. WALKER. It does, in our currency, when there is a premium upon our money.

Mr. BLAND. Then, did you vote to increase the price of gold in order to increase the tariff?

Mr. WALKER. No, sir; because the tariff is not now payable in gold, and the gentleman from Missouri ought to know it. He ought not to undertake to deceive this House or to impose upon its members or the country by any such question as that. He knows better.

Now, I want to say to this committee that trade is not between countries. Trade between countries! What an economic statement that is for a gentleman of so much mental and physical eloquence as the gentleman from New York! [Laughter.] Trade is always between individuals, between factories, and it is to-day

just as though all the factories in the world were operating in this country and were situated end to end and the workmen in them elbow to elbow at their varying wages.

[Mr. COCKRAN here made a remark in an undertone.]

Mr. WALKER (to Mr. COCKRAN). Oh, you will not get me mad. I do not get mad. Ask your questions. I do not ask sympathy from you or any other man. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I was simply remarking in an undertone to a gentleman beside me that I was slowly but surely getting mad, but I did not expect the gentleman from Massachusetts to hear the remark.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman's facility in transferring the application of his statements is equal to his facility in pounding his desk for eloquence. [Laughter.]

Why, do you know what the balance of trade was through all our free-trade times and all our protectionist times? What does it signify? Let the gentleman tell if he can. He is smarter than I am. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I want to make the distinction between the gentleman from New York and the class that he represents, on the one hand, and this "robber baron," this "American shark," on the other hand, as prominent and distinctive as I can, and I take my place with the shark. [Great laughter.]

Why, sir, does not the gentleman know that if we import $250,000,000 worth of goods, it is a physical necessity under the laws of labor and economics that the 1,000,000 of people who would manufacture those goods, reckoning all workers at $250 a year, must necessarily be thrown out of employment; and it would take a whole generation for them to be relocated in other employments? But the gentleman's sole and exclusive answer to this statement rises but little above the dignity of his answer to my proposition about "shutting up the woolen factories;" which is, "I say so; Tom says so; Dick says so; and these gentlemen have PH. D., D. D., or LL. D. after their names; and therefore what they say is true."

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COCKRAN. I will ask a moment, gentlemen of the committee, for a little colloquy with my friend.

Mr. WALKER. Certainly; that is what I am looking for. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. On behalf of my friends on this side of the House, and I may say on behalf of human nature generally, I want to protest most solemnly against the classification which the gentleman has made of himself. If there is anything that looks like a "shark" in the composition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I have yet to discover it. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts stands—in appearance at least—for everything that is benevolent and good-natured. The result of this discussion tends to place him in a position before this House such as he never occupied before.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, you do not know; you have not been here all the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. If I have missed any occasion when the gentleman has participated in debate, my loss has been great indeed.

Mr. WALKER. No doubt. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the grievance of the gentleman so far as I am concerned——

Mr. WALKER. Oh, I have no grievance; you have done me a service.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, that now we are quits. I may say——

Mr. WALKER. I do not wonder you call "quits." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that. We are not quits. I am doubly indebted to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Order must be restored on the floor.

Mr. COCKRAN. If I understand the ground of the gentleman's criticism it is that when he propounded to me the question as to what would happen in this country if $250,000,000 worth of goods were given to the people of this nation as a present——

Mr. WALKER. Cotton and woolen goods; be right for once in your life.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York must not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, I hope the Chair will make an exception in the case of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I say that the ground of the gentleman's criticism was that when he asked me what the effect of a gift of $250,000,000 worth of cotton and woolen goods to the people of this country would be, I answered the gentleman was not bound by the ordinary rules of controversy or the ordinary limits of common sense. Now, Mr. Chairman, there may have been some doubt as to the propriety of that remark before the gentleman last spoke. But when he has occupied the attention of the committee to make the statement that if those $250,000,000 worth of goods were landed in this country, every man's share being deposited at his doorstep, so that every person who chose might take his portion into his house, it would plunge the people of Massachusetts into destitution, he has justified anything that I may have said. What, may I ask, would the men who had taken their share of this $250,000,000 worth of goods do with them? How could they be in want while they had their portion of this gift of $250,000,000 worth of goods?

Mr. WALKER. What would become of the men who ought to have been engaged in the making of those goods?

Mr. COCKRAN. Are we to be told that the manufacturer would be so potent as to rob the laborer even of his share of this gift? [Applause.]

A MEMBER. The laborer could not eat cotton.

Mr. COCKRAN. A gentleman who sits behind the gentleman from Massachusetts, says the laborer could not eat cotton. Surely the gentleman would starve if the rule invoked by him were universal; for I am not aware that he produces anything edible or even tangible.

When a person obtains $250,000,000 worth of any kind of goods he can purchase other goods with them; I presume the gentleman from Massachusetts will not deny that.

Mr. WALKER. We were speaking about their using them, my friend, not selling them.

Mr. COCKRAN. Well, if they were limited to using them the goods certainly would not be a gift, because a gift implies the right of the person who receives it to dispose of it as he chooses. [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" on the Republican side and laughter.]

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts has made another criticism, and I want to apologize to him again. He finds ground for criticism in the fact that I have quoted a great number of books. I acquit the gentleman of any charge of even consulting one book. [Laughter.] But when he explains that the panic of 1873 came upon us because the tariff was reduced through the fall in the premium on gold, I would like to ask him why the Republican party in 1883 reduced that tariff still further?

Mr. WALKER. That was ten years afterward, was it not?

Mr. COCKRAN. Are you willing to admit, then, that in the progress of events a tariff should be reduced in amount?

Mr. WALKER. A tariff is a purely business arrangement, that may need altering as any other business arrangement may need altering, and the Republicans reduced the tariff in 1883 to reduce the revenue, as they did again in 1890 to reduce the revenue. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, I can take leave of the subject on that statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. He declares that in 1890 the tariff was reduced by the passage of the McKinley tariff act. If that statement comports with the sense of this House, then the gentleman has made a valuable contribution to the discussion. The fact of the matter is, however, that law made an actual increase in the tariff rates. It operated to remove this country still further from that reduction of duties which the gentleman from Massachusetts now declares should be a result of the continuance of the tariff system. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill and amendment as I understand it are for the purpose of letting in machinery and things that go into the construction of machinery, and also things that go into the construction of ships. What for? Presumably for the purpose of cheapening the cost of producing ships. The gentlemen on the Republican side are always making their argument from the standpoint that they want to protect the American laborer and to protect the American farmer. The American farmer and agriculturist, as I have had occasion to suggest before, are nearly one-half of the population of this country. A large part of the products of the farmer must seek a market in foreign countries. Anything that tends to cheapen the means of transportation tends to increase the profits upon agricultural products.

Mr. Chairman, for what have we spent millions of dollars in the opening up of the waterways of this country through the lakes and rivers if we can not avail ourselves of cheap transportation by securing the building of cheap ships in this country? What avail is it, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to put up a tariff that shuts us off from building up a commercial marine to reap the advantages of all of those waterways that lead to the sea? Under your protective tariff system we have destroyed our merchant marine and given a hundred millions of dollars every year to foreign ships that carry our commerce.

We can build ships and navigate them more cheaply than any other nation in the world.

It surprises me that the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Maine, who are always posing as friends of labor, should oppose this righteous reduction in the cost of building ships. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, these people are not

friends of labor. To prove this I want to have read a letter written by the gentleman who has just taken his seat, showing that he is not the friend of labor, showing besides that he does not understand the principles of this Government, and showing further that he has forgotten a lesson that was taught by his forefathers and the battle that was fought for the right of petition by the people of this country. I ask to have this letter read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, *January 12, 1894.*

GENTLEMEN: I have received the resolutions beginning, "*Resolved*, That we, the Central Labor Union of Worcester, Mass., etc., heartily indorse the Wilson bill, although only a modicum of the relief demanded."

Allow me to say to you that I shall not present these resolutions to Congress, because I do not believe that they express the opinions of a majority of the members of the Central Labor Union of Worcester.

I do not believe a majority of members of the union are in such besotted ignorance of economic law and present economic conditions, or what has brought idleness, hunger, and suffering to a very large proportion of the working people of Worcester and the country, and, I fear, in too many cases will bring death to your fellows or members of your families, as to deliberately adopt such resolutions, fully understanding their significance.

I believe if the majority of the members of the Central Labor Union have deliberately adopted the resolutions you sent me, that they were imposed upon and deceived by mercenary and unprincipled emissaries.

In behalf of the wage-workers, who form a very large majority of the people who elected me to the Fifty-third Congress, I repudiate and denounce this action as traitorous to their cause.

Regretting your want of intelligence. If you honestly believe the interests of workingmen will be advanced by the adoption of the Wilson bill, I am proud to be the servant of every intelligent and honest workingman in the Third Congressional district of Massachusetts.

Very truly, yours,

J. H. WALKER.

To Mr. MICHAEL O'DEA, *President*,
Mr. DONALD SMITH, *Secretary*,
Central Labor Union, Worcester, Mass.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, if there is any evidence in that letter, or anything that goes to prove that the workingmen of that city and State did not understand what they wanted, I think if there is any evidence of their ignorance or misunderstanding of who should properly represent them, it has been clearly proved while we have been listening to the explanation of economic laws delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] whether he believes that all trade should be free?

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman asks a very proper question, whether I believe that all trade should be free. I certainly do believe that all trade should be free. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania. Well, then, I would like to ask the gentleman why, in his own town of Medicine Lodge, the city has by ordinance provided that peddlers shall pay a license of $3 per day for trading in that city? The mayor of the city has sent me this dispatch:

We have a city ordinance providing that peddlers pay a license of $3 per day for trading in our city. Ordinance is popular.

Now, why is it that the people of his town believe in having their home market for themselves, rather than giving it free to the traveling peddlers who come there? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMPSON. The only way I can explain that to the gentleman is, that that town gives a Republican majority at every election. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see to what this principle of protection will lead us if carried to its logical conclusion. In olden times in England they had a large tax upon window glass, and it was said then, "If you abolish this tax upon window glass and enable the people to have cheap window glass so as to admit the sunlight of heaven, you will destroy the industry of making tallow candles, and thereby drive a large part of the community out of business and deprive them of that means of making a living." [Laughter.] That is the doctrine of protection carried to its last conclusion.

Now, I speak in favor of this bill, and in favor of this particular amendment, because I believe that a large portion of the community will be benefited by admitting free of tax or duty the materials which go into the construction of ships, thereby cheapening the means of transportation to carry the goods that labor produces to foreign countries and to different parts of our own country, and that thereby a large part of the community will be benefited.

I do not take that narrow view of the question which is taken by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] whereby he would benefit the few who produce these articles.

I am looking out for the interests of the consumer; and if I had my way and my vote would bring it about I would extend this not alone to the ships that sail upon the ocean between our country and foreign countries, but I would extend it to every ship in the coastwise trade and every ship that sails upon our inland seas, so as to cheapen the means of communication and transportation on every waterway in the United States. Why, we have in our coastwise and in our inland trade, I suppose, one hundred vessels to every one we will have upon the ocean trading with foreign countries, and larger benefits would come by extending this measure so as to reach not alone the ocean-going steamers on the Atlantic and Pacific, but those that sail on the lakes and rivers and in the coastwise trade of this country.

That is all I wish to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the fact that time is passing, and the time allotted for the consideration of this entire measure is so short, in consideration of the fact that there are more important matters to discuss than the pending amendment, I now ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken upon the pending amendment to the present paragraph.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Let us have a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will first be taken upon the amendment to the amendment. The Clerk will again report the amendment, and then the proposed amendment to the amendment.

The amendment and the amendment to the amendment were again read.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, this simply limits the amendment to the materials for the construction of marine engines, whereas the other amendments admit the completed marine engines and the machinery.

Mr. TARSNEY. That is right.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, on page 46, line 23, Schedule K, relating to wool, an amendment to incorporate in this bill the existing law as to wool. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

375. All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals shall be divided for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon into the three following classes:

376. Class one, that is to say, Merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools, or other wools of Merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated in classes two and three.

377. Class two, that is to say, Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and also hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

378. Class three, that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camels hair, and including all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for.

379. The standard samples of all wools which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be the standards for the classification of wools under this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall have the authority to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other custom-houses of the United States when they may be needed.

380. Whenever wools of class three shall have been improved by the admixture of Merino or English blood from their present character as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty either as class one or as class two, as the case may be.

381. The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed; and the duty on wools of the first and second classes which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed.

382. Unwashed wools shall be considered such as shall have been shorn from the sheep without any cleansing; that is, in their natural condition. Washed wools shall be considered such as have been washed with water on the sheep's back. Wool washed in any other manner than on the sheep's back shall be considered as scoured wool.

383. The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, or which shall be changed in its character or condition for the purpose of evading the duty, or which shall be reduced in value by the admixture of dirt or any other foreign substance, or which has been sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject: *Provided*, That skirted wools as now imported are hereby excepted. Wools on which a duty is assessed amounting to three times more than that which would be assessed if said wool was imported unwashed, such duty shall not be doubled on account of its being sorted. If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act imported as of any specified class, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable

as of any specified class shall contain any wool or hair subject to a higher rate of duty than the class so specified, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the highest rate of duty chargeable on wool of the class subject to such higher rate of duty, and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

384. The duty upon all wools and hair of the first class shall be 11 cents per pound (48.86 to 66.96 per cent), and upon all wools or hair of the second class 12 cents per pound (43.60 to 91.68 per cent).

385. On wools of the third class and on camel's hair of the third class the value whereof shall be 13 cents or less per pound, including charges, the duty shall be 32 per cent ad valorem (32 to 64 per cent).

386. On wools of the third class, and on camel's hair of the third class, the value whereof shall exceed 13 cents per pound, including charges, the duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem (50 to 100 per cent).

387. Wools on the skin shall pay the same rate as other wools, the quantity and value to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered brings before the committee in distinct shape the question of free or protected wool. The proposition I have offered is to embody in this bill existing law in regard to wool. The committee have offered in their bill to put wool on the free list. I desire to say that that proposition has been incorporated in the committee's bill, not in obedience to any public demand, but in the face of general and almost universal protest.

Mr. Chairman, I will wait until gentlemen will yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appeals to gentlemen to cease conversation, or retire to the cloak room. Gentlemen in the aisles will cease conversation.

Mr. BURROWS. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the proposition for free wool incorporated in this bill by the committee has not been asked for by any petition from any source except the one I hold in my hand, while it has been protested against almost universally. The only petition presented to the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of free wool from any portion of the United States is the petition of the Thurman Club of Columbus, Ohio, signed by the president and secretary of the club. I will not stop——

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen in front of the Chair, on the right, will please restore order.

Mr. BURROWS. I will not stop to read the resolutions adopted by this club, except in the first resolve they ask for "free wool, free coal, and free sugar." They must have forgotten, for the moment, we have free sugar now. But that is the only petition addressed to the Ways and Means Committee demanding free wool. I have before me a petition or remonstrance, or rather remonstrances, against putting wool on the free list; and I do not at this time, possibly not at any time, propose to enter into any discussion of the question, but I desire to have the Clerk read the petition and remonstrance, without reading the names, of 376 citizens of the State of Texas, presented by Mr. ABBOTT of Texas, in opposition to free wool, coming from his State, where they have over 4,000,000 head of sheep and the largest sheep-growing country in the United States. Although gentleman on the other side will not listen to debate, I trust they will hear the voice of their constituents. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To Hon. Jo Abbott,
Congressman, Sixth Congressional District, State of Texas:

We, the undersigned voters, respectfully request that you use your utmost influence to prevent a reduction of tariff on wool, for the following reasons:

First. That Texas alone owns about 4,000,000 sheep, or about one-tenth of all the sheep of the United States. Of this Bosque County alone owns about 82,000 head, bringing into our country every year a revenue from sales of wool and mutton about $140,000,000, which is expended at home for feed, herding, shearing, salt, shedding, lease of lands, etc.

Second. There is a vast amount of rough lands in this State now being utilized by the sheep industry, paying a good revenue, as the lands thus used increase their taxable value, which otherwise would be comparatively useless.

Third. That the agitation of a reduction on the tariff of wools, heretofore and now, has caused this product to drop from 18 cents and 20 cents to 6 cents and 8 cents per pound, in fact no sale at all, and the value of sheep in proportion.

Fourth. Taking into consideration the great number of men who are engaged directly and indirectly in this industry, and the vast amount expended annually among all classes of people, we think sufficient for setting forth the above reasons, as the herewith appended signatures of all classes will show.

We sign this regardless of party affiliations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask the indulgence of the committee for a few minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask the Clerk to read a remonstrance from the State of Indiana, signed by a large number of her citizens.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the honorable members of the Fifty-third Congress of the United States:

Whereas as the result of a general belief that the tariff on woolen goods will be reduced and wool put on the free list, the price of wool is now below the cost of production; and

Whereas we believe that if wool is put on the free list and the tariff on woolen goods materially reduced, the price of wool will be still lower; and

Whereas we can not afford to raise wool in competition with free wool raised in other countries like Australia, where the wool-grower rents land from the government at a less rental than we pay in taxes on our land, and receives government aid and encouragement; and

Whereas the lands of these United States are well suited to the raising of sheep, provided that we can get a fair price for our wool and mutton; and

Whereas we believe it is to the best interest of this country to prevent the slaughter of a large proportion of the sheep of this country, which will be the certain result of a further reduction in the price of wool:

We the undersigned farmers and wool-growers, irrespective of party, do hereby petition and beg that your honorable body will make no change in the present tariff affecting the wool and woolen schedule now in force.

Mr. BURROWS. I also hold in my hand several remonstrances from the State of Oregon. I desire to have read also a remonstrance which I presented a few days ago signed by 1,100 citizens of the State of Texas, protesting against free wool, and I trust gentlemen on the other side will listen to it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the reading of these different remonstrances may as well be omitted, as they all seem to be in the same form.

Mr. BURROWS. This one is not in the same form. Let the remonstrance be read, Mr. Chairman.

The remonstrance was read, as follows:

To the honorable members of the Fifty-third Congress of the United States:

We, your petitioners, wool-growers, merchants, and business men of West Texas, regardless of party, would respectfully represent as follows:

As a result of the general belief that wool will be put upon the free list, its price has fallen within the last twelve months from 15 cents to 6 cents per pound, and the value of our sheep from $2.50 to $1 per head.

Under a free schedule, foreign wools of a character competing with those grown in this section could be laid down in Boston to-day for 30 cents per scoured pound.

Allowing 70 per cent for shrinkage, our wools in same market would be worth 9 cents per pound in the grease, and deducting freight, scouring, and marketing charges, will leave to the grower a net value of 5 cents per pound, at least 5 cents a pound below the cost of the most economical production.

It is our belief that if wool is placed upon the free list there will be no material advance in the values above submitted.

Wool-growing is the prominent industry of West Texas, and the continuance of the present range of values for our main product, which may be fairly looked for under free wool, will bring ruin to the sheep industry in Texas and widespread loss and disaster to the mercantile and other interests dependent upon its prosperity.

There are two hundred thousand persons in West Texas alone almost directly dependent upon the wool interests.

With free wool one hundred thousand of them will be obliged to seek a living and occupation elsewhere.

In view of these facts, we your petitioners, beg that your honorable body make no material changes in the wool schedule now in force.

[Eleven hundred signers.]

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning, I have no desire to debate this question, because I know that anything we might say on this side will be of no service to influence the vote on this question, but I thought that gentlemen on the other side would perhaps be glad to hear from their own constituents, and therefore I have presented these large petitions from the State of Texas, from the people that gentlemen are sent here to represent, protesting against free wool. The majority of this House propose, very properly perhaps, urging the admission of New Mexico as a State into the Union. But they couple with that now, in this proposition, the destruction of her chief industry, and it may be a question whether she will appreciate their efforts to bring her into the Union as a State with her industries destroyed.

I ask the Clerk now to read a letter from a former member of this House, a delegate from the Territory of New Mexico, as to the effect that free wool will have upon the industries of that Territory.

Mr. SPRINGER. A Republican delegate?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know, and I do not care whether he was a Republican or a Democrat. I ask that this letter be read.

The letter was read, as follows:

WAGON MOUND, N. MEX., *December 10, 1893.*

SIR: Knowing that you are a member of the Committee of Ways and Means, and that your committee has now under consideration the McKinley bill, with a view of reducing the tariff on foreign wools under the free-tariff doctrine; and I being a wool-grower, for the last forty years a citizen of this great country, which offers protection to its citizens when asked for; I now, as such citizen and wool-grower, ask that our native wools be protected, and that the McKinley bill be left to stand such as it was originally, for the following reasons:

1. That already, with the present agitation of free wools, this section of the country has placed the sheep-growers in a state of bankruptcy.

2. That we can not grow and sell our wools here as cheap as foreign wools when they are almost as good, because our labor is 50 per cent higher, and our freights to Eastern markets are 300 per cent higher than those on foreign wools are, when the distance of transportation of ours is not half as far as the transportation of foreign wools.

3. Our wools here only netted us 10½ cents per pound this year, on account of the free-trade agitation, against 21 cents per pound last year, under the firmness of protective tariff supported by the McKinley bill.

4. If our wools are placed on the free lists to compete with foreign wools,

our wools will be worth on our farms, after paying all expenses, from 3 to 5 cents per pound, and that will compell every sheep-raiser to give up the wool industry, and that will cause our country in a very few years to even have our mutton shipped to us from foreign countries; and that, of course, would be a very nice protection to our citizens and country.

5. It has been stated that wool growing east of the Mississippi on high-priced lands under free wool might cease to be an industry; but that in the Rocky Mountain region the industry would thrive under free wool.

In the Rocky Mountain region as well as east of the Mississippi the wool will cease to be an industry under free wool, because our Rocky Mountain lands are every day being taken up for agricultural purposes and the sheep range is thereby being limited, so that in a short time on account of the rise in price of lands the wool will cease to be an industry under free wool in the Rocky Mountain region as well as east of the Mississippi.

6. Sheep of all kinds have this fall been shipped to the Eastern markets to be slaughtered by the millions, irrespective of quality, caused by the agitation of free wool and the great decline in the price of wool this year. Raisers refused last year for their one and two year old wethers from $1.75 to $2.75 per head, respectively, on account of the good price that their wools were bringing them under protective tariff. To-day the same sheep are being sold by the millions from 75 cents to $1.50 per head. This great decline has been caused by the free-wool agitation, placing thereby all the sheep-raisers almost in a state of bankruptcy, because to sell their wools this year at from 7 to 9 cents per pound and their wethers at from 75 cents to $1.50 per head against 17 to 22 cents per pound for wool and from $1.75 to $2.75 per head for sheep last year, they could not this year meet their obligations with their banks and merchants which they had incurred in anticipation of their getting last year's prices for their wools and under protective tariff. I can safely say that the scare is such that in the Rocky Mountain region one-half of the sheep have been shipped to the Eastern markets so that they be slaughtered, fearing that wools will be placed in the free list.

7. Under the Constitution of the United States of America, being the most sacred document which we own and of which we are so proud, being that it surpasses those of all other nations under the sun, its citizens are offered protection in all their branches of industry, and for that one reason alone those representing our nation in the national Halls should see that their citizens and their industries be protected as promised by our Constitution and not let a few of those which are more pledged to money by means of aiding foreign industries thereby enriching themselves and working against the interest of the American people in general and against our Constitution in particular. While I think unwise parting from the wool industry entirely until the present free-wool tariff fight is over, still there are hundreds of small wool-raisers that are leaving the wool industry drop entirely by selling their sheep in order to pay up for what they bought and the expenses they incurred at the beginning of the present year in anticipation of their getting last year's prices for their wool and sheep.

8. Wool can not thrive in this country without protection, in order to compete with Australian and other foreign wools, because the cost of keeping our sheep in this country is twice as much as the cost of keeping them in Australia. There the government fences their lands, sinks their wells, and leases them to sheep-growers for less money than what we have to pay for taxes alone in this country on our sheep. I find already that in freight rates alone from the Rocky Mountain region to our Eastern markets our rate is from 2½ to 3 cents per pound, against one-fourth of a cent per pound from London to our same Eastern markets. That alone I consider a great injustice against the wool-grower of the United States.

9. Should the McKinley duty of 11 cents per pound be taken off of foreign wools and with the reduced freight which they now have in their favor, they could well afford to sell their wools in our own Eastern markets say at 10 cents per pound, and at that price it would leave them a fair margin. While if our native wools should bring the same amount per pound after paying all expenses it would almost starve the raiser, and force him to step out of the industry; because at such prices per pound we can not possibly raise our sheep and make it a self-sustaining business. It costs us from 10 to 15 cents per head to take care of our sheep in this country without the 10 to 15 per cent loss of sheep per year, and the enormous tax rates which are imposed upon all the taxpayers in this country.

10. In 1892, and up to the time of the present movement of the free wool agitation, we did not have to go outside of our Territory to find buyers for our sheep, but there were more buyers than sellers here, and paying us the prices stated to you before; now we have to ship them East to be sold for almost nothing because there are no buyers here; they have all been scared away on account of the free wool agitation. No buyer seems to have confidence in the coming Congress, and fear that the foreign wools will be placed on the free lists, therefore are anxiously waiting the action of the coming Congress before investing in sheep or wool, thereby retarding the industry.

11. The future prospect of free wool has caused one-third of our wool-growers to go into bankruptcy, who were previously solvent, and prosperous and solvent, and perhaps force as many more before the end of the present year is out, all caused by the free-wool agitation, thereby causing thousands of men to be thrown out of employment and perhaps compel them to become common beggars.

12. Sheep heretofore have been paying the running expenses to their investors; this year they have fallen way behind of their doing so, even going as far as to place raisers to be compelled by their creditors to sacrifice their sheep in order to pay up their debts, because the wool industry this year did not bring the usual prices but instead brought only one-third.

The present Administration, in my opinion, seems to be inclined to protect foreign industries in our country in order to demoralize ours and compel our citizens, instead of protecting them, to compel them to leave for a foreign one as the last resort to save themselves from starvation.

Hoping, sir, that my few opinions from experience will be of some service to you, knowing that you are in favor of protecting home industries, and wishing you success in the present free-wool fight, I remain, sir,

Very respectfully,

TRINIDAD ROMERO,
Ex-Member to Congress from New Mexico, and late United States Marshal, New Mexico.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS,
Member of Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask indulgence to present one other remonstrance which is not long.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURROWS. I have a large number of remonstrances from New Mexico, and the sentiment of the people there, so far as I have been able to ascertain it from letters and from other communications, is almost universally against putting wool on the free list.

This may suggest to gentlemen on the other side that by admitting New Mexico as a State they will gain no political advantage if they are going to destroy one of her chief industries.

I also hold in my hand a remonstrance from the Territory of Utah. You propose to admit her into the Union, but before that act is consummated, you propose to destroy one of her great industries, and that may affect the political character of that would-be State. I ask to have the remonstrance read.

The remonstrance was read, as follows:

The woolen industry in this Territory prior to 1893, was in a prosperous condition, and the growers were doing fairly well. The effect of the free-wool agitation for the last six months or more has been demoralizing to the sheep-raiser and our Territory.

There are many reasons why wool can not be produced as cheaply in this section as in foreign countries. We pay for herders from $35 to $50 per month, shearing costs from 4 to 7 cents per head, transportation by rail is from seven to nine times higher than by water, which the other wool-producing countries enjoy, and the average annual loss to our flocks, caused by rigid winters and wild animals, reaches at least 10 per cent. The average yearly cost of running 2,500 sheep, the usual number in a flock, is about as follows:

To 2 herders, at $35 per month each	$840.00
To board for same, $15 per month	180.00
To shearing, at 4 to 7 cents, say 5 cents	125.00
To sacks and twine and sacking wool	32.20
To dipping, twice a year, 5 cents per head	125.00
To taxes, $2 per head assessed valuation	50.00
To five horses	175.00
To camp equipment	150.00
To 2 tons oats, winter feed, and freighting, same	60.00
To loss by wild animals and poverty, 10 per cent, 250 sheep, at $2 per head	500.00
Total	2,237.20

CREDITS.

By wool off 2,250 sheep, 6 pounds per head—13,500 pounds at 8 cents per pound (present price for best wools)	$1,080.00	
By increase 35 per cent or 787 lambs, probably worth $1 per head	787.00	
		1,867.00
Loss due to anticipated Democratic legislation, not counting owner's time or interest on capital invested		370.20

Wools netted us 60 per cent less this year than any previous year.

If wool is placed on the free list, and prices fall to present London prices, or free-trade level, our wools would bring us, on the farm, from 3 to 6 cents per pound.

If wool is admitted free of duty it will not be possible for the industry to exist in this Rocky Mountain region. The prospect has demoralized business to such an extent that in many cases growers are bankrupt.

Thousands of sheep have gone to the markets to be slaughtered because of the low price of wool. Growers were compelled to part with part of their flocks in order to meet obligations, the price obtained for wool this season not being ample to pay running expenses.

It will be utterly impossible for us to compete with the foreign wool producer, if the tariff is removed, for the reason that in Australia sheep graze out all the year, the pasture is better there in winter than in summer, the government fences the lands, sinks the wells, and leases the lands in large tracts for less money than we pay in taxes alone.

If the present McKinley duty is removed, wool-raising in the Rockies will go "Democratic."

According to good authority, the scoured cost of wool in the average suit of clothes would be about 75 cents cheaper under free trade than protection. It is plain that this small reduction would not nearly offset the 11 cents per pound reduction on wool, therefore the object of cheapening clothing for the masses by removing the tariff on wool would be defeated, and this great source of labor and revenue destroyed.

The average price of sheep in 1892 was $2.75—this year $1.25—caused by low price of wool.

The demand for sheep last year was good and more than the supply. The reason for this change—the Chicago Democratic platform.

There has been a material reduction, during the season, in the number of sheep, spring losses were extra heavy, and thousands have been marketed in Omaha, Kansas City, and Chicago.

The free-wool prospect has virtually bankrupted 75 per cent of the growers in these parts, and a large proportion of the business houses are much affected through the inability of the sheep men to meet their obligations.

Wool has paid the running expenses heretofore and has failed for the first time this year. Flocks have had to be reduced to satisfy creditors.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I thought I would not trespass further upon the committee, but, if they will indulge me, I will ask to have read a communication from the State of Nevada, in which the matter is presented so clearly that I am sure gentlemen on the other side will be interested in hearing it read.

Mr. SPRINGER. There need be no objection to printing the names signed to that petition, as it would be easy to print the names of the whole population of Nevada. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURROWS. Whatever criticism the gentleman from Illinois desires to make upon the people of Nevada of course lies with him. I have nothing to say about it.

Mr. CRAIN. Is the gentleman from Michigan going to have the names of those Texans who signed that memorial from Texas published in the RECORD?

Mr. BURROWS. I did not ask it, but I should be very happy to have it done if the gentleman from Texas will make the request.

Mr. CRAIN. I do.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] asks that the 1,100 names signed to one of these remonstrances from Texas, and also the 275 names signed to the remonstrance sent to the Hon. Mr. ABBOTT, be printed in the RECORD. I trust there will be no objection.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I feel constrained to ob-

ject, Mr. Chairman. This is unusual, and it is not proper to encumber the RECORD in this way.

Mr. BURROWS. There is no objection on this side to printing the names of these distinguished Texans.

Mr. CRAIN. I want to see how many of them are really engaged in the sheep-raising business.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman can examine the petition itself and ascertain that fact.

The remonstrance was read, as follows:

RENO, NEV., *November 30, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: If it is ever true that a protective tariff is useful in the building up of infant industries it is true to-day of the wool business of this poor State.

Nevada's chief industry has been mining, with the cattle product second in importance, but the growth of the sheep business has brought it forward so rapidly that it must soon be second and perhaps first, if the conditions which have obtained heretofore could be depended upon. The country is well adapted to the health and security of the animal, at least as well as to anything, and the conditions are conducive to excellence in quality of both wool and mutton, so that under the fostering hand of an intelligent and kindly policy this gentle and useful friend of the human family has multiplied in this distant region so recently given over as being unfit for anything but the wild beast and savage hunter, filling the mountains with herds and building up villages, or adding to the prosperity of those already built, and contributing to the forces that were supporting American civilization in this corner of the Union.

This state of affairs continued until the election of 1892 aroused the fear that the tariff was to be reduced or removed, resulting in a slump in prices of both the animal and its products, which has wiped out the accumulations of years and left the flock-owner with what he had outside of his bands, either in property or debts. There is simply no profit left in the business, and that renders the capital invested virtually dead, there being no sale for stock sheep and less than usual for mutton.

Our last year's markets were such as to give us a living show by good management and ordinary luck in weather and crops to make a reasonable profit. Mutton was worth from 7 to 9 cents per pound, and there was a demand for all that was right and prime. In October, 1892, we could get in San Francisco for our unscoured wool from 15 to 17 cents per pound, and fall wool brought us 12½ cents. Soon after there was a drop of 5 cents in two weeks on wool and almost no sale, while the fall wool can not now be sold for more than from 2 to 4 cents there. Mutton has now clogged the market at from 4 to 5 cents, and every one would sell if there was a buyer.

We simply can not compete in these mountain regions with the grower of the Southern Hemisphere, and I doubt if we can undersell those of Ohio or New England. The vast territory open in the south temperate zone lies at a lower altitude and is not subject to the fierce storms, to the intense cold and sudden changes that threaten us here and necessitate costly provision in the way of food and attendance. Their land is not worth a tenth as much, taxes are lower and wages greatly below ours; supplies can be laid down for less than half, while not one-quarter the quantity is required for men and horses to look after the stock. Where fences are built for the ranges by the Government or the landowner, there is little need of herders. We require one for every two thousand sheep, and one man additional with two horses must always be in attendance to carry provisions, salt, medicine, clothing, etc., and to move camp when it is necessary to find fresh pasture, which in this kind of feeding ground is an average of more than once a week all the year around. These men cost for wages an average of $40 per month and found. It costs us 7½ cents per head to shear, making 15 cents a year, as the climate makes it necessary to clip twice a year.

We are forced to rent feeding ground from the railroad company or other landowners at an average cost of 10 cents per head per year. We run in the Sierra Nevada mountains or in the high ranges in the center and eastern portions of the State in summer and on lower ground in winter, reaching by means of moisture provided by the first snowfall feed which we can not reach in summer on account of the lack of water for our animals to drink. The lands are unfenced and can not be as it is an untimbered country. We are taxed heavily to support the governments of the State and counties and in some places we have to pay a 5-cent license per head. This is imposed under the plea that sheep destroy the roads and we have to pay it. We are safe in saying that it costs an average of $1.25 per head to run sheep in Nevada and Eastern California. The men who have spent less on their stock have lost money by their frugality and are broke to-day. Sheep must never be allowed to get poor here as a change in weather may catch them any day which will cause a heavy mortality and at the same time ruin the hopes of marketing what survive.

The wool fiber is also injured whenever the sheep lose health or strength. The only way to succeed in this mountainous district is to pay great attention to the health, nourishment, and general care of the animals. They require salt regularly and doctoring carefully and frequently, close watching to protect them from wild beasts, and the greatest judgment in driving to prevent their piling up in close places or breaking over dangerous ground in case of panic. No other breeding ground in this or any other country has such losses in increase as we do. It is impossible to calculate upon any certain kind of weather at any certain time of year. We range at an altitude running from 4,500 to 11,000 feet, and be as careful as we may, the lambs are as likely to drop on a bleak, raw, windy day as on a warm one. The loss in such a case can not be foretold, but it exceeds any our brethren with warm sheds, comfortable stacks, or lower altitudes ever experience.

With free wool we could not have 1 cent profit per fleece. We ship 70 pounds of dirt with every 30 pounds of wool, and if we could figure on getting 30 cents per pound in New York for scoured wool it would leave us 13 cents per head for running our sheep. That is, if we could bring each sheep to the shearing pen for 13 cents it would cost us 17 cents per pound to get our wool clipped, washed, and freighted to New York. You can easily see that we would lose heavily under such figures. If 30 cents is to be the free-trade figure there is no hope for sheep-raising, at least in Nevada.

The theory that with free wool only the long staple now imported to mix with our common wool would come, and that it could be handled so cheaply that the demand for our wool to mix with it would compensate us for the loss in price or prevent any such loss, is infantile. The man who can raise long, fine wool can raise short, cheap wool still more cheaply, and if he could send it to America without duty he could afford to throw his mutton to the dogs or feed it to the hogs and then knock us out, with our high wages, our costly pastures, and our high rates of freight. I guess a man who can paint a good picture can paint as poor a one as anybody, and it is so with sheep-raising. Common sheep and common wool will grow wherever the finer breeds can be raised, and the only reason the common wool has not come in is because of the tariff.

Nevada has sent to the shambles 35 per cent of her flocks, and would have sent twice as many if the markets within her reach had not been loaded.

We can expect an average of, say, 6 pounds of wool per year per head, or, say, counting the first year light, a yield of 20 pounds in four years. The animal will cost 25 to care for, and if mutton is a good price, say 6 or 7 cents per pound, we could make a fair profit with unscoured wool at 15 cents per pound. Any less than that will leave us nothing for interest on our investments; nothing for our own time, risk, or personal experience; nothing but wages for the men, taxes, grocery bills, etc.

We pay the heaviest freight bills in the United States and perhaps in the world, considering the long distances. Shipping in the grease, we pay an average of $1.50 to San Francisco and $2 per 100 from there to New York. The wool carries 70 per cent dirt, and that runs our freight up to over 11 cents per pound as against a cent or half a cent in steam barges or clippers from the antipodes. You will see, therefore, that with the duty of 11 cents removed our business is ruined irretrievably and our occupation gone.

The pretense that the poor man would receive the benefit is on a line with the other humbuggery of the free traders. A hat will not weigh over a quarter of a pound and part of that is cotton. It costs from a dollar to five to the wearer. How much will he save if the duty on wool is removed and the raw material is put into the factory for 3 cents less? If the wool was given to the manufacturer the hat would not be sold for any less to one man in a hundred. The poor man's suit of clothes, generally half cotton, weighs from 3 to 7 or 8 pounds. Could the clothing man be found who would give him the benefit of a reduction in the tariff? Not in the Democratic party.

Half the value of every sheep in Nevada has been cut off by this agitation of the tariff. One year ago there was ready sale at $3 while now no one will buy at $1.50, and it is doubtful if they would at $1. As fast as the butcher is ready sheep are being forced upon him and this will continue until the poor man's mutton costs him more than he will save on his cheap suit of clothes. Then those of us who are here will resume our profits. When about one-tenth the sheep are here that formerly thrived those who own them can command a price for mutton that will make a profit whether they sell wool or not. We can not say that any wool-grower in Nevada has been bankrupted by the fall, for the reason that we have not gone into the market since the drop. We are just preparing to market this year's increase, or try to.

Indeed, the State of Nevada has come through the distress brought upon our formerly happy land by this fateful Administration without a man closing his doors or a bank asking for time on a single draft, but there is no prospect in store and the wool men will be forced to the wall by the prices at present ruling. It will not help us to advise us to hold. We can not do so any more than other business men can run at a loss. We simply can not live and we do not intend to try. We will be entirely closed out in two years from to-day if there is not a change for the better.

The wool clip, with the increase, has paid all expenses heretofore. This year nearly every man has been forced to encroach upon his standard stock to keep alive. He has generally owed some money rather than having a reserve laid up and had to sell to get means to run on.

The sheep industry is a regular step in State growth. It follows the cattle ranger who usually owns no land and does little if any farming. Our flocks require hay and shelter, which necessitates the ownership of land and leads to more systematic husbandry. The loss of the wool industry cuts off Nevada's hopes to some extent in this direction and tends to return her to the cowboy and the coyote. The increase in the sheep industry has been felt in every town in the State. The expenses were all local and benefited every branch of trade. All wages went to the nearest village, for the sheep-herder and shearer know of no use for money except to spend it, and it goes freely.

Nevada has suffered more than any State in the Union by the decline in silver, which nine out of ten men here believe to have been caused by hostile legislation. When Mr. Cleveland began his attacks upon it with the Warner letter it was worth about $1.11 per ounce, and he has never ceased in his efforts to reduce it until it has gone below any price ever known in the history of mankind, and the profits of mining have entirely ceased.

Similarly no State in the Union will suffer in proportion to population from Mr. Cleveland's persistent attacks upon wool. It will deprive her of an industry which was doing much to replace the loss occasioned by the depressed condition of mining and to lead men to an understanding of the capacities of the State in other directions. There is room here for many hundreds of bands of sheep, and there is a certain profit when intelligence and industry are combined. There are so few things possible in Nevada at present, and there are so many reasons for the uplifting of every weak sister in our Union, in order that our institutions may flourish and the genius of the Republic be maintained, that every true patriot must regret any act or accident which keeps us down, but there seems to be an animus in the Democratic breast which marks us for the slaughter at every opportunity.

This is Thanksgiving Day, the appointed time set apart by Mr. Cleveland as President for prayer for ourselves and for all our kind, for praise to the Giver of all good, for gentle thoughts for friend and foe alike, but I can assure you we feel anything but thankful to the President of this Republic either for his efforts or disposition toward us or our State.

Pardon the length of this letter and accept our thanks for the interest you manifest in our welfare.

With much respect, we remain,

J. B. TALBOTT. J. N. WATSON.
P. L. FLANIGAN. S. O. WELLS.
W. M. VAN BUREN. A. FEANDSEN.
H. ANDERSON. ABRAHAMS BROS.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS, *Member of Congress.*

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BURROWS. I will not ask the further indulgence of the committee at this time. These are only a few of the protests which I might have read against free wool. I have in my desk protests from thirty-four States and Territories against putting wool on the free list; and from no State or Territory have we a petition that it be made free, except the petition presented to the Committee on Ways and Means, as I said before, in favor of free wool, from the Thurman Club of the State of Ohio.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am moved to say a few words by reason of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has just had read a number of remonstrances against the passage of the Wilson bill, so far as it concerns the question of wool. One of those remonstrances appears to have come from the State of Indiana. I have information that Republican politicians in that State have been busily engaged in circulating these remonstrances amongst the farmers, urging them to sign the remonstrances with the view, if possi-

ble, of inducing this Congress to refuse to change the existing rates of duty upon raw wool and upon woolen manufactures.

If these remonstrances which have just been read mean anything, they are meant to impress upon this House the idea in the minds of the signers, that the laying of this tariff upon wool by the McKinley law makes better prices. If that be true, it is but a result of the system of education which our Republican friends entered upon with the farmers in 1888, in 1890, and again in 1892. If I am mistaken in my notion that the object of the gentleman from Michigan in having these remonstrances read was to make this fact appear I will be glad to be now corrected. [Pauses.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me strange, and it always did, that in every political campaign when the question of tariff is an issue, our high protection friends should go before the farmers and insist that the McKinley bill protected and benefited them. How? By placing a high tariff upon wheat in order that the farmer could get more for his wheat; by placing a high tariff on wool in order that he could get more for his wool; by placing a high tariff on barley and rye and all agricultural products in order that the farmer might get better prices for them. In that way the farmer has been asked to believe that he was receiving benefits from protection. Yet before the close of such an argument, in the face of that farmer audience, the Republican orator would tell them that laying a high tariff upon manufactured goods had had the effect, the necessary effect, of reducing the prices of the things that the farmer was to buy.

Now, what is the fact about this McKinley bill; and what did JOHN SHERMAN, Senator from the State of Ohio, who is thought to be an authority upon the question of a protective tariff, say when this very McKinley law was under discussion in 1890? I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk, as applying to this question of the wool tariff and its effect on the price of wool, what Mr. SHERMAN said on the 29th of August, 1890, as appears on page 10124 of the daily RECORD of the first session of the Fifty-first Congress. I do not introduce this for the purpose of indorsing it; I introduce it for the purpose of putting it in the RECORD alongside of the remonstrances which have just been read by the Clerk of this House.

Before the Clerk begins to read, let me call the attention of members of the Committee of the Whole to this fact: The question of the wool tariff was then under discussion; Mr. SHERMAN was upon his feet addressing the Senate in favor of the passage of the McKinley law; the question of the wool tariff of 1867—probably the highest tariff upon wool, if I am not misinformed, unless the McKinley law be an exception, that we have ever had in this country—came up; and the question was put to Mr. SHERMAN directly, as the Clerk will read, as to the effect of the tariff of 1867 upon the prices of wool as realized by the American farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BURROWS. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will have such further time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. All I desire is time to have this extract read.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman will have five minutes additional.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the extract sent to the desk by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DANIEL. Before the Senator takes his seat, will he be kind enough to tell us what was the effect of the tariff of 1867 on the price of wool to the farmers?

Mr. SHERMAN. It varied more or less by the season, but I do not think there was any very radical change. If anything, there was a decline. My observation is, as a rule, that a rate of duty put upon any kind of production, whether a production of the farm or a production of the workshop, inevitably tends to lower the price. I have no doubt about that; but any duty whatever put upon any form of industry tends to encourage it and increase it either in its manufacture or production. Whatever may be the source of production or the mode of production, it naturally tends to lower the price; and that is what we desire. We on this side of the Chamber desire as much cheap food and cheap articles and cheap goods as anyone else.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. That is all I care to have read of the remarks of Mr. SHERMAN. I read those remarks about the time of their delivery in 1890; and they have never passed from my mind from that time to this; so that when the question came up in this Congress, I recollected the date of those remarks, and sent for that copy of the RECORD. I desire Senator SHERMAN'S language to go into the RECORD along with the remonstrances signed by these wool-growers and sent here asking us to perpetuate upon them a system which, if Mr. SHERMAN knew what he was speaking about, has had the very effect which they now profess to apprehend from the passage of this bill.

Mr. COFFEEN. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to a lengthy array of petitions and remonstrances from several States, introduction by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. My remarks yesterday upon this question have made sufficiently clear my own position. I shall, as I then stated, support most heartily the Wilson bill, as it is termed, whether we shall secure our amendments or not. Nevertheless, I stand now, as before, in favor of a reasonable and proportionate tariff for revenue purposes on the wool product and on all others.

The matter I shall now send to the Clerk's desk to have read in the first place is the form of a petition. There is a sort of stereotyped form, I have noticed in these petitions from wool-growers of these Western States. The first part of the article which will be read at my request, from the Carbon County Journal of Wyoming, embraces the points involved in almost all the petitions that have come to me from my State.

I may remark, before the reading begins, that we do not apprehend any danger to the welfare of our State, whether we shall secure the amendments which I favor or not; for our resources, as I remarked yesterday, are so varied that for the decrease of every hundred or thousand sheep that we may cease to raise on our grassy plains there will be raised other stock that will be remunerative. So that we do not feel that we are in any manner in danger; nor do we stand here as beggars on this question.

The reason I wish to put this alongside the remonstrances read at such great length for the gentleman from Michigan is that we may have in connection with the same literature, first the substance of the petitions coming from Wyoming signed, as I have found upon examination of those presented by me in this House, by between one and two hundred people and then the answer to the statements of the petitions given by our own people.

I ask the Clerk to read first the petition, and then the response to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

THAT WOOL-GROWERS' PETITION.

[Rawlins Journal.]

The wool-growers' petition, which has been circulated throughout the State for the purpose of obtaining signatures, and which is to be forwarded to Senator CAREY and Congressman COFFEEN, contains the following points, stripped of their useless verbiage:

First. Wool can not be grown in Wyoming as cheaply as in Australia and other foreign countries, without the aid of a protective tariff, because the Wyoming climate causes a heavy loss in sheep, amounting to 20 per cent, with a possible loss of 50 per cent annually, in addition to a severe loss in each year's crop of wool, while in Australia the mild climate makes the growers' loss there little or nothing.

Second. It costs the Wyoming wool-grower 2½ cents a pound to lay his wool in the dirt or grease (which we have to do on account of our water being all alkali) down in Boston or New York, while Australia, with water transportation, can place their wool in Boston at one-half this price.

Third. Wages and living in Wyoming are from 50 to 75 per cent higher than in Australia.

Fourth. Taxes are high in Wyoming.

Fifth. A year ago wool netted in Wyoming from 12 to 14 cents, and this year from 6 to 8 cents; and sheep sold a year ago from $3 to $4 per head, and this year only $2 to $2.25 per head.

Sixth. London prices will govern with wool on the free list, and competition with all foreign wool of the Wyoming grade must follow with foreign nations.

Seventh. The bankers refuse to loan money on sheep.

Eighth. The cost of producing wool here is greater than in foreign countries.

Ninth. The prospects of free wool have made it impossible to get an extension on paper falling due, and the wool-growers themselves, from loss of confidence by the bleak outlook, are being completely paralyzed and have shaken the confidence of the banker and merchant.

Mr. COFFEEN. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk reads the answer I wish to call the attention of the committee especially to this, so that they may listen carefully as it embraces a response to the various points put in from the West. I want this given so that every one who does not fully understand the question may be enlightened as to the views and circumstances of the wool question from Wyoming, and what will be read now is the comment from the Wyoming Derrick, published in the center of the State, and copied from the Rawlins Journal, published in the southern part of the State, in the wool-growing region.

The Clerk read as follows:

Let us examine these statements in their order as to their truth or falsity. As to the first statement that, owing to the severe climate in Wyoming, wool can not be grown here as cheaply as in Australia. In Australia flock masters pay 25 cents per acre for their sheep runs. Here the range is free. There, from a scarcity of water, thousands of sheep die yearly, while here there is an abundance of water in summer and snow in winter, to supply every demand. The fact has not been disputed that in cold climates sheep will average a greater number of pounds of wool per head than in warm climates, as nature aids in the protection of its creatures by enabling them to harmonize with their environments. Wyoming sheep that produce from 8 to 13 pounds of wool per head, rather destroy the poetical idea that Wyoming growers, on account of the cold climate, can not compete with Australian flock masters.

As to an annual loss of 20 per cent per annum, with a possible loss of 50 per cent, the statement is too absurd to rebut. The average annual loss will not exceed 8 per cent, and as the lamb increase runs from 80 to 70 per cent, it is difficult to see where any annual loss comes in. The idea of 1,000 head out of every 5,000 head dying annually is preposterous on the face of it. Sheep-owners in Wyoming generally cull out (each fall) their old broken-mouthed ewes, and have good young sheep to go into the winter with, and their annual loss will not exceed 8 per cent.

As to the second statement, that the cost of transportation of Wyoming wool to Boston is 2½ cents per pound, and that the Australian's is only one-half that, owing to water carriage, the inference would be that the Australian grazed his flocks on the ocean's beach, and that all he had to do was shear, dump his wool as ballast in a sailing vessel, and head for London, and then to Boston, to pick up the fortune awaiting there. As a matter of fact, thousands of Australia's flocks are miles inland, and the cost of freight on wool to the ocean will equal nearly the cost of transportation from Wyoming to Boston.

In this second statement the claim is also made that Wyoming wool has to be shipped in the dirt or grease, "as the alkali water, which is all we have, is unfit for scouring purposes." Is the Platte River, Snake River, Big Horn River, and the immense streams tributary to them all alkali? What a false assertion! The reason the wool is shipped in the grease is simply because the railroad companies would charge as much freight for scoured wool as for wool in the grease, because the former occupies more space in their cars and because buyers would rather scour their own wool, as they want some of it scoured cleaner than the rest, it depending on the various uses for which it is intended.

Third. A San Francisco paper states "wages are as high in Australia as in California," and as California ranks third as a wool-producing State, we presume that but little difference exists between California and Wyoming wages.

Fourth. As to taxes. Taxes are high in Wyoming. We admit that. Four years of Republican rule have contributed materially to that condition, as there is hardly a county in the State that has not a bonded indebtedness. As to the amount of taxes paid by sheepmen, they do not begin to equal the amount paid by cattlemen. A Republican State board values the sheep, and the taxes are paid on sheep; not a cent is paid on the clipped wool, although nearly a million and a half pounds of wool were shipped from Carbon County alone in the past twelve months.

The fifth and sixth statements are in regard to the present low price of wool and sheep. With as much reason the petition could also have included the low prices of cattle, wheat, and horses. The author of the petition conveniently omits to mention that the McKinley bill is still in force, and that the shoddy mills are merrily grinding out 65 per cent of the woolen goods of the country, and that wool has steadily fallen in price since the McKinley bill was enacted. As to the price of $2 and $2.25 per head for sheep, there is not a flock master in the State that would sell his flock for either of those prices unless by extravagance or woeful mismanagement he was compelled to do so.

The seventh statement about London prices, and competing with foreign countries: This country can compete with foreign countries in very nearly all lines of manufacture. The world's markets will be opened to American wool manufacturers. A large export trade of woolens will create an increase in the demand and price of wools, and with a prohibition on shoddy, the sheep-growers would get better prices than ever for their fleeces.

The eighth statement about bankers refusing to loan money on sheep:

Very few of the Wyoming banks have been able to loan money on sheep or any other kind of property for the past six months, merely because they do not have the money to loan, but extremely rare are the cases where loans have not been renewed by the bankers to those actually needing them.

In the ninth statement the honest admission is made that the sheepmen themselves became paralyzed with fear, and that bankers and merchants lost confidence through the fear started by them.

This wonderful petition closed with prayer to save the business from destruction. When it is remembered that Wyoming does not produce a pound of wool of the grade which Australia exports, and which manufacturers need for their finer grades of goods, the political animus which inspires the petition can readily be perceived. It was drawn and circulated with no hopes of having the McKinley rates retained, but for the apparent purpose of raising a political issue upon which Republican wire-pullers and politicians could float into office. As a political scheme it will hardly succeed. Cattle-growers, horse-raisers, and small ranchmen are not particularly benefited by ranges eaten up and destroyed by the mouths and hoofs of thousands of sheep, and are naturally antagonistic to the industry.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has been empowered by about 1,500 people in Texas to present two remonstrances against the proposed action of the Texas delegation in the House on the question of free wool. I believed at the time they were submitted to the House that the majority of the signers of these remonstrances were members of the Republican party, or Democrats who were indirectly connected with the business interests of the Republicans who were engaged in the sheep industry in the locality from which these remonstrances come.

Mr. PASCHAL represents San Angelo, from which one of them emanated. He sent a telegram of inquiry about it to a responsible gentleman in Texas, who has been recently honored with a high official position, and that gentleman responded that not more than 30 per cent of the signers of the petition were members of the Democratic party.

Since that time Mr. PASCHAL has received a letter from the mayor of San Angelo, who is also postmaster of the town, in which he states, speaking of the telegraphic inquiry made by Mr. PASCHAL:

The gentleman to whom you wired was speaking to me about the telegram which he received from you in reference to the signers of the petition sent to Mr. BURROWS. He told me about what he had written to you, and I fully concur in what he says: in fact, am more indignant at the claim than he was. I venture the assertion that there is not even a considerable minority of the Democrats here who signed the petition, and those did it from purely selfish and mercenary motives—the men who want all for themselves and are not very particular about the other fellow's protection. I feel sure that I voice the sentiment of the real Democrats of this section when I say that they are willing to abide by the action of the Texas delegation on the tariff, believing that they are in a better position to know what is best, and, knowing, will do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I represented upon the floor of this House for eight years one of the largest wool-growing districts of the United States. For two years I have represented another district. But a very large number of my constituents are engaged in the wool-raising industry. I voted for free wool when I had the opportunity, and I shall vote again for free wool; and I voice the sentiments of my constituents in my old district as well as in my new district in so voting. About two years ago I made a speech in the city of Laredo, one of the principal wool markets of the State of Texas—the second or third, perhaps. A prominent wool-grower of the county of Webb, of which Laredo is the county seat, authorized me to say in the name of the sheep-raisers of that section, he owning and controlling about twenty-five thousand head of sheep, that they were in favor, with the exception of a few Republican protectionists, of free wool, and wanted me to vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In 1884, when I made my first canvass as the nominee of the Democratic party to represent that district, stretching from the commercial town of Galveston to historic Fort Brown, near the mouth of the Rio Grande, and running up that river nearly 700 miles, I indorsed the proposition of free wool everywhere in the district. I had been nominated by acclamation and carried the wool-raising portion of the district by a large majority. My vote in the House of Representatives upon that question was repeatedly indorsed, and for the fifth time have I been nominated by acclamation by the Democratic party, with the Democratic wool-growers of the district represented in every convention, and sent here to represent their interests according to what I believe to be the best for their condition.

In 1884, when I first went upon the Rio Grande, where the people are mainly engaged in cattle and sheep raising, the price of wool was low. The price of sheep was correspondingly low; the price of cattle was up, and cattle which a few years ago had been selling upon the prairies of Texas for $6 a head as a maximum price, were commanding in the market $20 a head running wild upon the range, the cow with the calf following at her side. The cattle men were triumphant. Their faces were radiant with joy. The sheep men were correspondingly despondent.

Two years afterward I made another canvass, and conditions were reversed. Cattle had gone down in price lower than their original price; sheep and wool had risen in price, and yet the tariff had not been altered, but remained unchanged.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] has expired.

Mr. WISE. I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended five minutes.

Mr. CRAIN. As I have not addressed the House before upon any subject connected with this bill, I ask that I may be permitted to speak as long as the committee will permit me to do so without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CRAIN. I think ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] asks that he be allowed to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move that the gentleman have as much time as he wants.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman only asks for ten minutes.

Mr. CRAIN. I repeat, that while the price of wool, sheep, and cattle had decreased, the tariff had remained unchanged. Yet I heard the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] the other day, in his reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], state that the law of supply and demand had long since been exploded. That law having once existed, and being based upon immutable principles, will never be exploded. You might as well say that the laws of nature, which govern the planets of the solar system in their revolution in their orbits around the sun, will be exploded.

If potatoes are plentiful, potatoes are cheap. If potatoes are scarce, potatoes are dear. If a man wants to build a house and there are plenty of carpenters in the town who are out of employment, he certainly can have his house erected for a lower price than if carpenters were not so plentiful.

It seems to me that that statement was unworthy of the gentleman from Maine, and I call attention to it because I believe—and I so stated and state now—that so far as the district which I have the honor to represent is concerned, the tariff had nothing to do with the price of wool or the price of sheep.

In 1867 the policy of protection was inaugurated, so far as the woolen industry is concerned. The object of it, as avowed by its inaugurators and promoters, was to increase the price of wool for the sheep-growers throughout the United States; but at the same time these gentlemen, fearing the manufacturing industries of the country, and believing that the manufacturers would raise a hue and cry against them, gave them in the act of 1867 a specific or compensatory duty on foreign woolen goods that might be imported, so that their condition with relation to wool would remain unaltered.

But what about the consumers, the masses of the people of this country, including the operatives in the factories as well as all other people? They paid the tax on the foreign wool that

was used by the manufacturers, and they also paid the enhanced price of the foreign cloth, a price enhanced by reason of the duty which was imposed. And where was their compensation, their compensatory duty? It was shown at the polls in 1892, when protection was denounced by these consumers, in the election of Grover Cleveland and the success of the Democratic party.

Now, what was the effect of the tariff of 1867? In 1867 there were 39,000,000 sheep in the United States. In 1875 the number had been reduced to 35,000,000. In 1891 there were about 43,500,000.

In 1867 the price of wool was 51 cents. In 1878 the price of wool was 40 cents, and to-day the price of similar wool is about 19 or 20 cents.

Under the act of 1883, by which the duty on raw wool was lessened by the Republican party, the duty was from 22 to 120 per cent. Under the law of 1890, called the McKinley act, it was 20½ to 160 per cent, or about 11 cents a pound. Last year woolen goods paid a tax of $34,293,666, the full value of the goods upon which this tax was paid being $35,792,905. The consumers of this country, therefore, paid a tariff of nearly 100 per cent upon the foreign-manufactured goods which they consumed. The same year the tax paid by manufacturers for raw material was about $8,000,000. They paid in taxes for raw wool which they imported about $8,000,000; and while the Government collected from the consumers nearly $35,000,000 in the shape of taxes on manufactured woolen importations, which were paid into the Treasury, the manufacturers, by reason of the protective rates of the McKinley act, also collected from them the $8,000,000 which they had paid on the raw wool used by them in their manufactories and which they were enabled to charge for their own productions above what would have been their selling price at a fair profit had they not been protected.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CRAIN. Certainly.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Is not the gentleman aware that it is a principle of taxation as urged by our Republican friends that the foreigner pays the tax; and does the gentleman think that the foreigner would pay a tax of $34,000,000 in order to sell $35,000,000 worth of goods?

Mr. CRAIN. I am not aware that it is a principle urged by our Republican friends; but I am aware that it is one of their stump declarations. [Laughter.] Everybody knows, or ought to know, that while the importer in the first instance has to pay the import duties at the ports of entry, those duties are added to the price of the imported goods when sold by him to the wholesaler and jobbers, that by them they are added to the price when sold to their customers in the country, and in turn are added by the retail dealers to the price which they ask of their customers; and who are those customers? They are the consumers of the country. I think the mere statement of the proposition thoroughly explodes the idea of our Republican friends that the foreigner pays the tax.

The proposition that a foreigner will sustain his own government and then come here and voluntarily support our Government by paying tariff taxes on the goods that he imports into our country is, it seems to me, preposterous.

When the Mills bill was under consideration in this House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKinley] produced a suit of clothes which he said was all wool, according to the guaranty of the seller, who was a merchant of Boston. I have the authority of woolen manufacturers on the floor of this House for the statement that that suit of clothes was not woolen in its composition and material, but that it was shoddy; and in my opinion the decadence of the woolen industry of this country is attributable to the tariff, which enables the shoddy manufacturers to produce a cheap article of clothing such as was exhibited by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] the other day as a tribute to American industry, and the overcoat which was shown by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], rotten goods.

From 1860 to 1870 the capital employed in the production of shoddy goods in this country increased nearly 600 per cent, while the product of the shoddy manufactories increased nearly 350 per cent. And during the last year 67 per cent of the woolen manufactures of this country was composed of shoddy; and in shoddy manufactures lies the main danger to the woolen industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken differently on this floor from my declarations upon the stump when I was soliciting the suffrage of my constituents. I told them then, and I tell them now, that I do not propose so to vote as to benefit any industry at the expense of the mass of the people.

I did not tell them that I would vote to the detriment of the consumers, for the purpose of raising the price of wool or the price of sheep. Protectionists claim that a protective duty on raw wool imported raises the price of American wool, and yet under the tariff act of 1890, which imposes such a high duty, wool can be bought in Texas to-day at 7 cents a pound, about the lowest price it has ever brought. And I will state for the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] and for the benefit of the members of this committee, that whereas he presented a remonstrance from 250 or 300 constituents of the gentleman who represents the Dallas district [Judge ABBOTT] against putting wool on the free list, that the latter gentleman told me that he had been offered 50,000 pounds of Texas wool at 5 cents a pound, although the tariff on foreign wool is 11 cents a pound.

Now, I admit that there is a difference in the price between Texas wool in the manufacturing market and the wool of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and of West Virginia of a similar grade, but that is explained by the fact, as manufacturers have told me upon this floor, that there is a greater amount of shrinkage in the Texas wool than in the cleaner wool of the States which I have mentioned. But, notwithstanding this fact, the price of the last mentioned wool graded as one-half and three-eighths is only from 13 to 19 cents, and the price of Texas wool is 10 and 14 cents for a similar grade, the rate of duty on each class being about 11 cents per pound.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how the condition of the sheep-raisers of Texas can be worse than it is to-day. They have had protection since 1867, and yet they are complaining of ruinous prices, while I know that in the county in which I live, De Witt County, which is not a sheep-raising county, before the war wool was selling at from 40 to 50 cents a pound that to-day does not bring 20 cents a pound. Certainly free wool with corresponding reductions of the rate of duty on manufactured woolens can not fail to benefit the wool-growers and also the people of the whole country. [Applause.]

The producers of wool in Texas had the benefit of protection under the act of 1867; they had it under the act of 1883, and to-day the price of the wool which they raise is less than it ever has been in the history of the wool-growing industry of the State. Their condition can not be worse than it is, and we insist that it will be better, because when wool is put on the free list there will be a greater demand for it in this country, and the enlarged demand here will increase the price in other countries, and the increase of price in the foreign markets will necessarily increase the price here, and I have been told by a member of the Committee on Ways and Means who is a manufacturer and by another member who is engaged in the wool-manufacturing industry, that the manufacturers will require American wools to mix them with foreign wools, to produce thereby different, better, and more diversified grades of goods, which I predict will sell more cheaply with the duties upon foreign woolen goods correspondingly reduced as they must and will be.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PICKLER was recognized.

Mr. BURROWS. If the gentleman from South Dakota will yield for a moment, I understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] to say that the remonstrance of eleven hundred citizens of the State of Texas, which I had read, was signed by only a few Democrats.

Mr. CRAIN. I said, or I do say, that so far as I am concerned I do not know anything about it, but I read a statement from a letter of the mayor of San Angelo, who is also the postmaster, to the effect stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. BURROWS. Very well. I desire to state that of the 1,100 signers of that remonstrance 642 put opposite to their names the word "Democrat."

Mr. CRAIN. Oh, as to the statements in the remonstrance, I do not believe them. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to offer an amendment to this bill.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman from South Dakota yields to me for a moment. I have no desire to address the committee at the present time on this question, but the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. CRAIN] conveyed the impression, if I understood him aright, that there are no interests outside of Republican interests connected with the wool industry in the State of Texas interested in the tariff. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a letter from a very prominent Pennsylvania Democrat who, with that enterprise which is sometimes characteristic of Pennsylvania Democrats, has invested a large amount of money in the wool-growing industry in the State of Texas.

The letter was read, as follows:

HARRISBURG, *January 5, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 26th instant is in due time received. I am inter-

ested in a ranch in Texas stocked with cattle and sheep. Free wool and free mutton will destroy the sheep business, and wool-growing will have to be abandoned if the free-wool clause of the Wilson bill is passed. In 1892 wool sold in Texas at 16½ to 17½ cents per pound. In 1893, under threatened free wool, it has sold at 6½ to 7½ cents, a reduction of fully 10 cents per pound, or about 60 per cent.

Just why this particular industry, engaged in by so many and in all parts of the country, should be sacrificed and abandoned, as it will be under the free wool and free mutton, is a mystery, and especially so as the people engaged in this business belong to the class for whose welfare the politicians of both parties seem to be so solicitous.

If a tariff for revenue "only" is the right thing, why should not wool bear its share of the tax? If cheap blankets and cheap clothing are a necessity, why not make them cheap by putting woolen goods and made-up clothing on the free list with wool? Why make a distinction, particularly when—

It requires more labor to raise the wool to supply a factory than is required in a factory to manufacture the same into blankets, or any ordinary woolen goods; and when—

It requires a greater investment of capital in land, sheep, and equipment to raise the wool to supply a factory than it takes to build and equip the factory itself—an investment five to ten times greater.

If you will look the matter up you will find that Texas has more sheep than any State in the Union, and is therefore more interested. Divide the whole valuation of the sheep in Texas in 1892 by two (they do not now sell for one-half that they sold for eighteen months ago), and add to this 10 cents per pound on the total wool clip of 1893, and you will get some idea as to the enormous loss that that State has already sustained. To this must be added a large shrinkage in the value of land on which the sheep pasture, if the Wilson bill becomes a law.

The Texas Congressman who votes for the Wilson bill as reported votes to destroy this great interest in his State—he does more, he votes to bankrupt three-fourths of those engaged in the business—for they are generally men of limited means. He votes to place a duty of 1¼ cents a pound—not ad-valorem, that may be shaded, but a specific duty of 1¼ cents per pound on rice, which is part of the food supply of the very men whose business he is voting to destroy; and as if to add insult to injury he votes a 45 per cent duty—the highest in the schedule—to protect Mr. Stevens, who has labored so faithfully to place wool on the free list and also to take such good care of his own particular interests.

The Wilson bill favors skilled labor at the expense of the unskilled; those who are best able to take care of themselves and their own interest at the expense of those who are least able. The "tie" which binds the planter's cotton is free; the "hoop" which binds the poor man's bucket is taxed. The bill is skillfully drawn. It even offers Middle Texas a bribe to help destroy the wool-grower of Western and the lumber manufacturer of Eastern Texas.

It seems to me the Texas Congressman who votes for this bill and who has any ambition to succeed himself will have some very interesting questions to answer next fall during the campaign.

Very truly yours,

A. J. DULL.

Hon. JOHN DALZELL,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend paragraph 384 by striking out "eleven" and inserting "twelve" in lieu thereof. Also strike out the word "twelve" in said paragraph and insert "thirteen" in lieu thereof, so that said paragraph when so amended will read as follows:

"The duty upon all wool and hair of the first class shall be 12 cents per pound and upon all wool and hair of the second class 13 cents per pound."

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan increases the tariff 1 cent a pound on the first and second classes of wool above that imposed by the McKinley law. It may be that this amendment will not be adopted by this committee [laughter], but I desire to offer it in good faith to emphasize, if I can, the position of every wool-grower in my State, regardless of the party to which he belongs, in his opposition to free wool.

I can not answer for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] or his constituents, but in my State, and I have traveled over it lately and talked with a great many wool-growers, I find no exception among Democrats, Populists, or Republicans, none who are not opposed to the reduction of the tariff upon wool. The gentleman from Indiana cites a case that he heard of lately of a Republican making a speech who argued to the wool-growers and the farmers that putting a tariff on their wool would increase the price of the wool, and then turned around and argued that a tariff upon manufactured goods would give them cheaper manufactured goods.

Now, sir, the truth of both those propositions is easily established, and the Republican who maintained them was right. As far as wool is concerned, we lack 60,000,000 head of sheep in this country in order to produce all the wool and mutton that we consume. Under a tariff to keep out foreign wool and foreign mutton until our sheep-producers can produce those 60,000,000 head additional, there would certainly be a good price for mutton and for wool. There is no question about that. Then at that time falling back upon the old principle of protection when the prices for wool and mutton being good, and good prices had induced a sufficient number of people to go into the sheep-producing business to make up the additional 60,000,000 head of sheep required, then at that point the competition in wool-growing and mutton-raising in this country would bring down the prices of wool and of mutton to a point where they could be carried on while affording a reasonable profit and paying to the American laborer and the American farmer what the American laborer and the American farmer are entitled to, fair wages, and there the prices would stand, and they ought not to go lower than that.

Now, as to manufactured goods, of course we know—it has been demonstrated so many times that I do not stop to argue the proposition this evening—that under a protective tariff the competition in the domestic manufacture of articles lowers the price; so that the Republican who made the speech to which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] referred was correct in both his propositions.

What my constituents want is the privilege of assisting in raising those 60,000,000 head of sheep; and while we are thus engaged we do expect a good price for our wool and mutton. But this bill deprives us of that altogether.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] made here yesterday a part of the same speech which he made on the occasion of that great spectacular demonstration last Saturday evening. He stated that there are ten men who do not raise sheep where there is one who does, and therefore he argued that the man one who is thus engaged in sheep-raising ought not to have any protection. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska this question, because he is one of the majority of the committee that reported this bill to the House. There are 10,000 people and more not engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods in this country to every one who is so engaged; yet he and the majority of his committee propose to give the woolen manufacturers a protection of 40 per cent.

Mr. CRAIN. Is the gentleman willing to vote for the amendment which I have pending reducing the tariff on woolen manufactures to 25 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. PICKLER. No, sir.

Mr. CRAIN. Then, why is the gentleman abusing those on this side because they do not make the duty lower on these woolen manufactures?

Mr. PICKLER. I am in favor of a reasonable protection on all articles, and I do not believe that 25 per cent is a reasonable protection on woolen goods. What I complain of on the part of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means is that there is not an article raised by the farmer—horses, cattle, sheep, hogs, wheat, barley, hops, butter, eggs, or anything produced by him—upon which you do not lower the tariff so it is no protection or put the article on the free list, while at the same time you protect the Eastern manufacturer. But I say to the gentleman from Texas that I do not believe this free-trade policy is permanent, so I do not wish to destroy the woolen manufacturer because the wool-grower suffers; but if it becomes permanent, I would vote not only to reduce to 25 per cent, but to no protection.

A MEMBER. The gentleman forgets rice.

Mr. PICKLER. No, rice is no exception, as suggested, to its being lowered under this bill, but it is still a protective tariff for rice.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Dakota be extended for ten minutes, which I understand is the time he desires. He has not had an opportunity to speak fully on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, the time of the gentleman from South Dakota will be extended for ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. A single remark before the gentleman from South Dakota resumes. He has propounded a question to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] who is not here to answer it. Will he allow me to answer it for him?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will try to do so.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to hear anybody answer that question.

Mr. SPRINGER. The question was why this bill allows 40 per cent protection on woolen goods——

Mr. PICKLER. And gives nothing to the farmer or the wool-raiser.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to state in regard to the protection given to the woolen manufacturers that under the operation of laws passed by the Republican party they have been invited to engage in a business in which they enjoyed last year 98 per cent protection on their products——

Mr. PICKLER. The wool-growers have as strong a claim in the same direction.

Mr. SPRINGER. And in consideration of the fact that thousands of persons have been induced to invest millions of dollars in these enterprises by reason of this large protection, we thought it would be unjust to deprive them suddenly of all protection; and, therefore, we propose to allow them to enjoy this protection for such a time as will enable them to readjust their affairs upon the basis of free wool, and to prepare themselves, in the near future, when our revenues will permit it, for a still lower rate of duty.

Mr. PICKLER. I understand that more than half the protection to the woolen manufacturers under the McKinley act was a compensatory duty on account of the tariff on wool.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is stricken off in this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. But you protect the woolen manufacturer just the same. The gentleman's answer is no answer at all. He talks about the capital invested in woolen manufactures in the East. Have we not capital invested in our flocks in the West? We have been working under the same law. The McKinley act promised the same protection to the wool-grower that it promised to the Eastern manufacturer. And now, when you undertake to destroy the McKinley law, why do you not treat all the beneficiaries of that law alike? [Applause on the Republican side.] Why do you not give the wool-grower as well as the woolen manufacturer a little time in which to readjust his business?

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. PICKLER (continuing). Why do you not give similar opportunity to the horse-raiser, the potato-grower, the producer of hops and barley? Instead of doing this, you put everything that the farmer produces on the free list, or what is substantially the same thing. Though you have professed to be the friend of the farmer and opposed to the protected manufacturer, you now with bended knees grant protection to the Eastern manufacturer, while you kick the farmer downstairs. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PICKLER (continuing). I only want to call attention to this——

Mr. WARNER. Does the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] for an inquiry?

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WARNER. What was the matter with the Republican friends of wool, for which interest the gentleman seems to be contending, that induced them to vote this morning against giving the farmer time to adjust his wool business to the changed conditions of this bill?

Mr. PICKLER. You are responsible for this legislation, you and your side. I will tell you the reason they voted for it, the wool men on this side. We knew from your previous threats of destroying the wool industry of this country that these men would have nothing to expect from you excepting injury; and, in fact, the wool business has been gradually growing worse and worse in consequence of the position they knew you held on the question ever since November, 1892. Putting wool on the free list, therefore, will not hurt us any more than we have been hurt already since the last election of 1892. [Applause on the Republican side].

Mr. WARNER. How did you vote on that question this morning?

Mr. PICKLER (continuing). And we want to compel your manufacturers to stand upon the same ground that we do. That is what we voted for.

Mr. WARNER. I hope the gentleman will answer my question. How did he vote?

Mr. PICKLER. I voted as my convictions led me to vote. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WARNER. Does the gentleman think that that vote is going to help the wool-growers?

Mr. PAYNE. If my colleague would only speak a little louder we could probably hear him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURROWS. Let me say to the gentleman from New York——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PICKLER. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I voted to extend the time until 1898, and by that time we will be in such a position that we will not have to ask any favors of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WARNER. Did you vote for or against the other proposition, to extend the time to August1?

Mr. PICKLER. I voted to prevent the Democratic party from doing a worse thing, although we are in such a position now that they could scarcely make it worse than it is. Our wool has been practically on the free list for ten months, and we did not propose that you buy our wool at free-trade prices, while you give the manufacturer McKinley protection.

Mr. WARNER. The gentleman claims that the wool-growers are now being ruined, but did not he and the most of his party at the same time vote to-day against giving them the proposed extension of time to arrange their business for which he now contends?

Mr. PICKLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am accustomed to blizzards myself, but I can not tolerate any more of that New York cyclone. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had ten minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman from South Dakota has only used five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, had no intention to retrench the time of the gentleman, and will recognize him for five minutes longer, if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLER. I do feel a special interest in the abuse that is heaped upon the farmers by this bill, because my constituency is largely or almost entirely an agricultural constituency. We are interested, it is true, in the mining business also, but it is the agricultural features of this bill that are so damaging to us.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] says that the Democrats down in his country are in favor of free wool. Mr. Chairman, my opinion is that they would read one out of the Democratic party in Texas where the gentleman has been making speeches if he advocated anything but free wool. They would not allow him to belong to the Democratic party in that State. They would say that he was a Republican. That must be the way they would class him. As soon as a man says he wants protection on wool in Texas they say he is a Republican. It comes not because Democratic wool-producers in that State believe they will get a better price for wool, but because under the teachings of the gentleman from Texas they think to be consistent Democrats they must be for free wool.

Mr. Chairman, in 1889—and I am still talking of the interests of the farmer—in 1889, before the protection under the McKinley law, there were imported into this country over $125,000,000 worth of foreign agricultural products, every dollar's worth of which ought to have been produced by the farmers of the United States, giving that much more employment to the people here and putting that much more money into circulation and keeping it at home rather than sending it out of the country. There was among those products $14,000,000 worth of animals and meats. The gentleman from Tennessee said the other day that there was a very small amount of meat products which came into this country; but for five years preceding the passage of the McKinley law there was an average of 88,000 head of cattle imported into this country annually.

My constituents want to assist in the raising of those 88,000 head of cattle, and to put a part of the money received for them into their own pockets, if they can be permitted to do so. Of dairy products there were $1,250,000 worth in that year; fruits, other than tropical, $8,000,000 and over; flaxseed, $3,857,000 worth.

Mr. TUCKER. How much tea and coffee?

Mr. PICKLER. Does not the gentleman mean sugar? [Laughter.] I will ask the gentleman further, do they raise tea and coffee down in Virginia where he lives? I judge from the late Senatorial contest at Richmond that there was a hotter production than tea which they were raising down there.

But I am not talking of tea and coffee. I am talking of products that the farmers of this country could have produced. There was over $3,000,000 worth of flaxseed brought into this country. We have a region as suitable for raising flax as can be found anywhere in the Union, and we want to assist in the production of that flaxseed and we do not want it to come from Canada or anywhere else. We want to produce these articles, so as to employ our labor.

It is remarkable, Mr. Chairman, how, when a man on the other side wants to say anything about the protection of the farmers, he always bases his salvation on wheat. I notice that the gentleman from Kansas did not talk about anything except wheat, wheat, wheat.

Mr. SIMPSON. Oh, yes; I did.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, we are not contending here that the tariff has made us any great amount of money as far as wheat is concerned, but it has helped us largely upon nearly every other product. But we do contend that every bushel of Canadian wheat that is kept out of this country allows some farmer in this country to produce that bushel himself, and that the same is true of every head of cattle and horses. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that this committee wants to vote upon this amendment as soon as possible, and I shall only detain the committee for a few moments.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] has made a statement about protection, and who should vote for protection. I accord to him, as I do to every gentleman, the right to choose whom he shall vote for, and what doctrine he shall vote for; but it seems to me that no man in this House should be called a Democrat who is in favor of protection. Every man in favor of protection ought to be a Republican, because protection, Mr. Chairman, means simply that one class of our people shall be

taxed in order to enrich another class, and that is not Democratic doctrine.

Mr. REED. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will make some reply to this. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUNTER. The doctrine of protection as advocated by our friends upon the other side of this Chamber is that somebody in this country must protect the manufacturers, and they claim the especial privilege and purpose of introducing the farmer as the man who shall do that protecting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I rose more particularly to speak concerning the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. He proposes to strike out, as it were, section 276 of the bill now pending before this House and to insert in lieu thereof the McKinley bill; and he claims and has sought to prove here, by sundry petitions from different States and Territories, that this section would be in the interests of the wool-grower.

If we are to take the statistics and the facts, we find that under a protective tariff wool has been declining for the last thirty years, and since the McKinley bill was adopted wool has continued to decline, notwithstanding the attempt to excuse that decline upon the theory that the Democratic party attained power in 1892.

But prior to the election of the present House and the present Administration, wool was on a constant decline, and now the gentleman attempts to introduce into this House the provisions of the McKinley bill so far as wool is concerned, under which was precipitated a more rapid decline in the price of wool than under any other tariff which was ever imposed in this country.

It seems to me strange, if he purposes to benefit the farmer, that he would introduce the very measure, and insist upon its adoption in this House, by which the price of wool has been reduced all the time. He thinks that the Territory of New Mexico will not come into the Union——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HUNTER. I have only five minutes. I would like to yield to my friend, because I know the kindly spirit in which he would ask a question and take up the balance of my time. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] says that he thinks the Territory of New Mexico will be excluded and that their people would not want to come into this Union if we do not retain the present tariff tax on foreign wool.

Now, I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, that they would be very ready to come into this Union wool or no wool, sheep or no sheep, because it is not dependent upon a question of that character; and why he should introduce that statement into his speech I can not quite understand. But there is a sort of prophetic method of stating these propositions, that if certain things are not done, if the wool tariff is not retained the country is going to ruin; if the tariff is not retained upon coal and iron ore that the country will go to wreck and to ruin. That is the doctrine and that is the statement in all instances of those who were receiving the benefits of protection when there has been an effort made, not only in this country but all over Europe to reduce taxation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee, but I have a communication here, which is only one of many similar in character that I have been receiving from my constituents, and which I desire to read to the House. And in this connection, I would say that this resolution is from a Democratic county in a Democratic part of my State and district.

MAPLEWOOD, WAYNE COUNTY, PA., *January 9, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of Harvest Grange, No. 892, Patrons of Husbandry, the following resolutions were passed:

"Whereas it is proposed in the Wilson bill to place on the free list twenty-nine of the finished products of the farm which are now protected by equitable duties; and

"Whereas the same bill gives many manufactories 40 per cent protection; and now therefore

"*Be it resolved*, That we heartily condemn the gross unjust discrimination against the farming interests manifested in that bill.

"*Resolved*, That we, as members of Harvest Grange, No. 892, Patrons of Husbandry, respectfully call upon our Congressmen and Senators to use their aid in opposing said measure.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Congressman and Senators, also to the Farmers' Friend for publication."

Respectfully, yours,

JOSEPH VEITH, *Master.*
E. H. SAMSON, *Secretary.*

Congressman WRIGHT, *Washington, D. C.*

I wish to say that it is only one of a large number of protests against the Wilson bill which I am daily receiving from my people—and from Democrats as often as from Republicans—and from farmers, mechanics, laborers, and manufacturers alike.

It seems that my constituents thus far are unable to see wherein the Wilson bill will be of any benefit to them; and regardless of previous political affiliations they demand the defeat of the proposed legislation.

It seems to me that Democratic solicitude for the farmer is all theoretical, and it seems equally true that the practical farmers in my district perceive the folly and iniquity of this Democratic attempt to put all the products of the farm on the free list.

I believe I have nearly a thousand protests similar to the one I have just read.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not at all surprising that we who are representing districts in which the wool industry predominates should be overwhelmed in this Chamber with petitions, remonstrances, and memorials appealing to this body to stay the hand that is to extirpate one of the greatest industries of this country, an industry which yields an annual revenue to the people of this country—our people, sir—of over $100,000,000; an industry which is valued at over $116,000,000 in the property of sheep alone; an industry which involves in the value of land, barns, sheds, and equipments, as the sheep industry, of $408,000,000, and which gives employment, directly or indirectly, to over 2,000,000 American people.

I say, again, that it is not surprising that the people engaged in these industries should at this moment, of all moments, be particularly interested as to the fate of this bill. My own State, which ranks about sixth in the order of wool-growing States of this Union, will feel this severe blow probably more than any other State engaged in this industry. One-half of that State, embracing an area almost as large as the States of New York and Pennsylvania, is largely engaged in this industry; and I have received communications certifying that if this bill passes as it is now framed that it is the last hour for the industry of wool in that entire country. So wrought up are the people in that portion of the State that I have received letters from a number of my Democratic constituents against the passage of the bill, and one of them concludes, "I have never had the nerve, sir, to look a sheep in the face since I voted for Grover Cleveland." [Laughter.]

Now, it has been said by my friend from Texas [Mr. CRAIN], who recently held the floor, that when wool is placed upon the free list it will inure very largely to the benefit of the wool-growers, in enhancing the price of wool. That is a statement that no doubt represented the views of his people at the time when he stated they were satisfied with whatever he did, and it is, no doubt, like a great many other people with respect to like statements from the free-trade element on that side of the Hall, as there were a great many people all over the country who wanted a change. The change has come, and with it has come a sad dissipation of all the encouraging and racy promises which were made to them.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HERMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I believe you stated that the product of this industry was $116,000,000 annually.

Mr. HERMANN. I said that the annual revenue was $100,000,000 and that the sheep in the United States were valued at $116,000,000.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That the value of the product was $116,000,000?

Mr. HERMANN. The value of the product was $116,000,000.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You also stated that there were 2,000,000 people occupied in producing this amount?

Mr. HERMANN. I said that, directly and indirectly, the wool-growers and those who were engaged in the wool-growing numbered 2,000,000 in round numbers.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The year round?

Mr. HERMANN. The year round.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then that is just $58 apiece for their labor the year round.

Mr. HERMANN. That statement is in accordance with the knowledge and candor which the gentleman generally manifests in discussing this question. A great many of these people are engaged in this business merely as an incident, as the gentleman so well knows. That is so in his own State, a State which will be more severely affected than any other State in the Union in proportion to its population if this proposed reduction is made.

And, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say in answer to the statements that have been usually made upon the stump and to the appeals which have been addressed to the laboring classes—the consuming classes of this country—telling them when wool is placed upon the free list it will bring a vast benefit to the consumer of clothing. In reply to those appeals permit me to make this statement, and I appeal to the Ways and Means Committee to consider the testimony that was presented before them on this subject by one of the best experts on the wool industry in this country, Mr. Justice, of Philadelphia.

A question was addressed to him by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] as to whether protection would not

be a greater injury even to the small wool-grower than free trade would be a benefit to him, and his answer was that the tax that protection put upon the consumer of woolen goods would not exceed 90 cents per suit, referring to a suit made of the finest Merino wool, such a suit as can be purchased at wholesale at $27; and taking the ordinary suit worn by the average citizen of this country, which costs about $13.50, the highest tax imposed by protection on that would not exceed 45 cents. And yet this great industry, in which over 2,000,000 of our people are engaged and which yields a product of over $100,000,000 in value, is to be sacrificed in order to overwhelm this menacing despotism which taxes the consumers of the country to the extent of 45 cents per suit of clothes!

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERMANN. I would like five minutes more, Mr. Chairman. I do not often trespass upon the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to extending the time of the gentleman five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERMANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, another suggestion has been made by my friend from Texas; that the people themselves, the consumers, the working people of this country, are not satisfied with the present tariff and that they are asking for this change. Sir, I hold in my hand a very pathetic appeal which comes to me from the laborers and operatives engaged in the humblest occupations in connection with one of the largest woolen mills on the Pacific coast. It is signed with their own hands and the names of some of them are written no doubt with very little skill. I commend to gentlemen of this committee the pathetic language of these working people contained in this appeal which I will now read. It is as follows:

PETITION OF THE EMPLOYÉS OF THE THOMAS KAY WOOLEN MILLS.

We, the undersigned employés of the Thomas Kay Woolen Mill Company, request you in the most earnest manner to vote against and to use your best influence to defeat the Wilson tariff bill. If this bill should become a law it would have the most disastrous effect upon the industry which gives us employment. Those among us who have worked in Europe know that the prices paid for labor in Europe are so much lower than the prices paid for the same labor in this country that if foreign-made goods were admitted to this country at such a rate of duty as the Wilson bill would give them, it would have the effect of either throwing us out of work entirely, or else cutting down our wages to about the same rate as is paid in Europe.

We desire to inform you that if we are thus deprived of our means of earning a livelihood, or if we are obliged to work for reduced wages, we will hold those responsible who vote for the bill, and we hereby assert most positively that, irrespective of former party affiliations, we will vote and work against the election of any member who will favor a bill that will cause such distress to the laboring classes.

Now, in regard to the condition that will be inflicted upon the wool-growers of the country by this proposed legislation, I hold in my hand a most intelligent communication from one of the leading woolgrowers in my State, a gentleman who has occupied for a number of years the distinguished position of State senator in the Legislative Assembly of Oregon. This gentleman gives to this House and to the country an itemized statement of the cost which is necessarily incurred in the production of wool in, I may say, all that portion of the country which lies west of the summit of the Rocky Mountains. It is asserted here, and has been asserted frequently, that in the production of wool a very large proportion of the receipts are in the form of a margin of profit and that that profit is paid by the consumers of the country.

Now, this communication demonstrates beyond question that the returns of the industry, even under the protection afforded by the McKinley law, is only such as affords a reasonable livelihood for those engaged in it. It brings into use a large body of land which probably would not otherwise be utilized, for I may say that the lands devoted to pasturage in that portion of my State are perhaps equal in area to the State of Connecticut and are generally unsuited for other farming purposes. I ask the Clerk to read this communication, and I ask that due attention and consideration be given to it, because it comes, as I have said, from one of the most intelligent woolgrowers of my State and sets forth clearly the cost of raising wool.

The letter was read, as follows:

THE DALLES, OREGON, *December 6, 1893.*

MY DEAR SIR: In a short time the question of the removal of the present tariff on many commodities will come before the United States Senate, and from what the papers tell us it is fairly reasonable to suppose that the principal industry of Eastern Oregon (woolgrowing) is seriously menaced.

As you know, my experience in woolgrowing has been considerable, and I have been fairly successful.

I have been engaged in the business for eighteen years and have run from ten to twelve thousand head. I have made it a point each year, for a period of thirty days, to accurately ascertain the actual cost of all my sheep camps, in the way of supplies, and you can accept the following figures as trustworthy since they are an average from all these records:

COST OF RUNNING 2,000 SHEEP ONE YEAR.

Herder, at $35 per month	$420
Board, at $15 per month	180
Camp-tender to help move and furnish camp	200
Salt, 2 tons, at $30	60
Hay, 50 tons, at $8	400
Extra help during lambing season	100
Extra help during winter feeding season	50
Shearing 2,000 sheep, at 7 cents per head	140

COST OF RUNNING 2,000 SHEEP ONE YEAR—Continued.

Board of shearers		$30
Extra help sacking wool, etc		25
50 wool sacks, at 40 cents		20
Feeding horses used to supply camp, etc		180
Shoeing horses used to supply camp, etc		30
Furnishing camp—tents, blankets, rope, etc		50
Hauling 16,000 pounds wool to railroad, at ½ cent		120
Cost of 16,000 pounds wool as per above		1,991
1,600 pounds wool, at 6 cents	$960	
700 lambs, being increase	875	
		1,835
Net loss on above basis		156

The only possible reduction that can be made in the cost of running a band of sheep is in wages, as the plow has driven the stock so far back into the hills that the cost of feed is greater as there is so little land that will produce, and freight to and from the railroad figures largely in salt and other supplies, and shipping wool (my ranch is 80 miles south of Arlington.)

Thus you will see that at 6 cents per pound for wool, which is the highest price we can expect, with free wool, for the class of wool raised here, calculating the weight of each fleece at 8 pounds, which is about the average, and the increase at 35 per cent (which is all an ordinary band of stock sheep will produce, as we have to carry the males until two years old and past before they are suitable for market, and can not breed the ewes until two years old), the owner would be about $200 loser on the year's work. This is leaving out of consideration all the taxes, interest on capital invested, and wear and tear to camp accouterments, which is considerable.

If a wool-grower were running but one band of sheep, several of these items would be greater, such as the expense of camp-tending and horses, which I have divided by three, as one outfit attends to three sheep-herders. Again, the average loss caused by wild animals and by accident during a year is at least 5 per cent, and this, taken with the interest at 6 per cent on investments in real estate, or the rent which must be paid to secure a winter range and feeding ground, will considerably increase the loss of the wool-grower.

You are, of course, better posted than we can be as to the probable reduction in cost in manufactured material to be brought about by the annihilation of the wool industry in this country.

But when we are told that only three or four pounds of scoured wool goes into a suit of clothes, it does not seem probable that so small a reduction will be of any great advantage to the consumer, as the protected manufacturer is evidently to have so much the best of it that he will probably be given, or take, this small margin also.

For the last four or five years I have averaged 15 cents per pound for my wool, and $2.75 for my mutton sheep. The latter can not now be sold for more than $1.50 (at the ranch), and our wool is now being sold in Boston for 10 cents. The cost of freight, including insurance and commissions, amounts to about 4 cents a pound.

But for the unfortunate accident of Democratic success in electing a majority in both Houses of Congress and a President, the price of this year's clip would have been considerably higher than before, as the immense amount of rags and shoddy imported during the six months before the McKinley law went into effect is about consumed, and the manufacturers who are now idle would be at work on our wool.

I am sure that you are working earnestly in opposition to free trade, and I sincerely hope that a resolute stand, such as you will take in our interest, will be successful.

There is one thing which you may not have had brought to your notice, and that is, that destruction of the sheep industry means the abandonment of thousands of acres of land which now furnish good sheep pasture in Eastern Oregon (and which once, though not arable, furnished bunch-grass range of high value for cattle-growing, have been so heavily stocked for a series of years that the bunch grass has been destroyed, and will never return).

The only vegetation which now exists is weeds and the small sheep grass, which will support nothing but sheep, and upon which they will thrive; take away the sheep and this is waste land and can never be anything else.

It would be impossible for us to continue the business under free wool; we would have to quit breeding and dispose of our sheep for mutton as they become of suitable age.

When the industry is destroyed in the United States, I apprehend, the foreigner will raise the price of wool probably to more than we have received under protection, but we will have no sheep, and it takes a long time to stock up a range, as sheep do not increase very rapidly.

I am, yours very truly,

CHAS. HILTON.

Hon. BINGER HERMANN,
Washington, D. C.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOLMAN, for this day, on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. The hour of half past 5 o'clock having arrived, the House, under the special order, will stand in recess until 8 o'clock this evening; the evening session to be devoted to debate only on the pending bill. At the evening session the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BROOKSHIRE, will perform the duties of the Chair.

The House accordingly took a recess until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was call to order by Mr. BROOKSHIRE as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is now in session for the further consideration of the tariff bill, and under the special order will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we are told that "modesty becomes the gods even," and with how much more grace is it worn by those who have the honor for the first time of a seat upon this floor. I feel like apologizing for an innovation upon that time-honored custom which enjoins and impels silence upon the new and callow members, and looks to older and more experienced heads for guidance and leadership. But when reputed leaders on either side of the House are found prostituting their influence and prestige to the promotion of their peculiar personal views and local advantages, in utter disregard of the rights of their peers and in contempt of the interests of the throbbing, seething masses behind them, it is high time that unappreciated courtesies should be flung to the wind, and individual effort and responsibility felt and emphasized.

In 1880, that distinguished soldier and patriot, Gen. Hancock, in what was deemed at the time an inopportune and unfortunate utterance, pronounced the tariff question a local one. Opinionated critics and pretended statesmen were disposed to sneer at the observation, and doubtless it worked to his prejudice. But to listen to the arguments incident to this debate one would be led to believe that he was the political Solon of his day. After years of agitation of this question, paramount to every other save one in national importance, when party zeal and courage have been rewarded with a victory magnificent and complete, we behold the advocates for tariff reform divided, bickering, and halting in the way, from considerations of personal and local concerns.

I regret to see that a question of such magnitude has developed into a game of earnest competitive "grab," in which longest arms and softest fingers bear away the richest booty. In fixing the schedule in this the most important tariff measure ever presented to Congress, it is expected that mutual concession, toleration, and fairness shall prevail. [Applause.] There is the strongest demand upon the unselfish liberality, both of the members of this House and those whom they represent. Standing here as a Southerner, entertaining a pardonable partiality for my own people, loving them first and best, and according to every other Representative the same privilege, I feel that I can safely declare that in supporting this bill the people of the South are laying upon the altar of the public weal more than their proportionate share of the advantages supposed to accrue from a system of protection.

It is more than an accident or coincidence that in the long catalogue of legislative acts granting special privileges under the guise of raising needed revenues for the Government the objects and beneficiaries of this legislation were found mainly in the North and East. The beneficence and munificence of protectionism have been, it is true, claimed and argued for the country at large; they have been felt and realized only in sections, and unfortunately, for my people, in other sections than theirs. If the balance sheet were now struck and the entire system abandoned forever, we of the South would on "the idea of strict equity" find ourselves creditors in account for legislative favors, which it is true we were never selfish enough to demand, but to which, nevertheless, we were upon every principle of reciprocity at least fully entitled.

We do not propose at this critical juncture to refer to past inequalities and bias in the tariff laws. To meet the present exigency, past jealousies must be forgotten and a closer and more compact organization of our forces had. Still, sir, it may be said, without irritation of our friends of the North and East, that they of all others have least grounds to object to this measure, both as to its general scope and the details of its provisions. The bright star of tariff reform is at length in the heavens! We hail it and welcome it with equal joy! [Applause.] If aught can be said against its advent, it is that it still reserves its brightest light for the Northern and Eastern sky, and its shadow, if it has one, for the South and the occident. [Applause.]

Standing by the old Democratic landmarks, I still believe in a tariff for revenue only, but admitting always that every schedule, however low, carries inherently and inseparably a certain amount of protection with it. Practically there are no free traders in this country. There never can be until we have assented to the idea of direct taxation for the support of the Government. Much, sir, both from the standpoint of a Southerner and an old-fashioned Democrat might be urged against the structure of this bill. I make the concession without for one moment admitting the propriety of antagonizing it. In the first place an extensive and an enlarged free list, involving necessarily a higher duty upon those articles retained upon the dutiable list, is unquestionably vulnerable.

There are two ways to thwart the purpose of a revenue tariff, and one is just as effective as the other. On the one hand you may levy an import so high as to render it entirely prohibitory, utterly precluding the importation of the article taxed, and thereby shutting off all revenue whatever from that source. On the other hand, you may levy no duty at all, placing everything upon the free list, and of course obtaining no revenue at all. The latter, sir, is the pleasing but delusive fatuity of a recent phase of Democracy, misconceived and misconstrued. The first is Republicanism run wild, hopeless, irreclaimable, and as dangerous to the property and prosperity of the people at large as anarchism, panics, revolutions, pestilence, or war. The latter is Republican protectionism in its last analysis. The first would be the logical outcome and result of Democratic low-tariff ideas, but for the natural, fixed, and unavoidable barrier of an ever-present and growing necessity for revenue. The man who apprehends and predicts absolute free trade under present conditions, under any administration, is either a fool or a hypocrite.

Let the alarmist on this line look about him and reflect for a moment. Let him behold the expenditure of every Department of this Government swelling with incredible rapidity. Let him look upon a national expenditure calling for $500,000,000 annually, and in connection with this contemplate the result of cutting off at one blow the source of two-thirds of the revenue of the Government. Such winnowing of economic chaff is mere trifling, whether it be upon the part of Republicans or Democrats. We may theorize on the subject as much as we please, but the time will never come when we shall have no tariff schedule.

Mr. HULICK. I understand the gentleman to say that he is not a free trader in practice and that free trade can not be carried out in practice; but is the gentleman a free trader in theory?

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. I know nothing about free trade in theory. What we want is something practical. I can not conceive of such a thing as free trade in theory and not in practice. [Applause.] I know of no such free trade as that. Whenever I hear a person predicting absolute free trade, if he is a Democrat, I think, to use a slang expression, he is "talking through his hat" [laughter], and if he is a Republican he is "talking through two hats." [Renewed laughter.]

Sir, that is not the real issue between the great political parties of the day and country. The question is not whether we shall have a tariff, but how much, and not only how much, but upon what articles, and not simply upon what articles, but with what spirit and for what ultimate purpose. The question is, shall we keep our eye upon the constitutional privilege and duty of taxation and the original purpose and aim of this privilege, to wit, the raising of revenue, laying the burden upon the people as evenly and uniformly as possible, letting results take care of themselves, or, on the other hand, losing sight of the extent and object of our license, pervert our authority, and magnify an incident of taxation, and one not contemplated by the framers of our Constitution, into the first object and chief end of such taxation.

Has any gentleman of the opposition an imagination vivid enough to conceive what would have been the language of the authors of the Federalist, the great advocates and defenders of the Constitution, in refutation of the proposition to levy imports solely or even mainly for the purpose of protection? With such an antecedent interpretation of this most important provision of the Constitution it never could have become the organic law of the land. Such a constructive extension of the taxing power was beyond the ken of those great statesmen and lawgivers who builded this house of constitutional authority for us, which has been our glory and our refuge more than a hundred years. In these latter days we have fallen upon new ideas and new theories, and the first chart of legislative authority has been amended by thousands and ignored by tens of thousands. The bill now under consideration is open to criticism. There lingers about it much of the smell and taint of unconscious protectionism. The gentleman from Connecticut who last addressed the House went a long way to strike a blow, though a very feeble one, at the South. He tells us that we of the South ought not to complain of tariff taxation; that it is a tax paid by consumers; that a large element of our people consume but little in the way of food, except "sweet potatoes, razor-backed hogs, and hominy," and that their wardrobe as a rule is not very extensive. I would say to the gentleman, that we are not accustomed to look to his State even for a supply of these delectable articles of food which he has prescribed for us; nor have we, in later years at least, encouraged to any great extent the consumption of wooden nutmegs, one of the staple productions of the historic old State from which the gentleman hails. [Laughter.] The gentleman's remark, though facetious, is neither correct nor in good taste. He and those whom he represents, of all others, have least cause to complain of this bill, for by fortune or necessity it transpires that they who were the first are to be the last recipients of whatever benefits are to accrue from the protective and discriminating features of a tariff schedule. Now to particularize:

Section 3 is as follows:

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid on the importation of all raw material or unmanufactured articles not enumerated or provided for in this act a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem; and on all articles manufactured in whole or in part, not provided for in this act, a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem.

Here we have in a general sweeping provision the first important discrimination of 10 per cent ad valorem in favor of the manufacturing industries over all others. The champions of protection on this floor should make their first and most profound obeisance to the reporting committee at this point. At this stage of the proceedings the free trader absolute and the low tariff and tariff-for-revenue-only individual will find small crumbs of comfort indeed.

But, sir, this is the mildest form of the protective idea that here and there and oftentimes crops out. Almost every raw material, certainly every important one except leaf tobacco, instead of being taxed 10 per cent ad valorem, is put upon the free list, while the duties on the manufactured articles into which they enter, instead of being limited to 20 per cent, range from 20 to 50 per cent, the average being over 30 per cent. The manufacturer should again doff his hat to the committee. Iron ore and manganese ore are on the free list now, but the duty on iron and steel range from 22½ per cent on pig and scrap iron up to 45 per cent on penknives and razors. The manufacturer again has cause for gratulation, while the man who digs and delves for ore will be pardoned for a little vigorous "kicking," at least.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that the gentleman is criticising the committee——

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. Not at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because it has put certain raw materials on the free list, and put certain high per cents on the finished product. Now, I think that the idea of the committee was simply to get revenue in that way. If the raw materials referred to that have been put upon the free list were the chief dependence of the Government for its support, I am frank to say that I do not believe the Government would get enough to pay the members of the House their salaries.

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. That may be true. I am not speaking for the purpose of criticising the committee. If my friend had heard my previous remarks he would have caught my meaning. I do not refer to these discriminations to find fault with the committee. But I am attempting to bring before the House this fact, that in putting these raw materials on the free list and at the same time preserving a high duty on the articles into which these raw materials are converted, the committee did, perhaps not intentionally, favor a certain class of people and a certain section of the country. And further, I may be permitted to say, that in doing this we are diverging from the old Democratic idea of a horizontal ad valorem tariff for revenue only.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will my friend allow me there?

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. With great pleasure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am of the opinion that after this bill is enacted into law and the due course of trade is established, that possibly we will get more revenue from these finished products at the rate we will put upon them than we have received from the higher duties we have had on them for some time.

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. Perhaps the gentleman is right. That is a prophesy; and I hope my friend may prove a true prophet.

Coal is on the free list, but every wheel in the great factories which it warms into life and activity at every revolution converts some unprotected commodity into a protective one, helps to swell the great fund which the factory system has for distribution among the favored classes, helps to make the riches of the rich a little more pronounced and potent, and the poverty of the poor a little more tantalizing and intolerable. Copper is on the free list, but the products of the copper are protected by a duty of 20 to 30 per cent. Wool is on the free list, but the duty on woolen goods runs from 35 per cent on worsted yarns to 55 per cent on ready-made clothing, and the proverbial wool-hat man still pays 35 per cent on his hat.

Silk cocoons and raw silk reeled from the cocoons are admitted free; but silk partially manufactured must pay 25 cents per pound, the duties on silk in other forms ranging from 20 to 50 per cent ad valorem. Flax before it is hackled is put on the free list; but the duties on linen goods range from 25 per cent on thread or yarn to 40 per cent on the highest grades of goods. Raw cotton is upon the free list. The country understands how it came there. Our Republican friends are fond of talking of Democratic hostilities to wool. It has furnished the text of many a campaign diatribe in Ohio and elsewhere. They have rung all the changes upon that gamut, but you never hear them speak of raw cotton being on the free list, and for a very good reason.

In 1882 there was a duty of 3 cents a pound on raw cotton. Here was a moderate duty on the most important agricultural product of the country. A Republican Congress in the early part of 1883, just before its expiration, repealed this duty and placed this Southern staple upon the free list. A result of this repeal has been an increased and an increasing importation of cotton from India, Peru, and Egypt. Why, cotton should have been singled out for the free list when coal, iron ores, and every other kind of ores, and wheat, and corn, and almost every other agricultural product was dutiable, I leave our Republican friends to explain. [Applause.] I refer to this not for the purpose of adverse criticism, but to show the status of the Republican mind ten years ago in reference to the idea of protecting the great agricultural interests of the country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not understand that my friend is taking the position that a duty on cotton would help the cotton producer of this country?

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. Practically it might not. Still if there is anything in the idea that putting an import tax on an article protects it, I do not see why it would not apply as well to cotton as wool.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not my friend know that two-thirds of the cotton raised in this country is sold in foreign countries, and that the price of every pound of cotton made in this country is regulated by the market in London and Liverpool? But it is not so with wool, for we import two-thirds of the wool we consume.

Mr. BOWER of North Carolina. I understand the distinction drawn by my colleague. It is a very just and material one. Still the fact remains that foreign cotton is brought to this country and sold in competition with ours.

Raw fur skins and undressed furs are to come free, but fur hats must still pay a duty of 30 per cent. Hides, hoofs, and horns are on the free list, but the manufactured products of these articles are still favored with a duty. Wood in its natural state and in its crudest and simplest phases of manufacture is thought to need no protection, but as soon as the deft fingers of the carpenter, the mechanic, and the artisan have touched it a tax of 20 per cent is imposed. Mica, to my regret and the chagrin and injury of a most respectable element of my constituents, loses by the provision of the bill the 35 per cent protection hitherto enjoyed, but stoves, in the manufacture of which it is most extensively used, still glisten and glow in the sheen of a 30 per cent protection.

Mr. Chairman, I might extend this review of what I consider the objectionable features of the bill, but I do not deem it proper to do so. Sam Jones, in many respects the biggest man of this day and country, speaking of the necessities of the hour, says that what this country needs now is not so much a man to think and plan and doctrinize, but a man that will act, that will "get up and get" and do something. That is what is needed in the religious field and that is what is imperatively demanded in the political world. In the light of most solemn promises and party pledges I stand ready to support the measure in whatever shape it may finally come to a vote. [Applause.] It will not meet every expectation of an impatient, suffering people, but in view of its many features of substantial relief and the wide field of hope it opens up, I am prepared to say, "with all its faults I love it still." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not impute to elections as much significance as some do. Where there are great sectional interests involved they seldom settle anything definitely. The only solution of such questions is revolution or war. The slavery issue was agitated hotly for nearly half a century. Elections were lost and won and won and lost upon it. The press teemed with incendiary articles on either side; big-mouthed politicians bawled themselves hoarse, ambitious and aspiring statesmen skulked and squirmed and "trimmed." False prophets were up all over the land, and now and then declared the issue settled, but after the shedding of much precious blood the final solution was had at Appomattox.

And so, I do not contend that the election of 1892 turned *solely* on the issue of a particular kind of tariff, nor that this issue is finally and unalterably settled. But, sir, as it was one of the elements of that contest, and made unusually prominent therein, we have a right to infer that much stress was laid upon it by the voters of the country, and to allow to it a proper influence upon the results of that very important election. Regarding that election as only a very significant battle won, we are still to prosecute the war to its legitimate conclusion.

The selfsame fight we are now making was fought by our predecessors sixty years ago. The battle was fought along the same lines. Then, as now, it was claimed that certain industries and certain classes of laborers in the country needed special privileges and advantages to enable them to live and to prosper. Then, as now, they demanded and obtained concessions and contributions from the brawn and sweat of the masses. The manufacturers have changed in nothing except in the argument of their contention and the method of their warfare. Every privilege then claimed was on the score of infancy. No other pretense was advanced. Sir, that argument has died with the

flight of years. A later and more effective one has taken its place. How it has cheered the bounty-hunting, looting horde to many an onset. [Applause.]

Oh, Labor! Labor! How many crimes are committed in thy name! [Applause.] What was then asked in consideration of the inefficiency of tender years is now urged from a sham regard for the interest of labor. Sir, we are constantly reminded that there is an army of laborers in this country who can not exist and flourish save by the fostering care of this Government. That army, we are told, is now knocking at the door of Congress, with petitions in one hand and threats and protests in the other, demanding an indefinite continuation of the taxes that have too long burdened an indulgent people. Gentlemen upon this floor talk often and vehemently about the protection of the laboring classes of America against the pauper-paid laborers of Europe.

But, sir, who are the laborers of this country, and where do they live, and how do they live? It has been shown by an eminent statistician that there are in this country about 17,000,000 laborers in all, of whom about 13,000,000 are engaged in industries not susceptible of so-called protection, while 600,000 of the remainder are only occasionally benefited thereby. So that we have in round numbers only about 3,400,000 as the beneficiaries of the protective system. Sir, if there were no other argument against it but this it ought not to stand on its present footing for a day. A general economic law that does not dispense its benefits with equal hand impartially to every class and to every individual, however high or low, is inherently and eternally wrong. [Applause.]

What right has the lawmaking power of this nation to say that thirteen men shall be assessed for the benefit and weal of three other men no better than the thirteen and having no better or stronger claims upon the Government than the thirteen? As Democrats we have been taught to believe, and we do believe, that every citizen in this broad land must work out his own individual material welfare and salvation, not with fear and trembling, but looking to the Government only for equal laws, equal burdens and benefits, and equal protection to property, to person, to life, and to liberty. [Applause.] He has a right to expect this much and no more. This doctrine is old and elementary, I know, but it can not be that it has lost any of its force from age. It is the same that was taught by Jefferson and Madison and Monroe and Jackson. Whenever it has had occasion to speak, the judiciary of the country, with rare exceptions, has given to it its unequivocal sanction.

As late as 1892 Justices Brewer, Field, and Brown, of the Supreme Court of the United States, joined in an opinion that epitomizes the true Democratic idea. Hear what they have to say on this line:

> The paternal theory of government is odious.
> The utmost possible liberty to the individual, and the fullest possible protection to him and his property, is both the limitation and the duty of government.
> If it may regulate the price of one service which is not a public service, or the compensation for the use of one kind of property which is not devoted to a public use, why may it not with equal reason regulate the price of all service and the compensation to be paid for the use of all property?

But our Republican friends tell us that while protection does more especially enhance the price of the protected labor, that it really does more than this; that it scatters its beneficence broadcast, as it were, dispensing blessings where they are not solicited even or expected. In a word, they tell us that a high tariff will increase the wages of all industries, agricultural as well as manufacturing. The constituency whom I feel proud to represent here are mainly engaged in agriculture. If, therefore, it can be demonstrated that the passage of this bill will work to their detriment I should feel impelled by the highest official obligation to oppose it. But it has not been and can not be shown that such is the case. According to the report of the Senate Committee on Finance upon Wholesale Prices, Wages, and Transportation, no such argument can justly be made for protection.

Statistics are always dull and often unreliable and, I think, should be sparingly indulged in. Some one has aptly remarked that "though figures do not lie, liars sometimes figure." According to the figures of this report by Mr. ALDRICH for the committee, it appears that the rise in wages in agriculture since 1860 has been only 4 per cent, while in the protective industries it has been in round numbers 69 per cent. In 1866, Mr. J. R. Dodge, the Statistician of the Department of Agriculture, made his first investigation into farm wages and announced the gratifying result of an increase of 50 per cent since 1860. But a like investigation in 1892 disclosed the unpalatable fact of a decrease of 46 per cent since 1866, leaving as a balance an increase of 4 per cent since 1860. From an examination of the same statistics we also find that the staple agricultural products, such as enter into general consumption and constitute the necessaries of life, on the whole, have declined 6 per cent since 1860.

So, sir, the agricultural laborer can make his own deductions and comparisons. Mr. Chairman, I undertake to say they can not be very unctuous to his pride or his sense of justice. He will find that while wages of 100 cents which he would have received in 1860, have been increased to 104 cents in 1892 for the same amount of labor and length of service, that on the other hand the products of that labor would have been so decreased in price that the same quantity of such products that in 1860 would have yielded 106 will now yield but 100 cents, so that in reality there is an actual balance against him in 1891 of 2 cents, which only can be made good by superior efficiency in work arising from improved implements, improved machinery, and improved methods of farming, etc.

Again, it is often asserted here and elsewhere by the advocates of a high protective tariff that while the prices of manufactured products have continued to decline for many years still the standard and dignity of manufacturing labor and the wages of manufacturing laborers have not only been maintained, but greatly advanced. If this be true, it is neither strange nor unexpected. Why or how should it be otherwise, if the great and wealthy manufacturers of the country keep faith with those in whose name they have so assiduously claimed the bonuses and bounties of protection? It would indeed be more than Punic bad faith on their part, if, after using their employés as cat's paws to pull the chestnuts from the fire, they should refuse them something like a respectable division of the chestnuts. I will say that if the wages of the mighty host of manufacturing laborers are not ample and satisfactory, they ought to be. It is not the fault of the laws of the land if they are not.

But the whole story of wage-earners has not yet been told. There has been suppression of facts and exaggerations of estimates to such an extent as to leave the real status of the laborer in doubt and confusion. The report of the Commissioner of Labor shows that there is little ground for the claim so often asserted that American labor has such superior compensation to that of other countries, and especially Europe. He gives us a table, for instance, in the cotton-manufacturing industry, from which it appears that in a Southern district of the United States the average daily wages in this industry was 69½ cents, while those of England in like industries were 66 cents; and the difference of wages is more than discounted by the cheaper supply of all the necessaries of life—cheaper rents, cheaper fuel, cheaper clothing, etc. I beg the indulgence of the House for submitting two tables taken from that report, from which it will be seen that while American wages in the few industries given are higher than those in Europe, yet, as a matter of fact, the amount actually saved as surplus is nearly the same in the two countries:

Income and expenditures per family.

[Page 857, Seventh Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor.]

Industry.	Families.	Average per family.	
		Income from all sources.	Expenditure for all purposes.
UNITED STATES.			
Pig iron	762	$591.61	$546.23
Bar iron	623	784.11	671.50
Steel	183	663.56	563.50
Bituminous coal	508	650.30	524.71
Coke	249	572.57	462.09
Iron ore	165	401.65	390.93
Cotton	2,132	657.76	610.61
Woolen	911	663.13	594.09
Glass	1,276	859.64	769.06
BELGIUM.			
Pig iron	11	374.53	372.51
Bar iron	75	359.37	353.45
Bituminous coal	10	426.55	371.33
Coke	4	378.26	393.83
Glass	24	627.67	492.42
FRANCE.			
Bar iron	40	464.74	401.09
Cotton	116	365.94	333.70
Woolen	179	424.51	284.05
GERMANY.			
Bar iron	22	282.20	288.07
Steel	35	250.13	252.19
Bituminous coal	18	391.49	369.39
Coke	10	389.51	393.32
Iron ore	19	348.71	365.01
Cotton	72	302.11	282.58
Woolen	24	275.99	281.59
GREAT BRITAIN.			
Pig iron	65	456.86	435.31
Bar iron	114	519.99	480.67
Steel	166	589.13	530.82
Bituminous coal	166	495.25	457.32
Coke	15	379.99	359.27
Cotton	341	556.14	502.13
Woolen	131	515.64	481.04
Glass	26	501.60	460.44
SWITZERLAND.			
Cotton	52	358.56	348.69

Summary of percentages of expenditures for different purposes in normal families, by objects of expenditure.

[Page 864, Seventh Annual Report of Commissioner of Labor, 1891.]

Object of expenditures.	Income under $200.		Income $200 and under $300.		Income $300 and under $400.		Income $400 and under $500.		Income $500 and under $600.	
	Families.	Per cent.	Families.	Per cent.	Families.	Per cent.	Families.	Per cent.	Families.	Per cent.
UNITED STATES.										
Rent	24	15.48	105	14.65	395	14.98	659	15.29	509	15.15
Fuel	24	7.07	105	6.59	395	6.04	659	5.56	509	5.63
Lighting	24	1.01	105	.96	395	.98	659	1.06	509	.97
Clothing	24	12.82	105	14.33	395	14.14	659	14.38	509	15.27
Food	24	49.64	105	44.26	395	45.59	659	45.08	509	43.84
All other purposes	24	13.98	105	19.21	395	18.27	659	18.63	509	19.14
EUROPE.										
Rent	31	9.38	181	12.05	258	11.93	124	11.42	52	10.26
Fuel	31	5.38	181	5.62	258	5.49	124	4.70	52	3.32
Lighting	31	1.66	181	1.68	258	1.59	124	1.54	52	1.37
Clothing	31	19.08	181	14.16	258	14.18	124	15.08	52	15.21
Food	31	48.32	181	49.62	258	49.58	124	48.20	52	50.06
All other purposes	31	16.18	181	16.87	258	17.23	124	19.06	52	19.78
UNITED STATES AND EUROPE.										
Rent	55	12.42	286	13.09	653	13.86	783	14.73	561	14.70
Fuel	55	6.22	286	6.01	653	5.84	783	5.44	561	5.42
Lighting	55	1.34	286	1.39	653	1.21	783	1.13	561	1.01
Clothing	55	15.90	286	14.22	653	14.15	783	14.48	561	15.27
Food	55	48.98	289	17.48	653	47.05	783	45.53	561	44.41
All other purposes	55	15.08	286	47.81	653	17.89	783	18.69	561	19.19

In conclusion on this point, I beg to submit that the idea that the American manufacturing employés as a whole are receiving such princely wages is the delusive dream of the high-protection orator of the day. Against such an idea let the protests of the labor unions of the country, and the numerous strikes more desperate and protracted than ever, speak. Theorizing is one thing, realization is another. The "bosses" and superintendents of the manufactories may be satisfied; their wages doubtless are liberal. Indeed, sir, it may be that capital all over the country is doing the very best it can for labor under the circumstances, but the fact still remains that hundreds and thousands of women and men are in the workshops and factories of the country toiling for 40 cents a day, and out of that 40 cents boarding and clothing not only themselves, but often-times their families. This is the condition that confronts us, and this is the indictment to which we must answer.

One of the greatest objections to tariff protection has been, and is, the tendency to sectional accumulation of wealth in favored localtities, where such accumulations are unnatural and forced as the result purely of special legislation. I believe, sir, that patriotism like charity should begin at home, though I concede that it ought not to end there. But, sir, when I come to observe the effects and operations of this or any other proposed law I trust I will be pardoned for considering more particularly the results upon my own people. I maintain that my own State with others of like situation and condition as compared with others of this Union has suffered in the past, and is likely to suffer in the future from the continuation of a system that reaches out and grasps all the surplus wealth of the country and concentrates and holds it in other more favored States.

The champions of protection never lose an opportunity of inculcating the doctrines that in the beginning God created the tariff, and that whatever good things have followed are the creatures of the tariff. [Applause.] If we rise in the scale of morals and civilization, it is the tariff that causes it; if agriculture quickens and we have an unusual crop of wheat and corn and rye, it is the tariff fertilizer that did it [laughter]; if our trade increases at home or abroad, it is attributable to the tariff; if the people discard their old clothes and wear more and better ones; if they display a more ravenous appetite and a more fastidious palate and eat more things and better things than they did before, and still keep clear of dyspepsia [laughter]; if they pull down their old cabins and cottages and build larger and more commodious houses, it is the tariff that did it all. And so, sir, if wealth accumulates and multiplies in the country at large and at particular localities, we are not allowed to forget the fact that it is all due to the tariff as the first great moving cause.

Now, sir, if this be true some of us have grievances to present. We are no communists, but with equal natural advantages and like conditions we claim that we ought to be able to make an equal showing in wealth. If we are not able to do so we are apt to think there is something wrong somewhere, and if it is protection that produces this inequality, then we have a right to inveigh against protection. If we take the three agricultural States of Mississippi, Alabama, and North Carolina and compare them with the three manufacturing States—New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania—the contrast will present in its strongest light the point I am trying to make. The total assessed valuation of the property in the three agricultural States named at the different periods was as follows:

States.	1880.	1890.
Mississippi	$110,628,129	$157,518,906
Alabama	123,867,228	197,080,441
North Carolina	156,100,202	212,697,287
Total	389,593,559	567,296,637

In the three manufacturing States it was as follows:

States.	1880.	1890.
Massachusetts	$1,584,756,802	$2,154,134,646
New York	2,651,940,006	3,775,325,938
Pennsylvania	1,683,459,016	2,592,841,032
Total	5,920,155,824	8,522,301,616

The aggregate wealth of the three agricultural States in 1880 was $389,595,559, and in 1890 it was $567,296,634, a gain in ten years of $177,701,075. In the three manufacturing States the aggregate wealth was in 1880 $5,920,155,824, while in 1890 it had reached the sum $8,522,381,596, an increase of $2,602,145,772.

The increase of wealth in the manufacturing States exceeds that of the agricultural States by $2,424,444,697, an amount nearly four times as great as the total wealth of the latter in 1890. In New York the increase was, in round numbers, $1,123,000,000; in Massachusetts, $560,000,000; and in Pennsylvania, $909,000,000; while in Mississippi it was $46,000,000, in Alabama $74,000,000, and in North Carolina $56,000,000. If you were to distribute this wealth per capita each individual would have as follows: In Mississippi, $122; in Alabama, $130; in North Carolina, $131; in Massachusetts, $962; in New York, $829; in Pennsylvania, $493. The average wealth by the head of the agricultural group was $102, and that of the manufacturing States $601, a ratio of nearly 6 to 1.

Massachusetts has been conspicuous for the advocacy of protection. Her industrial classes have been active and vigilant in the support of the system. I venerate the old Commonwealth for the splendid record of her Revolutionary patriots and heroes. Even those of later days, her scholars, her statesmen, and her orators have imparted an enviable luster to her name. Without, therefore, wishing to be invidious or offensive, I desire as a conclusion of the comparison I have undertaken to present the parallel of Massachusetts and my own State. In 1890 the population of Massachusetts was 2,238,943, and that of North Carolina 1,617,947. The area of Massachusetts is 7,800 square miles, and that of North Carolina 50,704 square miles.

The total wealth of Massachusetts, as before stated, was, in 1890, $2,154,134,646, and that of North Carolina was $212,697,287. The per capita wealth of Massachusetts being $962, and that of North Carolina, $131, the question arises, Whence this difference? Can it be accounted for on the assumption that Massachusstts has superior natural advantages? With all his State pride, I have heard no citizen of that State boast of her climate or her soil. He can not afford to do so. I have recently visited this historic old State under circumstances and upon an occassion well calculated to lend an enhanced value to her natural resources, and an additional charm to the beauty of her landscape.

I believe I can do her justice. In no point of natural advantage can she be compared to the old "North State." She is without the sunshine, the exuberance of climate, the diversity and fertility of soil that constitute North Carolina one of the most naturally eligible sections of the Union. And yet she boasts, and justly, that she has outstripped us in the race for wealth as $962 is to $131, and this calculation does not include a large amount of untaxed United States bonds held by her citizens as their chief investment. Her workmen, they tell us, are enjoying liberal wages, living in ease and independence, while her political economists labor as best they can to convince the balance of the country that it is the most natural thing in the world that matters should be just so. Sir, we have submitted to this state of affairs for more than half a century, and it is high time for a revolution along this line, a revolution radical yet lawful and just, infringing upon the natural rights of no class or section, and in perfect harmony with the general prosperity of the entire country.

We are told by the opponents of this bill that one of the results of its operation will be a Treasury deficit, and we are conjured therefore to avoid all reduction of taxation on this account. We are asked whence is to come the revenue with which to meet our public obligations and to maintain the public credit. I answer by saying that the untold wealth of this nation is back of all of its obligations, and there is no cause of alarm. But, sir, other legislation is to follow this bill, or at least ought to follow, looking to the equalization of taxation. I have said that a tariff for revenue is the only defensible tariff, and the only kind contemplated by the framers of the Constitution, but I do not contend that it is absolutely just and equitable.

Under this system of raising revenue the amount of tax paid by each individual depends upon the amount of the taxed commodity consumed by him. Now, sir, in the economy of nature there is a limitation to the amount of food consumed by each person, and in a democratic county like ours the simple tastes of our people prescribe, as a rule, a reasonable limitation upon the quantity of clothes used by them. So that as a matter of fact the independent yeoman in comfortable circumstances eats as much and clothes himself as well as the millionaire, and therefore upon these subjects pays as much tax as the millionaire. In other words, the tariff in this regard is more of a poll than a property tax.

Now, sir, the people of the country have conceived the idea that property and wealth ought to bear their just proportion of the burden of maintaining this Government. They can not and will not tamely submit to the idea of a man worth from three to five thousand dollars, and even less, paying as much tax as a Vanderbilt or a Rockefeller, with a hundred million of dollars each at his command. [Applause.] We are expected to impose an income tax, and we will be recreant to our pledges if we do not see that it is levied. [Applause.]

In conclusion I would make an especial appeal to the Democrats of the House to see to it that the promises made by us as a party be, so far as in our power lies, executed to the letter and the spirit.

We have been in session ordinary and extraordinary for several months and we have not as yet fulfilled those promises. We have promised the people of the country financial reform, and such reform necessarily involves an increase of the volume of currency. We have promised to maintain gold and silver as a part of the currency of the country, preserving their parity and continuing the coinage of each. So far we have not kept this pledge. We have promised to provide a home currency by the establishment of State banks. So far we have taken no step in this direction. We have promised tariff reform and reduction, and it remains to be seen whether we shall keep this pledge. I trust we shall. As a party we have been greatly trusted; let us measure the extent of our obligation by the extent of this trust. [Applause.] Let us keep faith with the people and the people will keep faith with us. [Applause.]

[Mr. HULICK addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. SPERRY withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I expected simply to extend my remarks in the RECORD and shall do so, but I want to reply somewhat to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY], with reference to his theory of the consumption of imported goods that are affected by a tariff law. His theory is a novel one to me. It is one I never heard advanced by any other gentleman, either upon this floor or elsewhere, or by any political economist. The ports of entry of this country are not numerous, and when we come to the ports that receive the largest share of imported goods, like New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, they distribute goods all over the United States and consumers are coextensive with the civilization of this country. Consumption is not limited by State lines or by districts, and can not be so in the very nature of trade and business. And this statement that South Carolina must necessarily consume only the goods that come through her ports is one the like of which I never heard before.

The gentleman allows nothing for the fact that the merchants of that State, for instance, purchase from importers in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Baltimore, which goods they distribute all over the State and elsewhere. To say that State lines shall be regarded as limitations upon the consumption of goods is, in my mind, a monstrous proposition. Therefore I think the gentleman's figures, while doubtless correct as to the imports of goods in the different ports of the South, and in the North as well, yet they prove nothing to my mind in the way of showing the distribution of those goods or where they are consumed.

Mr. Chairman, I will extend the remainder of my remarks in the RECORD, and surrender the floor.

[Mr. POST addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BAILEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) reducing taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HENDRIX. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. BUNN, from the Committee on Claims, reported, in lieu of the bill H. R. 2086, a bill (H. R. 5271) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of James M. Wilbur with the United States, and to pay said Wilbur such sum of money as he may be justly and equitably entitled to; which, with the accompanying report (No. 265), was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bills (H. R. 2630) for the relief of the estate of Ramsey Crooks and (H. R. 2632) for the relief of the estate of Ramsey Crooks, and the same were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEM: A bill (H. R. 5268) to restore homestead rights to certain settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5269) amending the act of June 8, 1880, entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint an officer of the Navy or Marine Corps to perform the duties of solicitor and judge-advocate-general, etc., and to fix the rank and pay of such officer," and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5270) for the relief of telegraph operators during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DURBOROW: A bill (H. R. 5272) for the transfer of a portion of the exhibit of the Department of State at the World's Columbian Exposition to the Columbian Museum of Chicago—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 5292) for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 5293) concerning leases in the Yellowstone National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5273) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie E. Owens, of Drew County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5274) for the relief of estate of Mrs. E. J. Davis, late of Drew County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5275) to correct the military record of Walter D. Kelly, alias John Purcell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE FOREST: A bill (H. R. 5276) to authorize Commodore F. W. Dickins, of the United States Navy, to accept the decoration of the Cross of Naval Merit of the third class from the King of Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5277) for the relief of A. T. Sands—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5278) for the relief of Francis M. Nisbet—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5279) for the relief of Calvin R. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5280) for the relief of Louisa M. Vann—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) for the relief of Wesley H. Daniel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5282) for the relief of John M. Barrett—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KRIBBS: A bill (H. R. 5283) granting a pension to Mary O Donnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEILL: A bill (H. R. 5284) for the relief of James Erwin, of McBee Landing, Marion County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 5285) for the relief of Capt. James B. Russell, late acting ensign in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 5286) for the relief of Mrs. Margaretha Engelhardt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5287) for the relief of William Cole—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5288) for the relief of the crew of the United States steamship Wyoming—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5289) to incorporate the Washington and Georgetown Terminal Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of John Murphy and the Spalding Lumber Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5291) to place on the pension roll the name of Mrs. Mary A. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Resolutions of the Central Labor Union, of Concordia, N. H., in favor of Government ownership of the telegraph lines of this country—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BALDWIN: Resolution of Duluth Stock Exchange, asking that no reduction be made in duties on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELTZHOOVER: Petition of Steacy, Denny & Co., Breemell, Schmidt & Co., P. A. & S. Small, and a large number of other persons and firms of York, Pa., engaged in industrial pursuits, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: Petition of the physicians of Garland County, Ark., praying for the passage of a bill to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petition of S. F. Catlin and 135 others, of Parke County, Ind., favoring the Wilson bill, and declaring protection a fraud and robbery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Resolution of Jefferson County farmers, in Kansas, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of National Grange, protesting against reduction of the tariff on farm products as now fixed by law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNDY: Petition of Jacob W. Saunders and 29 other Union soldiers of the war of the rebellion, of Ohio, praying for the adjudication of all pending pension claims by December 31, 1894—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Joseph W. Sanders and 45 others, citizens of Spriggs Township, Adams County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. E. Shattuck and 133 others, citizens of Jackson County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Papers in case of Samuel McBirney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper in the case of John B. Domm, for pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COVERT: Petition of S. B. Fanning and other residents of Suffolk County, N. Y., in favor of retention of existing duty on potatoes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry workers of Pittsburg, Pa., in making green and flint glass bottles, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry workers in making green and flint glass bottles in Pittsburg, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH: Petition of Rev. C. S. Woodruff and others, for an alcoholic liquor commission—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. EVERETT: Petitions of J. B. Bishop, Edwin L. Godkin, and others, of the city of New York, to have all books and other publications printed in the English language placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Frederick Bancroft, of Washington, D. C.; of William Dudley Foulke, of Richmond, Ind., and of William Henry Smith, of Lake Forest, Ill., for the free admission of all books and other publications printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the president and instructors of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., for the removal of the duty on books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the president and professors of Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., for the removal of duty on all books and other publications printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Samuel Brockett and 23 others, for the defeat of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Protest of 175 skilled mechanics of Easthampton, Mass., irrespective of party, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 11 employés of F. H. Harwood, of Springfield, Mass., engaged in the manufacture of gold leaf, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of over 200 employés of the Nonatuck Silk Company, of Florence, Mass., irrespective of party, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of John A. Evans and 90 others, farmers, laboring men, and business men and others, of Vinton County, Ohio, remonstrating against the Wilson bill, and urging that justice be done to worthy veterans—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULICK: Protest of J. S. Kesler and 74 other citizens of Brush Creek, Highland County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Protest of 81 of the employés of the Ottaquechee Woolen Company, North Hartland, Vt., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEARD: Petition of the officers of the Historical Society Drury College, Springfield, Mo., to have all books and publications put on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of 11,000 Good Templars of Illinois, by Uriah Coff, G. C. T., and R. J. Haylett, C. S., Rockford, Ill., for national commission of inquiry on alcoholic liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Lanark Manufacturing Company, of Lanark, Ill., in favor of 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi: Memorial of the trustees of the University of Mississippi—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 51 glass-workers of Olean, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDSON: Resolution of National Council of Cherokee Nation asking Congress for an investigation of allotments of Cherokee Strip—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCALL: Protest of Franklin Phillips, of E. and F. King & Co., Boston, Mass., against the placing of an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent on sulphate of alumina and alums—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of H. J. Bishner and other citizens of Wells, Minn., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of citizens of Murray, Minn., against the reduction of duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition from Nebraska for reduction of letter postage to 1 cent—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORSE: Resolution of the Gloucester Board of Trade for an appropriation in order to complete Harbor of Refuge at Cape Ann, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of John S. Black, M. D. Martin, and 100 others, Indian Bay sufferers, praying for relief, with Exhibits A, B, C, and D—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEIL: Remonstrance of the Merchant Tailors' Exchange, against the duties on ready-made clothing in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Boston, in favor of opening the navy-yard at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PASCHAL (by request): Petition of 64 citizens of San

Saba County, Tex., asking that the present tariff on wool be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of 43 residents of Palmyra and 1 of Macedon, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of raisin-growers of California, against the reduction of duty on raisins—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 20 residents of Wayne County, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means,

Also, petition of 50 manufacturers of clothing, against ad valorem rates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Subordinate Association, No. 1, New York; of the Lithographers' International Protective and Insurance Company of the United States and Canada, asking favorable consideration of Miscellaneous Document No. 43—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers and importers of marble in New York and vicinity, that the tariff on marble in block and sawed slab and in manufactured state be now retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 136 employés of Auburn Woolen Company, of Auburn, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 43 members of Williamson Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 119 wool-growers of Ontario County, N. Y., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, transcript of petition of New York importers and merchants, praying for a specific duty on sardines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. W. Tuttle & Co., of Auburn, N.Y., iron manufacturers, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of workers of Newark and Kearny, N. J., in Clark's spool-cotton factory, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of drug millers of New York, Jersey City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Fond du Lac, Wis., and Peoria, Ill., for a substitute for section 468 of the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers of South Butler, Wayne County, N. Y., against reduction of duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 27 cigar-makers of Auburn, N. Y., against reduction of duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 56 farmers of Conquest, N. Y., against reduction of duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition and resolution of 6,000 wage workers of Amsterdam, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jacob Ludy and others, manufacturers of cigars, of Lyons, N. Y., for uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. O. Frye and others, miners of Missouri and Kansas, against putting ores on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 200 employés of Brokaw Bros., manufacturers of clothing, of New York City, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Lane and Herbert Lane, manufacturers of cigars, of Starkey, N. Y., for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 72 residents of Clifton, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of A. A. Frank and 7 others, citizens of Ovid, S. Dak., asking that the tariff be not reduced on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Petition of H. G. Riemenschmid and others, of Peoria, Ill., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RITCHIE (by request): Petition of the Libbey Glass Company and employés, of Toledo, Ohio, against reduction of tariff on cut glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Union No. 81, A. F. G. W. U., of Toledo, Ohio, against reduction of duty on flint glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of 168 citizens of Spring City, Pa., protesting against any change in the tariff on window glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest of 109 citizens of Putnam, Conn., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSK: Two petitions of shipowners, masters, mariners, and merchants, asking for a light-house at Point No Point and a gas buoy at Smith's Point, Va.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial from R. J. Tyack and 157 others, citizens of Wakefield, Mich., protesting against removal of duty on iron ore, and declaring that such action must bring destitution to a large proportion of people in that section, among whom there is already great suffering owing to the uncertainty as to the action of Congress respecting iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of R. C. Harmon, D. L. Brown, L. M. Webster, B. L. Brown, C. M. Wilkinson, Charles Odell, George B. Haight, and 50 others, farmers and laborers, of Trowbridge, Allegan County, Mich., asking for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: Resolution of Cigar-Makers Local Union, No. 173, Zanesville, Ohio, protesting against any increase in the internal-revenue tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Petition of Johnson & Son and 22 others, of Springfield, Ohio, asking a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 18, 1894.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

EDWARD O. WOLCOTT, a Senator from the State of Colorado, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The signature of the President *pro tempore* was announced to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.; and

A bill (H. R. 4340) to amend section 407 of the Revised Statutes so as to require original receipts for deposits of postmasters to be sent to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR WALTHALL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair, with very serious regret, lays before the Senate a letter, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATE CHAMBER, *Washington, January 18, 1894.*

SIR: I respectfully advise you that I have forwarded to the Governor of Mississippi my resignation of the office of Senator in the Congress of the United States, to take effect on the 24th day of the present month.

Your obedient servant,

E. C. WALTHALL.

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
Vice-President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter will be placed on the files of the Senate.

AGREEMENT WITH YANKTON SIOUX INDIANS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an agreement made by the commission appointed to treat with the Yankton tribe of Dakota or Sioux Indians and other papers; which, on motion of Mr. PETTIGREW, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF BRIGHTWOOD RAILWAY COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the annual report of the president of the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hamblen County, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation placing Mrs. Eliza Baker, of Tennessee, on the pension rolls; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry farmers of Sevier County, Tenn., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented 6 petitions of members of the All-Tobacco Cigarette Manufacturers' Association of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation for a separate classification and distinction between the paper cigarette and the all-tobacco cigarette; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 45 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, soldiers of the late war, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of 341 citizens of Cleveland, of 27 citizens of Columbus, of 22 citizens of Washington, of 88 citizens of Youngstown, of 57 citizens of Troy, of 117 citizens of Cincinnati, of sundry citizens of Medina, of 118 citizens of Findlay, of sundry citizens of Colebrook, of sundry citizens of Ashtabula, of 97 citizens of McArthur, of 32 citizens of Cuyahoga Falls, of 25 citizens of Logan Falls, of 88 citizens of Ashland County, and of sundry citizens of Morrow County, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER presented a petition of sundry cigar manufacturers of Independence, Kans., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 120, of Lynn, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAULKNER presented a memorial of miners and employés of the Pulaski Iron Company, of Eckman, W. Va., signed by C. F. Keener and 69 others, remonstrating against placing coal and pig iron on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry cigar manufacturers of Wheeling, W. Va., remonstrating against an increase of the revenue tax on cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of coal operators of the Pocahontas coal fields of Virginia and West Virginia, remonstrating against the removal of the present duty on bituminous coal; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial adopted at a public meeting of the citizens, operators, and miners of the Wells Branch Coal Company, of Wayne County, W. Va., remonstrating against the removal of the present duties on coal and coke; which was referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union of Colorado, praying for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; the coinage of the seigniorage of silver now in the Treasury, and remonstrating against the issuance of bonds, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry wool-growers of Las Animas County, Colo., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAREY presented petitions of Gottlieb Hansing, of Wells, Minn., and of Harry Hanson and 3 other cigar manufacturers, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry wool-growers of Natrona, Carbon, and Sweetwater Counties, and of sundry business men of Rock Springs and Rawlins, all in the State of Wyoming, remonstrating against the repeal of the McKinley tariff law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of wool-growers of Converse County, Wyo., remonstrating against the repeal of the McKinley tariff law; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Gen. Winfield Scott Garrison, No. 68, of Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the act of February 14, 1885, relative to the retirement of enlisted men of the United States Army and Marine Corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TURPIE presented a memorial of employés of the Dillon Glass Company and Fairmount Glass Works, of Fairmount, Ind., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on green and flint glass bottles, as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 812) for the relief of William R. Steinmetz, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ROACH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred a memorial of the Anaheim Coöperative Beet Sugar Company, of Anaheim, Orange County, Cal., remonstrating against the repeal of the sugar-bounty law, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance; which was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 198) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United State Indian agent at Union Agency, Ind. T., for services and expenses, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1424) to amend section 8 of "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Calumet River," approved March 1, 1893, reported it with an amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1457) to repeal part of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WASHBURN introduced a bill (S. 1458) granting to the Duluth and Winnipeg Railroad Company a right of way through the Chippewa and White Earth Indian Reservations in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS (Mr. PLATT in the chair). By request of the Young Men's Christian Association I introduce a bill, and after a second reading I desire that the bill and accompanying petition be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1459) to exempt the property of the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia from taxation, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 1460) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Smithsonian Institution for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1461) granting an honorable discharge to Drury Shrewsbury; which was twice read by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ISSUE AND SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read and go over under the rule.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas, on the 17th day of January, 1894, the Secretary of the Treasury did prepare and publish the following notice:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"*Washington, D. C., January 17, 1894.*

"By virtue of the authority contained in the act entitled 'An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments,' approved January 14, 1875, the Secretary of the Treasury hereby offers for public subscription an issue of bonds of the United States to the amount of $50,000,000, in either registered or coupon form, in denominations of $50 and upwards, redeemable in coin at the pleasure of the Government after ten years from the date of their issue, and bearing interest, payable quarterly in coin, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

"Proposals for the whole or any part of these bonds will be received at the Treasury Department, office of the Secretary, until 12 o'clock, noon, on the 1st day of February, 1894. Proposals should state the amount of bonds desired, whether registered or coupon, and the premium which the subscriber proposes to pay, the place where it is desired that the bonds shall be delivered, and the office, whether that of the Treasurer of the United States or an Assistant Treasurer of the United States, where it will be most convenient for the subscriber to deposit the amount of his subscription. Failure to specify the above particulars may cause the proposal to be rejected.

"As soon as practicable, after the 1st day of February, 1894, the allotment of bonds will be made to the highest bidders therefor, but no proposal will be considered at a lower price than 117.223, which is the equivalent of a 3 per cent bond at par, and the right to reject any and all proposals is hereby expressly reserved. In case the bids entitled to allotment exceed the bonds to be issued, they will be allotted pro rata.

"Notices of the date of delivery of the bonds will be sent to the subscribers to whom allotments are made as soon as practicable, and within ten days from the date of such notice subscriptions must be paid in United States gold coin to the Treasurer or such assistant treasurer of the United States as the subscriber has designated, and if not so paid the proposal may be rejected.

"The bonds will be dated February 1, 1894, and when payment is made therefor, as above, accrued interest on both principal and premium from February 1, 1894, to date of payment, at the rate of interest realized to the subscriber on his investment, will be added.

"All proposals should be addresssd to the Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C., and should be distinctly marked 'Proposals for subscriptions to 5 per cent bonds.'

"J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*"

And whereas there is nothing in said notice to show that there is immediate or prospective need for the sale of bonds to accomplish the object sought by Congress in the enactment of the resumption law of January 14, 1875; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has no authority to issue and sell bonds for any other purpose than that set out in said resumption act: Therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate, That, in the opinion of this body, the Secretary of the Treasury has no lawful authority for issuing and selling bonds as proposed in the notice aforesaid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Senator from Kansas, who introduced the resolution, asks that it may lie over until to-morrow under the rule.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest that the resolution be printed and lie over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie over and be printed, if there be no objection.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I give notice that on Thursday of next week I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate to be heard upon the resolution.

The resolution was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Senate of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury is not clothed under existing laws with any legal authority to issue and sell the bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the Government, and any such bonds or obligations thus issued would be null and void.

SETTLERS ON INDIAN LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present a letter from the Commissioner on Indian Affairs to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, to accompany the bill (S. 131) making an appropriation to pay the damages resulting to the persons who went upon the Crow Creek and Winnebago Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, between the 17th day of February and the 27th day of April, 1885. I move that the letter be printed and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

THE RUSSIAN THISTLE.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture in response to a letter from the chairman of the committee requesting the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture on the bill (S. 1237) providing for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as "saltwort," or "Russian thistle," or "cactus." I move that the communication be printed and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no other resolutions the morning business has closed, and the Calendar is in order.

Mr. CALL. There was a resolution under consideration by the Senate yesterday morning, and which went over until this morning. I ask that it may be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator from Florida that according to the rules the resolution has been placed on the Calendar.

Mr. CALL. I understood that it was laid over with the express understanding that it would come up to-day. That was the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], and also of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that although that suggestion or request was made by a Senator, there was no order of the Senate made, and consequently the resolution has been placed upon the Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Florida can move to take up the resolution.

Mr. CALL. I move, then, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida asks, in accordance with what he supposed was the consent of the Senate, that the resolution which went over yesterday be now considered. The Chair hears no objection. Does the Senator desire to have the resolution read?

Mr. CALL. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL on the 16th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment be required to examine into the condition of the civil service of the United States and the expediency of its retention or increase, and to report to the Senate by bill or otherwise.

Mr. CALL. I ask for the consideration of the resolution, and a vote upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the adoption of the resolution. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. BERRY. I understood the Senator from Florida yesterday morning to move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. I think there ought to be an amendment to the resolution, and if he is going to ask for its adoption I should like to have it go over until to-morrow morning, with a view of offering an amendment. I understood that it was to go to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. CALL. If there is any particular desire that the resolution shall go to the committee I have no objection to a reference, but it simply directs the committee to make an inquiry. If the Senator from Arkansas wishes to move an amendment to it I ask unanimous consent that it be allowed to go over, to be taken up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that the resolution shall go over and be taken up to-morrow morning. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING IN POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. VILAS. I ask the consent of the Senate for the consideration, out of its order, of the bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes.

This is the second one of the two bills which were brought into Congress by the joint commission appointed under the act for the examination of the methods of business in the Department. As I presume will be in the remembrance of every Senator, this bill was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads for its examination, and in a pretty full meeting of the committee it was examined and unanimously reported back favorably with one amendment to correct a mistake in a single particular.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads was, in section 4, line 5, after the word "shall," to strike out "immediately after the close of the present fiscal year," and insert "as soon as practicable after this act takes effect;" so as to read:

SEC. 4. That section 5 of said act of March 3, 1883, be amended to read as follows:

"That the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department shall, as soon as practicable after this act takes effect, transmit to the Postmaster-General a statement of the aggregate amount of domestic money orders and postal notes which shall have remained unpaid for a period of one year or more from the last day of the month of their issue."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL BANK INTERESTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first business on the Calendar under Rule VIII will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART September 11, 1893, providing for a committee to inquire if any Senator is or has been a stockholder of or directly or indirectly interested in any national bank.

Mr. STEWART. Let that resolution lie over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over. Shall it go over under Rule IX?

Mr. STEWART. We are under Rule VIII now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now acting under Rule VIII.

Mr. STEWART. Let the resolution go over under Rule IX. There will be more time for its consideration under that rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be placed under Rule IX.

WILLIAM M'GARRAHAN.

Mr. TELLER. Do I understand that this call of the Calendar is under Rule VIII?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution which has been laid before the Senate is the first case on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. TELLER. I believe Senate bill 341 was passed over in my absence. I do not know but that it may be considered under the five-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of Senate bill 341, which is upon the Calendar under Rule IX. The Chair is advised that when that bill was passed over the Senate was considering bills under Rule IX, but that it was passed without prejudice. Perhaps properly it should be laid before the Senate at this time. The title of the bill will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 341) to submit to the Court of Private Land Claims, established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope that bill will not be taken up to-day. A bill of such importance, I think, ought to have a day fixed for its consideration of which previous notice should be given.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator objects, of course the bill can not be taken up under this rule.

Mr. MORRILL. I should not like to have the bill taken up to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the bill should be placed among the Calender of cases under Rule VIII.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then the Senator from Colorado can give notice that he will call the bill up on a certain day.

Mr. TELLER. I give notice that on the next legislative day immediately after the disposal of the routine morning business, I shall move to take up the bill.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope not, for there are some questions of importance coming up on the next legislative day which will undoubtedly occupy considerable time; for instance, the elections bill.

Mr. TELLER. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that the bill to which I have referred will not interfere with the elections bill. I give notice that I shall move to take up the bill on the first legislative day after to-day. Of course, if there should be any objection to proceeding with it at that time, that question can then be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the meantime the bill will be placed among the cases under Rule VIII on the Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTRACTS FOR DEPARTMENTAL SUPPLIES.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (H. R. 4292) to amend section 3709 of the Revised Statutes relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments in Washington.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill merely affects the method of advertising for bids in obtaining supplies for the Departments. It requires that all advertisements for supplies shall be on one day and that all the bids shall be opened on that day, and then leaves the method just as it is now. It affects the existing law only as far as that is concerned. There having been some doubt in regard to the exact language of the bill as it came from the other House, I have prepared a substitute which confines the operation of the bill to advertising and receiving the bids on one day so that there may be uniformity in the prices paid by the different Departments for the same articles. We except from its operation the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Public Printing Office, as it is not considered that they ought to be brought under the bill. They have so many different kinds of things to purchase that it might be injurious to them. I ask that the amendment, to strike out all after a certain part and insert what I send to the desk, may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "following" in line 4, and to insert:

And the advertisement for such proposals shall be made by all the Executive Departments, including the Department of Labor, the United States Fish Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Smithsonian Institution, the Government Printing Office, the government of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of the State, War, and Navy building except for paper and materials for use of the Government Printing Office and materials used in the work of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which shall continue to be advertised for and purchased as now provided by law, on the same days, and shall each designate 2 o'clock post meridian of such days for the opening of all such proposals in each Department and other Government establishments in the city of Washington; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall designate the day or days in each year for the opening of such proposals and give due notice thereof to the other Departments and Government establishments.

Such proposals shall be opened in the usual way and schedules thereof duly prepared, and together with the statement of the proposed action of each Department and Government establishment thereon, shall be submitted to a board of three officers, consisting of the chief clerks of the Treasury, Interior, and Post-Office Departments, or such other official representative of each of said Departments as the head thereof shall designate, at a meeting to be called by the official of the Treasury Department, who shall be chairman thereof, and said board shall carefully examine and compare all the proposals so submitted and recommend the acceptance or rejection of any or all of said proposals. And if any or all of such proposals shall be rejected, advertisements for proposals shall again be invited and proceeded with in the same manner.

So as to make the bill read:

That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding thereto the following:

"And the advertisement for such proposals shall be made," etc.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to suggest a modification of the amendment by striking out the words "chief clerks of the Treasury, Interior, and Post-Office Departments" and inserting "assistant secretaries" instead. That will give greater responsibility to the board. I will also strike out the words "or such other official representative of each of said Departments as the head thereof shall designate." That will confine it to assistant secretaries, and will give more responsibility than the other method.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to modify the amendment so as to make the latter part of it read:

Such proposals shall be opened in the usual way and schedules thereof duly prepared, and together with the statement of the proposed action of each Department and Government establishment thereon, shall be submitted to a board of three officers, consisting of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, Interior, and Post-Office Departments, at a meeting to be called by the official of the Treasury Department, who shall be chairman thereof, etc.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it read, "Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury and Interior Departments, and the First Assistant Postmaster General." In the Post-Office Department there is no assistant secretary. There might be some contention as to whether he was an assistant secretary. It will then read:

Shall be submitted to a board of three officers consisting of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury and Interior Departments and the First Assistant Postmaster-General of the Post-Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 339) to authorize the Chattanooga Western Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River, near Chattanooga.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 8,000 copies of the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 10,000 extra copies of the Report of the Smithsonian Institution for the year ending June 30, 1893.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 3195) granting a pension to Lovica Hall, a widow of a soldier of the war of 1812; and

A bill (H. R. 4449) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City.

STATUE OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN STARK.

Mr. GALLINGER. A few days ago I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 15) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark, in the city of Manchester, N. H. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] objected to its consideration, but he has since assured me he will content himself with voting against the bill, and will not object to its being considered. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered now.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with an amendment, in section 1, line 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty," so as to read:

That the sum of $40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark, within the limits of the city of Manchester, N. H., and for the proper preparation, grading, and inclosing of the lot and foundation upon which said statue shall be erected, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, or such officer as he may designate.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not like to do anything unpleasant to the Senator from New Hampshire nor to the people of the good State of New Hampshire, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to this proposed departure from the general practice of the Government, which is to confine its ornaments of statuary etc., to the city of Washington. The District of Columbia is the only ground in the United States which is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress. It may be that in its history heretofore the United States has provided ornaments and monuments for different cities of the Union, but if so I think

the cases have been very rare. Perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire may tell us of some cases where it has been done.

There is no man whose character is more interesting than that of Gen. Stark. He was one of the bravest and best soldiers of the Revolutionary period. He was a man of remarkable vigor and probably his name is among the cherished names of all who love Revolutionary history.

I should certainly be very glad to see a monument of Gen. Stark, either in the Capitol at Washington or in one of the parks about Washington, but I very much doubt the expediency of embarking in the execution of works of this kind to be placed in different cities of the Union. New York, Philadelphia, and all the great cities may call upon the Congress of the United States to immortalize in marble the heroes and patriots of the different States. Ohio would be very glad indeed to indicate worthy names for appropriate monuments to be erected at the capitol at Columbus. But if we enter upon that course there will be no end to it.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask my honorable friend a question? I ask him whether he does not think it would be wise for the national authority to erect at Marietta, in the State of Ohio, a monument in commemoration of the founders of that State?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think if an appeal were made to the Legislature of Ohio they would be very willing to order it.

Mr. HOAR. I thought my honorable friend introduced a bill to have it done by Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. It may be that I introduced a bill of that kind; but so far as I now recall I think such a bill was never passed. As a matter of course no event in our history is more important than the early settlement of the Northwest at Marietta, mainly by the people of Massachusetts. It is an event that ought to be commemorated and it was recently commemorated in a most striking and graphic manner. There were two anniversary celebrations. Disagreeing as to the day which ought to be celebrated the people held two magnificent anniversary festivals, I may say, in which the Senator from Massachusetts and myself and others participated and made speeches.

But it seems to me that we ought not to extend the building, by the Government of the United States, of monuments in memory of persons of distinction, whose death perhaps came before the framing of the Constitution of the United States. I only speak of this as a warning, because if we embark upon the movement as a matter of course there will be no end to it. There were events and men in the history of our country before the Constitution was formed, and in every State in the Union since it was formed, which ought to be commemorated by marble and by story and by song, but it seems to me it ought to be left to the States to do these things. Although I am not much of a State-rights man and believe in the strong powers of the General Government, I hesitate to enter upon the adornment of the capitals of the different States of the Union by monuments such as the one now proposed to be erected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am, I confess, somewhat surprised at the objection the Senator from Ohio has urged against the bill. A similar bill carrying a larger appropriation has passed the Senate twice, and, if I mistake not, three times.

I am not prepared to-day nor would it be wise to enter into a discussion of the great achievements of Maj. Gen. John Stark. New Hampshire has not been unmindful of what that great man did at Bunker Hill, at Bennington, and at Trenton to establish our Government. I think there are very few citizens of the Republic who are unmindful of his valor, his patriotism, and his wonderful career as a soldier of the Revolution.

My State has erected a statue of Maj. Gen. Stark in the park of the State house at the capital. The last Legislature of my State passed an appropriation to place a statue of Maj. Gen. Stark in Statuary Hall at Washington. In the city of Manchester, where lie his remains and the remains of his illustrious father, who came over from Scotland in the early days of this country, a rude monument marks the spot. The city desires to give a proper plot of ground if the Government—which owes so much to this man, in my judgment, perhaps more than to any other one citizen of this great country—will appropriate a small sum of money to erect a monument in commemoration of his grand deeds.

I do not know how many precedents there are for the action which is now asked of the Congress of the United States. I have not looked up that matter. My attention has not before been called to it, but I think there are precedents. However, whether there are precedents or not, it seems to me it will do no harm for the Congress of the United States, remembering the great achievements of this illustrious soldier, to establish a precedent. I am reminded by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that Congress contributed a statue at Plymouth, in the State of Massachusetts. So there is at least one precedent for the action that is proposed at the present time.

When the State of New Hampshire sends a statue of Maj. Gen. Stark to be placed in Statuary Hall, doubtless my colleague and myself will ask the indulgence of the Senate to talk a little while, more especially to the younger generation, about what this great soldier did to establish our Republic. It is not necessary for us to do so to the Senate, because I presume every Senator from the South as well as the North knows what Gen. Stark did for his country.

I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of the bill, and that it may be passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, it is true a similar bill has passed the Senate once or twice. It has always been passed over my opposition. I am opposed, as the Senator from Ohio well says, to the policy of the National Government engaging in the erection of monuments in the various States and localities of the Union. Everybody admits the patriotism and distinguished services of the great man in whose honor this monument is proposed to be erected. So far as the amount of money is concerned, it is no equivalent for his patriotism and his services. If we were to exhaust our Treasury a thousand times we could not make a full equivalent compensation for the patriotism and services of our Revolutionary sires. It is useless for us to undertake now to make in dollars and cents an equivalent for their services and their patriotism and their sacrifices. Those things can not be paid for, either in dollars and cents or in monuments erected by the national or State governments.

Mr. President, at this particular juncture in our financial condition and financial history not one solitary appropriation ought to be made which is not absolutely necessary for an honest and economical administration of the living Government, the active Government, the Government of the people to-day. It is no time to be indulging in appropriations in recognition of services performed a hundred years ago, or at any other time, when at the time compensation was supposed to have been made, just as has been done all the way along in our history. I am opposed to the bill; I am opposed to all similar bills; and I desire to record my vote in opposition to such measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on the Library.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and I withhold my vote for the present.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON], but I am at liberty to vote on this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL]. Not knowing how he would vote, I must withhold my vote. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIXON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL]. I notice that he did not respond to his name on the roll call, and I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). It is proper I should state that I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], but as he reported the bill and is in favor of it, I took the liberty of voting.

Mr. DUBOIS. May I inquire whether a quorum has voted? I am at liberty to vote if my vote is necessary to make a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no right to inform a Senator whether a quorum has voted.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to announce my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Allison,	Cullom,	Frye,	Hawley,
Call,	Daniel,	Gallinger,	Hoar,
Carey,	Dubois,	Gorman,	Morrill,
Chandler,	Faulkner,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,

Perkins,	Proctor,	Shoup,	Teller,
Pettigrew,	Ransom,	Stewart,	Washburn,
Platt,	Roach,	Stockbridge,	White, Cal.

NAYS—13.

	Coke,	Irby,	Vest.
Bate,	Gray,	Jones, Ark.	
Berry,	Harris,	Pugh,	
Blackburn,	Hunton,	Sherman,	
Cockrell,			

NOT VOTING—44.

Aldrich,	George,	McPherson,	Quay,
Allen,	Gibson,	Manderson,	Smith,
Brice,	Gordon,	Martin,	Squire,
Butler,	Hale,	Mills,	Turpie,
Caffery,	Higgins,	Mitchell, Oregon	Vance,
Camden,	Hill,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Cameron,	Jones, Nev.	Morgan,	Voorhees,
Colquitt,	Kyle,	Murphy,	Walthall,
Davis,	Lindsay,	Pasco,	White, La.
Dixon,	Lodge,	Peffer,	Wilson,
Dolph,	McMillan,	Power,	Wolcott.

The PRESIDING OFICER. No quorum having voted, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allison,	Dubois,	Irby,	Ransom,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Kyle,	Roach,
Berry,	Frye,	Lindsay,	Sherman,
Blackburn,	Gallinger,	Lodge,	Shoup,
Caffery,	Gibson,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Call,	Gorman,	Manderson,	Stockbridge,
Carey,	Gray,	Morgan,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Morrill,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Coke,	Hawley,	Pettigrew,	Walthall,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Platt,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Proctor,	White, Cal.
Dixon,	Hunton,	Pugh,	Wolcott.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Fifty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the passage of the bill, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I did not have an opportunity to vote on the bill because of my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], who is not present. If he were present I should vote against it, and in doing so I would violate some of the most sincere sentiments of my nature.

We ought to honor the Revolutionary heroes who have conferred not only great renown and honor upon the country, but who established its liberties. However, we have fallen upon such evil times, and the people of the United States by our legislation have been deprived of the use of their natural and other resources to such an extent that we are actually too poor to honor the memory of our ancesters, the great and glorious men who fought in the Revolutionary war. To build monuments we can not afford to borrow money at 5 per cent, and that is what we are about to do now upon a very questionable use of the statutes, for the purpose, I understand, of fortifying the gold reserve in the Treasury for the benefit of banks and bankers and dealers in gold coin and gold bullion. That class of patriotic and needy citizens of course must first of all be taken care of, and we must be just before we are generous. We are told that is the philosophy of good morals and good politics. Those men seem to have a claim upon the different departments of the United States, legislative and executive, which it is impossible to resist. We must yield to them in every demand that they make; and if we should impoverish ourselves to such an extent that we can not consult the better qualities and properties of our hearts and minds, of course so be it.

I am put in a category here where I can not, in justice to the people of the United States, vote any money out of its Treasury for any other than a work of absolute necessity until the financial situation of the country is changed, and until we have realized to the last degree what I conceive to be the unwisdom of that policy which locks up all our resources and puts us to the beggary, I will call it, of borrowing money for our daily support rather than to have collected out of the people such revenues as are necessary for the support of the Government, and putting within their ability and within their power the opportunity of paying what we ask of them. They do not cheerfully withhold anything that makes for the glory and the honor of the United States. They certainly are willing, even at the most extreme sacrifice, to supply all the necessities of the Government, even though they may be considered as extravagant necessities, created by unnecessary outlays under acts of Congress.

But, sir, the people of the United States are not able to stand any more burdens. No matter how much money there may be in the country, no matter though it may be rifted up in the banks and placed under lock in their vaults to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars, no matter though the banks in New York to-day are richer than the Government of the United States and have more money under their control, the people have no opportunity to get hold of it. It does not circulate simply because the Government and the banks will not allow it to circulate. The resources are here. The crops are made. The world needs them. The necessity in fact is imperious for food and raiment and the other elementary productions that we so abound in in this and all other countries. While wheat in the West is selling for 40 cents a bushel or thereabouts men are going about Washington City who have been accustomed to work, able and willing to work, almost literally begging their bread. Under such circumstances I must wait before I can vote for a bill so meritorious even as this is. I must wait until our country gets in a condition where we can say to the people, "We are not casting burdens upon you unnecessarily."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I feel very sensibly the force of the remarks made by the Senator from Alabama, but I regard this as a very meritorious measure. I have voted for a similar bill on several occasions before, and I should be very glad to see the appropriation made.

I am aware of the fact that we are about adopting war measures. It is not done because there is any visible enemy in the field. The trouble is that our enemy is invisible to the people, but it is really a war. It is a war which the money powers are waging against industry and production; and we are increasing the annual debt to carry on that war to reduce places. The great revolution which was inaugurated twenty years ago is now being conducted with great vigor. The destruction of one-half of the world's money and the reduction of prices that necessarily follows are being severely felt. The burdens of the Government must necessarily increase.

As the value of money advances the burdens will be continually made correspondingly heavier. That we all understand. To raise $500,000,000 annually to pay the current expenses is double the burden that it would be if we had not destroyed half our money. The debt of the people of the United States, the lowest estimate of which I believe is about $30,000,000,000, is a sore burden to bear with the shrinking volume of currency.

I am aware of all that; but as we are carrying on a war against the industries and adopting war measures for that purpose, I believe I will not change my vote upon this question. I shall still vote for this appropriation, knowing as I do that it is adding to the grievous burden, but it is not a feather's weight compared with the heavy hand of oppression which we see indicated by the publication in this morning's papers.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I only rise to say that I agree with the distinction that was made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] in regard to an appropriation for the statues of distinguished men and Revolutionary heroes at other places than the national capital. I think, when we consider the temptation that there will be for unlimited appropriations in this regard to be expended in the States, it is a very wise and conservative distinction to draw, and that the statues and other memorials of the heroes of our heroic age should be placed in the national capital. The States have not been derelict in their duty in this regard, and they will abundantly take care of the name and fame of their heroes in the form of their statehood.

Apart from the condition of the National Treasury at this time, I do not think that even otherwise it would be good policy to open the door for a practice such as is indicated by the bill which the Senator from New Hampshire has in charge. I say this with reluctance and regret, because I would be very glad to oblige my good friend from New Hampshire in promoting the object which he has at heart for his people. I do not think, though, that it is wise, or politic, or expedient at this time to appropriate money for such a purpose. Gen. Stark's name and fame are embalmed in the hearts of his countrymen. A statue of him has already been erected by the State of New Hampshire, as the Senator says, in the State house grounds at the capital of that State; he is to be remembered and his memory perpetuated in Statuary Hall in this Capitol building; and there seems to be no pressing exigency to provide that he shall not be forgotten, as he never will be.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I voted for an appropriation for this purpose at a previous session of Congress, and I hoped to vote for it again. I believe it is a worthy thing for the United States to erect statues to our Revolutionary heroes, and in the States which gave them to this great country. I voted for this appropriation this morning. Upon reflection, at the present time I believe it to be my duty to change that vote for the reason suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART]. I do not believe our financial situation is such as that I should be justified at this particular juncture in following the suggestion of my own heart and the nation's patriotic desire to pay this tribute to a State and to a hero who served his country in time of its utmost need.

Congress has seen fit to curtail the supply of money in this country at a time when it was famishing for it. We are in that famine, and every part of the land is feeling it, and, as we are advised by the Secretary of the Treasury, we have upon us a deficit which, according to his plan, is to be supplied by a recurrence to the credit of the country and the issue of bonds. According to the scheme of taxation which has been propounded, it would seem as if this deficit were to become for some years at least one of the institutions of our country, to be continuously fed by an extension of its credit, by the hoarding up of more money in the Treasury, and by a continuance of depressed financial conditions.

I should not feel warranted in my conscience at such a time in adding a feather's weight to the burdens of an afflicted people. While I have every sympathy with the object of the bill and dislike that my name should be put in an adverse vote toward it, our national poverty and not my will consents.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, perhaps it will be proper, as chairman of the Committee on the Library, as I made the report to the Senate in favor of the passage of this bill, that I should say a word as to why the report was made. It was because it has become a fixed and established policy of this Government to build monuments to its distinguished citizens. We have now in process of erection monuments to Gen. Logan, Gen. Hancock, and perhaps others. Fifty thousand dollars has been appropriated by Congress for the erection of these monuments.

Mr. GRAY. In this city?

Mr. MILLS. Not in this city, but for building them out of the public Treasury.

Mr. GRAY. In this city?

Mr. MILLS. I do not care where we are building them, we are building them out of the public Treasury.

Mr. GRAY. I only asked for information.

Mr. MILLS. It is not a question about the location, if I understand the objections made by the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Delaware, but it is as to the condition of the public Treasury.

If we are to begin the business of cutting down appropriations, I have no objection, if it is the desire of Senators and Representatives, to suspend for the present the business of building monuments to illustrious citizens who have done so much to establish and perpetuate the Government.

For myself, sir, I am in favor of building monuments to great men. I think they are great school-teachers. They impress great lessons upon those who have come after them and those who are still to come after them, and I am glad whenever I have an opportunity to vote to build these monuments to perpetuate the memory of the illustrious deeds of our ancestors.

I think that we might in some other part of our expenditures do some curtailing more appropriately than to commence with Stark and Francis Marion. The very first bugle note that I have heard sound in this Chamber for retrenchment and reform is to turn our backs upon the memories of two of the most illustrious men who founded this Government.

In obedience to American sentiment, strong, all-pervading among its people, when these measures have been before presented to this body they have been passed without a single dissenting voice. The Committee on the Library has reported in favor of erecting these monuments to these two illustrious scions of our Revolutionary days, and if we are getting so poor that we can not afford to build these monuments, I think we are getting in a very pitiable condition.

Mr. President, we may hear sometime during this session more evidences and more appeals for economy, but we shall not hear them when great appropriations are asked for, many of which are not wanted by the Government.

I leave to the Senate to pursue its own course in this matter. For me, I will not start the knife of economy upon the name of Francis Marion or John Stark.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, this appropriation is now, I believe, proposed to be made $40,000. There are about seventy million people in this country or will be by the time this statue is planned and the monument erected. So that it is about a half a cent apiece that the people of the United States are asked to pay.

We never have been in the habit of proposing many of these things in the same Congress; the Library Committee regulates that; and I do not suppose that it is likely that during the coming two years there will be any others proposed except this and the South Carolina one. If there should be four of them, it would be two cents apiece all around.

I differ with the Senators who think that, even in what we call hard times, this country is not rich and powerful enough and the people of the country are not willing to pay a proper tribute of respect to their heroes. I think the poorest person in the country, animated by an American spirit, would be—I was about to say, and I think I could say with truth—the most likely, in spite of hardship or want, to favor this kind of appropriation.

I differ also with Senators who think that these monuments ought to be put at the national capital. I think they ought to be put at the places where the men were born, where they died and perfomed their heroic actions. The whole country in New England is full of the memories and traditions of John Stark, and the whole country in South Carolina is full of the traditions and memories of Marion and Sumter.

Mr. President, these monuments educate the child who never is educated from books. They educate the child before the education of books begins.

The military spirit of the French people, the military and naval spirit of the English people, has been educated and trained and has grown because the French or the English child finds in every market place, in every public square of a great city, monuments to the men who have done their good fighting. Over every public square in an important city you will find towering the monument to Nelson or to Wellington or to Rodney. I suppose not 25 per cent of the French people even to-day are able to read and write. It is these monuments to Bonaparte in the Place Vendome, to the great marshals who accompanied him, to Lannes and to Ney, which educate in the French people the trait which responded to the great refrain:

Sons of France, awake to glory!

I want to see these things done at national cost, by national gratitude, and by the national power. It is not because the State of New Hampshire wants to save thirty or forty thousand dollars that her Senators propose that this tribute to the great New England soldier should be paid; it is because she desires there should come to him and to those who prize his fame the great honor and satisfaction of an expression of national gratitude. The monument when built by Congress is worth tenfold what it would be if built by any State, however respectable.

Where should the soldier rest but where he fell? Where should the monument to the soldier be built, but where he fell? I do not think there is ever any danger that we shall get too many.

I want to see a monument built by national gratitude to Marion and to Sumter. I want to see the great deed of George Rogers Clarke commemorated in the town of Lexington, where his dust sleeps. I want to see the great civic service of James Madison commemorated by national gratitude either at the national capital or in the State of Virginia. The State of the honorable Senator who has just spoken is so rich in heroes, that even in that magnificent work of art at the capitol in Richmond, where the statues of six great men surround that of Washington, there was no room for James Madison. I wish and I hope the Senators from Virginia will ask us before long to supply that need at the national cost.

George Rogers Clarke, having a little handful of men, holding a fort in the Northwest, in the forest, had the only military force in the great Northwestern domain, except an English force of ten times his power, which could, I suppose, have taken his little handful of men in an ordinary attack in an hour. He did not evacuate the fort and did not wait to be attacked, but he moved his own force through the forests and surprised the British garrison just before daybreak. He captured ten times his own number, and the result was that on the principle of *uti possidetis* we held the great Northwest, and our boundary was established where it is, instead of having the Ohio River as the northwestern boundary of the Republic. Yet that man sleeps beneath the soil of Kentucky in a grave without a stone to mark it. Mr. President, let a monument be put there, and hundreds and hundreds and thousands and thousands of American youths will gaze upon it and will learn that story by heart.

When we passed in the Senate a few years ago a bill for erecting a monument over George Rogers Clarke, an Englishman, the editor of a great New York paper, who undertakes to give us instructions in political economy, who is read more, I think, by my honorable friend from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] than by anybody else in this body, undertook to laugh and sneer at the proposition in the Senate to build a monument to this obscure and nameless man, of whom this Englishman had never heard.

I hope, Mr. President, there never will be a time, come hard times or come prosperous times, when the American Senate will not be ready, when asked by the representatives of a great State, to perform such an act as this in commemoration of her great heroes.

I said this monument would cost the people of the United States a half cent apiece. My honorable friend from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] corrects me and says it is half a mill apiece, the twentieth part of a cent.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator from Massachusetts has made my speech for me. Seventy million mills contributed by the

people of the United States, I believe, would be $70,000; and $10,000 would be a contribution of a trifle over half a mill by each individual.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I take very great pleasure in voting for this bill and in giving the reasons why I vote for it; and I take great pleasure in voting for it at this particular time.

The question presents itself whether or not when business is paralyzed and people are out of employment, when there is great suffering and want in the country, is the time to stop the necessary and proper expenditures of the Government, or whether it is not wise at such a period, when the people need employment, when suffering is abroad amongst them, to disburse the money of the Government and its credit in such a way that these people will be preserved from the evils of the want of work, of destitution, and of poverty?

Mr. President, a time of general suffering and want is the period when the Government should do whatever is needful and proper and legitimate to do, and should advance the public works and expend money in order that the people may have employment, not to make it a matter of charity, not to go beyond the bounds of constitutional jurisdiction and power, but within them to distribute the money and the credit of the Government in doing whatever is proper and useful and necessary for the general good in the largest manner.

There is no question of the fact that in this country business is paralyzed to a large extent; that the ordinary sources of the distribution of the products of the country have been in some measure checked and restrained. It matters not from what cause that may be. We are not here to discuss that question. We wish to know whether or not a country of seventy million people, of inexhaustible resources, of boundless production, capable of furnishing subsistence and comfort to every one of those seventy million people, shall at this time have no relief, no assistance by the supreme legislative power of the Government, and when it can be done in strict accordance with constitutional functions and its legitimate and proper duty.

Therefore, while I concur in all the suggestions which have been made, which address themselves to the patriotic consideration of this body and of the people of this country in perpetuating the memory of those men who have been the apostles of free government, in bringing them conspicuously before the people of this and future generations, I take especial pleasure in doing it at this time, because in a small degree it furnishes employment to the people who need it to preserve them from suffering and destitution.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] seems to be under the impression that this bill has heretofore passed the Senate without opposition. If the Senator will examine the RECORD he will find that there was a very strong contest over it on one or two occasions when it was here pending. It has never passed without opposition. We had a long discussion upon it when Mr. BLAIR was one of the Senators from New Hampshire, and it has been opposed every time it has been presented.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I stand corrected. I had understood that the bill had been passed without opposition. I regret very much to hear that there has ever been one word of opposition raised in this body to the erection of a monument either to Francis Marion or to John Stark.

History tells us that the battle of Bennington, which we won by the splendor of Stark's genius and his indomitable courage, was the cause of the fall of the British forces at Saratoga; and when we remember how much we have inherited of beneficence from that one man alone, and also from Marion, I am unwilling at this late day to interpose any objection to erecting a pile of stones to point our children to, and say that those stones were raised to the memory of one of the grandest acts in the history of the American Government and one of the grandest acts in the history of the world.

If economy, sir, is to be practiced and if we are to become alarmed at the present condition of the Treasury, let us practice it somewhere else. I agree thoroughly in all that my friend from Florida [Mr. CALL] has just said. In a time of great distress, when labor is thrown out of employment, when the streets and highways are filled with idle men, unwillingly idle, that is the time of all others when the Government ought to be liberal in its expenditure in employing the labor of the country and preventing it from starvation.

While I stand corrected as to the statement made by my friend from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], I still stand firmly for the passage of this bill and for the erection of the proposed monument.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, this bill has twice passed the Senate. On both occasions I think I not only recorded my vote against it, but made a few remarks to the Senate in opposition to it.

I do not believe that it was ever contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that the Congress of the United States should make appropriations to build statues or monuments in the various States to distinguished men who had performed distinguished services. I believe, if a monument is to be erected in New Hampshire, that New Hampshire ought to pay the bill, and not come to the General Government and ask it to appropriate money to build a statue in that State to Gen. Stark. If the monument were to be built here in the city of Washington, then there might be some reason for asking such an appropriation, but there is no reason, in my opinion, why we should appropriate money to build a statue in the State of New Hampshire or in any other State.

I am astonished to hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that now, because times are hard, this Government should be more liberal in appropriating money. That is not my theory of the Constitution. My idea is that each individual citizen of the United States should look to himself, and it is not the purpose of this Government to give work to individuals throughout the United States by appropriating money which belongs to other people and does not belong to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas will please suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER.]

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside informally until the pending measure is disposed of.

Mr. GRAY. I shall not object to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire if we can have a vote now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senate is ready to vote.

Mr. BERRY. I want two minutes more to complete what I wish to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent of the Senate that the unfinished business be informally laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the bill which was under consideration at the hour of 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. BERRY. I shall not object if the Senator from Delaware will consent that I may occupy not more than two minutes to conclude what I was about to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and he recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I had thought that the Senator from Texas agreed with me that the reason why distress exists in this country at this time is because the General Government has undertaken to take care of individual citizens and to give them advantages by reason of legislation enacted by this Government.

I say that I believe the distress which at present exists throughout the country is attributable to the fact that this Government has exercised a species of paternalism and has taken the money of the people, which belonged to all the people, and given it to individuals throughout the United States, sometimes by direct appropriation but more especially by tariff laws, intended to protect particular individuals and particular classes.

These are the reasons why I called for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill, and I hope the Senate may defeat it.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Arkansas allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly I will.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator this question: Suppose we admit the fact that the tariff or any other cause has produced the great want and destitution in the country, does the Senator prefer that the people should starve and die rather than that the Government should expend its money for legitimate purposes?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida knows that I want no man to starve or die; but he knows as well as I know that, according to the theory of our Government, where charity is to be given to those who are unable to make a living for themselves, who are indigent, it should be given by the States and by the counties and not by the General Government.

I say the whole theory of this Government is that there is no power under the Constitution by which we can appropriate money for the special benefit of a particular individual. That is my theory, and the Senator can not shift the issue by talking about people starving. Does he mean to say, if we are going to give charity directly to these individuals, that the best way is to vote money to build monuments all over the country? If we were going to give money to the people, I would pick out the most needy in the country and give it to them directly and spe-

cifically, if I believed as the Senator from Florida believes, rather than undertake to provide for those of a particular locality by building monuments.

Mr. GRAY. If there is going to be any continued debate I shall have to renew my objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think the bill had better go over.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think we can get a vote on it now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is, Shall the bill pass? upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. I do not know how he would vote on this question if he were present, and I therefore refrain from voting.

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If he were present I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIXON. I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL], and therefore withhold my vote. I understand if he were present he would vote "nay;" I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 15; as follows:

YEAS—32.

Allison,	Frye,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Call,	Gallinger,	Murphy,	Stewart,
Carey,	Gibson,	Perkins,	Stockbridge,
Chandler,	Gorman,	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Platt,	Voorhees,
Davis,	Hoar,	Proctor,	Washburn,
Dubois,	Lindsay,	Ransom,	White, Cal.
Faulkner,	Mills,	Roach,	Wolcott.

NAYS—15.

Bate,	Coke,	Hunton,	Pugh
Berry,	Daniel,	Irby,	Sherman,
Caffery,	Gray,	Jones, Ark.	Vest.
Cockrell,	Harris,	Kyle,	

NOT VOTING—38.

Aldrich,	George,	Manderson,	Smith,
Allen,	Gordon,	Martin,	Squire,
Blackburn,	Hale,	Mitchell, Oregon	Turpie,
Brice,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vance,
Butler,	Higgins,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Camden,	Hill,	Palmer,	Walthall,
Cameron,	Jones, Nev.	Pasco,	White, La.
Colquitt,	Lodge,	Peffer,	Wilson.
Dixon,	McMillan,	Power,	
Dolph,	McPherson,	Quay,	

So the bill was passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 3195) granting a pension to Lovica Hall, a widow of a soldier of the war of 1812, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4449) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I favor the repeal of the present Federal election law, for the reason that the premises upon which it is based are vicious and untenable. This legislation is based upon the assumption that the people of the United States are better than the people of the States. It is one of the remarkable features of political opinion in this country that since the civil war the idea has obtained almost generally that the control of the Federal Government is under Federal officials not responsible to the people of the States. It is the most remarkable assumption that has ever entered into public life that when you take a citizen of a State and clothe him in a Federal uniform he becomes a better, more intelligent, and more patriotic man.

While the framers of the Constitution in creating the autonomy of the Government recognized Federal and State jurisdiction, every intelligent citizen knows that the fountain of power, both national and State, is in the people. The stream never rises higher than the fountain, and to say that a Federal official taken from a State becomes better and wiser and more patriotic because he draws his salary from the National Government and is clothed with national authority is simply to obliterate the fundamental principles of our Government.

Public sentiment in the United States is at last the tribunal for the adjustment and adjudication of all public measures and policies. If public sentiment in the States is such that certain legislation can not be enforced, the same difficulty would apply to legislation coming directly from the National Government. Unless legislation, State or national, is supported by public sentiment, it becomes a dead letter and can not be enforced.

It is remarkable that as legislators we seem to have come to the conclusion that we can do through national power what we can not do through State power. The whole origin of this national or Federal election law comes from the anomalous circumstances that succeeded the war in the Southern States. My friend from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] told us frankly yesterday that he favored giving suffrage to the negro, and he assigned a patriotic motive for that belief and that action. Different motives prompted public men in favoring that measure.

I undertake to say to-day that it has been the source of more calamity to the people of the United States than any other enactment upon the statute book or in the Constitution. It was based upon the idea that the negroes would be able to protect themselves, although utterly unprepared for suffrage. It was in utter antagonism to the fundamental principle upon which this Government is based, that the people are intelligent enough for self-government. When you admit that the people of the United States are not intelligent enough, are not patriotic enough to govern their own affairs and to protect their own interests, you abandon the theory upon which this Government is based and declare it an absolute failure. And when you inject into the suffrage of this country, as a part of the controlling and administrative forces of the Government, suffrage which is dangerous through ignorance, you weaken to that extent the doctrine upon which the Government must stand or fall.

When from any motive (and I am not here to assail motives) suffrage was given to a race utterly unprepared for it, who had been brutalized by slavery farther back than we have any record upon the subject, the innocent victims of circumstances over which they could possibly have had no control—when that was done we weakened just so far the doctrine of intelligent self-government upon which the institutions of the people of the United States are founded. I have no disposition to go back and discuss the question of slavery. I simply state a fact which every intelligent man in the country to-day admits. I hope for a better result than came immediately from giving suffrage to the negro race, but these results must come from moral and intellectual powers, above legislation and beyond it.

Mr. President, whenever we admit that coercion either by national or State government is necessary to make the people protect themselves we give up popular institutions in this country.

This whole legislation is based upon distrust of the people. It must be assumed that there is here in Washington and in these Halls some mystic, necromantic, and subtle influence that purifies the political atmosphere of the country when it emanates from this great source of wisdom and purity. It is absolutely believed that when we send men clothed with Federal authority amongst our constituents an aroma of patriotism is diffused in the immediate vicinity and throughout the State. Is that so? Has experience proved it to be so? Public sentiment controls in the United States, and where universal suffrage obtains this must always be the case. Public sentiment in the States is day by day becoming more averse to Federal jurisdiction, because the democratic idea, which never goes backward, is becoming stronger in this country. Who can take away suffrage from any human being to whom it is now given? Who can limit suffrage? It will continue to be extended because the irresistible impulse of intellectual thought, of the never-ceasing and never-ending desire for more freedom, for the illimitable expansion of the right to think and act, forces irresistibly larger freedom in individual and political action.

Suffrage can never be taken away, nor can you stop the democratic impulse (and I use the word "democratic" in its largest sense) towards larger liberty in every direction, generally and personally. Public sentiment, I say, is becoming more averse day by day to Federal jurisdiction, because the officials of the Federal courts are not selected by the people. Whence comes this clamor now throughout the country for the election of United States Senators by the people? It is the irresistible tendency to a purer and more absolute democracy, if I can use the word "absolute" in connection with the term democracy. It is the essential belief of the people that public servants should be chosen by themselves. When you send amongst them a Federal judge appointed by a President by and with the advice of the Senate and not elected by the people, it excites the antagonism which all of us know exists to-day throughout the country.

Mr. HIGGINS. Will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HIGGINS. I ask the Senator whether the same antagonism exists to the appointment of electoral commissions in the

Southern States by their governors, who in turn select the election officers, so that the election officers in none of them are selected by the people at all, but in every instance either by the governor or by the Legislature of the State?

Mr. VEST. I make no exception. Take the body of the people of the United States, and when these appointments are made without consulting them they do not meet with enthusiastic popular support. I do not propose by any partisan question or allusion to be drifted away from the general tenor of the remarks I make. I am simply elaborating briefly the idea that the political coercion of the people from any source without their consent to make them better citizens is utterly antagonistic to the spirit of our institutions and the genius of our people.

A great deal could be said, Mr. President, in regard to the disastrous attempts that have been made by the National Government to regulate matters in the Southern States against public sentiment. I am not here to declare that all elections in the Southern States have been regular and according to law, and without interference that ought not to have existed. I am not here to say that the elections in the large cities are absolutely pure and fair and always reflect the wishes of a majority of the legal voters in those communities. But I am here to say that we had better—

Bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of—

and that unless we can rely upon the intelligent patriotism of the people to correct these irregularities the case is hopeless, and Federal coercion will never correct it.

The condition in the Southern States to-day is the most peculiar in all history. I do not propose to go into an irritating argument based upon sectional ideas as to what has resulted from giving suffrage to the negroes of the South. My friend from Maine [Mr. FRYE] suggested to us yesterday that he wanted to hear something upon this side of the Chamber that he could answer. I want him now (and I call his especial attention to it) to examine the report in the contested-election case of Hill against Catchings, in the House of Representatives, I think for the Fiftieth Congress. He will find in the testimony accompanying that report the sworn statements of more than twenty intelligent Northern men of the highest standing, clergymen, lawyers, business men from the New England and other States, who went South after the war, many of them officers in the Federal Army, who had shown their patriotism by risking life and limb upon the battlefield in defense of the Union; and they testified without exception that although Republicans who had never scratched a ticket, when they went to the State of Mississippi and found that negro domination meant absolute destruction of personal security and personal rights, they were forced by an instinct of self-preservation to act with the Democratic party.

Mr. FRYE. Will they not find from the same investigation that in a district made purposely a negro or colored district, with at least twenty or thirty thousand majority of colored voters, Mr. CATCHINGS was declared to be elected, having received only three or four thousand votes?

Mr. VEST. It is very possible; and I can show in Northern districts, in Ohio and Indiana and Illinois, and in my own State of Missouri, where a large majority of the people did not vote at Congressional elections. The Senator assumes that when this was done intimidation and fraud caused it; but the same thing happens everywhere to some extent. Why is it that in our late Presidential election New York cast two hundred and odd thousand more votes than in the State election recently had? Who can account for popular impulses and popular motives, unless he is contented from a partisan pedestal to hurl his shafts at the opposite party by assuming some partisan reason?

But I shall not be diverted from my statement by the question of my distinguished friend. I ask him to explain to me why it is that these Northern men, who still proclaim themselves Republicans and vote for the Republican electors on the Presidential ticket, after they have gone South were forced through an instinct of self-preservation to act with the Democratic party, to which they did not belong, to protect, as they say themselves, their own persons and their own property?

In the face of this state of things we are asked to coerce those people into holding elections in a certain way. We are asked that Federal power shall be invoked, ignoring the doctrine of popular sovereignty; because the people who are unfit to elect members of Congress are unfit to elect their county and State officers.

If the fountain be once poisoned it poisons all who drink from it, whether in the selection of a State officer or a Federal officer. There can be but one remedy, if the assumption of Senators on the other side be true, and that is to disenfranchise absolutely a certain portion of the people of the South in order that the others may exercise the right of suffrage intelligently and patriotically; in other words, to vote the Republican ticket. Our friends can not explain why it is that the same man ought to be permitted to go to the polls and select his governor and the State ticket and his county officers, but be denied the privilege of voting for a member of Congress except in a specified way, although he is the same man—corrupt in one instance but entitled to vote by regulating his conduct according to their rules in regard to the selection of another officer.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to ask him to explain how a voter, such as he describes, in a State is obliged now to vote differently for a member of Congress than for State officers?

Mr. VEST. I do not say he is compelled to vote differently, but I say that under the present election law you can put Federal officials there who will control the election.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator explain how? That is what I asked.

Mr. VEST. I will explain it by a practical illustration. I take it that every Senator looks upon this question especially from the standpoint of experience in his own State. I understand matters better in regard to the State of Missouri than any Senator here possibly can except my colleague. I know with absolute certainty what has occurred in Missouri.

In 1876 the necessities of the Republican party (and I will prove this from the sworn testimony of their own witnesses) demanded that three Congressional districts in Missouri should be carried for the Republican ticket. A determined effort was agreed upon here in Washington to carry the United States House of Representatives for the Republicans. Mr. W. D. W. Barnard was the confidential friend of Gen. Grant and the chosen instrument of the Administration to do that thing. He was the national bank examiner of the State of Missouri, appointed by Grant. The United States marshal in the St. Louis district was H. W. Leffingwell, whom I know very well—a real-estate man of high character and a very old citizen. Leffingwell was an honest man, conservative and patriotic.

Barnard carried the instruction of Mr. Taft, the Attorney-General of the United States, to the Republicans of St. Louis that those three districts must be carried for the Republican party by the use of the instrumentalities provided in the Federal election law. He carried the instructions of the Attorney-General to Leffingwell, the United States marshal, and they both swear to it. Leffingwell said, "Why, there is profound peace in Missouri: there is no danger of any tumult or riot here in the city of St. Louis. The calm is profound politically, socially, and otherwise." Barnard said to him, "Here are your orders. Who made you marshal?" "Well," said Leffingwell, "you had a good deal to do with it. You are very near the President." "Well, sir," he said, "the man who made can unmake: and if you do not carry out these orders I will put you out of this office." I am sorry my friend from Maine has left the Chamber, because I wanted him to hear this and have something to answer.

It is amusing to hear the Senator from New Hampshire, who does me the honor to listen, say that these supervisors are mere "lookers on here in Vienna;" that they never interfere; that they are mere witnesses, spectators, like gentlemen who visit the opera simply for amusement and pleasure. Now, let us see whether they were lookers-on in the cases I have mentioned.

Mr. HUNTON. What is the document?

Mr. VEST. I will read this. It is House Document No. 3491. It is hardly necessary for me to remark that the conspiracy was carried out and that the three districts were carried for the Republican party. R. Graham Frost was beaten by a Republican named Metcalfe on the return, though he was elected at the polls. Frost contested the election, and here is the testimony taken in that contest. It is found in House of Representatives Miscellaneous Document, second session, Forty-fifth Congress, 1877-'78, volume 4, page 317. Mr. Barnard was put upon the stand; he was asked this question——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator state what investigation that was?

Mr. VEST. It is the contested election case of Frost against Metcalfe. I am about to read the testimony of Mr. Barnard under oath. He said:

Q. You had great influence with Gen. Grant—

He was asked—

about that time, I believe?

A. That I can not say. Gen. Grant and myself had been acquaintances for thirty-odd years.

Q. And great personal friends?

A. I think so, sir.

Q. What did Mr. Leffingwell say to you?

(Objected to as irrelevant.)

Q. What was the nature of Mr. Leffingwell's dilemma?

(Objected to as irrelevant and immaterial to this issue.)

A. Well, Mr. Leffingwell had been engaged in the real estate business here for years, and a good many of his friends whom he had done business for had rather influenced him that Mr. Tilden would be the President, and if he put this law, which he was instructed to—

Which he was instructed to—

in force that he would make enemies and he would get out of office, and his business would be injured by it. A committee composed of a number of very prominent Democrats waited on him, and after an interview he promised to give them an answer the next day.

Q. What was the nature of the interview, right there?

A. In reference to enforcing the law.

Q. Were they protesting against it?

A. Yes, so I understood. I had a desk in the office, and I had overheard the conversation.

Q. You stated he would give them an answer.

A. An answer at 11 o'clock.

Q. He said he would give them an answer the next day?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did they call the next day?

A. They did; a portion of them called and he turned them over to me.

Q. What took place after the conversation that you had on the first day about this protesting committee?

A. Mr. Lefingwell and myself lived at Kirkwood, and on the train going there that evening he told me that he was in a great deal of trouble, and he did not know what to do. During the evening he said he did not know what he should do, and I said, "He had got his orders and instructions?" "Yes." "Well, you certainly will carry them out." He did not know. The next morning early, quite early, he sent for me and told me he was in a good deal of trouble and did not know what to do. I was somewhat amused at his position, and said to him after there was quite a conversation, I told him, "Lefingwell, have I had anything to do with your appointment as marshal?" "Everything; you made me marshal."

Q. He stated to you?

A. Yes. "And you have got instructions from the Attorney-General to enforce the laws of the United States?" "Yes." "And you refuse to do it?" He hesitated. "Yes," he said, he did not know what he should do; he never was in such a position in his life. "I then was influential in making you marshal?" "Yes." "And if you do not execute your orders I will see that you are not marshal much longer. The man that makes can unmake." Then he said to me, "What am I to do?" I said to him, "I can relieve you of that dilemma. Give me control of those marshals;" and he says, "I will do it."

Q. Well, did he do it?

A. I think so, sir.

Q. Well, what did you proceed to do then?

Mr. Barnard goes on to state that he himself took the authority away from the chief marshal and appointed 1,028 deputies, organized them into regiments, battalions, and companies; the captains reported to the majors, the majors to the colonels, and the colonels to him, and he reported to the Attorney-General of the United States. They put the city of St. Louis under a military organization under this law.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator if that does not present the constitutional question about laws paramount that we have had under consideration?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, my friend from Massachusetts has a nightmare in the shape of Liliuokalani. [Laughter.] If anything is said here on astronomy, botany, mineralogy, religion, or politics, he jumps up immediately with, "Paramount, Paramount Blount and Liliuokalani." [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I thought he was stating the exact proposition. Does he not think so? Here is a case of a person who he says undertook, under what authority I do not know——

Mr. VEST. No; neither does anybody else.

Mr. HOAR. He undertook, by the consent at any rate of the marshal who was in power, to take his functions upon himself, and to control his inferiors. Now, does the Senator think that is constitutional or not? If he does not, then he does not seem to have any nightmare about its being done elsewhere.

Mr. VEST. I think this was one of the most monstrous outrages the Republican party ever inflicted upon a free people. Unconstitutional? It was barbarous.

Mr. HOAR. Hawaiian.

Mr. VEST. I hope that is an answer to "paramount;" and if anything is necessary to be said as to old Lil, Liliuokalani, I am ready to give it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Barnard, under this authority from the Attorney-General, which the Senator from Massachusetts asks me whether it is constitutional, which had no foundation whatever except the necessities of the Republican party, proceeded to carry those elections. Mr. Barnard testifies that he disfranchised 5,700 voters; he took the registration lists and struck off 5,700 names; and amongst them were some of the most reputable and oldest citizens of St. Louis, men who had fought the Indians for sovereignty over their territory, men who had blazed the pathway of civilization with the ax in one hand and the rifle in the other. They were arrested on the morning of the election by these military deputy marshals, and terror seized the whole community. Many Democrats refused to go near the polls. Conservative business men remained at home during the entire day. Three Republican Congressmen were brought to the House of Representatives under that proceeding from three Democratic districts in my State.

It was charged here yesterday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] that this law was enacted for political purposes and not in the interest of fair suffrage and the purity of the suffrage. Let us see what was the object, according to Mr. Barnard's own testimony. He is asked further:

Q. Was there any more danger for the commission of frauds and for disturbance at this election than there was at previous elections?

A. Oh, well, all our large communities had become very corrupt in the exercise of the elective franchise, and it was thought essential to the protection of voters.

Q. Independently of political consideration, was there any more necessity for the appointment of marshals at that election than any previous election?

(Objected to on the ground that there can be nothing connected with the election independent of political associations.)

Q. In order to be precise, I will say, independently of all party consideration, was there any more necessity for the appointment of marshals for that election than for any previous election?

A. Oh, well, you gentlemen know very well that in a political struggle for party ascendency it is necessary for the coördinate branches of the Government to be in accord, and there was an effort on the part, so I interpreted it, of the party which I acted with to regain control of the House of Representatives.

There was no pretense that there was any disturbance in the city of St. Louis. There was nothing but absolute peace and tranquillity. Mr. Barnard, as he himself swears, received his orders in Washington from the Attorney-General to carry those three election districts under the election law, and he went out to St. Louis and achieved the purpose, and then he had the hardihood to avow it when a sworn witness upon the stand. But I leave to my distinguished friends on the other side to go through the testimony in detail. The conspiracy was successful. Fifty-seven hundred men were disfranchised. Hundreds were arrested on the morning of the election. It was an *ex parte* proceeding.

The Senator from New Hampshire seemed to resent the idea yesterday that the deputy marshals were anything else than reputable citizens, angels of political light and purity. Mr. President, this man Barnard called from the purlieus and dens of vice throughout the great city of St. Louis every reckless and characterless mercenary who for $5 a day would take his marshal's badge and arrest men at the polls. There were appointed at $5 a day 1,028 men without responsibility, without character, willing for this pitiful sum to strike down the liberties of any man, no matter how old, how respectable, how influential. It cost the people of the United States $21,000 to consummate that infamy. The bill was made out, and Barnard, following the conspiracy to its end, came back to report to his masters, with Henry T. Mudd, a deputy marshal, with him, and here is the account of his interview with Taft. I want my friend from New Hampshire to hear this. It will relieve the tedium of the debate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am already very much terrified, and I hope the Senator will not terrify me too much.

Mr. VEST. The idea of terrifying the Senator from New Hampshire, after all he has been through, after what he did in Florida, after all he knows about the election law! He would shake hands with the ghost of Banquo and then eat a hearty supper. [Laughter.] Mr. Barnard returned to Washington to give an account of this dirty and infamous job and to get his money for those pure and patriotic deputy marshals. Here is what he swears occurred with Attorney-General Taft:

Q. You think those marshals did very good service in the Congressional election, do you not, Mr. Barnard?

A. When I went to Washington with Mr. Mudd, who was chief deputy marshal for the settlement of this account, Mr. Taft asked Mr. Mudd how many marshals he had.

Mr. SHIELDS. Taft, the Attorney-General?

A. The Attorney-General. * * * Mr. Taft asked Mr. Mudd how many marshals he had. Mr. Mudd referred him to me, and said I had charge of the marshals; and he turned to me, and I said, "1,038." The old gentleman wheels around in his chair and says, "Were there no others out in Missouri you could have made marshals?" Says I, "Mr. Taft, we went in to win"—

"We went in to win"—

"and if it had been necessary to have had a posse comitatus—I think that is what you call it, and every other man over 15 years of age should have seen a fair election."—

That is what he calls a fair election—

and he said, "You bring a good deal of sugar in your spade."

And he signed the voucher.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who said that, Mr. Taft?

Mr. VEST. Mr. Taft, according to Mr. Barnard.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Taft said to Mr. Barnard, "You bring a good deal of sugar in your spade?"

Mr. VEST. Yes; "You bring a good deal of sugar in your spade."

Mr. CHANDLER. Can it be possible that an Attorney-General of the United States said that?

Mr. VEST. He was a Republican Attorney-General. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there is one phase of this interesting history that I have omitted. My friend from New Hampshire says the deputy marshals are mere spectacular gentlemen; that they do not interfere with elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator wishes to be accurate. I said the supervisors were mere lookers-on. I did not say the marshals were.

Mr. VEST. Well, the supervisors. Mr. Barnard was at the head of the supervisors and at the head of the marshals, by the authority of the Attorney-General, and, according to his own testimony, he was sent from Washington to do this business.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad the Senator put in the words "according to his own testimony." I think that is an important qualification of what the Senator is stating. I regard the whole story of this Mr. Barnard, which I have no doubt he told before the committee just as the Senator says he did, as a mere yarn—one of those yarns that men are apt to tell who think the world revolves about them.

Mr. VEST. That makes an infinitely worse case. The man then added perjury in order to make himself infamous. He is another Republican, with absolute power to control that whole business.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the evidence that he is a Republican?

Mr. VEST. His own statement.

Mr. CHANDLER. He appears to me from the testimony, to act like a Republican getting ready to go over to the Democratic party by the way of the Mugwump road.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, there is no room for him in the Democratic party. We do not want that sort of cattle. This man lived a Republican. If he is living now he is a Republican, and if he has died he died in the odor of sanctity as a Republican. He was the Republican national bank examiner for the State of Missouri. I knew him well. It is as well known as the name of my State that he did this work, and he was absolutely omnipotent at that election in the city of St. Louis. It is well known that he arrested men and discharged them, and represented the Republican party and the power of the Republican party when he did it.

But going back to the episode, which I neglected to name, there was one precinct in that great city in which the Democrats, notwithstanding all this fraud and force, secured a majority—precinct No. 71, well known in the political history of my State. Barnard found it had gone Democratic, and our returning board, composed of the county judge and the county clerk and another State officer, under the statutes of Missouri, met the next day or the day afterwards, the second day, to count the votes and make the return. Barnard, booted and spurred and armed, with an armed deputy marshal at his heels, went into the room in the court-house where the State returning board, under our law, met. He said, "I understand you are about to count precinct No. 71." Mr. Garesché, the county clerk, said, "What right have you in here, sir; this is a State board." And he ordered him out of the office. Barnard said, "I am under Federal authority, and if you dare to count the vote in that precinct I will put every one of you in jail before night." He swears that he did so, and Garesché then again told him that he must leave the office, and a personal difficulty was averted by pushing Barnard out of the door.

Now, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire, ought a law to remain upon the statute books under which such outrages can be committed? What argument to an honest and patriotic legislator can be more forcible than the existence of a statute which opens the door for trampling down the dearest rights of an American citizen in the name of party? It is no argument to tell me that there are abuses of suffrage in other localities. It is no argument to tell me that the large cities are full of political corruption. A statute which permits a brutal minion of the Federal power, armed and accoutred to do the work, to arrest American citizens without warrant, a statute which says they can be arrested with or without writ, which permits a Federal official to go into a State returning-board office and threaten the officers with arrest if they carry out their honest judgment and make the record as they saw it, ought to be wiped from the statute book in the name of decency if nothing else.

These facts are beyond any sort of controversy. They happened in my own State. They are recited here in a document printed by the Congress of the United States, and everything I have said is substantiated upon the sworn testimony of these men.

Mr. President, I repeat that whenever the time comes that national coercion is necessary to secure the purity of elections in the States, it is a confession that the principles upon which our Government is based have failed, and that popular sovereignty has passed into history merely as an attempt upon the part of the people to secure personal and constitutional liberty.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1894.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF UTAH TERRITORY.

Samuel A. Merritt, of Utah Territory, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

A. G. Curtin Bierer, of Oklahoma Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Cato Sells, of Iowa, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Iowa.

INDIAN AGENT.

George S. Doane, of Washington, D. C., to be agent for the Indians of the Quapaw Agency, in the Indian Territory.

MARSHAL.

J. V. Guillotte, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Louisiana.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Richard B. Hughes, of Rapid City, S. Dak., to be surveyor-general of South Dakota.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

William A. Hocker, of Evanston, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo.

Ephraim S. Johnstog, of Cheyenne, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Cheyenne, Wyo.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Henry Blackman, of Oregon, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oregon.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank Mills, of Hilliard, Wyo., to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo.

Frank Harris, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be receiver of public moneys at Salt Lake City, Utah.

POSTMASTERS.

Miss Louise Imogen Guiney, to be postmaster at Auburndale, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Merton Z. Woodward, to be postmaster at Shelburne Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

George W. Apgar, to be postmaster at Ithaca, in the county of Tompkins and State of New York.

Ellis O. Drake, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Michael J. Griffin, to be postmaster at Holyoke, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

Ellen A. Meehan, to be postmaster at Brookfield, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Thomas M. Bixby, to be postmaster at Herington, in the county of Dickinson and State of Kansas.

Clyde McManigal, to be postmaster at Horton, in the county of Brown and State of Kansas.

John E. Brown, to be postmaster at East Pepperell, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Jenifer Moulton, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

Thomas J. Lynch, to be postmaster at Augusta, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine.

W. L. Farrar, to be postmaster at South Paris, in the county of Oxford and State of Maine.

Fred Myers, to be postmaster at Prentice, in the county of Prince and State of Wisconsin.

Charles E. Kinder, to be postmaser at Miamisburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio.

Jacob Stief, to be postmaster at Carey, in the county of Wyandot and State of Ohio.

Jacob L. Argabrite, to be postmaster at Ventura, in the county of Ventura and State of California.

Nelson H. Biddlecom, to be postmaster at Menekaunee, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin.

William S. McChesney, to be postmaster at Lexington, in the county of Fayette and State of Kentucky.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1894.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

William H. Brawley, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the district of South Carolina.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Stephen P. Slocum, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for the district of Newport, in the State of Rhode Island.

Nelson Baldwin, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for the district of Erie, in the State of Pennsylvania.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Mellville E. Carter, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of North Carolina.

William J. Mize, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois.

Stephen H. Lane, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Pamlico, in the State of North Carolina.

Thomas W. Lamb, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for the district of Brunswick, in the State of Georgia.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles R. Henry, to be postmaster at Au Sable, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

J. H. Marcum, to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Cabell and State of West Virginia.

Theodore H. Holck, to be postmaster at Grundy Center, in the county of Grundy and State of Iowa.

James Parden, to be postmaster at Rock Valley, in the county of Sioux and State of Iowa.

William P. Campbell, to be postmaster at Wellsburg, in the county of Brooke and State of West Virginia.

Milford M. Smith, to be postmaster at Elkins, in the county of Randolph and State of West Virginia.

James McNamara, to be postmaster at Alpena, in the county of Alpena and State of Michigan.

Benjamin F. Moberley, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois.

John H. Driscoll, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota.

REJECTIONS.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 15, 1894.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

William B. Hornblower, of New York, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 17, 1894.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

J. Scott Harrison, of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Kansas City, in the State of Missouri.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 18, 1894.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

VETO MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President; which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without my approval House bill numbered 71, entitled "An act for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878."

This bill permits the proofs and affidavits which, under present statutes, parties desiring to acquire certain public lands are required to make before the registers and receivers of the land offices within which such lands are located to be made before any commissioner of the United States circuit court or before the judge or clerk of any court of records of the county or parish in which the lands are situated.

A similar bill was passed by the Fifty-second Congress and was disapproved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior. The successors of these officers oppose the present bill on the ground that in its operation it would open the door to fraud and to a perversion of the intentions of the Government in relation to the public lands.

It is difficult, with the most scrupulous care, to guard the alienation of our public lands from fraud and illegal practices. It is perfectly plain, however, that the prospect of accomplishing this result is better under present laws, which require the necessary proofs to be made before land officers who are appointed for that purpose and who are under the control of the General Land Office and amenable to its regulations, than it would be by substituting other officers over whom the Land Office has no control.

Certain rules and orders of the Land Office are now in force which regulate the taking of the necessary proofs and permit oral examinations by registers and receivers. These regulations are of the utmost importance if our land laws are to be justly and honestly administered.

I fully concur in the objections made to this bill by the officers having charge of the public lands in the last Administration and by their successors who are now charged with that responsibility. I am convinced that such a relaxation of our existing land laws as is contemplated by the bill under consideration would not be in the interest of good administration.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 17, 1894*

ANNUAL REPORT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION AND NATIONAL MUSEUM.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the report of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Museum for the year ending June 30, 1893, in two octavo volumes, 10,000 copies, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 5,000 copies for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, and 2,000 copies for the use of the National Museum.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate concurrent resolution. The House Committee on Printing has reported a similar one. This is the usual current printing of that institution. I ask that the Senate resolution be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate bills and joint resolutions; which were severally read a first and second time, and referred to the committees as indicated below:

A bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce;

Joint resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause the settlement of the accounts of Special Agents Moore and Woodson under the treaty of 1854 with the Delaware Indians, etc.—to the Committee on Claims;

Joint resolution (S. R. 51) to provide for the printing of the report of the joint committee of Congress and proceedings at the centennial celebration of the laying of the corner stone of the Capitol—to the Committee on Printing; and

A bill (S. 1266) to extend and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, A. D. 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY.

The Speaker laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office 8,000 copies of the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology, with accompanying papers and illustrations, and uniform with the preceding volumes of the series, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Bureau of Ethnology: the illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, when the Speaker laid that resolution before the House, I asked for its consideration, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, asked that it lie on the table until he should have an opportunity to look at it. I am informed that he has looked at it, and has no objection to its consideration and passage. It is the usual resolution to print the report of that Bureau.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER NEAR CHATTANOOGA.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 339) to authorize the Chattanooga Western Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Chattanooga.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chattanooga Western Railway Company, a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of Tennessee, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a bridge, and approaches thereto, over the Tennessee River, at or near the city of Chattanooga, in the county of Hamilton, State of Tennessee, which shall be so constructed as to provide for the passage of railway trains, locomotives, passenger and freight cars on, over, and across the same. And the right is also hereby given to the said county of Hamilton to erect, or cause to be erected, on, over, and above said railway bridge, using the latter as its sub-

structure, a public bridge to be used for the passage of street cars, wagons, and vehicles of all kinds, and for animals and foot passengers.

SEC. 2. That any bridge built under this act and subject to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post route, and shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States. That no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mail, troops, and munitions of war of the United States, or for through railway passengers or freight passing over said bridge, than the rate per mile for their transmission over the railroads leading to said bridge, and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies, and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge for postal-telegraph purposes; that the said bridge shall be constructed either by draw, span, or otherwise, so that a free and unobstructed passageway may be secured to all water craft navigating said river at the point aforesaid: *Provided*, That if said bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be constructed as a drawbridge the draw shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signals for the passage of boats or vessels; and whatever kind of bridge is constructed said corporation shall maintain, at its own expense, from sunset to sunrise, such lights or other signals on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have, and be entitled to, equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same, and over the approaches thereto, upon such basis or arrangement as may be agreed upon by and between such companies and the Chattanooga Western Railway Company; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge, and the several railroad companies, or any one of them, desiring such use, shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid, and upon rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon the hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties.

SEC. 4. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. And to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving, for the space of 1 mile below and 1 mile above the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the current at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject, and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War, the bridge shall not be built; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, so as to prevent or remove all substantial obstruction to the navigation of said river, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War: and if any litigation shall be had in regard to the location or construction of said bridge, the same shall be in the circuit court of the United States in whose territorial jurisdiction said bridge, or any part thereof, is located.

SEC. 5. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved; and any alterations or changes that may be required by Congress in the bridge constructed under this act, or its entire removal, shall be made by the corporation owning or controlling the same, at its own expense. Furthermore, if the construction of said bridge shall not be commenced within one and completed within three years after the passage of this act, all privileges conferred hereby and this act shall become null and void.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The House bill (H. R. 291) for the same purpose was laid on the table.

LIBRARY PRIVILEGES FOR JUSTICES OF SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Joint Committee on the Library be, and it is hereby, authorized to grant the privilege of using and drawing books from the Library to the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, in the same manner and subject to the same regulations as members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire that this joint resolution be now considered?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees.

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation a bill (H. R. 5061) to repeal section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The Clerk continued and completed the call.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill the title of which has just been read.

The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] is pending. To that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] offers an amendment. Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I have never been quite able to bring myself to believe that the industry of sheep husbandry will be directly promoted by putting wool upon the free list, nor am I now fully prepared to indorse the views of those who hold that the effect of tariff duties, when applied to wool, is to lower the price of that article, whereas, in respect to all other commodities, its effect is to maintain or increase prices.

For those who are so wedded to the protective idea that they can swallow, without wincing, the proposition that protection is required in order to cheapen the products of manufacture, so that trades unions and other industrial organizations may be able to compel manufacturers to pay higher wages for labor, it may not be difficult to believe that the result of a protective duty upon wool is to lower the price of that article and thereby render the sheep industry more profitable. And I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that there are those who profess to so believe.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] on yesterday sent to the Clerk's desk and caused to be read an extract from a speech of Senator SHERMAN delivered in the Senate in August, 1890, in which that Senator, representing one of the principal wool-producing States of the Union, declared in substance that the effect of a duty upon wool was to lower rather than to raise the price. Now, Mr. Chairman, such an expression from such a source may well challenge the attention and consideration of those who have been inclined, as I confess I have, to believe the contrary, for there is no public man of wider experience than Senator SHERMAN or whose opportunities for observation have been greater, and in the State of Ohio no man stands higher in Republican estimation, not even the distinguished author of the law which we are soon to repeal. And, as tending to prove that the words cited by my friend from Indiana were not spoken without consideration, upon the impulse of the moment and in the heat of debate, but that they express the well-settled and long-entertained convictions of the senior Senator from Ohio, I beg to quote from a speech delivered by him in the Senate on February 7, 1883, to be found in volume 61 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2201. In discussing the schedule of the tariff act of 1883, relating to manufactures of wool and incidentally speaking of the effect of duties upon wool, Mr. SHERMAN said:

> The State of Ohio produces 25,000,000 pounds of wool, far more than any other State in the Union. It is not by large flocks and herds, as in California and Texas, but almost every farmer has a flock of sheep, averaging about 100 in number, and from them they produce fine wools that are now most valuable to commerce, to the amount of 25,000,000 pounds. Under the operation of the existing law the price of wool has gradually gone down. Up to 1866 the wool-growers and the wool-manufacturers were in a perpetual state of war with each other, the wool-manufacturers insisting that there ought to be no duty on wool and the wool-growers insisting that there ought to be a duty upon wool to correspond with that on manufactured goods. They finally reconciled their interests in 1866, and the Tariff Commission, in speaking of that important fact, says this:
>
> "The law fixing these duties was passed in 1867 with the approval of the entire body of producers, so far as any expression could be secured, and the wisdom which guided its promoters has found substantial vindication in the growth of sheep husbandry during the past fifteen years."

And then Mr. SHERMAN proceeds to say:

> In the table which I have now before me it is shown that in 1867 (when this beneficent arrangement was first effected) the price of wool was 51 cents a pound; in 1870 it was 46 cents a pound; in 1875 it was 43 cents a pound; in 1880, which was an abnormal year, 48 cents a pound; but to-day I am told these same wools are sold in Ohio at from 35 to 40 cents a pound. So the result of the policy of protecting the wool-growers has been, as it is in all industries, to gradually reduce the price.

If the Senator were repeating the statement to-day, Mr. Chairman, that he made eleven years ago he would have to change it only so far as to say that "to-day these same wools are sold in Ohio at from 18 to 20 cents a pound." And I desire to emphasize the argument embodied in the closing sentence of the quotation I have read, so far as it relates to the effect of protective duties upon wool.

If, without the light of this and similar testimony by men of wider experience than my own and larger opportunities for tracing effects to their causes, I had undertaken to account for the continued and almost constant decline in the price of wool ever since the law of 1867 was enacted, I would have been disposed to attribute it to other causes than the tariff, and to say that the decline had taken place in spite of the tariff rather than as a consequence of it. For it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that of all the products of agricultural industry wool almost alone might

with some appearance of sound logic be deemed capable of deriving benefit from a protective policy. We are not exporters of wool, as we are of nearly every other product of agriculture.

On the contrary, we do not produce a supply at all equal in quantity or quality to the demands of our own markets. But it will be observed that Senator SHERMAN does not pretend that the decline in price has taken place in spite of protection. On the contrary, he plainly declares it to be a necessary consequence of protective duties when he says that, "the result of the policy of protecting the wool-growers has been, as it is in all other industries, to gradually reduce the price."

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent, the time of Mr. HARE was extended for five minutes.

Mr. HARE. It would seem, indeed, that the ordinary, natural, and logical operation of the policy of protection, which is to increase or maintain instead of to reduce prices, has been thwarted and defeated in the case of the wool industry; for whatever theories men may hold there is no gainsaying the history of the last twenty-seven years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There are two circumstances, Mr. Chairman, which in my judgment may account for the failure of protection to maintain, even approximately, the prices of wool. Protection does not always protect even its intended beneficiaries. In order to enjoy its benefits they must be in a position to combine against competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The wool-growers of the United States have not occupied this position, and in the very nature of their situation they never can. By reason of the fact that they are more than a million in number, widely scattered throughout all portions of the country, they have not been and never will be able to effect a combination that might enable them to fix a price for their product. This fact alone would be sufficient to deprive them of whatever benefit might otherwise inure to them under the law.

But in the next place, and to add to their discomfiture, they have practically but a single purchaser. The markets of the world are closed to them, and the only purchasers they have—the manufacturers of woolen goods—being comparatively few in number, are not competitors with each other, but, on the contrary, can, and presumably do, combine and fix the price to suit themselves. If, by reason of the high duties, they are compelled to pay high prices for the foreign wools which the necessities of manufacture require, they thereby to that extent exhaust their working capital, and having the prices of the domestic product within their own control, it would be but natural that they should endeavor to recoup their losses at the expense of the home producer. Whether they do thus seek to equalize prices, none of us can testify. It is enough for us to know that they could avail themselves of this advantage if so disposed.

But, Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the cause or the remedy, the fact remains that under the influence of the highest protective duties, maintained throughout a long period of years, the industry of sheep husbandry has persistently delined, the prices of wool have steadily gone down, and the number of sheep in the States east of the Mississippi River has constantly dwindled, until in Ohio there are not to-day more than two-thirds as many sheep as there were in 1868.

The truth is that what Ohio and the other States referred to need is protection against the wool of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California; and this, by reason of the wisdom and far-sighted sagacity of the framers of the Constitution, they can not hope to have. [Applause.]

But they do not need, Mr. Chairman, the protection contemplated in the pending amendment. It has been tried and found wanting. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To the wool-growers it has proved not merely a disappointment, but if it be true that the result of the proposed policy has been to gradually reduce the price of wool, as claimed by Senator SHERMAN, himself an apostle of protection, it has been a curse. For I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is a wool-grower in the United States who could be persuaded to give his assent to a policy involving such consequences, with the understanding that they were to be the necessary result of the policy. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a tariff for revenue.

[Here the hammer fell.]

On motion of Mr. LAYTON, Mr. HARE's time was again extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. HARE. If protection or benefit results from such a tariff to any industry, as an incident and not as an object of the duty, I will not complain; and personally I would as willingly derive revenue from a duty on wool as from any other commodity that enters necessarily into the consumption of every family in the land. If incidental benefit should result to the wool-growers from the imposition of such a duty I would not complain, for no beneficiary of the tariff system is more worthy or more entitled to consideration. [Applause.]

But if instead of being benefited the wool-grower is to be injured, if the effect of a duty on wool is to "gradually reduce the price," then I am opposed to the levy of any duty whatever, for, however great the necessity for revenue, my constituents can not afford any further reduction in the price of wool. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of mighty importance to the farmers of Ohio. There are 75,000 voters in Ohio who own sheep in sufficient numbers to pay taxes on them under our taxation laws. They are widely scattered all over the State, and belong to both parties. In the recent election in Ohio the heavy Democratic losses, heavier than anywhere else outside of a few of the large labor districts, were found in the principal wool-raising counties—Licking, Coshockton, Tuscarawas, Hardin, Marion, and others—and notably the counties in the district in which my distinguished friend who has just taken his seat [Mr. HARE] lives, and which he represents so well upon this floor.

Seventy-five thousand agriculturists in Ohio and more than a million in the whole country are assailed by the pending measure. The gentleman [Mr. HARE] has referred to the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in 1883 in modifying, through the adoption of the report of the Tariff Commission, the wool schedule of the tariff act of 1867. The Democratic party of Ohio did not occupy at that time the position which the gentleman now occupies. Senator SHERMAN, who voted under protest for the revision of the tariff and thereby affected this industry in a very small way, to an extent not exceeding three-quarters of 1 cent on the pound, was assailed by the Democracy of my State in their convention, and in the Legislature, and by their Democratic Representatives on this floor.

I hold in my hand and will put into these remarks the action of the Democratic party in Ohio upon that subject. They issued a circular, which found its way onto the farm of every wool-grower in Ohio, claiming that the action of the Republicans in Congress had been injurious to the farmers of that State, and later on the Democratic Legislature, by a unanimous vote of every Democrat in both houses, denounced the Republican action, as they were pleased to call it, assailed Senator SHERMAN, and continued to assail him until within the last four or five years, when suddenly the Democratic party of Ohio became a free-wool party. Every Democrat on the floor of Congress from that State voted to condemn the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives at that time in passing the tariff revision act. So the gentleman from Ohio here finds himself preaching a new crusade, and, among other things he says, what we hear quite often on this floor, that he is willing to favor a tariff for revenue which will reach out and protect incidentally the flocks of Ohio. That is the very question which I now want to present briefly to this committee.

By some means or other, Mr. Chairman, we must have more money in the Treasury of the United States. This morning the honorable Secretary of the Treasury makes an announcement, by fair inference, that the Treasury is about to go to protest, and it is said that if the appropriations now made and which are due and payable at the Treasury of the United States were presented for payment, as any other commercial demands upon any bank in the country would be, the Treasury of the United States would go to protest; so that this Government is practically bankrupt. We are running behind at the rate of $70,000,000 per annum. Bankruptcy stares us in the face. We are looking around for more things to tax; more ways to raise money to avoid national disgrace. We are contemplating war measures—war taxes.

Now, while all this is true there is being imported into the United States annually 300,000,000 pounds of wool or its equivalent. I want to ask any Democrat who favors a tariff for revenue what is there in the commodity of wool that lifts it out of the category of those things upon which revenue ought to be raised? We want the money, and the commodity is coming in. We must import 300,000,000 of wool, or we must go short of clothing. Why not tax this wool? Will somebody answer that question? The gentleman from Ohio deliberately charges that the operation and effect of a tariff upon wool is to lower the price of the commodity. If that be true, and if his logic is true, why not levy a tax for revenue, and in that way afford the incidental protection which he suggests?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. I hope the gentleman will be allowed additional time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This is a great question in my State, and I would be glad to have ten minutes more.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask that the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] be extended ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to answer the question which I have propounded to the other side. It

seems to me a fair and just criticism of this bill that it is not a bill to raise revenue; for all the great importations into the country, those upon which a tax can be most easily and certainly collected, and the character of which exempts them from the charge that their taxation would engender frauds upon the revenue, are exempted.

There is no difficulty in raising the money which our friends on the other side will have to furnish. A tariff upon wool, a tariff upon sugar—the party here having voted against free sugar—a tax upon whisky, and an additional tax of a dollar a barrel upon beer will put this bankrupt Government of ours in a solvent condition. Why is it—and this question will have to be answered at the polls in three hundred and fifty-six Congressional districts—why is it that you take this commodity which is the financial lifeblood of many a farmer and strip it of its protection, and expose it to destruction, when the gentleman on the other side, voicing the utterances of the Democratic party of his State for so many years, declares that a revenue tariff upon this commodity or even a protective tariff would lower the price of the wool and at the same time put money in the Treasury.

Mr. HUNTER. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, which in effect substitutes the provision of the McKinley law for the provision of the present bill, do you expect to realize more than you have done, when during the last three years, under the operation of the McKinley act, wool has been constantly declining?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think I can answer the gentleman. The price of wool in this country is settled and fixed by the London market. I will put in my speech a table which will show what I presume the gentleman is familiar with, that going back to 1867 and coming down through the period of inflation, down to specie resumption, down to 1883, when the protective duty was lowered, down to 1890, when the protective duty was raised, the wool of the Ohio farmer, which stands side by side with the grade which I will quote from Australia, has gone down in the same ratio that the nonprotected wool of Australia has gone down in the London markets. So the argument of the gentleman falls to the ground, because there stands between the cheaper wools of the foreign producer and the Ohio producer this barrier of protection, and but for this protection Ohio wool would sell at London prices, freight added.

Mr. HUNTER. One word further, if the gentleman will pardon me. I find by the Ohio Wool Report that in 1889, preceding the passage of the McKinley act, fine wool was 34 cents a pound in Ohio——

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is not true, but it is true within 4 cents.

Mr. HUNTER. And in 1890 the price was 38 cents; in 1891, 33 cents; and it is much lower now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is all true enough. At the same time the price of wool has been going down in the London market, affected by the foreign product; and at the same time there has stood this same barrier I am talking about. But let me go forward with my statement. The interruption of the gentleman has been made in good faith; and I am obliged to him for it.

If it be true that taking off the tariff on wool will not unfavorably affect the farmer of Ohio, why take it off? That is the question I propound to the country to-day. If it will not cheapen the product of the wool producer, why take it off? You are in favor of a revenue tariff. This product offers you a splendid field for your operations, and according to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio we can not produce within 300,000,000 pounds of all the wool that we require. Then that much must come from abroad. Why not have a revenue tariff upon it? Make it 10 per cent, 20 per cent, 35 per cent. The wool must come in; it will have to come in; let it come in and bring us revenue which we require, while according to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio, the farmer will not be damaged nor the clothier either.

The fact about the whole matter is this: We have in Ohio 4,000,000 sheep; that is to say, we did have that number about a year ago. At this time I regret to say the farmer of Ohio is sacrificing his sheep. One year ago they were worth an average of about $4 a head; to-day they are worth less than $1 a head. The reduction in value of Ohio sheep has amounted to $12,000,000 in a single year. The presence in power of the Democratic party has cost a good deal. It has come high, but we have it.

We were selling our wool one year ago at 26 cents a pound, not at the price claimed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HUNTER], because that was an erroneous statement based upon a special grade of wool, which is not the general grade of our wool, we were selling at 26 cents. The day when the Wilson bill was introduced here there was a nominal price of 18 cents; and from one side of the country to the other from the dealers in wool, there came orders to their agents to cease buying wool altogether. They seemed to understand. The men who want the wool seemed to understand that they were affected by the introduction of this proposed legislation.

The woolgrowing farmer stands helpless before the attacks and assaults of the Democratic party. He was warned in 1884 by the official declarations of that party that he was being wronged and injured by the reduction of 1 cent a pound on his wool, and now we find the same party taking off the 11 cents a pound which we understand and he understands to be a protection on his commodity. In case of war with a foreign country we must exist on one-half of the annual production of wool, or we must wait for the growth of flocks in order to produce our wool. The answer to the whole of this comes from the Democratic party, proclaiming first that they are in favor of a revenue tariff, then declaring that they are in favor of no tariff on wool, because it will enhance the value of wool—so says the argument on the other side—and at the same time they deprive the Treasury of the legitimate revenue which belongs to it.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter written by a most ingenious advocate of the Democratic theory upon this wool question, carefully written, comprising in a small compass all the arguments that have been made here and all the arguments that can be made here in favor of this provision. I also hold in my hand the answer to that letter, written by Mr. Justice, of Philadelphia, that answers, in my judgment, conclusively and successfully, every proposition made in that letter and every argument that has been made on the floor of this House.

My proposition—closing the few words I have been able to say—is this: We need the money, and the Democratic party is charged with the duty of raising it. They stand idly by, trying to lessen the revenues of the Government by $75,000,000 a year, while their Secretary of the Treasury is selling bonds bearing 5 per cent interest, principal and interest payable in gold, in order to save the Treasury of the United States from bankruptcy. One of the strongest and most persistent attacks which they are making is upon an article that by a revenue provision could go a long way toward furnishing the necessary money with which to meet the deficit of the Treasury and save a valuable agricultural product from absolute destruction.

THE WOOL INDUSTRY.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN E. H. GIESY AND THEODORE JUSTICE AS TO WOOL AND PROTECTION—COST OF RAW MATERIAL AND OF LABOR—WHAT WOULD HAPPEN WERE WOOL PUT ON THE FREE LIST.

[From the Chicago Inter Ocean.]

We publish below letters of great interest to all woolgrowers. Mr. E. H. Giesy, of Lockland, Ohio, wrote to Mr. Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia, presenting the arguments of those who would admit wool free of duty. His letter, and the reply of Mr. Justice, are given in full.

WOOL ON THE FREE LIST.

LOCKLAND, OHIO, *September 28.*

DEAR SIR: I read your letter to F. Mackaman, of Waynesburg, Ohio, which was published in the Cleveland Leader a few days ago. Although I am a Republican and a protectionist, I am not sure that American wool would not be better protected by being placed on the free list than by any import duty that might be placed on foreign wool. In the following you will find my reasons for this opinion, and if any of my assertions are not true I hope you will point to me clearly where I am in error, for I want to get the facts relating to the wool industry.

A great many articles are imported that might be manufactured in this country if we were not handicapped in the matter of raw material, and much money would be retained here that now finds its way into the pockets of the foreigners; for American labor, though dearer per man, is cheaper than foreign labor, because more is produced per man in this country than in foreign countries. In support of this statement, I will say that we export locomotives, watches, small hardware, and many other things composed almost entirely of labor, but we do not and can not export articles composed almost entirely of raw material.

I believe that by putting some raw materials, wool among them, on the free list, we would be protecting our manufacturers more than we are protecting them now, for we would enable them to make many things that they can not make under the present conditions. This would result in the employment of more people than have ever been employed here, and it would also result in greater export trade than we have ever had. I do not believe that placing wool on the free list would stop the production in this country or that it would lessen the price. To illustrate: We import many woolen goods that we can not make, because the duty on foreign wool precludes its use, and because of the fact that American wool can not be manufactured into as fine goods as are produced by a combination of American and foreign wools.

If the duty on foreign wool were removed, the American manufacturers, with the demands of 65,000,000 people back of them, would become bidders for this wool, and the price of it would naturally advance under the law of supply and demand. The foreign manufacturer would have to pay the same price for it that we would pay, and with the advance in price of the foreign wool there would be advance of the American wool. We are not handicapped in the matter of wages, as I have shown, although we pay more per day per man than foreigners pay, and if the foreigners should have to pay as much for raw material as we pay, we could manufacture many goods for our own consumption that we now import, and we could compete with them in many foreign markets where we now have no trade, and we would use much more American wool than we are now using.

You state in your article that owing to the low prices obtained for Australian wool in free-trade England many of the producers of Australian wool found it impossible to continue the production of it and sold their sheep to be slaughtered. This will lessen the supply of Australian wool, and may have some effect on England's prices for it, but if England should find such a competitor for this product as it would find in the United States, there

would be still further advances in the price of this wool. So long as England has no competition for Australian wool it will, to a great extent, control the price of it. So long as there is a high tariff in this country, which forces the American manufacturer to pay more per pound for wool than the English manufacturer pays, it can not be used to any great extent by the manufacturers in this country, and just that long will it be necessary for American people to buy from England manufactured goods that can not be made in this country owing to the handicap of high tariff on Australian wool, or the lack of this wool for use in this country, and just that long will we be furnishing the English laborer work and paying profit of the English manufacturer.

Hoping that you will give these points due consideration and let me hear from you, I remain,

Yours, truly,

E. H. GIESY.

THEODORE JUSTICE, Esq.

MR. JUSTICE IN REPLY—REASONS WHY AMERICAN WOOL SHOULD BE PROTECTED.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *October 6.*

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of September 28. I wonder that you are not a Democrat, believing, as you appear to, in so many untruths. Your facts are all wrong; therefore, it follows that your conclusions must be wrong, and I recommend your careful reading of a book on The American Wool Industry, written by Hon. William Lawrence, president of the Ohio Woolgrowers' Association. I mail you a copy and ask you to read it carefully, and to examine particularly the diagrams on the back cover with the description of that diagram which is on the inside of the back cover. The unthinking would undermine the foundations of our whole industrial system and bring down upon their heads the whole structure.

You, I am sure, hold your present views for want of proper information. How could the American wool industry be better protected by wool being placed on the free list when the London value from the time of the passage of the tariff law in 1867 up to January 1, 1893, was 50 per cent below the American price? If protection doubled the American price, would not the removal of that protection cause the price to fall to the level of the markets of the world, which from 1867 to 1893 were less than one-half of the American price, as you will see by examining the following table of comparison between protected American wool and similar wool in free-trade London:

Year.	Ohio medium fleece.*	Australasian medium fleece.†	American scoured medium.	Australasian scoured medium.	Cost of free wool below protected wool.
					Per cent.
1868	143	21½	71½	25½	‡50
1869	50	21½	83½	36½	‡56½
1870	45	20½	76½	34½	‡55
1871	46	27	76½	45	‡41½
1872	72	31½	88	53	‡40
1873	68	23½	1.13½	47½	‡58
1874	54	24½	90	41½	‡54
1875	56	25	93½	41½	‡55½
1876	52	23½	86½	39½	‡54
1877	43	23½	71½	39½	‡45
1878	45	22½	75	37½	§50
1879	35	21	58½	35	§40
1880	55	23½	91½	39	§57
1881	49	20½	81½	34	§58
1882	46	18½	76½	31	§59½
1883	43	15½	71½	26	§63½
1884	40	16½	66½	27	§59
1885	33	17½	55	29	§47
1886	36	18½	60	31	§48
1887	38	19½	63½	32½	§48½
1888	35	18½	58	31	§47
1889	38	19½	63½	33	§48
1890	37	20½	61½	33½	§45
1891	37	20½	61½	34	§44½
Average					51

*Shrinkage 40 per cent.

†New Zealand cross-bred grease.

‡Average percentage of cost of free wool in London below protected wool in the United States between 1868 and 1877, on currency basis, 50.95 per cent.

§Average percentage of cost of free wool in London below protected wool in the United States between 1878 and 1891, on gold basis, 51.32 per cent.

Attention is called to the fact that the American quotations from 1868 to 1877 were in currency, while the English quotations for the same period were in gold; that medium wool of the same grade, quality, and condition in free-trade London was more than 50 per cent below the value of the same kind of wool under protection in the United States. Attention is also called to the fact that the quotations for American and English wool between 1878 and 1891 were both in gold; and during this period wool of the same diameter of fiber and in the same condition averaged 51 per cent lower in free-trade London than under protection in the United States.

SHEEP IN THE STATES.

To-day we have 45,000,000 sheep in the United States, 27,000,000 of which are west of the Mississippi River. The freight on the wool of these sheep from the ranch to the Eastern markets varies from 2 to 3 cents per pound, while the freight on wool from London is only one-quarter cent per pound. How can the American woolgrower pay from 800 to 1,200 per cent more freight than his foreign competitor, when the freight alone under such unequal competition would of itself bar the American woolgrower from his own market? Thus, with the removal of protection, the difference in freight alone would be so heavily against the American woolgrower that he would be compelled to go out of business.

If you have visited the Chicago Exposition you will find that without exception the woolens made by the American mills in texture, color, and finish outclass all foreign competitors. There is nothing manufactured from wool that can not be as well made in this country as elsewhere. The difference between free raw material in London and protected raw material under the McKinley law is only 90 cents in a fine dress suit of broadcloth. You can buy abroad a fine suit of broadcloth containing 3 pounds of scoured wool costing in London 30 cents per pound, or 90 cents for all the raw material in such a suit. The whole of the balance of the cost of such a suit of clothing represents labor and profit to the manufacturers, the free raw material in it costing not over 90 cents. In America the same 3 pounds of scoured wool under the McKinley law costs double the free-trade price or $1.80 (1 pound of scoured merino wool would cost 60 cents here as against 30 cents in London). In a suit of clothing such as would be used by workingmen the difference would be less than in a dress suit and less than 90 cents, probably not over 75 cents on each suit of clothing made of coarse wool.

COARSE WOOLS.

Coarse or medium scoured wools cost over 25 cents per pound in London, and in the United States, under the McKinley law, the scoured cost of the same scoured coarse wool is under 50 cents, so that the greatest difference between free raw material and the protected raw material in a suit of workingman's clothing would not exceed 75 cents as against a difference of 90 between free raw material and protected raw material in a fine broadcloth suit, such as the well-to-do would wear for evening dress. To give the consumer the benefit of from 75 to 90 cents on each suit of clothes it is proposed to take from wool the protection it has had for a generation and subject it to the competition of imported cheap free wool.

Ignoring the difference in freight against the American woolgrower, alluded to above, the Australian woolgrower has the advantage of pasture all the year around, the pasture in Australia being better in winter than in summer. The woolgrower in Australia rents his land from the Government for a smaller charge than the Ohio woolgrower in many cases pays for taxes alone, and the latter, owing to our vigorous winter climate five months in the year, feeds his sheep on hay and grain, nearly the whole of which is labor. It costs nothing to grow hay or grain—nature does that.

COST OF RAISING WOOL.

The main cost to the farmer of hay and grain is in the preparing of the land, in cultivating, in harvesting, and the feeding, which are all labor, and which represent 90 per cent of the whole cost of production, the remaining 10 per cent representing interest and taxes.

Now, under these conditions, the cost of raising wool in the United States is at least 11 cents per pound in actual outlay greater than the cost of raising the same class of wool in Australia or the Argentine Republic, and the McKinley tariff law places the duty of 11 cents per pound on imported unwashed wool to put the American woolgrower on even terms with his foreign competitor. The latter has the advantages of cheap land and climatic condition and cheaper freight, which to him are fully equivalent to 11 cents per pound, and if wool is put on the free list the American woolgrower will have to submit to the disadvantages of raising wool in this climate on even terms with his foreign rivals, who do not have such difficulties to contend with, and so without adequate protection must necessarily be driven out of the business. Our seventh largest agricultural industry, producing annually $65,000,000 worth of wool and representing an investment of $160,000,000 in sheep, will be destroyed by free trade. Sheep will be fattened and will then be sent to market as food, and flocks will disappear forever.

Our food supply will in time thus be decreased, and our manufacturers eventually will be driven to buy their wool in London or in Australia. Gold will be thus sent out of the country again, increasing the harmful influences that must follow with the balance of trade permanently against us.

INJURIOUS EFFECTS.

The woolgrowers would be forced into some other industry. They would probably plow up their present sheep pastures when the land is suitable and raise wheat, of which already we have an overproduction and a surplus, and instead of having 60-cent wheat, as now, the probabilities are that in consequence of the great increase of our surplus of wheat, in a short time we will have only 40-cent wheat. It is to the interest of American farmers to diversify their industries, and to produce such articles as will find a market at home instead of abroad. The farmer who can sell direct to the consumers close to his home saves the middleman's profits and the cost of transportation, which otherwise always lessens the net price to him when he has to find a market abroad.

American manufacturers are now in no way hampered in the matter of raw material. This is proved by the fact that under the McKinley law our imports of foreign wool were much greater than ever before. We imported foreign raw wool during the year ending June 30, 1893, in round figures, over 168,000,000 pounds, an increase of 32 per cent over the heaviest imports of any one year under any previous tariff law. The cost of this wool to the American manufacturer was less, including duties, than it had ever been before; now, with the large quantities of wool imported, and with its cost lessened, wherein is there any ground for your statement that the American woolen manufacturer is handicapped in the matter of raw material? Besides, the McKinley law provides that exported goods made of imported wool shall entitle the exporter to a return of all such duties paid on such raw material, save 1 per cent. Thus, for export purposes, the American manufacturer has free raw material. Now, why does not he export his cloth? Because the labor he employs costs from two to three times the labor of his foreign free-trade competitor, making his product dearer and more costly.

IMPORTS.

Our imports of manufactures of wool under the McKinley law have practically not increased at all, and the great increase in our imports of raw material (wool) show that protection as adjusted by the McKinley law has stimulated woolen manufacturing in the United States to such an extent, and to have increased the American market for wool so greatly that the American mills have required not only the American clip, none of which is exported, but in addition have had to import over 168,000,000 pounds of foreign wool to supply their needs, and this has been done without in any manner increasing the cost of clothing to our people. If there has been any change the cost of a suit of clothing to-day under the McKinley law is lower than ever before in the history of the country.

If the duty is now removed or even reduced, at a time when the Government needs more rather than less revenue, the only way to procure even the same revenue that is now collected is to double our imports. If we double our imports we obtain our supplies from abroad instead of at home. We cripple our manufacturers and lessen our market for wool. We give a great industrial impulse to foreign mills, and to this extent take employment from our American mills, and for what? Simply in order to raise as much revenue under reduced duties for revenue only as we now collect under duties that are protective. Why, therefore, should we destroy a well-established industry that pays taxes to supply our Government and instead promote a foreign industry that pays nothing toward the support of our Government? If we reduce our revenue one-half by lowering or removing duties we must double our imports to collect the same revenue that we now

collect under present methods. The employment of American machinery to its fullest capacity under the McKinley law, as previously stated, not only consumed all of our own wool product, but required the importation of over 168,000,000 pounds more, an important quality which never before was ever approached.

FOREIGN WOOLS.

This foreign wool was bought because, even with the duty added, it was as cheap as American wool, the London or free-trade price of all wools having been only one-half of the American price for wool of the same kind and quality. Is it not, therefore, conclusively proven that protection doubles the price to the American grower? Cheap foreign wool makes cheap American wool, and if the American woolgrowers had held their wools above the prices here of the foreign wools with the duty added, the latter, being cheaper, would have entirely supplied American mills and would have left the American clip wholly unused, and the American woolgrower has been obliged to accept declining prices during the past few years because the markets of the world for wool have been declining. The London value of wool during the two years previous to Mr. Cleveland's inauguration fell over 30 per cent, and during the same period American wool declined less than 7 per cent. If it was not the protection of the McKinley tariff that stood between the Ohio woolgrowers and the cheaper wool market of the world what was it?

Since President Cleveland's inauguration, and the assault by his Administration upon the American wool industry, American prices have declined from 25 to 30 per cent, and why? Why did American wools hold up before this Administration came in, and fall immediately afterwards? It was because it was well known by everybody in the business that the London or free-trade price could not be reached without a decline in American prices of at least 30 per cent.

NOT TRUE.

When you state that a workman will produce more cloth in this country than in foreign countries under conditions otherwise similar, you make a statement without foundation in fact. A manufacturer in this vicinity who up to 1890, was making woolen goods in Bradford, England, under free trade, moved his machinery under the McKinley bill from England to the United States. He has been running identically the same machinery and with some of the same help employed upon the same machinery under free trade in England and under the McKinley law in the United States.

He says that the same man turns out as much or more work in England as in the United States, and that the labor cost in the weaving alone on 1 yard of cloth in England, under cheap foreign wages, is less than 2 cents, and the labor cost of weaving 1 yard of the same quality of cloth in the United States is 7 cents. This is owing to the higher wages paid here. This is for the labor of weaving alone, and the whole amount of labor represented by wages paid in constructing a yard of cloth from the time the wool is handled until the cloth is finished is only 15 cents in England, as against 34 cents in the United States. This is a comparison of free trade and protected labor on the same machinery, and in some cases with the same workmen, and is wholly outside of the cost of the raw material.

LOCOMOTIVES AND WATCHES.

You say that we export locomotives, watches, hardware, and many other things almost entirely composed of labor. The exporter of locomotives and watches gets a drawback of 99 per cent of the duties paid on his imported raw material, but, in point of fact, locomotives are now exported because the American type, rather than the foreign type of locomotives, are wanted abroad.

The largest exporter of locomotives informs me that the English machinists choose to copy our patterns of locomotives. Owing to the difference in labor in their favor, they will be able to beat us out of such foreign markets as we now hold. The same applies to watches. When we began to make watches by machinery, the Swiss handmade watches were supplanted by American machine-made watches, and the Swiss watchmakers were idle; but since Switzerland has been compelled to put in the American patterns of machinery for making watches, owing to cheaper Swiss labor, they now make them cheaper than American watches. They are not only regaining the markets of the world which they had previously lost, but are invading the United States, and you can now buy cheap Swiss watches at a price, including the duty, that is as low or lower than the same grade of American watches, and I would like to know who in this instance pays the duty. The McKinley duties on watches no longer cover the difference between Swiss and American wages, as was the case when that law was made.

RAW MATERIAL.

You say that by putting raw materials on the free list we would be protecting our manufacturers more than we are protecting them now. You appear to know more about their interests than they they do themselves; otherwise, why should 85 per cent of all the American woolen manufacturers join in a petition to the United States Senate against the placing of wool on the free list? You can see in the New York Daily Tribune of September 13 the telegram announcing from Washington that woolen manufacturers protested for seven hours before the Ways and Means Committee against any disturbance of the McKinley duties. "Every manufacturer of woolen goods who spoke strongly opposed the removal of duties from wool, declaring that it would be ruinous to the woolgrowers and flock-owners of the United States and of no benefit to American manufacturers or American wool consumers." You must admit that manufacturers know more about the interests of their own business than those not in the business, like yourself, and that the placing of such raw material as wool on the free list would not enable them to make a single yard more of anything which they can now make.

FINE GOODS.

You say that American wool can not be manufactured into as fine goods as are produced by a combination of American and foreign wools. Here you are again greatly in error. The late Capt. J. P. Bradley, of Ballardvale, Mass., and I believe, also, Mr. MOSES STEVENS, a member of the present Committee of Ways and Means, made goods a quarter of a century ago of American pick lock or Saxony wool, which were so extremely fine that a yard of it could be drawn through a lady's finger ring. No finer goods can be made to-day from any wool grown in any other part of the world.

Hundreds of thousands of pounds of this pick lock or Saxony wool, with a diameter of from 2,000 to 2,500 fibers to the inch, was sold under this very roof in former years. Australians did not produce it then, but now they produce Saxony wool so much cheaper than it can be produced on Ohio farms that our manufacturers have imported it from Australia, and the American woolgrowers, being unable to compete in price, are not now raising Saxony wool yielding two pounds to the fleece, but have gone into the business of producing the coarser merino wool, because they clip from 5 to 6 pounds to the fleece. If the duties are removed the Australian competition that forced the Ohio woolgrower out of the business of producing Saxony wool will also force him to abandon the production of double extra Ohio or merino wool.

DUTY ON FOREIGN WOOLS.

It is quite true, as you say, that if the duty on foreign wools is removed the American manufacturers would become bidders on foreign wool. If American manufacturers are to supply themselves with foreign wool it would be only because it would be cheaper to them than Ohio wool. Who, then, will be left to buy the Ohio clip, and what is to become of it? If American wool falls to the foreign price under free-trade the Ohio sheep will be fattened and sent to the butcher, and woolgrowing in Ohio will cease to be an industry there, except in limited cases, where the farmers can produce the coarser wool sheep for the meat, as they now produce cattle for that purpose. They would then consider the wool a by-product, as bullocks' hides are now considered.

When conditions arrive at this point there will be no merino or fine wool sheep in Ohio, and none of any kind except mutton sheep, as is now the case in England. Since the enormous increase in the world's supply in Australia and the Argentine Republic prices of merino wool throughout the world have fallen, and there is not a flock of merino sheep in England to-day. The only sheep left in that country are the coarse wool or merino sheep mainly produced for the meat. Under the severity of free-trade competition with Australia. England to-day produces only 130,000,000 pounds of wool, as against 160,000,000 pounds in 1875, when Australia only produced three-fifths of its present supply.

COMPARISON.

Chairman WILSON, of the Committee of Ways and Means, being wholly unable to find any plausible reason for the removal of the duty upon wool, had to resort, for an illustration, to a comparison with conditions in 1857. He stated that "wool in 1857 was put on the free list, and at that time we were prosperous." Now, what were then the existing conditions? In July, 1857, Ohio wool was worth 60 cents, and wool was then put on the free list; James Buchanan had been elected President, a financial panic spread all over the country, and by the end of that year Ohio wool had fallen to 30 cents—a decline of 50 per cent in six months.

Chairman WILSON points to this condition as a happy state of affairs, and invites the American people to a new trial of the same experience. Besides, in 1857 the conditions of the world's supply were very unlike those of 1893. Australia then produced only 30,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, as against 250,000,000 pounds in 1893, an increase of over 700 per cent; the river Platte produced over 10,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, and in 1893 that country produced 110,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, an increase of 1,000 per cent. The Cape of Good Hope in 1857 produced only 10,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, while in 1893 that country produced 50,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, an increase of 400 per cent.

Thus the world's supply of wool in 1893 is drawn from the southern hemisphere, where, by reason of perennial pastures, better in winter than in summer, wool can be produced cheaply, while in 1857 the bulk of the world's supply came from the northern hemisphere, where, owing to winter feeding, woolgrowing is costly.

New and extensive fields for woolgrowing have been opened in the Southern temperate zone that were idle in 1857. In March, 1893, double extra Ohio protected wool was worth over 60 cents scoured, and in free-trade London the same quality was worth 30 cents. If it were known that the McKinley law would not be disturbed, double extra Ohio wool in the fleece would again be worth 60 cents scoured (its value on the day that President Harrison left the White House), but with free wool the price of double extra Ohio would be the London price of 30 cents scoured.

AUSTRALIAN WOOL.

You say if Americans buy Australian wool it will lessen English supplies and advance English prices. This could not take place until the American clip is no longer produced. Then if we had enough protection upon cloth to cover the difference between English and American wages, so that we could compete with English cloth in our own markets, we would buy our raw wools in the London market as a matter of course, and the world's price for wool would advance. It might even advance to a degree that would make wool in the free-trade markets of the world as high as it is to-day in the United States under protection, but when this takes place the cost of the raw material in a suit of clothes must then be fully as great under free wool as it is to day with protected wool. Admitting that such may be the case, what has been accomplished? What has been gained?

You have destroyed the American wool industry, worth to the nation $200,000,000, and lessened the ability of the American woolgrower to purchase clothing. You have destroyed a market for 45,000,000 bushels of corn and 200,000,000, pounds of hay previously consumed by our 45,000,000 sheep. You have lessened the value of the sheep farm; you have paid an awful price for free raw material, and at the end of ten years, after destroying the American wool supply, which is one-eighth of the world's product, wool becomes scarce and dear, and owing to the advance in the wool markets of the world clothing would be as dear or dearer than it ever was under the McKinley law. Now, if clothing is not to be permanently cheaper, what advantage is there in paying such a price for the experiment?

When the free trader has realized to the fullest extent all that he ever hoped for from free trade, the cost of obtaining it will have been found to have been so great as to have counterbalanced more than hundreds of thousands of times over the supposed free-trade advantages. You can not destroy a great industry in which at least five million people, directly and indirectly, are interested without causing much misery to many men, nor without crippling to a greater or less degree every other man.

The prosperity of this country under the McKinley law has been the greatest in its history. Why should we, therefore, repeal that law under which the American nation has been not only the most prosperous nation of the world, but during that time the only prosperous nation of the world?

THEODORE JUSTICE.

E. H. GIESY, Esq.,
Manager Monroe Refrigerator Company, Lockland, Ohio.

This letter of Mr. Justice squarely meets and triumphantly answers each and every argument which has been made on this floor during this debate.

The following is the table to which I have referred. It shows that the difference between the price of the Ohio product at the seaboard and the price of similar wool in London has been about, generally, the tariff on the London wool at the port of New York:

Table showing prices of Ohio wool in seaboard market and of New Zealand wool in London market and tariff rate per pound.

Months.	Monthly price of unscoured—		Tariff rate per pound.
	Ohio medium, in seaboard market of United States.	New Zealand in London market.	
1890.			
January	$0.37½	$0.20½	$0.10
February	.38	.20	.10
March	.37	.20	.10
April	.37	.19	.10
May	.37½	.19	.10
June	.38	.19	.10
July	.39	.19	.10
August	.36	.19	.10
September	.35½	.19	.10
October	.38½	.19	.11
November	.39	.19	.11
December	.38½	.20	.11
1891.			
January	.37½	.21	.11
February	.38½	.21	.11
March	.38½	.19	.11
April	.38½	.19	.11
May	.38	.19	.11
June	.37	.20	.11
July	.36	.20	.11
August	.36½	.20	.11
September	.36½	.20	.11
October	.36½	.20	.11
November	.36	.20	.11
December	.36½	.20	.11
1892.			
January	.36½	.20	.11
February	.36	.19½	.11
March	.36½	.19½	.11

The woolgrowers of Ohio will suffer an irreparable loss if this bill passes. There are thousands of acres of land in Ohio, profitable for sheep husbandry under just protection, which will be become almost worthless if the industry goes down. Sheep husbandry furnishes occupation for thousands who if it fails will be driven to crowd the markets for other forms of labor. Wool has for many years been the source from which much of the ready cash of the Ohio farmer came. Destroy the industry and I do not know where he will look successfully for a substitute source of revenue.

This bill discriminates against this Northern industry. Rice is to be strongly protected, wool to be destroyed. Rice grows in Georgia and other Southern States. Wool grows in Ohio and other Northern States. I denounce the whole scheme as an unpardonable wrong. It is a blow at one of the greatest agricultural interests of the country, and as a representative of an agricultural constituency, I condemn it.

The scheme is unwise, un-American, unpatriotic, sectional, vicious, partisan, and Democratic.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have received some petitions yesterday and to-day signed by reputable and intelligent citizens of Parke County, Ind., and since I very heartily concur in the statements set forth in the petitions, I desire to send to the desk one of them that I hold in my hand at this time, and ask to have it read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

To Hon. E. V. BROOKSHIRE:

In view of the misrepresentation being made by the enemies of tariff reform in their desperate efforts to defeat the will of the people, as expressed by their votes at the last national election, we, the undersigned, Democratic voters of the Eighth Congressional district, would earnestly urge you as our Representative to vote for the exemplification of the Chicago platform as far as is possible to be secured in the Wilson revenue bill, viz:

That tariff taxes be reduced to the lowest point that will yield the greatest revenue necessary to meet the requirements of economical government, and that customs duties be ad valorem.

We further request that you keep in mind that so-called "protection" is a fraud and a robbery of the great body of the people for the benefit of a few, and wholly inconsistent with that Democratic principle: "Equal rights to all; special privileges to none."

We desire that you use your best efforts to secure a tax on incomes.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I will now send to the desk and ask to have read an editorial article from the Rockville Tribune, published in the State of Indiana, an ably edited paper, that has direct reference to the matter under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WOOL HUMBUG.

"In 1854, under low tariff, 2½ pounds of Parke County wool would pay the taxes on one hundred sheep. In 1893, under the McKinley bill, it takes 20 pounds to pay on the same number."—*Tribune.*

"It is child's play to make assertions. 'There's a great big bear! He'll eat you up! Look out!' says the little boy to his companion, but really there is no bear at all. We desire to see and most respectfully ask the Tribune to give us the figures to prove the above remarkable assertion. We want the price of sheep, the price of wool, and the rate of taxation in 1854 in Parke County, and the same things for 1893. We want information on this matter, not rash assertions. Will the Tribune give it?"—*Republican.*

The Tribune will cheerfully give the information, and having taken the time to get the facts asked for by the Republican, will that paper have the honesty to print them? We think not.

The returns of the assessors for 1854, on file at the auditor's office, show that 42,611 pounds of wool were valued at $10,878—a little more that 25 cents per pound. The same returns show further that during the six following years of low tariff the price averaged nearly 30 cents, being lower in 1854 than the average. So much for the assessed, not the market value of wool, which was no doubt higher.

In the same year 20,473 sheep were valued at $18,568; 100 head being valued at about $93. The rate of taxation was 57 cents on the $100, so that less than 2½ pounds of wool paid taxes on 100 sheep, even if we take the assessed value of wool as a basis, and not the money the farmer received at the factory.

In the year of our McKinley, 1893, 100 sheep are assessed $300—the lowest figure. The rate of taxation will average $1.36 on the $100. Twenty pounds of wool at 18 cents a pound will pay taxes to the amount of $3.60, while the taxes on 100 sheep are $4.08.

Instead of overdoing the thing in our unofficial statement, the undisputable evidence of the records shows that we did not put the tax paying power of wool high enough for 1854, while we put it too low for 1893. If the rejoinder is made that our taxes are higher than they were in 1854, by reason of improvements, why is it that land was then appreciating in value, while for twenty years it has been depreciating, in spite of all we have paid and are paying in taxes with a view of adding value to our farms.

The whole tariff humbug can be so well shown up in the wool discussion that we are prompted to give its exchange value when it comes to buying back the highly "protected" woolens. During the period of low tariff there were several factories in Parke County, and just over its borders. The farmer, when he took his wool to market, got 1 pound of yarn in return for 2 of wool. Now the factories are gone—driven to destruction because they could not put good woolens on the market in competition with shoddy—and the farmer's wool, exchanged at the factory of some Eastern plutocrat, must go at the rate of 4 or 5 pounds to 1 of yarn, if he gets the same quality he received thirty-five years ago. Does it pay to tax ourselves that we may grow 18-cent wool on three-dollar mutton?

If we take wheat we find the same story, for only once from 1855 to 1860 did it get below $1 a bushel on the Wabash Canal. A half bushel of wheat would buy nearly as much goods in 1890 as a bushel will buy now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the petitions which have just been presented and read from the Clerk's desk. The last one was apparently somewhat of an innovation, not only upon those read yesterday, but, I take it, it is one of a very few in that line.

Now, the petitions presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] as coming from the State of Nevada and the Pacific coast generally present exactly the interests and condition of the sheep men and wool-raisers in that region. Having lived among them for ten years, I hope I am somewhat acquainted with the business as carried on in the Western country, as well as with the condition and necessities of those engaged in the business of sheep-raising and wool-growing.

Now, there is one thing which must be borne in mind, which is that so far as the great sheep-owners of the Pacific coast are concerned, that they are farther removed from market than any others, that it costs them vastly more to get their products into the market than it does those who live nearer the Eastern seaports of the United States—the market for the American wool.

Now, putting wool upon the free list brings those of the Pacific coast as well as all other wool-growers into competition with the wool-growers of Australia, New Zealand, and the Argentine Republic, there now being over 100,000,000 sheep in Australia, and between 50,000,000 and 60,000,000 in the Argentine Republic, against 45,000,000 in the United States. These countries can lay their wool down in the market upon the Eastern seaboard markets of the United States at about three-fourths of a cent a pound, while it costs the Pacific coast wool-grower from 3 to 4 cents a pound, commission and insurance included, to lay his down in the Boston and Philadelphia markets.

Then, another thing, there is a vast disparity between the wages paid here and the wages paid in Australia and the Argentine Republic. We pay the shepherds of our country from $30 to $40 per month, while in Australia, in the most favored country of all that section—New South Wales—according to the special consular reports on Australian sheep and wool, compiled by George H. Wallace, consul-general of the United States, Melbourne, Victoria, August 5, 1892, page 41, they pay not to exceed $20 per month for the best white labor; and there one man cares for about 2,000 sheep, while with us it takes one man to every four or five hundred, to look after them properly.

Another thing, sheep in our country must bear their share of taxation. They are taxed the same as any other commodity or article, while in New South Wales there is no taxation upon the sheep. The sheepmen there pay a mere nominal land tax and sheep are exempted from taxation.

Now, gentlemen speak about wanting the duty on wool removed. How do other countries treat us as to being liberal to those engaged in the sheep business? If we desire to export sheep to Australia, what must we do? By referring to page 32 of the report to which I have alluded I find in the language of that report that—

The direct importation of sheep from the United States, which had grown to considerable proportions, was brought to a stop by the regulation adopted in 1880.

Under that regulation if we wish to send American sheep to Australia we must not only show that they have been held in quarantine for ninety days, but in the language of subdivision 1, of section 33 of the act, must further show, "That they (the sheep) have been in the country from which it is intended (*i. e.*, the United States) to introduce them for a period of sixty days, and not less than fourteen days in Great Britain or Ireland."

In other words, if the American sheep producer wishes to send sheep to Australia he must not only show that they have been held in quarantine for the required number of days, but that they have been shipped from England or Ireland instead of sending them directly across the ocean to the market; that is, that they must go by way of Great Britain and be held fourteen days there.

It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, when we come to look at this bill, that so far as the wool-grower of the West is concerned he must suffer a great hardship indeed; his product is classed as "raw material" and his hope for success ruined. It is proposed to give us our wool free and keep a tariff upon our woolen goods. By this bill even sheepskins are put upon the free list, while you impose a duty upon the gloves manufactured from these skins. The shepherd is to have no protection upon his wool or pelts, but there is a duty on his woolen clothing and sheepskin gloves.

To compensate him for this loss, what do you propose to do? You propose to reduce his wages, to drive him out of business; but in order to let him down easy you give him cheaper champagne. You reduce the duties on laces and embroideries; you let him have his silks and plushes at lower prices. You make kid gloves cheaper, also ostrich feathers and artificial flowers. That is what you propose to do for the sheep-owner in the West in this bill. You propose to reduce all these things to benefit the poor sheepman and at the same time wipe out of existence the very industry upon which he depends not only for the luxuries of life (still made dutiable by this bill), but for the necessaries of life he must have in order to support and educate his family.

I am free to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Western wool-grower can not continue in this business if this bill becomes a law. Its effect is already being felt, and that effect upon the people whom I have the honor to represent is dire indeed. In 1892 they were able to realize at home some 14 cents for their wool. To-day wool is a drug upon the market at 7 cents. I have a letter here from a constituent of mine, and a very intelligent man, who, in writing upon this subject, speaking of the effect of this tariff agitation, says:

PRINEVILLE, OREGON, *December 16, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: * * * I desire to say that it had a most disastrous effect, and to fully explain I call your attention to the figures below.

To be brief in the matter, I refer to the year 1892 and take for a basis good average wool-scouring, 60 to 65 per cent which, during the season of 1892, averaged our growers 14 cents from sheep of an average value of $3 per head. This season of 1893, under tariff agitation, the same staple of wool averaged growers 7 cents and same class of sheep declined to $1 per head. So you will readily see what the effect of the recent tariff agitation had on our industries and what losses were attributed to the decline in values. But to show more fully how it affected a small community like ours, we had in our county 200,000 sheep and a wool clip aggregating 1,500,000 pounds. On wool the loss was one half, or 7 cents per pound.

Loss on wool	$105,000
Decline on value of sheep, at $2 per head	500,000
Total loss in one season	605,000

From the above you can see what loss we have sustained only for one year.

Yours, truly,

J. H. GRAY.

Hon. W. R. ELLIS, *Washington, D. C.*

That is in a county large in area, which contains a population of less than 4,000 inhabitants, and it suffers a loss of $600,000. If by reason of the agitation of this measure the loss is so great, what will it be if this bill becomes a law? I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], referring to the price of wool, has properly explained why there has been a decline in the price of wool under the McKinley bill. Wool, like any other commodity, declines according to the demand for it in the market; and I claim that while there has been a small decline in later years, I think the decline has not been as great here as in the London market. I submit here a table showing the monthly price of Ohio medium unscoured in the seaboard markets of the United States and the New Zealand unscoured in the London market, the two being practically identical.

Months.	Monthly price of unscoured— Ohio medium, in seaboard market of United States.	Monthly price of unscoured— New Zealand, in London market.	Tariff rate per pound.
1890.			
January	$0.37½	$0.20½	$0.10
February	.38	.20	.10
March	.37	.20	.10
April	.37	.19	.10
May	.37½	.19	.10
June	.38	.19	.10
July	.39	.19	.10
August	.36	.19	.10
September	.36½	.19	.10
October	.38	.19	.11
November	.39	.19	.11
December	.38	.20	.11
1891.			
January	.37½	.21	.11
February	.38	.21	.11
March	.38½	.19	.11
April	.38	.19	.11
May	.38	.19	.11
June	.37½	.20	.11
July	.36	.20	.11
August	.36	.20	.11
September	.36½	.20	.11
October	.36½	.20	.11
November	.36½	.20	.11
December	.36½	.20	.11
1892.			
January	.36½	.20	.11
February	.36½	.19½	.11
March	.36½	.19½	.11

From this table it will be readily seen that the relative difference in price is maintained in this country, although there had been an apparent decline in price. A Western paper, to my mind, has well named this bill when it speaks of it as a "bill for the free coinage of panics." It seems to me that that would be a more appropriate title than the present one. And now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the time has come for us to put an end to booming charity, which is about the only thing that has received a boom by reason of the probability of this bill becoming a law. I believe in charity, but would much prefer that there were no necessity for it. The time has come when we should quit booming charity and monarchies and to do something to boom American industries and furnish work at remunerative wages to the American workingman. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, there are a few points in this discussion of the tariff that have not yet been mentioned; but, before I come to any of them, I desire to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] for having joined the "Calamity Howling Party." Out in Kansas Third Party men are called "calamity howlers." I have listened to their earnest and just complaints, and we have earned that title, perhaps justly. But, sir, I never have heard so long, so persistent, and a more truthful calamity howl than we heard yesterday afternoon in this House. Certainly I never heard it more strongly from a single industrial interest than the gentleman has repeated respecting the sufferings of the wool-growers of this country.

I want to say, in addition, that, what the honorable gentleman said was true. While I disagree with him as to the cause of the trouble I repeat that, all he said was true, and all that his correspondents have said is true; but as to the cause of their distresses of course we differ.

I desire to say that while wool has fallen in price, and while that industry has got into a bad condition, it is in no worse condition than other industries. While wool has fallen in price, so has wheat; while wool has fallen, so has cotton; so has corn, so has beef and pork, so have all the products of industry for the last eight or ten years. Take the State of Illinois, one of the richest States, one of the best agricultural States in the world, with her agricultural wealth and her manufacturing industries, and yet in the State of Illinois we find that there are industries which are so depressed that we are led to believe there is very little prosperity there; when, with all their natural advantages, the people of that State are carrying $384,000,000 of mortgage indebtedness on their lands.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Is that mortgage indebtedness limited to farm lands?

Mr. DAVIS. I did not say so, Mr. Chairman; it is on real estate.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But does not the gentleman know that a large part of that mortgage indebtedness is on property in the city of Chicago?

Mr. DAVIS. It does not matter about that; there is great industrial depression.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Yes; but——

Mr. DAVIS. I did not yield for an argument.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But the gentleman, in speaking of the farmers of Illinois and their condition, must not load the mortgage indebtedness of the city of Chicago upon their backs.

Mr. DAVIS. I repeat, sir, that in 1890, a long time before the tariff scare on account of the domination of the Democratic party occurred, there existed on the real estate of Illinois a mortgage indebtedness of $384,000,000; and I suppose that in Illinois there are other men besides farmers who try to own their homes and are compelled to mortgage them.

Then, in the State of Pennsylvania, that land of protection, that land of prosperity, supplied with ores and coal, and with all the requisite resources of wealth, the people are loaded with $613,000,000 of mortgage indebtedness on their real estate; and the mortgage indebtedness of the great State of New York is $1,600,000,000, more than half of the original debt of the United States at the close of the war. Those debts do not proclaim prosperity.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. DAVIS. For a question only.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman says that these mortgages do not indicate prosperity. I will ask the gentleman if he does not believe that its mortgage indebtedness is one of the great causes of prosperity of the city of Chicago; and I will ask him, further, if he believes that that city could have been built up after the great fire in 1871 had it not been that the credit of the business men in that city was such as to enable them to secure such large loans that have been used by them to construct those magnificent buildings that are an ornament to that city to-day?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I find a circular issued by a banking firm in New York City which states that wheat-raising has not paid since 1884, and that the farmer must now give 2 bushels of wheat to get possession of the same coupon that he could formerly have obtained by giving 1 bushel. I am stating general principles. There are exceptions to all rules, but I am arguing the general question all over this country. I submit the following statement:

A year ago we wrote, saying, "In attempting to forecast the future we look for higher prices for wheat the coming six months." No time during four months following did the price decline more than 1 cent below quotations in Chicago, December 23, 1892, and it did make more than 10 cents, and remained for many weeks above that advance. We again feel like renewing last year's forecast, especially so as values are more than 16 per cent less and far below cost of production everywhere where wheat is grown or consumed. Bears and consumers have had a long inning. It is about time the producer be given a chance. Since May, 1893, economies gowing out of the Baring failure in Europe in 1890, and those emanating from effects of the ukase in Russia in 1891, Hatch bill proceedings in Washington in 1892, and later "the object lesson," or credit panic, coupled with a surplus from the 1891 and 1892 crops, plus the two largest rye crops grown, and an unusually large root crop the world over, evidently prevented Chicago cash wheat from getting above the "dizzy heights of 70 cents" since early June. The average price has been about 63¼ cents.

Only three Mays in the past thirty years has wheat sold under 80 cents in Chicago. No punishment in any calling has been longer endured or more severe and steady than that of the wheat-grower, who has sold at a loss yearly since 1884, occasionally giving 2 bushels where he used to give 1 to get possession of the coupon from off his mortgage after reaping but 2 bushels where in 1891 he thrashed 3. The above seven reasons terminating around the ending of seven years has forced a large part of the world's supply into city elevators (where expenses for carrying each 5,000 bushels or contract per day is slightly more than $2.50). Our visible and the world's visible will likely soon reach the largest amount ever known. January 21 last it was then the largest, 82,250,000 bushels. We believe consumption and waste is about at the maximum the world over; that speculation is about at the minimum point with bull sentiment about "all gone." Doubtless consumers' "cupboards" have smaller and less flour sacks than years ago, jobbers less barrels of sacks in store. The flour visible is less than last Christmas. The milling output this month is about the same as in December, 1892; for November the output was never larger; for the calendar year it will fall short of 1892 about 14 per cent.

Since 1869 Great Britain's millers, farmers, or land owners have not prospered; then England took off protection for imported bread food. July wheat in Chicago is selling only about 1 cent over May, and at the lowest price at this season of the year ever known; in Minneapolis cash wheat commands May prices; their stocks are about 18 per cent less than a year ago. Minneapolis and Duluth have but 18,000,000 bushels, against 20,000,000 last year. It is reported in the Northwest that their visible is 35,000,000 bushels less. The world's visible will show but little gain this month. (Weekly market letter, Clapp & Co., bankers and brokers, 60 Broadway, New York, Friday morning, 9 a. m., December 22, 1893.)

Mr. HICKS. Does your estimate of the mortgages of Pennsylvania include building association mortgages?

Mr. DAVIS. I take the figures as I find them. I will submit a table from the United States census report showing some facts along with my remarks.

Mr. DALZELL. Does not the gentleman know that that mortgage indebtedness in Pennsylvania rests mainly upon property in the large cities, and not upon the farms?

Mr. DAVIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, covering the point that debts indicate prosperity, I will say that I know of but one calling in which debts indicate prosperity, and in which men do live on the interest of their debts, and that is the national banking business. [Laughter.] But, sir, all debts, bonds, and mortgages ultimately rest upon the people as a burden. They do not indicate prosperity for the people.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been interrupted repeatedly, and I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may understand the significance of that statement of the mortgage indebtedness of Pennsylvania, will the gentleman tell us what percentage it represents of the total valuation of the property in that State; for otherwise it does not give us any information.

Mr. DAVIS. I have here a statement of the per capita indebtedness of several of the States. I find that in Pennsylvania it is $117 per capita; in Colorado, $206 per capita; in my own State, $170 per capita; in New York, $268 per capita. These debts rest upon the people most certainly, somewhere and somehow, and gentlemen may apportion the burdens as they please; I will not subdivide this indebtedness in a short speech like this. It all rests upon the people.

New York has a per capita mortgage debt of $268, and in this respect exceeds twenty other States that have been tabulated, as appears in the following comparative statement:

[Extra Census Bulletin (United States Census) No. 54, August 30, 1893.]

Alabama	$26	Kansas	$170	New York	$268
Arkansas	13	Maine	49	Oregon	73
Colorado	206	Massachusetts	144	Pennsylvania	117
Connecticut	107	Minnesota	152	Rhode Island	106
Illinois	100	Missouri	80	Tennessee	23
Indiana	51	Nebraska	126	Vermont	84
Iowa	101	New Hampshire	50	Wisconsin	72

Mr. Chairman, I am told that Illinois farming has not paid for years. I have been told by a gentleman from Illinois that the last eight or ten corn crops have been a losing game to the amount of $10,000,000 per annum.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not truly represent the State of Illinois by any such statement as that which he has just made. I say that farming does pay in Illinois, and I say there has not been a corn crop raised in that State since the Republican party came into power in 1856 in the State of Illinois that has not brought wealth to the homes of the farmers of that State; and any figures which the gentleman may present here, showing that the farmers of Illinois have generally raised their crops at a loss, are totally unreliable.

Mr. DAVIS. I did not yield for a speech, Mr. Chairman. In the South we find that cotton and wool are failures as paying crops. Cotton has been sold at a loss, and last fall, sometimes, it could not be sold at all. In my own State wheat has been sometimes carried to market and home again without a bid. It could not be sold at all. We find, then, that cotton has not paid, wheat has not paid, and corn has not paid. And, sir, we find that the silver-mining industry has been closed up entirely. Now, in the face of all these facts I declare that the tariff is not the cause of our distresses. The tariff does not touch corn, nor many other articles which have fallen in price. Sir, there is an underlying cause which has produced this general shrinkage of prices. Sir, it has been a contraction of the currency of the country, causing falling prices, general indebtedness, and general inability to pay. The people are carrying monetary obligations beyond their ability to pay. Farmers are losing their homes with frightful rapidity through mortgage foreclosures and the sheriff's processes.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another point that I wish to touch upon. A false impression seems to be abroad in regard to the effect of the tariff on wool. The arguments and complaints that we heard here yesterday are almost identically of the same character as those that came from the English farmers when it was proposed there to remove the tariff on wool. They said that it would destroy the sheep industry. But the tariff was taken off, nevertheless, and the English sheep industry increased in consequence of free trade in wool. Free trade in wool will not lower the price of American wools. It will not admit foreign wools which will compete with our best wools; but it will bring in

foreign wools fit to mix with our own; thus causing a greater use of our wools and the manufacture of a greater variety of goods; and if we get those foreign wools cheaply our American manufacturers can afford to pay more for our home wools, and there will be an increased demand for our home product. These are not my own theories or ideas. They are the lessons of experience and history. If gentlemen who are willing to learn will look over the debates in 1857, they will find these sentiments uttered by such men as Charles Sumner and Henry Wilson, and others of the New England States. Those statesmen evidently believed that in some cases free trade was the best protection for the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the true position on the tariff? In my opinion, we ought to say as Garfield said, "I am a protectionist; I am in favor of protection; I am in favor of that protection which leads to ultimate free trade." That was the statement of Gen. Garfield in July, 1866. It was then good Republican doctrine.

As a general result, it has been found that there are no wools raised anywhere abroad for export that will compete with our American middle wools, such as are produced on the Oxford sheep, the Southdowns, and the like breeds of sheep; nor with our combing wools of the Liecester and Cotswold breeds. Every country producing these classes of sheep produces them primarily for their mutton, and secondarily for their wool; and each country needs more of that quality of wool than it can produce, so that none is exported to this country or to any other country in the unmanufactured condition.

Mr. HARTER. Is it not a fact that those grades of wool about which the gentleman is now talking have averaged a higher price per pound for the last eight or nine years in the London market than in the market of the United States, in which they are grown?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; I believe that has been more or less true ever since the Crimean war. One other point. Take the merino wools of South America and Australia, which come from a different atmosphere, from different soils, and from different climates from ours; when they are brought here you find that they are fit to mix with our native merino wools, and they do not directly compete. The facts of history show that after free trade in wool was established in England wool did not fall in price, but was in greater demand than before, and that more sheep were raised in England than ever before.

In this country, where lands ought to be higher, it is not profitable to raise large flocks of merino sheep. They may be raised for breeding purposes, but not for wool purposes alone. The profitable sheep in this country are those which are raised primarily for mutton and secondarily for wool; and the wool of these classes of sheep will not fall in the market from any change of tariff. If it falls, it is from the decrease of money, causing fewer dollars to buy a given article of property, compelling men to sell the products of their labor for lower prices, in order to meet their debts and taxes and general expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that our industries are safe when they are founded on the fickle policy of raising or lowering the tariff; because no matter what tariff you may adopt, there is the continual fear that it will be changed. And the tremor now exhibited all the time by gentlemen interested in the protected industries proves that the tariff is not a safe foundation for prices. Let us have a solid foundation that does not care at all for a low tariff or a high tariff. We can do this by removing the present system of tariff taxation and adopting a juster system. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say before I sit down that it is impossible to maintain an equitable distribution of property in a country where the revenues are gathered through tariff taxation. Ten men owning $1,000 each, and each having a family of six persons, pay tariff taxes on the consumption of sixty persons. One man with $10,000 and six persons in his family pays a revenue on but six persons. Hence, tariff taxation taxes property in many hands heavily; it taxes property in few hands lightly. That being so, these ten men with ten families, paying on consumption rather than on accumulations, pay ten times as much taxes in proportion to property as the one man with $10,000 pays. Now, let that one man be a millionaire, and then see how much greater the difference is. If the $1,000,000 be in the hands of one hundred persons, they pay one hundred times as much tariff taxes on that property as would be paid if the same property were in the hands of one person.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois obtained the floor.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Before my friend from Illinois begins to speak, I trust we may agree upon a time when the vote shall be taken on this question.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would bring that matter up a little later.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I do not want to take my friend off the floor or curtail his time; but can we not agree to have a vote at 1 o'clock?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Extensions of time have been pretty liberal on both sides of the House, and I would be glad if the gentleman would withhold for ten or fifteen minutes his proposition as to taking a vote.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I do not want to prevent the gentleman from Illinois having as much time as he may desire.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask that the gentleman from Illinois may be allowed to speak for fifteen minutes.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. There is no objection to that. I am only trying to see whether we can not now agree upon some time for taking the vote.

Mr. BURROWS. We will try to come to some understanding on that point after the gentleman from Illinois has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be allowed fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall want so much time as fifteen minutes, unless I can have more.

This question in its economic as well as in its financial aspect is peculiar. It is, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said yesterday, purely, from time to time, a question of business. A wise policy for Great Britain is not necessarily a wise policy for the United States. Note the difference between the two countries. Great Britain, a country of vast age, of small territory, fully settled, with 36,000,000 of people, with great accumulations of wealth, finds the markets for her products all about this earth. She has to journey everywhere at great expense to find her markets, which are far inferior in amount and quality than we find amongst ourselves in our own markets.

Mr. DINGLEY. And at the same time wages with us are larger.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes, wages are larger. What is true of Great Britain is true of Belgium and of all the countries in Europe. But in the United States we have not far from 70,000,000 of people at the present time; and the increase of population in the United States since 1860 is equal to the whole population of Great Britain. If we could fully utilize the market afforded by this increase of population alone in the United States since 1860, we would have a market equal to that which we would have in Great Britain if we monopolized her markets for all kinds of consumption. We are in a period of development. In the next hundred years our 70,000,000 of people are to grow to 250,000,000. Now, if we can dominate the market from this time to that, amongst ourselves with our own products, we will continue to have the best markets of any nation in the world, even if we do not sell one pound, one yard, or one bushel abroad.

This can only be done by developing all our resources—diversifying agriculture and diversifying all other industries. So that it is sound business policy to utilize our present markets and the markets to come. It is an unsound business policy to throw away a market of 70,000,000 of our own people, soon to be increased to 250,000,000, in order to compete in a market that is not one-twentieth as large elsewhere. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I will admit, in the fullness of time, when we shall have 250,000,000 of people instead of 70,000,000, as now, the time may come, and probably will come, when we shall dominate the markets of this country and this continent, and that we may then change our policy. But we ought not to change it until that time does come.

Now, then, on this foundation rests the whole policy of protection, in my own mind, so far at least as I am concerned.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I will yield for a bare question.

Mr. COX. Only a question. Then your conclusion is that it is only a question of time when you can come to the Democratic doctrine?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, no; when he comes to our doctrine.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. We will never get to the Democratic doctrine.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Let me answer now.

Mr. COX. Very well, let us know.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will answer, and hope I will not be interrupted to any great extent. When the time comes for us to change our policy, if it ever does, and in changing it we can gain for our people more than we lose, then I shall be for changing it, call it what policy you please. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A step farther. Much has been said about wheat. Wheat is cheaper now than it was formerly. Why? Because there are

only two countries in Europe that buy wheat of us or of anybody—and I hope I shall have attention. It is shown by the reports of the Agricultural Department that those two countries are Great Britain and Belgium. Who sells the wheat in that market in competition with us? I answer Roumania, Russia, India, and the Argentine Republic. It is a very small market. In the year 1890 we sold 36 per cent of our wheat product abroad, whereas we sold less than 5 per cent of our other agricultural products abroad. What is the true remedy? Wheat is sold at ruinous prices. The true remedy is to broaden our market at home. How? By giving everybody employment. Then everybody will be a generous customer instead of a starvation customer.

But again. We should further diversify agriculture in sugar, wool, and everything else. We should also further diversify our manufactures, because as we diversify our industries we make customers for the farmer and customers for all producers. It is better for the farmer to sell to customers at home the wheat he has been raising rather than to have more men on the farm to raise more 50-cent wheat to compete in the markets of the two countries in the world where we sell our wheat. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman not admit that we are now competing in Europe with the different countries of the Old World for the sale of our wheat?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly; with Roumania, Russia, and India.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman will admit that the price we receive there fixes the price of our article not only in the United States, but in the foreign markets?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly; all prices are regulated by the prevailing market wherever it is. But let me tell the gentleman this: If you increase the demand for our wheat in the United States by making more customers and fewer farmers—less men engaged in the raising of wheat and more men employed in other industries to consume wheat—we will soon have a market of our own and be absolutely indifferent to the foreign market. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMPSON. One word further, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, please make it brief, as I have but a few minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I only want to get at the truth of this controversy.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Very well.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want the gentleman to explain if he can in his speech how it is that so many millions of people are crying for bread in this country, while the price of wheat is so low. What is the matter with the law of supply and demand?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will answer the gentleman, and very fully. Twelve months ago there was no crying for bread—— [Cries of "That is it!" and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois (continuing). There was not only no cry for bread, but the prices of wheat were higher by one-half than they are now, and everybody who wanted employment was employed at remunerative compensation. The trouble is that when this "Old Man of the Sea," Democracy, came into full power [laughter and applause on the Republican side] with its old threats of interference with the industries of the people, then there was a stop to all enterprise, because the people said "They have promised to wreck our industries, they have promised to reverse our policy, we can not go on and produce because we do not know that we can get the cost of production;" and factories and mills and manufacturing establishments closed down everywhere, so that there was stagnation in every branch of trade and at the same time a cessation of the liberal orders of the customers that had formerly prevailed in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KYLE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Take it in Illinois, with a half crop this year of corn and other products; it is the first time in the recollection of anybody when a half crop in Illinois did not bring an increased price, but with a half crop there on the farm the price has decreased. Why? Because the millions of men that were fully employed a year ago, who were the customers of the farmers, are now subsisting on short wages and short employment, or starvation relief at the hands of charity.

Mr. SIMPSON. Just one point more. I think I am helping the gentleman out in his argument.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. My time is very short.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. DAVIS. Which crop do you refer to?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] yield?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If my time can be extended a little bit I will be glad to yield. I have not vexed this House much in this discussion. I will yield, trusting to the generosity of the House to give me a little extension.

Mr. SIMPSON. I just want to ask one more question? When we were called together in extra session, was it not agreed between Republicans and Democrats that the great cause of the hard times that had come suddenly upon us, was the fact that the Government was buying 4,500,000 ounces of silver every month? [Cries of "No!" "No!" on the Republican side.] And did not the Republicans vote with the Democrats on that theory?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appeals to gentlemen to preserve order and to resume their seats.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, Dr. SIMPSON has given the patient fits, and he is the devil on fits! [Laughter.]

A word finally in reply to my friend, and I say it in kindness. I have listened to his speeches here when he proclaimed the poverty in my State of Illinois. Why, my friend, it is a standing wonder and amazement to the multiplied thousands of farmers of Illinois, well-to-do up to the last twelve months, industrious and prosperous as never before in the history of this country—it is a standing matter of wonder and amazement to them how their brethren in Kansas in an evil hour could have sent a gentleman with the peculiar views of my friend from Kansas to represent them on this floor. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to give the gentleman a little information about Kansas.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If it is no more valuable than what the gentleman has attempted to give about Illinois, it is not worth listening to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Figures do not lie only when they lie on your side!

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I say in an evil hour these gentlemen were sent here to represent the State of Kansas, but by the mercy of God and the awakened and enlightened thought of their constituents, they soon are to represent that State no more in my opinion, unless they reform. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Be careful how you enter the domain of prophecy, for it may come home to yourself.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Possibly it may; if so, I will die fighting for the right policy. Now, Mr. Chairman, a step further. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], and that headlight on economic questions, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], and others, have proclaimed the magnificent condition of the people of Great Britain. I am not here to quarrel with the policy of Great Britain. I think very likely for herself it is a wise policy, but wise as it may be from her standpoint, what has it brought her? I call the attention of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], to this fact, and I ask him to pick up the Red Book and see what he will find: 800,000 paupers in Great Britain in a population of 36,000,000, to maintain whom requires $50,000,000 a year. Is that the kind of prosperity the gentleman wants in this country?

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to call his attention to one fact? I understand him to say there are about 300,000 paupers in Great Britain.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Eight hundred thousand, and they cost $50,000,000 a year to maintain.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Does not the gentleman know that before the passage of the Peel reform act in 1841, out of a population scarcely half as large, they had in Great Britain more than a million paupers?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not know, and in my judgment the gentleman does not know. [Laughter.] I speak now by the card when I speak of 800,000.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Go back further and you will find still more.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But I know another thing. In the United States, with nearly double the population of Great Britain, with our higher wages and under our policy, the paupers in this country are only 75,000 as against 800,000 there. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, somebody says, "Let us buy cheaper." With what shall we buy? With the farm products, they say, and they tell us that we have fine natural advantages to produce them. Drive our seventy millions of people out of their daily employments in order that they may buy cheaper under other conditions abroad; drive them onto the farm to compete with those people who are making 50-cent wheat now.

There is the logical standpoint from the other side, and it is fairly presented by some gentlemen and unfairly presented by this bill. Take my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK]; take the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], and they have the courage of their convictions. They walk up and say

they will vote for this bill, but it is not what they want. They proclaim one and all that they believe in the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from New York said in substance that he would make trade absolutely free with all the people upon this footstool "for whom Christ died." [Laughter.] Beautiful! Magnificent! Splendid! Why is it with this magnificent announcement the gentlemen on that side of the House vie with us on this side of the House to exclude the 100,000 Chinese from this country? Did not Christ die for them? The reason is that we can not compete with these Chinese. We have the home, the fireside, the family, the school to maintain. They do not help bear the burdens of government. We do; therefore we exclude them. And in the next breath the Democracy, including my colleague, Mr. BLACK, want to let the product of 400,000,000 of Chinese come into our markets free, without one cent of tax, to compete with the products of our labor.

The gentleman from Illinois, my colleague [Mr. BLACK], said in substance that if we were paying more wages here than like labor received abroad, which promoted immigration from abroad, that he would stop the immigration by cutting off the wages of labor here so that there would be no temptation to the foreign laborer to come to our shores.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I would like to have five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, then, wages are higher here than abroad. Prove it. Yes. The 500,000 to 700,000 who cross the great deep annually, as your fathers and mine crossed it, come here to find homes. Why? Because they better their condition: because the wages are better. We get some immigration, notably the Chinese, whom we are trying to exclude; and some immigration from Poland, and some from Italy that we do not like; and we have passed our laws sifting the immigration. It is wise legislation, but gentlemen declaim against that immigration, and to cure it my colleague from Illinois [Gen. BLACK] would reduce the wages of the man who lives by the sweat of his face in the United States to an equality with the man who labors in Europe, and then he says there would be no wage incentive for the foreigner to immigrate. All this he and the Democratic party propose to accomplish, as they proclaim, by absolute free trade.

In other words, the labor of other countries is to sell its products in our markets free in competition with our labor engaged in making like products. For what? Oh, that we may establish "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." Absolute free trade, "with everybody that Christ died for" [laughter], except the hundred thousand Chinese that these gentlemen are with us trying to exclude——

Mr. LOUD. I suppose Christ did not die for them?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I too believe in the "fatherhood of God" and the "brotherhood of man." This brotherhood is being established on a large scale by and through a Government of the people in the United States.

The people are sovereign, and if the sovereign rules wisely there must be character, patriotism, intelligence. This means the fireside, the home, the school, the church, the book, the paper, and something of leisure for thought and Government. All this demands a better return for labor than will barely keep soul and body together.

If the cheaper labor of the Old World sends its products to the United States free, and sells them in our markets in competition with like products of our better paid labor, this would not elevate their labor, but would pull down all labor. If the Old World wants free trade with us, let it place its labor on an equality with our labor, and until this is done, let us protect our own, and in the fullness of time all mankind will be benefited by the remainder of the world being elevated to our level.

Now, Mr. Chairman, upon this wool amendment. We grow one-half of the wool we consume. This is grown on large ranches in the West, in part; but in the thickly settled States the small farmers have, as a rule, a few sheep—in the aggregate a great many; and I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HUNTER, and to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LANE; to the gentleman from Illinois, Gen. BLACK, and all of these other people, who are trying to muddy the water like a cuttlefish and swim away, that they may excuse their vote for this bill, but that the multitude of small farmers of Illinois, who have seen their flocks shrink in price three-fourths and their wool product substantially one-half in the last twelve months, when 1894 and 1896 come, will show them by their votes that their economic policies have been "weighed in the balance and found wanting." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Think of it! Forty per cent of protection for the manufacturers of wool and nothing for the men who produce one-half of the wool that goes in those products. And then the Democrats are crying about wheat! Too much wheat produced! And to remedy that they turn around and wipe out the wool industry. And so it is all along the line. Would to God men had eyes clear enough and brains strong enough and a vision broad enough to look at the situation of this country according to the extent and territory of the United States. Canada on the north, Mexico, Central America, and South America upon the south, with the 250,000,000 of our people that are to come in the next century in our present territory. We must promote here all production that is practical, and the cheapest and best market is first to supply our own wants.

In the coming century our hive will swarm; our children will find homes to the northward and to the southward. Wisdom dictates that we develop and commercially dominate this continent rather than enter into competition with the overpopulated countries of Europe and Asia. This is the period for broad statesmanship; this is the time to construct the Nicaragua Canal and to secure a naval station in the Pacific Ocean by dominating the Sandwich Islands. But in place of all this, you Democrats are in power; you borrow 850,000,000 to-day to carry on the Government and at the same time press this bill, that will reduce the revenues $75,000,000 more, and your WILSONS, COCKRANS, and BLACKS call this statesmanship. You disturb the air proclaiming your little shortsighted policy. We denounce your policy as inefficient; and inefficency clothed with power is criminal. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE was recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I rise for the purpose of making some remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I only rose, Mr. Chairman, because the Chair had informed me that I would be recognized in a certain order, and the time had come.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is certainly mistaken in saying that the Chair had promised to recognize him at any particular moment. The Chair said he would recognize the gentleman as soon as possible, but the gentleman must remember that the Chair can not control the matter absolutely. The committee has already given the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] twenty-three minutes, and the Chair feels bound to recognize a gentleman on the other side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I have no desire to come in conflict with the Chair. I simply repeat what the page told me.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has reiterated one of the statements which I regard as false, but which is continually made on the other side of the House, as to the purpose and effect of this bill, namely, that it is intended to reduce the wages of the laboring people of this country. The leader of that side of the House, the gentleman from Maine, ignores entirely the law of supply and demand in relation to this question, and I wish to quote as against him a statement which I find in a speech made by the Senator from Maine, Mr. FRYE, in the city of Detroit, during the campaign of 1888. He said:

> Where there are two men seeking one job wages will be low. Where there are two jobs seeking one man wages will be high.

He then proceeded to illustrate the tariff and the effects of it upon wages in Europe. He cited the fact that upon the continent of Europe, in the woolen factories, there were women working at 20 cents a day and boarding themselves.

A few moments later he cited the other fact that there were 90,000 women working in the factories in Manchester, England, at from 35 to 40 cents a day. The Senator knew that the part of his audience that was most interested in the discussion of this proposition would take the latter statement as a reflection upon free-trade England, and he knew that that audience would not stop to compare the two sets of figures that he had given, that they would not observe that in the protected countries on the continent, according to his own statement, the wages of operatives were but 20 cents a day, while in free-trade England the wages paid for the same labor were twice as much.

He forgot, too, that the application of the rule he had just laid down as to the influence of supply and demand upon wages would show the fallacy of his argument. There are 361 people to the square mile in England, while there are but 20 to the square mile in this country. I do not intend to say that density of population alone determines the wages of labor, but it bears considerably upon it. The Senator also forgot to mention the fact that wages in free-trade England had increased from the

very day that the free-trade policy was adopted until this hour. There is as much difference between the wages in one part of this country and the wages in other parts as there is between American wages and English wages in some of the trades.

Mr. HARTER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is not the fact also that the prices of agricultural products advanced in England after the repeal of the corn laws?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is the fact: but it is not pertinent to the proposition I was discussing. Wages in the protected employments in this country are not any better than wages in the unprotected employments. The wages of those people who can not be affected directly by your protective tariff are better in this country than those paid in Europe to a greater extent than are the wages of our people engaged in protected industries.

What do I mean by unprotected labor? I might say the farmer constitutes the largest portion, because protective laws do not favorably affect the price of his products. The markets of the world, under the rule of supply and demand, fix their prices. But there are millions of others in this country the product of whose labor, or whose labor itself, can not be protected or increased by tariff laws—the teacher, the lawyer, the doctor, the minister, the railway employés, both street and across country, all men engaged in building trades, all workers as clerks, bookkeepers, and salesmen in stores, and the great class known as day laborers. Yet the wages of all these are greater here than anywhere else in the world.

Taxing their necessaries and comforts of life or the materials they use can not increase the pay they receive for their labor. They all belong to the Wool Consumers' Association. The differences between the wages paid workers in all the ways I have just mentioned in this country and that paid the same class of workers in Europe is as favorable, if not greater, than the difference between the wages paid in the woolen industries and other protected industries here and in Europe. The wages of workers in the woolen industry in England are better—nearly double—those paid the workers in the same industry in the countries of Europe which have high protective tariffs. These facts you do not controvert. Explain them without weakening your plea for a protective tariff if you can.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Now, will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I will, in a moment. The wages in the Argentine Republic are better than the wages in any of the protected countries of the world, in some employments.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I would like to have ten minutes additional in which to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEIL). The gentleman from Ohio asks ten minutes' extension of time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, as to another proposition of the gentleman from Illinois——

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me a question before he leaves the matter of wages of labor?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, I will yield for a question.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to this fact as to the prices of labor in Great Britain and Germany that the disparity in price was because of the factory system in England——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I did not yield for an argument.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Then I will ask a question. Does not the gentleman know that from 1880 to 1890 wages increased in Germany much more rapidly than they did in England——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That may be so; yet in many instances they are still not half as great as in England in some classes of employment.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. And the reason is that Germany is just emerging from the hand-made system to the factory system.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just taken his seat, stated that it is the apprehension of the action of the Democratic party with regard to wool that has caused this business depression and this depression in other industries with the consequent loss of wages in this country. He forgets that ever since 1885 the Democratic party of this country has been pledged that as soon as it could obtain the power it would place wool upon the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He forgets that the message of the Democratic President of the United States in 1888 declared positively in favor of free wool, and that the Democratic party has from that day to this fought upon that platform. He certainly will not plead that the people of this country were ignorant of what they were voting for when they voted for the Democratic platform in favor of a tariff for revenue only and voted for the man who had assumed the leadership of the party with his pronounced record in favor of free wool as a constituent part of its platform.

I will give the gentleman some facts and statistics as to the cause of the depression of the grain and cotton market in this country. I take the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics upon foreign commerce, and on page 17 I find this statement under the head, "Domestic exports by countries."

The mere statement that the value of domestic exports to Europe fell off $189,106,919 by itself almost tells the story, for it points immediately to diminished exports of breadstuffs, provisions, and cotton. In 1892 the United Kingdom took $68,704,503 in wheat; in 1893, $57,853,514, a difference of nearly $11,000,000. In 1892 it took $20,293,642 in corn; in 1893, $9,048,469, a difference of more than $10,000,000. In 1892, Germany took $7,842,902 in wheat and $7,481,125 in corn. In 1893 it took $2,569,261 in wheat and $2,794,689 in corn. The experience of these two countries could be extended so as to cover nearly all the countries of Europe depending upon foreign supply of grain, and applies with equal force to breadstuffs, to provisions, and to cotton.

Mr. SHAW. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SHAW. Will you turn to page 12 of that same report and look at the list of agricultural products and their prices? You will find, as any gentleman will, who may read it——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. This is not a question; and I do not yield.

Mr. SHAW. That the price of every agricultural product has been advanced.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman does not put a question; and his suggestion is not pertinent to my argument, and his statement is incorrect.

Mr. Chairman, a few remarks with regard to the paragraph immediately under consideration, or the amendment offered thereto. Remonstrances have been sent up and read in the presence of this House, which simply show to what length protection will run in its madness, or what people will ask protection against.

In one of these petitions it is stated that the destruction of the sheep going on in some parts of the country is the result of the impending bill. Was the destruction of the sheep in 1868 in Ohio, when sheep were driven to the shambles by the hundreds of thousands, the result of the tariff of 1867? The destruction of sheep that is going on in some portions of the country to-day is no more to be attributed to the pendency of this bill than was that destruction in Ohio in 1868 attributable to the increase in the tariff in 1867.

Another of the reasons why they ask for protection is because of local taxes upon sheep. Another is because there is a head tax in Nevada of 5 cents per head on sheep; therefore the Government must tax the individual consumers of wool to put that money back into the pockets of the sheep-owners. Another is that in some tropical countries—I believe Australia was alluded to—the government fences the land, and therefore the Government must tax the people of this country in order to fence their land.

In another case it was the difference in altitude; that they were raising their sheep at a higher altitude, away up in the air, while the ranchmen were raising sheep wool in Australia and probably in the Argentine Republic at a lower altitude, therefore the Government must tax all wool-wearers in order to protect them on account of this difference in altitude. There is also a difference of moisture in the air, and there are differences of other climatic influences, all of which must be protected against by a tax on the consumers of wool. It is also said in one petition that the waters of their territory were alkali; that you must therefore tax the people in order to furnish them with fresh water with which to wash their wool.

Another was the difference in the cost of transportation. That is a new argument, or is presented as such on the part of the protectionist, that having legislated to protect labor and having legislated to protect capital we must now begin to protect one part of the country against the transportation facilities of the other part. The complainants from Nevada complain that they can not compete in the raising of sheep with Ohio and New England, and complain that Australia sends her wool to our market by water, and therefore that the people of the country at large are to be taxed in order to pay for the transportation of their wool so that they can compete with the wool grown in Ohio and in New England, as well as that brought from Australia.

My colleague asks why not levy a tax upon wool as a revenue tariff? Because it is not and can not be a good subject of revenue tax; because it does not yield as a revenue tariff as much as many other articles that can be selected.

If the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois is correct, that about one-half the wool that we use in this country is raised here, what would be the effect of the imposition of the tax if the fact be as the gentleman claims, to increase the price of a pound of wool to the wool-grower? Would it not increase the price of the pound of wool to the wool-user as well? This tax on wool

would result in raising revenue in such a manner as that for every dollar of tax that would go into the Treasury of the United States to pay the expenses of the Government, one dollar would go into the pockets of the wool-raiser; and that is the serious objection to it.

Another objection, Mr. Chairman, is that it is made the pretext to increase the tax on the finished goods, or the products of woolen manufactories. In the McKinley bill is a direct recognition of that fact—worse than a recognition of it—an attempt not only to protect the manufacturer but also to assist him to levy tribute on the people of this country. In some instances the tax is described as so many times the tax upon a pound of new or unwashed wool and then so much ad valorem. The little tax upon wool is made a pretext for a big tax on woolens. Most farmers would be compelled to pay far more to the woolen manufacturer in the protective tribute he would lay on them than they would get back through the tariff on their wool.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE was recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEIL in the chair). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I wish to know what the rule of the House is, when a member rises in good faith in his seat before any other member and addresses the Chair in a respectful manner for the purpose of discussing a subject before the committee, as to the matter of recognition by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. But I made the parliamentary inquiry in good faith, and hope the Chair will answer it. I wish to know what the rule of the House is, when a member in good faith rises in his place before any other member, addresses himself respectfully to the Chair—"Mr. Chairman"—and asks recognition in that manner for debate on a matter pertinent and pending? What is the rule of the House about recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the question of recognition was settled on yesterday. The Chair is also of opinion that the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Pennsylvania rose about the same time, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I submit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I rose before he did, and I think twenty members of the House must have observed it.

But a further parliamentary inquiry: In what way can a member who desires to address the House on a pertinent subject before it address the present occupant of the Chair so as to secure recognition?

Mr. ENLOE. By respectfully addressing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to be fair. He does not consider the gentleman's last remark a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am not attempting to reflect upon the fairness of the Chair. I desire to get the floor, and I am proceeding upon the theory that there is an equality among the members here upon this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I hope the Chair will direct his attention this way. I propose to try to get the attention of the House when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] shall have concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, the question of tariff for revenue, or for revenue and protection, must be considered as applicable to this country only. Its experience in any other country will form no guide for its application in this. Our country is so large, our industries so numerous, our climate so varied, our soil so different in different localities, producing in one State what it will not yield in another, that the question should only be considered by its history and experience in this country. If this country consisted only of the State of Pennsylvania the policy of England as to tariff might possibly be considered with advantage. We would then have to import many articles of necessity which we now obtain from our sister States; but having nearly fifty States and Territories averaging in extent nearly or quite as much surface as Pennsylvania, and having free commerce between them, our policy should be so to legislate upon this question as to encourage the production of the principal products of each State by confining the consumption to our own home productions. In this way the products of Pennsylvania find a market in other States, and the cotton of the South and grains and meats of the West find a market in Pennsylvania.

It can not successfully be denied that this country has prospered under high protective tariffs. It can not successfully be denied that the country has suffered great business depression under low tariffs.

A reduction of tariffs necessarily means a reduction of wages, and this bill should be entitled "A bill to reduce the price of labor." It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of its framers to suppose that they expect or intend that the prices for labor prevailing during the past few years can be maintained under it. They do not make any such claim. It would be ridiculous to do so. The report of the committee says:

> Such a reform of the tariff must quicken every industry, must open a larger field for the employment of labor, must secure to it more working days at steadier wages.

Its framers expect more work at steadier wages; they do not say at higher wages.

Reduce the wages of our workmen to the price paid for labor in foreign countries and this country can undersell any country in the world; we have many natural advantages over the foreign producer. But the Republican party does not want to reduce wages in this country to the price paid in foreign countries.

The Democratic party by this bill declare their intention and desire to reduce the price of American labor. They admit that reduction of tariffs and putting articles on the free list will decrease the production of those articles in this country unless the cost of the labor in their production is reduced.

They say in their report:

> Logs are already on the free list; we have gone a step farther and put undressed lumber generally on this list. This may serve to cheapen and improve the dwelling houses of some of our people, but it is justified if it shall accomplish nothing more than to delay the rapid destruction of American forests.

Here, then, it is squarely admitted that the putting of undressed lumber on the free list will accomplish just what the Republican party claim that it will accomplish, viz, stay the manufacture of our own logs into lumber and supply our demand by foreign lumber. The American forests can not be preserved without ceasing to cut American trees, and putting lumber on the free list is to stay the cutting of American trees. It will do it. Put lumber on the free list and the American forests will be preserved. You allege it. We admit it. There is no dispute between us as to the effect of this bill on the American forests. There is no disguise about it. You openly say that your purpose in putting lumber on the free list is to preserve the American forests. You claim that it will do it. No one disputes you. You say nothing about the thousands of American choppers and sawyers that will be turned out of employment, nor how they are to be preserved. But the preservation of the American forests is far dearer to you than the preservation of the American workingman. Your object is accomplished. The trees will stand and the workmen will fall.

But if putting lumber on the free list will preserve the American forests, why of course putting coal on the free list will preserve American coal. There can be no escape from the argument. If, as you say, lumber on the free list will preserve the trees in the forests, why of course you admit that coal on the ree list will preserve the coal in the mountains. These great coal deposits will be preserved: so with our ore, and so with the many other articles which you put on the free list. The Republican party wants to develop the coal and the ore, but you do not. You want to keep it in the hills, to preserve it.

You are opposed to the development of the natural resources of the country. Keep the trees standing in the forests, keep the coal in the mines, keep the ore in the banks. That is your position, and you can not gainsay it.

You are behind the spirit of the age. You are not capable as a party of administering the affairs of this Government. Under your management the country will speedily relapse into a condition of innocuous desuetude.

I know that you spin beautiful theories, clothed in eloquent language, and it is a misfortune to the country that so much eloquence and logic is found in your ranks; but all of your eloquence and logic is dumb beside a starving man and an idle mill.

Of what use is it to argue to a man whom you have deprived of labor, and whose children are crying for bread? Anyone, it seems, would see the distress which you are bringing on the country. Any political party ought to see it, but you are joined to your idol of revenue reform—you are deaf to the cries of the people, you ignore their distress and their sorrow.

You say that you must use the surgeon's knife and amputate to save the patient's life; and yet the limbs which you are to cut away were healthy, in the full exercise of their functions, until you produced your surgical implements. I know that the schoolmaster is abroad in the land, and unfortunately for the country, he is in this House; but that his propositions are wrong, that his theories are wrong, and that his logic is false is demonstrated every day by the country.

You think that you have been sent here by the people to pass this bill; but the people who sent you here have changed their minds upon this matter and now call you to stop.

Abraham was sent to the mountain by God, to offer his son Isaac as a sacrifice, but Abraham listened to the voice of God and stayed his hand. Why will you not listen to the voice of the people and stay your hand? Your own party calls you to stop, and you, of all the Democrats in the Democratic party today, persist in going on. The people who sent you here have made a mistake, and they told you so last November most emphatically.

Are you so blind as to think that the people do not now and then make mistakes as well as their representatives?

The people made a mistake in making it possible for Congress to pass this bill, and they now see it. Let us grant your position, for the sake of the argument, that you have a power of attorney from the people to pass this bill: but do not you know that a power of attorney can be revoked? The people revoked your power of attorney last November, and they will revoke you next November if you pass this bill.

We are representatives of the people; we are here to represent their wishes, not our own theories obtained by reading Henry George and other writers, but the views of those who sent us here, coined from their own practical experiences; and I deny that you Democrats from the North, East, and West represent the people who voted for you when you vote for this bill.

I will not go into a discussion of the relative merits of this bill and the McKinley bill. I point to the condition of the country—that is my answer to all the eloquence and argument which have come from the supporters of this bill since the debate began.

I was impressed with the argument of my eloquent friend from Illinois, Gen. BLACK. He presented a new phase of this question. His theory is that this bill will restrict immigration; and he is entirely right. Of the many bills introduced in Congress during the past several years to restrict immigration not one of them has proposed to do it in the way he suggests, and he is entitled to the credit of having solved the problem that has so long troubled the gentleman from Alabama and others. His idea is that the half-million who annually come here do so to get the high wages paid under protective duties, and as this bill which reduces the protective duties would also reduce the wages, these foreigners would no longer have an inducement to come, and would stop. The American people are suffering from unrestricted immigration, it is true; but they do not wish to restrict it in that way. They do not want to take away the desire of foreigners to live here by making it undesirable to live here themselves. A famine here could restrict immigration on the same principles.

The cholera scare in 1892 restricted immigration. There is no doubt but that the good wages paid here has encouraged immigration, and there is no doubt but that immigration will decrease if you reduce the wages. My friend from Illinois is entirely correct in his reasoning, and no doubt if he wants to restrict immigration the passage of this bill will do it.

His reasons for his support of this bill are the most logical that I have yet heard advanced. He can go back to Illinois—to the workingmen of Chicago—and say, "I know that you are oppressed by foreigners who come over here to share your wages; well, we have stopped that; we have passed a bill to lower your wages to the same figures now paid these foreigners in their own countries, and they will no longer have any inducement to come over here to work"—and these Chicago workmen are expected to throw up their hats and hurrah for the Wilson bill and tariff reform.

They should be grateful. The Democratic party has restricted immigration. Great is the Democratic party, a friend of the people, especially the working people.

My friend from Illinois says if he was pursued by bees he would throw down the honey. In his illustration, so happily used, the honey is the high wages paid our workingmen under the McKinley bill, and the bees are the foreigners whose immigration he wishes to restrict. If my friend from Illinois with his hands full of honey pursued by bees should throw it down, the bees would get it; they would get it all, and then we would have no honey. How true his illustration is, and how aptly it fits this bill. Under it our workmen will throw down their wages and the foreigners will get them. He will not be pursued any longer by foreigners, for the wages of the foreigners in their own country, under the stimulus of making our wares for us, will be better than the wages of our workmen.

Our workmen have lost their wages, lost their honey, it is true; but then they are no longer pursued by foreigners, the bees, and that is consolation.

Advocated by such high Democratic authority—it may be Democratic, but it is not American.

The American idea, the Republican idea, is to hive the bees in their own country by laws restricting immigration that will restrict, and protect our working men and women in the enjoyment of their wages, their own honey.

God pity the American workingman if he trusts his political future to a party advocating such a measure! [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I only wanted to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I am still in existence, and that I hold the promise of the Chair, which is as good as his honor, to have recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is not in order. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I hope I am not to be subjected to the same treatment as the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I shall endeavor to get recognition some time this afternoon.

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand the copy of a resolution which I have received in the mail this morning, of the action of the Brooklyn Democratic Club, in which they have resolved that the inaction and delay of the Democratic majority in Congress in redeeming the pledges made by the Democratic party to reform and reduce the tariff is causing serious injury to the business of the country, and as a consequence is creating a feeling of deep resentment and indignation among the people, which threatens disaster to the party. I want here to resent the imputation that is cast upon the Democratic majority of this Congress, that it has been guilty of inaction and delay in redeeming the pledges made by the Democratic party to reform and reduce the tariff. The first day fixed by the law at which this Congress could have assembled after its election was the first Monday in December, 1893.

The only way that Congress could have been assembled sooner to deal with this question was by the proclamation by the President of the United States convening Congress in extraordinary session. This Congress was called in extraordinary session in the month of August of last year to deal—with what? Not to deal with the tariff question, but to carry into force the views of the present Executive of the United States upon the financial question; and this Congress was held here after the bill proposed by the Administration had passed the House to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman silver law from day to day awaiting the action of the United States Senate upon that bill. The close friends of the Administration even joined their forces with the Republican minority of this House to prevent taking up the bill to repeal the Federal election laws until driven from their position by a caucus of the Democratic members of this House and the indignation of the Democratic masses.

Then, if the blame rests with anybody, it is not with the Democratic majority of this Congress, but is with the President of the United States, who, as the recognized leader of the party, is under equal or greater obligations to redeem the pledges of the party in carrying into effect tariff reform than the Democratic majority of this Congress. But instead of tariff legislation being taken up at this extra session Congress was forced to take up the financial measure of the Administration, to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and the people were told that the moment that repeal went into effect great prosperity would come at once to the people of the United States, and the boom would be such that the complaint and dissatisfaction that was resting in the minds of the people would at once be dispelled.

That repeal act has been in effect for more than two months, yet the prosperity we were told was so soon to come has not come. The trouble and dissatisfaction of the people is still heard all over the land, and now for a so-called pretended Democratic organization to insult the Democratic majority of this House by passing a resolution of this kind ought to excite the resentment of every Democratic member here who has been ready and willing at all times to carry into effect the pledges of the Democratic platform in favor of tariff legislation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I ask five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITHIAN. Now, sir, after the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, what other demand is made of this Congress before tariff legislation shall be put into effect and before the pledges of the party shall be redeemed upon the great issue on which we were successful in the campaign of 1892? They got the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and now, to bring about the prosperity which they predicted would follow that repeal, but which has not followed it, they propose in a time of profound peace to issue interest-bearing gold bonds, to buy more gold to put into the Treasury of the United States. It is bonds that Wall street wants; and it seems to me that the Administration is more disposed to please Wall street than it is to

bring about speedy tariff reform. Wall street does not want tariff legislation. They want bonds. More bonds! is the demand of these gentlemen. And the men who are demanding bonds are the men who are behind this so-called Democratic organization, the Brooklyn Democratic Club. [Applause.]

I see by the morning papers that the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to issue bonds, and has already invited proposals for the purchase of the bonds that he intends to issue, under a law which gives him no more authority to issue United States bonds than I have, except for the purposes set forth in the resumption act. Why, sir, if the Government of the United States is in need of money to meet its current expenses, the Secretory of the Treasury has no right to issue a single dollar of United States bonds to raise money for that purpose—not a dollar. [Applause.]

Mr. REED. Let us impeach him. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. If the United States Treasury is in need of money to pay its current expenses, and the Administration will ask the Democratic majority of this Congress for authority to coin the seigniorage now in the vaults of the Treasury, over $50,000,000 can be made available for the purpose of meeting the current expenses of the Government.

Mr. BLAND. Let me say to the gentleman that we intend to pass that bill whether we are asked to do it or not.

Mr. FITHIAN. I hope so. But, Mr. Chairman, it may be said that the capacity of the United States mints will not permit us to coin the seigniorage fast enough to meet the wants of the Treasury.

Mr. SNODGRASS. What did they stop it for, then?

Mr. FITHIAN. Yes, what did they stop it for? But, Mr. Chairman, we can issue Treasury certificates against that seigniorage, and those certificates can be made available immediately, as fast as they are printed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and this Government will thus be put promptly in possession of enough money to tide over any deficiency which exists at the present time.

Mr. SNODGRASS. But that would not increase the interest-bearing debt.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the time of his colleague be extended five minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman is scoring a Democratic Administration, I will make no objection.

Mr. FITHIAN. Oh, the gentleman need not trouble himself about the present Administration. I want to call his attention to the fact that it was the legislation of his party that has brought about the present condition of the Treasury. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When Mr. Cleveland left the Presidency and turned the Government over to President Harrison there was in the Treasury a surplus of more than $100,000,000. During the four years of Republican administration you squandered that surplus and left the Government with a deficit for the Democratic party to take charge of.

Mr. HAGER. They ought to know how to handle a deficit, as they have never had anything else as the result of their administration of affairs. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. So, Mr. Chairman, all the blame of the present condition of affairs can not be laid upon this Democratic Administration. I am calling the attention to the shortcomings of this Administration since it came into power, but I also condemn the Administration of the Republican party which has brought about our present condition as much as I do the shortcomings of this Administration.

But, Mr. Chairman, the great cry is, "Bonds! More bonds! We must have more bonds!" to satisfy the appetite of the grasping Shylocks of Wall street.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. FITHIAN. It is not so much the purpose——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITHIAN. No, I do not. I have only a few minutes. The gentleman can follow me in his own time. This demand for bonds is not so much for the purpose of obtaining revenue to pay the current expenses of the Government, because that revenue can be obtained without the issuance of bonds, but it is to satisfy the greed of the Shylocks of Wall street who want these bonds.

Mr. BOEN. And the commissions for those who have the sale of the bonds.

Mr. FITHIAN. But, Mr. Chairman, is the United States a bankrupt institution? Is the United States so poor that its obligations will go begging in the money markets of the United States and of the world? If we need more money to meet the current expenses of the Government, is there a gold bug here so foolhardy and so steeped in his greed for United States bonds as to say that if the Government should issue $100,000,000 in United States Treasury notes that they would not be worth dollar for dollar? [Applause on Democratic side.] That they would not be received for every demand against the Government? Would you not take them in payment of your salaries?

Mr. BOEN. Certainly.

Mr. FITHIAN. Could you not pay your debts with them?

Mr. BOEN. Certainly.

Mr. FITHIAN. Would you not take them from any gentleman who owed you a debt?

Mr. BOEN. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. We always have.

Mr. FITHIAN. And do you doubt the power of the United States to levy an income tax, to levy internal-revenue taxes, to levy customs duties, enough to redeem every obligation that might be made by the United States by issuing noninterest-bearing Treasury notes in sufficient quantities to tide us over for the present? [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have not occupied the attention of the House before during this session, and inasmuch as I have had some difficulty in getting the floor on this occasion, and because of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] has challenged us to a discussion of the question as to who is responsible for the necessity of issuing bonds by the United States at this time, I ask unanimous consent of the House that I may have twenty minutes in which to enter into a discussion of this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for twenty minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the McKinley law was enacted in 1890, if I remember aright, and it was about that time that the Sherman law was also enacted. Therefore, the country had been under this Republican legislation for a little over two years when the present Democratic Administration came into power. If there was anything deleterious in that legislation ample time has elapsed in which to demonstrate it to the American people, but the fact is that during all this period of two years the country was in an exceedingly prosperous condition. Capital was buoyant and hopeful and was profitably employed. Our manufactures were all running. Our machinery was in full blast. There was not a single man in this land—North, South, East, or West—who desired to work, who did not have the opportunity presented to him to do so at remunerative wages.

Never, sir, was there a period in the history of the American people when they were more prosperous, or making more rapid strides upon the highway of material development than from the time of the enactment of those two measures, the McKinley bill and the Sherman act, up to the time the Democratic party came into power. The receipts of the Government were sufficient to meet its expenditures and the gold reserve was at its maximum. It is, therefore, I submit, a little late now for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] to come into this House and undertake to arraign the Republican party for the condition in which the public Treasury is found at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the prosperity that existed in this land up to the time that the Democracy assumed the reins of government is, I repeat, a refutation of that statement stronger than anything I can put into the form of language myself. If there was extravagant Republican legislation which caused the existing condition of the Treasury, why did not the Democratic party in this House, during the Fifty-second Congress and before the last election, introduce some measure looking to the repeal of such legislation? The effort at least could have been made. But nothing of the kind was done. By their failure they substantially admitted the justice of all those Republican laws of which they complain. What particular piece of legislation was it that they thought was wrong and extravagant? Let some one name it. With their declaration that the Republican party had been prodigal in laws which squandered the public funds, the Democratic party never sought then by legislation to change the condition of affairs which existed; and they have not done so since Mr. Cleveland came into control of affairs. Why, Mr. Speaker, the very Democratic House which complained most of the extravagance of the so-called "billion-dollar Congress" imitated its example and piled up its appropriations to a much larger amount.

Mr. Chairman, the real cause of the present condition of the country is apparent. Even a schoolboy can comprehend it. The very moment it was understood that a party pledged to reverse the existing condition of affairs was to assume the reins of government, that very minute apprehension and distress took pos-

session of the American people; capital became despondent; business was arrested; labor went unemployed; our factories ceased their operations; and in less than two months after the Democratic party had assumed the helm of the Government starvation was threatening many of the American people, and brave and honest men who were anxious and willing for the opportunity to work—men who had never known idleness before—stood upon the street corners of our cities and towns crying for daily bread, their necessities being relieved only by the charities of their countrymen. And now, in place of a revenue equal to the expenditures of the Government, as under Republican rule, in place of a surplus in the Treasury which the Democratic party once decried, but for which the Democratic Administration is now sighing, we find the receipts have fallen off, and that the Government, like its citizens, is in need for the very necessities of life.

Contrast the present condition of your Treasury with its condition when Benjamin Harrison went out of office. According to the estimate of your own official the revenues have so fallen off—and fallen off, as I insist, because of the advent of your party—that according to his first calculation there will be at the end of this fiscal year a deficit of $28,000,000, and according to his revised figures a deficiency of $78,000,000. Upon this admitted deficit you are seeking to establish a still greater deficit by the character of the legislation now pending before this committee.

Now, how do you propose to supply this deficiency? By simply letting the tariff bill alone and raising revenue as the Republican party did to the extent necessary to meet the just and proper expenditures of the Government? No; you are proposing to so levy tariff duties as to create a still greater deficit; and how are you going to supply this deficit? You are presenting to the country to day the miserable alternative either of voting to coin the seigniorage of silver now in the Treasury, every dollar of which is morally pledged to the redemption of the short-weight silver dollar now issued under the law, thus not only destroying this seigniorage as a reserve, but absolutely coining it into additional short-weight dollars, thereby increasing the indebtedness of the people—or you are presenting the other wretched alternative of doing in time of profound peace that which the exigencies of war alone required the Republican party to do—the issuing of bonds, payable principal and interest in gold, and increasing the weight of taxation to be borne by the people of this country irrespective of party.

What a beautiful spectacle the great Democratic party is presenting to the people of the country in this matter! To what unfortunate expedients it is resorting! You propose to do these things to meet the present urgent necessities of the Government. You propose to apply the gold for which you sell these bonds not only to maintain the reserve in the Treasury, but for the purpose of paying the current expenses of the Government; you are proposing by the sale of bonds to take gold into the Treasury with one hand, and then to pay the Treasury notes and greenbacks that will be presented the next minute with gold drawn from the Treasury with the other hand. Are you going on with this beautiful policy—putting gold into the Treasury by the issue of bonds, and then taking it out the next minute to redeem the greenbacks and the Treasury notes indefinitely? When and where do you propose to stop?

You realize that this thing can not supply the Treasury for any great length of time; that your permanent revenue must be sought in some other direction. You have repudiated one-half of the declarations of your Chicago platform; in the name of God why have not you the manhood and patriotism to repudiate the whole of it? Let the McKinley act alone; and in less than thirty days business will revive, the wheels of industry will again revolve in this country, unemployed labor will be employed, and the just revenues raised by this system of imposing duties will flow into the Treasury and save the necessity of resorting to these doubtful expedients about which you are now so divided. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, we understand what is coming. In order that certain gentlemen may put into practice in this country their exploded theories, in order that gentlemen on this floor may revamp the principles of Bartial and Henry George, without giving them credit by way of quotation, you are proposing to strike down and destroy the protective policy. And behind all this, as a system of raising Government revenue for the purpose of paying Government expenses, you are throwing upon the horizon of the future your single tax on land values, which, as is well known in this House, has far more than one earnest supporter on the Democratic side of this Chamber.

Your President and your Secretary of the Treasury are recommending another method of raising revenue, in their anxiety to destroy the protective tariff. They are insisting on a tax to be levied entirely upon the income of corporators.

But there is another motley crew of you which propose to have this income tax individual in its character—a tax so graduated that it shall be assessed only on those whose incomes exceed $5,000 per year. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party has steadily declaimed against war legislation; it is always crying out that we should strip from the statute books the last vestige of such enactments.

And yet the gentlemen who have been in the habit of denouncing these things are now insisting upon reviving what they once called the worst feature of war legislation, and which they said was justified only because it was necessary during the rebellion to raise revenue to preserve the Government. Now, in a time of profound peace, they are proposing to resurrect and place upon the statute book this alleged odious income tax, with all of its inquisitorial features and its premium to perjury and fraud.

Mr. Chairman, it has been declared time and again in this country, on the best of authority, and I assert that the logic of events has demonstrated it to be true, that the Democratic party has no constructive genius whatever. Its genius, if it has any at all, is purely destructive—destructive of that which is best and noblest in American civilization. [Applause on the Republican side.] It has not the capacity to formulate a sensible or patriotic policy. I believe a distinguished Democrat once characterized it as a party which could not flap its two wings together. It can not formulate a policy, and even if it could formulate anything, it has not the courage, tenacity, the patriotism and the common sense, to crystalize its ideas into the statute books, and to give the people laws under which the Government can be successfully administered. [Applause on the Republican side.] Your party is a party of indecision and of vacillation. It is composed of jarring elements; you are now fighting and quarreling among yourselves, both in secret and in public, and are airing your dirty linen, both in your committee rooms and on the floor of this Chamber, in the full presence of a thoroughly disgusted and indignant people.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I dismiss this subject simply with one suggestion. Time and again on this floor, during the progress of this debate I have heard gentlemen assert that the American people have on two occasions decided in favor of tariff reform and against the principles of a protective tariff. It seems to me that the gentlemen who make this declaration ignore that which is nearest to them and remember only that which is in the shadowy past.

Surely it ought to dawn upon the somewhat benighted understanding of these gentlemen who are constantly iterating and reiterating this thing in this Chamber, that last fall the people came to the polls in this country and with a full opportunity to pass upon the very subject of tariff reform, with the gauntlet thrown down by the Republican party and taken up on the part of the Democratic party, in all sections where there was an opportunity for an untrammeled ballot the American voters reversed their verdict of two years before, and declared absolutely and unequivocally in favor of the system of a protective tariff and against the free-trade theories now so pertinaciously advocated upon this floor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to advert to a subject which was the original reason of my asking recognition upon this floor. My distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE], I observed, arose this morning and sent to the Clerk's desk a petition in favor of the passage of the Wilson bill, signed by certain of his constituents. He asked that that petition might be publicly read from the desk in the hearing of the House, and his wish was complied with. I do not rise for the purpose of censuring my friend for that act. Indeed I think it is a matter to be commended. The right of petition is a very old and a much revered one in this country. I remember that one of the most distinguished Presidents of the United States, who, having retired to private life, was subsequently elected to this House, vindicated this right on this floor in language very emphatic in its character. It should be promoted, for it is one of the very best avenues whereby the people may make known their wishes to their servants, concerning matters in which the people are profoundly interested.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent to my mind, and I think will be to the House and to the gentleman himself, that the value of this right on the part of the people depends upon the impartiality with which it is recognized by their representatives. Now it so happens that sometime ago my distinguished friend got a petition from certain of the manufacturers and laboring men in his district, citizens of the county of Clay, in the State of Indiana, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill. That petition was numerously signed not only by the manufacturers, but by their laborers and by men of all shades of political opinion. The gentleman failed to present that petition to this House in any manner, shape, or form, and after the lapse of a considerable length of time——

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. May I ask my friend a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I hope the gentleman does not wish to be unfair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly not.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. On page 594 of the RECORD the gentleman will find that that petition was referred according to the rules of this House——

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Unquestionably. I will reach that point; but the fact nevertheless remains that after quite a long while, with ample opportunity to present that petition to this House, the gentleman failed and neglected to do it. Now, it turns out——

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Some of these petitions were sent to me, not directed to the Congress of the United States nor to the House of Representatives, but directed to me personally, and I think the petition to which the gentleman refers was directed to me personally. When I received information that the petitioners desired that that petition be referred to the committee I had it done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman anticipates me. If he will wait until I am through, he will see that I am doing him no injustice. That was not my purpose in rising. It seems that some of the signers of that petition, ascertaining that the gentleman had failed to present it to the House—having intended, whatever might have been its technical wording, that it should be so presented—having sent it for that purpose, wrote me a letter asking that I should see the gentleman, ask why he had not presented the petition, and request him to do so. In compliance with the wish of these petitioners, I saw the gentleman and called his attention to the matter, and he stated to me that he did not remember whether he had presented the petition or not, that it might be possible that it was addressed to him personally, and if so it ought not to be presented to the House, but that he would ascertain and let me know.

After rummaging among his papers, the gentleman eventually unearthed the petition and brought it to me, and indorsed a reference of it to the appropriate committee upon its back. Then he presented it, not in the open House, but had it deposited in the petition box, according to the usual rule, where, as everybody knows, it died, and no member of the House ever had any knowledge of its existence except the gentleman from Indiana and myself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a member upon this side of the House can very seldom get unanimous consent to publish a petition in the RECORD. I have tried and failed; but a gentleman upon the other side of the House could very readily have obtained unanimous consent over on his side and no objection would have been urged on this, and that petition could very well have been presented and read in the open House, just as the petition was read that the gentleman presented this morning. The mere fact that it was addressed to him personally is no excuse for his not having it read publicly to the House from the Clerk's desk, for the reason that the very petition which he procured to be read this morning was also addressed to him personally and not to this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise, as I said, for the purpose of making any stricture upon the gentleman, but for a twofold purpose. First, to show that the gentleman's own constituents had been petitioning him against the passage of the Wilson bill as well as for it. Secondly, for the purpose of showing that there is something defective about the rules of this House which enables one petition to be kept in the background and another to be presented. The very purpose of the presentation of petitions to this body is to give to the members of this House the sentiment of the people upon the particular subject petitioned for, and the rules, in my humble opinion, ought to be so changed that all petitions can be presented alike; if not, the very purpose and object of petition is destroyed. If no such rule can be passed, then I submit to every member of this House whether it is not a matter of the utmost and the nicest delicacy and importance—a sacred obligation, binding upon every member, to see to it that perfect equality is secured in the presentation of every petition which is forwarded to him by his constituents with a view of having it laid before this House.

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like the gentleman from Indiana to state to this House if he believes that it would be possible if all the time that we give to the sessions of the House was devoted to the reading of petitions that all the petitions that are sent to this House could be read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that nine-tenths of the petitions presented to this House are very brief in character and could be read to the House; but that is not the point I am making. If one petition is read then another petition should be read. [Applause on the Republican side.] If a gentleman gets a petition from his constituents protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill, he should present it whether the sentiment agrees with his own or not, provided it is couched in respectful language, especially where he has presented petitions from others of his constituents containing prayers of an opposite character. And each petition should be presented in an equally open and public manner.

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman answer another question right there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. ENLOE. I understand your position to be somewhat critical of your colleague for the action he has taken?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am simply stating the facts. If anything like criticism results from a statement of the facts I can not help it. If any of the gentleman's constituents send a petition such as this to the House, it is due to this body that it should know what is the sentiment entertained by those people.

Mr. ENLOE. I would ask the gentleman what he thinks of the conduct of his colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who absolutely declined to present a petition sent by his constituents, on the ground that they did not know what they were talking about?

Mr. WALKER rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I want to say for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] that he demonstrated yesterday so signally, in his debate with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], his capacity to take care of himself that I have no doubt if he has an opportunity to do so he will answer that question satisfactorily to the gentleman from Tennessee. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So far as I am individually concerned I stand ready at all times to present to the House any petition which is presented to me, and which is couched in respectful language, whether addressed to me personally or to this body, whether I agree with its sentiments or not.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I had the petition read in my own time this morning, and stated before the petition was read that the petition stated that a protective tariff, in the judgment of the petitioners, was a fraud and a robbery; and I indorsed that and had it read as a part of my remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I know that. The point I am making is that certain constituents of the gentleman, who did not believe that protection was a fraud and a robbery, asked him to make their sentiments known to this House, and that he failed to do so, and to give to this House a knowledge of their position on this subject as he did to the others whose petition he procured to be read publicly here to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care at this time to break into this discussion as to its merits, but the utterances of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] make me feel that perhaps I have been entirely mistaken in all the proceedings that I have taken in respect to petitions since I have been a member of this House. While the gentleman stated time and time again that he had no desire to be unfair with his colleague from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE], he has been nothing but unfair, with respect to the course that his colleague has taken as a Representative here. [Applause on the Democratic side.] On the merits of this bill the views of the gentleman from Indiana command my sympathies to some extent——

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Was it necessary for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] to travel around by way of Colorado in order to say that?

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I can not quite keep up with the rapidity of the words which fall from the gentleman from Richmond [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman would better try to keep track of my ideas.

Mr. PENCE. Well I do not know that I gather the ideas either, if they keep gait with the words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is the gentleman's fault.

Mr. PENCE. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I learned a long while ago that the smaller the windmill the faster it runs. [Laughter.] I want to be fair. I am not now protesting in behalf of the gentleman's colleague [Mr. BROOKSHIRE]. I am protesting in behalf of myself and of scores of other members here who have believed up to this time that we were honest and candid and in the line of our duty when we filed in the petition box the petitions that were forwarded to us by our constituents.

This morning, for the first time, the gentleman from Indiana

makes known to me that I am a deceiver, a pretender, a concealer of the wishes of my people, because I do not present their petitions in open House every morning. [Laughter.] I have not risen at this time to take part in the discussion of the merits of this bill, but to protest against such a line of criticism as the gentleman has indulged in this morning, evidently for political effect, against a colleague from his own State, and I make the protest simply because I do not propose to have the idea go out to the innumerable citizens of Colorado who have sent me petitions, which I have presented through the box in the honest belief that such action was in conformity to the rules and the practice of the House, that I have thereby been a party to concealing the expression of their views.

The gentleman from Indiana, who has just taken his seat [Mr. JOHNSON], has directed his criticisms to a colleague from his own State. Mr. Chairman, I was raised in the State of Indiana and I know what that means. An Indiana Republican is always hunting a chance to fight an Indiana Democrat, and *vice versa*. [Laughter.] They can not help it. It is bred in the bone. It is their nature. It can not be prevented. But the gentleman's criticism involves not only his colleague, but scores of other members of this House, and I want to put it upon record that my colleagues from the West have presented, and I have presented, petitions through the petition box in the belief that that was the proper course to pursue, and that in so doing we were not trying to conceal the expression of the wishes of our people. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana and Mr. MAGUIRE rose.

Mr. MAGUIRE was recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I trust the gentleman from California will yield to me for a moment, inasmuch as the gentleman from Colorado has referred to me so freely in his remarks.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I can not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Then surely the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. PENCE] will give me a hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE] is recognized.

THE SACRED RIGHT OF PETITION.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with what I desire to say on the pending amendment, I am charged with the duty of vindicating the right of petition here on behalf of certain of the constituents of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. Some of his constituents sent to him, to be presented to this House, their petition, in the form of a preamble and resolutions, recommending and requesting the immediate passage of the Wilson bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts, it seems, denied them the right of petition, because their petition did not support his own views, and practically advised the petitioners, by letter, not only that he would not file their petition with this House, but that they were foolish for signing it, practically telling them that they were not wise, because they did not understand that their interests could only be subserved by a policy which was calculated to take care of the rich and let the rich take care of the poor; the policy pursued by the Republican party down to the time of its final overthrow. His letter, which was read here yesterday by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], not only denies a sacred right of citizenship, but is a gross and gratuitous insult to every labor organization in this country.

I have been requested by those constituents of Mr. WALKER to present to the House the resolutions which he refused to have filed on their behalf. I ask that they be read by the Clerk. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must remind visitors in the galleries that they must keep order; they are not permitted to participate in demonstrations of applause. The Clerk will read the paper sent to the desk by the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE].

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, is a parliamentary inquiry in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The other day when I desired to introduce a memorial from my constituents, and asked the Clerk to read it, the Chair held that I must read it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is utterly mistaken as to the ruling of the Chair. The Chair made no such ruling.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I was forced to read that memorial as part of my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman certainly must have misunderstood the Chair.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I only wanted to suggest that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is certainly right in assuming that all members should be treated by the Chair with equal fairness. But the Chair has not at any time held that the Clerk could not be allowed to read a paper which a member desired to have read in the course of his remarks.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Then I may have misapprehended the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is altogether mistaken. The Clerk will read the paper sent to the desk by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolutions from the Central Labor Union of Worcester, Mass.

Whereas the Ways and Means Committee of the Fifty-third United States Congress have recommended for passage, by said Congress, the bill known as the Wilson bill; and

Whereas the said Wilson bill proposes to lift, in part at least, the burden of an oppressive and iniquitous indirect tax from the shoulders of the laboring masses of America: Therefore

Be it resolved, That we, the Central Labor Union, of Worcester, Mass., representing twenty-four labor organizations in Worcester and vicinity, tender our profound thanks to the members of the Congressional Ways and Means Committee for their manly and patriotic stand in the face of the clamors of interested monopolies, and in defense of the rights of the people; and

Resolved, That we heartily indorse the Wilson bill, although only a modicum of the relief demanded, as comprising as much of a concession to the wishes of the people as is available under existing circumstances; and

Resolved, That we recommend that the deficiency that it is claimed that the bill fails to provide for be made good by the enactment, by Congress, of a law providing for a special tax upon the monopolies of the natural resources of the country; and

Resolved, That these preambles and resolutions be given to the press of this city for publication, and that copies of the same be sent to our Senators and Representatives and the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in Congress.

MICHAEL O'DEA, *President*.
DONALD SMITH, *Secretary*.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I would be very glad if my time could be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALKER. I ask that I be allowed the same time in reply.

Mr. MAGUIRE. You have my permission.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALKER. I object, unless I can have five minutes.

Mr. MAGUIRE. The gentleman has my permission.

Mr. BURROWS. There will be no trouble about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again submit the request. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for ten minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, that petition the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] refused even to file in this House. I regret that the necessity for vindicating the right of petition here should arise in the case of a Representative from Massachusetts, my native State—a State famous for its constant defense of the principles of individual liberty and citizen sovereignty, and one of whose former Representatives on this floor presented the grandest vindication of the sacred right of petition that has ever been made in any legislative body in the world. It shows how the public spirit of Massachusetts, in some quarters, as it seems to be represented here, has degenerated since the time of John Quincy Adams. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

WHY WOOL SHOULD BE FREE.

Now, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen from the Pacific coast, speaking from the Republican standpoint, assuming to represent the wool interests of Washington, Oregon, and California, have denounced the proposition to put wool on the free list, and have urged on behalf of the wool-growers that the McKinley tariff on raw wool be retained. The greatest markets that the raw wool of the Pacific States ever had was furnished by the great San Francisco woolen mills, which between the years 1886 and 1890 were absolutely closed by the tariff on raw wool. The market for our Western wool was practically closed when the woolen manufacturers of San Francisco were obliged to close their factories and turn them into warehouses, because a heavy tariff barrier prevented them from securing the necessary long staple wool to mix in manufacture with the short staple domestic wool.

Those great factories will never resume operation again until freedom of trade shall be established in raw wool and bituminous coal.

If the domestic producers of copper should insist on a prohibitory duty on zinc, which is required to mix with their product in the manufacture of brass, they would be guilty of manifest folly, but they would not be more unwise than the growers of short staple wool when they insist upon a prohibtory tariff on the kinds of wool without the importation of which there can be practically no domestic market for their own. They burden the

manufacturing industries by compelling them to pay a heavy tariff on the foreign wool required to mix with theirs, thus diminishing production in that line, and closing their best market against themselves.

We are told that it is impossible to raise wool in this country in competition with the wool-growers of Australia; and from every wool-growing State in this Union, it seems, a petition or a letter to that effect has been sent to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. In everyone of those petitions and letters, so far as I have seen, there has been a uniformity of statement, untrue in fact, but indicating that they all emanated from the same source, from the same pen, and were merely distributed for signature throughout the wool-growing States.

But all or nearly all of these petitions and letters declare that it is impossible to compete with the wool-growers of the Australian colonies, because the rent of the Australian sheep pastures is less than the tax upon the American sheep-grazing lands, and because the wages paid to the American sheep-herders and other laborers connected with the production of wool are so much greater in this country than in the Australian colonies.

Now, sir, it happens, as shown by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], that the wages paid in certain sections of the United States to laborers engaged in the sheep industry are far lower than the wages paid to the laborers engaged in the same industry in the colony of New Zealand. He has shown that the wages paid shepherds in New Zealand are greater than the wages of superintendents of sheep ranches in Texas.

The difference between the rental value of sheep land in this country and in Australia is probably true. Whatever advantages have resulted from the protective tariff, as it bears upon the sheep-raising or wool-raising industry in this country, has gone into the sheep-grazing lands, to enrich the mere owners of the lands, and not to the men conducting the industries. Where the sheep-raiser owns the grazing land as well as the sheep, he gets benefit, of course; but he gets it as landowner, not as a sheep-raiser. Thus it has ever been; the owners of the monopoly element of production control production and appropriate all benefits flowing from protective tariffs.

The enormous value, Mr. Chairman, that has attached to the mere monopoly control of American lands under the protective system represents the vortex into which the benefits of protection have been pouring during the past thirty years. While industry has been prostrated and commerce destroyed, and while both have been sinking under an ever-increasing burden of debt—now aggregating twenty billions—the monopoly value of the natural sources of production in this country has increased until it is more than equal to the value of all the wealth of the country. By wealth, I mean the stored-up products of labor. Land is not wealth. It is the natural source from which wealth is produced. The market value of land represents, in capitalized form, the tribute that landowners are enabled by their monopoly to wring from labor without giving any equivalent.

PETITIONS AND PROTESTS.

Mr. LOUD. Will my colleague yield for a moment?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOUD. My colleague has gone to Worcester, in Massachusetts, to get a petition to present to this House. I would like him to say in all fairness what petition he has received from his own constituents relating to the woolen industry.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I have received some protests against the passage of the Wilson bill from gentlemen who, being protectionists and knowing my sentiments in favor of freedom of trade, presumably voted against me at the last election, and I presented them to this House. I present petitions coming from my district, from men of all political opinions, because I recognize the great right of petition as well when the petitions come from the minority as when they come from the majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask if one of the names signed here, that of Barclay Henley, is the name of a Republican——

Mr. MAGUIRE. I will state to my colleague that Mr. Barclay Henley, an excellent gentleman, whom I know and esteem, is largely interested personally in sheep-raising.

If he has signed a petition asking for a protective tariff on wool he has to that extent placed himself on the Republican side of the protective line.

If he has petitioned for a protective tariff on raw wool it was quite appropriate that he should have applied to the protectionists in this House to support that petition.

Mr. Henley has not addressed me on the subject. He has long known my position on this question, as have all of my constituents, and that may account for his having communicated with my Republican colleagues, and not with me. If he had sent me a petition or protest against the Wilson bill, addressed to this House, I would certainly have presented it.

Mr. LOUD. Have you received a petition from wool-growers——

Mr. MAGUIRE. My time is so short that I must decline to answer any other questions. I say, that I have received no petition from Mr. Henley.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that few petitions have come here in favor of the passage of the Wilson bill, and that many protests against its passage have been filed. Why should our constituents petition us to pass the Wilson bill? Why should they doubt that we will pass it? They elected us upon a solemn promise to pass such a measure. Why should they now insult us by sending petitions implying doubts of our fidelity to the promise on which we were elected? Our solemn pledge to that effect was made in the acceptance of the national platform, and it was repeated over and over again during the campaign. We are here to execute that promise; the people expect us to do it without further urging or petitioning.

The Republicans, on the contrary, not satisfied with the verdict rendered by the people who elected us and charged us with the duty of repealing the McKinley bill, persist in attempting to intimidate Democratic Representatives by clamor through their subsidized newspapers, through meetings called to represent their special interests, and by voluminous petitions and protests containing collectively fewer names than there are Republican voters in three Congressional districts out of the three hundred and fifty-six.

They are attempting to frighten us by exciting personal fears concerning the safety of our positions in the next campaign, and hope thereby to induce us to violate our promises and trample on our principles, by bowing down and worshiping the special interests which they represent.

We have promised, so far as possible, to wipe out the system of special privileges maintained by the Republican party, and establish in its stead "equal rights to all, with special privileges to none." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The people expect us, in this hour of conflict, not to hunt for places of personal safety, but to follow our standard to the end, regardless of personal consequences. Gentlemen say that the verdict of 1892 was reversed in 1893. I say there is absolutely no evidence of it; no Democratic vacancy in this House has been filled by the election of a Republican member of Congress. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] The elections in which the Democrats were defeated in 1893 were contested on local issues. There was not an issue presented in the campaign of 1893 concerning the action of this Congress, or the principles which should control its legislation, except where members of Congress were to be elected to fill vacancies; and wherever they were to be so elected, the same verdict was rendered in 1893 that was rendered in 1892.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WALKER and Mr. WILSON of Ohio addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio was recognized.

Mr. WALKER. I think I am entitled to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I should be very happy to indulge the gentleman from Massachusetts——

Mr. WALKER. Go ahead.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. But I know it is difficult to get an opportunity to speak during this discussion on this amendment.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the gentlemen who represent the great sheep-growing interests of Texas and California. Yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] spoke openly in favor of free trade in wool. To-day the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE] speaks for his constituents in favor of free wool.

The State of Texas raises more sheep than any other State in the Union. The State of Ohio raises the next largest number. The State of California stands third. The great sheep-raising States ought to be together on the great questions affecting the interests of the people of these States. While I admit that the State of Texas has more sheep than the State of Ohio, I believe it was conceded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] that the value of the sheep in Ohio exceeds that of the sheep in Texas.

Now, I can account for that only in one way, and that is because, as the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] would say, in Ohio the sheep have a higher degree of civilization than they have in the State of Texas. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They are of a better quality, and therefore are more valuable.

I am of the opinion, however, that the sheep in Texas are gradually approaching the standard of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and that it will only be a little while before Texas will be clamoring for protection to the wool industries of that great State.

I am glad that Texas has progressed in civilization. She is represented on this floor by a most distinguished and able delegation, by men who stand in the front line of statesmen in this House, and I am surprised that they are willing that that State, whose greatest industry is that of sheep-raising, should go back to where it was a few years ago. I can remember when I was a boy, when people talked of Texas as if it was a bad State; and when a wicked man in our section departed, it was always a question whether he had gone to Hell or gone to Texas. [Laughter.] But Texas has come up, and to-day, if she would stand with Ohio and California and the new States, the sheep industry of this country would develop until the people of this country would supply all the wool that is needed for American manufacturers and for American consumption.

It has been suggested here that it has not been shown that protection helped the wool industry. I say it has been shown. Since the passage of the McKinley bill the sheep industry has grown, and to-day there are more than 4,000,000 more sheep than there were in 1890, when the McKinley law was passed. We have supplied within 129,000,000 pounds the wool that is necessary for this country; and if you will give protection to American industries, the vast plains of Texas and the territory of the West will be dotted with flocks of sheep, and on every farm in the older States there will be small flocks; and I say to you when you strike down that industry in Ohio you have stricken down one of the greatest industries we have.

All through the States the farmers have small flocks of sheep. Many farms which would never produce enough to make farming profitable were it not for the flocks of sheep are made profitable by the little flocks that earn the surplus of revenue for those farms. Take them away from the farms of Ohio and you destroy the agricultural industries and all the industries lying round about the farming interests. I therefore appeal to the majority of this House to stop, and for the sake of the people of this country and for the sake of the people who own 4,000,000 sheep in Ohio not to destroy that industry.

The time of Mr. WILSON of Ohio having expired, by unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, it was extended five minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that it would be for the interest not only of the sheep-growers of this country, but for the interest of the entire people of this country if there is protection afforded the sheep-raisers of this country against the lower wool of other countries. I believe it would build up the manufactures in this country until we would here have the labor which is now employed in the old countries; that here we would have consumers for the agricultural products of this country, and we already have more than enough consumers for the wool product.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. CRAIN. If the high protective tariff would have such a beneficial effect upon wool manufacturers of this country, how does the gentleman account for the alleged decadence of the wool manufacturing industry? How does the gentleman account for the immense depreciation of the wool manufacturing industry since the passage of the act of 1867, and the passage of the act of 1890, both high protective acts?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The wool manufacturing industry has not decayed.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I do not admit that that is true. I understand that the woolen industries of this country, the manufacturing and the growing, have both increased. They are not now at the pinnacle, it is true. There was a time, however, a few years ago, when the products of the wool of this country were over 300,000,000 pounds, and it is now 285,000,000 pounds.

Mr. CRAIN. And has fallen off that way under protection.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Protection has been so uncertain. In 1883 there was a reduction in the tariff on wool of 2 cents a pound. The result of it was to intimidate and scare the wool-growers and the farmers of the country; and the Democratic party in Ohio, in their platform of that year, declared that the Republican party had destroyed the woolen industries of the United States, and that they ought to be driven out of power.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN. Why is it that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] offers an amendment substituting the tariff rate of the McKinley act for the wool schedule of this bill?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. There is a higher protection afforded in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan than the rate proposed in the bill offered by the gentleman from West Virginia. I do not believe that the proposition to impose about one-half of the present duties on wool is sufficient to protect American wool-growers, or that it is a good revenue measure. The simple fact of lowering the duties below the protective point is the same thing as if it were put on the free list so far as the promotion of that industry in this country is concerned.

Mr. CRAIN. Does not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] propose a protective rate, and is it not identical with the rate now in force under the McKinley act; and is it not claimed by your side that that is protection?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. We do claim that that is protection; and if the Democratic party had not won the election of 1892 the sheep and woolen industry of this country would have been more prosperous than ever before in the history of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is simply because of the impending changes in the tariff, and the threats of the Democratic party against the woolen interests that is closing the woolen manufactories all over the United States.

That is the trouble. It is the threat to destroy the woolen industries. I admit that the gentlemen from the South are compelled, perhaps, by their associations to go along with the majority here in favor of free trade. It is the misfortune of the State of Texas that she has no representatives of that great party which favors protection in the United States. It is the misfortune of the South that they have few Representatives upon this floor who can speak for the interests of the industries of that portion of the country which need protection.

Mr. CRAIN. I will state to the gentleman that on yesterday they had a valuable aid in the person of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] the floating member from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I did not catch the gentleman's remark.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will only consume a few moments. I want to reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], in which he stated that the effect of free trade in England had been to make 800,000 paupers in England, including with that, of course, the able-bodied and those who were not able-bodied. I read now, not from a work on political economy, but from a statistical work entitled Fiscal Legislation of England, by John Noble. Speaking of the time from 1836 to 1842, while the protective system prevailed, he said:

> The protective system had been long slowly undermining our prosperity, and the evils it had caused could not be removed by mere reductions of duty. The prospects of the country continued most gloomy; in two years there had been a falling off of nearly one-quarter in the whole amount of the excise revenue—a sure test of the condition of the working classes. The number of able-bodied paupers had increased from below 200,000 in 1836 to 407,570 in 1842, notwithstanding extensive emigration, the number of persons leaving our shores having increased from 44,478 in 1835 to 118,592 in 1841, and 128,344 in 1842. In the fifteen principal agricultural districts of England and Wales the increase in the poor rates between 1836 and 1842 was 21 per cent, and in the twelve manufacturing counties 30½ per cent. The total commitments for crime, which were 20,984 in 1836, were 31,309 in 1842; and the number of bankruptcies increased from 800 in 1838 to 1,500 in 1842. The national interests were accurately described in Parliament as being "in a state of the most complete prostration."

Now, I call attention to this point. Remember that in 1824 the population of England was about 17,000,000, and that it is 35,000,000 now. The number of able-bodied paupers had increased from below 200,000 in 1836 to 407,570 in 1842; doubling in six years under the effect of the highest protective tariff that ever cursed that country.

Now, I wish to reply to the general remarks, almost all of them, on the other side. They tell us that in the United States our great body politic is undergoing a wrenching and writhing in such a condition as the body politic has never known in the history of our country. Let us examine the causes. I will refer those gentlemen to a book, and recommend it to them to look over very carefully.

It is probably a little new, and some will object to its doctrines; but I find the four evangelists, all alike, give a description of a certain man who was beset by a legion of devils. When our Saviour approached the man to cast the legion out, you will remember that the devils asked to be let alone. Our Saviour then demanded that they leave, and before they left the man's body they threw him down. They wrenched him, they racked him, and they knotted and contracted his muscles, and he went through the most excruciating agony, and when eventually the legion of devils did go out of the man's body into the swine, and from there to the sea, that man arose and praised God, being a sound and able-bodied man.

Mr. HENDRIX. Was there ever any sympathy with the man who lost the pork? [Laughter.]

Mr. HALL of Missouri. I was going to make the application in a moment. I desire to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that after thirty years, during which our body politic has been possessed by a demon of the same kind and character, the accursed policy of Republicanism, very soon the Republican devils will go out of the man into the swine, and the swine will go into the

sea and the man will rise blessing God. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding to discuss the pending amendment I desire to give a little hint to gentlemen upon the other side that they are going to be deceived as to the number of votes that they will get here in favor of placing wool upon the free list. I know more, gentlemen, of the Democrats of Ohio than you do. You think you are going to get the votes of all the Ohio Democrats here, but, judging from their history, you are mistaken. Democracy in Ohio is changeless evermore. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. How is it about Republicanism?

Mr. NORTHWAY. That changes occasionally, but Democracy never. Democrats never change, so I warn you that if they stand by their time-honored doctrines you will have 21 solid votes from Ohio against free wool. I was educated in the doctrine of protection to wool by the Democrats of Ohio, and for years we have been fighting the battle side by side. It has been a battle fast and furious, but whenever we have got into the heat of the contest the Democrats have generally got ahead of me in their ideas in favor of protection upon wool. [Laughter.] I can remember that when the Republican Congress in 1883 reduced the tariff on wool about 18 per cent every Democrat in Ohio rose up in wrath, and if ever there was any one man upon whom curses were poured out, not loud but deep, that man was Senator JOHN SHERMAN, whom some of our Ohio Democratic friends have been quoting here this morning. [Laughter.]

I can remember that the Ohio Democrats not only condemned Mr. SHERMAN, but damned him, because he had voted to reduce the duty on wool about 18 per cent. I can remember when, in the Democratic Legislature, a joint resolution was introduced demanding of our Senators and Representatives in Congress that they vote to restore the tariff of 1867 on wool, and I can remember that every mother's son of the Democrats in both houses of the Legislature voted in favor of that joint resolution; and I can remember, too, when the gentleman who preceded my friend from the Columbus district came to this Congress and introduced a bill to restore the old tariff on wool.

Mr. CRAIN. Did not JOHN SHERMAN vote for the reduction of the tariff of 1846 in the House of Representatives in 1857?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Oh, that is too far back. [Laughter.] I can remember, Mr. Chairman, when another Democrat, representing the district now represented by the free trader, Mr. HARTER, the rock-ribbed gentleman, Judge Geddes—peace to his ashes—came here and made haste to propose to restore the tariff on wool. I can remember another thing. When the Democratic convention of 1883 met, the first resolution they adopted was one condemning the reduction of the tariff on wool and demanding that the tariff of 1867 should be restored; and I remember that they came very near tearing down the house in which their convention was held with their thunders of applause when that resolution was adopted. [Laughter.]

Another thing, Mr. Chairman; the Democratic executive committee got out a circular, of which I have a copy in my hand, and I want to read you the title of it: "The reduction on wool. Republican tariff-tinkering costing the Ohio wool-growers $6,000,000."

Democrats never lie, you know; so that must be true. "Fleecing the flockmasters: How it was done and who did it."

That was the front page of their circular.

They issued their Democratic circular, and I want to read a little of it to show you that the Democrats in Ohio and the Republicans, while upon many things are "separate as drops," upon the wool question are "one as the sea." [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. What is the date of that?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Eighteen hundred and eighty-three.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. A long time ago.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I will come down to a later time.

I tell you that Democracy in Ohio never changes. That was Democracy in 1883. It is Democracy now; for you say you never change.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. But they have sent some free traders down here since that time.

Mr. NORTHWAY. But you have never had anything born in the Democratic party since the days of Jackson; you never refer to anything younger in Democracy than Jackson. The first thing you do when you come together in convention is to resolve that Democracy is changeless.

Now, I want to read a little further from this circular to show you that in Ohio we are all united. You may think you are going to get some of those Democratic gentlemen to vote with you; but you will not.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. I would like to have my time extended for about ten minutes.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Now, as to the number of sheep in Ohio and as to the price of wool there, let me refer to the remarks of my colleague [Mr. HARE] this morning. If I mistake not he told us that the protective policy had reduced the price of wool in the State of Ohio. Now, I would give more for Democratic declarations on this subject than I would for census reports, because the Democrats always tell the truth. Now, this circular gives some information on this point. It goes on to give the figures:

Another fact should be noted. With the growth of the industry competition has wonderfully increased, and at all times has been exceedingly active. But it has never operated to reduce prices—indeed, it has been an equalizer. The following is a statement of the average price of the "wool clip" in the Boston market in 1870, 1875 and 1886:

1870	46 cents
1875	43 cents
1886	46 cents

The price being, it will be observed, the same in 1886 as in 1870—sixteen years before.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I am reading what is sound doctrine in the State of Ohio.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. From whom does it come?

Mr. NORTHWAY. From the Democratic executive committee of the State of Ohio; it was published by them. They go on to say:

It is by no means a specious argument to assert that the influence of the reduction—

That is, the reduction of the tariff—

upon the value of the sheep and their product will be felt upon the value of the land. Every farmer knows that a flock of sheep is one of the best of fertilizers. It is a remarkable fact that sheep can subsist upon very poor land.

They proceed further:

The Democratic party—

Now mark—

as the facts show, has been steadily and earnestly opposed to the perpetration of this great wrong against the people.

That is, the reduction of 18 per cent on the tariff of 1867.

Their almost unanimous vote indicates that, as a political party, they are heartily in sympathy with the wool-producers' cause.

When did they change in the State of Ohio? Now comes their final appeal, which would draw tears from the eyes of the most hard-hearted man. It is a promise, a wonderful promise. They say:

Farmers of Ohio, can you trust the party that has, in our National Legislature, outraged and robbed you at the bidding of the capitalists of New England? Is there any hope for you from such a party, who have thus deliberately sacrificed your dearest and best interest? The party that created this great wrong can not be trusted to give you relief. The Democrats in Congress were your friends.

[Laughter.]

Great Scott! think of it.

They sought by every means in their power to prevent this wrong from being inflicted on you. Trust the Democratic party in this matter; it has promised to and will give you relief.

And the Wilson bill is the fulfillment of the promise.

With that circular the Democratic stump orators went before the people of the State of Ohio, and the Democrats beat the Republicans because they had voted to reduce the tariff on wool. They elected Judge Hoadley, of Cincinnati, as governor, and they elected a Democratic Legislature upon that question. When have you changed in the State of Ohio? Do you not see that I can pledge my friend over there [Mr. HOUK of Ohio] and others to stand by us on this question?

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. You can not pledge me.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I am sorry for that. As I understand it, Democracy in Ohio never changes. But I am learning something. When I came down here I supposed that we should stand shoulder to shoulder in favor of an industry which you say the Republicans undertook to injure in 1883; and lo and behold! you want to put the products of that industry on the free list.

Mr. SPRINGER. Did you understand before the election that we were to do it?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I understand that you are ready to do anything to destroy that industry if you can. And I want to tell you another thing. The promise that the Democrats of Ohio gave to the farmers in 1883 may be ignored now; but it will be fulfilled to the letter by the voters of this country, as you will learn a year from now.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to ask the gentleman what promises they made in 1892?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Well, whatever they were they are not worth anything. [Laughter.] They never change in Ohio. They are always the same, as far as promises are concerned. If

they made any different promises it makes no difference. How can you trust a party, Mr. Chairman, that is everlastingly changing? Look at what they did in 1884, and in 1888, when they resolved in favor of a tariff equal to the difference between the cost of the foreign and the American labor. In both their national platforms of those years this same policy was set forth. In 1884 they said that the custom-house duties have ever been, as they must continue to be, the chief source of revenue for the country, and now you introduce a bill that proposes to cut down the revenue arising from customs to the extent of a hundred millions of dollars. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Can the gentleman explain the difference between what he claims now was the Democratic policy in 1888 and that enunciated in 1892?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman might just as well ask me to explain any other mystery as to explain the mystery of Democracy. [Laughter.] It can not be explained. Read your own platform. There is no single section of it that you can explain.

They wire in and wire out,
Leaving a person still in doubt
Whether the snake that makes the track
Is going south or coming back.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, because I am backed up by the Democratic voters of Ohio. The tariff is about what it was in 1867, and all the Democrats in Ohio voted in favor of it in 1883. You ought not to find fault with me if I vote good Democratic doctrine here to-day. I can go home and be consistent when you can not. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HUNTER. What about 1892?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I ask the gentleman what about 1893? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And I will tell you another thing. Let me warn you—

Dinna ye hear the slogan?

Wait until next year. Why do not you ask the Democratic party of Ohio what about 1893, instead of 1892? I have heard that everything under heaven is attributed to the Democratic victory of 1892; scarcely anything but what was involved in that contest. If you can name anything from orthodoxy down to politics I would like to know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. How about the Hawaiian question?

Mr. NORTHWAY. No; I believe you had nothing to do with the foreign policy in your platform.

Mr. COGSWELL. They have a good deal to do with it now. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes; you are in favor of queens now.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan for another reason—because it is common sense. This will be doing just what we ought to do. I believe in protecting all the industries of this country if we can. The gentleman from Kansas says, "Suppose that of ten men engaged in some industry one is protected to the injury of the other nine. Does the fact that one is protected benefit the other nine?" That is what we want to do in this case. We want a nation so great that we can raise all the shoemakers, blacksmiths, carpenters, wool manufacturers, and cotton manufacturers, and all other kinds of manufacturers who can prosper in their respective callings. We want a nation containing woolen manufacturers to produce if need be all the woolen goods that we use in this country. Is there any objection to having such a nation? The gentlemen over here want us to send abroad to buy everything. I tell you one thing, a nation of buyers is a nation of paupers.

Gentlemen over here talk about England. Why do they not refer to Ireland? In 1800 England forced Ireland into union with England against the protests of Grattan, the greatest of Irish leaders, through the treachery of Pitt. To bring about such a result the Irish people were to return certain tariff duties upon foreign competing products until 1827, when the list of such duties was wiped out. Ireland had a population of eight millions of people in 1800, and between that date and 1848 we are told that near two millions of her brave people had died from poverty and starvation, while another two millions had found a home on other shores, most of them in America. And to-day, as a free-trade country, Ireland is poverty-stricken, while England is growing rich upon that poverty. Why do not our Democratic friends allude to Ireland when they wish to illustrate the beauties of free trade?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would not intrude in this debate again but for the fact that what I had to say on the 9th of this month has furnished occasion for a great deal of comment upon the opposite side of this Chamber, and I have been so misrepresented that I rise to correct certain declarations which have been made as to what I said.

I deny the correctness of the interpretations given of what I said by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] or my more immediate colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who this morning addressed you. I do not alter, nor qualify, nor retract one word of what I then said. It was a personal declaration of what I believed to be a true statement of affairs. It was not a party declaration, and I ask no man to share with me responsibility for what I believe to be the truth.

Mr. Chairman, I referred to a condition of affairs very grave and menacing in the Republic, not to the integrity of the Republic, but to the present comfort and well-being of many of its citizens. I believed, as I believe now, that the condition of affairs depicted was due very largely to the existence of a protective system. The course of reasoning by which I had reached that conclusion was simply upon the facts that had come within my knowledge. I will give a few of the facts, if the House will bear with me while I do so.

Within my recollection, half a century of time, I have seen the growth and development, if not the very foundation, of the great manufacturing systems of the Northeastern and the Northern States; and I know that in the early part of that growth every loom and spindle was occupied by a man of the country, and that the recruits who came to aid the workers of those days came slowly and in the pursuit of happiness, and because they believed that America was a country of liberty and of opportunity for mankind. There was no overcrowding, there were no strikes, there were no great labor disturbances, but as fast as one occupation filled itself full it gently and easily overflowed its surplus into others, and in that way the whole, under the American system of congenerated industries, was rising to a magnificence which was challenging the regard of the world, and above all furnishing comfort to the American people.

I know that a system of protective laws was created, and that immediately enormous taxation began to spread itself out over the country, and great fortunes began to be accumulated by the people who were the immediate beneficiaries of this system of protection. I know that the next step in that line, and a natural consequence, was that the laborers who were engaged under these manufacturers, and who felt that they were not receiving a full and adequate share of the profits that were being made by these manufacturing establishments, combining together, made trades unions and assemblies, which spread through all the industries of the country, in all the great centers. I know that after that they made their demands, their strikes began, their labor combinations were effective, and then came the shut-outs and then the great disturbances which have shaken down whole industries.

I know that after that, in order to meet and overcome these combinations, the managers of these protected industries shipped into this country great numbers of foreign workingmen, men who were brought here virtually under contract, at least substantially, with the promise that they would be given wages superior to what they were getting in other lands.

[The time of Mr. BLACK of Illinois having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended ten minutes.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I know furthermore that the consequence of that was that in those great centers in the Northeast, where American manufactures had their birth and from which they have spread throughout the length and breadth of this land seeking new fields of occupation, the men who were found at the loom and the anvil thirty, twenty-five, and twenty years ago have been exiled and driven away.

A MEMBER. Dead?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Not dead, but exiled from the land where they had their birth and their work, and I know that in their places to-day there are thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands who have come over under the circumstances and by the force of this system which I have described, so that to-day, in many of the great factories in New England, to my knowledge and the knowledge of many other gentlemen on this floor, there are great numbers of men just freshly arrived from over our borders, who have taken the places of those who formerly worked there, and taken those places at greatly reduced wages, men who have been brought there for the purpose of meeting the combinations of American workingmen and destroying them. Would you know what has become of the workingmen who have been shipped in to take the places of the former laborers? Some are at work at miserable wages, and many, very many, are to-day among the million who ask for bread and are fed by charity.

Now, then, I have never said, and I never will say, that I think the wages of the American citizen should be broken down. What I said was that I believed that it was the protective system which gave the power into the hands of men so to control industry as to compel foreign immigration to come in for the purpose of breaking labor down, and after breaking it down by

bringing immigration in, and the instant they got to the point where they succeeded in breaking down the workers' unions for protecting wages of American labor, they broke down the wages. I said that that was a system that I would remedy by law, if I could, with my vote; and if that is wrong, if that is impolitic, if it is un-American, I will stand by it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman said that we did not have any labor unions here, or any strikes, as I understood him, until we had this protective tariff. I would like to ask the gentleman at what date he fixes the period when labor organizations were first formed in this country?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I did not make that statement in the way in which you have made it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Dropping the remark I made, when did you say that labor organizations first commenced in this country?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I do not know the date at which the first labor organization was formed in this country; but I know that it has been in recent years.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Has it been since 1870?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. No, sir; it has not. It was some little time earlier than that.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Has it been since 1860?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I would prefer not to be further catechised by my colleague about the birth hour or the day of the first organization of labor. I know very little about the birth of the gentleman, but I know that he is a man of full vigor, that he is a handsome grown man, but when he was born I do not know——

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Thank you.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Neither do I know the precise time when labor first organized, but I know the general time.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Another question, if the gentleman will allow it. Does the gentleman pretend to say that there have been no strikes in this country until recent years?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Relatively, that is true. There were some strikes in Massachusetts a good many years ago in which Ben Butler took a part; but the number of those strikes were very small, and the influence was very much confined compared with later developments in that matter.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Does not the gentleman know, speaking relatively to the population, that fifty years ago there were as many strikes as there are at present.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. No, sir; and I do not think that that is true. I deny it.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] to ask his colleague from Illinois whether he makes the distinction between the former day strikes by the laborers, when they put themselves in a position that they could demand higher wages, with the later day strikes, when the laborers put themselves into positions to resist the pressure to force lower wages upon them?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman is wrong in his premises and wrong in his conclusions.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Then let me resume my argument.

Mr. Chairman, to-day, in this period of high protection, wages are less than was ever paid to American labor.

Mr. Chairman, I am in a great deal better temper than when my colleague [Mr. CANNON] closed his remarks. I am glad of it. I pass by all the bitterness that might have been evoked by his peculiar line of comment. I was not, when addressing this House, making a speech for the hustings, but trying to address myself to the reason of this committee.

I want to say a word before I take my seat in regard to the special subject under discussion, the wool schedule, and to describe things I have seen. I have seen the prairies of Illinois occupied by large flocks of sheep. That was at a time anterior to the golden age in the morning of which the gentleman from Aurora, well named, was born—an Auroral birth, let me say, in all respects. [Laughter and applause.] At that time the prairies of Illinois were for sale at $1.25 per acre, and there were thousands and hundreds of thousands of sheep ranging their surface. As men have come in there, by birth and by immigration, by hundreds of thousands, until 4,000,000 of people occupy the soil of that State, the land has risen to $50 and $100 an acre; during our long winters the sheep have to be folded and shedded and fed on high-priced hay and grain. Constant care has to be bestowed upon them. There is no longer room for profitable sheep-growing, and the consequence is—and what I say of Illinois in this respect is true in large degree of all the States of the Northwest—the consequence is that the number of sheep flocks is small and the number of sheep in each flock is small.

Now, go with me farther West and I will show you another picture. I happened to be in Utah one sunshiny day, down in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, when my eye was attracted by what seemed at a distance a movement of the surface of the earth itself. As it came nearer I saw passing before me a flock of from twenty to twenty-five thousand sheep. I could not estimate their number with accuracy; they are not half so easily counted as men, but they covered the whole ground as they went; and the number of men in attendance upon that great flock was about two, with two collie dogs. They feed on the mountain ranges; they pay scant hire for pasturage and little for shelter. There was where the men of the Northwest had crowded the sheep of Illinois and other Northwestern States to, and that is why the sheep-raising of the Northwest has ceased to be profitable and has been transferred to the West.

It follows, and this is the logic of all the petitions and memorials and applications filed here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], that if protection is to be extended to wool at all, it is to be extended either to the men in Nevada and Utah and the far West upon a basis that will make their sheep-raising profitable, or else to the men of the States of the Northwest on a basis which will make their flocks profitable. But if you put on a tariff that will enable the farmer of Ohio and of Indiana to raise wool profitably see what gigantic fortunes you will put within the reach of those engaged in sheep-raising in the far West!

And, gentlemen, whether you urge, as Republicans and protectionists, that in the framing of this schedule you would fix your tariff rate for the benefit of the flock masters of Indiana and Illinois, or that you would fix it for the benefit of the men of Utah and Nevada, in either event all the protection you give, all the bounty you give, will be derived from taxation upon the great body of the people of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Do you not know that if it is true, as you urge, that the threat of Democratic ascendency has brought down the price of sheep until sheep sell for less than before, that would be a boon to the poor, who need cheap food and cheap clothes?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly stated upon this floor by gentlemen on the other side of the House, with a great deal of assurance and with much gravity, that the high protective tariffs of 1867, of 1883, and of 1890 upon wool had resulted in reducing the price of wool in this country. And with equal assurance and equal gravity it has been stated by gentlemen upon that side that the protective tariff during all these years has had the effect of increasing the price of all fabrics manufactured from that wool.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave the gentlemen upon that side of the House to reconcile these two statements, simply asking them how, if the high duty upon wool has reduced its price, that fact is to be reconciled with their other statement that a high protective tariff upon woolen goods has increased the price of those goods? I say I will leave the gentlemen to extricate themselves from the incongruous and illogical position in which they are placed by their own conflicting statements.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my State are not very largely interested directly in the production of wool. It is an industry, however, that is to be found in every county of the one hundred and one counties that constitute that great State, and, as was well said by my colleague to-day, that industry is one which is largely in the hands of the smaller farmers of the State.

But, sir, the great agricultural people of Illinois are desirous of seeing the farmers of Ohio, of West Virginia, of Texas, of New Mexico, and of the other Western States and Territories flourish. We are not, however, devoid of all selfish interest in that matter, because we well know—the intelligent farmers of Illinois well understand—that if the raising of sheep in this country shall be destroyed and the flocks composing the 44,000,000 sheep now in the United States shall give way to the flocks of South America and Australia, the lands where sheep are now raised will be devoted to the raising of cattle and horses, in which the farmers of my State are largely interested. [Applause.] I say to the gentlemen on the other side that the farmers of my State are intelligent people, and their intelligence has taught them——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. I would like to have a little more time.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I ask that my colleague's time be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, the intelligent farmers of Illinois have learned that the salvation of the agricultural interests of this country depends upon the diversification of their industries. Hence they favor every form of legislation that will assist in the direction of such diversification. Hence we would so legislate as to stimulate and encourage sheep industry in the

country. We would so legislate as to stimulate and encourage the production of barley in this country, so that our people may have an American market for this great cereal, and not be compelled to share that market with the people who live in the country upon our northern border.

The wheat producers of Illinois have sufficient intelligence to know that if they are allowed to have the barley market of this country to the exclusion of the barley-raisers of Canada, thousands and tens of thousands of acres of land now devoted to the cultivation of wheat will be transferred to the cultivation of barley. And in that way, and in various other ways by which agricultural pursuits may be diversified, we hope to see the day in the near future when we shall not be compelled to accept 45 and 50 cents a bushel for our wheat.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a vast amount of sympathy poured out by gentlemen on the other side of this House upon the backs of the "poor, suffering farmer." [Laughter and applause.] I want to say to gentlemen on that side that the farmers of Illinois do not ask for your sympathy. When you have reported the Wilson bill here, claiming before the country that it is a revenue measure and that its purpose is to lighten the weight of taxation and to relieve the people from their present burdens while you place every agricultural product of this country substantially upon the free list, and levy a duty of 45 or 50 per cent upon the wearing apparel of the people, there is intelligence enough among the farmers of this country to know that you are a set of infernal frauds. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I say that upon my own personal responsibility—that this placing of the farmer's products substantially upon the free list, while making him pay 50 or 55 per cent on his coat, is a fraud.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. I should like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request as soon as order is restored in the committee.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be closed at half past 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment be closed at half past 3 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. BURROWS. Do I understand the proposition is that debate on this amendment be closed in fifteen minutes. [Cries of "Yes," "Yes."] May I inquire of the Chair how many names he has on his list of gentlemen desiring yet to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has about eight on one side and four on the other.

Mr. BURROWS. I think that the time proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia for closing this debate is too limited. I am perfectly willing that we shall reach a vote on this question to-day; but I ask the gentleman to allow the debate to run a little longer. There are several gentlemen on this side who desire to be heard.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The debate threatens to run the entire day, and there are other questions we would like to reach.

Mr. BURROWS. There are several gentlemen on this side who desire to be heard on this question; and it is a very important one, as the gentleman from West Virginia understands.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I appreciate its importance.

Mr. BURROWS. We will coöperate with the gentleman in procuring a vote upon the question to-day. I suggest that the vote be taken at 5 o'clock.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Say 4 o'clock. That will let in all the gentlemen whose names are down.

Mr. BURROWS. That will not accommodate all of those on this side who desire to speak.

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman from Michigan objects to the agreement proposed by the gentleman in charge of this bill I make the point of order that further debate is not in order——

The CHAIRMAN. There are only three gentlemen on the minority side who have not spoken and who have asked for time.

Mr. BURROWS. Is the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] on the list?

The CHAIRMAN. He has not asked for time.

Mr. BURROWS. He desires to be heard for ten or fifteen minutes. I think that if 5 o'clock be named everybody can be accommodated.

Mr. McRAE. I object to that. We have already had two days' debate on this amendment. If the gentleman from Michigan objects to the proposition of the gentleman from West Virginia, I make the point of order that further debate on the amendment is not in order—debate upon this amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate according to the rule has been exhausted.

Mr. McRAE. There are other amendments upon which the Committee of the Whole desire and should have an opportunity to vote. Two days on a single amendment, in debating which gentlemen have not confined themselves to the amendment, can not be regarded as unreasonable. I want to give notice that I will insist upon confining the debate to the proposition under consideration and the enforcement of the rules of debate from now on.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The gentleman from Michigan and myself can probably agree on an hour when the debate shall close and the vote be taken. Suppose we take one hour.

Mr. BURROWS. I propose half past 4.

Mr. McMILLIN. One hour is certainly time enough, considering the time that has been already taken on the debate.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can agree to close at 4:30. I suggest to the gentleman from West Virginia that we make it 4:30.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Well, we are only a quarter of an hour apart.

Mr. BURROWS. And that will give ample time for a vote to-night.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Very well, let us agree to take the vote at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request. Is there objection to closing the debate on the pending amendments at half past 4 o'clock?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless there be objection the Chair will divide the time equally between the two sides, and if there be no objection the Chair will recognize the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] to control one-half of the time, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] to control the other half.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will have to control the time himself.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Will the Chair indulge me a moment? What was the order made?

The CHAIRMAN. To close the debate on the pending amendment at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon, the remaining time to be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. It was also understood though, Mr. Chairman, that the proposition contemplated that a vote should then be taken, because while the debate may close on this amendment other amendments may be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands, and that was the understanding of the committee as the Chair believes, that the debate should close and a vote be taken at that hour.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then I withdraw the objection I made a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, if there be no objection the Chair will recognize the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] to control the time on the two sides.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The understanding is that the debate closes on the pending amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been already ordered. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] asks an extension of time for five minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Michigan can control the time now under the order of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BURROWS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, in the three minutes to which by the indulgence of the House I am entitled, I desire to say that this bill is entitled "A bill to raise revenue," and yet confessedly it creates a deficiency in the neighborhood of $75,000,000. To judge by the speeches that have been made by gentlemen on the other side of this House, it is a revenue bill drawn upon free-trade lines, and yet dotted all along its lines with protective features.

The Democratic speakers in my district everywhere said in the campaign that if they carried the country they would give the people free wool hats and put the tax on silk hats. Yet this bill that you are trying to ram through this Congress, and force upon the people of this country, puts a duty of 35 per cent upon the poor man's hat and I have been unable to find where you left any duty upon the plug hat. Seventy cents of every $2 that the poor man's hat—the farmer's hat—costs is a tax.

Mr. SIMPSON. But they put the ram on the free list. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]